from the 1991 judgment of the Kanakaria mosaic case: "Only the lowest of scoundrels attempt to reap personal gain from this collective loss. Those who plundered the churches and monuments of war-torn Cyprus, hoarded these relics away, and are now smuggling and selling them for large sums, are just such blackguards." This is a good encapsulation of the bad guys in the supply side of the antiquities trade, but like so many other academic papers, books, and media pieces, missing from the equation is a discussion of the demand side. There are those willing to purchase mosaics, frescoes, and artifacts without carrying out due diligence in their acquisitions. This workshop and volume would have benefited from further consideration of why someone wants a mosaic without its entire object-owner history. Also missing from this volume, and from the general literature on illicitly-traded cultural heritage or heritage threatened as a result of conflict, is an analysis of the efficacy of UNESCO conventions, bilateral agreements, and other legal instruments in safeguarding cultural property—does signing a convention make any difference? Even with missing elements, however, this volume is an excellent resource for scholars interested in the legal intricacies and numerous governmental efforts aimed at protecting the past.

Crucifixion and Death as Spectacle: Umayyad Crucifixion in Its Late Antique Context. By Sean W. Anthony. American Oriental Series 96. New Haven, Connecticut: American Oriental Society, 2014. Pp. x + 99. $39.50 (cloth).

Reviewed by Christian Lange, *Utrecht University*

This slender monograph (sixty-eight pages of text with thirteen pages of appended translations) is a welcome addition to the recent studies dealing with crucifixion in early Islam by Tilman Seidensticker (2009), Lucien Reinfandt (2012) and, particularly, Andrew Marsham (2011), in addition to the older German contributions by Otto Spies (1967) and Hellmut Ritter (1976).[1] It differs from, and goes beyond, these studies in that it traces a great number of parallel instances of crucifixion in Late Antique Byzantine and Sasanian contexts, thereby demonstrating with hitherto-unprecedented detail the continuity of the practice from pre-Islamic to Islamic times. The book is well-presented and elegantly written, and offers much food for thought to historians of the early as well as later Islamic centuries.

Chapter 1 (pp. 1–5) helpfully provides a list of the "mischaracterization[s]" (p. 2) of Umayyad-era crucifixion that the study sets out to rectify. Firstly, Anthony argues that crucifixion (*ṣalb*) under the Umayyads did not betoken a sudden revival of a punitive practice gone out of fashion after the Roman Empire's embrace of Christianity; the practice, in fact, had never disappeared. Secondly, against suggestions sometimes made in the scholarly literature, crucifixion under the Umayyads was no less violent than Roman-style crucifixion; nor was it, thirdly, identical with the kind of crucifixion by nailing to a cross known to us by way of the iconography of Christ's passion. Umayyad-style *ṣalb,* in consequence, should be understood broadly, as the "fasten[ing] [of] a body, living or dead, to a piece of wood fashioned for the purpose of execution and/or suspension for ignominious display" (p. 5).

Chapter 2 (pp. 6–14) makes the point that crucifixion in Roman Late Antiquity was a "ramified phenomenon" involving various shapes and techniques, a pattern repeated by the early Umayyad rulers. Historical examples adduced in this chapter include, strikingly, the instances of crucifixion of pagans in Baalbek-Heliopolis under Tiberius II Contantine (r. 578–82). Anthony states that the Romans "refined" crucifixion as a punishment *par excellence*

[1] Tilman Seidensticker, "Responses to Crucifixion in the Islamic World (1st–7th/7th–13th Centuries)," in *Public Violence in Islamic Societies: Power, Discipline, and the Construction of the Public Sphere, 7th–19th Centuries* ce, ed. Christian Lange and Maribel Fierro (Edinburgh, 2009), 203–16 (leaning on Manfred Ullmann, *Das Motiv der Kreuzigung in der arabischen Poesie des Mittelalters* [Wiesbaden, 1995]); Lucian Reinfandt, "Bewaffneter Raub und Kreuzigung im frühen Islam," in *Strafe und Strafrecht in den antiken Welten unter Berücksichtigung von Todesstrafe, Hinrichtung und peinlicher Befragung*, ed. Robert Rollinger, Martin Lang, and Heinz Barta (Wiesbaden, 2012), 249–59; Andrew Marsham, "Public Executions in the Umayyad Period: Early Islamic Punitive Practice in Its Late Antique Context," *Journal of Arabic and Islamic Studies* 11 (2011): 101–36; Otto Spies, "Über die Kreuzigung im Islam," in *Fs. Gustav Mensching* (Bonn, 1967), 143–56; Hellmut Ritter, "Kreuzigung eines Knabens," *Oriens* 25–26 (1976): 38–40.

This content downloaded from 131.211.105.226 on February 23, 2017 06:44:09 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

for those who were thought to be the most serious offenders: brigands, traitors, rebel-slaves, patricides, etc.; if there was any decline in the punishment's implementation after Constantin, this came about only gradually and slowly. (In a footnote [p. 8 n14] it is mentioned that, by contrast, the *damnatio ad flammas* enjoyed uninterrupted popularity in Late Antiquity, an observation that triggers this reviewer to think that not just crucifixion, but also immolation in Islamic history deserves a study of the caliber of Anthony's. The anti-immolation hadith stating that "only God punishes with fire," cited by al-Bukhārī, al-Nasāʾī, and other authorities, seems to have provoked something similar to the historical amnesia that led earlier generations of scholars to conjecture that crucifixion, after Constantin, disappeared in Christendom. For a list of cases of public burnings in the history of the Nile-to-Oxus region, one may consult ʿAbbūd Shāljī's *Mawsūʿat al-ʿadhāb* [Beirut: Dār al-ʿArabiyya li 'l-Mawsūʿāt, 1980], vol. 6, pp. 187–204.) Confusingly, reports about Byzantine crucifixions in Syriac chronicles, according to Anthony, do not distinguish between execution on the Y-shaped *furca* and on the T-shaped cross (p. 11), a broadening of the semantic field of "crucifixion" (Syr. *z-q-p*) that, as one infers, is also characteristic of Arabic *ṣalb*.

In chapter 3 (pp. 15–26), Anthony reviews the evidence for crucifixions in Sasanid Late Antiquity. Syriac, Persian and Arabic sources relate instances of crucifixion (usually Syr. *z-q-p*, Pers. *bar dār kardan*, Arab. *ṣ-l-b*) performed by the Sasanians in the early seventh century as a punishment of either rebels or religious deviants (such as Manicheans). This pattern mirrors Byzantine and Umayyad crucifixions. However, Anthony notes (p. 20) that the Syriac Martyr Acts refer to executions of Christians by the Sasanians only occasionally, most of them occurring under Khusrow II (r. 590–628), as in the case of the martyred convert George of Izla, described at some length in Babai the Great's (d. 628) *Life of Mar George of Izla*. The reports occasionally specify that the condemned were tied to a wooden contraption with a rope around their necks. Although Anthony shows convincingly that in the case of George of Izla, this did not entail actual suffocation by hanging, it might be noted that such instances of *ṣalb*-cum-hanging do appear in later sources, such that *ṣalb*, in fact, becomes barely distinguishable from execution on the gallows. For example, according to al-Bundārī's thirteenth-century *Tārīkh-i dawlat āl Saljūq* (Beirut: Dār al-Āfāq al-Jadīda, 1978, 157), the vizier al-Darguzīnī was crucfied (*ṣuliba*) but fell to the ground "when the rope around his neck snapped." On a related note, one might question the translation of Pers. *dār* as "cross" (p. 21f., citing the *Shāhnāmeh*); there seems to be little evidence that *dār*s were ever T-shaped or even Y-shaped. According to Anthony, the exposure of the dead on their crosses for three days and nights "seems to be a genuine procedural element of Persian practice," deriving from "Zoroastrian taboos regarding the burial of the dead" (p. 25). The Romans, he states, were more casual in this respect. (In later Islamic legal literature, as is also noted by Anthony, the practice is reaffirmed, though obviously without reference to Zoroastrian burial practices, but also discussed controversially. Thus, while Mālikī jurists generally argued against leaving corpses hanging on the cross, others, for example the Ḥanafī al-Kāsānī, allowed it, although he judged that corpses mustn't be left to rot.)

Chapter 4 (pp. 27–39) moves the discussion into the early Islamic period. Although crucifixion is prominently mentioned in Q 5:33, the hadith literature gives little indication that it was current in Muḥammad's time; it is with his Companion successors that the practice becomes more visible in the sources. The legal doctrine regulating crucifixion took some time to crystallize, such that in the early period, Umayyad rulers were at leave to exercise a certain liberty in how they implemented the punishment. However, the use of a wooden contraption, according to Anthony, was common from early on, in contrast to assertions made by other scholars that *ṣalb* originally implied no more than tying someone to a tree. In discussing his evidence, Anthony acknowledges that the *sīra/maghāzī* literature is riddled with anachronisms, but he also claims that "[c]rucifixion accounts . . . belong to the earliest, initial strata of the genre . . ." (p. 34). Just why this is the case remains unclear, especially since Anthony goes on to cast serious doubt on the historicity of the crucifixion of Khubayb b. ʿAdī in 635, as reported by Ibn Isḥāq.

Chapters 1 through 4 all lead up to chapter 5 (pp. 40–64), which considers cases of crucifixion during the Umayyad caliphate, beginning with those of the counter-caliph ʿAbdallāh b. al-Zubayr (692) and the Shiʿi pretender, Zayd b. ʿAlī (720), two famous cases of post-mortem exposure of corpses in the history of punishment in Islam. The Umayyads' goal in publicly desecrating Ibn al-Zubayr's and Zayd b. ʿAlī's corpses, according to Anthony, was "to debase the

This content downloaded from 131.211.105.226 on February 23, 2017 06:44:09 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).

somatic self" (p. 43), and to reflect negatively on both men's religiosity: "For the Umayyads . . . crucifixion is a means to deny a malefactor the religious dignity of ritual burial and thus the final seal of his or her inclusion within God's chosen community" (ibid.). An interesting detail concerns the fact that Zayd b. ʿAlī's corpse was crucified at the Kunāsa, a former dumping ground in Kufa (p. 46 n20), echoing the treatment of another victim of Ummayad crucifixion, Ghaylān al-Dimashqī, whose corpse was thrown on a rubbish heap (p. 63). As one might add, dumping grounds, whose function is to enclose matter-out-of-place, continued to be used as theaters for public punishment in later centuries of Islamic penal history as well.

Anthony dwells on the fact that the process of decomposition of Zayd's corpse, scandalously stripped naked, was monitored and prolonged *ad nauseam* by the authorities (the sources speak of a period of up to six years), in an ostentatious attempt to increase the shame and symbolic ostracizing of Zayd. However, such brutal strategies of marking offenders as utterly humiliated and excised from the community (*jamāʿa*) of believers (the caliph Hishām, in one instance [p. 68], is quoted as saying that "the irrefutable proof is in the punishment") did not go uncontested. At this juncture, Anthony's study moves into a different gear, and becomes particularly intriguing. What now follows is a survey of passages in the chronicles and martyrologies that suggest alternative readings of the fate of the crucified. One example is the comment purportedly offered by the Companion Ibn ʿUmar to console Ibn al-Zubayr's grieving mother, Asmāʾ bt. Abī Bakr: "The souls are in heaven with God; this is but a cadaver" (to the references provided by Anthony, add Suyūṭī, *Sharḥ al-ṣudūr*, ed. Yūsuf ʿAlī Badawī [Beirut: Dār Ibn Kathīr, 1429/2008], 311). One might add here that the view that souls leave the body immediately after death ultimately did not become mainstream, as the doctrine of a continued body-soul connection between death and resurrection found broad acceptance, at least in traditionist circles. Further examples provided by Anthony of such counter-readings of instances of crucifixion are the various martyrologies devoted to Shiʿi martyrs under the Sufyānids (two of these martyrologies are translated in the appendix), as well as the Syriac and Armenian martyrologies of Peter of Capitolias and David of Dwin.

This theme is carried over into the conclusion (pp. 65–68). Anthony begins by noting that there appears to be an increase in crucifixion in the reign of the last Umayyad caliph, Marwān II (r. 744–50), an idea that co-relates to the earlier observation that by the end of the Umayyad period, the Umayyads "had mobilized the resources of Islam to appropriate crucifixion as a punitive institution" (p. 64). The idea that Marwān II's régime was particularly given to crucifying its opponents does not seem to find corroboration in the list of fifty Umayyad-era crucifixions collected by Marsham ("Public Executions," 126–36), of which only the final five belong to Marwān II's reign. Anthony is careful enough to admit, however, that as far as the Umayyad period is concerned, "the actual scale of the phenomenon eludes the full grasp of . . . modern historians" (p. 67). Summing up, crucifixion under the Umayyads was "a public and ritualized form of violence intended to conjure up an amorphous array of polyvalent symbols that, in the first instance at least, serve[d] the legitimizing effort of the Umayyad polity" (p. 67). As Anthony suggests, however, it is not so much the historical practice itself, but rather, the "dissymmetrical" modes of "memorialization of violence"—on the one hand subverting the power claims behind crucifixion, legitimizing them on the other—that ultimately makes crucifixion such a compelling object of analysis. In the appendix, as if to illustrate the point, both a martyrology and an anti-martyrology of Ghaylān al-Dimashqī are translated and commented upon (next to the two short Shiʿi martyrologies mentioned above).

Anthony's astute handling of a large variety of primary sources in the original languages is impressive, and he is to be congratulated for a fine piece of research and writing. There only seem to be a handful of typos in the text. Terms and passages from the Arabic, Hebrew, Aramaic, Greek and Syriac are carefully transliterated and translated throughout. Nonetheless, to conclude on a quibble, the translation of the poem by al-Faḍl b. ʿAbd al-Raḥmān on Zayd b. ʿAlī's crucifixion (p. 49) poses problems. In my opinion, the second verse should be transliterated as *yaẓallu ʿalā ʿamūdihim wa-yumsī / bi-nafsī aʿẓumun fawqa l-ʿamūdī*, and the first two verses therefore translated as "Has there been, after the Prophet's son Abū Ḥusayn, / a person crucified (*ṣalīb*) in Kunāsa on a wooden beam / who remains [hanging] on their pole? / May [his] bones on the pole be ransomed with myself!" (cf. Edward William Lane, *Arabic-English Lexion* [London: Williams and Norgate, 1863], 2354c, s.v. *mafdiʾ*; I owe this reference to Tilman Seidensticker, Jena).

This content downloaded from 131.211.105.226 on February 23, 2017 06:44:09 AM
All use subject to University of Chicago Press Terms and Conditions (http://www.journals.uchicago.edu/t-and-c).