

THE CHILDREN AND LEGIONS ARE UNWELL: THE ROMAN PROCESS OF GENOCIDE
AGAINST THE JEWS

by

Nathan DeBar

(Under the Direction of Peter O'Connell)

ABSTRACT

This thesis attempts to determine the process of genocide in the ancient world by examining ancient sources concerning Roman-Jewish relations from the 1st century AD until the end of the Bar Kokhba revolt in AD 136. In this thesis, I test Gregory Stanton's "Ten Stages of Genocide" against historical evidence. In the first chapter, I show which of Stanton's stages appear, in the ancient sources. The second chapter contains the stages from Stanton's model that do not occur. The third chapter has stages that I added to Stanton's model that are necessary to add to complete the genocidal process' overview. By seeing what stages appear, which ones do not, and the ones I added, we can see how the Roman process of genocide differs from that of the modern world.

INDEX WORDS: Genocide, Roman History, Latin Literature, Greek Literature, Roman military, Roman policy, Josephus, Bar Kokhba, Cassius Dio, Jews, Judea, Classics

THE CHILDREN AND LEGIONS ARE UNWELL: THE ROMAN PROCESS OF GENOCIDE
AGAINST THE JEWS

by

NATHAN DEBAR

BA, University of Mississippi, 2019

A Thesis Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of The University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF ARTS

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2024

© 2024

Nathan DeBar

All Rights Reserved

THE CHILDREN AND LEGIONS ARE UNWELL: THE ROMAN PROCESS OF GENOCIDE
AGAINST THE JEWS

by

NATHAN DEBAR

Major Professor:	Peter O'Connell
Committee:	John Nicholson
	Jordan Pickett

Electronic Version Approved:

Ron Walcott
Vice Provost for Graduate Education and Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2024

Dedication

For my parents, Kelley and Dennis, and my grandparents, Dean and Brenda.

ἀλλὰ φίλοις μὲν ἐμοῖσι φέρω χάριν, ἔστι δὲ μύσταις

κοινὸς ὁ τῶν Μουσέων ἡδυεπὴς στέφανος.

Acknowledgements

There are many people that deserve my thanks in the completion of this thesis. First, I would like to thank the Department of Classics at the University of Georgia for allowing me to pursue my interests and giving me the skills necessary to complete it. I would also like to thank the Department of Classics at the University of Mississippi, namely, Brad Cook, Molly Pasco-Pranger, and Jonathan Fenno, for preparing and pushing me towards graduate school.

Thank you to my family, officemates Dane and Ben, the Eta Sigma Phi group, my friends Melanie Longayrou, Joki Wallace, Samuel Perry, and Jacob Wight, and of course, my girlfriend Josie Klinar, whose support has been invaluable.

A thank you to Flavius Josephus, whom I got to know very well throughout this thesis and whom we all could learn from.

Special thanks to my professors at the University of Georgia, Christine Albright, Erika Hermanowicz, and Charles Platter, for their excellent classes and support which always pushed me to be a better student.

A tremendous thanks to Jordan Pickett and John Nicholson for thanks and insight into making my thesis not only done, but done well.

Finally, my greatest thanks to Peter O’Connell, not only for his invaluable help and patience on my thesis, but also for introducing me to the University of Georgia and its Department of Classics. I will never forget the first class I took, his Greek Prose Survey in the Fall of 2022. “τὰ μὲν γε σώματα θνητὰ πᾶσιν καὶ ἐκ φθαρτῆς ὕλης δεδημιούργηται, ψυχὴ δὲ ἀθάνατος ἀεὶ καὶ θεοῦ μοῖρα τοῖς σώμασιν ἐνοικίζεται” – Josephus, *Bellum Judaicum*, 3.372.

Table of Contents

	Page
Acknowledgments	v
List of Tables.....	viii
Introduction	1
Chapter 1: Stages That Did Occur	9
Introduction.....	9
Discrimination.....	9
Dehumanization	15
Polarization	19
Persecution	22
Extermination.....	26
Conclusion	30
Chapter 2: Stages That Did Not Occur	32
Introduction.....	32
Classification.....	32
Symbolization	36
Organization.....	39
Preparation	42
Denial.....	45
Conclusion	47

Chapter 3: Proposed Additional Stages	48
Introduction.....	48
Glorification.....	48
Resettlement.....	55
Conclusion	58
Conclusion	60
Bibliography	62
Works cited	62
References.....	64

List of Tables

	Page
Table 1: [Stanton's Ten Stages of Genocide]	1

INTRODUCTION

Wars of extermination occurred in antiquity, and, while ancient people could not articulate the concept of a genocide, these mass killings would today be considered genocides. That is what this present thesis will examine. For my definition of genocide, I defer to the United Nations' definition from the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, which reads:

In the present Convention, genocide means any of the following acts committed with intent to destroy, in whole or in part, a national, ethnical, racial or religious group, as such:

- (a) Killing members of the group;
- (b) Causing serious bodily or mental harm to members of the group;
- (c) Deliberately inflicting on the group conditions of life calculated to bring about its physical destruction in whole or in part;
- (d) Imposing measures intended to prevent births within the group;
- (e) Forcibly transferring children of the group to another group.¹

This has been used as the standard definition for genocide since its ratification in 1951. Under this definition of genocide, the exterminations of the Jewish people and their culture by the Romans at the end of the three Jewish Revolts qualify as genocide. For my framing, I have applied Gregory Stanton's "Ten Stages of Genocide" to the ancient evidence. Stanton summarizes his model as follows:

Table 1: Stanton's Ten Stages of Genocide²

Classification	When we classify the world into us versus them.
Symbolization	When we give names to those classifications like Jew and Aryan, Hutu and Tutsi, Turk and

¹ United Nations (1951).

² Stanton (1996).

	Armenian, Bengali and Pashtun. Sometimes the symbols are physical, like the Nazi yellow star.
Discrimination	When laws and customs prevent groups of people from exercising their full rights as citizens or as human beings.
Dehumanization	When perpetrators call their victims rats, or cockroaches, cancer, or disease. Portraying them as non-human makes eliminating them a “cleansing” of the society, rather than murder.
Organization	When hate groups, armies, and militias organize.
Polarization	When moderates are targeted who could stop the process of division, especially moderates from the perpetrators’ group.
Preparation	When plans for killing and deportation are made by leaders, and perpetrators are trained and armed.
Persecution	When victims are identified, arrested, transported, and concentrated into prisons, ghettos, or concentration camps, where they are tortured and murdered.
Extermination	What lawyers define as genocide, the intentional destruction, in whole or in part, of a national, ethnic, racial, or religious group.
Denial	A continuation of a genocide, because it is a continuing attempt to destroy the victim group psychologically and culturally, to deny its members even the memory of the murders of their relatives.

By seeing which stages fit, which stages do not, and by proposing additional steps of my own, I am attempting to create a model of identifying genocides that is relevant for the ancient world.

I chose the Jewish Revolts for three reasons. First, the end of the Bar Kokhba Revolt in AD 136 is perhaps the clearest example of genocide in the ancient world. The amount of destruction the Roman state inflicted upon the Jewish people and culture would amount to genocide in any era. Second, there is a wide variety of sources on the topic of the Jewish revolts;

from Roman senators like Cassius Dio to the rebel Jewish general Flavius Josephus and even later Christian writers like Orosius, there is a wide variety of perspectives. This is unlike many other examples in Roman history, which are mostly told from the Roman perspective. Third and finally, I chose the Jewish Revolts because there are still living Jews today. Hopefully, this thesis can provide insight to all people, but especially for those belonging to the group that were victims of it. Another hope is that a modern scholar of the Holocaust or another genocide involving Jews can take this study and place it in the proper context of broader Jewish history, which I am unable to do.

Gregory Stanton and his Ten Stages of Genocide

It is essential to have some background on Gregory Stanton and his Ten Stages. Stanton is a retired research professor of genocide studies at George Mason University, an advisor to the U.N. on genocide, and the founder of several anti-genocide groups. In 1999, Stanton founded the organization Genocide Watch, which helped bring about the Khmer Rouge Tribunal, where the perpetrators of the Cambodian genocide were put on trial.³ For almost thirty years, Stanton has served on various governmental committees and boards of many non-profits that work to end genocide worldwide.

In 1996, Stanton presented a briefing paper titled “The Eight Stages of Genocide” to the United States State Department. This brief was the first draft of what would eventually become Stanton’s ten stages. In this brief, Stanton’s original eight stages are “Classification,” “Symbolization,” “Dehumanization,” “Organization,” “Polarization,” “Preparation,” “Extermination,” and “Denial.” Stanton states that he developed this model based on Jean Piaget’s structuralist theories on moral processes and Lawrence Kohlberg’s research on the

³ Stanton (1996).

process of ethical reasoning. To build his genocide model, Stanton researched the process of genocide in the Holocaust, Cambodia, Armenia, and Rwanda. In 2012, Stanton added two more stages, “Discrimination” and “Persecution,” in the third and eighth spots to complete his model. Stanton professes that his model’s foremost use is to “look for these processes because they help us see when genocide is coming and what governments can do to prevent it.”⁴

Despite the tremendous good Stanton’s model does, there are drawbacks. The foremost issue any predictive model faces is the inevitable anomalies in any process. For example, not every genocide will have all ten stages listed by Stanton. Some will have fewer than others, and some may feature additional stages. Despite this structural problem, Stanton’s model is helpful for this study. By using Stanton’s model as the “standard” for the process of genocide, we can better understand how the process of ancient genocide functions. This use allows for a potential model of the genocidal process in the ancient world to be created, which I have attempted in this thesis.

The time difference is another issue when using Stanton’s model in this study. Stanton’s model was created for a modern world, while I am examining genocide in the ancient world. The modern world has organizations, such as the International Criminal Court and United Nations, and treaties, such as the *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*, that either prevent genocide or punish the perpetrators. In the ancient world, no such international organizations could punish rogue states or prevent international crimes from being committed.

While Stanton’s model was made for the modern world, it is still valuable for the ancient world. First, we can better understand how the history of genocidal processes evolved. By

⁴ Stanton (1996).

understanding the genocidal process over a period of time, the modern world can more effectively prepare for different possibilities in potential genocidal situations. Second, since it is such a well-used standard for modern genocide, Stanton's model lends credibility in applying the term "genocide" to the ancient world, which is a very recent development.⁵

The Jewish Revolts

Next, a brief overview of the Jewish revolts is necessary for context. There were three major Jewish revolts against the Romans in antiquity: the First Jewish Revolt, also known as the Great Jewish Revolt (AD 66-74), the Kitos War (AD 115-117), and the Bar Kokhba Revolt (AD 132-136). Roman involvement in Judea started long before the First Jewish Revolt. Pompey the Great invaded the region in 63 BC, having been invited to settle the Hasmonean inheritance dispute. Pompey had just created the province of Syria to the north of Judea at the conclusion of the Third Mithridatic War and was asked by the two claimants of the Hasmonaean Kingdom, Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II, to settle the matter. However, Aristobulus II did not wait for Pompey to arrive and attempted to seize the throne. After Pompey arrived, Aristobulus II surrendered, Jerusalem was captured, and Hyrcanus II was recognized as High Priest but not a king. Then, the Roman state governed Judea as a client kingdom through the Hasmonaean dynasty and then the Herodian dynasty. In AD 6, Augustus formally made Judea a Roman province, comprised of modern-day Israel, Palestine, and Jordan, which remained until Hadrian merged part of the province into Syria and designated the rest as Palestine in AD 136.

The First Jewish Revolt took place from AD 66 to 74, with the main phase of the war ending with the Siege of Masada. The Roman forces were led by the future Emperors Vespasian and his son Titus, which propelled both men's political careers. There were several Jewish

⁵ The foremost scholar leading this charge is Hans van Wees; see van Wees (2010) and (2016).

factions in the rebellion, and they fought against one another as much as they fought against the Romans. The main Judean force was the Judean provisional government, which Flavius Josephus belonged to, and which was led by the High Priest Ananus ben Ananus, Simeon ben Gamliel, and Yosef ben Gurion. The Judean provisional government was allied with Simon bar Giora and his peasant troops. Another faction was the Zealots, led by Yohanan of Gush Halav and Eleazar ben Simon. This faction was tangentially allied with the Sicarii, led by Menahem ben Yehuda.

Although these factions fought against Roman rule, they were too ideologically different to work cohesively. Nowhere was this fact more apparent than during the Siege of Jerusalem in AD 70.

The Romans destroyed the Second Temple, leading to disastrous consequences for Judaism.

Having been given command when Vespasian departed for Rome, Titus captured Jerusalem after almost seven months, thanks mainly to the provincial government and Zealot factions fighting each other in the city. Masada was the last significant stronghold remaining in the region for the Jewish rebels, and it too fell to a siege between AD 72 and 74, effectively ending the revolt. By the time Masada fell, all the significant leaders of each Jewish faction had either been killed or captured.

The Kitos War was fought in AD 115 to 117 and, most notably, was not centered around Judea. The revolt was fought in Cyrenaica, modern-day Libya, Crete, and parts of Egypt. The war derives its name from the principal Roman commander, Lusius Quietus, whose name became corrupted into “Kitos.” Quietus was sent by the emperor Trajan to handle the crisis. The Jewish rebels were led by Lukuas, whom Cassius Dio calls Andreas, a shadowy figure whose life remains mostly a mystery to modern historians, and Pappus and Julianus, two wealthy Jewish brothers. The revolting Jews destroyed as many pagan and Roman symbols as possible, sacking temples, killing Greek citizens, and slaughtering Roman garrisons. After moving along the

Mediterranean coast with initial success, Lukuas fled to Judea and disappeared. Around the same time, Quietus besieged the town of Lydda in modern-day Israel, where Pappus and Julianus held out until they were captured along with the city. The rebels were then executed, and the revolt fizzled out soon after. This ending was hastened by the new Emperor Hadrian, who decided to shore up his eastern border, abandoning Mesopotamia, which Trajan had conquered, and moving legions from there back to the region. With their leaders dead or missing and Roman reinforcements arriving, the rebellious Jews laid down their arms and dispersed. The Kitos War was relatively minor compared to the other two revolts, but its significance lies in its effect on the subsequent uprising.

The Bar Kokhba Revolt was fought in Judea from AD 132 to 136 and was the last of the Jewish Revolts. After the Kitos War ended, most of the remaining Jews in the Empire were forced to live in Judea by the Romans. With the memory of the previous two unsuccessful revolts festering, a Jew named Simon bar Kokhba rode a wave of Jewish nationalism into one of the most significant revolts in Roman history. Simon bar Kokhba had considerable success early on, defeating several Roman legions and establishing an independent Jewish state for almost three years. However, the Jewish rebels' fortunes would change when Hadrian sent Julius Severus to take control of the situation. Severus was an accomplished general entrusted by Hadrian to deal with provincial problems. Severus waged a campaign of guerrilla warfare against the Jews, preferring to cut off their supplies before finishing off weakened units. The reeling bar Kokhba retreated with his remaining loyalists to Betar, located in the modern-day West Bank. Bar Kokhba and his soldiers were defeated and killed during this siege, ending the revolt. The Bar Kokhba Revolt had far-reaching consequences for Jews in the region. The province of Judea was split between Syria and the newly formed province of Palestine. Large numbers of the Jewish

population in the east were massacred, leaving them a small minority in the region. The Roman state then placed severe restrictions on Jewish customs, even forbidding Jews from entering Jerusalem.

To summarize, the Jewish populations in the eastern part of the Roman Empire fought three significant revolts against the Romans from AD 66 to 136 and were defeated thoroughly each time. The First Jewish Revolt made the political careers of Vespasian and Titus at the price of many Jewish rebels. The Kitos War was much smaller but set the scene for the final revolt. The Bar Kokhba Revolt resulted from over a century of Roman domination of the Jewish people and a fervor of Jewish nationalism in the region. After the Bar Kokhba Revolt, the Jewish people were expelled from their homeland, had their customs severely repressed, and never again rose to challenge Roman hegemony.

CHAPTER 1: Stages That Did Occur

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will examine the stages of Gregory Stanton's "Ten Stages of Genocide" that appear within the primary sources used in this study. Five stages are congruent with Stanton's model: **Discrimination, Dehumanization, Polarization, Persecution, and Extermination**. These five stages are linked in their repression of the Jewish people by either legal or violent means. However, they do not appear to result from hatred for the Jewish race solely; instead, the Romans used these stages to control the province of Judea. The Romans wished to punish the Jews for their repeated revolts during the latter half of the first century and the early second century AD and, as Hans van Wees has shown, genocide was used as a punishment in the ancient world.⁶ Unlike in Stanton's model, these stages did not occur sequentially. Rather, they occurred simultaneously and increased in severity, leveling off after each significant conflict between Jews and Romans. In this chapter, I will demonstrate how the Roman state and army used a system of increased repression that culminated in the destruction of Judea and the mass murder of hundreds of thousands of Jewish men, women, and children at the end of the Bar Kokhba Revolt in AD 136.

Discrimination

Stanton's model describes the "Discrimination" step as, "A dominant group uses law, custom, and political power to deny the rights of other groups."⁷ The Romans used the power of their state to restrict Jewish customs and political rights. The Roman state was originally lenient

⁶ Van Wees, (2010) 253.

⁷ Stanton (1996).

towards Jewish practices and civic liberties, but after repeated social unrest and revolts, they gradually became more repressive. This section will examine how the Romans used legal means to disenfranchise the Jewish people and discriminate against their race and religion.

The Roman state's discrimination against Jewish people targeted two aspects of their society. First, the Romans prohibited Jewish political organization and rights. Although some collaborators were given extraordinary political privileges, the Romans perceived any Jewish political organization as a threat to their hegemony. Second, the Romans curbed Jewish religious customs with legal edicts. The most significant of these banned practices was circumcision. These acts indicate a concerted effort by the Roman state to discriminate against and disenfranchise the Jewish people in proportion to growing Jewish political discontent.

The Roman state escalated its discriminatory policy of stripping Jewish civil rights between the years of AD 37 and 66, the first year of the First Jewish Revolt.

Beginning in 37, Caligula, ever suspicious of Jewish people,⁸ gave harsh orders to the governors and Jewish leaders in the Near East to repress the native population in response to reports of unrest. The Roman governor of Egypt, Flaccus, attempted to please Caligula by placing his statues in the buildings known as *proseukhai*, "prayer houses," in Alexandria, which caused the Alexandrian Riots of AD 38. Flaccus stripped Jews of all their rights in response to this disorder (Philo. *In Flacc.* 8.53). Most significantly, he denied them any political representation in Alexandria, a city with a significant Jewish population, making them resident aliens.⁹ Caligula likely would have gone even further, especially after Apion's inflammatory speeches (Joseph. *AJ* 18.257-260), but his death prevented harsher measures from being carried out. Josephus writes that Caligula's megalomania and paranoia harmed the rest of the Jewish

⁸ See Joseph. *AJ* 18.257-260 for Caligula's suspicion against Jewish people.

⁹ Magness (2019) 133.

population (Joseph. *AJ* 19.1), despite his deep friendship with Herod Agrippa I.¹⁰ Claudius did carry out some of his predecessor's planned actions. He banned meeting places, taverns, and hot-food places for Jews (Cass. Dio 60.6-7). Essentially, Claudius barred any *collegiae* of Jews, fearing political organization arising from them, just as Flaccus did in Alexandria. Claudius had a good relationship with Herod Agrippa I¹¹ but did not wholly trust him; he banned the Jewish king from rebuilding Jerusalem's walls in case of a revolt (Joseph. *AJ* 19.326-327). Nero would continue and increase Caligula and Claudius' policies of stripping Jews of significant political rights.

Nero's actions were predicated by an outbreak of Jewish unrest. The incident started with Jews in Syria revolting for "equal civil rights (ἰσοπολιτεία)" (Joseph. *AJ* 20.173). This is probably because Flaccus' disenfranchisement order of 38 had been carried out in other provinces with significant Jewish minorities. Nero responded harshly, cancelling all civil rights equally for Jews (Joseph. *AJ* 20.183-184). The extent of Nero's order is unknown, but it is likely he either made Jewish citizenship harder to access outside of Judea or even cancelled it altogether.¹² This enflamed tensions and likely led to the First Jewish War. Josephus even says that Nero's order set future events in motion (Joseph. *AJ* 20.184).¹³ The First Jewish War was the turning point in the Jewish-Roman relationship and led to the most severe repressions the Romans would impose against them.

After denying Jews their civil rights, the Romans then turned to their other target: religious freedom. The most notable religious repression the Romans imposed on the Jews was the banning of circumcision. From the end of the first Jewish Revolt in AD 70 until the start of

¹⁰ See also *AJ* 18.293-300 for Caligula and Herod's friendship.

¹¹ See *AJ* 19-274-277.

¹² Smallwood (2001) 287.

¹³ i.e., the Jewish Wars.

the Bar Kokhba Revolt in 132, we see the same pattern of escalation in Roman policy toward circumcision that we saw in the repression of Jewish civil rights

Roman thought towards circumcision before the First Jewish Revolt was indifferent. They regarded circumcision as cruel but, in their early relations, did not take any legal actions to bar it. Roman state policy toward religious minorities was tolerant, provided that these minorities did not challenge Roman hegemony.¹⁴ Despite personal feelings, Romans were masters of *Realpolitik* and preferred not to rock the boat unnecessarily. The Romans benefited tremendously from this arrangement, as the power and wealth of the Mediterranean was concentrated on them and controlled by them.¹⁵ The Jews in both Judea and the wider Mediterranean were relatively docile. Despite scattered incidents of violence, there was no real-wide scale religious conflict between them and the Romans.¹⁶ This fragile tolerance would soon be shattered for all Jews by the First Jewish Revolt.

After the First Jewish Revolt by in AD 74, tensions between the Roman and Jewish communities were significantly strained. At the end of the revolt, the future emperor and then commander in Judea, Titus, imposed a tax of two drachmas on the Jews in return for free religious expression (Joseph. *BJ* 7.218, Cass. Dio 66.7.2). This tax must have appeared as a severe blow to many Jews outside of Judea, who played no part in the revolt. The Jewish tax was the first to be imposed on Jews for practicing their religion and was the first use of taxation to punish revolting people or as war indemnity.¹⁷ Under the reign of Domitian, the connection to circumcision became clear. Domitian levied even more taxes on the Jews than his predecessor

¹⁴ Smallwood (2001) 124.

¹⁵ Goodman (2007) 63.

¹⁶ Goodman (2004) 14.

¹⁷ Goodman (2004) 19.

Titus and carried them out more vigorously. The biographer Suetonius gives a first-hand account of Domitian's zeal in prosecuting Jews:

Praeter ceteros Iudaicus fiscus acerbissime actus est; ad quem deferebantur, qui vel inprofessi Iudaicam viverent vitam vel dissimulata origine imposita genti tributa non pependissent. Interfuisse me adolescentulum memini, cum a procuratore frequentissimoque consilio inspiceretur nonagenarius senex, an circumsectus esset.

Besides other taxes, that on the Jews was levied with the utmost rigour, and those were prosecuted who without publicly acknowledging that faith yet lived as Jews, as well as those who concealed their origin and did not pay the tribute levied upon their people. I recall being present in my youth when the person of a man ninety years old was examined before the procurator and a very crowded court, to see whether he was circumcised.

Suet. *Dom.* 12.2.¹⁸

This account not only indicates that practicing Jews were taxed, but even non-practicing Jews were subject to these penalties. It seems by Suetonius' account that circumcision was the only reliable way to mark someone as Jewish, thus effectively making it a tax on circumcision.¹⁹ The Roman poet Martial, writing during Domitian's reign, joked in one of his *Epigrams* that a certain Menophilus attempted to hide his circumcised penis but was exposed during a sporting event (7.82). The Jewish tax was a religious and racial tax used to profit from and discriminate against those subject to it. Under Domitian, circumcision became effectively a scarlet letter, becoming definitive proof that one was, in fact, a Jew and liable to extra taxation.

Hadrian's banning of circumcision was the final blow to the Jewish community. It destroyed any religious freedom for the Jews and contributed to the Bar Kokhba Revolt. Hadrian was a veteran of the Kitos Revolt before he ruled, so his hostility toward the Jewish people fell directly in line with that of the emperors who served in the First Jewish Revolt. Our only surviving account of this ban comes from the *Historia Augusta*, which states, "At this time, the

¹⁸ Translated by J. C. Rolfe.

¹⁹ Smallwood (1956) 4.

Jews started a war because they were forbidden to mutilate their genitalia” (SHA *Hadr.* 14.2).²⁰

While it is unlikely that the ban on circumcision was the leading factor for the start of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, the ban on circumcision cannot be doubted. Smallwood records that several Hebrew and Aramaic sources, including the *Babylonian Talmud*, which was written almost 100 years after the end of the revolt, complained about the ban, which effectively banned the Jewish religion.²¹ Hadrian’s banning of circumcision was not only an attempt to curb religious freedom for Jews but political freedom as well. The Jewish synagogues were important civic buildings where Jews could freely gather and organize.²² The banning of circumcision effectively ended religious and political freedom for Jews. By outlawing the central practice of Jewish religious practices, Hadrian outlawed a key component of political freedom since Jews could no longer gather anywhere. For the Jews, the banning of circumcision stripped them of their identity and forced them to either lose their tradition and community or face death, as was the case for Rabbi Akiba, according to the *Babylonian Talmud*.²³

To conclude, looking at these acts of legal and religious discrimination, we can see that the Roman state became more discriminatory as Jewish resistance increased. The Romans first targeted Jewish political freedom and civil liberties in response to minor acts of defiance. After these measures failed and Jewish resistance turned into armed revolt, the Romans began to target Jewish customs by attacking their religion. Both of these acts indicate a systematic attempt to discriminate against Jewish people to make them weaker, less unified, and susceptible to Roman domination. The Romans used political and religious discrimination to control the Jewish population.

²⁰ Translated by David Magie. Revised by David Rohrbacher.

²¹ Smallwood (2001) 428-431, 464-465.

²² Goodman (2007) 225.

²³ Smallwood (1959) 338-339.

Dehumanization

The Roman state used its patronage of the arts to engage in a dehumanizing propaganda campaign against Jewish people. Stanton's model describes the "Dehumanization" step as:

Hate propaganda in print, on hate radios, and in social media is used to vilify the victim group. Indoctrination prepares the way for incitement. The majority group is taught to regard the other group as less than human, and even alien to their society. ... They are equated with filth, impurity, and immorality.²⁴

Roman writers under the imperial system had to contend with two audiences of their work: their patron and the emperor, who were sometimes the same person.²⁵ Having a patron in a high political position transferred political importance to an author's work. Another wrinkle in this political nature of literature at this time was the author's status. Many Roman authors at this time were wealthy, political connected, or both. Elements of Latin literature in the first century AD reflected the policy of the government and the opinion of the aristocracy.

During the latter half of the first century, we see Roman authors take aim at the Jewish people in both poetry and prose. Roman authors already had a long-standing antisemitic literary history that they inherited from Greek literature.²⁶ Glimpses of this tradition can be seen in the Augustan poet Horace's *Satires*, which lightly poke fun at Jewish religious customs like proselytizing, superstitions of the Sabbath, and circumcision (4.142-143, 5.94-104, 9.69). On the poetry side, Martial and Juvenal mocked the Jewish people and their customs. On the prose side, Tacitus viciously attacks the Jews in his *Histories*. All three of these authors wrote their respective works after the First Jewish Revolt ended but before the Bar Kokhba Revolt started. The relative abundance of antisemitic literature indicates a shift from pre-revolt times: literary

²⁴ Stanton (1996).

²⁵ Gibson (2006) 71-72.

²⁶ Goodman (2004) 13.

propaganda against the Jewish people may have contributed to making violence against them more acceptable to the general Roman public.

Martial's epigrams treat Jewish characters in a derogatory and vulgar way, and they reduce Jews (specifically men) to their sexual organ. In *Epigram* 7.55, Martial threatens his fictional patron Chrestus with sodomitic rape at the hands of a Jewish person if Chrestus does not repay him. This scene, meant to be humorous, reveals much about the common opinion on Jewish men. By making the attacker a Jewish man, Martial seems to be drawing on a Roman stereotype that viewed Jewish men as sexually aggressive and defiling to their sexual partners.²⁷ For the Romans, oral rape was one of the most humiliating things a Roman man could endure, and making a joke in poetry or graffiti about it was quite common.²⁸ Martial expanded this paradigm by specifying the origin of Chrestus' would-be assailant as Jewish. Martial also wrote a poem attacking an anonymous Jewish poet described as "the circumcised poet" (*verpe poeta*) (11.94). The poet steals Martial's verses and disparages them, but what angers Martial the most is that he sodomizes Martial's young male lover (11.94.5-6). As in the first epigram, Martial's Jewish character is a sexually aggressive pervert, which essentially reduces him to his genitals.²⁹ In both epigrams, Martial dehumanizes Jewish men by depicting them as perverted sexual deviants that corrupt whatever they touch.

While Martial paints offensive caricatures of Jewish men in his poetry, Juvenal instead takes direct aim at Jewish customs. Juvenal was unhappy at any foreigners being in Rome, as his *Satires* make clear, but Jews seem to draw particular ire. Juvenal complains of Jews renting sacred spaces and taking up space in Rome (*Sat.* 3.12-14). Juvenal's greatest complaint is against

²⁷ Roux (2017) 81

²⁸ Dupoint & Eloi (2001) 164-172.

²⁹ Roux (2017) 83.

Jewish religious customs. In *Satire 6*, Juvenal depicts an elderly Jewish fortune teller as a superstitious zealot who corrupts the mind of innocent fools with predictions of good fortune (6.542-552). He ascribes to her the highest Jewish religious authority, calling her an “interpreter of the Laws of Jerusalem, high priestess of the tree, and a trustworthy intermediary of the highest heaven” (*interpretes legum Solymarum et magna sacerdos / arboris ac summi fida internuntia caeli*) (544-545).³⁰ By transferring the position of High Priest, one that was only given to rich and powerful men, to a woeful female pauper, Juvenal is mocking not only this woman but the entire Jewish religion.³¹ Juvenal expanded this attack on Jewish customs in *Satire 14*. He calls the Jews heretics, hostile to Roman *mores*, secretive in their religion, and lazy (14.96-106). Juvenal wrote these lines on the eve of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, a time when Roman-Jewish relations were at an all-time low. These lines match Stanton’s definition of “Dehumanization”³² and reflect contemporary elite ideas about Jewish customs.

Turning to prose, the historian Tacitus offers the clearest example of dehumanization towards Jewish people and their customs. In his ethnography about the Jews, Tacitus’ writing takes a disturbing turn:

Hi ritus quoquo modo inducti antiquitate defenduntur: cetera instituta, sinistra foeda, pravitate valere. Nam pessimus quisque spretis religionibus patriis tributa et stipes illuc congerebant, unde auctae Iudaeorum res, et quia apud ipsos fides obstinata, misericordia in promptu, sed adversus omnis alios hostile odium. Separati epulis, discreti cubilibus, proiectissima ad libidinem gens, alienarum concubitu abstinent; inter se nihil illicitum. Circumcidere genitalia instituerunt ut diversitate noscantur. Transgressi in morem eorum idem usurpant, nec quicquam prius imbuuntur quam contemnere deos, exuere patriam, parentes liberos fratres vilia habere. Augendae tamen multitudini consulitur; nam et necare quemquam ex agnatis nefas, animosque proelio aut suppliciis peremptorum aeternos putant: hinc generandi amor et moriendi contemptus. Corpora condere quam cremare e more Aegyptio, eademque cura et de infernis persuasio, caelestium contra. Aegyptii pleraque animalia effigiesque compositas venerantur, Iudaei mente sola unumque numen intellegunt: profanos qui deum imagines mortalibus materiis in species hominum effingant;

³⁰ Translated by Susanna Morton Braund.

³¹ Williams (2016) 123-124

³² See above on page 15 for the definition.

summum illud et aeternum neque imitabile neque interitum. Igitur nulla simulacra urbibus suis, nedum templis sistunt; non regibus haec adulatio, non Caesaribus honor. Sed quia sacerdotes eorum tibia tympanisque concinebant, hedera vinciebantur vitisque aurea in templo reperta, Liberum patrem coli, domitorem Orientis, quidam arbitrati sunt, nequaquam congruentibus institutis. Quippe Liber festos laetosque ritus posuit, Iudaeorum mos absurdus sordidusque.

Whatever their origin, these rites are maintained by their antiquity: the other customs of the Jews are base and abominable, and owe their persistence to their depravity. For the worst rascals among other peoples, renouncing their ancestral religions, always kept sending tribute and contributions to Jerusalem, thereby increasing the wealth of the Jews; again, the Jews are extremely loyal toward one another, and always ready to show compassion, but toward every other people they feel only hate and enmity. They sit apart at meals, and they sleep apart, and although as a race, they are prone to lust, they abstain from intercourse with foreign women; yet among themselves nothing is unlawful. They adopted circumcision to distinguish themselves from other peoples by this difference. Those who are converted to their ways follow the same practice, and the earliest lesson they receive is to despise the gods, to disown their country, and to regard their parents, children, and brothers as of little account. However, they take thought to increase their numbers; for they regard it as a crime to kill any late-born child, and they believe that the souls of those who are killed in battle or by the executioner are immortal: hence comes their passion for begetting children, and their scorn of death. They bury the body rather than burn it, thus following the Egyptians' custom; they likewise bestow the same care on the dead, and hold the same belief about the world below; but their ideas of heavenly things are quite the opposite. The Egyptians worship many animals and monstrous images; the Jews conceive of one god only, and that with the mind alone: they regard as impious those who make from perishable materials representations of gods in man's image; that supreme and eternal being is to them incapable of representation and without end. Therefore, they set up no statues in their cities, still less in their temples; this flattery is not paid their kings, nor this honour given to the Caesars. But since their priests used to chant to the accompaniment of pipes and cymbals and to wear garlands of ivy, and because a golden vine was found in their temple, some have thought that they were devotees of Father Liber, the conqueror of the East, in spite of the incongruity of their customs. For Liber established festive rites of a joyous nature, while the ways of the Jews are preposterous and mean.

Tac. *Hist.* 5.5.³³

While Tacitus' personal feelings towards Jewish people are hotly debated,³⁴ my focus will lie on the place of this passage in the literary culture of the time. Like Juvenal and Martial, Tacitus wrote after the First Jewish Revolt. In this passage, Tacitus seems to look toward the future by explaining the past. Tacitus wrote the *Histories* only a few years before the Kitos Revolt and

³³ Translated by Clifford H. Moore and John Jackson.

³⁴ See Gruen (2016) for more on the subject.

under the Emperor Trajan, who viewed the Jews as enemies of the Roman state.³⁵ Tacitus' diatribe against Jews could have been used as an excuse for the atrocities against them in the First Jewish Revolt. It also could have prepared the general public for the future atrocities in the Kitos War and the Bar Kokhba Revolt by justifying them. Tacitus took the imperial line on Jews and put it in his *Histories*: Jews were not to be trusted and viewed as hostile entities.

To conclude, Martial, Juvenal, and Tacitus all express an imperial sentiment in their writings against Jewish people. The Flavian and the early Nerva–Antonine emperors were all hostile to Jews and Judea, and the literature at the time reflected this prejudice. These writers all lived in the tense air between the First Jewish Revolt and the final two, and the two periods are linked by the literature. The writers attacked Jewish religious and social customs to justify not only previous actions but any possible future ones. The writers' attacks on Jewish people in the late first and early second century dehumanize the Jewish people as bizarre foreign agitators of the Roman public, helping to justify harsh treatment towards them.

Polarization

The Roman state used polarizing actions against the Jewish people to reinforce its dominance over them and justify harsher measures against them. Gregory Stanton describes his “Polarization” step simply: “Extremists drive the groups apart.”³⁶ Although “Polarization” occurs sixth in Stanton's model, it is the earliest step in the Roman treatment of the Jews. The emperors Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero antagonized the Jewish community of Judea by repeatedly violating the sanctity of their religious spaces. These polarizing acts of religious antagonism, paired with the stripping of rights we saw in the “Discrimination” section, led directly to the First Jewish

³⁵ Goodman (2004) 24.

³⁶ Stanton (1996).

Revolt.³⁷ The Roman state was hostile to any entity that challenged its hegemony and provoked the Judeans by demanding they choose between being faithful to their religion and incurring a Roman emperor's wrath.

For the Jews, with their belief in an all-powerful and jealous god, conflict was inevitable with the all-powerful and jealous Roman state. Yahweh was a national divinity to the Jewish people, separating them from all other ethnic groups in the ancient world.³⁸ Since Yahweh was such an important part of their national identity and Mosaic Law prohibited the worship of other gods, practicing Jews could not partake in the essential ritual of emperor-worship as polytheists could.³⁹ Emperor-worship was less a religious experience than a civic test of loyalty. To the emperors Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero, the failure to perform such a ritual incurred suspicion of disloyalty. They therefore required proof of Jewish loyalty, which did nothing but cause more tension between the Jews and Romans.

Tiberius was the first emperor to provoke the Jews with a test of loyalty, and it almost sparked a massive revolt before he backed down. Upon ascending to the throne, he sent Pontius Pilate to Judea as procurator and ordered him to set up military standards that had busts of the emperor attached to them in the city at night (Joseph. *AJ* 18.55, *BJ* 2.169-170). Pilate plotted to kill the Jews who complained (Joseph. *AJ* 18.57, *BJ* 2.171-173). Having been impressed by an extraordinary display of courage from the Jews, Pilate decided to remove the standards (Joseph. *AJ* 18.58-59, *BJ* 2.174). Pilate knew that his actions would cause a disturbance in the area, which is why he had set them up at night in the first place. Pilate more than likely did not intend to follow through with his own order to murder the complaining Jews but only intended to scare

³⁷ McLaren (2011) 131.

³⁸ Merrill (1920) 209.

³⁹ Merrill (1920) 209-210.

them.⁴⁰ He was caught between losing his authority in Judea and disobeying Tiberius. In the end, Pilate chose to defuse the situation rather than risk open revolt.

In contrast, Caligula antagonized the Jews in a similar manner and chose not to defuse the situation but to exacerbate tensions even further. Caligula ordered his image to be set up in the Temple of Jerusalem and issued a direct challenge to the Jews. After being enraged by Apion's speeches,⁴¹ Caligula sent Petronius to Judea to erect a statue of the emperor in the Temple and to execute or enslave any Jews that refused (Joseph. *AJ* 18.261-262, *BJ* 2.184-187). Caligula's actions indicate a distinct shift from the policy of Tiberius' intermediary Pilate. The erection of the statue was not a test of civic loyalty but rather was a punishment. Caligula put himself in a position to win regardless of the outcome. If the Jews accepted the statue, Caligula would have a great public victory, and, if not, then he would have a *casus belli* against the Jews. Petronius refused the extermination order and Caligula was assassinated before someone was found who would massacre all the Jews (Joseph. *AJ* 18.304, *BJ* 2.203). Nonetheless, the Jews now knew that the Roman state was willing to murder them all.

Finally, the Emperor Nero's polarization of Jews and Romans led to such deterioration in Jewish-Roman relations that the Jews openly revolted. Nero's actions happened through his intermediary, Gessius Florus. Unlike Tiberius' intermediary Pilate, Florus did not care at all about the delicacy of the political situation. Florus was described by Josephus in the most disparaging terms.⁴² Nero did not have Florus place effigies of the emperor in the city; instead Florus pillaged the Temple in Jerusalem in Nero's name (Joseph. *BJ* 2.293-296). After ineffectual appeals from the Jews about compensation, Florus ordered troops to be brought in and threatened

⁴⁰ Smallwood (2001) 161.

⁴¹ See Joseph. *AJ* 18.258-260.

⁴² For Florus' character, see *AJ* 20.252-256, *BJ* 2.277-283.

the native population (Joseph. *BJ* 20.318-320). The Jews did not back down and more acts of violence from both sides culminated in open revolt (Joseph. *BJ* 20.321ff.). Nero did nothing to alleviate this situation and may have even tacitly supported Florus' actions by lending his name to the looting of the Temple. Regardless, Nero sent Florus to Judea and gave him the credibility needed to drag Jewish-Roman relations to levels necessary for a revolt.

Using this timeline, it is clear that Tiberius, Caligula, and Nero's continual violation of sacred Jewish spaces drove a wedge between the two peoples until they took up arms against each other. The Roman government did not recognize the importance of Jewish religious spaces. The Romans made trials of Jews' loyalty by intentionally desecrating their holy spaces with effigies of the emperor or extracting tribute from them. To the Jews, the idea of a non-Jew entering their holy places and displaying effigies was tantamount to blasphemy. The thought of polluting their city and the Temple with effigies of Roman emperors and giving the gentile Roman government money from the Temple was unthinkable. In the end, the Roman government's polarization of Rome and Judea by continual disrespect made the First Jewish Revolt inevitable.

Persecution

While tensions were being inflamed by the polarizing actions stated in the previous section, the Roman state needed to punish physically the Jewish people for their defiance. The key difference between "Polarization" and "Persecution" is that the former does not involve violent action, while the latter is predicated on it. Stanton describes the step of "Persecution": "The victim group's most basic human rights are systematically violated through extrajudicial killings, torture and forced displacement."⁴³ The Roman state committed all three of these

⁴³ Stanton (1996).

actions against the Jewish people from the first to early second century. The Roman state massacred civilians without trial, tortured innocent people, and forcibly removed Jews from their homes. These actions happened simultaneously, combining for a devastating effect on the Jewish people. Each of these persecuting actions was used by the Roman state to punish the Jewish people for their defiance and prevent further resistance.

First from Stanton's list of persecuting actions, the Roman government under the Julio-Claudians used extra-judicial violence against Jews to punish displays of defiance to their rule. When Jews would openly protest decisions the provincial Roman government made, the Roman governor would respond with extreme force. Josephus described three instances in which Jews protested outside of the governor's house and were massacred; one occurred under Pilate (Joseph. *AJ* 18.62), another under Cumanus, a governor under Claudius, after the Jews protested the "Lewd Soldier Incident" (Joseph. *AJ* 20.111-112), and the final incident occurred under Felix, during the year AD 60 (Joseph. *AJ* 20.160-166, *BJ* 2.270). The violent repression of protestors was intended to keep further unrest from happening. This method did not work; instead, protests began to turn violent as Jewish nationalist groups used them as recruiting tools.⁴⁴ As a result, the Romans began to respond in turn with more violent repression. Upon hearing that the Jews were protesting his governorship (Joseph. *BJ* 2.293-295), Florus ordered his soldiers to arrest, beat, rob, and even kill the Jews of Jerusalem (Joseph. *BJ* 2.305-308). These massacres escalated in scale as Jewish resistance became more heated until the First Jewish Revolt kicked off.

The next of Stanton's stated actions of persecution is torture. The Roman state used the extremely painful method of crucifixion to scare and punish defiant Jews, and the punishment

⁴⁴ Faulkner (2002) 36-37, Smallwood (2001) 256-257.

became more common as the fighting turned more brutal. Crucifixion was a legal punishment, and was designed not only to execute its victim but also to scare those witnessing it.⁴⁵ The most famous recipient of this punishment was Jesus Christ, but Josephus also stated that family members of revolutionaries (Joseph. *AJ* 20.101-102) and civilians (Joseph. *BJ* 253) were subject to it. These crucifixions happened before the outbreak of the First Jewish Revolt and were less common than during it, as so severe a punishment was reserved for those who seriously threatened Roman rule. During the First Jewish Revolt, it was recorded during the Siege of Jerusalem that:

τολμηροὺς δὲ πρὸς τὰς ἐξόδους ὁ λιμὸς ἐποίει, καὶ κατελείπετο λανθάνοντας εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους ἀλίσκεσθαι. λαμβανόμενοι δὲ κατ' ἀνάγκην ἡμύνοντο, καὶ μετὰ μάχην ἱκετεύειν ἄωρον ἐδόκει. μαστιγούμενοι δὲ καὶ προβασανιζόμενοι τοῦ θανάτου πᾶσαν αἰκίαν ἀνεσταυροῦντο τοῦ τείχους ἀντικρῦ.

Famine, however, emboldened them (i.e., the Jews in Jerusalem) to undertake these excursions, and it but remained for them if they escaped unobserved from the town to be taken prisoners by the enemy. When caught, they were driven to resist, and after a conflict it seemed too late to sue for mercy. They were accordingly scourged and subjected to torture of every description, before being killed, and then crucified opposite the walls.

Joseph. *B.J.* 5.449.⁴⁶

The reason for the increase in the frequency of crucifixions is explained in part by desire for revenge for the treachery and in part for expediency. The Romans fighting in Judea had a difficult task of prisoner management. They would routinely capture large swaths of Jewish civilians, deserters, and soldiers, and housing them all proved to be difficult.⁴⁷ As such, to satisfy their revenge and to reduce the risk that their prisoners would revolt, the Romans began crucifying prisoners immediately upon capture in full view of the enemy. The Romans' hope was that the Jews would be terrified into surrender, but, as Josephus noted, it had the opposite effect

⁴⁵ Faulker (2002) 232.

⁴⁶ Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray.

⁴⁷ Faulkner (2002) 232.

(Joseph. *BJ* 5.305-308). The Romans intended the horrible torture of crucifixion to scare and punish the revolting Jews, but the Jews instead increased the ferocity of the fighting, fearing this awful torture.

In the aftermath of each major revolt, the Roman state forcibly displaced Jews from their homes by confiscating their property, selling them as slaves, and banning them from their previous homes. The Roman government's forcible displacement was the harshest punishment leveled toward Jewish people, save extermination. After the Siege of Jerusalem ended in AD 70, the First Jewish Revolt was effectively ended and Titus was said to have ordered all captives over seventeen years old to be enslaved and sent to work in Egypt (Joseph. *BJ* 6.418-420). Furthermore, the Emperor Vespasian ordered that Jewish property be leased out and that Judea be made an imperial property (Joseph. *BJ* 7.216-217). Vespasian and Titus wished to erase the fighting spirit of the Jews and punish them so harshly that no revolt would ever take place again in Judea. For almost fifty years, this repressive tactic worked. After the Kitos War ended in AD 117, the persecution escalated even further. After the revolt was put down by Lusius Quietus, Trajan decreed that no Jew should ever set foot in Cyprus on pain of death (Cass. Dio 68.32.2-3). As a result, all Jews in the Near East were essentially forced to live in Judea, which led to the Bar Kokhba Revolt.⁴⁸ Finally, after the end of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, the Romans completely laid waste to Judea (Cass. Dio 69.14.2). Although the Romans mostly chose to exterminate the Jews at the end of the revolt, Jews who escaped extermination were sold for the price of horse feed, according to a medieval chronicle.⁴⁹ This anecdote shows that, despite the large number of killings, many Jews were taken as slaves and sold across the empire.

⁴⁸ Hornbury (2014) 276-277.

⁴⁹ Powell (2017) 81.

To conclude, the Roman state used persecution as a physical punishment toward the Jewish people for their defiance. The Roman state's increased persecution of Jews paralleled Jewish resistance. To counteract protests, Roman governors would use soldiers to repress Jewish outcry violently. When this failed and protest turned to revolt, the Romans began to use crucifixion to torture Jewish captives and terrify the others. Finally, after each major revolt, the Roman state sold Jews as captives, banned them from certain regions, and confiscated their property until Jews became an unthreatening and insignificant minority. Overall, for Jews who survived the revolts, their troubles were still not over as the Roman state would continue to persecute them.

Extermination

The Romans turned to extermination of the Jewish people as retribution for their defiance to Roman rule. Two factors of "Extermination" in Stanton's model are relevant to this study: (1.) extermination targets all people in its target group but usually is unsuccessful in killing all members, and, (2.) during campaigns of genocide, no difference is made between civilian and combatants.⁵⁰ Like the "Persecution" step, the "Extermination" step was used as a punishment by the Romans after major Jewish revolts. However, these steps differ because the "Persecution" step applied to those that escaped the "Extermination" step. Extermination for the Roman state was reserved for the most serious threats to its hegemony.

The Roman state was comfortable issuing orders of extermination when it perceived Jewish resistance was growing. As mentioned before, the Emperor Caligula gave precise orders to Petronius to exterminate all Jews in the Near East if they resisted his commands (Joseph. *AJ* 20.269-271, 304, *BJ* 2.185). Petronius stalled long enough that Caligula's order of extermination

⁵⁰ Stanton (1996).

died with him. Despite not being carried out, Caligula's order had raised the stakes for both the Romans and the Jews. For the Romans, a precedent was established that execution was an acceptable punishment for Jewish defiance. For the Jews, it prepared them not only to resist the Roman state when it transgressed their customs but also for possible martyrdom.⁵¹

At the end of the First Jewish Revolt, Titus presided over a mass extermination of Jewish people in Jerusalem by two methods: famine and executions. The famine that occurred during the siege of Jerusalem was not accidental, as Josephus recorded that Titus himself gave the order to starve the city into submission or death by building an outer wall (Joseph. *BJ* 5.499-500). The wall had devastating consequences. The total number of Jewish dead was so high that burials could not be conducted, and anarchy took hold of the city (Joseph. *BJ* 5.512-518). Famine pushed the Jews to the extreme, resulting in looting, murder, and even cannibalism in the form of parents eating their children (Joseph. *BJ* 6.193-213). The horrid scene struck Titus, who, Josephus says, begged God to see that this was not his doing (Joseph. *BJ* 5.519). Josephus ascribes a majority of the Jewish dead to famine (Joseph. *BJ* 6.420-421).

Famine by itself killed many, but it also produced another deadly agent: disease. With the breakdown of social, political, and economic order in Jerusalem coupled with the threat of the Romans outside, the sanitary conditions began to deteriorate to catastrophic levels. Modern knowledge of disease in the ancient world indicates that the number who died from disease during the siege was greater than those who died of starvation.⁵² As discussed earlier, there was no escape from the internal chaos, as those who attempted to leave the city faced crucifixion by the Romans.

⁵¹ Goodman (2007) 384.

⁵² Faulkner (2002) 235.

While the famine was a strictly hands-off method of extermination, the Romans moved to more active methods of extermination. When the walls of Jerusalem were breached, the rebel leaders make a desperate plea to Titus, begging him to spare their children and women (Joseph. *BJ* 6.351). Titus, furious that his previous offers of peace had been rejected, denied this request and ordered his men to destroy the city and exterminate its inhabitants (Joseph. *BJ* 6.353-354). Since the city had been decimated by disease and famine, resistance was minimal (Joseph. *BJ* 6.403). However, there was still a great number of Jews in the city, and, as Josephus tells us, the Roman soldiers indiscriminately slaughtered every man, woman, and child they could find (Joseph. *BJ* 6.271-274, 403-408). The extermination was very thorough, as the Romans ran out of living victims and began to completely destroy the city itself (Joseph. *BJ* 7.1).

Here we see an essential part of Stanton's definition of "Extermination": the lack of distinction between civilian and military targets. For the Romans sacking Jerusalem, there was no distinction between civilians and rebels. In ancient sieges, the soldiers of each side treated the besieged city as a battleground and turned the war into total war.⁵³ Every besieged person, regardless of age, capacity, or even willingness was an enemy, somehow helping the war effort. This idea of total war, paired with Titus' order of extermination, allowed for the mass murder in Jerusalem to occur.

While the extermination at the end of the First Jewish Revolt was brutal, it paled in comparison to the extermination during the Bar Kokhba Revolt. Cassius Dio is the main source for the Bar Kokhba Revolt, stating:

καὶ τὸ μὲν πρῶτον ἐν οὐδενὶ αὐτοὺς λόγῳ οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι ἐποιοῦντο· ἐπεὶ δ' ἦ τε Ἰουδαία πᾶσα ἐκεκίνητο, καὶ οἱ ἀπανταχοῦ γῆς Ἰουδαῖοι συνεταράττοντο καὶ συνήεσαν, καὶ πολλὰ κακὰ ἐς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους τὰ μὲν λάθρα τὰ δὲ καὶ φανερώς ἐνεδείκνυντο, πολλοὶ τε ἄλλοι καὶ τῶν ἀλλοφύλων ἐπιθυμία κέρδους σφίσι συνελαμβάνοντο, καὶ πάσης ὥς εἰπεῖν κινουμένης ἐπὶ τούτῳ τῆς οἰκουμένης, τότε δὴ τότε τοὺς κρατίστους τῶν στρατηγῶν ὁ Ἀδριανὸς ἐπ'

⁵³ Faulkner (2002) 253.

αὐτοὺς ἔπεμψεν, ὃν πρῶτος Ἰούλιος Σεουήρος ὑπῆρχεν, ἀπὸ Βρεττανίας ἧς ἦρχεν ἐπὶ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους σταλείς. ὃς ἄντικρυς μὲν οὐδαμῶθεν ἐτόλμησε τοῖς ἐναντίοις συμβαλεῖν, τό τε πλῆθος καὶ τὴν ἀπόγνωσιν αὐτῶν ὁρῶν· ἀπολαμβάνων δ' ὡς ἐκάστους πλήθει τῶν στρατιωτῶν καὶ τῶν ὑπάρχων, καὶ τροφῆς ἀπείργων καὶ κατακλείων, ἡδυνήθη βραδύτερον μὲν ἀκινδυνότερον δὲ κατατρίψαι καὶ ἐκτρυχῶσαι καὶ ἐκκόψαι αὐτούς. ὀλίγοι γοῦν κομιδῇ περιεγένοντο. καὶ φρούρια μὲν αὐτῶν πεντήκοντα τά γε ἀξιολογώτατα, κῶμαι δὲ ἐνακόσιαι καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ πέντε ὀνομαστότατα κατεσκάφησαν, ἄνδρες δὲ ὀκτὼ καὶ πεντήκοντα μυριάδες ἐσφάγησαν ἐν τε ταῖς καταδρομαῖς καὶ ταῖς μάχαις· τῶν τε γὰρ λιμῶ καὶ νόσῳ καὶ πυρὶ φθαρέντων τὸ πλῆθος ἀνεξερεύνητον ἦν, ὥστε πᾶσαν ὀλίγου δεῖν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἐρημωθῆναι, καθάπερ που καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου αὐτοῖς προεδείχθη· τὸ γὰρ μνημεῖον τοῦ Σολομῶντος, ὃ ἐν τοῖς σεβασμίοις οὗτοι ἄγουσιν, ἀπὸ ταυτομάτου διελύθη τε καὶ συνέπεσε, καὶ λύκοι ὕαιναί τε πολλαὶ ἐς τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἐσέπιπτον ὠρυόμεναι. πολλοὶ μέντοι ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ τούτῳ καὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων ἀπώλοντο· διὸ καὶ ὁ Ἀδριανὸς γράφων πρὸς τὴν βουλὴν οὐκ ἐχρήσατο τῷ προοιμίῳ τῷ συνήθει τοῖς αὐτοκράτορσιν, ὅτι ‘εἰ αὐτοὶ τε καὶ οἱ παῖδες ὑμῶν ὑγιαίνετε, εὖ ἂν ἔχοι· ἐγὼ καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα ὑγιαίνομεν.’

At first the Romans took no account of them (i.e., the Jews revolting). Soon, however, all Judaea had been stirred up, and the Jews everywhere were showing signs of disturbance, were gathering together, and giving evidence of great hostility to the Romans, partly by secret and partly by overt acts; many outside nations, too, were joining them through eagerness for gain, and the whole earth, one might almost say, was being stirred up over the matter. Then, indeed, Hadrian sent against them his best generals. First of these was Julius Severus, who was dispatched from Britain, where he was governor, against the Jews. Severus did not venture to attack his opponents in the open at any one point, in view of their numbers and their desperation, but by intercepting small groups, thanks to the number of his soldiers and his under-officers, and by depriving them of food and shutting them up, he was able, rather slowly, to be sure, but with comparatively little danger, to crush, exhaust and exterminate them. Very few of them in fact survived. Fifty of their most important outposts and nine hundred and eighty-five of their most famous villages were razed to the ground. Five hundred and eighty thousand men were slain in the various raids and battles, and the number of those that perished by famine, disease and fire was past finding out. Thus, nearly the whole of Judaea was made desolate, a result of which the people had had forewarning before the war. For the tomb of Solomon, which the Jews regard as an object of veneration, fell to pieces of itself and collapsed, and many wolves and hyenas rushed howling into their cities. Many Romans, moreover, perished in this war. Therefore, Hadrian in writing to the senate did not employ the opening phrase commonly affected by the emperors, “If you and our children are in health, it is well; I and the legions are in health.”

Cass. Dio 69.13-14.1-3.⁵⁴

In this account, Dio describes the phenomena of total war being applied to the entire war, not simply a single episode. He states that Severus changed his tactics to guerilla warfare to combat

⁵⁴ Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert B. Foster.

the rebels, a stark change of previous Roman military policy.⁵⁵ This drastic tactical change indicates a desperate situation that Dio hints at with his final remarks above. The severity of this revolt impacted the Roman psyche in a way that it had not been moved since the Battle of the Teutoburg Forest. As such, the greatest revolt warranted the greatest reprisal.

The Romans punished the Jews for this revolt similarly to the First Jewish Revolt, but this time they carried the extermination to the extreme. The Romans killed more Jews than they had before and not only destroyed Jerusalem but turned it into a pagan city called Aelia Capitolina, after Hadrian's family name Aelia.⁵⁶ The Jews were not erased physically but metaphorically as well. After Bar Kokhba's defeat, Hadrian split the province of Judea in two, creating the province of Palestine and giving the rest of the land to Syria.⁵⁷ This extermination was meant to be final, a conclusion to the nearly century and a half conflict that existed between Jews and Romans.

Overall, the Roman state worked to punish Jews for their defiance in the most extreme terms possible. At first, extermination was a threat to scare Jews into submission, as Petronius demonstrated. Then, when the First Jewish Revolt materialized and the brutality was realized, Titus ordered his legions to exterminate the Jews and Jerusalem. Finally, in response to the bloodiest revolt, the Romans attempted to destroy the Jewish people, their city, and even the memory of their existence.

Conclusion

To conclude, the five steps work in concert with each other to culminate in the final destruction of Judea and near destruction of the Jewish people. The Roman state discriminated against the Jews as a race and religion, imposing unfair taxes and banning their civic and

⁵⁵ Bloom (2010) 213.

⁵⁶ Bloom (2010) 208.

⁵⁷ Bloom (2010) 208.

religious rights. Roman literature contributed to dehumanization by desensitizing its audience to violence against Jewish people. The Roman state polarized the Jewish and Roman populations in an attempt to force the Jews to choose between safety and their religious laws. The Roman state then persecuted the Jewish people by using extra-judicial killings, torture, and forcible displacement. Finally, the Romans turned to extermination as their greatest punishment, exterminating Jews, Jewish customs, and even the name of Judea. Overall, these stages worked together and resulted in near total obliteration of the Jewish people.

CHAPTER 2: Stages That Did Not Occur

INTRODUCTION

This chapter will examine the stages of Gregory Stanton's "Ten Stages of Genocide" that do not appear within the primary sources used in this study. Five stages are not congruent with Stanton's model: **Classification, Symbolization, Organization, Preparation, and Denial**. These stages either have insufficient evidence to support their existence on any meaningful scale, or the ancient sources prove their inexistence. The first two stages, "Classification" and "Symbolization," existed in a broad sense but were unrelated to genocide against the Jewish people. Instead, they both exist as common distinguishing markers in the ancient world to recognize a member of another *gens*.⁵⁸ Regarding the following two stages, "Organization" and "Preparation," there is no extensive evidence in the ancient sources that the Roman state was organized in its extermination of Jewish people. Instead, the repression of Jewish people was a direct response to their revolts. The final stage, "Denial," not only does not appear, but the exact opposite is evident. The Roman state did not attempt to gloss over their triumphs against the Jews but thought it a fine accomplishment. In this chapter, I will prove that none of the aforementioned stages impacted the process of genocide or are evident.

Classification

Stanton defines the "Classification" step as: "All cultures have categories to distinguish people into 'us and them' by ethnicity, race, religion, or nationality: German and Jew, Hutu and

⁵⁸ Hudson (1996) 248.

Tutsi. Bipolar societies that lack mixed categories... are the most likely to have genocide.”⁵⁹

Stanton’s definition makes a clear distinction between official and unofficial classification. In the case of the Jews, Romans recognized that the Jews were a different *gens* but Roman society was still very culturally diverse. Stanton further claims that the best way to prevent classification is to have institutions that transcend these cultural differences, such as citizenship rights for all.⁶⁰

Before and even after the First Jewish Revolt, the Romans provided paths for citizenship to Jews as Greek citizens or even full Roman citizens, despite resistance from other local communities.

The Romans extended olive branches to well-behaved communities, and Roman-Jewish relations before the First Jewish Revolt could be considered cordial.

The Roman state offered Roman citizenship to individual Jews as it did for other peoples it had conquered. Roman citizenship was unique in the ancient world; while many peoples, such as Greek city-states, guarded their citizenship fiercely, the Romans were much more relaxed, granting individuals, cities, and even entire provinces Roman citizenship.⁶¹ Being a Roman citizen was extremely important for people living in the Roman Empire, as it provided material benefits and a sense of acceptance.⁶² In fact, one would be hard-pressed to identify if one were a Roman citizen or not in Jerusalem solely based on appearance.⁶³ There are two notable examples of individual Jews having Roman citizenship. The first is Paul of Tarsus, and the other is Flavius Josephus, the author who has provided much to this study. Using these two men as examples, one can see how the Romans were open to giving Jewish people citizenship on relatively equal footing.

⁵⁹ Stanton (1996).

⁶⁰ Stanton (1996).

⁶¹ Goodman (2007) 156.

⁶² Goodman (2007) 158.

⁶³ Goodman (2007) 156.

In *Acts of the Apostles*, the apostle Paul demonstrates the peculiarity of Roman citizenship. Paul was Jewish by birth, a Christian convert, and a Roman citizen; the status of a Roman citizen superseded his religious or ethnic background. When Paul was first arrested in Jerusalem, his first appeal to the authorities was to reveal his citizenship (*Acts* 21:39). In this instance, Paul claims his citizenship to be that of Tarsus to prove his identity. Later, Paul reveals his status as a Roman citizen:

But when they had strapped him down Paul said to the centurion on duty, "Is it legal for you to flog a man who is a Roman citizen and has not been brought to trial?" When he heard this the centurion went and told the tribune; "Do you realise what you are doing?" he said, "This man is a Roman citizen." So the tribune came and asked him, "Tell me, are you a Roman citizen?" "I am" Paul said. The tribune replied, "It cost me a large sum to acquire citizenship." "But I was born to it," said Paul. Then those who were about to examine him hurriedly withdrew, and the tribune himself was alarmed when he realised that he had put a Roman citizen in chains.

Acts 22:25-29 [translation from *CTS New Catholic Bible*].

This interaction reveals several things about Jews and their relation to Roman citizenship. First, that Roman citizenship supersedes all other forms of identity. To the legates of the Roman government, no identity matters more than Roman citizenship, since being a citizen grants a person particular legal privileges. Second, Paul's revelation that he was born a citizen indicates that there was a possibility for Jews to be deeply entrenched in Roman society. One could only be born a citizen if their father was a citizen and their mother was Roman or a member of a recognized community.⁶⁴ Being born a Roman citizen also provided an individual with a support system by putting them in a *gens*, which was supposed to support them.⁶⁵

Another prominent example of an individual Jew receiving Roman citizenship is Josephus, the historian who fought against the Romans in the First Jewish Revolt. Perhaps even

⁶⁴ Goodman (2007) 156.

⁶⁵ Goodman (2007) 210.

more incredibly, Josephus was granted citizenship by the Emperor Vespasian, his adversary in the First Jewish Revolt (Joseph. *Vit.* 423). Vespasian's gift of Roman citizenship indicates two primary indications about Jews and Roman citizenship in the aftermath of the First Jewish Revolt. First, the Roman state was still willing to grant privileges to Jews despite their rebellion. This fact is significant because it signals that the Roman state did not view all Jews monolithically and could recognize that not all Jews participated in the revolt. Second, Josephus' writings, written after he accepted Roman citizenship, show a clear favoritism towards the Romans. Goodman points out that it is likely that Josephus wished to stress his identity as a Jew and Roman to make the two seem more compatible.⁶⁶ Josephus' best defense for Roman citizenship as an integrating force appears in *Against Apion*, when he states:

ἡ δὲ Ῥωμαίων φιланθρωπία πᾶσιν οὐ μικροῦ δεῖν τῆς αὐτῶν προσηγορίας μεταδέδωκεν, οὐ μόνον ἀνδράσιν ἀλλὰ καὶ μεγάλοις ἔθνεσιν ὅλοις; Ἰβηρες γοῦν οἱ πάλαι καὶ Τυρρηνοὶ καὶ Σαβῖνοι Ῥωμαῖοι καλοῦνται.

Have not the Romans, in their generosity, imparted their name to well-nigh all mankind, not to individuals only, but to great nations as a whole? Thus, those who were once Iberians, Tyrrhenians, and Sabines are now called Romans.

Joseph. *Ap.* 2.40-41.⁶⁷

Despite not mentioning Jews, Josephus' argument against Apion is that the Romans will accept various ethnic groups as "Roman" by citizenship rights, so the same statutes should apply to the Jews. While many authors, modern and ancient, view Josephus as a traitor who sold out his people for an easier life,⁶⁸ I agree more with Goodman's sympathetic view that Josephus wrote his works to defend Jews and Judaism when he under no constraint to do so.⁶⁹ Pushing

⁶⁶ Goodman (1994) 333-334.

⁶⁷ Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray.

⁶⁸ Bilde (1988) 60; also see the title of Desmond Seward's 2009 book *Jerusalem's Traitor: Josephus, Masada, and the Fall of Judea*.

⁶⁹ Goodman (1994) 338.

Goodman's point further, I believe that Josephus foresaw the destruction of Judea unless the Jews forcefully followed his example. Unfortunately, as history shows, they did not listen.

To conclude, by examining the offer of Roman citizenship for Jews in the first century AD, we can see that the "Classification" step does not apply in this instance. While the Romans certainly saw themselves as separate from all other peoples in the world, they were also remarkably accepting of allowing different groups to access citizenship. St. Paul's citizenship and his subsequent use of it demonstrate that Roman citizenship was available to Jews and even superseded their ethnic identity to the Roman state. Josephus' Roman citizenship and his favor in the Imperial Court reveals that this practice of extending Roman citizenship to Jews did not end after the First Jewish Revolt. This fact is remarkable, considering that the Roman state did punish the Jews in other ways for the revolt. Overall, despite the simple ethnic classification of "Jews" and "Romans," the Roman state provided Jews with citizenship rights, should they have wanted them, which transcended all other distinctions.

Symbolization

Closely related to the "Classification" step, Stanton's "Symbolization" step occurs when the dominant party forces certain symbols on the group it intends to exterminate.⁷⁰ These symbols can include colors, dress, markings, and a variety of other emblems to differentiate two groups. The Roman state, however, did not force any symbols on the Jewish people; on the contrary, they freely wore distinguishing clothing to express their Jewish identity. For example, Jewish men and women would wear specific clothing on the Sabbath such as a *sudra* or a *tallit*. The Roman state was certainly comfortable using identifying markers on groups of people, such

⁷⁰ Stanton (1996).

as tattoos and brands on slaves and criminals,⁷¹ but never forced such markers on Jews. Jewish identity was complicated, as it was more a matter of self-identification than of a government forcing identifying marks on Jews.⁷² The Romans did not force Jews to be distinguished from themselves or other groups, but, if they so desired, Jews would differentiate themselves from the Romans by their dress or cultural attitudes.

First, examining the flexibility of Jewish identity in Ancient Judea is essential. Unlike being Roman, being Jewish carries the significance of religion, ethnicity, or both. While one cannot become ethnically Jewish, Goodman notes that religious conversion by Gentiles happened frequently in antiquity.⁷³ Josephus records several examples of conversion by Gentiles in the *Jewish Antiquities*, with the most prominent example being Izates II, King of the Parthian client state Adiabene, and his mother Helena in the early first century AD (Joseph. *AJ* 20.17-96). Izates II did not seek conversion; he was converted by a Jewish merchant named Anaias (Joseph. *AJ* 20.34). This reveals two critical distinctions about Jewish conversion. First, a rabbi or religious figure was not necessary for conversion, at least not initially. Second, Jews were encouraged, or, at the very least, not prohibited from attempting to convert gentile peoples. Josephus accepted Izates II's conversion as legitimate, indicating that one was Jewish because he said so. Izates II initially had problems with his conversion, as Helena warned him of internal instability should he become circumcised (Joseph. *AJ* 20.39-40). However, Anaias soothed the king, who did not consider himself fully Jewish until he was circumcised (Joseph. *AJ* 20.38), by telling him God would understand if he did not become circumcised (Joseph. *AJ* 20.41-43). This contrast is striking: an ethnically Jewish person telling a gentile convert that a critical component

⁷¹ Jones (1987) 141-142.

⁷² Goodman (2007) 163.

⁷³ Goodman (2007) 161.

of his new religion was not necessary. Though Izates II would become circumcised later through the urging of the more orthodox Jew Eleazar (20.44-46), Izates II is viewed as no less Jewish before his circumcision. Josephus' account of two conflicting ideas about circumcision reveals that even the most crucial aspect of being Jewish could be negotiable.

Despite the flexibility previously demonstrated in Jewish identity, it still required certain adherences, none being more important than the acceptance that Jerusalem was the most central place of Jewish worship. Jews of the first century AD took this claim seriously; groups such as the Samaritans were forcefully excluded from being Jews by attempting to offer their own regional temples as replacements for Jerusalem.⁷⁴ This idea of Jerusalem as the navel (ὀμφαλός) of the Earth has Biblical precedent. Twice in the Book of Ezekiel, the Lord proclaims that Jerusalem is the center of the world (τὸν ὀμφαλὸν τῆς γῆς), with all other nations being placed around it (5:5, 38:12). In contrast, the rest of the world is considered “outside” of Jewish space. With this knowledge, we may return to Tacitus' claim in *Histories* 5.1 about Jews sending tribute to Jerusalem. While Tacitus depicts this as just another example of Jews being greedy and hoarders, we can understand reverence for Jerusalem as a necessary part of Jewish expression. This is a fundamental cultural difference between Roman and Jewish perceptions of the world. While both cultures viewed their cities as the centers of the world, this meant different things to Romans and Jews. Romans, ever the expanders, viewed Rome as projecting outward, expanding abroad, and always looking to the world around them. Jews, on the other hand, looked inward and preferred to build up Jerusalem since it was the only place that truly mattered.⁷⁵

⁷⁴ Goodman (2007) 167-168.

⁷⁵ Goodman (2007) 172.

The most relevant conclusion to this study of Jewish identity is that neither of these identity markers, rigid or flexible, was forced upon the Jews by the Roman state. Jews were free to set their own rules and regulations on their identity. The most prominent example is circumcision; though Jews were taxed for being circumcised under the Jewish tax of later emperors, as mentioned in Chapter 1, the Romans did not force ethnic or religious Jews to become circumcised. Likewise, admitting Jerusalem as the center of the world was a sure sign that a person was Jewish in the first and second centuries AD. However, the Romans did not force this confession from the Jews; their own religious laws laid this action on them. To conclude, though there were ways one could identify a person as a Jew, either religiously or ethnically, these were not forced upon Jewish people externally but were instead created internally.

Organization

The fifth step of Stanton's method, "Organization," is defined as "often using militias to provide deniability of state responsibility (the Janjaweed in Darfur). Sometimes organization is informal (Hindu mobs led by local RSS militants) or decentralized (terrorist groups)."⁷⁶ The Roman Empire did recruit local units during the Jewish Revolts to fill their army. These were called *peregrini*, which means "foreigners" in Latin.⁷⁷ However, the Romans universally carried out this practice throughout their history, and it was not unique to the revolts. These foreign units were called *auxilia* and were comprised of volunteers and mercenaries.⁷⁸ Josephus reports that Jews served as *auxilia* in the Roman army before the revolts (Joseph. *BJ* 1.388). These *auxilia* were not militia recruited by the Romans to wreak havoc; they were an essential part of the

⁷⁶ Stanton (1996).

⁷⁷ Southern (2006) 143.

⁷⁸ Parker (1971) 43.

Roman army, filling in as much needed cavalry and archers. In this section, I will examine the Romans' use of foreign soldiers in the Jewish Revolts to prove they were not explicitly recruited to murder Jews.

During the First Jewish Revolt, the Romans recruited various peoples around Judea for convenience, not with the intention to murder the Jewish people. Tacitus' account in *Histories* 1.1 seems to disprove this claim, as he states the recruited auxiliaries of Arabs, Syrians, and other Eastern peoples hated the Jews. However, Tacitus admits later that Titus kept his troops under strict orders and would not let them fight on their own (Tac. *Hist.* 1.1). Josephus backs up Tacitus' claim of local auxiliary units. Still, he makes no claim about their temperament towards Jewish people (Joseph. *BJ* 3.8). This absence of claims of prejudice is surprising since Josephus would have had firsthand knowledge of it as a general in the Jewish forces, should it have existed. Instead, Josephus makes the opposite claim, lauding the restraint of the Roman army and its auxiliaries specifically as they made their way into Jewish territory (Joseph. *BJ* 1.21-22, 3.70). While Josephus' praise of Roman restraint is undoubtedly excessive, it has some credibility. As stated in Chapter 1, the Romans were masters of *Realpolitik* and still wished for the Jews to return to their empire as tax-paying and law-abiding subjects. It would have been entirely counterproductive for the Roman state to allow rogue foreign soldiers to ransack Jewish lands which they considered part of their empire.

Even if the neighboring peoples held a hatred against the Jews, as Tacitus claims, that is not the most pressing reason for their recruitment. The Romans instead recruited local auxiliaries for practical reasons. The Romans needed *auxilia* to fill gaps in their army on short notice. They especially needed light infantry and archers. (Joseph. *BJ* 3.116). Cassius Dio's account of the start of the Jewish revolt and of revolts across the empire give the impression that the Roman

state was unprepared for such military actions (Cass. Dio 62.22.11.1a). While certainly the Romans would have appreciated extra zealotry in their *auxilia* in the First Jewish Revolt, there is simply no evidence that it existed or was put to use by the Roman army.

Turning to the Kitos War, our sources are very scant but provide a valuable insight: the Roman auxiliaries took a severe beating. While Cassius Dio and the *Historia Augusta* provide little detail on the Kitos War, auxiliaries were undoubtedly present. William Horbury notes that a Greek document on a papyrus, dated September AD 117 from Egypt, is an official governmental receipt that states almost 130 men were being recruited to replenish an auxiliary cavalry unit (PSI 1063).⁷⁹ The unit mentioned is the well-attested *cohors I Lusitanorum*. Horbury points out that 130 men is a lot to lose in a cavalry unit, and the necessity to recruit these reinforcements outside of Egypt shows the dire straits the Kitos War put the Roman state into.⁸⁰

During the Bar Kokhba Revolt, Roman auxiliaries were again present, but their actions were unremarkable compared to those of the rest of the Roman army. Horbury again notes that there were several auxiliary units of various ethnic backgrounds stationed in Judea at the time which fought in the ensuing revolt.⁸¹ Revisiting Dio's account of the revolt, we see no special mention of any auxiliary units (Cass. Dio 69.13-14.4). Like with the first two Jewish revolts, the lack of specific mention of any *auxilia* actions indicates that the auxiliaries acted as regular units of the Roman army. While it is unquestionably probable that the *auxilia* participated in the overall destruction of Judea, so did the rest of the Roman army. Like the regular Roman army,

⁷⁹ Horbury (2014) 241.

⁸⁰ Horbury (2014) 241-242.

⁸¹ Horbury (2014) 324, 331, 343.

their losses were probably also significant, as *auxilia* were usually placed at the front to absorb missiles and soften the initial enemy assault.

To conclude, the *auxilia* of the Roman army differ from Stanton's description of rogue militias recruited to target an ethnic group. The *auxilia* showed considerable restraint during the First Jewish War, earning praise from Josephus. During the Kitos and Bar Kokhba Revolts, the *auxilia*'s actions are unknown. The lack of specific mention of these auxiliaries makes us believe they were no more or less cruel than the regular Roman legionaries. The Romans recruited locals to help in their fight against the Jews, but the Romans did this out of practicality, not hatred.

Preparation

Stanton's seventh step is "Preparation," which he defines as "National or perpetrator group leaders plan the 'Final Solution' to the Jewish, Armenian, Tutsi or other targeted group 'question.' They often use euphemisms to cloak their intentions, such as referring to their goals as 'ethnic cleansing,' 'purification,' or 'counter-terrorism.'"⁸² The Roman state never needed to disguise its actions in its treatment of the Jewish people involved in the revolts. There are several instances of Roman commanders either sparing or trying to reason with the revolting Jews rather than exterminating them as the default. Clemency is considered a premier virtue in the Roman world, and generals and statesmen alike were expected to display it.⁸³ In this section, I will use the ancient sources to show that the Roman state never planned the mass exterminations that took place after each Jewish revolt and actively tried to avoid them.

Publius Petronius disregarded Caligula's orders to massacre Jews if they were disobedient to his commands and petitioned Caligula on their behalf. When Petronius was sent to

⁸² Stanton (1996).

⁸³ Konstan (2005) 340.

Judea, Caligula was angry with the Jews for their perceived slights against him, so he dispatched Petronius to force them to have Caligula's image set up in the Temple (Joseph. *AJ* 18.261-262). However, rather than punish the Jews as Caligula instructed, Petronius listened to their pleas, spared them punishment, and even wrote to Caligula begging him to see reason (Joseph. *AJ* 18.273-283, *BJ* 2.192-203). Petronius' actions came with considerable personal risk. Petronius understood this, gathering the Jewish leaders at Tiberias and telling them:

“ὃ καλῶς ἔχον ἐστὶν τὸν γε τιμῆς τοσαύτης ἐπιτετευχότα συγχωρήσει τῇ ἐκείνου οὐδὲν ἐναντίον πράσσειν· οὐ μὴν δίκαιον ἡγοῦμαι ἀσφάλειάν τε καὶ τιμὴν τὴν ἑμαυτοῦ μὴ οὐχ ὑπὲρ τοῦ ὑμετέρου μὴ ἀπολουμένου τοσοῦτων ὄντων ἀναλοῦν διακονουμένων τῇ ἀρετῇ τοῦ νόμου, ὃν πάτριον ὄντα περιμάχῃτον ἡγεῖσθε, καὶ τῇ ἐπὶ πᾶσιν ἀξιῶσει καὶ δυνάμει τοῦ θεοῦ, οὗ τὸν ναὸν οὐκ ἂν περιδεῖν τολμήσαιμι ὕβρει πεσεῖν τῆς τῶν ἡγεμονευόντων ἐξουσίας. στέλλω δὲ ὡς Γάιον γνώμας τε τὰς ὑμετέρας διασαφῶν καὶ πῃ καὶ συνηγορία χρώμενος ὑπὲρ τοῦ καθ’ ἡμᾶς παρὰ γνώμην πείσεσθαι⁶ οἷς προὔθεσθε ἀγαθοῖς. καὶ συμπράσσοι μὲν ὁ θεός, βελτίων γὰρ ἀνθρωπίνης μηχανῆς καὶ δυνάμεως ἢ κατ’ ἐκείνον ἐξουσία, πρυτανεύων ὑμῖν τε τὴν τήρησιν τῶν πατρίων καὶ αὐτῷ τὸ μηδὲν ἀνθρωπείαις παρὰ γνώμην βουλευέσσει τιμῶν τῶν εἰωθυῶν ἀμαρτεῖν. εἰ δ’ ἐκτικρανθεὶς Γάιος εἰς ἐμὲ τρέψει τὸ ἀνήκεστον τῆς ὀργῆς, τλήσομαι πάντα κίνδυνον καὶ πᾶσαν ταλαιπωρίαν συνιοῦσαν τῷ σώματι καὶ τῇ τύχῃ¹ ὑπὲρ τοῦ μὴ ὑμᾶς τοσοῦσδε ὄντας ἐπὶ οὕτως ἀγαθαῖς ταῖς πράξεσι διολλυμένους θεωρεῖν. ἅπιτε οὖν ἐπὶ ἔργα τὰ αὐτῶν ἕκαστοι καὶ τῇ γῇ ἐπιπονεῖτε. πέμψω δ’ αὐτὸς ἐπὶ Ῥώμης καὶ τὰ πάντα ὑπὲρ ὑμῶν δι’ ἑμαυτοῦ καὶ τῶν φίλων οὐκ ἀποτραπήσομαι διακονεῖν.”

“It is only right that one upon whom such high position had been conferred by grant of the emperor should thwart him in nothing. I do not, however,” he said, “deem it right not to hazard my own safety and position in order to save you, who are so numerous, from perishing. You are carrying out the precepts of your law, which as your heritage you see fit to defend, and serving the sovereign of all, almighty God, whose temple I should not have had the heart to see fall a prey to the insolence of imperial authority. Rather I am sending a dispatch to Gaius fully explaining your determination and also in some way advocating my own case for compliance, contrary to his decree, with the good object which you have proposed. May God assist you, since His might is above any human ingenuity or strength; may He enable you to maintain and to preserve your ancestral laws without His being deprived of His customary honours by capricious human plots. If, however, Gaius is embittered and makes me the object of his inexorable wrath, I will endure every form of danger and every form of suffering that may be inflicted upon my body and my fortune rather than behold you who are so numerous destroyed for deeds so virtuous. Go, therefore, each to your own occupation, and labour on the land. I myself will send a message to Rome

and will not turn aside from doing every service in your behalf both by myself and through my friends.”

Joseph. *AJ* 18.279-283.⁸⁴

Petronius' heroic action paid off, as Caligula would soon die before he could exact revenge on him and the Jews alike (Joseph. *AJ* 19.14-16). Petronius' refusal to follow Caligula's orders allows a significant conclusion to be drawn about the Roman state. There were mechanisms in place to stop an emperor from making a rash decision to exterminate a group. Caligula is often depicted in ancient sources as completely outside the realm of what a normal Roman emperor should be,⁸⁵ and Josephus records that every land suffered from this (Joseph. *AJ* 19.1). Josephus also notes that Rome itself disapproved of his actions since it was the primary victim of his actions (Joseph. *AJ* 19.2). Petronius is working within the policy of extermination as punishment for severe offenses, so his refusal falls in line with standard Roman policy. Despite the pressure from the Emperor, Petronius chose to de-escalate a volatile situation and spare the Judeans.

Roman clemency came from another unlikely source: the future emperor Titus. Despite the well-documented atrocities committed by Titus and his soldiers, Titus did display clemency in two foremost instances: at Gishala and Jerusalem. At Gishala, Titus predicted that the town would fall easily and attempted to negotiate with the Jews there (Joseph. *BJ* 4.92-96). Titus even allowed the Jews to mull over the decision, giving them the Sabbath off at their own request (Joseph. *BJ* 4.98-102). The Jews eventually acquiesced to Titus' offer, allowing him to enter the city with much fanfare from its inhabitants (Joseph. *BJ* 4.112-113). This account matches Cassius Dio's account of Titus' conduct at the start of the war. Dio reports that Titus wished to reason with the Jewish rebels, only resorting to military force after negotiations failed (Cass. Dio

⁸⁴ Translated by Louis H. Feldman.

⁸⁵ For Caligula's madness, see: Suetonius' *Life of Caligula*, Tacitus' *Annals* 6.28-51, and Cassius Dio 65.

65.4.1). This picture of forgiveness starkly contrasts with that of the butcher of Jerusalem at the end of the war. However, these two pictures perfectly align with the theory of extermination as a punishment. Titus, like Petronius, attempted to de-escalate the situation, as both sides were aware of the result should the Jews lose. Titus never intended to exterminate the Jews for their rebellion, but when peace talks broke down, he was left with no choice.

To conclude, the Roman state never planned out the details of its eventual extermination; it was a gradual process that resulted from the gradual escalation of the rebellions. Petronius successfully spared the Jews despite orders from Caligula, while Titus attempted to negotiate a peace settlement with mixed results. Despite the limited amount of information, signs indicate that the leading Roman general of the Bar Kokhba Revolt, Julius Severus, attempted the same tactic: Dio states that the Jews were forewarned of their destruction should they continue (Cass. Dio 69.14.2). The accounts of the clemency displayed by the Roman generals in the Jewish Wars indicate that Roman policy was to negotiate first, kill second.

Denial

Stanton's final step is "Denial," which he defines as "... the final stage that lasts throughout and always follows genocide. It is among the surest indicators of further genocidal massacres. The perpetrators of genocide dig up the mass graves, burn the bodies, try to cover up the evidence and intimidate the witnesses."⁸⁶ Perhaps the most striking contrast with modern genocides is that there is no evidence that the Roman state attempted to deny or cover-up any of the exterminations of the Jewish Wars. In this section, I intend to prove that the Roman state

⁸⁶ Stanton (1996).

understood the concept of genocide, was willing to use it, and never denied that it did so against the Jewish people.

The most prominent example of a Roman understanding of the concept of genocide is Cassius Dio's account of the Bar Kokhba Revolt. In Dio's account, he states that Julius Severus was able to "crush, exhaust, and exterminate them [i.e., the Jews]" by cutting off the rebels' food, water, and shelter (Cass. Dio 69.13.3). To emphasize his point further, Dio ends the section with the chilling line "Very few of them in fact survived" (Cass. Dio 69.13.3). Dio is even more explicit in his account of the aftermath of the revolt, stating:

καὶ φρούρια μὲν αὐτῶν πεντήκοντα τὰ γε ἀξιολογώτατα, κῶμαι δὲ ἐνακόσιαι καὶ ὀγδοήκοντα καὶ πέντε ὀνομαστόταται κατεσκάφησαν,¹ ἄνδρες δὲ ὀκτὼ καὶ πεντήκοντα μυριάδες ἐσφάγησαν ἔν τε ταῖς καταδρομαῖς καὶ ταῖς μάχαις (τῶν τε γὰρ λιμῶ καὶ νόσῳ καὶ πυρὶ φθαρέντων τὸ πλῆθος ἀνεξερεύνητον ἦν), ὥστε πᾶσαν ὀλίγου δεῖν τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἐρημωθῆναι, καθάπερ που καὶ πρὸ τοῦ πολέμου αὐτοῖς προεδείχθη· τὸ γὰρ μνημεῖον τοῦ Σολομῶντος, ὃ ἐν τοῖς σεβασμίῳις οὗτοι ἄγουσιν, ἀπὸ ταῦτομάτου διελύθη τε καὶ συνέπεσε, καὶ λύκοι ὕαιναί τε πολλαὶ ἐξ τὰς πόλεις αὐτῶν ἐσέπιπτον ὠρυόμεναι.

Fifty of their most important outposts and nine hundred and eighty-five of their most famous villages were razed to the ground. Five hundred and eighty thousand men were slain in the various raids and battles, and the number of those that perished by famine, disease and fire was past finding out. Thus nearly the whole of Judaea was made desolate, a result of which the people had had forewarning before the war. For the tomb of Solomon, which the Jews regard as an object of veneration, fell to pieces of itself and collapsed, and many wolves and hyenas rushed howling into their cities.

Cass. Dio 69.14.1-2.⁸⁷

In this account, Dio clearly understands the concept of genocide, but he does not have the vocabulary to express it. To Dio, the destruction of the tomb of Solomon is noteworthy because it stands for the Jewish nation. The destruction of Judea and its inhabitants was total, as Dio fully records. Dio's account has no justification, denial, or dismissal of the events but instead reads like a credible historical account of a modern genocide.

⁸⁷ Translated by Earnest Cary and Herbert Foster.

Conclusion

To summarize, the Roman state committed genocide but was less official in its policy than modern states. The first two steps, “Classification” and “Symbolization,” existed, but not in a harmful capacity against Jewish people. The Jewish people contributed to these two stages independently with no urging from the Roman state. The Roman state never formalized a policy of genocide against the Jewish people through the “Organization” and “Preparation” stages. Instead, genocide was a punishment used against populations that rebelled against the state. Finally, the “Denial” stage does not appear, and, in fact, the opposite seems true. Cassius Dio notes the extermination in Judea and offers no excuses. This absence of these stages indicates one conclusion: the Roman state never planned or was ashamed of their genocide of the Jews. The truth was that it happened; to the Romans, this fact was how things had to be.

CHAPTER 3: Proposed Additional Stages

INTRODUCTION

This section will cover the two additional stages that I think are necessary to add to complete the overview of the Roman process of genocide: **Glorification** and **Resettlement**. The “Glorification” step I am proposing replaces Stanton’s “Denial” stage, which I showed did not occur in Chapter 2. The Romans instead viewed their genocide as a military conquest similar to normal ones. They celebrated triumphs and built monuments commemorating their suppression of the Jewish Revolts. The “Resettlement” step aligns with the Roman policy of practicality. Once an area was depopulated, the Romans would not let such space go to waste and would move populations to the region by incentives or by force. This created a tax base in the area, ensured stability, and allowed the Empire to function more smoothly. The Roman process of genocide did not end with the extermination of a group but instead required two extra steps.

Glorification

For the victorious Roman generals, glorification over the Jews happened in three distinct ways: triumphs, monuments, and coinage. The Roman state would hold lavish celebrations for their victorious generals called triumphs, in which the general would ride through the streets of Rome basking in the admiration of his fellow citizens. A triumph was the ultimate achievement in a Roman general’s career.⁸⁸ The Romans also erected massive triumphal arches, the most famous being the Arch of Titus. Even the Bar Kokhba Revolt, supposedly a blot on the Roman

⁸⁸ Southern (2006) 173.

legacy, was commemorated with an arch called the Tel Shalem Arch, which was located in the northeast of modern Israel on the border with Jordan. These arches were monuments to Roman success, totally unapologetic in their conquest of the Jews. Finally, the Roman state minted coinage in which the emperors depicted themselves conquering the Jewish people. The Roman people would have seen these images with frequency. The Flavian and early Nerva-Antoine emperors took full advantage of these images, gaining legitimacy for their emperorships and increasing their *imperium* by exploiting their actions in the Jewish Revolts.

After the First Jewish Revolt, Vespasian and Titus were awarded individual triumphs by the Senate but decided to combine them into one massive triumph (Joseph. *BJ* 7.120-122). Josephus was a witness and his account makes the triumph seem more like a circus than a military march. He tells of the beautiful art and decorated beasts and men (Joseph. *BJ* 7.120-122, 7.134-138), the fantastic moving pictorial stages (139-148), and the spoils of war (149-152). The climax of the procession took place with the execution of Simon bar Giora, the most prominent leader of the First Jewish Revolt, which was part of the spectacle (Joseph. *BJ* 7.153-157). This triumph was more spectacular than usual, with Faulkner declaring that it surpassed all other triumphs that came before it.⁸⁹ Josephus would certainly agree with Faulkner's assessment, as he declares that his words will be unable to capture the magnificence of the triumph (Joseph. *BJ* 7.132). It not only worked to elevate Vespasian and Titus, but also served as a message. For the Jews, the message was clear: "you have been utterly conquered." This triumph prepared the Jews for the next half-century of dominance from the Roman state and Jewish-Roman relations for the rest of antiquity.⁹⁰

⁸⁹ Faulkner (2002) 260.

⁹⁰ Goodman (2007) 431.

Titus had two arches dedicated to his victory, one on the Via Sacra and another in the Circus Maximus, and Hadrian had one erected for his victory over Bar Kokhba, the Tel Shalem Arch. While a triumph was an event that existed in memory, the arches were monuments of victory that would last until they were torn or knocked down, a perpetual reminder.

Titus' arch on the Via Sacra, formally called the Arch of Titus, is the most striking reminder of the First Jewish Revolt that stands today.⁹¹ Dedicated by Titus' brother Domitian, the Arch of Titus is an impressive monument. It stands between the Forum and Colosseum, linking the two. On one side of the passageway is Titus, a triumphant figure, surrounded by his faithful soldiers and lictors as he rides by, elevated on a chariot. Next to Titus, on his chariot, perches an eagle, symbolizing Jupiter and the divine glory Titus obtained by conquering the Jews. Opposite Titus is a sorrowful scene, as the loot of the Temple in Jerusalem is paraded on display, the spoils of the Roman victory. The most striking piece being carried is a menorah by four spoils-carriers. All other features could be ascribable to any Roman general in a triumph, but the menorah could not.

If a modern viewer, living 2000 years later can identify this arch as a monument to the conquest of the Jews, it stands to reason that an ancient Roman observer would as well. Since literacy rates were low in the Roman world,⁹² the Roman state used images to communicate its message. After AD 70, the menorah was the most recognizable symbol of Judaism.⁹³ Juvenal, writing almost fifty years after the arch's dedication, associates a Jewish woman with a menorah, calling her "a great priestess of the tree (*magna sacerdos / arboris*)" (Juv. *Sat.* 6.544-545). Wiesen points out that there are several possibilities of what this tree is, but the most logical

⁹¹ The description of the Arch of Titus will be my own and taken from photos I took while visiting it.

⁹² Harris (1990) 96.

⁹³ Wiesen (1980) 18.

explanation is that Juvenal is conflating the common Jewish tree symbols with the menorah.⁹⁴ In antiquity, the most prominent Jewish symbol was the palm tree, which the Emperor Nerva used on coinage when he repealed harsh measures against the Jews.⁹⁵ To a pagan observer with the knowledge of the palm tree symbolism, the menorah was simply another representation of that tree. Despite Juvenal's sketchy knowledge of Jewish symbolism, the fact remains that he still could identify the menorah as a Jewish symbol, even if his terminology was unclear.

To Jews in Rome, the Arch of Titus was not a glorious moment of a victory but an eternal reminder of their defeat. While an exact population estimate is impossible, there was a sizable community in Rome. Goodman notes that 8,000 Jews lobbied Augustus after Herod's death in 4 BC,⁹⁶ indicating that Jews in Rome wielded some political influence. By the time of the Arch of Titus' erection, the Jews and their descendants taken to Rome as slaves under Pompey's conquest would have been manumitted and integrated.⁹⁷ Domitian erected the arch to memorialize his brother's victory over the Jews, but it had another consequence. While the Romans felt admiration and pride for their emperor, empire, and conquest, the Jews felt the exact opposite: horror, shock, misery. From a Jewish perspective, the Romans not only erected a monument to their defeat but also one that represented a perpetual threat. The Jewish imagery on the Arch of Titus would have been unmistakable to any ancient Jewish observer, and the object's position would have sent a clear message: "if you will revolt, this will happen again." Like the Roman observers, the Jews had no need to read the inscription on the arch, the imagery of their people taken in war was enough.

⁹⁴ Wiesen (1980) 18.

⁹⁵ Wiesen (1980) 16.

⁹⁶ Goodman (2007) 368.

⁹⁷ Goodman (2007) 368, Smallwood (2001) 2.

Moving to Hadrian's arch, formally called the Tel Shalem Arch, we can see that, despite the severe losses the Romans took in the Bar Kokhba Revolt, they still viewed it as a great victory. The Roman losses weighed on Hadrian, as he stopped giving the traditional greeting to the Senate by stating that the legions were well (Cass. Dio 69.14.3). However, the Tel Shalem Arch's existence points to a more traditional aftermath of the war. The Tel Shalem Arch was discovered in 1977 and survives only in much-debated reconstructions and fragments of an inscription. Werner Eck's reconstruction of the fragments ascribes them to a victory arch dedicated to Hadrian. He argues that the Tel Shalem Arch commemorates Hadrian's victory over the Jews in the Bar Kokhba Revolt. In his reconstruction, Eck argues that the appearance of the title *Imp. II*, which cannot be attributed before AD 136, points to Hadrian accepting the title of *imperator iterum* shortly after the defeat of the Jewish rebels in the same year.⁹⁸ Other scholars have proposed alternate explanations of the arch and its date,⁹⁹ but, if Eck is correct, then the Tel Shalem Arch, like the Arch of Titus in Rome, glorified the emperor and his army in a war that the Romans considered to be a great victory.¹⁰⁰

There was a bronze statue of Hadrian's torso and head found alongside the Tel Shalem Arch. Richard Gergel argues that the statue dates from either AD 132/3, to honor Hadrian's personal involvement in the Bar Kokhba Revolt, or AD 135, to celebrate Hadrian's reorganizing of Judea into Syria-Palestine.¹⁰¹ On this statue, Hadrian's chest plate depicts a battle scene.¹⁰² While this battle scene is ambiguous, Gideon Foerster posits that the scene depicts the final duel between Aeneas and Turnus, based on the Phrygian cap on the central figure.¹⁰³ Foerster pushes

⁹⁸ Eck (1999) 87-88.

⁹⁹ E.g. Bowersock and Schafer (2003).

¹⁰⁰ Eck (1999) 89.

¹⁰¹ Gergel (1991) 249.

¹⁰² Gergel (1991) 234-235.

¹⁰³ Foerster (1985) 155.

this theory further, explaining that Hadrian wished to associate his victory over the Jews with Aeneas' victory over the Latins, thus founding a new Rome.¹⁰⁴

The statue's most noteworthy feature may not have been Hadrian or his chest plate, but instead what may have been under him. Alongside the torso and head of the Hadrian statue, the fragmentary head and torso of a young boy was found, which might have been a Jewish captive.¹⁰⁵ Using anatomical analysis of the surviving torso, Gergel postulates that, based on the reconstruction of the hips, the left leg would have borne the full weight of the statue while the right leg might have been bent standing upon a captive boy.¹⁰⁶ Gergel bases his theory on the right leg's reconstructed positing and another statue of Hadrian from Crete, where he stands upon a defeated soldier.¹⁰⁷ Basing our assessment of the Tel Shalem statue on the Creten statue, there is nothing to distinguish this defeated soldier from other Eastern peoples, but the rest of the statue provides a clear implication. The statue's location in Judea, combined with Hadrian's breastplate, points to a strong possibility that the figure being trampled upon was a Jewish captive. To the few Jewish survivors left in the region, this would have been a horrifying image, like a god having smitten the Jews for their transgressions. Like Titus' elevation in a chariot upon his arch, this statue sends a clear message: "our emperor has crushed you." Unlike the Arch of Titus, located in Rome, these artifacts were discovered in Judea. This is an even more stark reminder to the Jewish people, as the victory was no longer just celebrated in Rome, but now even in their homeland.

¹⁰⁴ Foerster (1985) 155-157.

¹⁰⁵ Gergel (1991) 234-235.

¹⁰⁶ Gergel (1991) 234.

¹⁰⁷ Gergel (1991) 235-236.

Lastly, the Flavians used coinage to mark their overwhelming victory over the Jews in a coinage series now commonly referred to as “Judaea Capta,” which translates to “Judaea has been conquered.” On the face of these coins, we see either Vespasian or Titus, while on the back are usually spoils or captives from Judea.¹⁰⁸ Not only minted for Roman consumption, Barag points out that these coins made their way to Judea as well.¹⁰⁹ This reveals a sinister joke by the Romans. Not content to subdue and beat down the Jewish people, they forced them into contact with their defeat every day by imprinting it on their coins. This fact is revealed by minting the inscriptions in Greek in Judea¹¹⁰ so that more Jews could read the message. Greek was the *lingua franca* for people in Judea, and the Jews were no exception. Josephus states that Julius Caesar sent decrees specifically to the Jews with the wish that they be inscribed in Greek and Latin (Joseph. *AJ* 14.189-191). Further, in the episode of Jesus’ crucifixion, the Roman governor Pontus Pilate fixed a sign at the top of Christ’s cross reading “King of the Jews” in Latin, Greek, and Hebrew (*John* 19:21).

While the Romans had been minting coins with Greek inscriptions since the formation of the province of Judea, these inscriptions were never more than the name and title of the imperial family.¹¹¹ The “Judaea Capta” coins are markedly different, conveying a clear message of conquest. Like the Arch of Titus’ menorah, the symbols representing the conquered Jews could get the message across to even the illiterate Jews.

To summarize, the Roman state used a multitude of methods to glorify their accomplishment of defeating the rebellious Jews. Vespasian and Titus enjoyed a lavish triumph

¹⁰⁸ See Barag (1978) Plate 4, coins 10 & 11.

¹⁰⁹ Barag (1978) 16.

¹¹⁰ See Barag (1978) Plate 3, coin 6.

¹¹¹ “Ancient Jewish Coins.”

unlike any the Roman world had seen at that point, inserting their conquest into the minds of those who saw it for years to come. For a more permanent reminder, arches were dedicated to Titus and Hadrian in Rome and Judea as a towering reminder of their triumphs and victories over the Jews. Last, Vespasian and Titus commemorated their victory in Judea with coinage. These coins did not just commemorate a great success for the Emperors; they were everyday reminders to the Jews of their defeat and the possible consequences should they revolt again. Roman emperors were willing to use state-sponsored mechanisms to exalt their achievements after subduing the Jews and to send a message about those who challenged their leadership.

Resettlement

To the Romans, ever the practical rulers, the demographic loss of a large population in an area of the Empire was a problem. After the three revolts, large numbers of Jews were killed, enslaved, or displaced from their homes (Tac. *His.* 5.12, Cass. Dio 68.32.3, 69.14.1-2). Despite the initial riches brought into Rome by sacking cities and stealing valuables from individuals, this wealth would eventually dissipate. The Roman state solved this population shortage by settling other people there, usually veterans of the war. This concept of settling veterans in Judea was not new, as several colonies were set up in the years preceding the Jewish Revolts comprised of almost 6,000 men.¹¹² These colonies did two significant things for the Roman state. The colonists provided a new economic base for the Romans, and the Roman state could depend on the colonies not to revolt against them. The colonies also provided to the Roman state a town of veterans who were familiar with the province in the area should the remaining population revolt again. Resettlement provided the Roman state with an easy solution to its demographic problems by providing security and economic benefits.

¹¹² Faulkner (2002) 55.

Before moving to examples of Roman resettlements, it is important to note a principal distinction between modern and ancient resettlements in genocide. In modern genocides, resettlements are the goal of genocidal projects, while in ancient genocides, the resettlements are a byproduct of depopulations. For example, an essential part of the Nazi idea of *Lebensraum* was exterminating other ethnic groups to create living space for the German people.¹¹³ The Nazis needed to exterminate other groups to allow space for resettlement to take place. To the Romans, resettlements are a solution to the problem of depopulation. Dead and exterminated people do not contribute to the economy, which was the primary Roman concern. For the Roman state, the issue was not that Jews lived in the region, but that they revolted, prompting the extermination. The Romans were not driven by an ideological desire to eliminate a people and replace them, but were driven instead by a profit incentive.

After the First Jewish Revolt ended, Vespasian needed to build up his power base and he used the settlement of veterans and elevation of status to achieve this. Vespasian first founded a colony called *Colonia Amosa* with about 800 veterans in modern-day Motza.¹¹⁴ Not content with founding a new colony, Vespasian renamed the toparchy capital Emmaus as Nicopolis, effectually re-founding the city, and he promoted to colony status Caesarea, where he had been proclaimed emperor.¹¹⁵ These small moves allowed Vespasian to tighten his grip on the province that made him the emperor of Rome.

After the Kitos War, the Romans had an even more significant problem. The 4th-century historian Orosius records that the province of Cyrenaica, modern-day Libya, was so depopulated

¹¹³ Giaccaria & Minca (2016) 151-152.

¹¹⁴ Belachye (2001) 82.

¹¹⁵ Smallwood (2001) 343.

that Emperor Hadrian had to step in and repopulate it with colonists (Oros. 7.12.6).¹¹⁶ Libya was significant as it held a sizable Jewish population and was the origin point of the Kitos Revolt.¹¹⁷ Horbury notes that each of the five major cities in the province, Cyrene, Apollonia, Ptolemais, Teucheira, and Berenice, all have epigraphic evidence of strong Jewish communities from the Ptolemaic era, while the high fertility and large number of villages in the province indicates a considerable rural Jewish population as well.¹¹⁸ While the exact number of Jews is unknown, their fate is not disputed. All Jews in the province were executed, sold into slavery, or forcibly deported to Judea.

The massacres of the Jews were not the only killings that left the province empty after the Kitos Revolt. The Jews massacred as much of the gentile population as they could, as Cassius Dio reported that 220,000 Romans and Greeks died in Cyrene (Cass. Dio 68.32.1).¹¹⁹ Bloom notes that the region was so destroyed that it required extensive rebuilding after the revolt's end with the most notable example being the Temple of Apollo.¹²⁰

The resettlement was significant for the Jews in two ways. First, it diminished their importance within the Empire, as they were now seen as less trustworthy and less numerous. Second, the Jews were then concentrated in one area: Judea. These two factors made a total genocide more probable if the Romans chose to carry one out.

Last, the Romans had serious population issues in Judea after the Bar Kokhba Revolt. We have examined Dio's account of the desolate land and the animals that ran wild in the cities, so the Romans had a formidable task ahead. In a brilliant or cynical move, Hadrian chose not to

¹¹⁶ For epigraphic evidence of Trajanic and Hadriatic colonies in Cyrenaica, see Horbury (2014) 202 n.128.

¹¹⁷ Bloom (2010) 191.

¹¹⁸ Horbury (2014) 191-193, for the claim of rural Jewish settlements in Cyrenaica, see Joseph. *AJ* 14.115-118.

¹¹⁹ Horbury (2014) 201-202.

¹²⁰ Bloom (2010) 191.

rebuild Judea, but rather to reorganize the entire region. The province of Judea had held its name since it was formally brought into the Roman empire in AD 6. After Bar Kokhba's defeat, Hadrian renamed the province Syria-Palestine.¹²¹ To add insult to injury, Hadrian chose the name "Palestine" in reference to the Philistines, one of the oldest and bitterest enemies of the Jewish people.¹²² Hadrian wanted a fresh start to the troublesome province of Judea and attempted to erase the memory of the Jews that defied the Romans by renaming the province that held their namesake.

To summarize, the Roman state needed to replace a significant portion of its economy after each revolt, so it resettled the land the Jews once occupied with loyal subjects. After the Jewish War, veterans were placed in colonies, and municipalities were given an elevated status to consolidate control. After the Kitos War, so many Jews died that Trajan had to intervene and settle colonists in Cyrenaica personally. Last, after Bar Kokhba's defeat, Hadrian ensured a complete overhaul of the province of Judea by turning it into Syria-Palestine. The Romans did not simply kill the Jews in their genocide. An essential component was replacing the Jews where they once were.

Conclusion

To conclude, the Romans combined expediency with insult to strike at the Jews in these two proposed steps. The Romans did not deny their genocide of the Jews but rather viewed it as an achievement. They celebrated triumphs, built arches, and minted coins that extolled their generals and served as a reminder to the surviving Jews. After killing a large portion of the revolting Jews, the Romans then had to replace the lost population. Their resettlement solution

¹²¹ Bloom (2010) 208.

¹²² For an ancient account of the Jewish-Philistine rivalry, see Josephus *AJ* Bk 6. Bloom (2010) 208.

provided both safety and wealth to their empire, which allowed it to flourish. Overall, “Glorification” and “Resettlement” are essential steps that should be added to the ancient model of the genocidal process.

CONCLUSION

The most important conclusion from this thesis is that the Roman state committed horrendous acts which deviated from their standard policy in dealing with a rebellious people. The Romans inflicted such harsh measures on the Jews because of their refusal to integrate culturally. For example, the Romans never inflicted such punishments on Gauls after their conquest by Julius Caesar. The Roman state could point to the considerable amount of Gaulish assimilation to Roman culture. Since the population of Gaul accepted Roman hegemony, there was never a need to punish it. While the Gauls assimilated, the Jews refused to accept complete Roman hegemony over their religion and customs. This defiance caused friction and eventually revolution. In response to these revolutions, the Roman state inflicted severe reprisals in the form of cultural and physical extermination. To some, this conclusion may seem comforting, that the Romans were only willing to go as far as a population pushed them. To others, this conclusion will be terrifying, as it presents the idea of a cold, calculating state that would murder as many people as it took to keep itself comforted.

Stanton's model, despite its flaws, it still is useful in discussing genocide in the ancient world. As the United Nations' definition shows, the most essential step to consider anything a genocide is Stanton's "Extermination" step. This step occurred in the Roman response to the three Jewish revolts. This is undisputable through the ancient evidence. Five of Stanton's stages occurred while five did not. With the addition of my two stages, we arrive at seven stages that appeared in this genocidal process. Stanton never claims to examine the ancient world in his

models, but classicists can use Stanton's model as a baseline for understanding how the process of genocide functioned in the ancient world. One way this study could be expanded upon is by using a different framework. For example, one could use James Waller's "risk factors" for genocide, in which a state's overall status is examined to determine how likely it is to commit a genocide.

This study will allow for further discourse about the idea of genocide in the ancient world – a far too understudied subject. My proposal would work best being tested along with other possible examples of genocide committed by the Romans. Two prominent examples come to mind, Julius Caesar's conquest of Gaul and the Punic Wars. Once my model has gone through rigorous testing in the Roman world, it may be possible to expand it to the ancient world as a whole. Possible examples of ancient genocides are the Siege of Melos in 416 BC, the fall of Troy, and even episodes in the Old Testament, such as the destruction of the Midianites by the Israelites. By understanding genocide as an ancient concept, which many scholars are hesitant to do, we will have a better understanding of genocide today. Once we have a better understanding of genocide, we can better prevent it.

Bibliography

Works Cited

Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume VII: Books 56-60*. Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1924.

Dio Cassius. *Roman History, Volume VIII: Books 61-70*. Translated by Earnest Cary, Herbert B. Foster. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1925.

Historia Augusta, Volume I. Translated by David Magie. Revised by David Rohrbacher. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2022.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume VIII: Books 18-19*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Josephus. *Jewish Antiquities, Volume IX: Book 20*. Translated by Louis H. Feldman. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1965.

Josephus. *The Jewish War, Volume I: Books 1-2*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Josephus. *The Jewish War, Volume II: Books 3-4*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1927.

Josephus. *The Jewish War, Volume III: Books 5-7*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1928.

Josephus. *The Life. Against Apion*. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1926.

Juvenal, Persius. *Juvenal and Persius*. Edited and translated by Susanna Morton Braund. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2004.

Martial. *Epigrams, Volume II: Books 6-10*. Edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Martial. *Epigrams, Volume III: Books 11-14*. Edited and translated by D. R. Shackleton Bailey. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1993.

Orosius, Paulus. *Seven Books of History Against the Pagans*. Translated by Andrew T. Fear. Liverpool: Liverpool University Press, 2010.

Philo. *Every Good Man is Free. On the Contemplative Life. On the Eternity of the World. Against Flaccus. Apology for the Jews. On Providence*. Translated by F. H. Colson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1941.

Suetonius. *Lives of the Caesars, Volume II: Claudius. Nero. Galba, Otho, and Vitellius. Vespasian. Titus, Domitian. Lives of Illustrious Men: Grammarians and Rhetoricians. Poets (Terence. Virgil. Horace. Tibullus. Persius. Lucan). Lives of Pliny the Elder and Passienus Crispus*. Translated by J. C. Rolfe. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1914.

Tacitus. *Histories: Books 4-5. Annals: Books 1-3*. Translated by Clifford H. Moore, John Jackson. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1931.

References

“Ancient Jewish Coins.” Ancient Jewish Coins: Coins from the Procurators (6 - 66 CE).

Accessed April 2, 2024. <https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/coins-from-the-procurators>.

Barag, D. “The Palestinian ‘Judaea Capta’ Coins of Vespasian and Titus and the Era on the Coins of Agrippa II Minted under the Flavians.” *The Numismatic Chronicle* (1966-) 18 (138) (1978): 14–23.

Belayche, Nicole. *Judaea-Palaestina: The Pagan Cults in Roman Palestine (Second to Fourth Century)*. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2001.

Bilde, Per. *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1988.

Bloom, James. *The Jewish Revolts Against Rome, A.D. 66-135: A Military Analysis*. Jefferson, NC: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers, 2010.

Bowersock, Glen, and Peter Schafer. “The Tel Shalem Arch and P. Nahal Hever / Seiyal 8.” In *The Bar Kokhba War Reconsidered*, edited by Mohr Siebeck, 171–181. Tübingen, Ger: Mohr Siebeck, 2003.

Dupont, Florence, & Eloi, Thierry. *L'érotisme masculin dans la Rome antique*. Paris: Belin, 2001.

Eck, Werner. “The Bar Kokhba Revolt: The Roman Point of View.” *The Journal of Roman Studies* 89 (1999): 76–89.

Faulkner, Neil. *Apocalypse: The Great Jewish Revolt Against Rome AD 66-73*. Charleston: Tempus Publishing, 2002.

Foerster, Gideon. "A Cuirassed Bronze Statue of Hadrian." *'Atiqot, English Series* 17 (1985): 139–60.

Gergel, Richard A. "The Tel Shalem Hadrian Reconsidered." *American Journal of Archaeology* 95 (1991): 231–251.

Giaccaria, Paolo, and Claudio Minca. "Life in space, space in life: Nazi topographies, geographical imaginations, and Lebensraum." *Holocaust Studies* 22 (2016): 151-171.

Gibson, Bruce. "The High Empire: AD 69-200." In *A Companion to Latin Literature*, edited by Stephen Harrison, 69–80. Newark: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

Goodman, Martin. "Josephus as Roman Citizen." In *Josephus and the History of the Graeco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morten Smith*, edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers, 329–338. Leiden: Brill, 1994.

Goodman, Martin. "Trajan and the Origins of Roman Hostility to the Jews." *Past & Present* 182 (2004): 3–29.

Goodman, Martin. *Rome and Jerusalem: The Clash of Ancient Civilizations*. New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 2007.

Gruen, Erich. *The Construct of Identity in Hellenistic Judaism: Essays on Early Jewish Literature and History*. Boston: De Gruyter, 2016.

Harris, William V. "Graeco-Roman Literacy and Comparative Method." *The History Teacher* 24 (1990): 93–98.

Horbury, William. *Jewish War Under Trajan and Hadrian*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2014.

- Hudson, Nicholas. "From 'Nation' to 'Race': The Origin of Racial Classification in Eighteenth-Century Thought." *Eighteenth-century studies* 29 (1996): 247-264.
- Jones, C. P. "Stigma: Tattooing and Branding in Graeco-Roman Antiquity." *The Journal of Roman Studies* 77 (1987): 139–155.
- Konstan, David. "Clemency as a Virtue." *Classical Philology* 100 (2005): 337–346.
- Magness, Jodi. *Masada: From Jewish Revolt to Modern Myth*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2019.
- McLaren, James. "Going to War Against Rome: The Motivation of the Jewish Rebels." In *The Jewish Revolt Against Rome: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, edited by Mladen Popovic, 129–153. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Merrill, Elmer Truesdell. "The Attitude of Ancient Rome toward Religion and Religious Cults." *The Classical Journal* 15 (1920): 196–215.
- Parker, H.M.D. *The Roman Legions*. New York: Barnes & Noble Inc, 1971.
- Powell, Lindsay. *The Bar Kokhba War AD 132–136: The Last Jewish Revolt Against Imperial Rome*. New York: Bloomsbury Publishing, 2017.
- Roux, Marie. "A re-interpretation of Martial, Epigram XI.94." *Scripta Classica Israelica* 36 (2017): 81-104.
- Rutgers, Leonard Victor. "Roman Policy Towards the Jews: Expulsions from the City of Rome During the First Century C.E." *Classical Antiquity* 13 (1994): 56–74.
- Smallwood, E Mary. "Domitian's Attitude Toward the Jews and Judaism." *Classical Philology* 51 (1956): 1–13.

Smallwood, E. Mary. "The Legislation of Hadrian and Antoninus Pius against Circumcision."

Latomus 18 (1959): 334–347.

Smallwood, E. Mary. *The Jews Under Roman Rule: From Pompey to Diocletian: A Study in*

Political Relations. Boston: Brill Academic Publishers, Inc., 2001.

Southern, Pat. *The Roman Army: A Social and Institutional History*. Santa Barbara, CA: ABC-

Clio, 2006.

Stanton, Gregory. "Genocide Watch - Ten Stages of Genocide." Genocide Watch, 1996.

<https://www.genocidewatch.com/tenstages>.

United Nations. *Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide*. UN

Doc A/RES/96-I. (12 January 1951).

van Wees, Hans. "Genocide in the Ancient World." In *The Oxford Handbook of Genocide*

Studies, edited by Donald Bloxham and A. Dirk Moses, 239–258. Oxford: Oxford

University Press, 2010.

van Wees, Hans. "Genocide in Archaic and Classical Greece." In *Our Ancient Wars: Rethinking*

War Through the Classics, edited by Victor Caston and Silke-Maria Weineck, 19–37. Ann

Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2016.

Wiesen, David S. "The 'Great Priestess of the Tree': Juvenal *VI*, 544-545." *Classical Journal* 76

(1980): 14–20.

Williams, Margaret. "Juvenal, the Jews and Judaism. Two Puzzling Allusions Re-Interpreted."

Latomus 75 (2016): 116–128.