

***This is a direct translation of pages
46 and 47 showing the way Jesus died.***

Then we pass to the feet. But you ask, "Did the hands have to bear the entire weight (of the body)?" For it appears that the whole body (especially if one should bend the feet) hung by the hands alone. think it was so. Why not? Those parts are tough and _____ and slow to break. Perhaps the nails were not always fixed into the middle of the hand, but rather a little bit higher where the hand joins with the arm, that is, around the wrist. Plautus, who writes to humor, causes on to believe that the arms are pierced, not the hands. But I consider this more fully. If the body is rather heavy or the hands more slight often ropes were used for support. They were also added around the shoulders and the midchest, tightened to the cross. I would prefer this (theory) rather than to bring the plank or pole with other things, in which the feet are nailed and tied at the same time. For this piece of work is very exact, but on the other hand, delicate. However, Gregorius Turonicus identifies (this) in the cross of Christ; because he did not or because he did imagine it meticulously? He himself says the following: "A hole made in the upright beam is evident. The feet were inserted in this hole in the small board, indeed the sacred soles (of the feet) were nailed upon this board, as if (in the position of) a man standing. I do not know whether the words of Innocent to this matter should be referred to: *"In the Lord's cross there were four pieces of wood, the upright beam, the crossbar, a tree trunk (pieces of wood) placed below, and the title (inscription) placed above."* For I have seen those who accept (believe) this section from his work *Truncus*, although the word "Truncus" seems to deny this, which word is too little appropriate to that tiny board. When I examine

many following words of Innocent, I would say he did not know about this board placed in, but truly (as he says) he knew about the trunk placed below, from which the cross itself rose. Thus it appears he knew this: that there was some kind of trunk, and either it was placed at the bottom of the cross to prop it (the Greeks call this kind of oblique prop "resisters") or the trunk was placed under the upright beam itself in the ground, to which it was inserted so that the beam might stand more firmly. I do not allege that it was done this way: I set down the opinion of the writer. Also they hand down (this account by) Trevaecus: "The construction itself of the cross has five ends: two on the vertical and two on the horizontal, and one in the middle where the person attached with nails rested." For, they say, that middle end was the plank on which the body rested. I admit the words go on to this point, and I would not assert (an opinion) from another's ideas rashly. However Justinus the Martyr says the following concerning this end: "In the middle a plank is fixed, and it sticks out like a horn on which those who are crucified are borne and almost carried." He calls it a horn and he wishes to note it: how does he do this appropriately in this clear picture? Neither writer understands anything that is to be seen from the above mentioned sense. They divide the cross into five ends ("points" Tertullian calls them), those four which are known (familiar) and extend out, and the fifth which they place in the middle of the cross, where the transverse beam cuts and crosses the fixed beam. With this consideration, there are five ends; and that post (cut, however) makes three each. As to what they say about being carried and resting — it is true.

I have translated these passages as accurately as possible and to the best of my ability.

Marie Shioely Tseng

University of Southern Calif. 10/3/76