

of God, seems to be the assumption of much Pauline (see *Romans* 1–8) and Johannine theology. The crucial difference is that for early Christians, God's decisive intervention through Jesus' death and resurrection had already broken the real power of sin, death, and the Law (Paul), and of darkness or the "world" (John), whereas the Qumran texts are more oriented to the future for such an intervention (though there are elements of "realized eschatology" in them).

These issues are glimpsed also in Josephus's contrasting descriptions of the Pharisees and Sadducees (*The Jewish War* 2.162–166; see also *Jewish Antiquities* 13.297–298, 18.12–15; *Acts* 23.6–10), though allowance must be made for his addressing non-Jewish readers in their own terminology (fate, immortality of the soul) and the shifting meaning of the term *Sadducee*. The Pharisees are said by Josephus to ascribe everything to fate and God, whereas the Sadducees deny fate and hold that God is so remote that he can neither commit sin nor even see it. For the Pharisees the decision to choose to do right or wrong rests mainly with human beings; nevertheless fate is at work in every action. But the Sadducees say that humans are entirely free to choose between good and evil, and each individual chooses his course of action without the influence of God or fate. The Pharisees are said to have believed in the immortality of the soul as well as in reward and punishment after death, whereas according to Josephus the Sadducees denied both. The rabbis generally followed the Pharisees's balanced combination of divine guidance and human freedom in choosing what one should do.

[See also Damascus Document; Hodayot; Mystery; Rule of the Community; and Wisdom Texts.]

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Elgvin, Torleif. "The Genesis Section of 4Q422 (4QParaGenExod)." *Dead Sea Discoveries* 1 (1994), 180–196.
- Harrington, Daniel J. "Wisdom at Qumran." In *The Community of the Renewed Covenant: The Notre Dame Symposium on the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Eugene Ulrich and James C. VanderKam, pp. 137–151. Notre Dame, Ind., 1994. Treatment of the role of creation in Sapiential Work A and *Ben Sira*.
- Holm-Nielsen, Sven. *Hodayot: Psalms from Qumran*. Aarhus, 1960. Good treatment of biblical and theological aspects of the Hodayot.
- Leaney, A. R. C. *The Rule of Qumran and Its Meaning*. Philadelphia, 1966. A literary and theological exposition of the IQRule of the Community.
- Ringgren, Helmer. *The Faith of Qumran: Theology of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Expanded ed. New York, 1995. Contains a good treatment of creation (pp. 52–57).

DANIEL J. HARRINGTON

CROSS, FRANK MOORE, was born on 13 July 1921. He received a bachelor of divinity degree from McCormick Theological Seminary in 1946 and a doctor of phi-

losophy, under William F. Albright, from Johns Hopkins University in 1950. He then taught at McCormick until he was appointed to the Hancock Professorship of Hebrew and Other Oriental Languages at Harvard University in 1957. He remained at Harvard until his retirement in 1992. During those years he supervised more than one hundred doctoral dissertations and was curator and then director of the Harvard Semitic Museum. He has been very active in learned societies such as the American Schools of Oriental Research and the Society of Biblical Literature, serving as president of both.

Cross's first essay on the Dead Sea Scrolls appeared in 1949, and in light of his training under Albright in epigraphy, paleography, and orthography, he was appointed in 1953 as the first member of the newly formed team of scholars to join Józef T. Milik in the sorting and editing of the innumerable fragments from Qumran Cave 4. He identified the many thousands of biblical fragments, forming copies of *Genesis* (13), *Exodus* (9), *Leviticus* (6), *Numbers* (1), *Deuteronomy* (18), *Joshua* (2), *Judges* (2), *Samuel* (3), *Kings* (1), *Jeremiah* (5), *Ezekiel* (3), *The Twelve Minor Prophets* (6), *Job* (2), *Ruth* (2), *Song of Songs* (3), *Ecclesiastes* (2), *Lamentations* (1), *Daniel* (5), *Ezra* (1), and *Chronicles* (1). He published preliminary editions of several of these manuscripts, and all have now been published in the Discoveries in the Judaean Desert series (vols. 12, 14–17), many of them by his students whose dissertations he had supervised.

Cross was a pioneer of many insights that have shaped Qumran studies. He expressed his views in his widely used introduction to the Dead Sea Scrolls, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (first edition, 1958; second edition, 1961; a third edition of the work appeared in 1995 under the shortened title *The Ancient Library of Qumran*).

He wrote a series of essays on the implications of the textual variants in the biblical manuscripts for the development of the texts of the Hebrew Bible. He argued that in the Second Temple period there were three local texts of the Pentateuchal books (the one represented now in the Masoretic Text, of Babylonian origin, the one in the Septuagint, of Egyptian origin, and the one in the Samaritan Pentateuch, of Palestinian origin) and that when the text was standardized after the fall of Jerusalem in 70 CE, one of these, the Masoretic Text, was chosen as the normative text. For other books in the Hebrew Bible there were two textual families and again just one was chosen after 70 CE. He was also able to clarify the history of the Greek text through use of the Qumran Hebrew texts and evidence from other Judean Desert sites.

In addition to his contributions to the study of the text of the Hebrew and Greek Bibles, Cross also produced

"The Development of the Jewish Scripts" (1961), which still remains four decades later the standard paleographical study of the scribal hands used in writing the Qumran manuscripts and other finds from the Judean Desert.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Miller, Patrick D., Jr., Paul D. Hanson, and S. Dean McBride, eds. *Ancient Israelite Religion: Essays in Honor of Frank Moore Cross*. Philadelphia, 1987. Pages 645–656 contain a bibliography up to that date of Cross's more than two hundred publications.

EUGENE ULRICH

CRUCIFIXION. Extremely widespread as a method of execution even before Rome conquered the East, sources such as *Esther* (7.9–10), *Ezra* (6.11), and Herodotus (for example, *Hdt.* 1.128.2) suggest that crucifixion originated among the Persians. By the fourth century BCE at the latest, this mode of punishment had become familiar to the Greek-speaking world. Crucifixion is apparently attested in Ptolemaic papyri, and during the fourth and third centuries BCE, Alexander the Great and his successors, the Diadochi, especially the Ptolemies and the Seleucids, all employed it. Among the Seleucids, Antiochus III, who directly ruled the Jews beginning in 203 BCE, is particularly noteworthy for crucifying several individuals.

Crucifixion may have become a penalty for state crimes among the Jews as early as the Maccabean Revolt, and it remained as such under the early Hasmoneans. According to Josephus (*Jewish Antiquities* 12.256), Antiochus IV Epiphanes imposed the penalty on some Jewish loyalists who refused to abandon their ancestral traditions in 168/167 BCE: "They were scourged and their bodies mutilated. While still breathing and alive they were crucified. Their wives and children, whom they had circumcised in contravention of the king's orders, were strangled, then hung from the necks of the crucified fathers." [See Antiochus IV Epiphanes.] It should be noted, however, that some scholars doubt the reliability of Josephus on crucifixion during the Maccabean period. No mention of the penalty appears in *Maccabees*. During his reign the Jewish high priest Alcimus executed a large number of Hasideans who had deserted Judah the Maccabee to ally themselves with him. Although it is not certain, numerous scholars believe that these executions, dating to 162 or 161 BCE, were by crucifixion. [See Hasideans.] The *Testament of Moses* (8.1) contains a reference to either these crucifixions or other contemporary crucifixions (again, the historical reliability of this source is questionable, since it underwent some revision during the Roman period).

Not too many years later (perhaps in 77 BCE, if the colophon refers to Ptolemy XII), the *Book of Esther* was translated from Hebrew into Greek. The Greek version unquestionably understood Haman's execution as a cru-

cifixion, for it rendered *Esther's* Hebrew *talah* ("hang") by the Greek *stauroo* ("crucify"). Since the Jewish translator presumably interpreted the biblical events in light of his own contemporaries' use of *talah*, this version is crucial for understanding the apparent references to crucifixion found in the Dead Sea Scrolls. All these references use the verb *talah*. The *Esther* translation shows that this ambiguous term was the normal Hebrew word for the term *crucify* in the period of the scrolls.

In the Roman legal tradition, crucifixion represented the supreme penalty. This was true by the time of Cicero (*In Verrem* 2.5.168), and when the works of the jurist Julius Paulus were compiled in the *Sententiae* some four centuries later, *crux* ("the cross") still stood at the head of the list of "supreme penalties," followed by burning and decapitation. The *Sententiae* include as crimes properly punished by crucifixion desertion to the enemy, betraying of state secrets, inciting to rebellion, murder, prophecy regarding the health of rulers, magic, and aggravated falsification of wills.

In the areas of Roman rule, crucifixion was presumably a common punishment, generally inflicted on members of the lower classes. Presumably, for the elite there were less horrible alternatives because the literary and inscriptional evidence regarding crucifixion is limited; only a single Latin epigraph appears to refer to it, and mentions in literary contexts are sparse. Martin Hengel (1977, p. 38) has suggested that "the relative scarcity of references to crucifixions in antiquity, and their fortuitousness, are less a historical problem than an aesthetic one, connected with the sociology of literature. . . . The cultured literary world . . . as a rule kept quiet about it."

Two—perhaps three—passages in the Dead Sea Scrolls refer to crucifixion. As noted, in each case the verb *talah* is used. The word first appears in Temple Scroll^a (11Q19 lxiv.6–9). This portion of the Temple Scroll is reacting to *Deuteronomy* 21.22–23, which reads in part: "If a man is guilty of a sin whose sentence is death, let him be put to death. Then you shall hang him on a tree." The biblical passage leaves many questions unanswered, but it clearly indicates that the guilty party is first executed, then hung on a tree. The object is not crucifixion, but rather exposure of the corpse. Temple Scroll^a rewrites *Deuteronomy*:

If a man is a traitor against his people and gives them up to a foreign nation, so doing evil to his people, you are to hang him on a tree until dead. On the testimony of two or three witnesses he will be put to death, and they themselves shall hang him on a tree. If a man is convicted of a capital crime and flees to the nations, cursing his people and the children of Israel, you are to hang him, also, upon a tree until dead.

Two points stand out in the scroll's treatment of the biblical text. First, the author (or an earlier source upon which he relies) has reversed the order of the biblical