Preface

The present volume is the result of several strands of research pursued in recent years by the two editors. Lucia Cecchet's project on *Multiple Citizenship in Roman Asia Minor*, funded by the *Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft*, provided the framework for the international conference "Citizenship Practised, Citizenship Imagined: Citizens and Non-Citizens in the Ancient Greek World", which took place in May 2021 and was hosted (online, due to the Covid-19 pandemic) by the *Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur* (*Abteilung: Junge Akademie*) in Mainz. This was further developed into a team project at the Department of History, University of Milan, with the title *Citizenship and Identity in Post-Classical Asia Minor*. Chiara Lasagni's long research experience on public organisation and citizenship in the Greek states,[1] conducted from a comparative perspective encompassing the models of the polis and the *ethnos*, has confirmed the value of considering the concrete practices and multilayered aspects that characterised Greek 'citizenships' through an emic approach to ancient citizenship. This framework further strengthened the idea of exploring the discursive construction and pragmatic experience of Greek citizenship in a co-edited volume, based mostly (but not only) on the case studies discussed in the 2021 conference.

We are above all grateful to the team of experts on Greek citizenship that accepted our invitation to attend the conference and join the publication project, providing insightful discussions on several aspects, issues and 'fragmented images' of Greek citizenship. As the papers and lively discussions at the conference pointed out in several ways, Greek citizenship was far from being a monolithic concept, despite the view of a long and consolidated tradition of studies that approached Greek citizenship as mainly a legal notion. In fact, nineteenth-century studies on the ancient *Staatskunde* and *Staatsrecht* regarded citizenship as a juridical status that had already been defined as early as the beginning of the polis, and political constitutions as somewhat ahistorical normative categories. For example, this was the perspective of Emil Szántó, who in the beginning of his *Griechisches Bürgerrecht*[2] defines the polis as "the sum of its citizens" ("*die Summe von Bürgern*").[3] In the discussion of different grants of citizenship and the

1 Lasagni 2011 and 2019.
2 Szántó 1892.
3 Szántó 1892: 4–5; citation from p. 4. See discussion by Giangiulio 2017.

rights that were bestowed on the beneficiaries, Szántó described Greek citizenship as a condition of sharing in the government of the polis ("Die Teilnahme an der Regierungsgewalt ist der Prüfstein des Bürgerrechts").[4] This view relied mainly on Aristotle's definition of the *polites* as "the one who shares in the judicial function and in office" (*Politics* 3, 1275a.23), which was strongly bound to classical democracy, and it also finds a similar expression in Pericles' famous image of the Athenian citizen as an individual constantly engaged in participating in public life (Thuc. 2.40.2). This type of evidence has profoundly influenced modern approaches to the topic of citizenship in the classical polis, even beyond the Athenian model. Notably, Philippe Gauthier considered Greek citizenship as a form of 'active citizenship', stressing the participative character of the Greek institutions and politics, a perspective that led him to consider acquired citizenships as merely honorific titles, or 'potential' citizenships.[5]

During the 1980s and 1990s, based on the awareness that the formation of the polis was a long process, citizenship began to be regarded as a notion that gradually developed as a part of this process, a perspective that marked a distinct change from the legalistic approach adopted by the old *Staatskunde*. Historians such as Christian Meier, Philip Brook Manville and Uwe Walter rightly regarded citizenship as a concept that developed along with the formation of the institutions of the polis, rather than being the foundation on which those institutions were shaped.[6] More recent studies have pointed out that while participation in public institutions and ruling bodies is indeed a characteristic of the Greek citizen, Greek citizenship cannot be defined only in terms of political participation. Wolfgang Blösel, Winfried Schmitz, Gunnar Seelentag and Jan Timmer have stressed that even in the classical period political participation often remained a privilege of a small community within the Greek *poleis*.[7] This was evident in oligarchic constitutions, but also in other *politeiai*.[8] A more glaring fact is that, even in democratic Athens, women could not exert deliberative and judicial functions. Thus, following Aristotle's interpretive framework, women would not be classified as 'full citizens'. Nonetheless, while it is true that citizenship was the *conditio sine qua non* for access to political offices,[9] it is also true that the definition of citizenship cannot

4 Szántó 1892: 66.

5 Gauthier 1974: 207–215 and Gauthier 1981. For recent criticism concerning Gauthier's view of Greek citizenship, see Müller 2014, Müller 2023 and Cecchet 2023 (mainly with reference to the Greek *poleis* in the imperial period).

6 Respectively, Meier 1988: 47–95; Manville 1990; Walter 1993.

7 On the limits of political participation, Blösel, Schmitz, Seelentag, and Timmer 2014. Cf. also Walter, Beck, and Scholz 2008.

8 It is noteworthy to observe that even in democratic Athens citizens of the lowest census class (thetes) were not allowed to access the highest magistracies and the Council, though this regulation was probably no longer observed in the fourth century ([Aristot.] *Ath. Pol.* 7.2–4; on this Cecchet 2024).

9 On citizenship and religious offices at Athens, see Blok 2009 for a reconsideration of Pericles' citizenship law.

be simply confined to 'the political'. Josine Blok has clearly shown that religion, rather than politics, was the sphere of public life that contributed to defining the civic community in Athens.[10] The prominent role of female citizens in polis religion shows that there were factors other than political participation that contributed to defining individuals as citizens.[11] Looking at the origins of citizenship in the archaic *poleis* with a different approach, Alain Duplouy[12] has highlighted that not only economic aspects such as the census and timocratic criteria played a role in defining the citizen body, but also behavioural and performative aspects. From this perspective, office-holding and access to institutions come as a later stage in the definition of the civic community; the first steps of the process of definition of citizenship in the archaic *poleis* are, according to Duplouy, a matter of performance and social recognition. Maurizio Giangiulio has made a strong case for reconsidering our understanding of civic communities in the archaic period as 'oligarchies of a fixed-number' in favour of the view they were 'citizen-bodies in the making', in which status performance was a fundamental part of signalling membership in the archaic polis.[13]

In the study of post-classical epochs, it has long been argued that the extent of political participation of the civic body in the government of the polis was rather limited. Studies by Christian Habicht, and more recently by Patrice Hamon have pointed out that in the Hellenistic world political participation increasingly became a prerogative of the elites.[14] Christian Mann's and Peter Scholz's work on Hellenistic democracies has highlighted the profound changes that the political world of the *poleis* underwent in the Hellenistic period, even though the demos was far from being a silent and 'passive' political entity.[15] The Greek political world in the imperial period seems to further witness a limitation of the political role of the demos, as Anna Heller has argued.[16] All of this has further reinforced the need to call into question the idea that political participation and access to ruling bodies, magistracies and judicial functions were the essence of Greek citizenship.

A fruitful strand of research has focused on the close contacts between citizens and non-citizens in the ancient cities. Historians such as Kostas Vlassopoulos,[17] Claire Taylor,[18] and Paulin Ismard[19] have highlighted the fact that the Greek cities were not

10 Blok 2017.
11 This is particularly clear in the Greek *poleis* of the imperial period, see Horster 2006: 194–207.
12 Duplouy 2018 and, in general, Duplouy and Brock 2018.
13 Giangiulio 2018; cf. Giangiulio 2017.
14 Habicht 1995: 87–92; Hamon 2005 and Hamon 2007.
15 Mann and Scholz 2012. Cf. Grieb 2008; Carlsson 2010. However, the recent work of Mirko Canevaro, in the framework of his ERC project *Class Struggle in Anciet Greek Democracy*, has challenged the view of a passive role of the demos in the Hellenistic period.
16 Heller 2009.
17 Vlassopoulos 2007.
18 Vlassopoulos and Taylor 2015.
19 Ismard 2010.

closed-off communities, but were rather very permeable to the presence and role of non-citizens. Citizens and outsiders were often in close contact through several forms of associations and networks. In fact, there were public venues where the boundaries between citizens and non-citizens were blurred. These worlds point to the importance of stressing the social dimension of citizenship and its limits, beyond the political.

More recent studies, among which is a co-edited volume on citizenship by Lucia Cecchet and Anna Busetto,[20] as well as a recent comprehensive work on ancient citizenship edited by Jakub Filonik, Christine Plastow and Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz[21] which also includes a section on the Ancient Near East, have attempted to provide a comprehensive discussion of citizenship from the archaic to the imperial period, pointing out that there are still many open challenges to our understanding. As far as the Greek world is concerned, we have to deal with a heterogeneous and idiosyncratic society in which the local dimension of the polis co-existed and intersected with other political structures, such as federations (*koina*), and also with the administrative structure of the Roman Empire during the imperial period. Greek citizens often combined their own local citizenship with forms of 'supra polis-membership' and, increasingly often during the Hellenistic and imperial periods, with acquired citizenship(s).[22]

Looking at the archaic and classical periods, we should probably not be too hard on Aristotle. He was the first one who applied, from a theoretical perspective, the notion of 'sharing' to the concept of citizenship, thereby bringing a new and fundamental heuristic tool to subsequent studies of citizenship (Greek and otherwise). An ongoing research project, *"Sharing in the community": Citizenship and Society in the Greek World (VII – II century BC)*, led by Michele Faraguna and others, emphasizes the importance of not abandoning the perspective of 'sharing' suggested by Aristotle, which has been at times too narrowly interpreted by historians as based on *Politics* 3, 1275a, while Aristotle's *Politics* is also rich with references to further aspects of social and religious life shared by citizens.

Taking into account these advances that have been made in the study of Greek citizenship, which we could only briefly outline here, the 2021 conference in Mainz shed light on the less explored question of the different ways in which citizenship could be claimed, represented, experienced, and negotiated in the Greek *poleis* both at the local and at the regional (federal) levels. Whether imagined or practised, Greek citizenship shaped its rules and expressions with a single and supreme purpose in view: the stability and well-being of the political community. As Josine Blok pointed out in her keynote lecture for the conference (as well as in the introductory section of this book),

20 Cecchet and Busetto 2017.

21 Filonik, Plastow and Zelnick-Abramovitz 2023.

22 On Greek federalism: Larsen 1968; Beck 1997; Mackil 2003; Corsten 2006; Bearzot 2014; Beck and Funke 2015; Lasagni 2017; Funke 2018. On multiple citizenship, see Heller and Pont 2012; Müller 2015; Cecchet 2023.

stability does not mean immutability, and in approaching Greek citizenship, we must adopt a flexible approach. The great variety of often synchronic experiences and practices is what perhaps makes it impossible to write a global and unified history of Greek citizenship. One of the elements that most clearly emerges from the chapters of this volume is the necessity to think in terms of 'Greek citizenships' even in relation to the same context of action and interaction. As many of these contributions show, *politeia* often appears as a multiple and multi-layered phenomenon.

This volume offers readers a discussion of different case studies, divided into three sections. The first section discusses practices and discourses that shaped citizenship and the formation of a citizen group among the various groups that inhabited the polis in the archaic period (Duplouy, Seelentag), and the public discourse and representation of citizenship through the lens of civic honours in classical Athens (Canevaro). The second section discusses the issues of the integration (or exclusion) of non-citizens into the civic community from the Archaic to the Hellenistic period, starting with the case of Solonic legislation (Schmitz), diviners and experts in mantic (Trampedach), artisans (Marchiandi) and foreign (or divine) office holders (Horster). The third section discusses experiences of Greek citizenship beyond the local dimension of the polis, namely in *supra*-polis structures or in political organisations other than the polis, such as *ethne* and federations (Müller/Priol, Lasagni), Greek communities in Italy during the Republic (Carlà-Uhink) and the Greek *poleis* of Bithynia in the imperial period (Cecchet).

As the reader will appreciate, there is no unified approach to citizenship in this book, and not all of our contributors would necessarily agree with each other. We consider this a strength, rather than a weakness, in the hope that this volume can to some extent preserve the same empirical spirit and variety of approaches and positions that animated the conference.

Lucia Cecchet and Chiara Lasagni, May 2024