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Seen in historical perspective, the defining feature of the Roman regime of citizenship is its openness. The *Constitutio Antoniniana* of 212/13 – Caracalla’s famous universal grant – appears as the natural culmination of a slow but inexorable process of integrating subjects. But it is important to resist the temptation to make Caracalla’s grant the telos of the earlier history of enfranchisement.[[1]](#footnote-1) Teleological narratives obscure the contingency of earlier measures, which were often taken in pursuit of particular political or personal goals rather than any long-term plan to incorporate all subjects. They also ignore or present as aberrant a long history of measures to restrict access to citizenship and to secure the privileges of citizens over non-citizens, underestimating the tenacity of principles of selectivity and exclusivity that were antithetical to the universalisation of citizenship.

This chapter offers a brief history of Roman practices of enfranchisement from their origins to Caracalla’s grant. It considers the varied purposes which enfranchisement was made to serve over several centuries and attempts to gauge the fluctuating pace of expansion and trace the changing shape of the citizen body. It also assesses the role played by Rome's distinctive approach to citizenship in its remarkable success as an imperial power. From the beginning the expansion of the citizen body was bound up with the expansion of Roman hegemony. But the fact that enfranchisement was regularly deployed as an instrument of empire does not necessarily mean that it was the key to Rome's success. Lastly, the chapter reflects on the implications of an expanding citizenship for Roman discourses of identity, with a focus on the imperial elite. Again, it is easy to exaggerate the importance of citizenship relative to others vectors of elite identity.

# Enfranchisement in the Republic

The most important source of new citizens was always the citizen household, through the birth of children and the manumission of slaves. To be born a Roman citizen, one had to be conceived within a valid Roman marriage or be born legally fatherless to a citizen mother.[[2]](#footnote-2) The status of offspring of unions between citizens and non-citizens was regulated in the first instance by the legal concepts of *conubium* and the *ius gentium*. *Conubium* – a right which first existed between Romans and Latins and which the emperors later granted to enfranchised veterans and their peregrine wives – made it possible to form a marriage recognised by Roman law with certain non-citizens.[[3]](#footnote-3) Given *conubium*, unions between Roman men and non-Roman women were Roman marriages and the offspring were citizens; conversely unions between Roman women and non-Roman men were foreign marriages and the offspring were peregrines. In the absence of *conubium*, unions were at first governed by the *ius gentium* doctrine that children of mixed marriages took the status of the mother (producing the reverse effect to *conubium*). But this was superseded by a *lex Minicia* (or possibly *Minucia*) which provided that the offspring of all mixed unions without *conubium* were peregrines.[[4]](#footnote-4) The date of the law is uncertain, but it probably predates the Social War.[[5]](#footnote-5) Its highly restrictive provisions are entirely in keeping with the political culture of that period, but it is striking that it remained in force throughout the imperial period and was indeed reaffirmed when the legal regime which governed the intersection of enfranchisement and the family was rationalised under Hadrian.[[6]](#footnote-6)

Citizens could also create new citizens by freeing their slaves. Slaves of Roman citizens who were manumitted ‘in accordance with the law’ (*legitime*) automatically became Roman citizens themselves – a practice that set the Romans apart from other Mediterranean slave societies, as noted by outsiders such as Philip V of Macedon and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[[7]](#footnote-7) The conditions for lawful (often called ‘formal’) manumission were tightened by Augustus, who took various measures to regulate what he represented as excessive manumission as part of his programme of social renewal, establishing minimum ages for both the master (20) and the slave (30), setting strict limits on the number of slaves that could be manumitted in a will and disqualifying certain notionally degraded categories of slaves from any possibility of becoming citizens.[[8]](#footnote-8) He also conclusively determined the legal status of slaves who had been freed by means other than the three recognised forms – by the rod (*vindicta*) before a magistrate, by will (*testamento*) and through the census (*censu*) - such as slaves who were declared free in a letter or before friends. Henceforth they would be deemed free, but not Roman citizens. Instead they became ‘Junian Latins’, a new form of personal status modelled on the Latin right, as did any slaves freed in violation of the restrictions on age.[[9]](#footnote-9)

From an early period, the supply of citizen children and *liberti* was supplemented by enfranchised aliens. In the earliest phases of Roman expansion, naturalisation was employed as a means of organising and controlling conquered populations. It was a status imposed on rebellious, not loyal, aliens – a striking inversion of later practice.[[10]](#footnote-10) The details are obscure due to the limitations of the evidence, much of which is late and often guilty of anachronism (reimagining what was a mechanism of annexation as a form of benefaction in the light of the much later enfranchisement of Italy), but the broad outline is clear.[[11]](#footnote-11) At first, the Romans seem to have dissolved existing state structures and even urban centres, annexing conquered territories and populations directly to the city of Rome.[[12]](#footnote-12) The fourth-century marked a new departure with the innovation of the *municipium*, which provided a legal framework for incorporating existing states as self-governing populations of Roman citizens. The first example was perhaps the Latin city-state of Tusculum, annexed following a rebellion in 381, but the most important application was in the geopolitical restructuring that Rome imposed on Latium and Campania in 338, in the aftermath of the Latin War (in which many of Rome’s Latin allies had joined forces with Capua and other recently subordinated Campanian cities in a revolt against Roman hegemony).[[13]](#footnote-13) The Romans punished most of the rebel communities by annexing them as *municipia*. Their territories became Roman territory and their former citizens were unilaterally re-designated Roman citizens. But they were left as largely autonomous urban centres with their own magistrates, cult and laws. The Romans invented the term *municipium* for these anomalous cities without citizenship. In a further complication, the old Latin cities were incorporated as full citizens whereas the inhabitants of communities further afield received a new, inferior form of citizenship that denied them the vote – *civitas sine suffragio*. The majority of Roman citizens now lived outside the city of Rome and its hinterland, in their own autonomous communities. Many of them were formally barred from voting in Roman elections; many of the rest are likely to have been hindered from doing so by their distance from the city of Rome. In the meantime, privileged communities were left independent. A few favoured Latin cities retained their independence after 338. More notably, the colonies that the Romans established throughout central Italy over the following 120 years were all, with only a handful of small exceptions, independent communities with the ‘Latin right’. The institution of the Latin colony redeployed what had been a vehicle for the special recognition that Rome had extended to citizens of the other cities of Latium as an instrument for organising Roman and allied populations implanted in conquered territory to exploit and control it.[[14]](#footnote-14) All the colonists, Romans included, gave up their existing citizenship to become citizens of new and independent communities.

Direct annexation continued to be employed sporadically over the following seventy years.[[15]](#footnote-15) By the 260s swathes of central Italy, on the order of 27,000 km2, had been transformed into Roman territory inhabited by Roman citizens (many of them disenfranchised), a sea of naturalised subjects scattered with an archipelago of a privileged few independent communities and colonies.[[16]](#footnote-16) But the Romans began to develop a preference for keeping their subjects separate from the Roman *res publica*. In Umbria, Etruria and Samnium, conquered peoples were increasingly left as ‘allies’ rather than annexed as *municipia* or *ager Romanus*. The last annexations seem to have taken place in the west of Samnium after a revolt in 268.[[17]](#footnote-17) Henceforth, it became the norm to leave conquered peoples nominally independent with obligations defined by treaty or fiat.[[18]](#footnote-18) This was the new model for the conquest of northern and southern Italy and was later reproduced in the overseas provinces. The incipient equation of subjection with citizenship was broken and Roman magistrates became accustomed to ruling over a mixed population of citizens and ‘allies’.

Over the course of the next century citizenship seems to have been reimagined as a privileged and hence desirable status. It continued to serve as an instrument of empire, but was deployed in new ways that begin to appear after the Second Punic War. This period saw a dramatic shift in colonial practice by which the colony of Roman citizens displaced the Latin colony as the preferred instrument of colonialism. From the 180s the Romans began to establish large Roman citizen colonies where they would previously have used Latin colonies.[[19]](#footnote-19) The last Latin colony in Italy was probably Aquileia, founded in 181 (though the institution of the *colonia Latina* would later be reinvented again as a privileged status that could be granted to existing provincial communities, possibly in Spain in the second century and certainly in Cisalpine Gaul in the first). Formal independence was evidently no longer considered attractive or appropriate for Romans and allies settled far from the city of Rome. They now remained (or became) Roman citizens in self-governing communities within the Roman *res publica*, formally in much the same position as the punished rebel communities of the fourth century BC.

The same period also saw the first significant use of citizenship as an incentive or reward for individual foreigners who collaborated with Rome. Citizenship became a vehicle for according *personal* privilege and/or distinction to persons who remained in their native communities rather than settling in juridically Roman territory. The first credible examples of what gradually developed into one of the most distinctive features of Roman imperial practice date back to the Hannibalic War. Livy records that two Carthaginian deserters who had helped the Romans to capture Syracuse in 211 were granted Roman citizenship and land in Sicily.[[20]](#footnote-20) Grants to individuals continued sporadically through the second century.[[21]](#footnote-21) At first, these grants required a law of the Roman people in each instance, but by the first century BCE authority to enfranchise was sometimes devolved to magistrates (under the principate it would become the prerogative of the emperor).[[22]](#footnote-22) It was also after the Hannibalic War that the promotion of magistrates to Roman citizenship became a feature of the Latin right. After the annexation of most of the original Latin communities in 338 and before the extension of the Latin right to the provinces in the first century BCE, the most important group of ‘Latins’ were the inhabitants of the Latin coloniae founded throughout Italy between 338 and 181, approximately thirty in total.[[23]](#footnote-23) Many of these populations were descended from Roman citizens who had given up their citizenship in order to enjoy the then privileged status of an independent community with its own citizenship. At some point, probably in the second century and certainly before 89 BCE, the Roman state created a mechanism for their leading families to become Roman citizens by holding a magistracy.[[24]](#footnote-24)

The latter two developments produced a small but growing body of Roman citizens who lived alongside peregrines in non-Roman communities. Their numbers were swelled by citizens among the expanding Italian diaspora. Over the two centuries following the Hannibalic War, mobile, opportunistic Italians probably numbering in the hundreds of thousands spread across the Med taking advantage of the opportunities opened up by empire.[[25]](#footnote-25) Being Italian was an advantage in dealing with Roman provincial governors and the Roman army. Many, though not all, were Roman citizens.

In the early first century BCE, a challenge to Roman supremacy precipitated one of the two massive discontinuities in the history of the citizenship (the other being the C*onstitutio Antoniniana*) – its extension to the entire free population of peninsular Italy. Over the preceding half century, several Romans had raised the possibility of granting citizenship to the Latin colonies and even to the other allied communities of Italy, but their proposals were consistently rejected. It was probably frustration with the repeated insistence on the divide between the Romans and their allies that spurred many of the communities of central and southern Italy to revolt in 91 BCE, instigating the so-called Social War (their motivations remain open to debate due to anachronisms in surviving accounts, all of which postdate the successful incorporation of Italy into the *res publica*).[[26]](#footnote-26) It was in the face of this threat that the Roman political elite finally embraced the enfranchisement of Italy as a means of re-establishing hegemony. A series of laws were passed over the following years that progressively granted citizenship to the whole of peninsular Italy, probably first to communities and individuals that fought for Rome, then to Italian peoples that had capitulated early and eventually even to the most stubborn rebels.[[27]](#footnote-27) The new citizens continued to live in their existing communities, now reorganised as Roman *municipia*. Though there may have been some delay between the legislation and the actual registration of the new citizens, which may have taken decades, the result was a massive expansion of the citizen body. Census figures record that the citizen population more than doubled between 115/14 and 70/69 BCE, and it is not even certain that all new citizens were registered by the latter date.[[28]](#footnote-28)

Expansion of the citizen body continued during the internal conflicts of the first century CE as political rivals used the reward of citizenship to consolidate their power bases in the provinces. By 90 CE at the latest, the Roman people began to pass laws devolving the authority to enfranchise to individual magistrates.[[29]](#footnote-29) Sulla, Pompey, Caesar, Octavian and Antony all made prolific use of the discretionary powers granted to them to enfranchise individual provincials.[[30]](#footnote-30) Caesar went further and enfranchised all of Cisalpine Gaul in 49 (which had already been granted the Latin right in 89), in what would prove the last large-scale grant until Caracalla. He also granted the Latin right to the communities of Sicily and Antony engineered their promotion to Roman citizenship, but this was almost certainly revoked under Octavian.[[31]](#footnote-31) In the meantime, Caesar and Octavian also granted citizenship to several individual cities such as Gades in Spain and Utica in Africa, reorganising them as Roman *municipia*.[[32]](#footnote-32) After their victories in civil war, both Caesar and Octavian also had to demobilise hundreds of thousands of legionaries and satisfy their expectation of land. Although both continued the established practice of settling veterans in Italy, they broke the longstanding taboo on settlement outside Italy which had hitherto limited overseas colonies to a tiny handful. Between them, they founded around a hundred Roman *coloniae* in the provinces.[[33]](#footnote-33) Besides settling hundreds of thousands of Italian colonists, they also enfranchised some of the indigenous population in at least some cases, presumably to bolster the implanted citizen population.[[34]](#footnote-34)

Shortly before the death of Augustus in 14 CE, the Roman census counted 5 million Roman citizens, probably inclusive of women and children.[[35]](#footnote-35) Allowing for the likelihood of an undercount, that would imply an actual population of up to 6 million.[[36]](#footnote-36) That is only a small fraction of a total population of at least 40-50 million and conceivably more in the empire as a whole.[[37]](#footnote-37) On Peter Brunt’s estimate, around 2 million Roman citizens lived in the provinces.[[38]](#footnote-38) The vast majority were concentrated in *ca.* 150 Roman *coloniae* and *municipia*; the remainder – probably only a few hundred thousand – were dispersed among around the *ca.* 2,000 other autonomous communities of the empire.[[39]](#footnote-39) Though they constituted only a few percent of the total provincial population, they now represented a significant share – around a third – of the citizen body. In a few decades, the exigencies of civil war had transformed the geography of citizenship.

# Enfranchisement in the Principate

The diffusion of citizenship in the provinces continued under the emperors, though probably at a slower pace than in the civil war period and with considerable regional and chronological variation.[[40]](#footnote-40) Enfranchisement continued to serve multiple purposes, the principle drivers now being the army and patronage. Under the emperors, enfranchisement became harnessed to the task of maintaining a standing army. Though the practice of granting citizenship as a reward for aliens who fought for Rome dates back to the second century BCE, it did not become the norm until Augustus and his successors regularised the *auxilia*, organising alien units into a standing formation with standardised terms of service.[[41]](#footnote-41) By the early second century CE, the so-called ‘non-citizen’ branches of the army – the *auxilia*, fleet and irregular *numeri* – would account for at least 60% of the total manpower.[[42]](#footnote-42) Augustus, Tiberius and Gaius used their discretion to reward some auxiliaries with Roman citizenship after long service, but the procedure did not become regular until the reign of Claudius.[[43]](#footnote-43) It was almost certainly Claudius who instituted the semi-automatic grants that became perhaps the single most important mechanism of enfranchisement over the following century and a half; it was certainly he who introduced the bronze diplomas documenting the grant that are our most important source for the regime. Henceforth, imperial constitutions enfranchising all eligible soldiers were issued for most units most years, normally grouped by province. The constitutions, which listed all beneficiaries by name, were published on bronze tablets in Rome and abbreviated copies on bronze diptychs were issued the beneficiaries. To qualify for a grant, soldiers had to have served at least 25 years in the *auxilia* (or at least 26 in the fleets). Enfranchisement did not necessarily coincide with discharge. In the first century auxiliaries often served considerably longer than 25 years, so it was common to serve for several years after becoming a citizen. The grant extended to any existing children and grandchildren whose names were submitted, but it excluded wives. The Claudian regime endured largely unchanged right up to 212 CE, with the single significant exception that grants to children were discontinued in 140 CE (for reasons that continue to be debated).[[44]](#footnote-44) Though they were nominally exclusive to citizens, the legions too were a mechanism of enfranchisement. The principle that Roman legions were recruited exclusively from Roman citizens had been broken in the civil wars of the late Republic, when Caesar, Pompey, Octavian and Antony all raised legions from peregrines.[[45]](#footnote-45) The practice continued in the principate, especially in the East where the pool of potential citizen recruits was more limited, though the fiction of exclusivity was maintained by enfranchising recruits before enrolment.[[46]](#footnote-46) The production of new citizens through the army will have peaked under Hadrian, following a century of expansion in the size of the *auxilia* and with growing stability of service which promoted family formation among soldiers, before undergoing a sharp drop following the end of grants to children and a further slow decline as it became increasingly common for citizens to enrol in the nominally non-citizen units, making the imperial grant redundant for an increasing proportion of soldiers.[[47]](#footnote-47)

The second principle driver of enfranchisement was patronage. Reciprocal obligations bound the emperor to the office-holding elite of senators and equestrians and them to each other and to the municipal elite of Italy and provinces in a web of patronage that spread out into the provinces and down the social hierarchy. The test of a patron’s worth was his ability to secure and maintain privileges for his clients. Since most privileges were the emperor’s to give or revoke, much of the work of patronage involved intermediaries ‘brokering’ imperial favours for friends and dependents, a process that is richly illustrated in Pliny’s *Letters*.[[48]](#footnote-48) Citizenship – the grant of which was an imperial prerogative – was but one of many privileges disbursed through the conduits of patronage.[[49]](#footnote-49). Like other imperial *beneficia*, grants of citizenship will usually have been ‘brokered’ by the imperial elite around the emperor – senators, leading equestrians, the emperor’s own family and his freedmen. We know that Tiberius and Livia both petitioned Augustus for citizenship for clients, a Greek and a Gaul respectively, though both were refused (which is the only reason Suetonius records the story).[[50]](#footnote-50) Book 10 of Pliny’s *Letters* includes requests for citizenship for fourteen persons (six peregrines and eight Junian Latins) in four different letters, almost always at someone else’s request.[[51]](#footnote-51) For example, he requested citizenship for a man called Chrysippus, his wife and two sons at the request of his physician Postumius Marinus.[[52]](#footnote-52) The famous Tabula Banasitana records that two successive governors of Mauretania Tingitana interceded with the emperors to support petitions for citizenship for the families of two successive leaders of a Berber tribe on the margins of the empire.[[53]](#footnote-53) We can assume that similar processes were at work behind the many other examples of individual grants that are recorded in the literary and epigraphic records.

Personal grants of citizenship were relatively common. A vastly grander favour was the promotion of a whole community en masse.[[54]](#footnote-54) Philo writes that some of Gaius’ friends had secured citizenship for their home cities and suggests that Agrippa I, being the emperor’s close friend, might have asked the same for Jerusalem – though he did not.[[55]](#footnote-55) But Valerius Asiaticus, the first Gaul to reach the consulship, did prevail on Gaius to transform his home city of Vienna into a *colonia* of Roman citizens.[[56]](#footnote-56) M. Valerius Severus, an African who commanded auxiliaries during the annexation of Mauretania, secured citizenship for his patria Volubilis from Claudius, presumably with the support from the senatorial commander.[[57]](#footnote-57) Similar grants continued sporadically through the first and second centuries, though they are hard to track. Besides from a handful of cases that are attested explicitly, promotion has to be inferred from indirect evidence such as reorganisation as a Roman *municipium* or *colonia* (a procedure that is complicated by the existence of *municipia* and *coloniae* with Latin rather than Roman status). But it is clear that the number of promotions was relatively small. Of more than 2,000 autonomous communities in the provinces, only a few hundred were Roman *coloniae* or *municipia* before 212 – and around 150 of them were already Roman by 14 CE.

A lesser and more common favour was the grant of the Latin right (variously termed *Latium*, *ius Latii* and *Latinitas*). Originally a bundle of reciprocal rights which Rome extended to citizens of the other cities of Latium and subsequently reinvented as the legal framework for colonisation in Italy up to the second century, the Latin right was reimagined again as a privileged status short of citizenship that could be granted to alien communities when C. Gracchus proposed granting it to the non-Latin Italians in 123 BCE. Though the Gracchan proposal was rejected, its vision was later realised when Pompey Strabo granted the Latin right to all of Transpadane Gaul in 89 BCE. Caesar subsequently granted it to Sicily (though it may have been later revoked from some communities) and probably also Narbonensis. He and Augustus also granted it to numerous individual communities in Spain, Africa and the Gallia Comata. Henceforth grants to individual cities seem to have become the norm, with the exception of block grants to the Alpine provinces by Claudius and Nero and – the single biggest grant – to the Spanish provinces by Vespasian.[[58]](#footnote-58) There were around one hundred Latin communities at the death of Augustus. By 212 that number had grown to more than a thousand, spread across the western provinces (there were never any in the East).

For present purposes, the most important consequence of the Latin right was that leading citizens could secure Roman citizenship for themselves and their families by holding office. The regime is well documented for the Iberian provinces thanks to the copy of the Flavian municipal law from Irni, a *municipium Latinum*.[[59]](#footnote-59) Men who held a qualifying magistracy – at Irni, the duumvirs, aediles and quaestors, six in total – acquired citizenship on quitting office. The grant extended to their parents, wives, legitimate children (provided they were still in *potestas*) and grandchildren in the male line (again provided they were still in *potestas*).[[60]](#footnote-60) Grants of the Latin right were in the imperial period mobilised primarily by patronage relations between provincial communities and the imperial elite. Once granted, however, Latin status became an autonomous mechanism of enfranchisement. It worth noting that the Latin right devolved the choice of who should be a Roman citizen to non-citizens.[[61]](#footnote-61) Whereas grants to soldiers, personal grants and communal grants all required the intervention of the emperor (and manumission was at least effected by Roman citizens), in the case of the Latin right it was the predominantly non-Roman citizens of the Latin community who elected their magistrates and thus determined who became Roman.

The scale of enfranchisement through the Latin right will have been dampened by the success of some families in holding office over multiple generations, since the entitlement to citizenship will have been redundant for magistrates who were already Roman citizens. Several scholars have supposed that the supply of new citizens will have slowed to trickle after a few decades, given a relatively closed circle of elite families.[[62]](#footnote-62) Although we should not overestimate the capacity of elite groups to reproduce themselves in politics, given the unpredictability produced by high mortality rates, the cost of political competition and the partitive principle in the law of intestate succession, it must nevertheless have been the case that the production of new citizens from each city peaked in the first decades after the grant of the Latin right.[[63]](#footnote-63) Nevertheless, the proliferation of Latin status over the course of the first and second centuries will have made it an ever important engine of enfranchisement.

Its operation will have accelerated in the second century with the introduction of a superior form of the Latin right – *Latium maius* – under which citizenship was granted upon entry to a community’s senate rather than holding a magistracy.[[64]](#footnote-64) Unfortunately, we do not know when or why the new status was created or how widely it was granted. We only know about its content thanks to a single comment by the second-century jurist Gaius, who distinguishes the operations of the two forms of Latinity.[[65]](#footnote-65) Indeed our only other evidence for its existence is a single inscription from Gigthis in Africa Proconsularis honouring a local notable for having secured *Latium maius* for his city through two embassies to Rome, the first being unsuccessful.[[66]](#footnote-66) (The example further illustrates the role of the economy of favours in distributing the Latin right and its work of enfranchisement.) A grant of *Latium maius* has also been inferred for the city of Thisiduo, again in Proconsularis, on the basis of an inscription that styles its decurions as CR (*cives Romani*).[[67]](#footnote-67) The innovation is regularly attributed to Hadrian, but that is speculation. The fact that only two beneficiaries are attested – and both in the same province – might suggest that it was rare, and conceivably limited to the African provinces. On the other hand, the fact that Gigthis and Thisiduo, both relatively unimportant towns, acquired this status makes it unlikely that it was denied to more prestigious communities with stronger patronage links to Rome. So it may equally well have been widespread.

Quantifying the cumulative impact of enfranchisement (not forgetting the continued manumission of slaves) over the two centuries between the death of Augustus and the *Constitutio Antoniniana* is a long-standing problem. The last census data we have is for Claudius’s census of 47 CE (which was in fact the second-last census of Roman citizens), which Tacitus reports as counting 5,984,072 Roman citizens.[[68]](#footnote-68) The figure, transmitted through the manuscript tradition and thus vulnerable to error (and indeed contradicted by Eusebius, who reports a million more), is less reliable then the Augustan figures transmitted by the *Res Gestae* (themselves not unimpeachable, as illustrated by a discrepancy between the figures reported by the Latin and Greek texts). It is in any case of little value in extrapolating to the following 150 years. A long tradition of scholarship has fastened instead upon the surprising silence about Caracalla’s grant in contemporary sources and inferred that the grant had little impact both because citizenship was already widespread and because it had lost much of its significance as a result.[[69]](#footnote-69) But the foundations of that model have been shaken by the growing epigraphic and papyrological evidence for the frequency of the *nomen* Aurelius in the third and fourth centuries. Many or most of these must be persons enfranchised by ‘Caracalla’ (M. Aurelius Antoninus), or their descendants.[[70]](#footnote-70) This has led a growing number of scholars to the conclusion that Caracalla’s grant must have been more significant, at least in some communities and especially in the East of the empire.[[71]](#footnote-71) Unfortunately the onomastic evidence is too ambiguous (given the challenges of inferring citizen status from onomastic form), too sparse and uneven, and in the case of epitaphs often too hard to date, for it to support secure hypotheses about the level of enfranchisement in particular communities, let alone entire provinces or the empire as a whole.[[72]](#footnote-72) The question of the scale of enfranchisement has thus remained open. I have argued elsewhere that the solution lies in an entirely different approach, which focusses not on the onomastic evidence but on the operations of the mechanisms of enfranchisement and deploys a more sophisticated approach to uncertainty.[[73]](#footnote-73) Imperfect though our knowledge is, we already know enough about the mechanisms of enfranchisement and the demography of the empire to be confident that less than a third of the free population of the provinces can have been Roman citizens in 212. The cumulative impact of the various mechanisms of enfranchisement was relatively modest and citizenship remained a minority status within the provincial population right up to Caracalla’s grant.

In 212 or early 213 CE, a constitution of Caracalla – in all likelihood the fragmentary edict transmitted by P. Giess. I 40 – granted Roman citizenship to all free aliens in the Roman empire, with the possible exception of a small class of *dediticii*.[[74]](#footnote-74) If my analysis is correct, this transformed citizenship from the privilege of a minority of individuals and communities into the common property of all (or almost all) free subjects of the empire. As with so many other developments in the history of enfranchisement, Caracalla’s universalisation of citizenship may have been conceived as a means to an end, rather than an end in itself. The motives for the grant remain obscure. Cassius Dio ascribed it to a desire to alleviate fiscal pressure by increasing the scope of the inheritance tax (which was levied exclusively on citizens) – though the fiscal effect must have been limited, since citizens were over-represented in the wealthiest strata of provincial society and so a large proportion of total taxable wealth must already have been owned by citizens at this point.[[75]](#footnote-75) In what appears to be the text of the *Constitutio* itself, Caracalla seems to represent it as an act of *religio*, repaying the gods of the Roman state for safeguarding his life in a period of crisis (possibly his conflict with his brother Geta) by increasing the number of their worshippers.[[76]](#footnote-76) Caracalla’s motives continue to generate heated debate, but it would be entirely in keeping with the earlier history of enfranchisement if this crucial final step in the diffusion of Roman citizenship was propelled by the very contingent and personal concerns of Caracalla in 212-13. Of course that would not in itself explain why universal enfranchisement had become conceivable as a means to those ends. In the first century CE the universalisation of citizenship was the stuff of bizarre fantasy, as for example in Seneca’s *Apocolocyntosis*.[[77]](#footnote-77) By 212 it had obviously entered the domain of the politically possible. A study by Kostas Buraselis remains the fullest attempt to reconstruct the political and ideological context that made this possible.[[78]](#footnote-78)

# The foundation of empire?

In his speech defending Cornelius Balbus’ title to Roman citizenship, Cicero represented Rome’s generosity with its citizenship as crucial to its imperial success: ‘There can be no doubt that the most important foundation of our empire and the key source of the glory of the Roman people was the lesson that the founder of this city Romulus taught through his treaty with the Sabines – that the citizen body should be expanded by the admission even of enemies. On his authority and example, our ancestors never ceased from granting and sharing citizenship.’[[79]](#footnote-79) According to Cicero, the promise of citizenship was the crucial incentive that induced non-Romans to put themselves and their communities at risk in the pursuit of Roman interests.[[80]](#footnote-80) In modern scholarship too, Rome’s distinctive use of citizenship is regularly credited with a special role in Rome’s success as an imperial power. The conventional analysis of the Roman empire stresses Rome’s success in co-opting local elites. The argument is presented most clearly in two classic analyses of Roman rule by Peter Brunt and Friedrich Vittinghoff, both of whom assign a key role to citizenship (though both certainly acknowledge the many other factors at work). Brunt argued that Roman citizenship ‘symbolized, rewarded and fortified the loyalty of the magnates’.[[81]](#footnote-81) Vittinghoff similarly saw citizenship as the ‘decisive factor’ in integrating the diverse political and economic elites of the many provincial communities into a hegemonic superstructure.[[82]](#footnote-82)

As we have seen, enfranchisement was certainly instrumentalised again and again as Rome expanded and consolidated its hegemony, but it is all too easy to exaggerate the role it played in that process – i.e. its importance among the institutions and practices that underpinned Roman rule. Clifford Ando was surely right to assert (à propos an even grander argument about the transformation of political subjectivity in the provinces) that ‘citizenship as *explanation* must remain an illusory fantasy, destined to collapse under the weight of the phenomena for which its champions intend it to account.’[[83]](#footnote-83) The commonplace that citizenship was key to the co-option of local elites assumes that the distribution of Roman citizenship in the province at least roughly mapped the social hierarchy. The assumption that citizenship and social status were closely correlated is certainly not a modern invention. Most famously, Aelius Aristides asserted that the most distinctive and praiseworthy feature of Rome’s citizenship was the way that it divided the population of the world into the worthy and unworthy: ‘dividing into two parts all those in your empire ... you have accepted the finest, noblest and strongest element everywhere as fellow citizens and kinsmen, and the rest of the population as subjects and subordinates’ (*Or*. 26..59). But the second century *rhetor*’s strong reading of Roman citizenship should not be mistaken for accurate description.[[84]](#footnote-84) On the contrary, all the evidence we have indicates that the social distribution of citizenship in the provinces was much more complex than he suggests. Because the process of enfranchisement was driven by several different instruments, in the pursuit of multiple and shifting objectives, the division between citizens and non-citizens never straightforwardly reflected the social stratification of provincial society.

Promotion through the Latin right, it is true, was restricted to magistrates and their families. The social range of beneficiaries of personal grants by the emperor will have been similarly narrow, since generally only the wealthy and cultured had the social capital to mobilise the support within the imperial elite that was necessary to secure an imperial favour, though even here some grants will have reached lower down the social hierarchy as senators and equestrians intervened in support of soldiers, administrators and other personal dependents (as Pliny did for an ex-slave physician and an auxiliary centurion’s daughter).[[85]](#footnote-85) In any case the beneficiaries of the Latin right and personal grants were probably outnumbered by enfranchised soldiers (and their children) and ex-slaves. Over the century and a half from Claudius to Caracalla, the army worked to diffuse citizenship at a much lower level of provincial society. Many enfranchised veterans settled in predominantly Roman communities in the militarised zones on the frontiers, but many others settled in Latin or peregrine communities in the interior of the provinces where they served or from which they had been recruited. Moreover, the enfranchisement of ex-slaves meant that the minority of provincial citizens included many ex-slaves and their descendants. Despite Augustus’ restrictive measures, we should not underestimate the number of citizens created through manumission, especially as the other mechanisms of enfranchisement diffused citizenship within the wealthiest 1-2% of the imperial population, who must have owned a disproportionate number of slaves.[[86]](#footnote-86) All the more so, as new mechanisms were created to allow at least some Junian Latin freedmen to secure full citizenship for themselves and their children, partially circumventing the restrictive provisions of the original Augustan regime.[[87]](#footnote-87) Given what we believe about the concentration of slave holding and the importance of manumission, it is likely that in communities where Roman citizenship was relatively rare (such as in many cities in the east of the empire) there will have been a sharp bifurcation in the social status of Roman citizens, including on the one hand some of the wealthiest local families and on the other a potentially substantial population of ex-slaves and their descendants. Meanwhile, communal grants extended citizenship to dozens of communities *en masse*, transforming everyone from the loftiest local aristocrat to the lowliest free citizen into Romans, with the result that existing social distinctions were reproduced within the new citizen body.

It is thus no surprise that citizenship is a highly imperfect index of social status in the Roman world. The distribution of citizenship in the provinces was determined first and foremost by the distinction between Roman and non-Roman communities. Of the 2,000-2,500 largely autonomous communities into which the provinces were divided in the early third century, only a few hundred were communities of Roman citizens before Caracalla’s grant. But they probably accounted for the majority of citizens in the provinces. Outside those Roman *coloniae* and *municipia*, in the many Latin and peregrine communities of the empire, citizenship was spread unevenly and its distribution did not obviously follow the contours of social status. Not even in the second century were the local *ordines* and councils that assumed much of the burden of governance uniformly composed of Roman citizens. The Latin communities of the West probably came closest. Insofar as the epigraphic corpus gives a representative picture of the curial class and the use of the *duo* *nomina* is a reliable index of citizen status (both problematic assumptions), the evidence suggests that peregrine decurions and magistrates were rare, but not unknown, among the Latin communities of Gallia Comata and Iberia.[[88]](#footnote-88) But this was not necessarily the case among the dwindling but still significant number of peregrine communities in the West, especially in North Africa. And it was certainly not true of the peregrine communities of the East, where citizenship was only sparsely distributed among the civic elites of many *poleis* and peoples. Citizenship was not even uniform at the rarified level of those who held office at provincial level. Of 63 known holders of the office(s) of Asiarch and high-priest of Asia in the second century, 10% were apparently peregrines; so were a third of around 110 high priests of the imperial cult for the province of Lycia known to have held office in the same period.[[89]](#footnote-89) Not even the super-rich were uniformly Roman citizens. The most famous example is the Lycian Opramoas, who spent more than four million sesterces – four times the senatorial census – on benefactions to around thirty cities, yet seems not to have been a Roman citizen.[[90]](#footnote-90) Another example from later in the second century is Menodora of Sillyon in Pamphylia, daughter of Megakles and mother of another Megakles, none of them Roman citizens. She commemorated benefactions amounting to a total of 1.2-2.8 m sesterces (between one and three times the senatorial census).[[91]](#footnote-91) On a slightly lower scale, Iason son of Nikostratos of Kyeaneae, another Lycian, spent at least 80,000 denarii on benefactions in the 140s – still a significant amount, a fifth of the equestrian census.[[92]](#footnote-92) He too has the name of a peregrine, not a Roman citizen.

At the same time, the cumulative impact of migration, manumission, enfranchisement through the army and downward social mobility diffused citizenship into the lower social strata. In the Latin *municipium* of Solva in Noricum, approximately half of the 93 members of an association of textile-dealers (*collegium centonariorum*) named in a list of 205 CE were Roman citizens.[[93]](#footnote-93) In Macedonia, almost 40% of 120 predominantly rural slave-owners who commemorated manumissions at a sanctuary in the hinterland of Beroia, a peregrine polis, between 170-212 CE appear to have been Roman citizens.[[94]](#footnote-94) But apparently there was not a single Roman among the 53 men who signed a decree of the small community of Battyna in Orestis in the mountainous interior in the 140s or 190s.[[95]](#footnote-95) In Boiotia, Roman citizens made up 10% of 74 citizens of Thespiae who volunteered to serve in Marcus’ German campaigns some time between 169 and 172.[[96]](#footnote-96) These texts give us snapshots of the composition of individual communities at particular points in time. They are too few and too far between to support any bottom-up estimate of the overall level of enfranchisement (hence the need for an alternative approach, discussed above), but they do suffice to show that Roman citizens could also be found lower down the social hierarchy and that their prevalence varied widely from place to place.

Roman citizenship was never universal among the local elites on whose ongoing collaboration Roman rule depended. Nor was it a straightforward form of distinction that marked them off from the local populations they governed. Rome’s distinctive use of citizenship can only be a small part of the explanation for its success in creating a reproducible network of local elites. The pace and scope of enfranchisement varied considerably from region to region and even city to city. Yet there is no obvious correlation between the distribution of citizenship in an area and the solidity of Roman rule. The enfranchisement of local elites is evidently neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition to explain collaboration. Enfranchisement was only one element – neither a necessary nor a sufficient condition in itself – in an ensemble of practices by which local elites were integrated into the Roman order. Just as important was the alignment of their material interests with those of the imperial state and local landowners;[[97]](#footnote-97) their integration into the hierarchical network of patronage (what Greg Woolf has called the ‘empire of friends’);[[98]](#footnote-98) and the construction by Roman administrative and juridical practice of an aristocratic social order in which *dignitas* might count for as much as citizen status (such that by the later second century peregrine *honestiores* enjoyed privileges denied to lower status citizens).[[99]](#footnote-99)

# Citizenship, identity and community

Until Caracalla’s grant, to be a Roman citizen was to be a member of an imperial people. The imperium Romanum remained in principle a *republican* empire, in which the citizen was elevated above the non-citizen subject. As noted earlier, after an early experiment with naturalising conquered populations, Rome settled into the practice of leaving them nominally independent and Roman magistrates became accustomed to governing a mixed population of citizens and aliens. By the second century BCE at the latest, it had become conventional to refer to Rome’s non-citizen subjects as ‘the allies’ (*socii*). Throughout Latin literature, the dyad ‘citizens and allies’ serves to denote the totality of the populations governed by Roman magistrates.[[100]](#footnote-100) The citizen body – the *populus Romanus* – is variously styled the master (*dominus*), conqueror (*uictor*, *domitor*, *pacator*) and ruler (*princeps*, *imperator*, *moderator*, *arbiter*) of the whole world (*orbis* *terrarum*) or all peoples (*omnes gentes*).[[101]](#footnote-101) As Clifford Ando has noted, ‘an imperial state that had once forcibly ... assimilated foreigners as citizens gradually committed to a new practice of juridical distinction at the level of empire and a new ideology of juridical equality at the level of the state.’[[102]](#footnote-102) His formula neatly captures the interdependence of two principles – the notional parity of all Roman citizens and their collective superiority to their alien subjects. This interdependence can be observed, for example, in Pliny’s *Panegyricus* which praises Trajan’s instantiation of the ideal of the ‘citizenly leader’ (*civilis princeps*) in his relations with his fellow citizens while simultaneously insisting on the distinction between citizens and ‘allies’ within the empire.[[103]](#footnote-103)

Nevertheless, we should be wary of exaggerating the salience of citizenship is a vector of identity, especially among the metropolitan elite. It is often asserted that Roman identity was based on juridical status, not ethnicity or culture.[[104]](#footnote-104) It may well be true that ‘Roman identity must start with citizenship,’ but it does not end there.[[105]](#footnote-105) The citizen body – the *populus Romanus* – was of course an imagined community, composed as it was of millions of persons dispersed across the Mediterranean and Northern Europe. But it was, to continue using Benedict Anderson’s terms, imagined in a very different style to a modern nation.[[106]](#footnote-106) In particular, it was not normally conceived as ‘a deep horizontal comradeship’.[[107]](#footnote-107) On the contrary, the community of citizens was – despite its notional juridical parity and collective sovereignty – usually imagined as steeply stratified, not least by the self-avowed aristocrats who governed the empire. As much as citizens may have been united by their juridical distinction from the broader population of Latins and aliens, they were also divided by important distinctions on several other equally important axes of difference – social, spatial, cultural and even ethnic – that could be invoked to delimit other communities that were often more exclusive than that based on citizenship.

From the perspective of the imperial elite, the most important of these axes was that of social status. It articulated a hierarchy based on birth, wealth, *paideia* and – in the eyes of its beneficiaries – honour and virtue (as aristocrats represented a hierarchy based on wealth and birth as a hierarchy of honour and virtue). Roman senators and equestrians had more in common with the propertied elites of the many peregrine cities of the empire than they had with most of the citizen population. Throughout the history of Roman expansion, the ruling elite always recognised social distinction in the societies they incorporated. Roman commanders and governors accorded special treatment to those they acknowledged as fellow-aristocrats, regardless of whether they were Roman citizens. Thus Cicero exhorted his brother to ensure as governor of Asia that the cities of the provinces ‘were governed by the judgement of the best men’ (*ut civitates optimatium consiliis administrentur*, Cic. *Qfr.* 1.1.25), using the conventional language of social distinction in Roman politics. Similarly Pliny the Younger advised his friend Maximus, charged with the administration of the free cities of Achaea, to ‘observe the distinctions of rank and status’ among the population he was to govern (*discrimina ordinum dignitatumque custodias*, Plin *Ep*. 9.5.3). This community of regard achieved normative expression with the development of the dual penalty system for *honestiores* and *humiliores* in the mid-second century CE.[[108]](#footnote-108) These categories feature prominently in classical criminal law, which usually prescribed different penalties for any given crime depending on the *dignitas* of the culprit. The two categories appear not to have been explicitly defined. It seems that part of the point was to keep the boundaries vague so that judges could use their discretion in determining who deserved respect. But it is generally agreed that the category of *honestiores* was normally interpreted as encompassing Roman senators, equestrians, local senators and (less certainly) veterans and their families. The terms themselves are first attested under Pius, but the first evidence for the dual penalty system is a Hadrianic ruling that exempts all local senators from the death penalty for all crimes except parricide (*Dig*. 48.19.15). Since many senators in the west and even more in the East were still peregrine in the mid second century, the privilege seems to have been attached to social distinction irrespective of citizen status.

Geography was another divider. The late republic and early empire saw the development of a new rhetoric of ‘provinciality’ that was used to put provincial citizens in their place, much as the rhetoric of ‘municipality’ had marginalised Italians in the late Republic.[[109]](#footnote-109) By the time of Cicero, the adjective *prouincialis* was used with nouns such as *homines* and *uiri*, to denote ‘men in the provinces’ – always Romans rather than natives.[[110]](#footnote-110) For example, Cicero commends his brother Quintus for his propriety in his relations with *prouinciales homines* and *Graeci* – ‘with Roman residents and with Greeks’ (care was required in both cases!), as Shackleton Bailey correctly translates it (Cic *Qfr*. 1.1.18).[[111]](#footnote-111) Thus the lexicon of empire distinguished Romans in the provinces not just from the subject population of non-citizens, but also from Romans in the centre (variously understood as the city of Rome or the whole of Italy). Over the course of the next century, *prouincialis* established itself as a noun and came to encompass all the inhabitants of the provinces, not just Roman citizens, obscuring the first of those two distinctions.[[112]](#footnote-112) The growing importance of the distinction between centre and periphery can be seen for example in the emperor Claudius’ famous speech in favour of admitting men from Gaul to the senate. Claudius takes it for granted that a senator from Italy (*Italicus*) is superior to one from the provinces (*prouincialis*), though he argues that this is not in itself grounds for denying provincials access to the senate (*ILS* 212 col II 5-8). By the second century CE, it became common for senatorial writers to conflate all provincials, both citizen and alien, under the categories *provinciales* and even *socii* – a term hitherto reserved for non-citizens.[[113]](#footnote-113)

Language was a fourth important axis of difference. The population of Roman citizens was divided between Latin-speakers and Greek-speakers (not to mention speakers of the numerous local languages that co-existed in a diglossic relation with Latin in the West and Greek in the east). Greek must have been the first language of most citizens born in the East of the empire; many probably had limited or no Latin.[[114]](#footnote-114) Conversely, bilingualism was not uncommon in the highest social strata in the west, where members of the senatorial and equestrian elite were often highly competent in Greek. Yet Latinity remained central to their identity.[[115]](#footnote-115) Many – though certainly not all – continued to assume an opposition between the categories *nos* or *Romani* and *Graeci*, implicitly constructing the former as linguistic and cultural communities. Several Roman writers pointedly refer to Latin as the *Roman* tongue (*lingua Romana*).[[116]](#footnote-116) Cicero once claimed that Roman citizens were united by language as well as law ([*cives Romani] qui et sermonis et iuris ... societate iuncti sunt*, *2Verr*. 5.167). The emperor Claudius famously stripped citizenship from a Latinless equestrian from Lycia on the grounds that someone who could not understand Latin should not be a Roman citizen.[[117]](#footnote-117) Pliny the Younger praised the consular Arrius Antoninus for his writings in Greek, expressing his surprise that a *Roman* could speak Greek so well (*Hominemne Romanum tam Graece loqui?* *Ep*. 4.3.5). And the Roman state continued to insist that all Roman citizens perform certain key legal actions – notably registering births and deaths, manumitting slaves and composing wills – in Latin alone, implicitly reminding any Greek-speaking citizens of their cultural *alterité*.[[118]](#footnote-118) The *Gnomon of the Idios Logos* – a set of guidelines for fiscal administration in Egypt from the second-century – include a notable provision that if Roman citizens add a clause to their wills providing that any codicils in Greek be regarded as valid (ὅτι ὅσα δὲ ἐὰν διατά[ξ]ω κατὰ πινα̣κ̣ίδας Ἑλληνικὰς κύρια ἔστω), the clause was to have no legal effect. This shows both that Latinless citizens sought to circumvent the burden of using Latin and that the Roman state refused to accommodate them.[[119]](#footnote-119)

Even ethnicity – a sense of identity based on kinship and descent – played a more significant than it is normally allowed.[[120]](#footnote-120) The most important distinction here was between Italians and others. This is what underlies the poet Statius’ praise of Septimius Severus, a young man from an equestrian family from Leptis Magna in Africa (and ancestor of the future emperor), for being not ‘Punic’ and ‘foreign’ (*externus*) but ‘Italian’, on the grounds that he was brought up in the city of Rome. [[121]](#footnote-121) Of course, Statius’ conceit suspends the logic of ethnicity by assuming that education can trump birth, but it presupposes an ethnic distinction and implicitly denigrates Severus’ fellow-provincials as Punic and foreign. But Italian-ness was not monopolised by the inhabitants of Italy. Like the Persians and Greco-Macedonians before them, the Italians constituted a great imperial diaspora. That diaspora had its origins in the movements of veterans and other opportunistic individuals during the second and first centuries BC; it was massively expanded by the programmes of colonisation in the second half of the first century BC and was further swelled, though at a much slower pace, by more emigration and colonial foundations in the first century CE. Of course intermarriage would have very quickly blurred the boundaries between these Italians and the populations within which they settled. So like all ethnicities, Italian-ness was essentially a fiction. But that does not mean that it did not matter. Those who saw themselves as the descendants of Italian settlers could and did claim to be different from ‘native’ provincials. In Spain, for example, they seem to have distinguished themselves from ‘native’ Iberians by styling themselves *Hispanienses* as opposed to *Hispani*.[[122]](#footnote-122) They were also disproportionately represented (compared to other provincials) in the two imperial aristocracies – the equestrian and the senatorial orders – which supplied the commanders and administrators who governed the provinces and captured much of the rents of empire.[[123]](#footnote-123)

This chapter has focussed on the perspective of the centre, exploring how the senatorial and equestrian elite that governed the empire used citizenship and what it meant to them. But a metropolitan perspective cannot exhaust the meaning of citizenship. Elsewhere, the local context must have mattered enormously. Citizens were to be found in many different juridical ecologies – from the almost exclusively Roman landscape of Italy through wholly Roman communities implanted in provincial territory to a diverse array of Latin and peregrine communities – across which the function and significance of citizenship must have varied considerably. The other chapters in this volume offer an oblique perspective on how Roman citizenship was imagined in the periphery.
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