

JOHN GRANGER COOK

Crucifixion in the
Mediterranean World

*Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament*

327

Mohr Siebeck

Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen
zum Neuen Testament

Herausgeber / Editor

Jörg Frey (Zürich)

Mitherausgeber / Associate Editors

Markus Bockmuehl (Oxford) · James A. Kelhoffer (Uppsala)

Tobias Nicklas (Regensburg) · J. Ross Wagner (Durham, NC)

327



John Granger Cook

Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World

2nd, extended edition

Mohr Siebeck

JOHN GRANGER COOK, born 1955; 1976 B.A. in Philosophy, Davidson College; 1979 M.Div., Union Theological Seminary (VA); 1985 Ph.D. at Emory University; Professor of Religion and Philosophy, LaGrange College, LaGrange, GA.
orcid.org/0000-0002-4874-6368

ISBN 978-3-16-156001-9 / eISBN 978-3-16-156256-3
DOI 10.1628/978-3-16-156256-3

ISSN 0512-1604 / eISSN 2568-7476 (Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament)

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

1st edition 2014

© 2019 Mohr Siebeck Tübingen, Germany. www.mohrsiebeck.com

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 and storage and processing in electronic systems.

The book was printed on non-aging paper and bound by Gulde Druck in Tübingen.

Printed in Germany.

לזכר נשמת חברי ענדרו משה מוסקוויץ
ניצול שואה

et

ELISABETH
FILIAE DILECTISSIMAE

Acknowledgements

After I wrote an article on the *lex Puteolana*, the Palatine graffito, and several other ancient pieces of evidence about Roman crucifixion, the late Professor Martin Hengel asked me to revise his small book on the topic. I soon reached the conclusion that it would be advisable to write my own monograph. Along the way many have offered their help and advice, and some have read parts of the manuscript. These include: Professors Paul Achtemeier (†), Jean-Jacques Aubert, Timothy D. Barnes, Roger Bagnall, Jerker and Karin Blomqvist, John Bodel, Daniel Botsman, Giuseppe Camodeca, David W. Chapman, Kathleen M. Coleman, Simon Corcoran, Werner Eck, James Hevia, Annewies van den Hoek, Carl R. Holladay, Erkki Koskenniemi, Thomas J. Kraus, Felicity Harley McGowan, Josh van Lieu, Antonio Lombatti, Gordon Newby, Vernon Robbins, Arthur Robinson, Filippo Canali De Rossi, Donald Schley, A. J. Boudewijn Sirks, Timothy Moore, and William R. Turpin. I owe a particular debt of gratitude to Professor Coleman for helping me sort out the semantics of *patibulum* and its relationship to *στραυρός* and for her unstinting willingness to help with a number of other issues. The same debt is due to Professor Sirks for critiquing my views on crucifixion and Roman law. I am, of course, responsible for my conclusions and any errors. Professor Aubert encouraged me to gather as much archaeological material as I could and to consider punishments related to crucifixion. The *lex Puteolana* and the Alkimilla graffito were fruits of that search (both were well known to a very narrow group of classical scholars). Professor Robinson, librarian and Latinist at my own institution, procured numerous obscure resources for me and answered many questions about Latin. Mr. Joseph E. Zias graciously provided me with information on various archaeological matters in ancient Palestine. Drs. Richard Goulet and Marie-Odile Goulet-Cazé (Paris) and Dr. Anne-Madeleine Goulet (Rome) answered a number of questions and sent material I found impossible to find in the USA. Several colleagues from diverse fields provided extremely helpful information about the physical effects of Roman impalement and some of the arguments I have used in the monograph. They include: Professors Terry Austin (physics), Melinda Pomeroy-Black (biology), Nickie Cauthen (biology), William Paschal (anatomy), and Senior Lecturer Ian Morton (philosophy). I was able to make an unforgettable visit to the *taberna* in Pozzuoli (the Alkimilla graffito), which I am convinced is one of the most

valuable pieces of visual evidence about Roman crucifixion that has survived from antiquity. On the same visit to Italy I was able to closely inspect the fresco from the Arieti tomb in the Centrale Montemartini (Capitoline Museums, Rome), which is valuable in its own right for its depiction of a man attached to a *patibulum*. With regard to the Alkimilla graffito, I am profoundly indebted to Professor Camodeca for his photographs and the time he spent informing me about the find in correspondence. My students constantly pose inspiring questions including one a theologically inclined New Testament scholar always needs to ask herself or himself: What is the value of this research for understanding the New Testament, and what is its value for the church? I am grateful to Provost David Garrison and President Dan McAlexander of my own institution, LaGrange College, for helping make this monograph possible. Most of all I am thankful for my wife Barbara Horton who supported my research into a very dark corner of human history.

For his guidance and acceptance of this manuscript into the *Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament I* series I thank Professor Jörg Frey. I also thank Dr. Henning Ziebritzki, the editor of theology at Mohr Siebeck, for his constant encouragement. Herr Matthias Spitzner of Mohr Siebeck graciously provided his expert help with the production of the book.

For permission to use images I thank the British Museum, the Berlin-Brandenburgische Akademie der Wissenschaften, the Mainz Römisch-Germanisches Zentralmuseum, the Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali – Soprintendenza Archeologica di Roma, the Roma Capitale Struttura di Linea Sovraintendenza Capitolina, the Ministero per i Beni e le Attività Culturali Soprintendenza Speciale per i Beni Archeologici di Napoli e Pompei, the Österreichische Nationalbibliothek Bildarchiv und Grafiksammlung, The University of California, Berkeley (C. V. Starr East Asian Library), the University of Nagasaki Library, the Bridgeman Art Library International, Professor Camodeca, Professor van den Hoek, Mr. Zias, and Professor Lombatti.

I thank Walter de Gruyter for permission to reuse the material from two articles: “Crucifixion in the West: From Constantine to Recceswinth,” *ZAC* 16 (2012) 226-246 and “Roman Crucifixions. From the Second Punic War to Constantine,” *ZNW* (2013) 1-32.

I thank Mohr Siebeck for permission to reuse material from: “John 19:17 and the Man on the *Patibulum* in the Arieti Tomb,” *Early Christianity* 4 (2013) 427-453.

Reprinted by permission of the publishers and the Trustees of the Loeb Classical Library from Harvard University Press:

CICERO: VOLUME VIII, THE VERRINE ORATIONS II, Loeb Classical Library Volume 293, edited/translated by L. H. G. Greenwood, pp. 9, 69, 113, 309, 31, 481, 483, 485, 645, 647, 649, 641, 653, 655, 657, Cambridge,

Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1928-1935. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Other excerpts are reprinted from:

AMMIANUS MARCELLINUS, ROMAN HISTORY, vol. 1-3, Loeb Classical Library Volume 300, 315, 331, edited/translated by J. C. Rolfe, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1935-1939. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

APULEIUS, THE GOLDEN ASS, Loeb Classical Library Volume 44, edited/translated by W. Adlington and W. Gaselee, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1924. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CASSIUS DIO, ROMAN HISTORY, VOL. 1-9, Loeb Classical Library Volume 32, 37, 53, 66, 82-3, 175-177, edited/translated by E. Cary, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1914-27. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CATO, ON AGRICULTURE, Loeb Classical Library Volume 283, edited/translated by W. D. Hooper and H. B. Ash, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1934. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CICERO: VOLUME V, BRUTUS. ORATOR, Loeb Classical Library Volume 342, edited/translated by H. M. Hubbell, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1939. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CICERO: VOLUME VII, THE VERRINE ORATIONS I, Loeb Classical Library Volume 221, edited/translated by L. H. G. Greenwood, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1928. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CICERO: VOLUME IX, PRO LEGE MANILIA ..., Loeb Classical Library Volume 198, edited/translated by H. G. Hodge, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1927. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CICERO: VOLUME XIV, PRO MILONE ..., Loeb Classical Library Volume 252, edited/translated by N. H. Watts, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1931. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

CICERO: VOLUME XVI, DE REPUBLICA. DE LEGIBUS, Loeb Classical Library Volume 213, edited/translated by C. W. Keyes, Cambridge, Mass.:

- Harvard University Press, © 1928. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- Cicero: VOLUME XVIII, TUSCULAN DISPUTATIONS, Loeb Classical Library Volume 141, edited/translated by J. E. King, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1927. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- CICERO: VOLUME XIX, DE NATURA DEORUM. ACADEMICA, Loeb Classical Library Volume 268, edited/translated by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1933. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- CICERO: VOLUMES XXII.-XXIV, XXIX, LETTERS TO ATTICUS, vol. 1-4, Loeb Classical Library Volume 7-8, 97, 491, edited/translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1999. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- CICERO: VOLUME XXVIII, LETTERS TO QUINTUS AND BRUTUS ... Loeb Classical Library Volume 462, edited/translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 2002. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- LUCIUS JUNIUS MOERATUS COLUMELLA, ON AGRICULTURE, vol. 3, Loeb Classical Library Volume 408, edited/translated by E. S. Forster and E. H. Heffner, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1955. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- DEMOSTHENES, ORATIONS, vol. III, Loeb Classical Library Volume 299, edited/translated by J. H. Vince et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1935. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- DIO CHRYSOSTOM, DISCOURSES, vol. 1-5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 257, 339, 358, 376, 385, edited/translated by J. W. Cohoon and H. L. Crosby, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1932-51. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- DIODORUS SICULUS, LIBRARY OF HISTORY, vol. 1-12, Loeb Classical Library Volume 279, 303, 340, 375, 384, 399, 389, 422, 377, 390, 409, 423, edited/translated by C. H. Oldfather et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1933-1967. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- DIOGENES LAERTIUS, LIVES OF THE EMINENT PHILOSOPHERS, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 184-5, edited/translated by R. D.

- Hicks, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1925. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- DIONYSIUS HALICARNASSUS, THE ROMAN ANTIQUITIES, vol. 1-7, Loeb Classical Library Volume 319, 347, 357, 364, 372, 378, 388, 465-6, edited/translated by E. Cary, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1937-1950. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- EPICTETUS, THE DISCOURSES AS REPORTED BY ARRIAN, THE MANUAL, AND FRAGMENTS, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 131, 218, edited/translated by W. A. Oldfather, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1925-8. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- EUSEBIUS, ECCLESIASTICAL HISTORY, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 153, 265, edited/translated by K. Lake et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1926-32. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- FLORUS, THE EPITOME OF ROMAN HISTORY, Loeb Classical Library Volume 231, edited/translated by E. S. Forster, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1929. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- FRONTINUS, THE STRATAGEMS, Loeb Classical Library Volume 174, edited/translated by C. E. Bennett, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1925. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- HERODOTUS, PERSIAN WARS, vol. 1-4, Loeb Classical Library Volume 117-20, edited/translated by A. D. Godley, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1921-4.
- HISTORIA AUGUSTA, vol. 1-3, Loeb Classical Library Volume 139, 140, 263, edited/translated by D. Magie, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1921-1932. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- HORACE, ODES AND EPODES, Loeb Classical Library Volume 33, edited/translated by N. Rudd, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 2004. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- HORACE, SATIRES, EPISTLES, ART OF POETRY, Loeb Classical Library Volume 194, edited/translated by H. R. Fairclough, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1929. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- JOSEPHUS, vol. 1-13, Loeb Classical Library Volume 186, 203, 487, 210, 242, 490, 281, 326, 365, 489, 410, 433, 456, edited/translated by H. St. J.

- Thackeray et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1926-1965. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- LIBANIUS, *SELECTED ORATIONS*, vol. 1, Loeb Classical Library Volume 451, edited/translated by A. F. Norman, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1987. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- LIVY, *HISTORY OF ROME*, vol. 1-14, Loeb Classical Library Volume 114, 133, 172, 191, 233, 355, 367, 381, 295, 301, 313, 332, 396, 404, edited/translated by B. O. Foster et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1919-1959. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- LUCAN, *CIVIL WAR (PHARSALIA)*, Loeb Classical Library Volume 220, edited/translated by J. D. Duff, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1928. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- LUCIAN, vol. 1-8, Loeb Classical Library Volume 14, 54, 130, 162, 302, 430, 431, 432, edited/translated by A. M. Harmon et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1913-67. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- MACROBIUS, *SATURNALIA*, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 510-11, edited/translated by R. A. Kaster, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 2011. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PETRONIUS, *SATYRICON*, Loeb Classical Library Volume 15, edited/translated by M. Heseltine, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1925. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PHILO, vol. 1-10, Loeb Classical Library Volume 226, 227, 247, 261, 275, 289, 320, 341, 363, 379, edited/translated by F. H. Colson ed al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1929-62. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PLATO, *REPUBLIC*, vol. 5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 237, edited/translated by P. Shorey et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1914-35. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PLAUTUS, vol. 1-5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 60, 61, 163, 260, 328, edited/translated by P. Nixon, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1916-38. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

- PLAUTUS, vol. 1-5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 60, 61, 163, 260, 328, edited/translated by W. de Melo, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 2011-3. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PLINY, NATURAL HISTORY, vol. 4-5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 370-71, edited/translated by H. Rackham, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1945-50. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PLINY, LETTERS AND PANEGYRICUS IN TWO VOLUMES, Loeb Classical Library Volume 55, 59, edited/translated by B. Radice, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1975. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PLUTARCH, PARALLEL LIVES, vol. 1-11, Loeb Classical Library Volume 46, 47, 65, 80, 87, 98-103, edited/translated by B. Perrin, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1914-26. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PLUTARCH, MORALIA, vol. 1-15, Loeb Classical Library Volume 197, 222, 245, 305, 306, 337, 405, 424, 425, 321, 426, 406, 427, 470, 428, 429, edited/translated by F. C. Babbitt et al, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1927-69. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- POLYBIUS, THE HISTORIES, vol. 1-6, Loeb Classical Library Volume 128, 137-8, 159-161, edited/translated by W. R. Paton, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1922-27. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PROCOPIUS, HISTORY OF THE WARS, vol. 1-5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 48, 81, 107, 173, 217, edited/translated by H. B. Dewing, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1914-28. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- PTOLEMY, TETRABIBLOS, Loeb Classical Library Volume 435, edited/translated by F. E. Robbins, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1940. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- [QUINTILIAN], THE LESSER DECLAMATIONS, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 500-1, edited/translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 2006. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- SENECA THE ELDER, DECLAMATIONS, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 463-430, edited/translated by M. Winterbottom, Cambridge,

- Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1974. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- SENECA, AD LUCILIUM EPISTULAE MORALES, vol. 1-3, Loeb Classical Library Volume 75-7, edited/translated by R. M. Gummere, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1917-25. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- SENECA, MORAL ESSAYS, vol. 1-3, Loeb Classical Library Volume 214, 254, 310, edited/translated by J. W. Basore, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1928-35. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- SILIUS ITALICUS, PUNICA, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 277-8, edited/translated by J. D. Duff, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1927. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- STATIUS, SILVAE, Loeb Classical Library Volume 206, edited/translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 2003. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- STRABO, GEOGRAPHY, vol. 6, Loeb Classical Library Volume 223, edited/translated by H. L. Jones and J. R. S. Sterrett, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1917-32. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- SUETONIUS, LIVES OF THE CAESARS, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 31, 38, edited/translated by J. C. Rolfe, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1914, revised 1997. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- TACITUS, AGRICOLA. GERMANIA, HISTORIES, ANNALS, vol. 1-5, Loeb Classical Library Volume 35, 111, 249, 312, 322, edited/translated by M. Hutton et al., Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1914-37, rev. 1970. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- TERENCE, THE WOMAN OF ANDROS ..., vol. 1, Loeb Classical Library Volume 22, edited/translated by J. Sargeant, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1912. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.
- TERTULLIAN, APOLOGY AND DE SPECTACULIS. MINUCIUS FELIX, OCTAVIUS, Loeb Classical Library Volume 250, edited/translated by T. R. Glover and G. H. Rendall, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1931. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

VELLEIUS PATERCULUS, COMPENDIUM OF ROMAN HISTORY.

RES GESTAE DIVI AUGUSTI, Loeb Classical Library Volume 152, edited/translated by F. W. Shipley, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1924. Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

VIRGIL, ECLOGUES, GEORGIS, AENEID, vol. 1-2, Loeb Classical Library Volume 63-4, edited/translated by H. R. Fairclough and G. P. Goold, Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, © 1999-2000 (1st ed. of Fairclough 1919). Loeb Classical Library ® is a registered trademark of the President and Fellows of Harvard College.

Reprinted by Permission of the University of Pennsylvania Press:

The Digest of Justinian, vol. 1-4, translation edited by A. Watson, Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press 1985.

Reprinted by Permission of the University of California Press:

Collected Ancient Greek Novels, edited by B. P. Reardon, Berkeley, CA et al: University of California Press 1989.

Preface to the Second Edition

The preface, in which I engage some of my reviewers, an additional image requested by a reviewer (10 bis), and an *addendum* after the original conclusion of the first edition (2014) comprise the changes for the second edition of *Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World*. The *addendum* includes some textual material and some comments on archaeological data with possible relevance to ancient crucifixion. I have corrected some typographical errors noted by reviewers.

My book appeared after David Chapman's first-rate analysis of perceptions of crucifixion in ancient Judaism and after Gunnar Samuelsson's impressive frontal assault on the understanding of Roman crucifixion contained in the lexica, commentaries, and scholarly works of various sorts on crucifixion and on the passion of Jesus.¹ Together with the monograph also published in 2014 by David Chapman and Eckhard Schnabel on texts relevant to the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, all four volumes provide the interested reader with more material on crucifixion than she or he could ever want.²

A number of individuals have been kind enough to review the first edition of my book.³ By far the most critical of these reviews is that of my colleague

¹ D. W. Chapman, *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*, WUNT 2/244, Tübingen 2008, G. Samuelsson, *Crucifixion in Antiquity. An Inquiry into the Background of the New Testament Terminology of Crucifixion*, WUNT 2/310, Tübingen 2013.

² David W. Chapman, and Eckhard J. Schnabel. *The Trial and Crucifixion of Jesus. Texts and Commentary*, WUNT 344, Tübingen 2015. Cf. J. G. Cook, rev. of Chapman and Schnabel, *JTS* 68 (2017) 290–293.

³ J. West, *Zwinglius Redivivus* 2014/10/03, <<http://zwingliusredivivus.wordpress.com/2014/10/03/crucifixion-in-the-mediterranean-world/>>, K. Brown, *Diglotting* 2014/08/27 <<https://diglot.wordpress.com/2014/08/27/book-review-crucifixion-in-the-mediterranean-world/>>, D. Senior, *TBT* 52 (2014) 375–6, B. Paschke, *Soteria* 31 (2014) 45–6, *NTA* 58/3 (2014) 620–1, V. Fàbrega, *Actualidad Bibliográfica* (2014) 162–164, S. Schreiber, *BZ* 59 (2015) 147–9, C. L. Quarles, *RBL* 04 (2015) <<https://www.bookreviews.org/bookdetail.asp?TitleId=9807>>, A. O'Leary, *JSNT* 37/5 (2015) 7–8, A. Standhartinger, *TRev* 111 (2015) 119–21, G. Ghiberti, *Archivio Teologico Torinese* 21 (2015) 157–60, Z. J. Kapera, *The Polish Journal of Biblical Research* 14 (2015) 223–7, M. Matter, *RHPR* 95 (2015) 476–8, R. Vicent, *Salesianum* (2015) 77 (3) 570–1, G. Samuelsson, *TLZ* 141 (2016) 329–31, M. Gourgues, *RB* 123 (2016a) 292–7, M. Gourgues, *ScEs* 68 (2016b) 425–9, J. N. Carleton Paget, *JEH* 67 (2016) 849–51, A. Heindl, *SNTSU* 41 (2016) 208–11, J. Botticelli, *The Christian Librarian* 59 (2016) 280–1, David Chapman, *BBR* 26 (2016) 590–2, J. H. Dee, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 2017.01.19,

and friend Gunnar Samuelsson. His is the only review (out of twenty-six reviews and abstracts known to me) that seeks to “considerably weaken the basic argumentation of the book.”⁴ This is only fair, since I subjected the radically skeptical methodology he adopted in his own monograph on crucifixion to protracted criticism in the *Review of Biblical Literature*.⁵ In general I do not think it profitable for scholars to argue back and forth with one other in the journals (or in monographs) in endless interchanges, and after examining the pages below, the readers of this Preface may well agree. The guild of scholars of early Christianity and the guilds of classical philologists and historians will ultimately have to make the decision between the methodologies adopted by Samuelsson and myself. What follows may be taken as a sort of *Apologia pro libro suo*.

The key issue can be summarized in one sentence: examinations of crucifixion in Roman antiquity should begin with the evidence in Latin texts, *or* they should begin with the evidence in Greek texts. Samuelsson, after noting this issue, then attempts to clarify my own “methodological” position by quoting two sentences from the book and then revealing the presuppositions in the second statement: The first, with the words Samuelsson does not quote in brackets, is: “[Against Samuelsson, however,] when the context of an account of suspension does not indicate any other mode of execution (including impalement) besides crucifixion, then it is fair to assume that crucifixion is the mode of death, given the linguistic usage in texts of the Roman era.”⁶ This sentence followed the description of four markers of crucifixion that Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn posited: “suspension,” “completed or intended execution,” “with or without a crossbeam,” and “an extended death struggle.”⁷ Samuelsson notes four assumptions that he finds in my monograph⁸:

A) The setting in which crucifixion first was widely used and became famous was the ancient Roman world. Latin became both the definer of, and the vehicle for, the notoriety of crucifixion. B) It is possible to determine the meaning of certain words and tie them di-

<http://bmc.brynmawr.edu/2017/2017-01-19.html>, D. Tombs, *The Bible and Critical Theory* 13 (2017) 103–7, S. Asikainen, *Teologinen Aikakauskirja* 122 (2017) 188–189, W. Carter, *Interpretation* 71 (2017) 338–9, T. Witulski, *HZ* 305 (2017) 496–7, H. Schwier, *JLH* 56 (2017) 86–7.

⁴ Samuelsson, rev. of Cook, 331.

⁵ J. G. Cook, review of G. Samuelsson, *Crucifixion in Antiquity. An Inquiry into the Background and Significance of the New Testament Terminology of Crucifixion*, WUNT 2/310, Tübingen 2013 in: *RBL* (04/2014) http://www.bookreviews.org/pdf/9718_10735.pdf.

⁶ Samuelsson, rev. of Cook, 330, with ref. to Cook, *Crucifixion*, 2. For the second statement, cf. objection four below.

⁷ H.-W. Kuhn, *Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit. Ihre Wirklichkeit und Wertung in der Umwelt des Urchristentums*, ANRW II/25.1 (1982) 648–793, esp. 679. Cf. Cook, *Crucifixion*, 2.

⁸ Samuelsson, rev. of Cook, 330.

rectly to crucifixion. The occurrence of one⁹ such defined word is sufficient to label the text as a crucifixion account. C) Impaling did not occur or at least was very rare, which leads to the conclusion that texts containing assumed crucifixion terminology depict crucifixion. D) Impaling was a swift killer. If a victim is alive while suspended, e.g., is talking or expressing agony, it is a crucifixion at hand.

In general, these are fairly accurate, although “C” needs a bit of modification. Crucifixion terminology “probably” indicates a crucifixion unless there is explicit mention of an impalement (as in the texts of Seneca in which he uses *stipes*).¹⁰

Before responding to Samuelsson’s critique in detail, it may be useful to look at the global argument he formulates in his review. The British empiricists often appealed to what has come to be identified as the “argument from illusion,” in which one sought to replace language about objects (or the “external world”) with language about immediate and incorrigible “sense data” by appealing to certain illusions of perception. The sceptic concludes that “variation in our perceptual experience undermines all claims to know the world based on sense experience. Doubt about some contaminates all.”¹¹ Samuelsson uses a very similar argumentative structure: if one can create a small doubt with regard to the meaning of the vocabulary in a given Roman text that is normally thought to refer to a crucifixion of some variety (vertical pole, pole with horizontal cross bar or *patibulum*, tree, etc.), then one can no longer describe a text as referring to Roman crucifixion. To know that a text refers to crucifixion, all four markers must be explicitly present. In his monograph Samuelsson sought to create doubt by hypothesizing that impalement or even hanging¹² could be envisioned by the author in question. The doubt then results in a step back from crucifixion language on the part of the scholar to indeterminate “suspension language,” just as the empiricists tried to convince their readers to cease speaking about “objects” and commence using the language of “sense data.” A. J. Ayer pointed out, after a discussion of sceptics who question the justification for believing in the existence of physical ob-

⁹ This is a misunderstanding of linguistic methodology on Samuelsson’s part. A word such as *crux* in one particular text (*parole* in Ferdinand de Saussure’s terminology) gets its meaning from its usage in the entire Latin language (*langue*) where polysemy (multiple meanings) is possible. Cf. K. Baldinger, *Semantic Theory. Towards a Modern Semantics*, Oxford 1980, 15 and F. de Saussure, *Cours de linguistique générale*, Paris 1916, 32–40.

¹⁰ Cook, *Crucifixion*, 3 (and references there).

¹¹ I owe this formulation to Ian Morton (communication of 20 July 2018). Cf. A. J. Ayer, *The Problem of Knowledge*, Baltimore, MD 1956, 85–95, L.-G. Nilsson, *Perspectives on Memory Research. Essays in Honor of Uppsala University’s 500th Anniversary*, Hillsdale, N.J. 1979, 180–2, G. Dicker, *Perceptual Knowledge. An Analytical and Historical Study*, Dordrecht 1980, 26, and J. Troyer, In *Defense of Radical Empiricism, Essays and Lectures* by Roderick Firth, Oxford 1998, 193–203 (“Austin and the Argument from Illusion”).

¹² Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*, 28–9, 149, 175, 197 and cp. Cook, rev. of Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*.

jects, other minds, and the past that “... if there cannot be a proof, it is not sensible to demand one. The sceptic’s problems are insoluble because they are fictitious.”¹³ Similarly, Samuelsson is demanding that only what is “incorrigible” (that is, no errors possible) is acceptable – much like the sceptic responsible for an argument from illusion with regard to perception. And even the four markers for a crucifixion are not ultimately “incorrigible,” since even if all are present in an account, one can still doubt if a crucifixion ultimately took place (and not an accidental death due to other factors such as being burned to death, being killed by a sword, or being killed by a wild animal).

There is no evidence that the Romans ever practiced hanging on the gallows, so that is a red herring.¹⁴ In addition, the only two texts that explicitly specify that the Romans practiced impalement are in Seneca, and he is careful to use the word *stipes* to refer to the object used for impaling a victim.¹⁵ The only other explicit references to impalement in Greco-Roman texts, of which I am aware, refer to practices of non-Roman peoples.¹⁶ Consequently, Samuelsson’s continued insistence that *crux* can refer to impalement when there is no explicit indication in the text is just another red herring that can be dismissed with a high degree of confidence. It is part of his “argument from illusion” (just like the suspicion that *crux* and other terms associated with crucifixion might refer to hanging at certain points). The fact that Justus Lipsius¹⁷ in his *De cruce* shows a victim impaled vertically (*per obscena* [through the genitals or rectum]) throughout his body “alive and kicking” is, *pace* Samuelsson, of no evidential value whatsoever.¹⁸ Far more important is the judgement of modern biologists that such a practice would result in immediate death due to the volume of blood lost.¹⁹ There are no other known forms of impaling in ancient Rome. Seneca’s reference to Maecenas’s wish to sit on the sharp cross (*hanc mihi vel acuta / si sedeam cruce sustine*) is almost certainly not a reference to impalement since (as noted below in the monograph), Seneca envi-

¹³ Ayer, *The Problem of Knowledge*, 81. I thank Ian Morton for noting this text for me (21 July 2018).

¹⁴ Cook, *Crucifixion*, 3–4. Suicide was another matter, of course.

¹⁵ Cf. Cook, *Crucifixion*, 2, 3, 26, 35, 71, 96–8.

¹⁶ See the references in Cook, *Crucifixion*, 256–7, 304–6. In his review (331), S. refers to LSJ’s entry on ῥάχης (“spine, backbone”) and Hesychius Lexicon Σ § 1072 σκόλοψιν ὡς ὀπτῶσιν (cf. Cook, *ibid.*, 304) to show that impaling in Roman practice could be survived. This is erroneous, however, because the Greek authors refer to a punishment that was never used historically in Greece (for refs., see Cook, *ibid.*, 304–5 and the comments of M. Halm-Tisserant, *Réalités et imaginaires des supplices en Grèce ancienne*, CEA 125, Paris 1998, 13–5, 26, 162).

¹⁷ J. Lipsius, *De cruce libri tres: Ad sacram profānamque historiam utiles; Unā cum notis*, Antwerp 1593/1594, 23 (Leiden 1595).

¹⁸ Samuelsson, rev. of Cook, 331.

¹⁹ Cf. Cook, *Crucifixion*, 3.

sions Maecenas suspended from a horizontal *patibulum*.²⁰ It is also probably not a reference to a *sedile* (seat) that pierces the male victim's perineum (or rectum), because that also would cause nearly immediate death due to the volume of blood loss.²¹ The occasional use of *sedilia* in Roman crucifixions is, however, perhaps confirmed by the graffito of Puteoli (figures five and six) in which Alkimilla appears to straddle a small peg, part of the "painful" or "sharp" cross.²²

Samuelsson's main comments and objections follow:

1. "C. outlines the meaning of *patibulum* as 'crossbeam' ... C. argues that *σταυρός* outside the New Testament clearly signifies a cruciform shape, thus 'cross' while *σταυρός* within the Gospels means 'crossbeam' *patibulum*."²³

Response: These are oversimplifications of my views. For details, interested readers should consult the introduction. *Patibulum* usually does mean "crossbeam," but there is also a *pars pro toto* ("part for the whole") usage in which it stands for the T-shaped cross (or something similar). And while *σταυρός* (*stauros*) can often mean a T-shaped object (or something similar), it also can certainly stand for vertical pole, or in some cases (as in John 19:17), it is the translation (by synecdoche) adopted by the Gospel authors for *patibulum*, "crossbeam."

2. "The book lacks at large a methodological positioning."

Response. The introduction provides forty-seven pages of close linguistic evaluation of the terms usually taken to refer to crucifixions or related punishments. That research is the fruit of a number of years of careful reading of the Greek and Latin texts that use what has been traditionally taken to be crucifixion language. Methodologically, if the results are correct, then texts which use those terms do actually refer to crucifixions and not simply im-

²⁰ Cook, Crucifixion, 101.

²¹ Such a move is not available to Samuelsson who claims (Crucifixion, 5) "neither Lipsius nor the ancient authors mention any *sedile* in this sense [i.e., in the middle of the cross]"; cp. 191 ("the origin of the label *sedile* in the sense of a sitting device on a suspension tool is unknown to the present author"), 288, 290, 292–4, 295 ("When it comes to the commonly mentioned wooden seat (*sedile*) there is not one single text that tells of any such thing ... The closest is the mention of a pointed *crux* by Seneca the Elder [*sic*] (Sen. *Epist.* 101.10–11), but to interpret this as a support for a *sedile* is difficult"). The first extant use of the term is Tert. Nat. 1.12.4 (cf. Cook, Crucifixion, 7, 35–6 [see Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian on the seat included on some Roman crosses, which they would have observed, since crucifixion was still practiced in II–III C.E.], 101).

²² Cf. Cook, Crucifixion, 101, 427. Felicity Harley-McGowan is cautious: "Something like this may be inferred in the depiction of the lines between the legs of the crucified victim in the Puteoli graffito, but there is not enough clarity to sustain the idea with any certainty" (The Alexamenos Graffito, in: *The Reception of Jesus in the First Three Centuries*, ed. C. Keith, H. Bond, and J. Schröter, Bloomsbury T & T Clark, forthcoming).

²³ Samuelsson, rev. of Cook, 330. I will discontinue footnotes to his review at this point, since it is only two full columns long in the *TLZ*.

palements or hanging or the other red herrings that Samuelsson used to create uncertainty in scholars' (and lexicographers') minds using his "argument from illusion." I started, for example, with the standard "hypotheses" about the meaning of *crux* (such as the lemmas in the ThLL and the OLD s.v. *crux*), proceeded to textual analyses, which were the "tests," found no evidence inconsistent with the hypotheses, and then wrote the material in the introduction about *crux*.²⁴

3. "... assumptions C and D are to some extent contradictions."

Response. This is incorrect from the perspective of elementary logic, in which two propositions contradict each other only if they are in the form of "p" and "not-p," or if together they imply "p" and "not-p." Two propositions either contradict each other or do not, not to "some extent."²⁵ Samuelsson fails to show that C and D contradict each other. The apparent rarity of impalement in the Roman republic and imperium according to the extant evidence is a historical fact (if correct), however easily one might impale a human being vertically on a sharpened stake.

4. The next objection is:

A weightier example [than the alleged contradiction in "3"] is found in the introduction where a characteristic sentence illuminates two potential weaknesses with C.'s book: 'In historical research one often has to settle for evidence that is less than impeccable, and since crucifixion belonged to Roman daily life authors of that period did not need to spell out the details for their audiences – details which could be taken for granted' (49). First, evidence which is not impeccable is not evidence.²⁶ It is rather an *indicum* or *circumstantial* [S.'s italics] evidence.

Response. Samuelsson's term "circumstantial evidence" is a strange use of the concept, at least in current English usage, where it refers to a prosecutor's (or detective's) lack of eye-witnesses to a crime.²⁷ *Indicum* is a term from the ancient rhetoricians. Quintilian, for example, uses the word in what is presumably its characteristic sense:

The Latin equivalent of the Greek σημεῖον is *signum*, a sign, though some have called it *indicum*, an indication, or *vestigium*, a trace. Such signs or indications enable us to infer that something else has happened; blood for instance may lead us to infer that a murder has taken place. But bloodstains on a garment may be the result of the slaying of a victim

²⁴ O. Hey, *crux*, Thesaurus Linguae Latinae [ThLL], vol. I –, Leipzig/Berlin 1900 –, IV.1255.7–1260.26. "OLD" is P. G. W. Glare, ed., Oxford Latin Dictionary, Oxford 1982.

²⁵ Cf., e.g., B. Garrett, *Elementary Logic*, New York 2012, 17–8.

²⁶ This is actually an example of a logical contradiction, and S. created it.

²⁷ Cf., e.g., S. H. James, J. J. Nordby, and S. Bell, *Forensic Science. An Introduction to Scientific and Investigative Techniques*, Boca Raton, FL 2014, 28 ("It is important to understand that forensic evidence is circumstantial evidence" [e.g., DNA, etc.]), 566 ("Evidence requiring the trier of fact to infer certain events – for example, linking a defendant to a crime scene (and ultimately to the crime) via DNA, hair, fiber, glass, footprint, fingerprint, or ballistics evidence").

at a sacrifice or of bleeding at the nose. Everyone who has a bloodstain on his clothes is not necessarily a murderer.

*Signum vocatur, ut dixi, σημεῖον (quamquam id quidam indicium, quidam vestigium nominaverunt), per quod alia res intellegitur, ut per sanguinem caedes. At sanguis vel ex hostia respersisse vestem potest vel e naribus profluxisse: non utique, qui vestem cruentam habuerit, homicidium fecerit.*²⁸

Kuhn's four markers that both Samuelsson and I have accepted are, however, *indicia* by Quintilian's definition. The historian can never escape the use of what a modern individual might call "forensic evidence." Even if an author, such as Plautus, lists all four markers in a text, one can imagine (i.e., it is logically possible) that a bear in the arena escaped its handlers and came along and ripped the throat out of the "intended victim of crucifixion."²⁹

The (in my view) questionable historical methodology inherent in Samuelsson's demand that all four markers be present for a scholar to describe a given text as a crucifixion may be illustrated by a text of Plautus's *The Ghost*, where a slave named Tranio is looking for someone who will agree to be executed in his place:

Who could bear to be tortured instead of me today? ... I'll give a talent to the chap who first makes a sally onto the cross [*crux*]; but on this condition: that his feet and arms are nailed down [or "attached"] double.

*Qui hodie sese excruciari meam ui<cem> possit pati? ... Ego dabo ei talentum primus qui in crucem excucurrerit; / sed ea lege, ut offigantur bis pedes, bis brachia.*³⁰

Samuelsson claims, in his treatment of the passage:

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 of 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.³¹

One need not wonder just what the skeptical Samuelsson would need for Plautus to say for him to willingly label Tranio's demand as a "demand to be crucified in my place" – Plautus would have to include all four markers, or he (via one of the *dramatis personae*) would need to say in an aside, "this is a

²⁸ Quint. 5.9.9, trans. of Quintilian, *Institutio oratoria*, ed. and trans. H. E. Butler, vol. 2, LCL, Cambridge, MA 1921, 199. Cp. H. Lausberg, *Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft*, Stuttgart ³1990, § 358.

²⁹ Cf. the mime "Laureolus" below (200–1).

³⁰ Plaut. *Most.* 355, 359–60. Trans. of Plautus, 5 vols., LCL, ed. and trans. W. de Melo, Cambridge, MA 2011–3, 3.351. Cf. pp. 49–50, 56 below.

³¹ Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*, 173.

crucifixion in the traditional sense.”³² Romans knew that slaves were often crucified. The overwhelming evidence may be found in the volume that follows.³³ One can, with Descartes, probably doubt anything except the existence of himself or herself as a thinking being,³⁴ and Hume even doubted the existence of a substantial self.³⁵ Samuelsson’s doubts are simply a reduction to absurdity of his own methodology. The evidence for a reference to crucifixion that I find in this passage of Plautus is superb in my view, given the frequency of crucifixions of slaves (in history and fiction) in ancient Rome. To my knowledge, *crux* does not ever *explicitly* refer in classical Latin literature to any form of punishment that does not involve the suspension and execution of a victim, although it may be combined with other punishments as in the case of the mime “Laureolus” and the execution of the Christians by Nero.³⁶ In his entire volume, Samuelsson fails to find even one use of *crux* that refers *explicitly* to a punishment other than crucifixion.³⁷

5. It is best if I quote the following objection in full:

Second, (assumption A and B above) the last part of the quote³⁸ is based on an *if*, albeit cloaked under a *since*: *If* crucifixion belonged to Roman daily life – then it is possible to postulate that this is the reason why the texts are not more informative. But the *to be* or *not to be*, combined with the *how*, of crucifixion in the Roman society appears to be one

³² Philosopher Ian Morton (personal communication of 19 July 2018) makes this point: “If the only facts, observations, findings, testimony, data, etc., which count as evidence are those which entail the truth of the conclusion, then the law courts waste a huge amount of time considering material which is not, and never was, evidence in that sense. Each element considered by the court might well not prove guilt or innocence on its own, but is properly regarded as evidence.”

³³ Cf. the index, s.v. “crimes/disobedience of slaves” and “crucifixion/of slaves” and in particular the *lex Puteolana* discussed in chapter five. See also J. G. Cook, Augustus, R. GEST. DIV. AUG. 25,1: TRIGINTA FERE MILLIA CAPTA DOMINIS AD SUPPLICIUM SUMENDUM TRADIDI, ZPE 201 (2017) 38–41.

³⁴ Renati Des-Cartes, *Meditationes de prima philosophia, in qua Dei existentia, & animæ immortalitas demonstratur*, Paris 1641, 21, Medit. 2. [Even if an evil deceiver could cause Descartes to doubt everything, one certainty is left]: *Cogitare? Hic invenio: cogitatio est; haec sola a me divelli nequit. Ego sum, ego existo: certum est* (To think? This I discover: it is thought, this only cannot be torn away from me. I am, I exist, it is certain).

³⁵ D. Hume, *A Treatise of Human Nature*, ed. with an analytical index by L. A. Selby-Bigge, rev. text with variant readings by P. H. Nidditch, Oxford 1978 [first ed. of Book I, 1739], 252 (§ 1.4.6 “Of Personal Identity”): “For my part, when I enter most intimately into what I call *myself*, I always stumble on some particular perception or other, of heat or cold, light or shade, love or hatred, pain or pleasure. I never catch *myself* at any time without a perception, and can never observe anything but the perception.” I thank Ian Morton for his comments on this issue.

³⁶ On Nero, cf. 191–2 below. For Laureolus, see 200–1.

³⁷ This thesis about *crux* is also the conclusion of Claire Lovisi, a historian of Roman law. Cf. p. 381 below.

³⁸ Cf. objection § 4 above for the quotation.

of the basic questions of the book, that is, something that should be resolved in the conclusion. Is it not then a bit odd to use that aim – to show that crucifixion belonged to Roman daily life – as an argument for a conclusion in the very beginning of the book? The danger of circular argumentation is imminent, if one selects a word on basis of its assumed meaning, then decides what it means, next searches for texts that contain the word, and finally studies what the word means.

Response. Although I included the linguistic material in the introduction first, it is – of course – based on a close study of the entire tradition available to me in Latin and Greek. Samuelsson’s claim that there is a danger of circular reasoning is specious. One, as noted above, begins with a hypothesis about the meaning(s) of a term based on hundreds of years of lexicographical research (e.g., the ThLL, OLD and predecessors), then one analyzes the texts looking for disconfirming evidence, and finally one produces an introduction such as I have done. Consequently, although Samuelsson wants to call “A” and “B” *assumptions*, they are actually the conclusions of years of labor. I thought it best, and still believe, that these results should be placed in the introduction. The frequency of words such as *crux* and *crucifigo* in Latin texts of many varieties (fiction, poetry, and history) indicates the probable frequency of crucifixion in Roman life, and this is not contradicted by the evidence in Greek. Samuelsson’s own failure in his monograph, and apparent continued unwillingness, to begin with the Latin evidence is (in my view) the fundamental weakness of his methodology.

6. With regard to impalement, Samuelsson asks “What happens (assumption D above) if it turns out that some forms of impaling might be survivable?”

Response. I have dismissed this possibility above (p. xix), since it is based on a misunderstanding of the Greek evidence.

7. With regard to suspension, Samuelsson asks,

Why (assumption C above) are there only two suspension options? How about suspension on a board, on a wall, on a statue, on a tree, on a trunk? There are several different punishment forms that could be described with “crucifixion terminology.” Is it possible to conclude that only two suspension forms occurred throughout antiquity? This, in my opinion, is a misleading simplification. The step from *if* to *since* is vast. It is enough that one of these examples of foundational *ifs* is shown inaccurate to considerably weaken the basic argumentation of the book.³⁹

Response. I do not doubt that there were many suspension options, although I have no explicit evidence that Romans suspended victims on a wall or board.⁴⁰ One finds such evidence in Greek texts describing non-Roman practices. If the Romans suspended victims from trees, statues, etc., then there is no evidence that Samuelsson or I have found that indicates they used anything other than the language of crucifixion to describe that form of execution.

³⁹ These two last statements of S.’s are a prime example of his “argument from illusion.”

⁴⁰ For exposure on a board in the Greek world, cf. Cook, *Crucifixion*, 13–5.

Samuelsson's refusal to recognize that crucifixion was almost certainly a staple of Roman daily life ("the step from *if* to *since* is vast") illustrates the weakness of his own philological and historical method, in my view. The evidence for the position I take is relentless and depressing. Here I will generalize a statement published by Géza Vermès a month before his death (which I quote on p. 418 below in its original form):

The trouble with the method of Samuelsson and of similar sceptics is that ... they sit at their desks and absorb the smallest details discoverable in books but have no time or inclination to face up to reality. Mediterranean authors during the imperium knew what crucifixion was from eyewitness experience.

8. Samuelsson's last objection is that I restart the argumentation several times, that there is repetition in the book, and that this "affects the reading negatively." I do not regret including a review of historical crucifixions in Rome (chapter two) after a review of crucifixions in Latin texts, even though the second chapter is an expansion of an earlier article. I attempted not to repeat texts in the first two chapters. The fifth chapter on law inevitably entailed some textual repetition. But in general, I will concede this point to Samuelsson.⁴¹

I doubt that these eight pages of response to Gunnar Samuelsson are very profitable for the general reader, but perhaps they are necessary for the specialist who is interested in the nuances of argumentation about a topic that is, by its very nature, of central importance for those interested in early Christianity and the history of one of the darkest corners of the Roman imperium.

Michel Gourgues, in two very detailed reviews for which I am grateful, perceptively notes that the material on crucifixion vocabulary in the introduction actually is dependent on the material in the first three chapters. He argues that the introduction should, consequently, constitute a fourth chapter.⁴² His insight is important, although the material in the introduction actually depends on the research in the fifth and sixth chapters also.⁴³ Consequently, it would really be the conclusion as Samuelsson noted. Although I considered that option very briefly for the second edition, I determined that for the general reader (and specialist) it is far easier to present the lexical results first. More seriously, perhaps, he questions whether Maecenas's *acuta si sedeam cruce* (and Seneca's references to Maecenas) might not refer to a form of impalement that was inflicted gradually.⁴⁴ Here one can only refer to what the sources ac-

⁴¹ Asikainen, rev. of Cook, Teologinen Aikakauskirja, 189 also notes the book's repetitive features. I am grateful for colleague Esko Ryökäs's translation of the Finnish review.

⁴² Gourgues, rev. of Cook, RB 2016a, 296, ScEs, 2016b, 428.

⁴³ For example: the *lex Puteolana* (*crux* and *patibulum*) in chapter five is crucial, as is the detail that Jesus (or Simon of Cyrene) carried the *σταυρός* (*stauros*) = *patibulum* in chapter 6.

⁴⁴ Gourgues, RB 2016a, 296–7, ScEs, 2016b, 428.

tually say, not to what they do not say. Seneca is the only author to describe the details of a Roman impalement, and they are so extremely violent that one could not survive more than a few minutes (if that long). And he uses *stipes* and not the terms *crux* and *patibulum* that appear in his discussion of Maecenas. In addition, Justin, Irenaeus, and Tertullian, along (presumably) with the image of Alkimilla, all envision a small “horn” (κέρας) or *sedile* which the victim straddles while being crucified.⁴⁵ That is almost certainly Maecenas’s reference.

David Tombs also refers to Seneca’s two texts about impalement and argues that the *sedile* in the case of Maecenas “could be used to anally impale a victim.”⁴⁶ But Seneca insists that a *patibulum* was present, and it is highly probable that, as noted above, he envisions Maecenas sitting on the same kind of object that Alkimilla straddles (*suffigas licet et acutam sessuro crucem subdas*). It cannot be a vertical impalement, since Seneca states that he was suspended, stretched out on a *patibulum* (*patibulo pendere districtum*).⁴⁷ The scientists (biologists) at my institution insist that impaling a victim brings nearly immediate death due to blood loss (wherever in the groin one impales them). Consequently, given the lack of positive evidence for anal impalement by a *sedile* in Greco-Roman texts⁴⁸ and given the positive evidence from Justin, Irenaeus, Tertullian, and the Alkimilla graffito for a *sedile* which one straddles, Tomb’s contention that crucifixion included rape by a *sedile* should be rejected. More interesting, in my view, in Tombs’s review and article is his insistence that nudity on a cross was sexually humiliating. This needs more nuance, however. Christopher Hallett argues that the stripping of Roman prisoners to be executed “intensified [their] public degradation.”⁴⁹ The Greek

⁴⁵ Justin Dial 91.2, Iren. 2.24.4, Tert. Nat. 1.12.3–4, fig. 5–7 (Alkimilla). Cf. the discussion above and the texts in Cook, Crucifixion, 7, 35–6.

⁴⁶ Tombs, rev. of Cook, Bible and Critical Theory, 105. Cf. D. Tombs, Crucifixion, State Terror, and Sexual Abuse, USQR 53 (1999) 89–109, esp. 101–2 where, however, he refers to Sen. Dial. 6.20.3 (which as noted above is vertical impalement *per obscena*).

⁴⁷ Cf. Crucifixion, 100–1 below.

⁴⁸ Tombs believes such a form of impalement would be survivable.

⁴⁹ C. Hallett, The Roman Nude. Heroic Portrait Statuary, 200 BC–AD 300, Oxford 2005, 63–4. His references are numerous and important. Sen. Contr. 9.2.21 (“commands given to the lictor” including *despolia* [strip, despoil] prior to scourging and execution); “stripping the victim” for scourging prior to execution: Liv. 2.5.8 (*nudatos virgis caedunt* [they beat them, stripped, with rods]), Plutarch Publ. 6.4 (περιεσσηγγυνοσ τὰ ἰμάτια [“they tore off their himatia/togas]), Liv. 28.29.11 (*nudi*), Dion. Hal. 20.16.2 (γυμνοί [nude]), Suet. Nero 49.2 (*nudi* and beaten to death on a *furca* [fork]; an ancient punishment occasionally found in the imperium – Tac. Ann. 2.32.3 [*more prisco* (ancient custom)], Suet. Claud. 34.1 [*antiqui moris supplicium ... deligatis ad palum noxiis carnifex deesset* (punishment according to ancient custom ... the criminals being bound to the stake, no executioner was present)], Dom. 11.2–3 [*more maiorum puniendi condemnarentur* (they were condemned to be punished according to the custom of the ancients)]). Hallett also notes stripping increased the prisoner’s “vulnerabil-

word (γυμνός *gumnos*) Artemidorus uses in his book on dream interpretation for crucified individuals (Onir. 2.53), does not necessarily mean “completely nude.”⁵⁰ Felicity Harley-McGowan, following a contention of Christopher H. Hallett, writes that those depicted as *nudus* in ancient sources, usually “retained an undergarment, the *perizoma*” (περιζώμα).⁵¹ In the Palatine graffito, the donkey man wears a short tunic that exposes part of his buttocks, but Alkimilla appears to be entirely nude in the graffito of Puteoli.⁵² One of the earliest surviving depictions of Christ crucified (preserved on the Pereire gem) shows him fully nude, and there is no surviving evidence to suggest that Jesus was depicted completely nude on the cross before the middle ages.⁵³ Exposure on the cross, even in a loincloth, was presumably humiliating.⁵⁴

James H. Dee astutely remarks that I consulted a wide variety of experts, including in particular Kathleen M. Coleman. What I understand of Latin lexicography is due to her kind tutelage.⁵⁵ Dee argues that “it would have been good to have more classical period illustrations (for example, gems).” There are no more illustrations I am aware of from the imperium. Most of the gems are from late antiquity (IV C.E. and later). Harley-McGowan has published them all in her article on the Constanza carnelian, and she has nearly finished a monograph concerning all of the most ancient images of crucifixion, many of which are preserved on engraved gemstones.⁵⁶ Dee also writes that “a line

ity”: Cic. Verr. 2.5.161 (*foro medio nudari ac deligari et virgas expediri iubet* [Verres ordered that he be stripped and bound in the middle of the forum and that rods be prepared]), Petr. 30.7 (*servus ... despoliatus* [a stripped slave]).

⁵⁰ Tombs, Bible and Critical Theory, 105–6, idem, Crucifixion, 102–5. Cp., however, Cook, Crucifixion, 192–3.

⁵¹ Harley-McGowan, The Alexamenos Graffito. Cf. Hallett, The Roman Nude, 61. Plutarch Rom. 21.7 describes the nudity of the Lupercals with ἐν περιζώμασι γυμνοί (naked [*gumnoi*] in *perizōmata*). Cf. Hallett, *ibid.*, 63 for an illustration of such a Lupercal. Both Greek words are used to describe the clothing of individuals in a number of texts including Polybius frag. 196 Büttner-Wobst, Nicolaus frag. 91 FHG (twice), Strabo 15.1.73, and Plutarch Aetia Romana 280B. In Pausanias 1.44.1, however, an individual ran *gumnos* without a *perizōma*.

⁵² On the tunic and the frontal presentation of the image, cf. Harley-McGowan, The Alexamenos Graffito.

⁵³ For discussion, see F. Harley-McGowan, Jesus the Magician? A Crucifixion Amulet and its Date, in: *Magical Gems in Context, Proceedings of an International Conference 16–18 Feb, 2012, Budapest, Museum of Fine Arts*, ed. Á. M. Nagy, J. Spier, and K. Endreffy, Reichert Verlag, forthcoming. Cf. Cook, Crucifixion, figures 5–7, 10, 14 for the images.

⁵⁴ Cf. Harley-McGowan, The Alexamenos Graffito: “all Romans associated crucifixion with shame and humiliation.”

⁵⁵ Dee, rev. of Cook, BMCR. In addition, all my scholarly life I have been indebted to the courses in semantics, text linguistics, and linguistics I took with David Hellholm (emeritus of Oslo) and the late Hendrik W. Boers (Emory).

⁵⁶ Cf. F. Harley-McGowan in the bibliography below. The monograph builds on her Ph.D. dissertation (Adelaide), also referenced in the bibliography.

drawing for the Palatine graffito ... would clarify the scratchy photograph.”⁵⁷ I have included such a drawing (figure 10 bis) in the second edition. Zdisław J. Kapera made the sensible suggestion that I gather “all the archaeological data into one compact chapter ... the information is too scattered.”⁵⁸ Kapera reveals one of my weaknesses: I simply am not qualified to write a full chapter on the images, and for that I would encourage interested scholars to read through the full range of Harley-McGowan’s publications, an expert in ancient images of crucifixion.⁵⁹

There are clearly weaknesses in the monograph. Angela Standhartinger remarks that “more discussion on context, on dating, and on the literary and historical integration and history of interpretation of the texts” would have been desirable.⁶⁰ Doubtless she is correct, although the monograph would have been many hundreds of pages longer, and it is already reader-unfriendly enough. James Carleton Paget notes that my book “bears little resemblance to Hengel’s much shorter, but more invigorating, book of almost forty years ago.” Absolutely.⁶¹ Stefan Schreiber writes that it would have been helpful to emphasize the relationships more strongly between the material and the Passion narratives. He does concede that the “material establishes a basis for further social-historical and theological reflection on Roman crucifixion in general and the death of Jesus in particular.”⁶² Chapter six probably should have been longer, but that need has now been admirably met by the monograph of Chapman and Schnabel. Chapman, a kindred spirit in this field,⁶³ also argues that “more could be drawn out from the individual sources and their contexts, especially concerning the standpoint of the author and intended readers toward the victim and punishment.” I concede that point – but that would have lengthened the manuscript considerably. He would place chapter two after chapter three, which would have made good sense. One point of philology he argues is that the *Consonants at Law* (the *Iudicium vocalium*) attributed to

⁵⁷ In defense of the photograph provided by the Soprintendenza: graffiti are by nature often difficult to make out even when one is standing in front of them.

⁵⁸ Kapera, rev. of Cook, *Polish Journal of Biblical Research*, 226.

⁵⁹ Here one should also mention the early chapters in R. Jensen, *The Cross. History, Art, and Controversy*, Cambridge, MA 2017.

⁶⁰ Standhartinger, rev. of Cook, *TRev*, 121.

⁶¹ Carleton Paget, rev. of Cook, *JEH*, 850–1 (with ref. to M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, Philadelphia 1977).

⁶² Schreiber, rev. of Cook, *BZ*, 149. In this regard, T. Witulski, rev. of Cook, *HZ*, 497 notes that much less material from Roman and Jewish sources would have been needed to establish “the interpretive background for the texts and theology of the NT.” Schwier, rev. of Cook, *JLH*, 87 also notes the monograph comprises “occasions for further theological work.”

⁶³ Along with specialists including Jean-Jacques Aubert (crucifixion and Roman Law), Kristan Foust Ewin (exposition, crucifixion, and other similar punishments in the Near East, Greece, and Rome), Felicity Harley-McGowan (art history), Robin Jensen (art history), and Gunnar Samuelsson.

Lucian “could well be pseudepigraphic according to Harmon.”⁶⁴ He is correct that such a position could be important for my research. In my review, however, of the monograph he wrote with Schnabel, I argued that his position (and that of the Loeb editor and translator) “goes against the grain of modern scholarship.”⁶⁵ Boris Paschke notes the Roman material in the second chapter, but regrets that I make no attempt to develop a general history of crucifixion.⁶⁶ Michel Matter believes (presumably because of the data in my monograph) that the origins of crucifixion are in the Orient (Persia), but probably came to the Romans via Carthage. That is certainly possible, but I am unsure even of the truth of this statement.⁶⁷ At this time I still do not believe a history of Roman crucifixion to be possible.⁶⁸

Giuseppe Ghiberti, in his fairly lengthy review, objects to my statement that the Shroud of Turin is “apparently a medieval forgery.”⁶⁹ Msgr. Ghiberti, at one time president of the Turin diocesan commission on the Shroud and professor of Sacred Scripture at the Facoltà Teologica dell’Italia Settentrionale, argues in his review that the “procedure that resulted in the origin of the object and even more the motivations for the origin of the Shroud are completely unknown.”⁷⁰ I realize there are Catholic, Orthodox, and Protestant Christians who are Shroud enthusiasts and do not wish to anger them.⁷¹ But

⁶⁴ Chapman, rev. of Cook, BBR, 592. Harmon’s argument is confined to one phrase: “This mock presentation, probably not by Lucian ...” (Lucian, 8 vols., LCL, ed. and trans. A. M. Harmon et al., Cambridge, MA 1913-67, 1.395).

⁶⁵ Cook, rev. of Chapman and Schnabel, JTS, 292. My reference there is: S. Swain, *Hellenism and Empire. Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*, Oxford 1996, 48–9. Swain refers to B. Baldwin, *Studies in Lucian*, Toronto 1973, 58: (“The parody is quite in the Lucianic manner with its travestied decree, the allotropes of legal phraseology, the high-flown rhetoric, jests and invective, and the deposition of false evidence”; and cp. n. 54: “Harmon offers no good reason for his view ...”) and H. Wolanin, *Problematyka językoznawcza w “Sądzie Samogłosek” Lukiana* [Linguistic Issues in Lucian’s *Court of the Vowels*], *Meander* 45 [1990] 3–11). For the key text, cf. Cook, *Crucifixion*, 5 (Lucian *Jud. voc.* 12).

⁶⁶ Paschke, rev. of Cook, *Soteria*, 46.

⁶⁷ Matter, rev. of Cook, *RHPR*, 477.

⁶⁸ A statement from my book (451) that Paschke quotes.

⁶⁹ Ghiberti, *Archivio Teologico Torinese*, 158.

⁷⁰ Ghiberti, *ibid.*, 158.

⁷¹ For an argument by a Jewish documentary photographer, who was a member of the Shroud research team of 1968, in favor of the Shroud’s authenticity, cf. B. M. Schwartz, *Five Reasons Why Some Christians are Shroud Skeptics*, *The City* 9 (2016) 67–73, esp. 71 “...science has proven the Shroud is *not* a manmade artwork.” On the other side of the aisle, the arguments of Robin Lane Fox (*The Unauthorized Version. Truth and Fiction in the Bible*, New York 1993, 250–1) are worth noting (e.g., “... radiocarbon dating” confirmed a “fourteenth-century date”; there is no record of the Shroud’s existence whatsoever until the 1350s; a bishop of Troyes claimed to have “found (so he said) the person who admitted faking it”; the image “... was artfully imprinted by a craftsman who used chemical compounds ... traces

no serious scholar could possibly consider using the controversial Shroud to do any kind of research on Roman crucifixion – the Shroud is for those of the Christian faithful who accept its authenticity.

I will conclude with some remarks Martin Hengel wrote me on 20 March 2009 – only a few months before his death. In the email, Hengel was objecting to Kuhn’s tendency to devalue the importance of the “historical cross” for understanding Paul’s theology of the cross. His last sentences were:

Auf dieser Grundlage [the work of Hengel, Kuhn, and Chapman] können Sie jetzt für die nächsten 100 Jahre eine umfassende Monographie zum Thema schreiben, wobei die theologische Bedeutung der paulinischen *theologia crucis* nicht unterschlagen werden dürfte. Ohne sie wird Paulus überhaupt unverständlich.

On this basis [the work of Kuhn, Hengel, and Chapman] you can now write a comprehensive monograph on the theme which will be valid for the next 100 years. Thereby, the theological relevance of Paul’s *theologia crucis* [theology of the cross] ought not to be suppressed. Without it, Paul becomes altogether incomprehensible.⁷²

Whether the monograph will stand for 100 years remains to be seen – *vita brevis, ars longa*. That is out of my hands. I must leave to experts in Pauline exegesis the task of relating this material to Paul’s theology of the cross. Although trained in exegesis, it was not my intention to write such a book. Those who have spent their scholarly lives writing on Paul are in a much better position to relate the historical material on Roman crucifixion to the understanding of Paul’s theology.

of his pigments have been found on threads of the cloth ... etc.” For a sceptical approach (by a former member of a Shroud team), cf. W. C. McCrone, *Judgment Day for the Shroud of Turin*, Amherst, NY 1999.

⁷² My thanks to Professor Jörg Frey for his suggestions for the translation.

Table of Contents

Introduction: Crucifixion Terminology	1
1 Definitions and Methodological Assumptions	2
2 Greek Terminology	4
2.1 σταυρός , σταυρώω, ἀνασταυρώω, σκόλοψ, ἀνασκολοπίζω..	5
2.2 κρεμάω, κρεμάννυμι	11
2.3 ἀποτυμπανισμός, ἀποτυμπανίζω	13
3 Latin Terminology	15
3.1 The Meaning of <i>Patibulum</i>	16
3.1.1 Latin (pagan) authors and <i>patibulum</i>	16
3.1.2 Christian Authors and <i>patibulum</i>	26
3.2 Excursus: <i>Patibulum</i> and σταυρός	28
3.3 Summary	33
3.4 <i>Crux</i> and <i>crucifigo</i>	34
3.5 <i>Furca</i>	37
3.6 <i>Furcifer</i>	44
3.7 The <i>Arbor Infelix</i>	45
4 Executions and Imperial Murders during Gaius’s Rule	48
5 Conclusion	49
 <i>Chapter one: Crucifixion in Latin Texts</i>	 51
1 Republic (Late Sixth Century until Caesar)	51
1.1 Quintus Ennius (239–169)	51
1.2 Plautus (wrote ca 205–184)	52
1.3 Publius Terentius Afer (active in the 160s)	58
1.4 Marcus Terentius Varro (116–27 B.C.E.)	59
1.5 Gaius Sempronius Gracchus (tribune in 123 and 122)	62
1.6 Marcus Tullius Cicero (106–43)	62
1.7 Ps. Caesar	78
1.8 Gaius Valerius Catullus (ca 84–45 B.C.E.)	78
1.9 Gaius Sallustius Crispus (probably 85–35 B.C.E.)	79
1.10 Quintus Horatius Flaccus (8 Dec. 65 – 27 Nov. 8 B.C.E.)	79
1.11 Sextus Propertius (b. between 54–47)	82
1.12 Gaius Maecenas (d. 8 B.C.E.)	82
1.13 Titius Livius (59–17 C.E.)	83
1.14 Lucius Annaeus Seneca (b. ca 50 B.C.E.–ca 40 C.E.)	86

1.15	Vitruvius Pollio (military engineer of Caesar).....	92
2	From Caesar's Assassination to Constantine	92
2.1	Publius Ovidius Naso (43 B.C. – 17 C.E.).....	92
2.2	Gaius Iulius Phaedrus (ca 15 B.C.E. – 50 C.E.).....	93
2.3	Lucius Annaeus Seneca (born ca 4 B.C.E./1 C.E. – 65).....	94
2.4	Appendix Vergiliana (era of Augustus to 100 C.E.)	103
2.5	Valerius Maximus (reign of Tiberius, 14–37).....	103
2.6	Pliny the Elder (23/24–79 C.E.)	106
2.7	Marcus Fabius Quintilianus (born ca 35 C.E.).....	107
2.8	Ps. Quintilian (school of Quintilian?).....	109
2.9	Ps. Quintilian, Major Declamations	111
2.10	Marcus Annaeus Lucanus (39–65 C.E.)	112
2.11	Publius Papinius Statius (b. between 45 and the early 50's).....	115
2.12	Lucius Iunius Moderatus Columella (fl. 50 C.E.)	116
2.13	Marcus Manilius (reign of Augustus and Tiberius).....	117
2.14	Petronius (Petronius Arbiter? d. 66 C.E.)	118
2.15	Tiberius Catus Asconius Silius Italicus (ca 26–102).....	120
2.16	Marcus Valerius Martialis (38/41 – 101/104).....	121
2.17	A Graffito from Pompeii.....	122
2.18	Cornelius Tacitus (born ca 56)	122
2.19	Quintus Curtius Rufus (wrote I C.E.–early II C.E.)	124
2.20	Calpurnius Flaccus (wrote after ca 100 C.E.)	126
2.21	Apuleius of Madaurus (born ca 125).....	129
2.22	Sextus Pompeius Festus (late second century scholar).....	132
2.23	Lucius Annaeus Florus (Antonine era).....	133
2.24	Marcus Cornelius Fronto (ca 95–ca 166).....	134
2.25	Decimus Iunius Iuvenalis (II C.E.).....	134
2.26	Hyginus (II C.E.)	137
2.27	Porphyrus (234–ca 305).....	138
3	Writers after Constantine	140
3.1	Marcus Iunian(i)us Iustinus (II–IV CE.).....	140
3.2	Scriptores Historiae Augustae	142
3.3	Servius (IV C.E.)	143
3.4	Ps. Probus (II–IV C.E.?)	145
3.5	Scholia in Iuvenalem (IV C.E.).....	146
3.6	Firmicus Maternus (337).....	147
3.7	Anthologia Latina	149
3.8	Acta Pilati.....	151
3.9	Jerome (347–420).....	151
3.10	Ausonius (IV C.E.).....	152
3.11	Caius Iulius Victor (IV C.E.?).....	152
3.12	Consultius Fortunatianus (IV C.E.).....	153

3.13	Medicina Plinii.....	154
3.14	Rutilius Taurus Aemilianus Palladius (mid V C.E.?).....	154
3.15	Iunius Philargyrius.....	155
3.16	Orosius (composed his work between 416–418).....	155
3.17	Hermetis Trismegisti, De triginta sex decanis.....	157
4	Conclusion.....	158
 <i>Chapter two: Roman Crucifixions.....</i>		159
1	Synthesis of the Evidence.....	159
2	Republic.....	161
2.1	Second Punic War (218–201 B.C.E.).....	161
2.2	M. Acilius Glabrio.....	164
2.3	First Sicilian Slave War (?135–132).....	164
2.4	L. Domitius Ahenobarbus (97 B.C.E.), Second Slave Revolt.....	167
2.5	Mucius Scaevola (97 B.C.E.).....	167
2.6	Bruttius Sura (87 B.C.E.).....	168
2.7	Valerius Soranus (82 B.C.E.?).....	168
2.8	Julius Caesar and the Pirates (75 B.C.E.).....	170
2.9	Strato, <i>servus</i>	170
2.10	The Third Servile War (73–71).....	171
2.11	Theodotus of Chios/Samos.....	173
2.12	Alexander, <i>servus</i>	174
2.13	Pirates.....	174
2.14	The Battle of Ucubis (45 B.C.E.).....	175
2.15	The Triumvirate (43–32).....	175
2.16	Theodorus <i>paedagogus</i>	179
3	Imperium.....	180
3.1	Augustus (27 B.C.E.–14 C.E.).....	180
3.2	Tiberius (14–37).....	182
3.3	Gaius Caligula (18 March 37 – 24 June 41).....	186
3.4	Claudius (41–54).....	188
3.5	Nero (13 Oct. 54 – 9 June, 68).....	190
3.6	Galba (8 June 68–15 Jan. 69): Crucifixion of a Guardian.....	195
3.7	Vitellius (2. Jan.–20 Dec. 69): Geta’s Crucifixion.....	195
3.8	Vespasian (1 July 69–23 June 79).....	196
3.9	Before the Destruction of Pompeii in 24 Aug. 79 C.E.....	199
3.10	Titus (24 June 79 – 13 Sept. 81): “Laureolus”.....	200
3.11	Domitian (14 Sept. 81–18 Sept. 96).....	201
3.12	Egypt, first century C.E.....	202
3.13	Trajan: Bishop Symeon son of Clopas.....	203
3.14	Trajanic-Hadrianic Period: Alkimilla.....	203
3.15	Africa.....	204

3.16 Avidius Cassius (175).....	205
3.17 Commodus (180–192): An Accuser (<i>calumniator</i>).....	206
3.18 Pertinax (31 Dec. 192–28 March 193): Slave-Informers.....	207
3.19 Clodius Albinus (195/196): A Legionary Centurion.....	207
3.20 Opellius Macrinus (11 April 217–8 June 218).....	208
3.21 Severus Alexander (222–235).....	208
3.22 Maximinus Thrax (235–238).....	209
3.23 Aurelius Valerius Maximianus (Oct./Dec. 285–ca. July 310).....	211
3.24 Maximinus Daia (1 May 305–late summer 313).....	213
4 The Frequency of Crucifixion.....	214
5 Conclusion.....	216

Chapter three: Crucifixion in Greek Texts 218

1 Republic (Late Sixth Century until Caesar).....	218
1.1 Aesop.....	218
1.2 Herodotus (probably died in the 420s).....	219
1.3 Thucydides (born between 460–455).....	222
1.4 Ctesias (late V B.C.E.).....	222
1.5 Demosthenes (384–322).....	223
1.6 Callisthenes (d. 327 B.C.E.).....	224
1.7 Theopompus (died ca 320).....	225
1.8 Septuagint.....	225
1.9 Hellenica (P.Oxy. 5.842: First half of IV B.C.E.).....	228
1.10 Polybius (ca 200 – ca 118 B.C.E.).....	229
1.11 Amyzon.....	230
1.12 Diodorus Siculus (I B.C.E.).....	231
2 Imperium.....	233
2.1 Strabo (born ca 64 B.C.E., dead after 21 C.E.).....	233
2.2 Dionysius Halicarnassus (reign of Augustus).....	234
2.3 Philo Judaeus (I C.E.).....	234
2.4 Flavius Josephus (born 37/38).....	236
2.5 Dio Chrysostom (ca 40/50–after 110).....	239
2.6 Plutarch (before 50 – after 120).....	243
2.7 Ps. Plutarch.....	246
2.8 Lucius Flavius Arrianus (ca 86–160).....	247
2.9 Appian (end of I A.D. – 160s).....	249
2.10 Lucian of Samosata (born ca 120).....	250
2.11 Polyaeus (II C.E.).....	254
2.12 Valerius Harpocration (II C.E.).....	255
2.13 Cassius Dio (ca 164–after 229).....	255
2.14 Claudius Aelianus (165/70–230/5).....	257
2.15 Flavius Philostratus (d. 244–249).....	258

2.16	Palladas of Alexandria (IV C.E.)	258
2.17	Philogelos	259
2.18	Ps. Phalaris	259
3	Romance Novels	260
3.1	Chariton of Aphrodisias (I – II C.E.)	260
3.2	Xenophon of Ephesus (ca 100–150)	263
3.3	Achilles Tatius (II C.E.)	264
3.4	Iamblichus	265
3.5	Heliiodorus (230?)	266
3.6	The Alexander Romance of Ps. Callisthenes	266
4	Rhetors	268
4.1	Aelius Aristides (Nov. 17, 117–ca 179)	268
4.2	Aelius Herodianus (II C.E.)	269
4.3	Libanius (314–ca 393)	269
4.4	Anonymous Rhetor: Rhetorical Problems in Status Theory	270
4.5	Anonymous Rhetor: On Figures of Discourse	270
5	Philosophers	271
5.1	Plato (ca 429–347 B.C.E.)	271
5.2	Epictetus (mid I–II C.E.)	272
5.3	Atticus (ca 150–200 C.E.)	273
5.4	Diogenes Laertius (Second half of III C.E.?)	273
5.5	Ps. Diogenes	273
6	Pagan Critics of the New Testament	274
6.1	Celsus	274
6.2	Porphyry	278
6.3	The Anonymous Philosopher of Macarius of Magnesia	278
6.4	Flavius Claudius Julianus (ca Feb. 360 – 26/27 June 363)	281
7	Astrologers	282
7.1	Dorotheus of Sidon (I or beginning of II C.E.)	282
7.2	Vettius Valens (wrote between 152 and 162)	282
7.3	Ptolemy (wrote in Alexandria between 146 and ca 170)	283
7.4	Ps. Manetho (II–III C.E.)	284
7.5	Hephaestion of Thebes (IV–V C.E.)	285
7.6	Rhetorius (620 C.E.?)	285
7.7	Johannes Lydus (490–ca 560)	287
7.8	Theophilus of Edessa (d. 785)	287
7.9	<i>Astrologica, De mansionibus Lunae</i>	288
7.10	<i>Hermae Trismegisti methodus mystica</i>	288
7.11	Apomasar (IX C.E.)	289
8	Dream Interpreters	289
8.1	Artemidorus of Ephesus (mid/late II C.E.)	289
8.2	Achmet (X C.E.)	292

9	Physicians.....	293
9.1	Galen (129–?199/216).....	293
9.2	Alexander of Tralles (525–605).....	294
10	Later Traditions of Crucifixion and the <i>furca</i> in Greek Texts.....	294
10.1	Sozomen.....	294
10.2	Socrates.....	295
10.3	A Byzantine Tradition on Purim.....	295
10.4	ἀναδοκολοπίζειν as a Byzantine Penalty.....	296
10.5	ἀναδοκολοπίζειν as a Penalty Used by non-Byzantines.....	304
10.6	Priscus (Fifth Century).....	307
11	Conclusion.....	309
 <i>Chapter four: Hebrew and Aramaic Texts</i>		311
1	Impalement in Middle Eastern Texts.....	312
2	<i>tlh</i>	315
2.1	Qumran Texts (4Q Nahum Peshier and the Temple Scroll).....	316
2.2	תלה (<i>tlh</i>) in other Qumran Texts.....	322
2.3	m. Sanhedrin 6:4.....	324
2.4	t. Sanhedrin 9:8.....	325
2.5	b. Sanhedrin 46b.....	325
2.6	Sifre Deuteronomy 21:22.....	326
3	<i>šlb</i>	326
3.1	Targum Ruth.....	327
3.2	Deuteronomy 21:22–23 in the Targums.....	328
3.3	Numbers 25:4.....	329
3.4	Joshua 8:29 (Targum).....	330
3.5	Sifre Deuteronomy on Crucifixion.....	330
3.6	The Bodies of the Crucified.....	332
3.7	Blood.....	332
3.8	Nails.....	335
3.9	Jose ben Jo‘ezer.....	336
3.10	The Hadrianic Persecution?.....	338
3.11	Simeon b. Shetach and the Witches.....	339
3.12	Brigands.....	340
3.13	The Last Judgment.....	343
3.14	Mordecai and Haman in Midrashic Literature.....	344
3.15	Mordecai and Haman in the Targums to Esther.....	347
3.16	Isaac.....	352
3.17	Exodus Rabbah: Moses.....	353
3.18	Deuteronomy Rabbah.....	353
3.19	A Persecution.....	354
3.20	Midrash Tannaim.....	354

3.21 Redemption from Crucifixion.....	355
4 Crucifixion in the Muslim World.....	355
5 Conclusion	356

Chapter five: Crucifixion. Law and Historical Development.. 358

1 Law and Crucifixion.....	358
1.1 The Use of Crucifixion.....	358
1.2 The Question of the <i>Summa Supplicia</i> (Extreme Penalties).....	359
1.3 Differential Application of Punishments.....	362
1.4 The <i>lex Puteolana</i>	370
1.5 Crucifixion in the Classical Jurists.....	387
1.6 A Third Century Inscription.....	390
1.7 <i>Pauli Sententiae</i>	392
1.8 The <i>Edictum de accusationibus</i>	395
1.9 CIL VIII, 18261 = CLE 278.....	396
1.10 The Abolition of Crucifixion.....	398

Chapter six: Roman Crucifixion and the New Testament 417

1 Roman Procedure and the Gospels.....	417
1.1 Crucifixion as a Miserable and Shameful Death	418
1.2 The Practice of Crucifixion	423
2 The Medical Causes of Death from Crucifixion.....	430
3 The Theology of the Cross in Mark	435
3.1 Methodology	436
3.2 Markan Texts.....	438
4 Conclusion.....	448

Conclusion: Crucifixion in the Mediterranean World..... 450

Addendum..... 453

1 Textual Material.....	453
1.1 C. Clodius Licinus	453
1.2 The Punishment of the Fugitive Slaves in S. Pompeius's Army ...	455
1.3 Martial	457
1.4 The Trial of Jesus and <i>maiestas</i>	460
1.5 The Burial of Jesus's Crucified Body	461
1.6 Ardalio the Mime.....	462
2 Archaeological Material	463
2.1 The Abba Cave and Alleged Nails used in Crucifixion.....	463
2.2 The Nails found in the Caiaphas Tomb.....	470
2.3 The La Larda Locality of Gavello: Skeletal Remains.....	471
2.4 The Mendes Harbor: Skeletal Remains.....	472

2.5 Presumed Christian Crosses in Pompeii and Herculaneum	474
<i>Images</i>	479
<i>Bibliography</i>	493
Ancient Sources	493
Databases, CD Roms, Websites	501
Scholarship	502
<i>Sources</i>	513
1 Classical Texts before Constantine with Selected Scholia	513
2 Biblical Literature	527
3 Christian Texts before Constantine	528
4 Latin Texts after Constantine	529
5 Greek Texts after Constantine	532
6 Coins, Inscriptions, and Papyri	534
7 Juristic Texts	535
8 Semitic Texts	536
<i>Images Index</i>	540
<i>Ancient Individuals</i>	541
<i>Modern Authors</i>	543
<i>Subjects</i>	545

Introduction

Crucifixion Terminology

The New Testament's narrative of the crucifixion of Jesus of Nazareth and the accompanying *theologia crucis* (theology of the cross) or perhaps better *theologiae crucis* (theologies of the cross) motivate many of the studies on crucifixion in the Mediterranean world – as they do my own. One of the great humanists of the sixteenth century, Justus Lipsius, wrote a seminal work in 1593, a book written soon after he had reembraced the Catholic faith in 1591 under the influence of the Jesuits after a journey through Neostoicism.¹ The title, *De cruce libri tres: Ad sacram profānamque historiam utiles; Unā cum notis* (*Three Volumes on Crucifixion: useful for sacred and secular history; together with notes*),² indicates his continuing interest in humanist scholarship (a characteristic of the Jesuits), but his dedication to the reader and the first words of the book in which he prays to Christ that he may write what is true make his intentions clear.³ He does, however, indicate his historical method: *Siquid usquam praeter religionem moresque veterum, non agnosco ...* (I do not acknowledge anything at all except the religion and customs of the ancients ...). The book includes illustrations, and although later scholars argue with various aspects of his conclusions it remains a fascinating element in the man's vast scholarship. The illustrations are an element that has been omitted in many of the best modern studies of the theme – perhaps because they are not “objective” enough. Rather than use illustrations below of my own making, I will appeal to what archaeological evidence I have been able to find including graffiti, a fresco, the famous crucifixion nail in a *calcaneum* bone,

¹ He obtained a position at the University of Louvain in 1592. Cf. idem, *Politica*. Six Books of Politics or Political Instruction, ed. with trans. and intro. by J. Waszink, Assen 2004, 23 (and cf. the entire biographical section in *ibid.*, 15-23). Waszink (23) calls the book on the cross a work of “antiqarianism.”

² Published in Antwerp in 1593 (the edition used below was published in 1594 by the same printer in Antwerp).

³ Lipsius, *De cruce*, Ad lectorem and pp. 1-2. Cp. J. de Landtsheer, Justus Lipsius's *De Cruce* and the Reception of the Fathers, *Neulateinisches Jahrbuch* 2 (2000) 99-124, esp. 119 (on Lipsius's “approach of the ancient historian”) and F. P. Pickering, Justus Lipsius' *De Cruce libri tres* (1593) or The Historian's Dilemma, in: *Festgabe für L. L. Hammerich*. Aus Anlass seines siebenzigsten Geburtstags, Copenhagen 1962, 199-215 (esp. 202-3, on where the text belongs in Lipsius's historical study [*Ritualia-profana-publica*]).

and so forth (figures 1, 5-7, 10-14). It is not my intention to give a history of research on the topic. A partial attempt at such an exercise may be found in the able study by Gunnar Samuelsson whose work has served as a muse for my own semantic research.⁴ In my view the path breaking studies of August Zestermann in the nineteenth century remain some of the best material before the fine investigation of Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn in the twentieth century.⁵ Martin Hengel's collection of data is also of great usefulness. A very welcome addition to the field is David Chapman's extensive survey of attitudes toward crucifixion in Hebrew and Aramaic literature of Second Temple and Rabbinic Judaism, which enabled me to write chapter four below.⁶

1 Definitions and Methodological Assumptions

The definition of crucifixion as "execution by suspension" is acceptable as long as one excludes impalement or hanging.⁷ Four markers of the execution that Samuelsson takes over from Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn are important: "suspension," "completed or intended execution," "with or without a crossbeam," and "an extended death struggle."⁸ Against Samuelsson, however, when the context of an account of suspension does not indicate any other mode of execution (including impalement) besides crucifixion, then it is fair to assume that crucifixion is the mode of death, given the linguistic usage in texts of the Roman era.⁹ By "Roman era" I refer to the period beginning with the Second Punic war when the first historical crucifixions appear in Roman texts and ending with Constantine.¹⁰ There does not seem to be any overwhelming rea-

⁴ G. Samuelsson, *Crucifixion in Antiquity. An Inquiry into the Background of the New Testament Terminology of Crucifixion*, WUNT 2/310, Tübingen 2013, 2-24.

⁵ A. Zestermann, *Die Kreuzigung bei den alten*, *Annales de l'académie d'archéologie de Belgique* 24, 2^e série, tome quatrième (1868) 337-404 and *idem*, *Die bildliche Darstellung des Kreuzes und der Kreuzigung Jesu Christi historisch Entwickelt ...* Leipzig 1867. Cp. H.-W. Kuhn, *Die Kreuzesstrafe während der frühen Kaiserzeit. Ihre Wirklichkeit und Wertung in der Umwelt des Urchristentums*, ANRW II/25.1 (1982) 648-793 and M. Hengel, *Crucifixion in the Ancient World and the Folly of the Message of the Cross*, Philadelphia 1977 (cp. *La crucifixion dans l'antiquité*). S. Castagnetti, *Le leges libitinariae* flegree, Napoli 2012, 49-84, 103-14, 214 etc. is of fundamental importance.

⁶ D. W. Chapman, *Ancient Jewish and Christian Perceptions of Crucifixion*, WUNT 2/244, Tübingen 2008.

⁷ Samuelsson, *Crucifixion in Antiquity*, 19, 143, 262 (and cf. 261-70).

⁸ See Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*, 19, 29, 30 and Kuhn, *Die Kreuzesstrafe*, 679.

⁹ I am aware of no Latin texts, for example, in which *crux* was used for some kind of Roman exotic torture (and not execution) – the *arbor infelix* being the exception (with its distinct terminology). Cf. the discussion of Cicero's *Rab. perd.* below in § 3.7 and chapt 1 § 1.6.

¹⁰ Cp. chapt. 2 and J. G. Cook, *Roman Crucifixions: From the Second Punic War to Constantine*, ZNW (2013) 1-32.

son to assume that when a penal text indicates a person was suspended that any other method of execution was then subsequently used. That would be a needless and rather gratuitous exercise in interpretive futility and skepticism. What is logically possible in this context is not historically probable. An author narrating a past event (fictional or historical) is forced by the nature of language itself to choose the details the author has an interest in describing.

It is impossible, of course, to completely exclude impalement in all cases that use *crux*, *σταυρός* (*stauros*) and the associated verbs, but explicit impalement is (textually) rare as a Roman punishment. Seneca, for example, in one of his letters distinguishes the cross (*crux*) from the *stipes* used in impalement.¹¹ Physically it is not difficult to impale an individual lengthwise on a sharp stake.¹² My colleagues in biology assure me that such a stake could not possibly avoid fatally damaging vital organs and/or nicking the descending aorta or inferior vena cava, which would have caused a victim to bleed to death immediately.¹³ In Greek texts before the Roman era, however, that describe non-Roman penalties one cannot always assume that impalement is not the intended form of execution. Another form of execution that can be ruled out both during the Republic and the imperium is hanging, since it was used during neither period by the Romans.¹⁴ They did make use of garroting, how-

¹¹ Seneca, Ep. 14.5. Cf. chapt. 1 § 2.3. In Ep. 101.10-12 it is doubtful that impalement is the punishment, because Maecenas does not die immediately and in 101.12 prolongs his life hanging with his arms extended horizontally on a *patibulum*. Seneca includes impalement as a form of crucifixion in Dial. 6.20.3 *Video istic cruces, non unius quidem generis ... alii per obscena stipitem egerunt*. But even in that text he uses *stipitem* for the object used in impalement. See § 3.1.1, 4 below. In the revolt of Boudicca (60/61 CE), for example, the Britons suspended (*ἐκρέμασαν*) the elite Roman women of two captured Roman cities. Cassius Dio, however, uses the precise expression *πασάλοις ὀξέσι διὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος κατὰ μῆκος ἀνέπειραν* to refer to their subsequent impalement with sharp stakes through the length of the entire body (Cassius Dio 62.7.2). Tacitus (Ann. 14.33.2), on the other hand, uses the vocabulary of crucifixion to describe the executions (*patibula ... cruces*) and not the vocabulary of impalement. Cp. chapt. 3 § 2.13 and chapt. 1 § 2.18.

¹² “Pressure (pounds per square inch or newtons/square meter) is the result of a force acting on a given area. Pressure (P), force (F), and area (A) are related by $P = F/A$. For a given force the resulting pressure varies inversely with the area. For example, a 150 lb person on a 1 square inch surface would have a pressure of 150 lb/in² exerted on the area in contact with the surface. If the contact surface area were reduced to 1/2 inch by 1/2 inch yielding a 1/4 in² surface the resulting pressure would be 150 lb/(.25 in²) = 600 lb/in². So the act of tapering the stake dramatically increases the pressure at the point of contact.” My thanks to colleague Professor Terry Austin for this calculation.

¹³ I thank Professors William Paschal, Melinda Pomeroy-Black, and Nickie Cauthen.

¹⁴ E. Cantarella, *I supplizi capitali in Grecia e a Roma*, Milan 1991, 185. Cf. J.-L. Voisin, Pendus, crucifiés, *oscilla* dans la Rome païenne, *Latomus* 38 (1979) 422-450, esp. 441. Of 410 cases of suicide between 509 B.C.E. and 235 C.E., Voisin finds only six cases of hanging (ibid., 426). Cp. S. Castagnetti, *La lex cumana libitinaris* nelle sue due redazioni, in: *Libitina e dintorni. Libitina e i luci* sepolcrali. *Le leges libitinae* campane. *Iura sepulcrorum*. Vec-

ever (while the individuals were on the ground), using a garrote or noose (*laqueus*). W. A. Oldfather lists a number of terms used for this form of execution including *strangulare*, *laqueo gulam frangere*, *cervicem frangere*, *fauces elidere*, etc.¹⁵

2 Greek Terminology

The Greek terminology for “cross”, “stake”, and “crucify,” “impale,” or “suspend” is ambiguous at times. One must pay careful attention to the context. The context is a reliable guide for determining if an act of suspension is a penal execution. During the Roman era there does not exist much doubt that suspension (i.e., crucifixion) was a frequent form of execution.¹⁶ The fre-

chie e nuove iscrizioni. Atti dell’XI Rencontre franco-italienne sur l’épigraphie, ed. S. Panciera, Libitina 3, Rome 2004, 133-46, esp. 140 (approves Cantarella’s position). W. A. Oldfather, *Livy* i, 26 and the *Supplicium de More Maiorum*, TAPA 39 (1908) 49-72, esp. 54, “There is not a particle of evidence that Romans ever hanged criminals from a gallows.” W. B. Tyrrell, *A Legal and Historical Commentary to Cicero’s Oratio pro C. Rabirio Perduellionis Reo*, 93 “... hanging by the neck is unattested as a means of executing criminals.” One possible example from the Republic is *Cic. Ver. 2.3.57* (Nymphodorus of Athens was apparently not “hung” by Apronius [a tithe collector], but kept in discomfort suspended from an olive tree, and then rescued [*suspendi ... in oleastro ... pependit in arbore ... quam diu voluntas Apronii tulit*], according to Cantarella, *ibid.*, 177) and cp. Oldfather, *Supplicium*, 52 (he escaped with his life although he was suspended a long time). *pependit in arbore* should be compared to *Ov. Pont. 1.6.38* and *Mart. Sp. 9.(7)4* (both *pendens in cruce*), *Iuvenius Euang. 4,662* (CSEL 24, 140 Huemer) *Iamque cruci fixum pendeat in arbore corpus*. Cp. Apronius’s temporary punishment of another individual in *2.3.56* (*quantum Apronii libido tulit*). Apronius did not have legal authority to put him to death. In *Ammianus 15.7.4-5* a rioter named Peter is suspended with his hands tied behind his back and flogged (*post terga manibus vincitis suspendi*), but not put to death. One of the earliest accounts of execution by hanging occurs in *Oros. Hist. 5.16.5* (V C.E.). The Cimbric in 105 B.C.E. executed their prisoners by placing nooses on their necks and hanging them from trees (*homines laqueis collo inditis ex arboribus suspensi sunt*). The earliest evidence for Roman hanging I have found is from the era of Constantine (319) in *Codex Iust. (CJ) 9.14.1.1* where Constantine decrees a charge of murder against masters who suspend their slaves by a noose (*suspendi laqueo praeceperit*). He also used the noose (while the condemned was presumably standing): He had the vertebrae of Maximianus Herculeus fractured using a noose after capturing him in Marseilles: *Maximianus Herculeus a Constantino apud Massiliam obsessus, deinde captus, poenas dedit mortis genere postremo, fractis laqueo cervicibus* (*Epit. 40.5* [BiTeu 164,27-9 Pichlmayr]).

¹⁵ Oldfather, *Supplicium*, 54. *Tac. Ann. 6:5.9.2* depicts the “squeezed throats” (*oblisis faucibus*) of Sejanus’s two children who were then thrown down the Gemonian stairs. Cp. *Tacitus* in chapt. 1 § 2.18, *Cic. Vat. 26* (*fregerisne in carcere cervices*), *Sal. Cat. 55.5* (*laqueo gulam fregere*), *SHA Trig. Tyr. 22.8* (*strangulatus in carcere*), *Vell. 2.4.2* (*elisarum faucium* [apparently a murder])

¹⁶ Cf. Cook, *Roman Crucifixions*, passim and chapt. 2.

quency, dreariness and brutality of the act itself did not encourage authors to expend a great deal of energy making narrative descriptions.

2.1 σταυρός (*pole, cross*), σταυρόω (*crucify*), ἀνασταυρόω (*suspend, crucify, impale*), σκόλοψ (*stake, cross*), ἀνασκολοπίζω (*impale, crucify*)

Samuelsson has recently made numerous and intriguing claims about crucifixion terminology.¹⁷ In my view his attempt to identify one main sense for σταυρός, i.e. “a raised pole” or “a pole onto which something or somebody (dead or alive) is suspended,” is erroneous.¹⁸ Clearly words can have numerous senses.¹⁹ Samuelsson’s claim that σταυρός “is a pole in the broadest sense. It is not the equivalent of a ‘cross’ (†)” is almost certainly incorrect. Two texts and two graffiti that he ignores are decisive evidence against his position. Lucian writes in his *Consonants at Law*:

People weep and mourn over their destiny and often curse Cadmus, because he brought the Tau into the class of letters. For they affirm that tyrants follow its [Tau’s (T)] figure and imitate its form and then join beams together with the same figure to crucify people on them. From this [Tau], the evil name [*stauros*, cross] is united with the evil device. For the cross [*stauros*] has been created by this letter [the Tau], but has been given a name by people.

κλάουσιν ἄνθρωποι καὶ τὴν αὐτῶν τύχην ὀδύρονται καὶ Κάδμῳ καταρῶνται πολλαίως, ὅτι τὸ Ταῦ ἐς τὸ τῶν στοιχείων γένος παρήγαγε· τῷ γὰρ τούτου σῶματί φασι τοὺς τυράννους ἀκολουθήσαντας καὶ μιμησαμένους αὐτοῦ τὸ πλάσμα ἔπειτα σχήματι τοιοῦτοῦ ξύλα τεκτῆναντας ἀνθρώπους ἀνασκολοπίζειν ἐπ’ αὐτά· ἀπὸ δὲ τούτου καὶ τῷ τεχνήματι τῷ πονηρῷ τὴν πονηρὰν ἐπωνυμίαν συνελθεῖν. ὃ δὴ σταυρός εἶναι ὑπὸ τούτου μὲν ἐδημιουργήθη, ὑπὸ δὲ ἀνθρώπων ὀνομάζεται.²⁰

Lucian thinks it self-evident that σταυρός has a cruciform shape. Barnabas, in his discussion of Gen 14:14, also draws an equivalence between tau and *stauros*, since tau’s numerical value is 300: “Ὅτι δὲ ὁ σταυρός ἐν τῷ Τ ἡμελλεν ἔχειν τὴν χάριν, λέγει καὶ τοὺς «τριακοσίους» (Because the

¹⁷ Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*, 203, 309 (σταυρός is “a pole in the broadest sense”). σταυρός in certain contexts can be used for the stake to which an individual was bound (προσδέω) on the ground and then flogged to death (Cassius Dio 2.11.6 [I, 27,9-11 Bois-svain], 30-35.104.6, 49.22.6, 63.13.2).

¹⁸ Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*, 285. He then hedges his definition of σταυρός: “a pole or wooden frame on which corpses were suspended or persons exposed to die” (cf. OLD, s.v. *crux*).

¹⁹ One of the most useful handbook for semantics is K. Baldinger, *Semantic Theory. Towards a Modern Semantics*, Oxford 1980.

²⁰ Lucian *Jud. voc.* 12. J. Sommerbrodt deletes the last sentence, but it is included in the Oxford edition (Luciani Opera. Tomus I. Libelli 1-25, SCBO, ed. M. D. Macleod, Oxford 1972, 143). Samuelsson, *Crucifixion*, 278 includes this text in his quotation of LSJ s.v., but does not discuss it, nor modify his position accordingly (in either edition). P. Degen, *Das Kreuz bei den Alten*, Aachen 1872, 24 recognized the importance of this text.

cross was going to have grace in the tau, he says “300”).²¹ Barnabas (ca 130-132) naturally identified the shape of a σταυρός with the T-shape.²² Two Roman graffiti (by pagans) of crucifixions are both in the shape of a tau (Τ).²³ The Puteoli graffito is probably from the era of Trajan. This evidence is surely not coincidental. Lucian and Barnabas show that σταυρός is not the equivalent of “pole” in its broadest sense. The word could mean “pole” or some kind of “cross.”²⁴ Lest one object that the cruciform sense of the word can only be shown to apply in the NT era (and later), one merely has to consider the meaning of *patibulum* below (§ 3.1-3). It clearly signifies the horizontal member of the cross and can also be used to refer to the entire structure in some Latin texts. Many of those texts are pre-Christian. Consequently, it is clear that Roman crosses could be cruciform. The preferred Greek word that was used to describe the *patibulum* and *stipes* structure (i.e., the cruciform shape) was σταυρός (*stauros*).²⁵ Since one can demonstrate that σταυρός could have a cruciform sense beginning with the NT period, there is no overwhelming reason for doubting that the same meaning existed in some texts prior to the NT.²⁶ It could, of course, also mean “pole.” The cruciform sense of *crux* (one of its two main senses) warrants the belief that the cruciform sense of its Greek equivalent (σταυρός) existed before the NT.

Several patristic writers and Artemidorus confirm this interpretation. Justin, after quoting Deut 33:13-17, discusses the shape of crosses in his *Dialogue with Trypho*. He intends his typological exegesis to reveal the power of the mystery of the cross (τὴν ἰσχὺν τοῦ μυστηρίου τοῦ σταυροῦ).²⁷

²¹ Barn. 9.8. Cp. J. Stockbauer, *Kunstgeschichte des Kreuzes*, Schaffhausen 1870, 89.

²² The date is from *Die Apostolische Väter. Griechisch-deutsch Parallelausgabe auf der Grundlage der Ausgaben von F. X. Funk, K. Bihlmeyer und M. Whittaker, mit Übersetzungen von M. Dibelius und D.-A. Koch*, newly trans. and ed. A. Lindemann and H. Paulsen. Tübingen 1992, 24 with ref. to Barn. 16:3 (the new editors date the construction of the temple of Jupiter to 130, which is problematic). Cf. E. M. Smallwood, *The Jews and Roman Rule. From Pompey to Diocletian. A Study in Political Relations*, Boston/Leiden 2001, 432-435.

²³ On the Puteoli graffito, cf. J. G. Cook, *Crucifixion as Spectacle in Roman Campania*, *NovT* 54 (2012) 68-100, esp. 92-98 and on the Palatine graffito, cf. idem, *Envisioning Crucifixion: Light from Several Inscriptions and the Palatine Graffito*, *NovT* 2008, 262-285, esp. 282-284. See figures 5-7, 10. The tau shape appears on an amulet of III C.E. (figure 14).

²⁴ Cp. the similar picture of cross in Artemidorus *Onir.* 2.53 (below in this section and in chapt. 2 § 3.1.4) and cp. the image of cross as mast in Eusebius *H.E.* 8.8.1 (chapt. 2 § 3.24.1) quoted below.

²⁵ Cf. § 3.1-2 below on *patibulum* and σταυρός.

²⁶ Diodorus 25.5.2 (chapt. 3 § 1.12), e.g., mentions an individual nailed to a cross, which probably had a *patibulum*. Cp. Diodorus 20.54.7 (chapt. 3 § 1.12) where it is also clear that *stauros* is not a simple pole and 2.18.1 (chapt. 3 § 1.12: nail to a cross).

²⁷ Justin *Dial.* 91.1 (PTS 47, 226,1-2 Marcovich). The quotation of Deut 33:13-7 then follows.

No one can say or demonstrate that the horns of the single horned animal are [signs] of any other matter or figure other than of the type which represents the cross. For the one beam is upright, whose highest part is raised up into a horn when the other beam is attached to it, and on each side the ends appear as horns that are yoked with the single horn. And what is fixed in the middle [i.e., the *sedile*] is like a horn and it projects [outward], and those who are being crucified rest on it; and it itself also appears to be a horn conformed and fixed with the other horns.

μονοκέρωτος γὰρ κέρατα οὐδενὸς ἄλλου πράγματος ἢ σχήματος ἔχει ἄν τις εἰπεῖν καὶ ἀποδείξει, εἰ μὴ τοῦ τύπου ὃς τὸν σταυρὸν δείκνυσιν. ὄρθιον γὰρ τὸ ἔν ἐστι ξύλον, ἀφ' οὗ ἐστὶ τὸ ἀνώτατον μέρος εἰς κέρας ὑπερηρμένον, ὅταν τὸ ἄλλο ξύλον προσαρμωσθῆ, καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν ὡς κέρατα τῷ ἐνὶ κέρατι παρεξευγμένα τὰ ἄκρα φαίνηται· καὶ τὸ ἐν τῷ μέσῳ πηγνύμενον ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ ἐξέχον ἐστίν, ἐφ' ᾧ ἐποχοῦνται οἱ σταυρούμενοι, καὶ βλέπεται ὡς κέρας καὶ αὐτὸ σὺν τοῖς ἄλλοις κέρασι συνεσχηματισμένον καὶ πεπηγμένον.²⁸

Thus Justin is a witness for a T-shaped cross. One should compare his description to the Puteoli graffito (figures 5-7) that includes a *sedile* (seat) and a *patibulum*. Since “pagan” crosses correspond to Justin’s description (cp. the Palatine graffito [figure 10]), his conception accurately mirrors Roman practice.²⁹

Artemidorus (mid - late II C.E.) explains the nature of the cruciform shape in one of his dream interpretations:

Being crucified is a good thing for all sailors. For a cross is made from posts and nails like a ship, and its mast is like a cross.

Σταυροῦσθαι πᾶσι μὲν τοῖς ναυτιλλομένοις ἀγαθόν· καὶ γὰρ ἐκ ξύλων καὶ ἥλων γέγονεν ὁ σταυρὸς ὡς καὶ τὸ πλοῖον, καὶ ἡ κατάρτιος αὐτοῦ ὁμοία ἐστὶ σταυρῷ.³⁰

²⁸ Justin Dial. 91.2 (227,11-8 Marc.) and cf. the quotation by Tertullian of the same text of Deuteronomy below in two texts (§ 3.4: Iud. 10.7, Marc. 3.18.3). Justin 1 Apol. 55.3 (PTS 38, 110,10-11 Marcovich) says that diggers (σκαπανεῖς) do their work with a tool in the form of a cross. A man carries a tool (a † shape) in a depiction on a roof tile found in a Roman graveyard in Baltatonberény. K. Sági, Darstellung des altchristlichen Kreuzes auf einem römischen Ziegel, AAH 16 (1968) 391-400 (figure on 399) thought it was a pagan caricature of Christ and his cross, however it is more likely a representation of a gravedigger. Cf. D. Gáspár, Christianity in Roman Pannonia. An Evaluation of Early Christian Finds and Sites from Hungary, Oxford 2002, 139-40 § 61.II.a (figs. 386a, b) and cp. figures 52 (found in Aquincum) and 53 for depictions of the tools of a *fossor*. The tool on the roof tile closely resembles a tool on the ground in the depiction of “*Diogenes fossor* ...,” that was found in the catacomb of Domitilla. An illustration is in É. Michon, *fossarius, fossor*, DAGR II/2, 1333-4. For the inscription, cf. ICUR (1896) III, 6649 (IV CE). Both text and illustration are on the Clauss-Slaby database (accessed 11 April 2013). Consequently, Hengel, Crucifixion, 20 is probably in error (i.e., his claim that the tile is a parody of Christ carrying his cross).

²⁹ Consequently Samuelsson’s (Crucifixion, 295) dismissal of such descriptions as “Christian” is baseless.

³⁰ Artemidorus Onir. 2.53. Kuhn, Die Kreuzesstrafe, 702.

The important point is that a cross is made from posts and not just one stake, in his conception. The mast clearly comprises a horizontal member, because for Artemidorus a cross consists of two members, at the least. In another text Artemidorus mentions individuals who carry the cross before crucifixion, and this is a clear reference to a *patibulum*.³¹

Eusebius confirms the role “mast” terminology plays in a text on crucifixions which he witnessed in Egypt in 313:³²

... others with good courage stretched forth their heads to them that cut them off, or died in the mist of their tortures, or perished with hunger; others again were crucified, some as malefactors usually are, and some, even more brutally, were nailed in the opposite manner, head-downwards, and kept alive until they should perish of hunger on the gibbet [mast/cross].³³

... ἄλλοι δ' εὐθαρσῶς τοῖς ἀποτέμνουσιν τὰς ἑαυτῶν προτείναντες κεφαλὰς, οἱ δὲ καὶ ἐναποθανόντες ταῖς βασάνοις, ἕτεροι δὲ λιμῶ διαφθαρέντες, καὶ ἄλλοι πάλιν ἀνασκολοπισθέντες, οἱ μὲν κατὰ τὸ σὺνηθες τοῖς κακούργοις, οἱ δὲ καὶ χειρόνως ἀνάπαλιν κάτω κάρρα προσηλωθέντες τηρούμενοί τε ζῶντες, εἰς ὅτε καὶ ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἰκρίων³⁴ λιμῶ διαφθαρείεν.³⁵

The word Eusebius uses for gibbets can mean “mast” or “cross.” It is also evident that there are no uses of *σταυρός* that include clues or additional semantic details which describe an impalement.³⁶

The verb *ἀνασταυρόω* can mean “impale” in certain texts when describing the treatment of disembodied heads. Herodotus describes Taurians who sacrifice shipwrecked Greeks and suspend/impale their heads (*τῆν δὲ κεφαλὴν ἀνασταυροῦσι*). They treat enemies similarly:

³¹ Artemidorus Onir. 2.56. See § 3.2 below. For the argument concerning *patibulum* and *crux* (which in Roman texts one *never* carried), see § 3.2.

³² Eusebius H.E. 8.9.4 (T. D. Barnes, *Early Christian Hagiography and History*, Tria Corda 5, Tübingen 2010, 342) and cp. idem, *Constantine and Eusebius*, Cambridge, MA/London 1981, 148.

³³ Here and elsewhere in translations I take from other scholars the material in brackets is my own contribution.

³⁴ LSJ, s.v. “ἰκρία III, sg., = ἰστός, *mast*.” Cp. Eustathius Comm. ad Hom. Il. (3.784,1-2 van der Valk) in which the word is used for the top of a mast: ἄλλοι δὲ ἰκρία φασι τὰ ἐξέχοντα τῶν νηῶν ἄκρα. ὅτι δὲ ἰκριον λέγεται καὶ ἐπὶ ἰστοῦ ... (with ref. to Homer, Il. 15.685). LPGL s.v. ἰκριον “*scaffold, gallows; of cross ...*” Cp. Eusebius D.E. III 3.4.27 (GCS Eusebius Werke VI, 115,1-2 Heikel): ... κᾶπειτα ἐπὶ τοῦ ἰκρίου φωνήσας μέγα, καὶ τῷ πατρὶ παρατιθεὶς τὸ πνεῦμα ... (and then calling out loudly on the mast/cross and commending his spirit to the Father) and Lucian Cat. 13 (chapt. 3 § 2.10): ἰστῶ (mast).

³⁵ Eusebius H.E. 8.8.1, trans. of Eusebius, *Ecclesiastical History*, vol. 1-2, LCL, ed. and trans. K. Lake and J. E. L. Oulton, Cambridge, MA/London 1926-1932, 2.275. Cp. the similar account in Laus C. 7.7 (chapt. 2 § 3.24.1).

³⁶ See, in contrast, Diodorus 25.5.2 (chapt. 3 § 1.12; nailed to a *stauros*), *Anthologia Graeca* 11.192 below, and Plutarch An vit. 499D (nail to a *stauros*) below.

Each one cuts off his enemy's head and brings it to his home, then impales it on a great beam and places it high above the home, especially above the smoke hole in the roof.

ἀποταμὸν [ἐκαστος] κεφαλὴν ἀποφέρεται ἐς τὰ οἰκία, ἔπειτα ἐπὶ ξύλου μεγάλου ἀναπέρας ἰστῆ ὑπὲρ τῆς οἰκίης ὑπερέχουσαν πολλόν, μάλιστα δὲ ὑπὲρ τῆς καπνοδόκης.³⁷

The verb, however, means “crucify” in texts such as Josephus’s description of Alexander Jannaeus’s crucifixion of 800 of the Pharisees’ supporters in 88 B.C.E.:

While he feasted with his concubines in a conspicuous place, he ordered some eight hundred of the Jews to be crucified, and slaughtered their children and wives before the eyes of the still living wretches.

ἐσιώμενος γὰρ ἐν ἀπόπτῳ μετὰ τῶν παλλακίδων ἀνασταυρῶσαι προσέταξεν αὐτῶν ὡς ὀκτακοσίους, τοὺς δὲ παῖδας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας ἔτι ζώντων παρὰ τὰς ἐκείνων ὄψεις ἀπέσφαττεν.³⁸

The fact that the crucified victims were still living while their families were murdered in front of them indicates that impalement was clearly not the punishment. In a much earlier text Herodotus uses ἀνεσταύρωσε to describe Darius’s intended crucifixion of Sandoces (he was released).³⁹ I am aware of no text using the verb ἀνασταυρόω that describes an explicit impalement of a living person (i.e., a text with additional semantic clues).⁴⁰ The linguistic and historical contexts are crucial for determining which sense of the verb should be adopted (i.e., “suspend,” “impale” [presumably for most disembodied heads], or “crucify”).

σταυρόω can refer to suspension as in Diodorus Siculus’s description of the death of Onomarchus: “Onomarchus was wounded (or cut in pieces) and suspended/crucified” (Ὀνόμαρχος ... κατακοπεῖς ἐσταυρώθη).⁴¹ The *Greek Anthology* preserves an epigram of Lucillius, who was active during

³⁷ Herodotus 4.103.1-3 (cf. Samuelsson, Crucifixion, 45). Cp. Herodotus 9.78.3: the impalement or suspension of Leonidas’s head by the Persians τὴν κεφαλὴν ἀνεσταύρωσαν. See chapt. 3 § 1.2. Josephus A.J. 6.374 describes the attachment (not impalement), by the Philistines, of the bodies of Saul and his sons to the walls of Bethshan (τὰ δὲ σώματα ἀνεσταύρωσαν πρὸς τὰ τείχη τῆς Βηθσάν πόλεως). Cf. chapt. 2 § 3.22 for other uses of the verb to refer to impaled or suspended heads. It is possible that nails were occasionally used for suspending heads. Strabo 4.4.5 describes Druids who nail the heads of their enemies on the doors of their homes (κομίσαντας [τὰς κεφαλὰς] δὲ προσπατταλεῦν τοῖς προφυλαίοις). Cf. Samuelsson, *ibid.*, 46.

³⁸ Josephus A.J. 13.380. Trans of Josephus, *Jewish Antiquities* Books XII-XIV, vol. 7, ed. and trans. R. Marcus, Cambridge, MA/London 1933, 417. Cp. B.J. 1.97 (same scene).

³⁹ Herodotus 7.194.1-3 (cf. chapt. 3 § 1.2). Diodorus 25.5.2 (cf. chapt. 3 § 1.12) is another use of ἀνεσταύρωσεν that clearly means “crucified,” since it is parallel with εἰς τὸν αὐτὸν σταυρὸν ... προσήλωσεν (nailed to the same cross).

⁴⁰ No text describes an explicit hanging by a noose using the verb.

⁴¹ Diodorus 16.61.2 (cf. chapt. 3 § 1.12).

the reign of Nero in which the verb manifestly refers to crucifixion and not impalement:

Envious Diophon, seeing another man near him crucified on a higher cross than himself, fell into a decline.

Μακροτέρῳ σταυρῷ σταυρούμενον ἄλλον ἑαυτοῦ
ὁ φθονερός Διοφῶν ἐγγύς ἰδὼν ἐτάκη.⁴²

Diophon, while being crucified himself (and so not impaled, which would have resulted in immediate death), was consumed with envy of another man's more impressive cross. No occurrence of σταυρόω I have found describes the explicit impalement of a living person (i.e., a text with additional semantic clues). Consequently, "suspend" (in the case of corpses) or "crucify" are acceptable translations of the verb in most penal contexts.⁴³

σκόλοψ could be used for a stake to impale an individual. Plutarch mentions it as a possible form of death (unspecified executioner), which he contrasts with crucifixion, ("will you nail him to a cross or impale him on a stake?" εἰς σταυρὸν καθηλώσεις ἢ σκόλοπι πήξεις;).⁴⁴ Celsus, however, uses the noun interchangeably with σταυρός, and does not conceive Jesus' death to be an impalement. His mention of the piercing of Jesus' hands probably implies the presence of a *patibulum*.⁴⁵ An oracle attributed to the Milesian Apollo describes Jesus nailed to stakes (γομφωθεὶς σκολόπεσσι), which indicates a cross built from at least two members.⁴⁶ Cassius Dio can use ἀνασκολοπίζω for suspension. The governor envisions impalement by stakes after suspension using the verb: "... to be suspended ... to be pierced by

⁴² Anthologia Graeca 11.192 (chapt. 2 § 3.5.4). Trans. of The Greek Anthology, Vol. 4, LCL, ed. and trans. W. R. Patton, Cambridge, MA/London 1918, 163. Cp. the use for crucifixion (with nails mentioned) in Lucian Prom. 1 (ἐσταυρῶσθαι).

⁴³ An exception may be Priscus's use of the verb to describe Attila's executions (cf. frag. 2 [Blockley] in chapt. 3 § 10.6). The verb is never used to express hanging by a noose (i.e., with explicit semantic clues).

⁴⁴ Cf. Plutarch An vit. 499D (chapt. 3 § 2.6). Cp. Euripides Iph. Taur. 1430 σκόλοπι πήξωμεν δέμας ([Asia Minor] let us [some barbarians] impale their [live] bodies on a stake), El. 898 πήξασ' ἔρεισον σκόλοπι (Orestes to Electra: impaling it [the corpse of Aegisthus] thrust it down on a stake [a murder]), Diodorus 33.15.1 οἱ δὲ κεφαλὰς καὶ χεῖρας καὶ πόδας ἀφῆρημένοι· καὶ τούτων οἱ μὲν ἐπὶ σκόλοψιν, οἱ δὲ ἐπὶ δένδροισιν ἀνήρτηντο ([Diegylis, a Thracian, executed some hostages:] some were deprived of heads, and hands and feet; of these some were fixed to stakes and others to trees), Eur. Bacch. 1139-41 κρᾶτα δ' ἄθλιον / ... / πήξασ' ἐπ' ἄκρον θύρσον ([Agave] fixed his [Pentheus's] miserable head on the top of a thyrsus), Homer Il. 18.176-7 κεφαλὴν ... / πῆξαι ἀνὰ σκολόπεσσι ταμόνθ' ἀπαλῆς ἀπὸ δειροῆς (cutting his [Patroclus's] head from the tender neck fix it on stakes).

⁴⁵ Origen C. Cels. 2.55 τὴν ἐπὶ τοῦ σκόλοπος αὐτοῦ φωνήν (his voice on the stake [this text also mentions the nails in his hands]), 2.61 τῶν ἐπὶ τῷ σταυρῷ τραυμάτων (the wounds he received on the cross). Cf. chapt. 3 § 6.1 (Celsus) and the discussion of *patibula* below (§ 3.1).

⁴⁶ Lact. Inst. 4.13.11, cf. chapt. 1 § 2.27.

Sources

1 Classical Texts before Constantine with Selected Scholia

Achilles Tatius		[Apollodorus]	
Leucippe et Clitoph.		Bibl.	
2.37.3	264	1.45	251
Acta Pilati		Artemidorus	
(Ruf. Hist. 9.6.3)	151	Onir.	
Aelianus		1.pr	32
frag. 65	258	1.2	289
frag. 276	257	1.76	32, 251, 289
Aelius Aristides		2.53	7, 32, 182, 192, 289–
Or. 3.378	268–9	2.56	290, 382, 427, 429
Schol. in Aelium		2.68	8, 31, 290, 383, 423,
232,13 (Jebb)	269	2.68	424
Aeschylus		4.33	290
Eum.		4.49	291
189–90	305	5.pro.	291, 427, 439
Prom.		5.34	32
64–5	251	Appian	291
74, 76, 81	251	Bell. civ.	
Aesop		1.119/553	171
Fab. 157	218–9	1.120/559	171
Anthologia Graeca		2.90/377	173
9.378	258–9	3.3/9	12–3, 175, 384
11.192	8, 10, 193	4.28/120–22	373
Anthologia Latina		4.29/126	176
(Buecheler/Riese)		4.35/148	177
415.23–4	149–50	4.81/343	177
794.27–8	150	5.70/295	177–8
794.35–6	150	5.131/545	178–9
		Libyca	
		4/15	95
		Mithr.	
		8/25	249
		29/114	168
		84/378	250

97/450–1	250	Indica 5.11.33	249
Sicelica frag. 2.8	250	Succ. frag. 1.18	248–9
Apuleius Met.		Atticus frag. 2.16	273
1.14.2	129		
1.15.6	129		
3.9.1–3	129	Augustus Anc.	
3.17.4–5	130, 383	25.1	160, 178, 455–7
3.17.5	107		
3.32.4	117		
4.10.3–4	21–2, 130	B. Afr. 66.4	78
4.10.4	26		
4.11.3	41		
6.31.1	17, 21, 131, 375, 428	B. Hisp. 20.5	175
6.31.3	21, 131, 381		
6.32.1	131, 387		
8.30.2	378	Callisthenes FGrH 2B 124 frag. 3	225
10.7.4	132		
10.7.7	45, 132		
10.8.1	132	[Callisthenes] Hist. Alexandri Mag. Recensio α	
10.9.1	45, 132	1.35.6	267
10.12.4	17, 132, 375	1.37.4	267
Aristophanes Thesm.		2.21.24	268
930–1	14	2.21.26	268
1003	14		
Scholia in Aristoph Plut. 476	15	Recensio ε 15.3	267–8
Aristotle Rhet.		Calpurnius Flaccus Decl.	
2.5.14 (1383a)	13–4	17	110, 126–7
		23	127
		33	128
frag. 611.16 Rose	221	50	128–9
Arrianus Anab.		Cassius Dio 2, frag. 11.6	5, 256
4.14.3	12, 247	11	255
5.3.2	249	12	255–6
6.17.2	248	30–35.104.6	5
6.29.2	248	49.12.4–5	179
6.30.2	248	49.22.6	467
7.14.4	248	54.3.7	380
		54.20.4	256
		60.24.4	256

62.7.1	256–7	Orat.	
62.7.2	3, 256–7	102	72
62.11.4	11, 257		
75.7.3	210	Phil.	
76(77).10.1–3	373	1.5	98, 176, 384
		13.21	78
Cato		13.27	429
Agr.			
26	18, 20	Pis.	
68	18	42	74, 354
		43, 44	75
Catullus		83	41
99.1–6	78–9		
		Q. fr.	
Cicero		1.2.5	74
Att.		1.2.6	73, 118, 359, 424
7.11.2	76		
12.49.2	384	Rab. perd.	
14.15.1	13, 175–6, 354	8	366
14.16.2	13, 176, 354	10	70–1, 428
		11	30, 71, 382, 424, 428
Cat.		12	367, 379
1.27	359	13	70, 365, 367
4.11	367	15	373
		16	70, 72, 98, 365, 383–
Clu.			4, 419, 428
176–87	136, 372, 456	17	70
187	170–1, 375	28	71, 424, 428
Deiot.		Rep.	
26	45, 58, 76	2.31	366
Div.		Tusc.	
1.55	38	1.102	77, 243
		1.107	459–60
Fam.		5.32	77
4.12	178		
10.32.3	96	Vat.	
		26	4
Fin.		Ver.	
5.84	77, 375	1.13	68
5.92	77, 220	2.1.7	68, 172, 365, 387
Leg.		2.1.9	68, 365
2.23	365	2.1.145	382
3.6	373	2.1.156	62
		2.3.6	68, 365
Mil.		2.3.56, 57	4
59–60	75	2.3.59	68
		2.3.112	68

2.3.119	359	Cratinus	
2.4.24	66	fr. 341 Edmonds	14
2.4.26	66, 427–9		
2.4.84–89	24	Ctesias	
2.4.90	17, 24	FGrH 3C 688 Frag.	222
2.5.7	108, 167	14.39	
2.5.11	63	FGrH 3C 688 Frag.	223, 232
2.5.12	63, 358, 423	1B.500–1	
2.5.14	63, 173, 379, 423	FGrH 3C 688 Frag.	223, 231
2.5.72	42	1B.30–31	
2.5.140–2	379		
2.5.160	377	Curtius	
2.5.161	63–4, 172, 358, 364	4.4.17	13, 124
	377–8	6.3.4	124–5
2.5.162	64, 364, 379	6.11.7	378
2.5.163	65–6, 374, 379, 423	7.5.40	125
2.5.164	64, 375	7.11.28	125
2.5.165	64, 359, 374, 418–9	9.8.16	125, 248
2.5.166	65, 375		
2.5.168	30, 65, 172, 359, 364	Demosthenes	
2.5.169	66–7, 160, 172, 358–9, 423, 428–9	Mid. 105	223
2.5.170	67, 160, 375	Schol. in Demosth.	
2.5.171	69	21.370	224
Chariton		Dio Chrysostom	
Chaer.		4.27	240
3.4.18	11, 260, 266, 429	4.21	240–1
4.2.6–7	166–7, 260–1, 375, 423	4.65	241
		4.66	241
4.2.7	32, 424	4.67	241
4.3.5–6	261, 430	4.67–70	241–2
4.3.5	424	17.15	220
4.3.9–10	262		
4.3.10	32	Diodorus Siculus	
5.10.6	382	2.1.10	223, 231
8.7.8	11	2.18.1	223, 232
8.8.2, 4	262	2.44.2	231
8.8.4	430	3.65.5	231
		5.32.6	233
Clodius Licinus		13.111.4	231
Libri rerum roman.		14.53.4	231
frag. 3 Peter = frag. 2	22, 23, 40, 166, 375	16.35.6	231
Oakley	423, 453–5	16.61.2	9, 231
		17.46.4	13, 231, 233
Columella		19.67.2	231
1.7.2	116	20.54.7	6, 232
10.348–50	116–7	20.54.2	232
		20.69.5	231
		20.103.6	231

24.12.3	127	Paul. Fest.	
25.5.2	6, 8, 9, 229–30, 232	79,1 Lindsay	44
25.10.2	231	81,26–7 Lindsay	47
26.23.1	231	241,1–3 Lindsay	385
33.15.1	10	423,9–11 Lindsay	169–70
34–35.12.1	231–2		
37.5.2	168	Florus	
37.5.3	167–8	1.18 (2.2.24–5)	133
		2.7 (3.19.7–8)	166, 457
		2.9 (3.21.14)	385
		2.30 (4.12.24)	133–4
Dionysius Halicarn.			
1.80.1	193		
5.51.3	234		
7.69.2	38	Frontinus	
12.6.6	234	Stra.	
		4.7.24	162
[Diogenes]			
Ep.		Fronto	
28.3	274	Parth.	
32.2	274	7	134
Diogenes Laertius		Galen	
6.4.5	273	Adhortatio ad art. ad.	
		4.3 (88 Boudon)	293
Dorotheus of Sidon		De usu partium	
Fragmenta graeca		12.1	293
362,9–12 Pingree	282–3		
Ennius		Gracch.	
Ann.		In Pomp. et matr.	
XI 359 (360) fr. vii	51–2	(Malcovati)	
		fr. 38	62
Epictetus		Val. Harpocraton	
Diatr.		Lexicon	
2.2.20	272–3	I, 56,15–57,2	255
3.26.21–2	273	Dindorf	
Euripides		Hellenica	
Cycl.		(P.Oxy 5.842)	
643	304	FGrH 2A 66 frag.	229
Iph. Taur.		1.15.5 (436–9)	
1430	10		
Rhes.		Heliodorus	
514	305	Aethiopica	
		4.20.2	266
Festus		Herodianus	
(Bi Teu Lindsay)		Ab excessu d. Marci	
136,12–19	62	5.2.2	208
423,9–11 Lindsay	169–70	8.6.7	10

Aelius Herodianus		Hyginus	
De prosodia		Fab.	
Gramm. Graec. 3/1		194.8	138
276 Lenz	269	257.4	138
		257.7	138
Herodotus		Iamblichus	
1.128.2	221	Babyl.	
2.134.3–4	219	2	265
3.125.3–4	219	21	265
3.132.2	221	22	265–6
3.159.1	221	frag. 61	266
4.1–4	140		
4.43.2	221	Iustinus	
4.103.1–3	9	Epit.	
4.202.1	221	2.5.6–7	140
6.30.1	219	9.7.10–11	140
7.33	13, 220, 452	18.3.18	140–1
7.194.1–3	9, 220–1	18.7.15	141
7.238.1	219	21.4.7	141
9.78.3	9, 219	22.7.8	141–2
9.120	13	22.7.9	142
9.120.4	220	30.2.6–7	142
9.122.1	220		
Homer		Iuvenalis	
Il.		1.155–7	380
18.176–7	10	6.219–23	135
		8.187–8	136, 369
Horatius		10.66–7	383
Carm.		10.329–45	188
3.19.2	445	13.103–5	137
2.7.46–7	80	14.77–8	137
Ep.		Schol. in Iuv.	137
1.16.40–1	80	1.155, 157	380, 382
1.16.46–8	81	6.220	135
2.1.154–5	81	8.187	136, 369
		8.235	380
S.		8.266	146
1.3.80–3	79–80, 252	10.332–3	188, 368
1.8.30–3	80	13.103, 105	137
1.8.43–4	80	14.78	137
		14.238	146
Pseudacron		Josephus	
Schol. in Ep.		A.J.	
1.16	81	2.73	236
2.1.154	82	6.374	9, 237
Schol. in S.		11.17	237
1.8.8–10	386	11.208	237

11.246	237	10.365–7	114
11.261	237	10.513–9	114–5
11.267	237		
12.256	237–8, 439	Schol. in Luc.	
12.413	338	2.364	133
13.380	9, 238, 319	6.543	113
15.9	466	6.547	113
17.295	181		
18.63–4	185	Lucian	
18.79	182–3	Cat.	
19.94	238	6	13, 254
20.102	188–9	13	8, 182, 253
20.129	189		
		Char.	
Bellum		14	254
1.357	466		
2.75	181	Dial. d.	
2.241–2	189	5.1	251
2.253	190		
2.307	194	Dial. mar.	
3.321	196–7	14.3	33
4.317	239, 462		
5.289	197	Jud. voc.	
5.449–51	197–8	12	xxx, 5, 11, 32
6.304	378		
7.202–3	199, 418	Iupp. conf.	
7.202	424	8	251
		16	254
Vita			
420–1	198, 434, 439	Jupp. trag.	
		19	13, 254
Livius			
Ab urbe condita		Peregr.	
1.26.6–7	45, 70	11	11, 253
1.26.10	46	13	11, 253, 439
2.36.1	38	33	446
22.13.9	84	34	252, 428
22.33.1–2	71, 162	39–40	439
24.14.7, 28.37.2	84	45	253, 424
29.9.10	85		
29.18.14	85	Philops.	
33.36.2–3	164, 378	17	107, 252, 383
34.48.13	85	29	254
Perioch.		Pisc.	
17	83	2	254
Lucanus		Prometheus	
6.543–9	112	1	10, 12, 250–1
7.304–6	114	2	251, 452

4	252, 418	Nonius Marcellus	
7	251	(BiTeu Lindsay)	
9	252	1.168,10	60
10	80, 252	1.287,10–13	51
34	252	1.327	22, 40
		2.582	18, 22
Sacr.			
6	251	Ovidius	
		Am.	
[Lucian]		1.12.17–8	92
Amores			
20	265	Pont.	
		1.6.38	4
Macr.		1.6.37–40	93
14	254		
		Palladas	
Lucretius		Anth. Graec. 9.378	258–9
3.1016–1017	380–1		
		Petronius	
Lycophron		53.3	118
Alexandra		58.2	118, 429
1076–9	269	111.5–6	118, 428
		112.5–6	118–9
Gaius Maecenas		112.8	119
Poet.		113.2	119, 428
frag. 4	82–3	126.9	119
frag. 8	83	137.2	119
		Phaedrus	
[Manetho]		Fab. 3.5.6–10	93
Apotelesmatica			
1.148–9	284	Appendix Perottina	
4.196–200	285, 462	15.6–10	93–94
4.199	422	15.25–39	94
5.219–21	284		
Manilius		[Phalaris]	
5.549–55	117	Ep.	
		147.3	259
Martialis			
Epigr.		Philo	
2.82	457–60	Flacc.	
4.86.8	380	36	240, 445
10.25.5	380	72	187, 378
10.82.5–8	121–2	83	187, 387
		84–5	187, 462
Sp.			
9(7).1–12	200–1, 217, 369	Ios.	
9.(7)4	4, 30	96	235
		98	235
		156	236

Post.		902	52
27	315		
61	11–2, 234–5, 383	Carb. frag. 2	17, 22, 30, 375, 423
Somn.		Cas.	
2.213	11, 235, 383	93–4	52
Spec.		389	40
3.151–2	236	416	54
Philogelos		437–8	40
121	259	611–2	52
		641	54
		977	52
Philostratus		Cist.	
Heroicus		248	45
19.17	258		
Plato		Cur.	
Gorgias		611	52
473B–D	271	693	53, 375, 423
Phaedo		Men.	
83D	235	66	52
		328	52
Resp.		849	52
361E–362A	271–2	915	52–3
		943	40
Plautus		1017	53
Am.		Mil.	
(after 1034), frag. 1	55	184	54
As.		309–10	54–5
474	429	359–60	21
484–5	45	372–3	55, 88, 387, 429
545–51	56	545, 547	44
549–51	379, 423	722	429
940	52		
Aul.		Mos.	
58–9	55, 428	55–6	423
520–2	54	55–7	21, 33
631	54	56	131, 375
		359	424, 428
		359–61	56
Bac.		359–60	xxiii, 50, 383, 424
361–2	56–7	850	53
584	54	1133	54
Capt.		Per.	
469	52	294–5	55
596–7	380, 423	352	52

795	54	Plutarch	
855–6	40, 55–6	Ag. Cleom.	218, 315
Poen.		20–1	12, 315
271	53	20.4, 6	12, 245, 247–8
309	122	59.4	12, 245, 248
347	52	60.2	
495–6	53	Alex.	
511	53	3.2	240
789–90	53	43.6	125
799	53	55.8	244
886	429	55.9	12, 247
1309	53	72.3	244
Ps.		Amatorius	
331–6	53–4, 428	16, 420C	264
839	53		
846	53	An vit.	
1182–3	53	499D	8, 10, 243, 383, 462
1294	53		
Rud.		Ant.	
176	53	36.4	466
518	52	81.1–2	179
1070	56	Art.	
1162	53	17.7	222
St.		Brut.	
625	427	31.5	12, 248, 315
625–6	57		
Trin.		Caes.	
598	52	2.4	12, 247
		2.7	12, 170, 247
Plinius		Cat. Maj.	
Nat.		21.4	372, 456
3.65	169		
8.47	37, 106	Cor.	
14.12	34, 106, 427	24.5	37–8
14.32	19		
16.108	47	Fab.	
17.212	19	6.5	243–4
18.12, 28.18	47		
28.41	106, 383	Flam.	
28.46	107, 113, 335, 383, 425	9.4	244
		21.6	231
29.57	40, 144, 245, 387		
34.6	62, 173	Fort. Rom.	
36.107	107	12, 325D	244–5
36.73	19		

Garr. 13, 508F–509A	245	Par. min. 24 311E	246
Luc. 25.1	250	Reg. imp. apoph. 195B 205F	247 247
Per. 282	13, 224	206A 207B	170 181–2
Pomp. 10.4 24.1–28.4 77.2 80.6	169 174 173 173	Polyaenus Stratagem. 7.6.3	254
Publ. 6.2–4	xxvii, 42	Polybius Hist. 1.11.5 1.24.6 1.79.4	230 83, 230 230
Quaest. conv. 718D	235	1.86.4–6 5.54.6 8.21.3 10.33.8	229–30 230 230, 245 163
Quaest. Rom. 61 70	169 38	Porphyrus (Fragmenta, Smith) 343F = Aug. Civ. 19.23	138–9, 382, 422
Sera 554A 554B 554D	31, 245, 423 380 218	Contra Christianos frag. 84 Harnack = Method. C. Porph. 1	278–9, 422
De soll. 968E	15	De Abst. 4.21.4	152
Sull. 24.4 30.2	105 114	Priapeia 2.16–21	103
De superst. 169F–170A	15	Sextus Propertius 3.22.37–8	82
Tim. 22.8	244	Ptolemy Tetrabiblos 4.9.12–13	283
[Plutarch] De fluviis 1.1 1.4	247 246	[Ptolemy] Fructus sive centil. 73	284
De prov. Alex. frag. 4	247		

Quintilianus		7.6.13	89
Inst.		7.6.14	79, 89–90
3.6.58	153	7.7.pr.	37, 90, 428
4.2.17	108, 167	7.7.5	90, 428
6.1.54	108	7.7.9	90, 429
7.1.29–30	108	7.7.18	91
8.2.4	108	8.4.1	91, 387, 429
8.4.4–5	109	9.2.8	373
		9.2.10	373
[Quintilianus]		9.6.18	381
Decl. min.		10.5.6	91
274.13	37, 109, 205, 428	10.5.7	91–2
380.pr.	110, 127, 370	10.5.9	381
380.1	110		
380.2	110, 180, 427	Seneca	
		Ep.	
[Quintilianus]		4.7	48
Decl.		14.5	3, 35, 97–8, 161, 192, 380–1, 384–5
5.16	111	47.5	135
6.9	111	82.3	98, 384
12.12	112	92.35	83, 98
Rhet. Her.		98.12	100
3.23	72–3	101.10–12	3, 100–101, 161
		101.10	xxi, 83, 100
Sallustius		101.12	26, 79, 83, 375
Hist.		101.13	101, 428, 430
frag. 9	174	101.13–4	102, 419
Jug.		Ben.	
14.15	78	4.21.6	381
Scholiasts		Clem.	
(indexed by author commented on)		1.23.1	99
		1.26.1	99
Seneca		Dial.	
Con.		1.3.9–10	95, 429
3.9.pr.	37, 86, 127	3.2.2	33, 96
3.9.1	86–7	3.18.1	429
7.4.5	87	3.18.3–5	184
7.6.pr.	30, 87	3.19.3	184
7.6.2	87–8, 200	3.32.1	429
7.6.3	88	5.3.6	96, 98, 381
7.6.4	45, 88	5.19.2	48
7.6.6	88, 200	5.40.2–4	135
7.6.9	45, 88	6.20.3	3, 21, 26, 29, 34, 96– 97, 161, 375, 395, 427
7.6.10	89		
7.6.11	89		
7.6.12	89		

7.19.3	21, 26, 28, 35, 98–9	Gal.	
	383, 425, 428	9.1	30, 195, 365, 372,
9.14.3	243		382, 423
9.14.4–7	48		
		Vit.	
frag. 124	21, 26, 102, 284, 375	17.2	98, 384
		Dom.	
Epigr. (Prato)		10.1	37, 201
24	150	11.1	37, 202
		11.2–3	xxvii, 42
Silius			
1.151–4	120		
1.165–8	120	Statius	
1.171–5	120	Silv.	
1.179–81	120–1	4.3.27	34
		4.3.27–31	115–6
Sophocles			
Aegeus		Strabo	
frag. 20	304	3.4.18	180
		4.4.5	9
Ant.		14.1.39	233
308–9	12		
		Tacitus	
Suetonius		Ann.	
Jul.		1.61.4	21, 122–3
74.1	34, 170	2.32	xxvii, 41
75	176	2.85.5	183
		3.49.2	360
Aug.		3.50.1	124, 360
67.2	429	4.30.1	41
		4.72.3	23, 123, 375
Tib.		5.9.1–2	373
36.1	183	6.3.4	360
44.2	429	6:5.9.2	4, 124
61.4	98, 384	6.25.3	124
75.1	98, 384	11.27	188
		11.35.2	188
Cal.		12.54.4	189
12.2	49, 186, 374	13.32	178
30.2	48	14.33.2	3, 123, 381
32.2	427	14.42–5	178
57.4	200	15.44.4	23, 191–2, 292, 369,
			381
Claudius		Germ.	
26.2	188	12.1	124
34.1	xxvii, 42, 373		
		Hist.	
Nero		2.72.2	195, 358, 457
49.2	xxvii, 40–1, 373	3.77.1	196
		4.3.2	28, 196, 375

4.11.3	196, 358	L.	
		5.25	385
Terentius			
An.		R.	
621	58, 457	1.8.1–3	20
Eu.		Men. fr. 24	59–61
382–5	59		
Ph.		Vergilius	
543–5	58	A.	
368	58	3.549	36
		12.646	101
Schol. Ter. An. 619	42	Philargyrius	
Don. Ter. An. 618.2	44	In Ecl. 3.104–5	155
Don Ter. Ph. 368	58		
Theopompus		[Probus]	
FGrH 2B 115, frag.	225	Comm. in Buc.	
291		6.42	145
Thucydides		Servius	
1.110.3	222	A.	
		1.277	168–9, 368
		1.519	143
Titinius		3.551	144
frag. 11 Guardí	14, 15–6	8.652	144
		12.603	144–5
Valerius Maximus		Ecl.	
1.7.4	39, 40	8.55	145
2.7.9	165		
2.7.12	163	Vettius Valens	
2.7. ext. 1	103–4	Anth.	
6.2. ext. 3	104	2.41.35	282
6.3.5	167	2.41.37	283
6.9. ext. 5	104, 462		
8.4.2	174	Vitruvius	
9.2.3	105	7.pr.9	92
9.2. ext. 3	105–6		
Iulius Paris		Xenophon of Ephes.	
Epit. 1.7.4	39, 40	Eph.	
		4.2.1	263
Varro		4.2.3	263, 423
Gramm. fr. 265	61	4.2.6	263
(Funaioli)		4.4.2	263
		4.6.2	264

2 Biblical Literature

<i>Hebrew Bible</i>		1 Esdras 6:31	225
Genesis		2 Esdras 6:11	225
40:13	316	Esther	
40:19	316	2:23 o'	226
Deuteronomy		5:14 o'	226
21:22-3	226, 316, 320-1, 356	6:14(11) L	227, 315
21:23	340, 419	7:9-10 o'	227
Joshua		7:12L	228
8:29	316	7:28L	228
10:26	316	E17-18 o'	227
		9:25 o'	227
1 Samuel		1 Maccabees	
31:9-10	316	9:54-56	338
2 Samuel		Psalms	
4:12	316	21:2	448
21:12	316	37:22-3	444
Ezra		Lamentations	
6:11	314	5:12	228
Esther		<i>Vulgate</i>	
2:23	315	Genesis	
5:14	315	40:19	375
7:9	312	40:22	375
Psalms		Joshua	
22:2a	444	8:29	43
22:7-9	444	Esther	
22:19	444	5:14	375
<i>Septuagint</i>		6:4	375
Genesis		7:10	375
14:14	5	8:17	375
40:17	235	Psalms	
Deut.		21:2	442
21:22-3	226	21:23	443
33:13-17	6	<i>New Testament</i>	
Josh		Matthew	
8:29	226	24:14	443
10:26	296		

27:38	184–5	21:18–19	192
27:46	448	20:24–9	440
		20:25	382
Mark			
1:1	447	1 Corinthians	
10:45	437	1:23	439, 440
15:15	377	2:2	439
15:20, 32	458	15:17	440
15:24	192, 444		
15:26	427	2 Corinthians	
15:27	184–5	12:9	442
15:29	444	13:4	439, 448
15:30	430		
15:34	440–8	Galatians	
15:37	440	3:1	439
15:38	447		
15:39	445, 447	Philippians	
15:43 par.	429	2:8	417
16:6	438–9, 440		
		1 Thessalonians	
Luke		1:10	417
23:26	31	15:10	417
John			
19:17	26, 28, 30	Hebrews	
19:20	439	7:25	439
19:23	427, 458	12:2	423
19:26, 33	429		
19:34	111, 429	Revelation	
		11:8	439

3 *Christian Texts before Constantine*

Acta Andreae		Justin	
54	426	Dial.	
		90.1	419
Arnobius		91.1	6
1.36	364, 421–2	91.2	xxvii, 7, 35
7.39	39		
		1 Apol.	
Barn.		13.4	419
9.8	5–6, 32	22.3–4	420
		55.1	420
1 Clem		55.3	7, 182
55:2	446		
		Mart. Pet.	
Irenaeus		8.4.–9.1 (Zwierlein)	192
Haer.			
2.24.4	xxvii, 35–6, 427		

Lactantius		8.54	15
Inst.			
2.4.21	390	Mat.	
4.13.11	10, 139, 382, 422	124 (Matt 27:22)	421
4.26.29	422		
4.26.32	429	Tertullianus	
		Apol.	
Minucius Felix		9.2	204–5
9.4	421	16.6–7	49
29.2	421	16.6	281
29.8	37	21.19	429
29.7	49	50.3	381
Origen		Iud.	
Comm. Ser. Mat.		10.6	27
140, Matt 27:54	111–112, 434	10.7	7, 28, 36, 133
		13.20	27
		13.21	27
C. Cels.			
1.66	428		
2.5	151	Marc.	
2.24	446	3.18.2	27
2.31	15	3.18.3	7, 36–7
2.36	11, 274–5, 428, 440	3.18.4	29, 35, 36–7
2.37	275		
2.55	10, 275, 428, 446	Mart.	
2.61	10, 276, 382	5.1	380
2.63	151		
2.68	276	Nat.	
3.32	429	1.12.3–4	xxvii, 35, 427
5.64	277	1.12.4	xxi, 49, 101
6:10	275, 421	1.18.10	380
6.34	276		
7.36	281	Praescr.	
7.40	11, 277	36.3	192
7.53	277–8, 440		
7.68	281	Val.	
8.39	278	14.4	200

4 Latin Texts after Constantine

Agennius Urbicus		Ambrosiaster	
De controversiis		Qu. test.	
agrorum 47,1–2	386	115.67 De fato	400
Thulin			
		Ammian. Marcellin.	
Ambrose		Res gestae	
Abr.		15.7.4–5	4
1.8.72	27	19.9.2	405

24.5.3	405	Eutropius	
27.2.9	405–6	Breviarium	
		7.15.1	42
Andreas de S. Vit.			
Exp. super hept.		Firmicus Maternus	
In Iosue 8:29, 145–7	42	Mathesis	
		1.10.13–14	406
Augustinus		6.31.58, 59	23, 40, 147–8
Civ.		6.31.73	148
3.27	385	8.17.2	148, 406
4.26	38	8.22.3	148, 406
19.23	138–9, 382, 422	8.25.6	148
Ep.		Fortunatianus	
140.5.14	441	Ars rhetorica	
140.6.15	442	1.21	153
140.6.17	442	2.30	153–4
140.6.18	442, 443		
140.11.28	443	Glossaria	
140.17.43	443	CGIL 5.130,22–5	
		(Placidus Cod. Par.)	18, 20
Psal.		CGIL 5.360	45
21.2.3	442	CGIL 2.436,47	25
36.2.4	401		
Serm.		Hermes Trismeg.	
88.8	401	De triginta sex dec.	
		25.21	157
		26.77	157–8
Tract. Io. = Eu. Io.			
36.4	190, 401, 426, 443	Hieronymus	
		Iov. 2.7	151
Aurelius Victor			
De caesaribus		Matt. 4 line 1477–9	448
41.4–5	398–400		
41.11–12	404–5	Hilarius	
[Aurelius Victor]		Trin.	
Epit. de Caesaribus		10.13	426
5.7	41–2		
40.5	4	Historia Augusta	
		Hadrian	
		18.7	371
Ausonius			
Cupido cruc. Ep. ad		Avidius Cassius	
Gregorium	152	4.1–2	30, 205
Cupido cruciatus		4.5	429
56–62	152	4.6	30, 206, 358
Cassiodorus		Commodus	
Hist. trip.		17.4, 18.5, 6, 19.1–7	384
1.9.13	402		

Pertinax		Laterculus regum	
9.10	30, 207	Vandalorum et Rom.	
		10	410
Septimius Severus		Macrobius	
4.3	206	1.11.3, 5	24–5
Clodius Albinus		3.7.3	170
11.6	30, 207	3.20.3	46–7
Opellius Macrinus		Medicina Plinii	
11.6	59	3.14	154
12.2	30, 208, 358		
12.11	206–7	Orosius	
Severus Alexander		Hist.	
1.1	60	4.6.6–8	155
23.8	30, 208	4.6.19–20	156
28.5	30, 209	4.6.32	156
37.2	381–2	4.9.9	156–7
		5.9.4	164
		5.9.6–7	166
Maximini duo		5.16.5	4
8.7	30, 209	6.18.33	179
16.6, 23.6	209–10		
Tyranni triginta		Palladius	
22.8	4	Opus agriculturae	
29.3	143	1.35.3	154
29.4	26, 143, 210, 375	Panegyrici Latini	
Ioh.–Bicl.		Pacatus	
Chron.		2(12).42.1	408
93	415	2(12).44.1	408
		2(12).45.2	408–9
Iord.		Passio Carpi	
Get.		2, 3	467
48.247	414	4	469
Isidorus		Paulus Epitome Festi	
Orig.		see Festus above	
5.27.34	17		
5.27.33–4	42–3	Rufinus	
[Isidorus Iunior]		Clem.	
Hist. Goth. Wand.		9.11.4	381, 382
Sueb. V. Cont. Hisp.		Hist.	
a. DCCLIV 71	415	5.1.41	381
		9.6.3	151
Iulius Victor		Orig. Ios. 8.3	43
Ars Rhetorica			
1 De coniectura	152–3		

Sidonius Apollinaris		Victor Vitensis	
Epistulae		Hist.	
4.23	409	3.63	410

5 *Greek Texts after Constantine*

Achmet		H.E.	
Oneirocriticon		3.1.2	192
89	299	3.22.3	203
90	292	3.226	203
126	292–3	8.9.4	8
5.pr.	32	8.8.1	8, 213
		8.14.13	213
Alexander of Tralles		9.6.3 (Ruf. Hist.)	151
Περὶ ἐπιληψίας		Laus C.	
(I, 567 Puschmann)	107, 294	7.7	213
Apomasar		De mart. Pal.	
De rev. nativatum		(long recension)	
BiTeu Pingree		11.24	214
204,8–11	289		
Append. monum.		P.E.	
ad Recogn. Clement.		1.4.7	152
PG 1.1457C	295–6		
Astrologica		Vita C.	
De mans. lunae		1.58.2	213–4
CCAG 11/1 Wein.		Gregorius Thamat.	
150,33–151,2	288	Epistula canonica	
		7	413–4
Athanasius		Greg. Naz.	
Apol. ad Const.		Apol.	
33	211	84 (orat. 2)	212
		PG 35.489	
Cedrenus		Hermes Trismeg.	
Compendium histor.		Methodus mystica	
(CSBH 2.510,16–7	303	CCAG 8/1 Cumont	
Bekker)		176,14–7	288
Const. VII Porphy.		Hephaestion	
De insidiis		Apotelesmatica	
(190,20–1 de Boor)	303	2.25.11	285
Eusebius			
D.E.			
3.4.27	8		
10.8.31	448		

Hesychius Σ § 1072	xx, 304	Περὶ τῶν ὀγμ. τοῦ λόγου 22	270–1
Julianus C. Gal. 194c,d fr. 43 (Mass.)	281	Rhetorius Capitula Selecta CCAG 8/4 Cumont 192,23–193,1	286
Libanius Or. 15.56	269–70	200,12–3, 201,2–5 201,21–2	286–7 287
Lydus De ostentis 32 Nov. 9	287	Johannes Skylitzes Synopsis hist. Const. VII iterum 5 (239,73–6 Thurn)	298
Macarius Magnes Monogenes 1, index 6 2.23.2–6 3.1, 3.1.2 3.3.2 3.22.3	279 279 279 279 279	Basil I 32 (155 Thurn) Socrates H.E. 7.16.3–4	298 295
Malalas Chron. 18.71 (395 Thurn)	300	Sozomen H.E. 1.8.13 7.15.4	401–2 294
Methodius C. Porph. 1	278–9, 422	Suda A § 2071 A § 2327 I § 430	304 304 304
Nicolaus Cabasilas Vita in Christo 2.83, 85	211, 462–3	Synaxarium Eccl. Const. April. 18.3	211–2
Priscus frag. 2 (Blockley) frag. 11.2 (Blockley) frag. 14 (Blockley)	10, 307 308 309	Syncellus Ecloga Chron. a.m. 5563 (BiTeu 415,4–6 Mosshamer)	303
Michael Psellus Epitaph. ... Cerull. (347 Sathas)	301	Themistius Orat. 21, 251A–B	15
Procopius De bellis 2.11.37 7.38.20	305 306	Theodoret Graec. Affect. Cur. 9.3.6	152
Rhetorica Anon. Prob. rhet. in status 67	270		

Theodorus Prodr. Epigr. in V. et N. T. Jos. 87	299	CCAG 11/1 Zur. 259,7–8	287–8
Theophanes Conf. Chronogr. a.m. 6024 (I, 184 de Boor)	300	Theophylact Simoc. Hist. 1.11.21	298
Theophanes Contin. Chronogr. 5.62 (303 Bekker)	299–300	Timaeus Lexicon Platonicum 975b Dübner	272
Theophilus (Edessa) De rebus p. bellicis		Zosimus 2.14.3–4	397

6 Coins, Inscriptions, and Papyri

Coins

Roman Imperial Coinage VII (RIC) Antioch § 98-9 p. 695 Pl. 24	403	Constantinople § 19, p. 572 Pl. 18 Ticinum § 36, p. 364	403 403
--	-----	--	------------

Inscriptions

Amyzon (Robert) 61	230–1	GladPar 79	199
CIL IV, 1864, 2082 IV, 9983A IV, 10062 VIII, 2721 VIII, 10570 = ILTun 1237 VIII, 18261 XI, 5820	122 199, 369 474–5 398 377 396–8 78	ICUR (1896) III, 6649 <i>lex Puteolana</i> (See Juristic Texts) SCCP (Eck et al.) 45–6 49–52	7 369 183
CHIP 55	463–4	SEG 8, 13 53, 633	391 215–6, 390–2
<i>Papyri</i> PGM 5.73–4	102	P.Oxy. IX, 1186 XXII, 2339.10–11, 25–26	377 202
P. IFAO III, 34	202		

P.Sijp. 61 297 SB V 7523 r,A.3–4 376

7 Juristic Texts

<i>Lex xii tabul.</i> 8.10	191	14.3.6	394
		15.2.3	206
<i>lex Cumana</i>			
A Col. I,1-2.13; II,2	387 n. 162	Codex Theodosianus	
B Col. I,6-7	387 n. 162	2.8.1	402
		9.1.14	207
<i>lex Puteolana</i>		9.5.1	207, 395–6
II.8–12	370–87	9.18.1	406
II.8–10	381	9.35.2.1	378–9
II.8	371–2, 457	9.40.8	408
II.9	374–8, 382, 423, 425	15.12.1	406–7
II.10	374–8		
II.11	372–4	Digesta	
II.12	379–82, 382–3, 423–5	1.6.1.1–2	371
		47.7.9	191
II.13	383–5, 385–7	47.12.11	360, 391
		48.10.8	362
Gaii Inst.		48.13.7	389
1.52-3	135–6, 371	48.19.8.1	361–2
		48.19.9.11	363, 389
Pauli Sententiae (PS)		48.19.10.pr.	376
5.12.12	392	48.19.28.pr.	362, 388
5.17.2	216, 362, 392, 412	48.19.28.13–4	363
5.19A.1	391–2	48.19.28.15	205, 303, 388–9
5.21.4	206, 216, 392–3, 412	48.19.28.16	363
		48.19.38.1	216, 301, 395
5.21A.2	388, 394–5	48.19.38.2	303, 387, 393
5.22.1	164, 216, 387, 393	48.24.1	386–7
		48.24.3	387
5.23.1	216, 259, 361, 393	49.1.18	126
		49.16.7	348
5.23.15, 17	216, 394, 412		
5.25.1	216, 362, 393, 411–2	Codex Iustinianus	
5.26.1	367–8, 378	9.14.1.1	4
5.26.2	368		
5.30B.1	394, 411	lex romana	
		Visigothorum	
Collatio		PS	
1.2.2	393, 411–2	5.19.2	412
1.6.4	389	5.23.4	412
3.3.2	136	5.24.1	412
8.4.2	393, 411–2	5.25.1	412
11.7.2	362	5.25.9, 11	412
14.2.2	394, 411	5.27.1	412

CTh 1.4.1 interpret.	413	Leo VI Sapiens	
Glossa Cod. Reg.		Novellae 67	301
Parisiensis 4413			
CTh 1.9.1 interpret.	413	Basilica	
lex Visigothorum		60.51.26	302
2.1.31, 2.2.7, 2.2.8	415	60.51.35	301–2, 303
3.2.2	415	Scholia in Basilica	
3.4.14, 8.2.1	415	60.51.26.1	301
6.5.17	415		
12.2.11, 12.2.17	415		

8 Semitic Texts

Near Eastern Texts

Annals of Tiglath-pileser		Mari	
23:9'–10'	313	ARM(T) XIII: 108	314–5
Assyrian Law Code		Papyrus Abbott	
53	312	6,9–17	314
Balawat gates (King)		P. BM 10052	
Plate VII (Urartu)	312–3	7,2–3; 8,25–6; 10,12;	314
XXV (Dabigu)	312–3	10,17; 11,19	
LVI (Kulisi)	312–3	Ramesside Inscr.	
Bisitun Inscription		Merenptah	
§ 60 (Babylonian)	313	IV, 3/13–14	314
II 76 (Persian)	313	(Kitchen)	
III 91–2 (Persian)	313	Sennacherib	
Calah Annals		stone panel	
II 109	312	Lachish (ANEP 373)	313
III 84	312	Summary Inscription	
Hammurabi Code		(Tiglath-pileser)	
L153	312	1:9–10	313

Dead Sea Scrolls

4QpNah 3–4 i 5–9	317–19, 321	4Q541 fr. 2 col. ii 1	322
(4Q169)		4Q541 fr. 24 ii 4–5	322–3
4Q200 fr. 1 ii 1–3	324	4Q584 frag. x 1–3	323
4Q385a fr. 15 col.		11Q10 xxxiii 3–5	323–4
i 2–4	322	11Q19 LXIV, 6–13	319–21

Rabbinic Texts

Mishnah		Ḥag.	
Ohol.		2:2 (77d–78a Kroto.)	339
3:5	333, 428		
Sanh.		Sanh.	
6:4	324–5, 339	6:8 (23c Kroto.)	339
Shabb.		Shabb.	
6:10	336, 38	6:9 (8c Kroto.)	336, 383
Yeb.		Yeb.	
16:3	332–3	16:3 (15c Kroto.)	333
Tosefta		Mekilta	
Git.		Baḥodesh 6	338
7[5].1	334, 428	Mek. de Rabbi Ishm.	
Ohol.		Shirata 7	340–1
4.11	333–4, 428	Shirata 10	341
Sanh.		Mekhilta de-Rab.	
9:7	340	Shimon bar Yoḥai	
9:8	325	33.1	341–2
		36.2	341
Babylonian Talmud		Midrash of Abba	
Git.		Goryon (Buber)	
70b	335, 428	1:236–9 on Esth 2:1	347
		3:17 on Esth 3:1	347
Nid.		3:25	347
71b	334, 428	5:9–10 on Esth 5:14	347
Pes.		Midr. Ps	
112a	337	11:7	338
		45:5	355
Sanh.		121:3	343
46b	325–6	Midrash Rabbah	
Shabb.		Gen. Rab.	
67a	336	30:8	346
		56:3	352
Sem.		65:22	336–7
2.9 (44b)	331–2, 462	Exod. Rab.	
2.11 (44b)	332	9:4	353
Palestinian Talmud		Lev. Rab.	
Git.		28:6	346
7:1 (48c Krotoschin)	334, 428		

Deut. Rab.		Midrash Tannaim	
20,6–8 (Liebermann)	353–4	1:9	354
Esth. Rab.		Pesiq. Rab.	
Prologue 1	344	19	346
2:14	344	31	352
3:14	342–3	Pesiq Rab. Kah.	
3:15	344–5	11.2	343
7:3	345	Supplement 2.2	343
7:10	345	Sifre Numbers	
7:11	345	131	330
9:2	345	Sifre Deuteronomy	
10:5	335, 346	1:27 § 24	330–1
20:10	346	21:22 § 221	326
Eccl. Rab.		32:5 § 308	331
7.37 [21c]	342	32:31 § 323	331
Midr. Tanḥ.		Sifre Zuta	
Toledoth 19	354	19.11	334
<i>Taylor Schechter</i>			
T-S Arabic 44.44 (2/18)	336, 383, 425	T-S B 11.52 folio 1v	351–2
<i>Targumim</i>			
Pseudo Jonathan		1 Sam	
Num 25:4	329	31:10	330
Deut 21:22–23	328	Targumim on Hagio- grapha	
Neofiti		Ruth	
Lev 19:26	328–9	1:17	318, 321, 327–8
Num 25:4	329	Esther I	
Deut 21:22–23	328	2:23	347
Frg. Tg. MS 440 (FTV)		5:14	348
Num 25:4	329–30	7:9	314, 348
Deut 21:22	329	7:10	348
Jonathan		9:14	348–9
Joshua		Esther II	
8:29	330	7:10	349, 350
10:26	330	9:7–10	351
		9:14	351

Arabic Texts

Qur'ān		Al-Zamakhsharī	
5:33	355	Rabī al-Abrār	
		1.39 (Sayyid)	356

Images Index

- Figure one. Arieti Tomb: Man on a *patibulum*: 2, 16, 31–3, 95, 375
- Figure two. Arieti Tomb: Wrist attached to *patibulum* with a fetter: 16, 33, 95, 375
- Figure three. *cista*. Andromeda exposed on a *patibulum*: 32–3, 117, 222
- Figure four. CIL IV, 2082: IN CRUCE FIGARUS (GET CRUCIFIED): 122
- Figure five. Puteoli graffito: 2, 6–7, 23, 31–2, 35, 83, 101, 148, 190, 203, 285, 418, 425, 427
- Figure six. Drawing of the Puteoli graffito: 2, 6–7, 23, 31–2, 35, 83, 101, 148, 190, 203, 285, 418, 425, 427
- Figure seven. Puteoli graffito: ΑΛΚΙΜΙΛΑ (Alkimilla): 2, 6–7, 23, 31–2, 35, 83, 101, 148, 190, 203, 285, 418, 425, 427
- Figure eight. Roman Lamp: *damnatio ad bestias*: 193
- Figure nine. *Lagynos*: *damnatio ad bestias* 201
- Figure ten. Palatine graffito: ΑΛΕΞΜΕΝΟΣ ΣΕΒΕΤΕ ΘΕΟΝ (Alexamenos worships god) 2, 6–7, 23, 31–2, 152, 230, 285, 427, 452
- Figure ten bis: Palatine graffito, drawing xxviii–xxix
- Figure eleven. Jehohanan ben Hagqol's Right Calcaneum Pierced by a Nail: 2, 190, 336, 382, 425
- Figure twelve. Reconstruction with skeletal remains of a human foot: 2, 190, 336, 382, 425
- Figure thirteen. Drawing of Jehohanan: 2, 190, 336, 382, 425
- Figure fourteen. Magical Amulet, late II – early III C.E.: 2, 6, 185–6, 263, 425
- Figure fifteen. CIL IV, 9983a: 199
- Figure sixteen. Genesis 40:20–22. The baker on a *furca* (Vienna Cod. theol. gr. 31): 43–4, 296
- Figure seventeen. *haristuke* by Terasaki Kōgyō, Ōkyo ga nanfuku zu mosha: 431
- Figure eighteen. *haritsuke*: Execution of Sokichi, ca 1865–1868 (Felice Beato): 418, 432
- Figure nineteen. *haritsuke*. The Crucifixion of the Servant Sokichi (Felice Beato): 432

Ancient Individuals

- Achaeus 230, 245
Acilius Glabrio, M. 164
Alexander, *servus* 174, 216
Alexander Jannaeus 9, 238-9, 318-9, 322, 357, 429
Alexander of Macedon 12, 124-5, 140-1, 231, 233, 239-44, 247-50, 254, 266-8
Alkimilla 203-4, 216, 418, 427
Andrew 426
Andromeda 14, 32-3, 117, 148, 157, 222, 284, 406, 421
Antigonus 463-9
Antiochus IV 237-9, 318, 439
Antonius, Marcus 62, 77-8, 175-7, 179, 384
Ardalio 200, 211-2, 462-3
Asiaticus 196, 216, 358, 364
Attila 10, 307-9
Augustus 24, 79, 135, 160, 178-9, 181-2, 378, 382, 386, 455-7
Avidius Cassius 30, 205-6, 358, 362, 429
Avillius Flaccus 48-9, 186-8, 234, 236
- Bruttius Sura 168
- Caligula, Gaius 48-9, 186-8, 200, 238
Calocerus 404, 416
Calpurnius Piso, Lucius 165
Calpurnius Piso, Gnaeus 183-4
Carbo Arvina 105
Christians 37, 159, 191, 201, 211-4, 217, 253-4, 276-8, 281, 293-5, 369, 381, 399, 403, 408-10, 413, 421-3, 429, 439
Claudius 42, 99, 124, 188-90, 217, 256, 373, 383
Clodius Albinus 207-8
Commodus 206-7, 217, 384
Constantine 2, 4, 17, 44, 112, 137, 147, 149, 160, 214, 216, 286, 296-7, 303, 305, 371, 387, 393, 395-409, 416, 422, 426, 429, 441
Cyrus 146, 254, 231, 237, 254
- Domitian 42, 201-2, 373
- Domitius Ahenobarbus, L. 63, 167
- Eleazar of Machaeurus 199, 382, 418, 424
Eleazar the brigand 190
Eros 181-2
- Galba 41, 195, 365, 368
Galerius 207, 213, 216, 395-6
Gavius of Consa, Publius 62-9, 78, 121, 134, 171-2, 216-7, 358-9, 364, 377-9, 429
Geta, *servus* 195, 216, 358
- Hadrian 35, 122, 136, 203, 338, 354, 361-3, 371, 389
Haman 226-8, 237, 295, 312, 314-5, 335, 344-352, 375
- Ida, *liberta* 182-3, 216, 364
Isaac 27-8, 352-3
Iunius Brutus, M. 173, 176-7, 384
- James son of Judas 188-9, 216
Jehoḥanan ben Ḥagqol 107, 185, 189-90, 216, 263, 382, 387
Jesus 1, 10, 27-8, 30-4, 43, 110-1, 139, 151, 184-6, 192, 212, 216-7, 239, 242-3, 263, 274-80, 293, 310, 344, 350, 382, 387, 401, 403-4, 417, 419-21, 423, 425-6, 428-30, 435-49, 460-62
Jose ben Jo'ezer 336-8
Julius Caesar 12, 40, 69, 170, 173, 175-6, 247, 360, 366-7
- Laureolus 136-7, 191, 200, 217
Lentulus 136, 200
- Mattathiyah 463-9
Maximinus Daia 151, 159-60, 213-4, 382
Maximinus Thrax 11, 209-11
Mordecai 226-8, 237, 295, 315, 335, 344-52, 375, 448
Moses 36, 280, 330, 353, 410, 420
Mucius Scaevola 167-8

- Nero 10, 41-2, 94, 99, 118, 190-6, 201, 217, 256, 278, 292, 368-9, 380-1, 447
 Nymphodorus of Athens 4
- Opellius Macrinus 206, 208, 215
 Oroetes 77, 104, 134, 219
- Pandira, ben 350
 Pertinax 207
 Peter 160, 192-3, 216-7, 278, 280, 303, 382
 Polycrates 77, 104, 134, 219-21, 254, 293
 Ponticus 457-9
 Prometheus 11, 91, 145, 200, 249-52, 418, 421
- Quintilius Varus 181
- Rabirius, Gaius 46, 69-73, 365-7
 Regulus 94-5, 100, 121, 127, 133, 156, 429
- Septimius Severus 206, 210, 215, 217, 373, 388, 391, 428
 Severus Alexander 208-9, 215, 381-2, 399
 Silius, Gaius 188, 216, 368
 Simeon ben Shetach 325, 339-40, 357
- Simon of Cyrene 16, 27-8, 30, 33
 Simon son of Judas 188-9, 216
 Spartacus 171-2, 198
 Symeon son of Clopas 160, 203, 216-7
- Theodorus of Cyrene 10, 77, 104, 243, 383
 Theodorus *paedagogus* 179, 216
 Theodotus rhetor 173-4, 216
 Theodulus, 160, 214, 216
 Tiberius Alexander 188-9
 Tiberius 48, 98, 124, 133, 151, 182-6, 384
 Timothy and Maura 198, 430
 Titus 191, 197-8, 200, 333, 382, 434
 Trajan 6, 35, 160, 203-4, 215, 239
 Tullius Cicero, Quintus 73-4, 359
- Ummidius Quadratus 189
- Valerius Maxentius 396-8
 Valerius Soranus 168-70, 216, 368
 Verres, Gaius 23-4, 62-9, 74, 171-3, 216, 358-9, 364, 374, 377-9, 382
 Vitellius 195-6, 384
 Vespasian 196

Modern Authors

- Allen, F. D. 19
Aubert, J.-J. 146, 159-60, 163, 184, 186, 194,
196, 204-6, 208, 358-9, 362, 364, 376,
379, 381, 387, 404
- Baldinger, K. xix, 5, 17, 30, 34
Barnes, T. D. 8, 143, 147, 159, 191-2, 198,
203-4, 213-4, 395-7, 402, 404, 407, 410-1
Bauman, R. 74, 114, 176, 359, 388
Baumgarten, J. M. 312, 318, 321, 327, 329
Berrin, S. L. 238, 317-9, 321, 326-7
Blinzler, J. 161, 221, 233, 290
Bodel, J. 22, 113, 370, 374, 379, 382, 385-6
Brasiello, U. 360, 362, 387-8, 390, 395
Brecht, C. 16-7
Briquel, D. 45, 70
- Camodeca, G. 204, 370
Cantarella, E. 3-4, 14, 41, 45-8, 175, 355,
376
Carey, H. J. 443-4, 447
Castagnetti, S. 2-3, 46-7, 161, 365, 370, 373,
387, 390, 395
Chapman, D. 2, 181, 190, 194, 225-6, 238,
295-6, 311-57, 383, 425, 427-8, 430
Chapman, D. and E. J. Schnabel xvii, xxix,
xxx, 460-1
Cobet, G. C. 29-30, 261
Coleman, K. M. 21, 115-6, 136, 191, 200-1,
211-2, 296, 433
Corcoran, S. 207, 216, 395-6, 410-12
- Degen, P. 5
Ducrey, P. and N. 14-5
Dumont, J.-C. 57, 127, 135-6, 171, 370, 372,
375
- Eck, W. 178, 183-4, 398
- Franchi de' Cavalieri, P. 389
Fulda, H. 263
- Galsterer, H. 372-3
- Garnsey, P. 44, 47, 73-4, 360-2, 365-6, 368,
388-90, 395
Gatti, P. 16-9, 21-3, 25, 42
Gernet, L. 13-4
Grodzynski, D. 394
Guarducci, M. 203
- Halm-Tisserant, M. xx, 11, 14-5, 33, 82,
125, 167, 212, 218, 222-4, 272, 305
Harley-McGowan, F. xxi, xxviii, xxix,
185-6, 193, 427
Hengel, M. 2, 7, 14, 16, 23, 47, 59, 80, 83,
85, 94, 102, 136, 139, 141, 150, 159, 167,
168, 174, 178, 182, 195, 200, 205, 210,
215, 219, 231, 235, 243, 264, 365, 382,
416-7, 420-1, 423, 425, 427-8, 438, 445
Hey, O. xxii, 29
Hijmans, B. L. 22, 130
Hinard, F. and J.-C. Dumont (and research
group) 16-7, 21, 34, 45, 134, 162, 370,
372, 374-6, 379, 381-2, 423, 425, 428
Hitzig, H. F. 39, 47, 373
- Keramopoulos, A. D. 14
Klostermann, E. 28, 443
Kuhn, H.-W. 2, 7, 16, 23, 31, 69-70, 72-3,
85, 123-4, 159, 181-5, 190, 200, 203,
205, 264, 358, 362, 387-9, 417, 419-21,
436-40
Kunkel, W. 171, 372
Kyle, D. G. 193, 208, 211, 433
- Lafaye, G. 33, 116, 193
Lagrange, M.-J. 28, 439
Latte, K. 14, 41, 45, 47, 191, 368
Liebs, D. 361, 392-4, 411
Lipsius, J. xx, 1, 98, 159
Longenecker, B. 474, 476-7
Lovell, N. C. 473-4
Lovisi, C. 16, 372-3
- Maiuri, A. 476-7
Marquardt, J. 32, 34, 38-9

- Matera, F. 444, 447
 Mazois, F. 475-6
 Mommsen, T. 41, 47, 159, 178, 186, 207,
 286, 355, 358, 361, 365, 368-9, 373, 427
 Oldfather, W. A. 4, 12, 40, 45-7, 70, 113,
 124, 152, 154, 373, 387
 Parente, E. 16, 21, 161
 Pölonen, J. 362-3, 378-9
 Robbins, V. K. 239-43, 444-5, 447
 Saglio, E. 193
 Samuelsson, G. xviii-xxvi, 2, 5, 7, 9, 16, 18,
 23, 31-2, 34, 97, 101, 219, 221, 229-30,
 271, 306, 345, 374, 417-8
 Santalucia, B. 367, 378, 388
 Sárosi, P., 387, 408, 418
 Schechter, G. 184-5
 Schnabel, E. J.
 Serbat, G. 16-7, 19-20, 34, 37, 60, 148
 Simshäuser, W. 372-3
 Sirks, A. J. B. 369, 396
 Smith, P. 464-5
 Speck, P. 296-8
 Stockbauer, J. 6, 193, 227, 393
 Telford, W. 436-8
 Thyen, H. 28
 Timonen, A. 209-10
 Tyrrell, W. B. 4, 45, 69-70, 72, 76
 Vermes, G. xxvi, 311, 418
 Voisin, J.-L. 3, 45, 210
 Yadin, Y. 190, 319-21, 326
 Zestermann, A. 2, 18, 23, 29-30, 63, 159,
 201, 216, 219-21, 359, 372, 387, 399,
 409, 422, 424-5, 427-8
 Zias, J. and E. Sekeles 190, 425, 429, 433
 Zias, J. 464-5, 472-3

Subject Index

- Abba cave 472–9
- ad bestias* 59, 201, 301, 362, 389–90, 392, 406, 469
- ἀνασκολοπίσειν/ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι 10–1, 163, 179, 187–8, 208, 213, 220–2, 227, 233–6, 247, 251–3, 255–7, 259–60, 266, 272, 274, 277–8, 283, 287, 294, 296–309
- ἀνασκολοπίσθη ... ἔβλεπεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ 260
- ἀνασκολοπισθέντες ἄχρι θανάτου ... προσήλονται 235
- ἀνασκολοπισθέντες ... κάρα προσήλωθέντες 213
- τί φησι καὶ ἀνασκολοπιζομένου 275
- τῷ σταυρῷ προσηλωθεὶς ἀνασκολοπιζεται 280
- ἐπὶ σταυρῶν ... ἀνασκολοπίζεσθαι 187
- ἀνασκολοπίσις 289
- ἀποτυμπανισμός, ἀποτυμπανίζω 13–5
- arbor infelix* 45–7, 70–1, 162, 365, 384
- campus Martius* 70–1, 114, 162, 424, 428
- crematio* 48, 73–4, 91, 96, 131, 146, 157, 186, 191, 194, 200–1, 209–11, 213, 232, 247, 250, 259, 263, 271, 282–3, 289, 292, 298, 301–2, 318, 327, 337–8, 331, 337, 341, 343–4, 353–4, 359–4, 379–82, 384, 386, 388–9, 391–2, 394, 404, 409, 415–6
- crimes leading to crucifixion
- arson 191 (Christians), 200–201 (a slave, citizens also?), 217, 369, 392
- brigandage 108, 149, 167, 184–5, 188–90, 199, 215, 218, 285, 288, 303, 340–2, 355, 363, 373, 388, 427–8
- consulting astrologers about an emperor? 206
- consulting astrologers about a master 206, 216, 392–3, 412
- counterfeiting/adulterating coins 216, 392–3
- desertion 78, 156, 163, 215–6, 250, 301, 358, 361, 390, 394–5
- disobedience of slaves 57, 89, 110, 170–1, 214
- disobedience (soldiers) 206, 216
- false accusation 206–7, 207
- falsifying a will 216, 393
- accusations against a master 146, 160, 177, 207, 395 (also *liberti*)
- kidnapping 394, 411, 430
- magic 216, 392–4
- murder of a master 81, 200–1
- murder (including false testimony that brings about death of the accused) 216, 392
- piracy (see brigands) 12, 87, 170, 174, 260, 429
- sacrilege 93–4, 200–1 (a slave, citizens?) 215, 389–90
- *seditio* 216, 302–3
- *seditionis auctor* 125, 156 (Carthage), 164 (slave), 171 (slaves), 181, 184–5, 189–90, 202, 203, 393, 412
- theft 209, 360 (a slave)
- cross, theology of the 417, 435–48
- crosses
- configuration of victims on 8, 96–7, 197–8, 213, 395, 427
- height 57, 141, 289–91, 299, 427
- location of 428
- nails from/for 7–10, 21, 25–6, 31–6, 49, 56, 95, 98, 107, 111–3, 130, 139, 154, 181–2, 189–90, 194–5, 197–8, 213–4, 224, 232–5, 243, 246, 250–3, 268–9, 276, 280, 284–5, 289–90, 293–5, 335–6, 351–2, 370, 382–3, 422–6, 430–1, 470
- nails (for magic/healing) 107, 112, 130, 252, 294, 336, 383, 425
- placard 110, 180, 427
- raising 71, 195, 382, 423
- ropes/fetters 107, 113, 185, 190, 263, 290, 335–6, 383, 425–6
- *sedile* xxi, xxvii, 7, 35–6, 83, 101, 427
- shape of 5–8, 23, 29, 32, 36, 49, 117,

- 185, 261, 285, 290
- *suppedaneum* 427, 431
- view from 67, 90, 121, 260, 428
- words spoken on 171, 267–8, 428
- crucarius* 45, 88, 119, 126–7, 132, 199–200
369
- crucifigere* 37, 86, 112, 138
- crucifixion
 - abolition of 398–416
 - by Dionysus 231
 - by Carians 230
 - by Britons 3, 123
 - by Carthaginians 83–6, 94–5, 103, 120–1,
133, 141–2, 155–7, 161, 229–31, 243–
4, 250, 255–6
 - by Germans 123, 133–4, 256
 - Libyans 229
 - by Rhodians 256
 - blood 66, 102, 104, 200, 238–9, 274–5,
331–5, 428
 - burial of the crucified 111, 239, 371, 385–
7, 429
 - chains/bonds used in
 - definition of 2
 - denial of burial 104, 31, 429
 - “family resemblances” 158, 418
 - length of 92, 101–2, 111–2, 198–9, 430,
434
 - medical causes of death from 430, 434–5
 - methodology for determining 2–4, 48–9
 - misery and shame of 418–23
 - nudity of the victim xxvii–viii, 192–3, 427
 - of captives by pirates 87, 111 etc.
 - of children 194
 - of slaves 52–8, 63, 72–3, 75–6, 79–81, 84,
86–91, 99, 108, 110, 118, 126–8, 132,
135–7, 153, 170, 174, 176–80, 196,
201–2, 207–8, 214, 230, 234, 253, 260–
1, 282, 370–9
 - of citizens 62–9, 74, 168–9, 171–3, 195,
361–70, 372–4, 393–4
 - of *humiliores* 216, 363, 389–90, 392–4
 - of *liberti* 88–9, 146, 186, 182, 196, 359,
364, 372, 395
 - of *peregrini* 127, 173, 181–2, 184–6, 188–
9, 192–3, 197, 203, 216, 359, 364, 369,
372–3,
 - of women 119, 131, 142, 194, 203–4, 428
 - victims pierced by a spear 111–2, 429
 - delivery from 93, 149–50, 262, 291–2,
- 333, 348, 355, 430
- Roman concept of 7, 56, 67, 73, 90–1, 93,
107, 112–3, 117, 123, 130–1, 139, 142,
197–8, 232, 236, 243, 251, 254, 263,
293, 417–8
- Roman practice of 423–30
- crucisalus* 57
- crurifragium* 148, 207, 429
- crux* 2–3, 34–6, 158
 - *abscedere in maximam malam crucem* 52
 - *abstrahere in maximam malam crucem* 52
 - *agere in crucem* 30, 35, 39–40, 49, 64,
77, 88, 118, 126–8, 162, 164, 171,
174, 179, 186, 206, 374–5, 379
 - *agere patibul(atum/um/o) in cruce* 370,
374–5
 - *cernere ex cruce* 67
 - *curam agere in cruce* 90
 - *ad/in crucem damnatio/damnari* 301, 388,
390
 - *defigere crucem/in cruce* 30, 66–7, 81
 - *diffundere in cruce membra* 33, 96
 - *ducere/perducere in cruce* 37, 57, 138
 - *excurrere in cruce* 49
 - *facere vota in cruce* 93
 - *ferre in cruce* 54
 - *figere (cruci implied)* 457–60
 - *figere/affigere/suffigere cruci/crucem/in
cruce* 23, 35, 37, 40, 67, 78–9, 90, 107,
119, 122, 141, 145, 153–4, 162, 202, 388
 - *figere in malam crucem* 53
 - *ire/abire in (maximam) (malam) crucem*
30, 52–3, 56, 119
 - *in crucem* (imperative use) 176
 - *infigere cruci* 114
 - *iocare in crucem* 89
 - *levare in crucem* 169
 - *merere crucem* 89
 - *mittere amplexus in crucem* 119
 - *parare crucem* 87
 - *pascere in cruce* 81
 - *pati crucem* 87
 - *pendere in cruce* 4, 30, 89, 140, 200
 - *pergere in cruce* 52
 - *ponere crucem* 135, 423
 - *rapere in crucem* 65
 - *redire cruce* 150
 - *refigere cruce* 26, 98–9
 - *spectare ab/de cruce* 90, 121
 - *statuere crucem* 30, 195, 371, 382, 423

- *subdere acutam crucem sessuro* 101
- *suspendere in cruce/crucem* 81, 155, 375
- *suffigere (cruci implied)* 89, 101
- *sedere acuta cruce* 83, 101
- *sustollere in crucem* 55
- *tollere in crucem* 23, 26, 30, 35, 64–5, 68, 76, 83–5, 87, 108–9, 125, 128–9, 134, 143, 146–9, 163, 167, 172, 175, 205–10, 358, 393–4, 406, 408,
- *vigilare in cruce* 95
- (*diu*) *vivere in cruce* 190
- used as an obscenity (see *ire in malam crucem*) 122

- decurions 215, 363, 378, 389
- domestic tribunal (slaves) 135–6, 171, 372

- Edictum de accusationibus* 207, 395–6
- exposition (Greek) 11, 13, 33, 222–4, 229, 271, 284, 310
- nails/staples for 13–5, 117, 218, 220, 223

- fire (used for torture) 63, 66, 80, 91–2, 97, 100, 120, 129, 173, 187, 192, 196, 213, 260–1, 271, 379–81, 390, 408, 410, 423
- flogging 4–5, 21, 24, 29, 38, 40–2, 45–7, 53, 56, 63–6, 68, 70–2, 81, 84–5, 91–2, 96, 109, 120, 141, 162, 164, 173–4, 187, 191, 194, 197, 202, 212, 234, 241–2, 254, 256, 260–1, 267, 292, 295, 339, 360, 365–71, 374–9, 381, 383, 390, 415, 423, 425, 429
- furca* (φοῦρκα) 16–7, 19–21, 25, 28, 37–46, 58, 60–1, 144, 164, 215–6, 226, 245, 287, 296–305, 307–10, 369–70, 373, 387–90, 392–5, 399, 400, 413, 416, 428
- furcifer* 38, 42, 44–5, 58, 76, 88, 132,

- gabalus* 59–61

- hanging 2–4, 9–10, 12, 47, 48–9, 53, 92–3, 113, 122, 124, 140, 161, 218, 242, 248–9, 282, 289, 315–6, 318
- haritsuke* 430–3
- Herculaneum V.15–16 “cross” 476–7
- honestiores* 360–1, 363, 391, 393–4
- humiliores* 216, 360, 363–4, 368, 374, 376, 391–4

- impalement
- Roman 3, 50, 96–8

- Near Eastern 312–5
- ancient Greek texts attributing the usage to other cultures xx, 10, 304–5
- Boudicca’s victims 3, 256–7

- κρεμαστός 12, 258
- κρεμάω, κρεμάννυμι 11–3, 171, 175–6, 225–8, 232, 247–50, 254, 264, 299–300, 304
- ἐπὶ ξύλου διδύμου 226, 296
- κρεμᾶν ... ἀνεσταύρωσεν 12, cp. 245
- σιτίων σπάνει ... θνήσκει κρεμασθείς 236
- σταυρόν/οῦ 199, 237, 268
- τῶν κρεμαμένων ... προσκαθήλωσαν ... σταυροῦ 232
- ἀνακρεμάννυμι 219–20
- <πρός> σανίδας προσπασσαλεύσαντες ἀνεκρέμασαν 220
- ἀνεσταύρωσε ... Ἀνακρεμασθέντος 221

- La Larda: skeletal remains 471–2
- laqueus* 3–4, 93, 112–3, 124, 144, 316, 359–60, 362, 383
- lex Iulia de vi publica et privata* 366–8
- lex maiestatis* 41–2, 72, 360, 460–61
- lex Porcia* 65–6, 366–7, 379
- lex Puteolana* 23–4, 26, 28, 30, 32, 40, 54, 57, 63, 80, 98, 100, 121, 131, 135, 164, 178, 192, 359, 370–87, 423–5, 428
- lex Sempronia de capite civis* 66, 367,
- lex Valeria de provocatione* 366–7

- Mendes harbor: skeletal remains 472–4
- metal plates 66, 379, 423
- mime 212, 238, 369
- Laureolus 136–7, 191, 200–1, 238, 428
- Ardalio 200–1, 211–2, 462–3

- nails (see crosses and exposition)
- nails, Caiaphas tomb 470–71

- πάσσαλος ὀξύς 257
- προσπατταλεύειν/διαπατταλεύειν 9, 220, 222, 251
- patibulum* 15–34, 423
- *patibulum ferre* 22, 30, 370, 375
- *patibulo affigere/suffigere* 375
- *patibulo pendere* 26, 375

- *extendendae per patibulum manus* 21, 102, 284, 375
- *alii brachia patibulo explicuerunt* 21, 26, 34, 97, 375
- *ex patibulo ... conspuerent* 21, 26, 98, 375
- *pars pro toto* usage 17, 21, 24, 27, 30, 97, 102, 123, 131–2, 142–4, 153, 156, *patibulatus* 21–2, 130, 370, 374–5
- pitch 271, 273, 370, 379–81, 423
- Pompeii I.13, cruciform graffito 474–5
- Pompeii VI.6.20–21, cruciform image 475–6
- προσηλοῦν/προσηλοῦσθαι 8, 223–4, 235, 250–1, 269, 296
- (προσηλωμένος ὥσπερ) οἱ ἀνασκολοπισθέντες 235
- ἰστῶ νηὸς προσηλωθῆναι 182
- κάτω κἀρα προσηλωθέντες τηροῦμενοί τε ζῶντες 213
- σταυρῶ 31, 194, 223, 232, 246, 280, 290, 293, 424
- φθαρταῖς ὕλαις 235
- ξύλῳ 296
- προσήλωσις 213

- צלב 310, 326–55, 356–7
- צ'לב/צ'וב 329–30, 333, 339–40, 346–52
- صلب 355–6

- servile supplicium 163, 195, 358, 457
- skeletal remains
- Delos (exposition) 14, 224, 272
- Jehohanan ben Hagqol (crucifixion) 189–90, 425
- Phalerum (exposition) 14, 224, 272
- σκολοπιῆς μοῖρα (προσαρτηθέντες ἐν ἥλοις) 285
- σκόλοψ 10, 230, 243, 245, 275–6, 282, 304, 306
- See ἀνασκολοπίζειν above
- σκολοπισμός 282–3
- σταυροποιά 202
- σταυρός 5–8, 28–34, 166, 180, 182, 187, 193–4, 198–9, 214, 218, 222–3, 229, 232, 234, 236–7, 243, 246, 251–3, 256, 259–60, 263, 265–6, 270, 272–3, 276, 279, 281, 290, 293, 309–10
- ἀγείν ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν 265
- ἀναβαίνειν ἐπὶ σταυρὸν 262
- ἀναστῆσαι σταυρὸν 263, 382
- ἀναρτώμενος ἐπὶ σταυροῦ 265 (cp. 261)
- ἀνορθομένους σταυροῖς 283, 285
- βατάσαι τὸν σταυρὸν 261–2, 290
- ἔβλεπεν ἀπὸ τοῦ σταυροῦ 260
- ἐκφέρειν τὸν σταυρὸν 245, 261
- ἐκ ξύλων καὶ ἥλων ὁ στ. 290
- ἐπέμπετο ἐπὶ τὸν σταυρὸν 265
- ἐνηλώθη σταυρῶ 276
- ἐπιβαίνειν τοῦ σταυροῦ 261
- ἐπιτεμόμενος τοῦ σταυροῦ τὴν περιόδον 266
- καθαιρεθῆναι με τοῦ σταυροῦ σχεδὸν ἤδη πέρας ἔχοντα 262
- καταβαίνειν τοῦ σταυροῦ 261
- κατάρτιος ὁμοία σταυρῶ 290
- κατάγειν ... ἄκοντα τοῦ σταυροῦ 266
- καταπηγνύναι σταυρὸν 199, 382
- κρέμασθαι ἐπὶ σταυρὸν 268, 274
- παιανίζειν ἐπὶ τῶν σταυρῶν 180
- πηγνύναι σταυρὸν 244, 262, 382
- προσαρτῆσαι σταυρῶ 263
- προσδήσαντες σταυρῶ 295
- σταύρωσις 292
- ἀνασταύρωσις (τὰς χεῖρας σφίγγαντες καὶ τοὺς πόδας) 263
- ἀνασταυροῦν 8–9, 166, 179–80, 189–90, 197–8, 210, 218–9, 222–3, 225, 232, 236–9, 244–5, 251–2, 258, 261–8, 271–2, 282, 288, 293, 309–10
- ἀνεσταυρώθη τοῦ θανάτου καταμειδιῶν 197
- ἀνεσταυρώσθω ἐκπετασθίεις τῷ χεῖρε 251
- ἀνεσταυρωμένους ... καθαιρεθέντας αὐτοὺς θεραπείας ... τυχεῖν 198
- ἔτι ζώντων τὰς ἐκείνων ὄψεις 238
- σταυρῶ 9–10, 181–2, 192–3, 203, 218–9, 224, 227–8, 233, 238–9, 247, 250–1, 257, 259, 269–70, 272, 279–80, 282, 284, 286–92 295
- ἀπαχθέντας σταυρωθῆναι 267
- ἀπενεχθῆναι εἰς τὸ σταυρωθῆναι 267
- διὰ τὴν τῶν χειρῶν ἔκτασιν ... σταυρωθήσεται 289
- (ἐσταυρώθη καὶ) ἐνεπρήσθη 292
- ἐκτείνας σεαυτὸν ὡς οἱ ἐσταυρωμένοι 273
- (ἐσταυρώθη καὶ) κατήλθεν 292
- ἥλον ἐσταυρωμένον 294

- ἤλοις παραδίδοσθαι καὶ ἐσταυρῶσθαι 224
- stipes* 35, 425
- used for *crematio* 191, 380–2, 469
- used for crucifixion 6, 25–6, 35–7, 98–9, 102, 133, 150, 152, 281, 376
- used for *damnatio ad bestias* 469
- used for impalement 3, 26, 34–5, 50, 71, 96–8, 158, 161, 243
- summum supplicium* 216, 269, 359–62, 388,
- supplicium sumere* 455–7
- הלל 311–2, 315–26, 356–7
- tree hanging (WW II) 433–5
- τύμπανον, τυμπανίζειν 15
- tunica molesta* 192, 271, 380
- ultimum supplicium* 359–61
- uncus* 72, 96–8, 370, 383–5
- wax (for torture) 370, 379–81