Greek and Roman Citizenship: State of Research and Open Questions

Lucia Cecchet

1 Citizenship in the Greek World: Variety of Organisations, Communities, and Civic Bodies

There are many aspects concerning ancient citizenship that we know with richness of detail from our sources. Philosophical treatises, historical works, theatre plays, public and private speeches, testaments and letters, as well as public and private inscriptions are all typologies of sources that provide information on the theory and practice of citizenship in the ancient world. These sources inform us about the formal requirements for membership in the citizen-bodies, the public and private rights of citizens, the governing bodies, and the necessary steps for a political career. Both the sources addressing vast audiences and those circulating among a few individuals (such as private documents) are also useful to our knowledge of the performative aspects of citizenship (i.e., the practices, behaviours, and discourse associated with it).

Nonetheless, there are still many aspects of ancient citizenship that lay in the shadows. When we look at the Greek polis of Athens, for which we have the most extensive information in the classical period, we see a clear case of how much and how little we know about ancient citizenship. We know quite well, for example, what the formal requirements and rights of Athenian citizens were. Pericles' law from the middle of the fifth century, attested in [Aristotle]'s *Ath. Pol.* 26.2, prescribed that citizenship could be granted only to those individuals whose parents were both Athenians.[1] Athenian citizens had the right to participate in Assembly meetings, cast their vote for public decisions, be selected or elected for many public offices (with the exception of the thetes, the members of the fourth census class, who could nonetheless sit in the Assembly and in the jury courts),[2] and receive state pay for public service.

---

[1] For recent works on the Athenian citizenship law, see Blok (2009) 141–170 and Coşkun (2014) 1–35. See also Patterson (1981).

[2] For admission of the thetes to the jury courts and the Assembly alone, see [Aristot.] *Ath.*

What we know less well, however, is how the citizen body (at Athens as in the other *poleis*) came to define itself in the course of the Archaic period. In the nineteenth and part of the twentieth century, scholars regarded ancient citizenship as a well-defined legal status that emerged as early as the emergence of the polis itself. Nineteenth-century scholars tended to trace the origins of citizen communities back to ethnic groups, such as the Dorians or the Ionians, who, in their view, formed the core of the polis as an 'ethnic-based state'. Today, it is clear that this explanatory model is no longer valid. Civic communities and citizen rights defined themselves through a gradual and long process that followed different routes in each polis: ancestry, ethnicity, individual wealth, and clan affiliations are all factors that might have played a role in defining groups, but it is virtually impossible to describe the stages of this process with an univocal explanatory model.[3]

It is interesting to note that when the Greeks founded new communities overseas, they had clarity on what to do and whom to choose as the citizens of the new settlements. In the few foundation decrees that we have from the Archaic and classical period, such as the decree of foundation of Cyrene, possibly reproducing a document of (allegedly) seventh century BC, or the Athenian decree for the foundation of a colony at Brea of fifth century BC, we see that the selection of the citizen body and the principle of division of the land upon arrival was defined before departure.[4] But colonies were particular realities. In the mother cities, the process of definition of the citizen-community did not start as an agreement or a decree, it went hand in hand with the development of the structure and institutions of the polis itself. If we look again at Athens, we note that the Athenians themselves identified the founders of their political system in figures such as Solon and Cleisthenes, who are associated with moments of social and political strife. The foundation of new institutions was, in part, a response to tensions internal to the citizen body. From the little we know of Athenian Archaic history, we indeed derive the idea

---

Pol. 7.3. However, on the effective limitations imposed on the thetes in accessing offices and institutions, there are some doubts (see n. 10 below).

3   For objections to the idea of citizenship as a legal status since the archaic period, and a discussion of this idea, which dominated the studies of the so-called *griechische Staatskunde* in the 19th and 20th centuries, see the paper of Giangiulio in this book, with references to the modern scholarly debate.

4   Foundation decree of Cyrene: ML 5. The inscription itself is a fourth-century document; for questions concerning its date and interpretation, see Cecchet's paper in this book; cf. Hdt. 4. 153–159. Brea decree: *IG* I³ 46.

of the definition of the citizen body and of citizen rights as a complex and, in part, traumatic process.[5]

Another gap in our knowledge of ancient citizenship is the extent to which citizens did in fact participate in political life and accessed ruling bodies. According to Aristotle, a citizen is the one who has the right to take part in deliberative power and in judicial power.[6] In Athenian democracy, such a right was open to all citizens; in oligarchic and timocratic regimes, by contrast, individual wealth played a key role in determining membership in the civic body and access to political institutions.[7] According to Pericles' speech in Thucydides 2.37 ff., the criteria that defined a good citizen in Athenian democracy included the citizen's willingness and capability to contribute to the administration of the state, and not to be concerned with only private affairs. The citizen who does not partake in public life is useless. Domenico Musti defined this as a form of active citizenship (*concezione attivistica della cittadinanza*),[8] stressing the participatory aspect of Athenian citizenship. This idea of political activism, which has often been explored in scholarship on Athenian democracy,[9] was closely linked to another idea that was necessary to make political activism work: the polis must grant to its citizens state pay for public service in order to offer them a concrete possibility of taking part in political life. Athenians received public pay (*misthos*) for their service as jurors, councilors, magistrates, and—from the early fourth century BC onwards—also for participating in the Assembly. The reason beyond the institution of public pay seems to be offering the middle and lower classes the possibility of taking part in political

5   On the definition of the Athenian civic body, see Sealey (1983) 97–129; Manville (1990) 3–54; Blok (2013) 161–175. On Archaic citizenship, see Duplouy (2011) 89–106, and (2016) 59–82. On the semantics of citizenship, see Blok (2005) 7–40. On the importance of regarding the development of polis institutions as a process parallel to—and not prior to—the definition of the civic body, see Walter (1993) and, now, Seelentag (2014) 13–46 (discussing evidence from Cretan *poleis* as a case study).

6   Arist. *Pol.* 1275b18–20.

7   See Gauthier (1974) 210 with n. 12 on the fact that the participatory character of Greek citizenship applied not only to democracy, but even, to a less extent, to citizens in aristocratic and oligarchic regimes. Cf. Cartledge (2009) 149–163 and now, Wallace (2013) 191–204 on councils in Greek democracies and oligarchies. On political participation in the classical *poleis*, see now Blösel-Schmitz-Seelentag-Timmer (2014). Specifically on the question of the differences and similarities, with respect to political participation and census, between democracies and moderate oligarchies, see Blösel (2014) 71–93.

8   Musti (1997) 103–104 and 114.

9   On democratic ideology and participation, see Ober (1989) and (1998); Sinclair (1988); Rhodes (2009) 57–69; Schmitz (2014) 47–70 (specifically on archaic and early-classical Athens).

life, granting access to magistracies.[10] However, questions such as who in fact attended the Athenian Assembly or sit in the jury courts, and whether there were changes from the fifth to the fourth century BC, are still unclear.[11] If we consider that these uncertainties concern the polis whose internal organisation and functioning is the most-well documented by sources, we need not point out that our level of knowledge dramatically shrinks when we look at other *poleis*.

After all, Athens was just one city among many cities, and democracy was just one of the many existing *politeiai* in the Greek world. Ancient political thinkers often discussed the question of the best form of constitution, to a good extent based on observations of the political realities and variety of organisations different from Athens. Before the works of Plato and Aristotle, the Athenian literary sources of the fifth century BC, in particular Euripides, already devoted a good degree of attention to the question of who the best citizens of the polis were.[12] Such questions focus on the role that both economic standing and ethical virtues should play in granting the right of partaking in public affairs and leading the polis. The central concern regarded the right of the urban and landless mob to take part in politics, and the necessity of evaluating the characteristics that make individuals fit for citizenship—beyond ancestry, of course. A practical answer to such questions was given by that part of Athenians that organised and supported the oligarchic coupe of 411 BC, entrusting power to the oligarchy of the Four Hundred, and subsequently, to the Five Thousand, (i.e., those 'who were able to provide their own arms').[13] The timocratic criterion was at that point set out as the *conditio sine qua non* for membership in the new civic body even if for a short time. A similar idea

---

10   Magistracies were prohibited, at least formally, to the thetes (see n. 2 above). However, in the Classical period, this might have been more a matter of theory than of practice. Membership in the census classes did not matter any longer to the appointment of offices in the fourth century, as [Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.4 seems to suggest. Cf. also Duplouy (2016) 77.

11   Specifically on jurors' pay, see Markle (1985) 265–297; Todd (1990) 146–173. Recently, on the payment of magistrates in the fourth century, see Pritchard (2014) 1–16. Recent studies have tried to shed light on questions such as the socio-economic and geographical provenance of public officers, especially in the fourth century; see Taylor (2007) 313–324 and (2011) 117–134.

12   See, for example, Eur. *Supp.* 238–245; 420–425; *El.* 367–379; *Or.*, 917–922. For recent discussion of these passages, see Cecchet (2015) 88–101. For recent works on Greek political thought, see Carteldge (2009a); Brock (2013); Raaflaub (2013) 72–93.

13   Thuc. 8.97: ὁπόσοι καὶ ὅπλα παρέχονται.

popped up when Phormisius proposed to restrict citizen rights only to those possessing land in 403 BC.[14]

In all probability, no Greek constitution was similar to another. Additionally, one must certainly note that, despite Aristotle's classification of constitutions, many forms of polis organisation in the Greek world did not fit any univocal criterion of categorisation. Aristotle himself seems to be aware that, in more than one case, it is not possible to speak of either democracy or oligarchy and some *poleis* had a 'mixed' constitution, that is, an organisation containing aspects of democracy, oligarchy, monarchy, and even in some cases, tyranny.[15] This seems to be the way in which he obviates the problem of a too rigid theoretical schematisation that could hardly fit the variety of real cases.

Indeed, variety of political organisations is a feature of the Greek world in the Hellenistic period also. The Hellenistic *poleis* maintained typical institutions that were to a good extent common to all, such as the Boule and the Ekklesia—though the criteria regulating access to these bodies may have varied from polis to polis. However, they also presented specific ruling bodies with local or regional variations.[16] The same holds true for local magistracies, so that the path to a political career in the Greek world varied considerably from city to city. What is more, it has long been acknowledged that the polis was not the only form of political organisation in the Greek world: alongside *poleis*, alternative forms of political organisations, such as the *ethnê*, existed.[17] In light of this, we have to admit that our questions about citizen-bodies become even more problematic. For organisations alternative to the polis, on the one hand, it is misleading to speak of civic bodies; on the other hand, we can presume that even these polities had an internal structure regulating the organisation

---

14　Dio. Hal. *Lys*. 32. On the discussion of alternatives to the ancestry-based criterion for citizenship in Athens, see Davies (1978) 105–121.

15　See, for example, Sparta in Aristot. *Pol*. 1265b33–6a1; Hodkinson (2005) 227. On the fact that the dichotomy between oligarchy and democracy is in good part a theoretical construct, and that in reality Greek constitutions were multifaceted, see now Leppin (2013) 146–158. For democracies other than Athens in the Greek world of the classical period, see Robinson (2011).

16　For a brief overview on Hellenistic cities and their institutions, see Gauthier (1984) 82–107. For the question of Hellenistic democracies, see Mann-Scholz (2012).

17　See the section *Communities Beyond the Polis* in Brock-Hodkinson (2000); on the limits of the polis-approach to the study of Greek history, see Vlassopoulos (2007a); on the Greek *ethnos* as a political unit alternative to the polis, see Lasagni (2011); for an inventory of Greek *poleis*, see Hansen-Nielsen (2004) with Fröhlich (2011) 637–677 for comments and critics on this work.

of public life and military defence. How then should one distinguish between the civic bodies of the *poleis* and the communities in other forms of political organisations?

One further problem regards the relations between citizens and non-citizens and their impact on civic identity. The majority of the *poleis* were not closed communities. Foreigners could reside in the city, in some cases for their entire lifetime (such as the metics in Athens).[18] In many *poleis* there existed specific institutions, such as the *proxenia*, for welcoming foreign guests and protecting them during their stay in the city.[19] Further, new citizens could be admitted to the citizen body through public decisions (decrees).[20] As far as we know, in all forms of polis organisation, from the Classical to the Hellenistic period, politics was one of the few sectors of public life restricted exclusively to (male) citizens: many other fields, such as manufacture and trade, cults and festivals, and even warfare, saw the lively participation of non-citizens as well. In classical Athens, metics and slaves worked along citizens as manufacturers and traders, and among them there were also women.[21] We have evidence for slaves owning and running banks, and metics being deeply involved in commerce and in legal issues, while being deprived of political rights. Further, we know that women (even citizens) were running businesses in the Agora.[22] Also in the Hellenistic age, epigraphic evidence testifies to the active participation of non-citizens in public life. We see, for example, foreigners fighting for the polis, indeed a phenomenon that, after the 'explosion' of mercenary service since the fourth century BC, becomes particularly evident in the Hellenistic period.[23] Recent studies have pointed to the fact that this reality of daily contact and exchange between citizens and non-citizens may have brought to a 'blurring of identities' in many sectors of public life.[24] In other words, it is legitimate to wonder to what extent citizenship was still a distinctive status

---

18   For recent work on metics, see Akrigg (2015) 155–173. The seminal work is Whitehead (1977).

19   On Athenian proxeny in the fifth century, see Walbank (1978); on proxeny in general, see Mack (2015).

20   On naturalization in Athens, see Osborne (1981).

21   See the emblematic cases of the orator Lysias (a metic) and the slave (later on freedman and naturalised citizen) Pasion and his son Apollodorus. On citizens, metics and slaves working side by side, see Vlassopoulos (2007b) 33–52, and (2009) 347–363.

22   See, for example, the mother of Euxitheus in Dem. 57. For the role and position of immigrant women in classical Athens, see now Futo Kennedy (2014).

23   The expression 'explosion of mercenary service' is from Miller (1984).

24   The expression 'blurring of identities' is from Vlassopoulos (2007b, 2009).

and an element defining individual identity beyond, of course, the context of political institutions. We have to consider that both in classical and Hellenistic *poleis*, citizens and non-citizens interacted not only in economic, religious, and military life, but also in other forms of associations and networks, often on a territorial base where they shared the experiences of everyday life. Recent works have stressed the importance of these networks in bringing together citizens and non-citizens, urging for the necessity of abandoning the vision of the polis as an entity merely limited to the civic body.[25] Yet, the question of how such contacts affected the self-perception and representations of citizens deserves further attention in future research.

Furthermore, from the Hellenistic period onwards it is legitimate to wonder about the extent that citizenship was still bound mainly to one single polis. The Greek world knew phenomena of federal associations between *poleis* since the Archaic period, both with religious character (see the case of amphyktionies) or for political purposes.[26] However, as far as the source material is concerned, it is not before the Late Classical and Hellenistic period that inscriptions allow us to have a good glimpse of the practice of dual (or multiple) citizenship. In the Hellenistic and Roman periods, additional citizenships could be granted in several ways. For individuals, grants of citizenship were often a reward: the phenomenon of euergetism increased the practice of awarding citizenship as a return for public benefactions to the city, and it ended up creating an 'international' elite of individuals holding citizenship in several cities.[27] At the institutional level, the politics of federations (*koina*) and *ad hoc* agreements between cities (*isopoliteiai* or *sympoliteiai*) established forms of federal citizenship, though their practical implications are for us difficult to define.[28]

Overall, it is not clear how multiple citizenship worked. In the case of individual grants, the question is whether they were only honorific titles or if they were real 'additional citizenships', and if they granted full citizen rights to the

---

25 See Ismard (2010) and the recent work of Taylor-Vlassopoulos (2015), especially *Introduction* for methodological premises.

26 See Lasagni (2011) 67–149; MacInerney (2013) 466–479 on transregional governance in the case of amphyctionies, see now Funke (2013) 451–465; for recent work on Greek federalism, see Beck-Funke (2015).

27 For the imperial period, see the emblematic case of the Lycian magnate Opramoas, also discussed by Ștefan in this book.

28 On federal citizenship, see Lasagni's paper in this book (with bibliography); on *sympoliteia* and *koinon*, see also Lasagni (2011) 81–90. On *isopoliteia*, see Gawantka (1975).

holders.[29] While for elites they were usually honorary titles, grants of citizenship to ordinary individuals were most probably a way to practically integrate newcomers into the civic body. Especially in the first and second century AD in the cities of Asia Minor, we see professionals moving their residence into the city where they had been naturalized (and working there) while at the same time also maintaining their former citizenship. Some of them seem to have moved their residence several times during their lifetime, practically enjoying citizen status in more than one polis. In these cases, grants of citizenship were clearly tools promoting geographical and social mobility.[30]

Thus, we need to adopt a flexible approach to the study of Greek citizenship: an approach that takes into consideration not only the historical development from the classical to the Hellenistic and Roman period, but also synchronic differences among contexts, *poleis*, and—in cases of citizenship grants—recipients. To regard Greek citizenship as a set of universally valid rules means we decide to ignore the variety of political organisations in the Greek world, and also the different contexts in which citizenship and civic honours were bestowed on individuals. What is more, we need to complement studies of the legal and political aspects of citizen status with a broader perspective on how it was experienced, performed and, "constructed" in terms of identity and public discourse.

2   Citizenship in the Roman World: A Civic Body in Constant Expansion

When we look at the Roman world, we immediately note a macroscopic difference when compared to the Greek world. For the Romans, from the mid-Republic onwards, one of the chief aims and meanings of citizenship related to the issue of controlling and administering a vast territory, a problem that the

---

29   For example, the expression πολιτευόμενος δὲ καὶ ταῖς κατὰ Λυκία πόλεσι πᾶσαις—'being a citizen in all the cities of Lycia'—in Lycian decrees, is referred to magistrates of the league or to local magnates. Some scholars denied that such a formula did in fact refer to full citizen rights in all the cities of the federation. According to Larsen (1957) 9 ff., it referred to the praxis of conferring civil (but not political) rights in several *poleis* for officers of the Lycian league, and it is earlier than the imperial period. *Contra* Behrwald (2000) 225–226 points to the fact that, since the late Hellenistic period, all of the citizens of the *poleis* members of the Lycian league enjoyed *epigamia* and *enktêsis* in all the cities of the federation, hence this status was not only limited to magistrates.

30   See van Nijf (2012) 175–194 and Ştefan's paper in this book.

Greek world, neither in the classical nor in the Hellenistic period, knew in those terms.[31] The Romans were not simply living within the boundaries of a city, or within the boundaries of a league of cities, but in a much more integrated system where Roman citizens had a legally recognised status in every part of a territory politically and judicially controlled by Rome. Local identity in the Roman world was a different matter than local identity in the Greek world: it was much less important to be a citizen from the town of X or Y than it was to be a *civis Romanus*, regardless of the geographic provenance and membership in a city.[32]

Roman citizens during the Republic had the right to vote; although different from the Greeks who voted individually either per hand-show, by using plaques, or else signalling their approbation or denial by shouting out, Romans employed a system of voting by groupings. They voted per tribe in the *comitia tributa*, and per census and military unit (*centuria*) in the *comitia centuriata*.[33] Social divisions mattered to political career in as much as (at least in the early Republic) the *cursus honorum* of patricians was different than that of plebeians, and some magistracies remained accessible only to specific orders (such as the tribune of the plebs). Further, census and financial qualifications played a role in access to the Senate and membership in equestrian order. All these features of Roman Republican organisation explain why, in the eyes of a Greek thinker such as Polybius, the Roman Republic looked like a successful mixture of democratic, aristocratic, and even monarchic features.[34]

While the territorial horizon of the Romans expanded, so did the level of political and legal integration. It is perhaps easier to sketch a history of Roman citizenship than it is to attempt a history of Greek citizenship, for in the case of the Roman world, as we noted already, we have to deal with a more homogeneous and unified legal system. And we can reconstruct quite well the stages of definition and expansion of the Roman civic body from the Republic

---

31   On the transformation of Rome from city-state to Empire, including comparison with the Athenian case, see Raaflaub (2011) 39–66.

32   The priority of Roman citizenship over local membership seems to have mattered especially during the Republic: see form example Cic. *Caec.* 100 and Cicero's idea of Rome as the *communis patria* in *Leg.* 2.5; on this, see Ando (2000) 10–11; on dual citizenship, see Marotta (2009) 91; specifically on Cicero's ideas about double fatherland, see the paper of Carlà-Uhink in this book. In the imperial period, double citizenship was allowed, as in the case of the Greek East shows; see Marotta (2009) 93–95.

33   On the voting districts of the Romans, see Taylor (1960).

34   Pol. 6.11. On the theory of mixed constitution in Greek political though, see now Hahm (2009) 178–198.

to the Empire, although Sherwin White was right in reminding us of 'the danger of giving too static an account of Roman institutions', which is a risk one can incur due to the stability of Roman legal and institutional terminology.[35]

When Rome arose as an economic and political hub in Latium during the fifth and fourth centuries BC, it rapidly became a cosmopolitan reality, and originally Roman citizens were just one of the many residents groups in the city.[36] As for the beginning of the polis and for Greek citizenship, our knowledge of the beginnings of the Roman Republic and of Roman citizenship derives mostly from late sources. Beyond legitimate scepticism of their reliability, if we are to follow at least the core information provided by authors such as Livy or Dionysius of Halicarnassus, we should believe that since the fifth century BC, Rome started stipulating alliances with neighbouring Italic communities, securing a networks of allies—the Latin *socii*, who were bound to Rome by the agreement of military support and by the ban to ally against Rome.[37] Further, beyond treaties of alliance, Roman expansion on the Italian peninsula relied on extending Roman citizenship, however differentiating into different 'degrees'. Beyond full rights for Roman citizens, Rome could award alternative forms of citizenship, such as Latin citizenship and citizenship without the right to vote (in the sources of the Late Republic, this is indicated with the expression *civitas sine suffragio*).

The *civitas sine suffragio*, generally granted to the *municipia* after 338 BC, was described by Mommsen as a sort of semi-citizenship (*Halbbürgerrecht*),[38] based on the fact that the *cives sine suffragio* could not vote, could not hold Roman magistracies, and were subjected to the *imperium* of Roman magistrates; still, they had the same obligations of Roman citizens to be registered in the census and to serve in the army. This offered apparent advantages to Rome,

---

35   Sherwin White (1973) 39.

36   On this, see Isaev's paper in this book.

37   See Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 6.95 on the *Foedus Cassianum*. For an optimistic view on the reliability of the core of information of sources for the early Republic, at least on accounts about the fourth century BC onwards, see Cornell (1995) 1–30 (see p. 18: '… there was bound to be a great deal of misunderstanding and unconscious distortion. Nevertheless, the fact remains that our sources do depend ultimately on a hard core of authentic data, much of which is readily identifiable'). On the early stages of Roman and Latin citizenship, see Coşkun (2009a) 31–34 with n. 64 for extensive bibliography on the *Foedus Cassianum*.

38   Mommsen (1887). On *civitas sine suffragio*, see Sherwin White (1973) 38–58; on *coloniae* and *municipia* in the early Republic, see Marotta (2009) 17–20; Coşkun (2009a) 117–122. On the *civitas sine suffragio* in the second century BC, see also Mouritsen (2006) 418–425 and (2008) 471–483.

which managed to maintain a relatively exclusive civic community while at the same time collecting revenues and recruiting people for military service from the *civitates* and the *municipia sine suffragio*. The citizens of these cities, in turn, enjoyed some privileges in their relations with the Romans, such as the *ius conubii*, the *ius commercii*, and the *ius migrationis* (however disputed today).[39] On a higher position, in addition to these rights, the citizens of Latin law also enjoyed some fundamental political rights, such as the right to vote in Rome, even with some limitations.[40] Though remaining subjected to the *imperium* of magistrates, Latin citizenship was a rather privileged status, if we note that as early as 338 BC, there seems to have been no considerable interest from the Latin cities to acquire full Roman citizenship.

Nonetheless, things gradually changed, and Roman citizenship gained more and more prestige in the course of the second century BC, probably also as a consequence of the expansion of Rome into the Mediterranean and her victories in the Punic Wars. As late as 91 BC, the issue of Roman citizenship had become so crucial to the neighbouring communities of the Romans that the Social War broke out. The reasons that led the Latin cities and the *socii* to rebel against Rome, starting from the first uprisings in the second half of the second century BC until the war of 91 BC, are still a topic of discussion among scholars.[41] Beyond the uncertainty about the original motivations behind the

---

39 On *conubium, commercium*, and *migratio*, see Kremer (2006) 9–40; on *conubium*, see also Coşkun (2009a) 34–39, (with the note that not all Latins enjoyed the *ius conubii*, ibid., 37–38; cf. Sherwin White, ibid., 109); on *commercium*, see Coşkun (2009a) 39–47; on *migratio*, ibid., 70–73 with references to further bibliography. For scepticism on the traditional interpretation of the *ius migrationis* deriving from Mommsen, see Broadhead (2001) 69–89.

40 On this, see Coşkun (2009a) 124–128; cf. Kremer (2006) 43–45. On *ius Latinum* in general, see Kremer (2006).

41 In fact, it is debated whether the rebels aimed at enfranchisement in the sense of rights equal to those of Roman citizens, or they rather aimed at other forms of recognition on the political and social level, such as the *ius provocationis*, which would limit the power of Roman magistrates over them. Gabba (1954) argued that the *Italici* aimed at *suffragium* in order to protect their commercial interests. Brunt (1971), by contrast, believed that their motivations were essentially political. Sherwin White (1973, 142–148), noting that the allies never presented an ultimatum demanding citizenship under the threat of a war, notably suggested that complete enfranchisement, which they finally obtained, was not the original demand of the *socii* and of the Latins, but rather the contribution of the second generation of rebels, affected by the consequences of the *lex Licinia Mucia* of 95 BC. For an overview of the early scholarly debate, see Gabba (1994) 104–128. For a recent alternative interpretation of the literary tradition, in particular of Appian and Plutarch on

rebellion, what we know for sure is that with the end of the Social War in 89 BC, Roman citizenship was extended to the cities of the Italian peninsula up to the Po River, and from 49 BC up to the Alps.

The process of expansion of the Roman civic community continued after the Social War with a new challenge: the expansion beyond the Alps, which indeed started way before the Late Republic, had posed the question of the legal status and position of the provincials. In a way, the enfranchisement of the Italian peninsula can be regarded as a prelude to what happened in the provinces during the first three centuries of the Empire. Indeed, the mode of expansion of the civic body is better documented in the imperial period than it is for the Republic. The amount and typology of sources attesting to grants of citizenship now includes military diplomata as well as literary texts and inscriptions. In the Imperial Age, in fact, citizenship could be granted either *ad hoc* (to entire communities in some territories, especially in the West, or, more often in the East, *viritim* to the elite members of prominent cities) or by law to individuals who served in the Roman army and in the fleet after completion of their service (as attested on military diplomata). Just as it already was granted during the Republic, citizenship could also be granted to those who held a local magistracy, or to slaves by *manumissio*, and according to other ways prescribed by law.[42]

During the Augustan age, the tendency was to recognise full citizenship for the cities where Italian immigration constituted the largest foundation (*oppida civium Romanorum* or *conventus civium Romanorum*), whereas Latin citizenship (mostly in the form of *civitas sine suffragio*) was granted mainly in the West to the communities where the native elements constituted the majority of the population.[43] Under Claudius, the number of senators from the provinces started increasing, though their number remained small compared to that of the Italic senators. In his famous Lugdunum speech, the Emperor explained his reasons for admitting the *primores* of Gallia Chomata to the

---

the grants of rights to the Italian *socii* in the second century BC, see Mouritsen (2006) 418–425; cf. also Mouritsen (1998) and (2008) 471–483. On the Social War and the demands of the rebels, see Keaveney (1987) 117–162. For recent works, see Kendall (2013) and Dart (2014). On the unification of Italy and the formation of the Italic/Roman civic identity, see Carlà-Uhink, forthcoming.

42   For a concise treatment of the modes of access to Roman citizenship in the Imperial Age, see Marotta (2009) 61–89.

43   Sherwin White (1973) 225. On the *ius Latinum* during the Empire, see Kremer (2006) 111–189.

Senate.[44] In the version of the speech attested by Tacitus, Claudius reminds his audience that since its early history, Rome has welcomed foreigners and defeated enemies in its citizen body, and that this has characterised its great strength, while the exclusion of foreigners has been the cause of the ruin of Spartans and Athenians.[45] In his parody of Claudius in the *Apokolokyntosis*, Seneca depicts the Emperor as showering citizenship on peregrine communities,[46] but this is an obvious exaggeration. What is clear is that Claudius' principate signed the moment when grants of citizenship started increasing as a reward for military service, as shown by diplomata; this phenomenon indeed continued to the third century AD.

Notably, Sherwin White described the extension of citizenship in the provinces from the middle of the first century AD with the metaphor of the 'flood tide', an image that was strongly associated to Mommsen's idea of the decline of the content and the value of citizenship in the imperial period.[47] Though this view is still shared among scholars, it has been noted that it excessively downplays the important private and civil rights that Roman citizenship granted to the provincials. Roman citizenship indeed had important implications in the private spheres of marriage, inheritance, ownership, trade, and so on.[48]

There are clear signs in the literary record that the provincial elites appreciated Rome's citizenship policy, and in particular that they praised the extensive

---

44   CIL 13.1668 = ILS 212. Cf. Tac. *Ann*.11.24.

45   Tac. ibid.

46   Sen. *Apok*. 3. Sherwin White was right in noting that the real revolutionary aspect of Claudius' citizenship policy consisted not so much in the dimension of the phenomenon of citizenship grants in the provinces, but rather in the importance of such grants themselves, as 'he shattered the opinion that the Roman state knew boundaries determined by any other consideration than her own power of absorption and attraction' (1973, 249).

47   Mommsen (1887) regarded imperial citizenship mostly as honorary and passive citizenship. For the theory of the 'flood tide', see Sherwin White (1973) 251–263.

48   For the idea of the decline of the importance of citizenship during the Empire, see Spagnuolo Vigorita (1993) 7–15 and 39–43. On the opposite view, Marotta (2009) 59, rightly notes that, in the second century AD, Roman citizenship still ensured to citizens of the lower ranks substantial rights and legal protections. Against the idea of a significant decline of Roman citizenship in the second century AD, see also Buraselis (2007); Lavan (2016) 3–46 (with a new estimation of the figures of Roman citizens in the provinces before AD 212), and Besson's paper in this book. Ancient authors were aware of the importance of Roman citizenship on the sphere of legal rights: see, for example, Ael. Arist. 26.102 on the importance of the right of *conubium* (marriage) among citizens coming from different parts of the Empire. For a concise exposition of the rights and duties of Roman citizens, see Gardner (1993).

Roman awards of citizenship. In his letter to the city of Larissa in 214 BC, Philip V
of Macedonia, an enemy of Rome at that time, exhorted the citizens of this
city to imitate the Roman practice of awarding citizenship to the manumitted
slaves upon the argument that this practice would enlarge their citizen body
and make their city stronger.[49] Several centuries later, this admiration for the
Roman citizenship policy is emblematically represented by the words of Aelius
Aristides in his speech *To Rome*.[50] Certainly exaggerating by virtue of the lauda-
tory purpose of the speech, Aristides praises Roman citizenship for knowing no
geographic boundary and being open to anyone who shows himself worthy of a
magistracy. This pride for the citizenship policy of the Romans was also recog-
nized as one of the strong points of the Empire by late authors, and it will suffice
here to recall the words of Rutilius Namantianus in *Red.* 1.63: *fecisti patriam
diversis gentibus unam*. Nonetheless, we should stress again that the Romans
awarded citizenship based on precise choices, ultimately aiming at securing
control and stability in the provinces.[51] Further, despite their 'generosity', we
should not forget that there were entire communities and geographic areas that
remained deprived of Roman citizenship until the *Constitutio Antoniniana*, like
the case of the Egyptians discussed also in this volume by Marotta.[52]

To sum up, we can certainly say that, before Caracalla extended citizenship
to (nearly) all free inhabitants of the Empire in AD 212, Roman citizenship was
regarded as a prestigious status both in terms of personal and civil rights and
in terms of political career both in the West and in the East.[53] But it was never
a closed and inaccessible status. Since the early Republic, Rome had made
its point of political strength expansion rather than restriction of the civic
community; this policy continued, *mutatis mutandis*, during the Empire.

A legitimate question in light of the above is how this gradual and constant
expansion affected the self-perception of Roman citizens, both in Italy and
in the provinces, and how the political discourse of citizenship reflected on
this phenomenon of constant enlargement of the civic body. While juridical
sources provide 'formal' evidence regarding the legal dimension of citizenship,
it is mostly in epigraphic and literary sources (including papyri) that we should

---

49   *Syll.*³ 543. However, Philipp V was not right in saying that the Romans enabled the enfran-
      chised slaves to take offices; on this, see Marotta (2009) 34.

50   Ael. Ar. 26.59–64. See Pernot (2008) 175–202.

51   See Coşkun (2009b) 21. On Roman 'generosity' on admitting foreigners, see Gauthier (1974)
      and Coşkun (2009b) 7–41.

52   On the Egyptians, cf. also Marotta (2009) 60. On the fact that many citizens in the
      provinces did not hold Roman citizenship before AD 212, see Garnsey (2004) 137.

53   On this, see Besson's paper in this book.

look at in order to grasp the performative aspects and experiences of citizenship in the provinces. How did the newly enfranchised communities and individuals react in terms of everyday practice to their 'being Romans'? How did the new political Roman identity co-exist with previous and indigenous forms of political memberships in the communities? Additionally, on the other hand, how did the first-holders of Roman citizenship (i.e., the citizens of Rome and of the Italian peninsula) regard citizens from the provinces?

Discussions on the questions of Roman and indigenous identity and the impact of Roman administration, culture, and institutions on provincial communities have been raised within studies on the broader topic of Romanization—a topic that is certainly not limited to the aspect of citizenship.[54] However, more work is needed to shed light on similar questions in relation to the specific problem of citizenship. With respect to this, it is in both directions that we have to look, that is, towards both the legal and political aspects connected to the extension of Roman citizenship, and on the cultural and social implications of this phenomenon.[55]

3   *Politeia* and *civitas*: Some Fundamental Aspects of Difference

Based on the constant expansion of the Roman civic body from the fourth century BC to the third century AD, we can say that Roman citizenship was a prestigious status, but, in a way, less exclusive than Greek citizenship. The Greek cities of the classical and (above all) Hellenistic period granted citizenship mainly as a means to reward benefactions and ensure the future *euergesia* of wealthy elite-members by signalling gratitude, thereby increasing the prestige of the recipient. Grants of citizenship in the Greek world were not a rare event, but

---

54   Bibliography on Romanization—understood as the impact of Roman administration and culture on local political organizations, social structures, and local identity—is vast. Here I offer a short selection of studies according to geographical area: on the West, in particular the Hispanic provinces, Blagg-Millett (1990) and Blázquez (1996); on Italy and the West in comparative perspective, Keay (2001); for a broader geographic scope and focus on the epigraphic record, Häussler (2008); specifically on northern Italy, Häussler (2013); on the West, the East, and Africa during Augustus' principate, MacMullen (2000); on Gaul, Woolf (1998); on the Black Sea region, Bekker-Nielsen (2006); on Cilicia, Pilhofer (2006); for theoretical reflections and case-studies on the concepts of *Romanisierung* und *Romanisation*, Schörner (2005); cf. Savino (1999); Hingley (2005).

55   This has recently been done for the Greek East of the Roman Empire, where a citizenship culture existed since centuries; on representation of identity in the Graeco-Roman East, see Coşkun-Heinen-Pfeiffer (2009); on multiple citizenship, see Heller-Pont (2012).

they were always accompanied by a rhetoric of honour that stressed the exceptional character of the grant. By contrast, the Romans made a more practical use of citizenship. As early as Claudius' principate, the honorary element was indeed present in the concession of citizenship to foreigners having served in the Roman army, but honour and prestige played a smaller role compared to the practical purpose of building a solid *pied-à-terre* in all areas of the Empire, promoting the integration of provincials and building a solid network of trusted partners.[56] Grants of citizenship were for the Romans a tool for governing a vast territory; for the Greeks, grants were mostly a way of regulating the internal affairs of the polis, and to define specific and *ad hoc* situations in foreign policy.

Further, the Romans awarded citizenship as the result of an individual act, either *per magistratum*, or by will of the Emperor in the imperial period. The civic body was certainly not involved in decisions concerning grants of citizenship. Quite differently, citizenship in the Greek *poleis* was awarded as a collective decision of the polis (i.e., upon decision of the Boule and of the Assembly), and this also contributed to making such grants occasional practices rather than ordinary procedures. All this refers to what Gauthier used to call 'Greek avarice' as opposed to 'Roman generosity' when arguing against an established tradition of studies.[57] Reflecting on these two realities, Gauthier was certainly right in stressing the fact that the different approach that Greeks and Romans had towards extending citizenship must above all be understood in light of the strong differences between Greek *politeia* and Roman *civitas*.[58]

The first and perhaps most major of these differences concerns the sphere of political rights and political participation. Although Greek citizenship can hardly receive a univocal and consistent definition, there seems to have been at least one feature common to the great majority of Greek *poleis*: citizens had the right to vote for common decisions. As we said before, Greek citizenship was an active and participatory form of citizenship, and although in many cities offices were not open to all citizens, public decisions were mostly collectively taken or at least submitted to the feedback of the citizen body, as the standard formula recurring in public decrees since the late classical period suggests: ἔδοξε τῇ βουλῇ καὶ τῷ δήμῳ. The Greek world did not know a form of citizenship in which

---

56   On grants of Roman citizenship as a mode to gain consensus in the provinces during the Imperial Age, see Ando (2000) 57–59. For recent work on the clients and 'friends' of the Romans in the late Republic and Early Principate, see the papers in Coşkun (2008); and, for a reappraisal of Badian (1958), see now Jehne-Pina Polo (2015).

57   Gauthier (1974) 217–215.

58   Gauthier, ibid., and (1981) 167–179. For recent criticism of Gauthier's approach, see Müller (2014) 533–554.

the fundamental right to vote was denied to citizens, and in which only private and civil rights were recognised. This condition applied to categories other than citizens, such as metics in classical Athens.

By contrast, the Romans knew since the early Republic a form of 'non-full citizenship' (i.e., the *civitas sine suffragio*), or citizenship without the right to vote. This became the most widespread form of citizenship in the provinces during the Empire. However, as Sherwin White already rightly pointed out, it would be misleading to regard the *cives sine suffragio* as half-citizens, for the right to vote was never one of the characteristics that defined Roman citizenship, and magistracies were never open to the whole community, but rather to the privilege of the wealthy elite since the time of the Republic.[59] Along the same lines, Gauthier used to regard only Senators as full citizens 'in the Greek sense' (i.e., citizens with political rights), while for the ordinary Roman citizens, the content of the *civitas* was confined to the level of mostly civil rights.[60] It is therefore precisely its non-participatory character that distinguished Roman citizenship from the active and participatory character of Greek citizenship.

As far as private rights are concerned, a Greek *politês* enjoyed some fundamental rights that were the same to the vast majority of *poleis*, such as the right to possess and inherit land. Grants of Greek citizenship, as we read in honorary decrees, were generally accompanied by the list of rights and honours for the new citizens; while some of them, such as the purchasing of land and passing citizen rights to their offspring, were common to all citizens, other rights, such as that of *proedria* (i.e., the right of a special seat in the theatre) were indeed exclusive honours. As we noted previously, it is not clear to what extent the awarded rights and honours *de facto* helped the recipients to integrate in the new civic community, let alone the case of professionals who moved their residence to the new city. A grant of Roman citizenship, either full or *sine suffragio*, by contrast, entailed a clearly defined set of private and civil rights, and it marked a real change in legal status, in addition to an increase in prestige and social recognition.

On the level of discourse and rhetoric of citizenship, there are also some important differences between the Greek and the Roman world aside from political and legal aspects. As noted above, the concept of local membership for the Romans (i.e., membership in a local community) was different than for the Greeks. Needless to say, the Greeks did not know anything like 'Greek

---

59   Sherwin White, ibid., 264–265.

60   Gauthier (1974) 213. Against this view and on the role of the people's assemblies in the Roman Republic, see now Tatum (2009) 214–227.

citizenship', but only polis-citizenship—or if anything, forms of federal citizenship, as we mentioned previously. We see very well the importance of the local dimension of Greek citizenship at play in the speeches contained in the works of classical historians, and recorded as delivered by politicians, *rhêtores*, or generals to their fellow-citizens, listing the glorious achievements of their city and its current constitution.[61] Also, we see very well the rhetoric of citizenship at play in the fourth century BC in the several speeches of Athenian orators before the Assembly or the courts appealing to common civic values and to the recent and remote history of the city.[62] In Greek sources, we indeed find examples of Pan-Hellenic pride, encompassing the boundary of one single polis to highlight common membership in the Greek *ethnos* and culture; however, in the classical period, such cases are sporadic and mostly refer to a construction of 'super-national' identities as a response to external threats. One should think here of the rhetoric of Greek unity against the Persians at the time of the Persian Wars, and again as late as the fourth century BC, at the rhetoric aiming at stressing the opposition between Greeks and 'Barbarians'; or else, for the Greek world outside Hellas, examples such as Hermocrates' speech appealing to Pan-Sicilian identity at the conference of Gela in 424 BC, as a response to the threat of an Athenian dominion over Sicily.[63] However, super-national feelings seem to disappear quickly once the threat has been defeated, and the local, polis-oriented discourse of citizenship in the Greek world was certainly more widespread than the Pan-Hellenic discourse.

In contrast, the Roman discourse of citizenship more rarely stressed local membership. Rome—and in more abstract terms, the Empire—are generally the foci of attention. In the famous praise of Rome by Aelius Aristides mentioned previously, we see a provincial holder of Roman citizenship, reproducing exactly this logic and adopting the view point of Rome as the *communis patria*. But there is a fundamental difference between Aristides' view of Rome as common homeland and the first formulation of this concept by Cicero: while

---

61   As an emblematic example, see the importance of the praise of Athens and its constitution in the genre of the Athenian *epitaphios logos*, notably in the one of Pericles in Thuc. 2.37 ff. Bibliography on this subject is vast, and for the purpose of the present introduction, I limit myself to recall the seminal work of Loraux (1981).

62   See the paper of Filonik in this book. For some case-studies of appeals to the remote past of the city in Attic oratory, see Steinbock (2013); for appeals to the past in 'international' contexts, see now Osmers (2013).

63   For references to Greek unity against the Barbarians in Greek oratory, see, above all, Isocrates' *Panegyricus*, *passim*; for Hermocrates' speech in Gela, see Thuc. 4.58–64.

Cicero affirms the priority of Roman citizenship over local identity,[64] hence of Rome over its neighbouring communities in Italy, Aelius Aristides refers to Rome as a metonymy of the Empire. The fundamental boundary line in Aristides' speech is between the world of the Empire and beyond its borders, which to a good extent echoes the boundary between Greeks and Barbarians. The discourse of local identities here finds no place at all.[65] Yet, we should not forget that this was a speech delivered before the Emperor. Aristides, as many other Greek orators of his time, would have certainly spoken in a much different way if he was addressing the Assembly or the Council of a Greek polis.[66]

So what about the Greeks during the Empire? These two diverging perceptions, uses, and discourses of citizenship (i.e., *politeia* and *civitas*) did not come into conflict, and this is explained by the fact that the Romans granted citizenship to members of the Greek cities without imposing on them to abandon their former local identity. The hostile feelings that a thinker like Cicero applied to his views on dual citizenship were not at play any longer when the Romans, during the first three centuries of the Empire, dealt with the Greek East.[67] Local identities were not suppressed, and to the Greeks they certainly continued to matter. However, local citizenship was not any longer the only form of civic identity. The case of Asia Minor under Roman rule precisely shows cases of membership in local Greek communities and their intersections with Roman/global citizenship.

To put it bluntly, Roman citizenship in the East was never an alternative or a rival to Greek citizenship, but rather an added value. It was a fundamental step for a political career and for access to the institutions of the Empire. Not less important, it was a sign of prestige within local communities. Greek local identities and Roman 'global' identity overlapped, while remaining well-distinct and, in a way, complementary statuses.

There are certainly many more aspects of difference between Greek and Roman ideas and the practice of citizenship than those briefly outlined in this introduction. As the reader will agree, this is a too broad topic to be exhausted in a single book dealing with many aspects of ancient citizenship. We hope,

---

64   See for example Cic. *Leg.* 2.5.

65   Ael. Arist. 26.59–61. At 26.60 he says that Roman citizenship recognized no physical border, while creating a common Republic of the world. See Ando (2000) 57–58.

66   On this, see the paper of Ştefan in this book.

67   See the letter of Marcus Aurelius to the Athenians (SEG 29, 127) and the comments in Marotta (2009) 93.

however, that the time-span of roughly eight centuries covered in this volume will encourage the reader to regard ancient citizenship as a condition that evolved gradually in time and space, and to grasp some of the fundamental differences between the Greek and Roman practice. One of these is the local, idiosyncratic, and more exclusive dimension of Greek citizenship, as compared to the global, universally valid, and more accessible content of Roman citizenship. These differences, nonetheless, did not prevent the Greeks from experiencing forms of 'super-national' citizenship since the Archaic and classical periods with the experiences of the leagues, and again in the age of the Empire, nor did they hinder the Romans in preserving their own sense of membership into local communities.[68]

4   Beyond the Institutional Approach: Structure and Contents of This Book

The first section of this book focusses on the definition of citizen bodies, their re-foundations, and the overlapping of several forms of citizenship for members of Greek cities from the Archaic period to the late second century AD. The authors aim at discussing important aspects that contributed to the formation of civic identity both within the boundary of the polis and in the context of inter-*poleis* relations and, ultimately, in the global context of the Empire.

The problem with the definition of citizen-community and the methodological assumptions that have guided studies of ancient citizenship in the past centuries are treated in the opening of the volume with Maurizio Giangiulio's paper. Giangiulio focusses on the methodological questions concerning the study of citizenship in the Greek polis since the first comprehensive works on ancient history until contemporary research. By warning against the application both of the Aristotelian classification of ancient constitutions as oligarchies, aristocracies, and democracies, and of paradigms valid for the modern world to the Archaic *poleis*, he argues that we should regard citizenship as a process and not as a given fact in the early *poleis*. In the cities of Greece and Asia Minor during the seventh and sixth century BC, we have to deal with citizen-bodies in the making. What later classical authors classify as oligarchies were in many cases fixed-numbers citizen-communities—a common reality in the early *poleis*.

---

68   See the paper of Carlà-Uhink in this book.

Lucia Cecchet's paper further explores the question of the definition of citizen bodies in the late Archaic and early classical period, focussing on three specific cases of reform of civic subdivisions in continental Greece (Athens), Libya (Cyrene), and Sicily (Camarina). Based both on literary and epigraphic evidence, she discusses how these three *poleis* changed the internal partitions of their citizen-bodies in order to neutralise internal conflicts and integrate foreigners. Despite the differences in the three tribal reforms, it is noteworthy the fact that in all these cases political stability was achieved mainly through the reformation of civic divisions.

While Cecchet offers a perspective from the micro (civic-subdivisions) into the macro (the polis), the following contributions of Chiara Lasagni is rather 'a look from above' (i.e., a study on the agreements of shared citizenship that involved several *poleis*). Moving to the Hellenistic period, Lasagni explores the question of federalism, investigating the practice of *sympoliteia* (i.e., the granting of citizen rights between different *poleis*). Based mainly on epigraphic evidence, she warns against the tendency to systematise the evidence into a coherent and univocal model. *Sympoliteia* was not a technical term indicating a legal institution, but rather a practice of sharing in the political, military, and religious life of different *poleis*.

The question of multiple citizenship-holders is also discussed by Andreea Ștefan with reference to the cities of Asia Minor during the imperial period. Drawing both from epigraphic evidence and from the biographical references contained in the speeches of Dio Chrysostomus, Aelius Aristides, and Arrian of Nicomedia, Ștefan shows how the holding of multiple citizenship for elite-members was primarily a way of signalling social prestige, with the listing of the *poleis* awarding such honours as a way of mapping social networks. It usually did not show effective sharing in the political and civil rights of local communities. However, an exception is given by the cases in which the recipients of citizen rights were non-elite members (i.e., professional workers settling in a new city).

The second section is devoted to the Roman world from the Republic to the early third century AD. As it becomes clear from this part of the book, Roman citizenship underwent deep changes from the early Republican period down to the first three centuries of the Empire. Pointing to the early stages of this process, Elena Isayev analyses Plautus' comedies as historical sources on the perception of foreigners in the local communities of Italy between the late third and second century BC. Based on an analysis of the keywords indicating citizens, inhabitants, and foreigners—such as *civis, incola, peregrinus, ignotus, hospes*, and *alienus*—she argues that these plays witness a moment of transition in which Rome and the cities of Italy were becoming more and

more cosmopolitan. While in the following decades Roman citizenship rapidly gained prestige, Plautus' comedies reflect a fluid period when Roman citizens were just one of the many categories of inhabitants that populated cities. At that time, what appears to matter more than the distinction between citizens and non-citizens is the distinction between the free-born and the slave.

Donato Fasolini's paper offers an example of how the new database *Roman Imperial Tribal Ascription* (R.I.T.A.) can offer new useful information to the study of a specific aspect of Roman citizenship: the tribal ascription of children. Fasolini argues that, contrary to what is generally agreed, juvenile tribal ascription, unlike female tribal ascription, was not a practice limited to the families of the elite. This view has contributed to convey the idea that in Roman society, children were somewhat set aside and undervalued in their function as members of the civic community. Drawing both from literary sources and from the 280 epitaphs of children burials contained in the new database, Fasolini shows that we should reconsider this issue and its meaning for our understanding of Roman citizenship.

Valerio Marotta deals with the long-debated question of access to Roman citizenship for the Egyptians from the first century AD until the eve of the Antonine Constitution. Drawing mainly from Flavius Josephus' speech *Contra Apionem*, Pliny's *Letters*, and from second-century AD papyri containing letters from *classiarii* (soldiers serving in the Roman fleet), Marotta shows that before AD 212, Egyptians were prohibited from directly obtaining the *civitas Romana*. However, taking into account the complex hierarchic structure of Egyptian society and the deep change in the structure of the ruling class after Trajan, Marotta highlights cases in which Egyptians could access Roman citizenship even before Caracalla's Edict.

With a contribution in a way complementary to Marotta's paper, Arnaud Besson deals with the modes in which one could achieve Roman citizenship, and the rights it entailed in civil law (i.e., inheritance, property, obligation, marriage, family law) in the roughly fifty years before the Antonine Constitution, based mainly on Gaius *Institutes*. He shows that, contrary to what some scholars believe, Roman citizenship was in this period still a highly prestigious status—not easy to achieve—and that it entailed a great number of privileges. This made grants of Roman citizenship strongly desirable and intensively sought-after by inhabitants of the provinces.

The third section of the volume deals with ideas and discourse of citizenship in the Greek and Roman world, with the last two papers of the volume offering an *Ausblick* on the reception of Roman citizenship in the philosophy of Hegel, and an analysis of the idea of cosmopolitanism from antiquity until today. This section starts with Jakub Filonik's analysis of how conceptualisations of

citizenship and civic duties could be skilfully re-framed by Athenian orators for their rhetorical ends, based on the analysis of Lycurgus' speech *Against Leocrates*. Filonik explores how the orator, who accused Leocrates of treason for leaving Athens shortly after the defeat of Chaeronea in 338 BC, attempts to redefine the boundaries of treason by playing with the several meanings implied in the common perception of Athenian citizenship, that is, mainly citizenship as sharing in the polis, citizenship as duty on the battlefield, and citizens as the children of the polis.

With Filippo Carlà-Uhink's paper we return to the question of belonging in different communities already treated in different ways by Lasagni and Ștefan. This time the focus is on philosophical and political reflection. The author discusses Cicero's thoughts about having two fatherlands in *De legibus*, putting it in the context of the identity crisis of the mid-first century BC, when in the aftermath of the Social War, the greatest enfranchisement of Roman history before the Antonine Constitution took place. Cicero ponders on local belonging in the Italic towns and on Roman citizenship, but he does not push this duality into opposition: influenced by the Stoic idea of individual citizenship regulated by civic law, and universal citizenship regulated by natural law, he regards Roman citizenship as the historical fulfilment of Stoic (universal) citizenship. In so doing, he confers to Italy fundamental importance as the place of successful integration of peoples with different fatherlands, that is, the affective one (local community) and the juridical one (Rome).

The last two papers of this volume look at the reception of ancient citizenship and its later uses in modern political discourse. Valerio Rocco Lozano provides a perspective on Roman citizenship and of *romanitas* in the work of Hegel in close connection to two epochal events: the French Revolution and the restoration of absolutism in Napoleon's era. Hegel's perspective shifts from the admiration of the values of the Republican *libertas* during the so-called Bern period, in which he connected the *libera res publica Romanorum* to the newly-born French *République*, to the later Frankfurt period, characterised by a harsh criticism of the *romanitas*. In this later period, the Roman Empire is depicted as a precedent of the *Ancien Régime* and of the French Revolution, considered this time in its most violent aspects. The paper provides a useful example of the re-interpretation, according to the changing political and cultural climate, of the idea of Roman citizenship into the framework of late eighteenth- and early nineteenth-century philosophy and political debate.

In the last paper of this book Anna Busetto dwells on the idea of cosmopolitanism, offering a discussion of ancient and modern concepts of citizenship. The author explores the idea of cosmopolitanism from its Greek origins as early as the fifth century BC with Democritus, through its first proper formulation

in Stoic philosophy, until its Christian re-interpretation, its re-discovery in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, and, finally, its new nuances in present-day Europe. Busetto discusses the several salient moments of this complex and yet almost un-interrupted process of re-interpretation of cosmopolitanism over almost twenty-five centuries through key figures (i.e., Erasmus of Rotterdam and the idea of a *res publica litterarum*, the philosophers of the Enlightenment, Immanuel Kant and the idea of a *Völkerbund* and *Weltbürgerrecht*) until the 21st-century moral cosmopolitanism of Charles Beitz and Thomas Pogge, the ethical cosmopolitanism of Martha Nussbaum, and the rooted cosmopolitanism of Anthony Appiah.

Without the claim of covering the full range of topics concerning ancient citizenship, we hope that the papers presented in this book will contribute to pointing out some of the questions that are still open. The political, and civil rights of citizens developed as a result of a presumably long process that went hand in hand with (and not preceded) the definition of political organisation and institutions in the community. Yet, legal and institutional aspects alone do not explain the whole dimension of ancient citizenship. As many papers in this collection show, we need to develop an adequate approach that also includes the way in which citizenship was 'lived-off', experienced, represented, performed, and, ultimately, the way it functioned as a tool for constructing identities. While these aspects might seem more or less clear when we look at citizenship within one community (polis or *civitas*), the picture indeed becomes more complex when we have to deal with individuals holding membership in several cities in the cosmopolitan reality of the Hellenistic kingdoms and later on of the Roman Empire. The adoption of a diachronic perspective from Greek archaism to the Roman imperial period urges the abandoning of universally valid definitions of citizenship in favour of a flexible approach in time and space that takes into account chronological development, regional characteristics, and the varieties of political organisation the ancient world. We hope that this book will serve as a tool for prompting further discussion on these aspects in the future.

Bibliography

Akrigg, B. 2015. *Metics in Athens*. Oxford. 155–173.

Ando, C. 2000. *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*. Berkeley—Los Angeles—London.

Badian, E. 1958. *Foreign Clientelae (264–70 B.C.)*. Oxford.

Balot, R.K., ed. 2009. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought*. Oxford.

Beck, H., ed. 2013. *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*. Chichester.

Beck, H. and P. Funke, eds. 2015. *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*. Cambridge.

Behrwald, R. 2000. *Der lykische Bund: Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung*. Bonn.

Blagg, T. and M. Millett, eds. 1990. *The Early Roman Empire in the West*. Oxford.

Blázquez, J.M. 1996. *La romanización en Occidente*. Madrid.

Bekker-Nielsen, T. 2006. *Rome and the Black Sea Region: Domination, Romanisation, Resistance*. Aarhus.

Blok, H.J. 2005. Becoming citizen. Some notes on the semantics of "citizen" in Archaic Greece and Classical Athens. *Klio* 87: 7–40.

Blok, H.J. 2009. Perikles' citizenship law: A new perspective. *Historia* 58: 141–170.

Blok, H.J. 2013. Citizenship, the citizen body, and its assemblies. In Beck (2013) 161–175.

Blösel, W. 2014. Zensusgrenzen für die Ämterbekleidung im klassischen Griechenland. Wie groß war der verfassungsrechtliche Abstand gemäßigter Oligarchien von der athenischen Demokratie? In *Grenzen politischer Partizipation im klassischen Griechenland*, eds. W. Blösel, W. Schmitz, G. Seelentag, J. Timmer, 71–93. Stuttgart.

Blösel, W., W. Schmitz, G. Seelentag, J. Timmer, eds. 2014. *Grenzen politischer Partizipation im klassischen Griechenland*. Stuttgart.

Broadhead, W. 2001. Rome's migration policy and the so-called *ius migrandi*. *CCG* 12: 69–89.

Brock, R. 2013. *Greek Political Imagery from Homer to Aristotle*. London, New York.

Brock, R. and S. Hodkinson, eds. 2000. *Alternatives to Athens: Varieties of Political Organization and Community in Ancient Greece*. Oxford.

Brunt., P.A. 1971. *Italian Manpower 225 BC–AD 14*. Oxford.

Buraselis, K. 2007 [1st ed. 1985]. *Θεία δωρεά: das göttlich-kaiserliche Geschenk: Studien zur Politik der Severer und zur "Constitutio Antoniniana"*. Wien.

Carlà-Uhink, F. forthcoming. *The "Birth" of Italy. The Institutionalization of Italy as a Region in the Roman Republic (3rd–1st centuries CE)*. Berlin, Boston.

Cartledge, P. 2009a. *Ancient Greek Political Thought in Practice*. Cambridge.

Cartledge, P. 2009b. "Rights", individuals, and communities in ancient Greece. In Balot (2009) 149–163.

Cecchet, L. 2015. *Poverty in Athenian Public Discourse. From the Eve of the Peloponnesian War to the Rise of Macedonia*. Historia Einzelschriften 239. Stuttgart.

Cornell, T. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264 B.C.)*. London.

Coşkun, A., ed. 2008. *Freundschaft und Gefolgschaft in den auswärtigen Beziehungen der Römer*. Frankfurt am Main.

Coşkun, A. 2009a. *Bürgerrechtsentzug oder Fremdenausweisung? Studien zu den Rechten von Latinern und weiteren Fremden sowie zum Bürgerrechtswechsel in der Römischen Republik (5. Bis frühes 1. Jh. V. Chr.)*. Hermes Einzelschriften 101. Stuttgart.

Coşkun, A. 2009b. Großzügige Praxis der Bürgerrechtsvergabe in Rom? *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur Mainz. Abhandlungen der Geistes- und Sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse* 2009: 7–41.

Coşkun, A. 2014. Perikles und die Definition des Bürgerrechts im klassischen Athen. Neue Vorschläge zu Inhalt, Zeitpunkt, Hintergrund und Auswirkungen des Gesetzes. *HZ* 299: 1–35.

Coşkun, A., H. Heinen, S. Pfeiffer, eds. 2009. *Repräsentation von Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Frankfurt am Main.

Davies, J.K. 1977. Athenian citizenship: The descent group and its alternatives. *CJ* 73: 105–121.

Dart, C.J. 2014. *The Social War, 91 to 88 BCE. A History of the Italian Insurgency against the Roman Republic*. Farnham.

Duplouy, A. 2011. Deux échelons de citoyenneté? En quête de la citoyenneté archaïque. In *Clisthène et Lycurgue d'Athènes. Autour du politique dans la cite classique*, eds. V. Azoulay, P. Ismard, 89–106. Paris.

Duplouy, A. 2016. *Ploutos* e cittadinanza nella Grecia arcaica. In *Ploutos&Polis. Aspetti del rapporto tra economia e politica nel mondo greco*, eds. S. Sanchirico, F. Pignataro, 59–82. Roma.

Fröhlich, P. 2011. L'inventaire du monde des cités grecques. Une somme, une méthode et une conception de l'histoire. *Revue Historique* 202: 637–677.

Funke, P. 2013. Greek amphiktyonies: an experiment in transregional governance. In Beck (2013) 451–465.

Futo Kennedy, R. 2014. *Immigrant Women in Athens: Gender, Ethnicity, and Citizenship in the Classical City*. London.

Gabba, E. 1954. *Le origini della guerra sociale e la vita politica romana dopo l'89 a. C.* Pavia.

Gabba, E. 1994. Rome and Italy: the Social War. In *The Cambridge Ancient History IX*. 2nd ed., eds. J.A. Crook, A. Lintott, E. Rawson, 104–128. Cambridge.

Garnsey, P. 2004. Roman citizenship and Roman law in the Late Empire. In *Approaching Late Antiquity: The Transformation from Early to Late Empire*, eds. S. Swain and M. Edwards, 133–155. Oxford.

Gardner, J.F. 1993. *Being a Roman Citizen*. London, New York.

Gauthier, Ph. 1974. «Générosité» romaine et «avarice» grecque: sur l'octroi du droit de cité. In *Mèlanges d'histoire ancienne offerts a William Seston*, 207–215. Paris.

Gauthier, Ph. 1979. Sur le citoyen romain. *Commentaire* 6: 318–323.

Gauthier, Ph. 1981. La citoyenneté en Grèce et à Rome: participation et intégration. *Ktèma* 6: 167–179.

Gauthier, Ph. 1984. Les cites hellénistiques: épigraphie et histoire des institutions et des régimes politiques. *VIIIe Congrès international épigraphique*: 82–107.

Gawantka, W. 1975. *Isopolitie: ein Beitrag zur Geschichte der zwischenstaatlichen Beziehungen in der griechischen Antike*. München.

Hansen, M.H. and T.H. Nielsen, eds. 2004. *An Inventory of Archaic and Classical Poleis. An Investigation conducted by the Copenhagen Polis Centre for the Danish National Research Foundation*. Oxford.

Hahm, D.E. 2009. The mixed constitution in Greek thought. In Balot (2009) 178–198.

Häussler, R., ed. 2008. *Romanisation et épigraphie: études interdisciplinaires sur l'acculturation et l'identité dans l'Empire romain*. Montagnac.

Häussler, R. 2013. *Becoming Roman?: Diverging Identities and Experiences in Ancient Northwest Italy*. Walnut Creek.

Heller, A. and A.-V. Pont, eds. 2012. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*. Bordeaux.

Hingley, R. 2005. *Globalizing Roman Culture: Unity, Diversity and Empire*. London.

Hodkinson, S. 2005. The imaginary Spartan *Politeia*. In *The Imaginary Polis*, ed. M.H. Hansen, 222–281. Copenhagen.

Ismard, P. 2010. *La cité des réseaux. Athènes et ses associations, VIe–Ier siècle av. J.-C.* Paris.

Jehne, M. and F. Pina Polo, eds. 2015. *Foreign Clientelae in the Roman Empire. A Reconsideration*. Historia Einzelschriften 238. Stuttgart.

Keaveney, A. 1987. *Rome and the Unification of Italy*. London-Sydney.

Keay, S. 2001. *Italy and the West: Comparative Issues in Romanization*. Oxford.

Kendall, S. 2013. *The Struggle for Roman Citizenship. Roman, Allies, and the Wars of 91–77 BCE*. Piscataway (NJ).

Kremer, D. 2006. *Ius Latinum. Le concept de droit latin sous la république et l'empire*. Paris.

Larsen, J.A.O. 1957. Lycia and Greek federal citizenship. *SO* 33: 5–26.

Lasagni, C. 2011. *Il concetto di realtà locale nel mondo greco: uno studio introduttivo nel confronto tra poleis e stati federali*. Roma.

Lavan, M. 2016. The spread of Roman citizenship, 14–212 CE: Quantification in the face of high uncertainty. *Past&Present* 230: 3–46.

Leppin, H. 2013. Unlike(ly) twins?: democracy and oligarchy in context. In Beck (2013) 146–168.

Loraux, N. 1981. *L'invention d'Athènes: histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la "cité classique"*. Paris.

McInerney, J. 2013. "Polis" and "koinon": federal government in Greece. In Beck (2013) 466–479.

Mack, W. 2015. *Proxeny and Polis. Institutional Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.

MacMullen, R. 2000. *Romanization in the Time of Augustus*. New Heaven.

Mann, Ch. and P. Scholz, eds. 2012. *"Demokratie" im Hellenismus. Von der Herrschaft des Volkes zur Herrschaft der Honoratioren? Die hellenistische Polis als Lebensform* 2. Mainz.

Manville, Ph.B. 1990. *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton.

Markle, M.M. 1985. Jury pay and assembly pay at Athens. In *Crux. Essays Presented to G.E.M. De Ste Croix on his 75th Birthday*, eds. P. Cartledge, F.D. Harvey, 265–297. Exeter.

Marotta, V. 2009. *La cittadinanza romana in età imperiale. Una sintesi*. Torino.

Miller, H.F. 1984. The practical and economic background to the Greek mercenary explosion. *G&R* 31: 153–160.

Mommsen, Th. 1887. *Das römische Stattsrecht*. 3rd ed. Leipzig 1887.

Mouritsen, H. 1998. *Italian Unification. A Study in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. London.

Mouritsen, H. 2006. Caius Gracchus and the *cives sine suffragio*. *Historia* 55: 418–425.

Mouritsen, H. 2008. The Gracchi, the Latins, and the Italian Allies. In *People, Land, and Politics. Demographic Developments and the Transformation of Roman Italy, 300 BC–AD 14*, eds. L. De Ligt and S.J. Northwood, 471–483. Leiden, Boston.

Musti, D. 1997. *Demokratia. Origini di un'idea*. Roma.

Müller, Ch. 2014. (De)constructing *politeia*: reflections on citizenship and the bestowal of privileges upon foreigners in Hellenistic democracies. *Annales HSS* 69: 533–-554.

Nijf, O. van. 2012. Athletes, artists and citizens in the Imperial Greek City. In *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*, eds. A. Heller and A.-V. Pont, 175–194. Bordeaux.

Ober, J. 1989. *Mass and Elite in Democratic Athens: Rhetoric, Ideology and the Power of the People*. Princeton.

Ober, J. 1998. *Political Dissent in Democratic Athens. Intellectual Critics of Popular Rule*. Princeton: Princeton.

Osborne, M.J. *Naturalization in Athens*. Bruxelles.

Osmers, M. 2013. *"Wir aber sind damals und jetzt immer die gleichen". Vergangenheitsbezüge in der polisübergreifenden Kommunikation der klassischen Zeit*. Historia Einzelschriften 226. Stuttgart.

Patterson, C. 1981. *Pericles' Citizenship Law of 451/0 B.C.* New York 1981.

Pernot, L., 2008. Aelius Aristides and Rome. In *Aelius Aristides Between Greece, Rome, and the Gods*, ed. W.V. Harris, 175–202. Leiden.

Pilhofer, S. 2006. *Romanisierung in Kilikien?: das Zeugnis der Inschriften*. München.

Pritchard, D.M. 2014. The public payment of magistrates in fourth-century Athens. *GRBS* 54: 1–16.

Raaflaub, K.A. 2011. From city-state to empire: Rome in comparative perspective. In *The Roman Empire in Context: Historical and Comparative Perspectives*, eds. J.P. Arnason, K.A. Raaflaub, 39–66. Chichester.

Raaflaub, K.A. 2013. Archaic and classical Greek reflections on politics and government: from description to conceptualization, analysis, and theory. In Beck (2013) 73–92.

Rhodes, P.J. 2009. Civic ideology and citizenship. In Balot (2009) 57–69.

Robinson, E. 2011. *Democracy beyond Athens: Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*. Cambridge.

Savino, E. 1999. *Città di frontiera nell'Impero romano: forme della romanizzazione da Augusto ai Severi*. Bari.

Schmitz, W. 2014. Legitimation durch Mehrheitsentscheid? Partizipationschancen und Partizipationsgrenzen im Athen des 6. und frühen 5. Jh. In *Grenzen politischer Partizipation im klassischen Griechenland*, eds. W. Blösel, W. Schmitz, G. Seelentag, J. Timmer, 47–70. Stuttgart..

Schörner, G. 2005. *Romanisierung—Romanisation: theoretische Modelle und praktische Fallbeispiele*. Oxford.

Sealey, R. 1983. How citizenship and the city began in Athens. *AJAH* 8: 97–129.

Seelentag, G. 2014. Bürger sein im Bürgerstaat. Soziopolitische Integration im klassischen Kreta. In *Grenzen politischer Partizipation im klassischen Griechenland*, eds. W. Blösel, W. Schmitz, G. Seelentag, J. Timmer, 13–46. Stuttgart.

Sherwin White, A.N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. 2nd ed. Oxford.

Sinclair, R.K. 1988. *Democracy and Participation in Athens*. Cambridge.

Spagnuolo Vigorita, T. 1993. Cittadini e sudditi tra II e III secolo. In *Storia di Roma, III: L'età tardoantica, 1, Crisi e trasformazioni*, eds. A. Carandini, L. Cracco Ruggini, A. Giardina, 5–50. Torino.

Steinbock, B. 2013. *Social Memory in Athenian Public Discourse: Uses and Meanings of the Past*. Ann Arbor.

Tatum, W.J. 2009. Roman democracy? In Balot (2009) 214–227.

Taylor, C. 2007. The sociology of Athenian democracy: A prosopographical approach. In *Prosopography. Approaches and Applications. A Handbook*, ed. K.S.B. Keats-Rohan, 313–324. Oxford.

Taylor, C. 2011. Migration and the demes of Attica. In *Demography and the Graeco-Roman World: New Insights and Approaches*, ed. C. Holleran, 117–134. Cambridge.

Taylor, C. and K. Vlassopoulos, eds. 2015. *Communities and Networks in the Ancient Greek World*. Oxford.

Taylor, L.R. 1960. *The Voting Districts of the Roman Republic: the Thirty-five Urban and Rural Tribes*. Roma.

Todd, S.C. 1990. Lady Chatterley's lover and the Attic orators: the social composition of the Athenian jury. *JHS* 110: 146–173.

Vlassopoulos, K. 2007a. *Unthinking the Greek Polis. Ancient Greek History Beyond Eurocentrism*. Cambridge.

Vlassopoulos, K. 2007b. Free spaces: identity, experience and democracy in classical Athens. *CQ* (n. s.) 57: 33–52.

Vlassopoulos, K. 2009. Slavery, freedom and citizenship in classical Athens: beyond a legalistic approach. *European Review of History* 16: 347–363.

Walbank, M.B. 1978. *Athenian Proxenies of the Fifth Century BC*. Toronto.

Wallace, R.W. 2013. Councils in Greek oligarchies and democracies. In Beck (2013) 191–204.

Walter, U. 1993. *An der Polis teilhaben: Bürgerstaat und Zugehörigkeit im archaischen Griechenland*. Historia Einzelschriften 82. Stuttgart.

Woolf, G. 1998. *Becoming Roman: the Origins of Provincial Civilization in Gaul*. Cambridge.

Whitehead, D. 1977. *The Ideology of the Athenian Metic*. Cambridge.