



**HAL**  
open science

## ”Introduction”

Katell Berthelot, Jonathan Price

► **To cite this version:**

Katell Berthelot, Jonathan Price. ”Introduction”. Katell Berthelot; Jonathan J. Price. In the Crucible of Empire: The Impact of Roman Citizenship upon Greeks, Jews and Christians, Peeters Publishers, pp.1-17, 2019, 978-90-429-3668-3. hal-02338877

**HAL Id: hal-02338877**

**<https://hal.science/hal-02338877>**

Submitted on 30 Oct 2019

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L’archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d’enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

## INTRODUCTION

Katell BERTHELOT (CNRS) and  
Jonathan PRICE (Tel Aviv University)

Roman citizenship was a unique phenomenon that broke precedent and defied expectation: it was both dynamic and a stabilizing force; it was a legal and political definition and an expansible, fungible idea; it had both particular and universalizing aspects. The Roman concept and application of citizenship played an essential role in the success of the vast and long-lived multi-ethnic Roman Empire. Yet its historical development, as both a practical legal-political status and a dynamic concept, is far from simple and straightforward; practically every detail and technical term, as well as the changing essence of Roman *civitas*, has engendered controversy. The modern historical debate about Roman citizenship began with Adrian N. Sherwin-White's fundamental study, first published in 1939,<sup>1</sup> which *inter alia* drew a direct connection between the spread of Roman citizenship and the strengthening loyalty of different provincial populations to Rome and their gradual incorporation into the Empire. Recently, Clifford Ando, in his study, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire*,<sup>2</sup> has included citizenship as only one component in a universalizing tendency in all aspects of Rome's rule, including administration, ceremony, and art and architecture, combining into a process which he terms a shift "from *imperium* to *patria*".

While the importance of Roman citizenship for the building of empire is thus being rightly re-evaluated, the impact of Roman citizenship in all its political, legal and above all ideological aspects upon the inhabitants of the Empire, both citizens and non-citizens, has left many open questions. Most studies, beginning with Sherwin-White, while investigating the attitudes and action of provincials, take an

<sup>1</sup> See Adrian N. Sherwin-White, *The Roman Citizenship*, 2<sup>nd</sup> edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1973).

<sup>2</sup> See Clifford Ando, *Imperial Ideology and Provincial Loyalty in the Roman Empire* (Berkeley; Los Angeles; London: University of California Press, 2000).

unstated top-down, Roman perspective; this is partly the result of the sources used. Still insufficiently understood is the impact of the Roman model upon other types of citizenships, such as the local citizenships of the Greek *poleis*, and even more so upon the way other groups within the Empire that did not constitute civic communities came to define themselves either by imitating Roman discourses and practices, or by elaborating counter-models that were meant as an alternative to the Roman self-definition. This book aims to address these large issues, focusing in particular on Jews and Christians, their discourse about citizenship, peoplehood and membership in a community, their civic and communal practices, as well as the ways they integrated new members, sometimes designated as new “citizens,” into their communities. What kind of an impact did the Roman discourse and practice of citizenship have upon the way Jews and Christians defined their own people or communities in the Roman imperial context, both before and after 212 CE? How did Roman discourse and practice differ from those of the Greeks, with which Jews had already been confronted in the framework of the Hellenistic kingdoms, and which, through their training in Greek *paideia*, also greatly influenced Christian authors?

Roman citizenship was an evolving phenomenon, but in all its stages differed in many ways from Greek citizenships.<sup>3</sup> First, at the end of the Republic and during the imperial period, the *populus Romanus* was not defined in reference to ethnicity (understood as implying not only a common language and a shared culture, but also a common descent, no matter how fictitious).<sup>4</sup> Rather, its definition

<sup>3</sup> On the institutional and political differences between Greek and Roman citizenships, see Philippe Gauthier, “La citoyenneté en Grèce et à Rome : participation et intégration,” *Ktèma* 6 (1981): 167–79.

<sup>4</sup> Patrician families had a keen sense of their genealogy, and the Julio-Claudian dynasty made extensive use of their alleged connection with Aeneas and his mother Venus (through Caesar, Augustus’s adoptive father), but the idea that all the Romans descended from the Trojans was indefensible in view of the numerous grants of citizenship (see below), and was not even argued for by Roman historians, who, on the contrary, emphasized the mixing of peoples at the origins of Rome and all along its history. Clifford Ando thus writes: “For the many and varied legends of the foundation of Rome agree on at least two details: Rome’s original population had been heterogeneous, to say the least, and it had established and maintained itself in its early years through warfare” (*Imperial Ideology*, 52). Erich S. Gruen writes in a similar vein: “The idea of autochthony or indigenous origins never made

was political and legal: to be a member of the *populus Romanus* was equivalent to being a Roman citizen. Of course, for a long period of time, the most common way to be a Roman citizen was to be born to parents who were themselves Roman citizens, which comes close to the transmission of ethnicity. Hereditary transmission of citizenship, however, was not the only way of becoming Roman.

Roman citizenship could be granted to individuals or to communities, for instance when a city received the status of a Roman *municipium*, using Roman law; after the Social War of 91-88 BCE, all the cities of Italy came to benefit from this political and legal framework. A city could also be refounded as a Roman colony. As far as individuals were concerned, a slave could become a Roman citizen through manumission, if the master of the slave was himself a citizen and if the manumission procedure was performed in accordance with Roman law. This ability of one person to confer citizenship upon another person was utterly unheard of in the world of the Greek *poleis*, in which grants of citizenships always had to be a collective decision. Individuals could also become Roman if they had served in the Roman army as auxiliaries for a certain number of years, or if they lived in a Latin *municipium* and had held local political offices. Exceptionally, Roman citizenship was also granted to individuals who had served Roman interests and proved very faithful to Rome; from the Principate onward, this decision was taken by the emperor alone.

The second fundamental aspect of Roman citizenship therefore was its “openness” or, to use Philippe Gauthier’s expression, its “permeability”. Much has been written, first by ancient Greek and Roman authors and then by modern historians, about the supposed “Roman generosity” in granting citizenship, often compared to the “avarice” of the Greek *poleis*. The ideological dimension of this discourse has been duly analyzed by the French historian and epigraphist Philippe Gauthier, who has drawn attention to the radical difference in nature between the Greek *poleis* and the Roman *civitas*.<sup>5</sup> To put it in a nutshell,

much headway in Rome. [...] Romans represented themselves without embarrassment as a composite people who belonged intimately to the broader Mediterranean world” (*Rethinking the Other in Antiquity* [Princeton; Oxford: Princeton University Press, 2011], 249).

<sup>5</sup> See Gauthier, “‘Générosité’ romaine et ‘avarice’ grecque : sur l’octroi du droit de cité,” in *Mélanges d’histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston*, Publications de la Sorbonne, série Etudes 9 (Paris: De Boccard, 1974), 207–15.

Greek *poleis* can be described as structures of participation, whereas Rome is rather characterized as a structure of integration. The Roman *civitas* was of a different nature from the Greek *politeiai*, first and foremost because Roman citizens were far more numerous and spread out than those of any Greek city. In the second century BCE, the number of Roman citizens already approximated 300 000. By 14 CE, it is said to have exceeded four million, and Myles Lavan suggests in his article in this volume that it could even have reached six million — but this number included women and children; and it extended throughout the entire Italian peninsula, the Roman colonies and Cisalpine Gaul, and individual cities in the provinces.

It is clear from Miles Lavan's survey of the history of Roman citizenship here, "The Foundation of Empire? The Spread of Roman Citizenship from the Fourth Century BCE to the Third Century CE,"<sup>6</sup> that roughly four periods have to be distinguished in the history of Roman citizenship. 1) The period of the Republic before the Social War of 91-88 BCE, during which, in the earliest phases of Roman imperialism, enfranchisement was actually imposed on conquered populations as a means of regulation and control; but eventually, especially after the Second Punic War, Rome's expanding power enhanced the advantages of Roman citizenship, so that they began using citizenship-grants not as a punishment but as a reward. Near the end of this period, several sources actually testify to a growing stinginess and reluctance on the part of the Romans to grant full citizenship to their Latin allies, leading to expulsions from Rome. 2) The period running from the end of the Social War and the *lex Plautia Papiria* up to the beginning of the Principate, which saw an enormous increase in the number of citizens and a significant transformation in what Lavan calls "the geography of citizenship". 3) The period from 27 BCE to the edict of Caracalla in 212 CE, when the citizen body was expanded mostly through army service and patronage of both individuals and whole communities. 4) From 212 onward, when the edict of Caracalla granted universal citizenship to all free persons in the Roman Empire. According to Aristotle's analysis in the *Politics* (VII.4, 1726 a-b), even in the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE the Romans would never have been

<sup>6</sup> In addition, see his article, "The Spread of Roman Citizenship, 14–212 CE: Quantification in the Face of High Uncertainty," *Past and Present* 230 (2016): 3–46.

considered a *polis*, but rather an *ethnos*.<sup>7</sup> They were, however, by their own definition, a *populus* and a *civitas*.

What did Roman citizenship imply for the citizens? More than the active participation in the political institutions of Rome, which very much depended upon one's wealth, social status, etc., and from the beginning of the Principate progressively came to an end, Roman citizenship implied three things: 1) the participation in the *maiestas* of the Roman people; 2) the enjoyment of specific rights — *conubium*, *commercium*, *provocatio* (first *ad populum* and then *ad imperatorem*), as well as a better legal protection than that of the *peregrini*; and 3) administrative, military, fiscal and religious duties. Some of the rights of the Roman citizens became less effective with the passage of time and the growth in the number of citizens, whereas from the period of the Antonine dynasty onward, only religious duties and some particular taxes were still incumbent upon the citizens. According to Cassius Dio, the aim of Caracalla's decision to extend Roman citizenship to all free men in the empire (with the exception of the *dediticii*) was to increase the number of tax-payers and thus alleviate the fiscal burden connected to the inheritance tax (which was paid by Roman citizens alone). Although its exact relationship to the edict of 212 is still debated, the papyrus Giessen 40 makes clear that religious aspects were involved as well.<sup>8</sup> To increase the number of Roman citizens meant to increase the number of those who worshipped the Roman gods, and therefore to increase the honours paid to the gods. Lavan, in his article here, favors "the very contingent and personal concerns of Caracalla in 212-13" as the main motivation for the decree.

Before 212, and at least from the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE onward, Roman citizenship was generally considered an honour and a privilege. According to Cicero, who famously spoke about the two *patriae*, the *patria* of origin and the *communis patria*, no status or membership

<sup>7</sup> See Gauthier, "La citoyenneté en Grèce et à Rome," 169.

<sup>8</sup> See Peter Alois Kuhlmann, *Die Giessener literarischen papyri und die Caracalla-Erlasse: Edition, Übersetzung und Kommentar*, Berichte und Arbeiten aus der Universitätsbibliothek und dem Universitätsarchiv Giessen 46 (Giessen: Universitätsbibliothek, 1994). For a recent analysis of the text as artifact, see Ari Z. Bryen, "Reading the Citizenship Papyrus (P.Giss. 40)," in *Citizenship and Empire in Europe 200–1900: The Antonine Constitution after 1800 years*, ed. Clifford Ando, *Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge* 54 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016), 29–43.

could be more prestigious than Roman citizenship, and “loyalty toward Rome occupied a superordinate position”.<sup>9</sup> Cicero viewed the promise of Roman citizenship as a powerful tool to extend Rome’s authority throughout the world, and indeed the standard view agrees with this, crediting citizenship as an important imperial instrument used to integrate provincial populations into the “hegemonic super-structure,” as Lavan puts it.

Obviously, participation in the Roman world far exceeded participation in the Roman *civitas*, as Clifford Ando in particular has emphasized.<sup>10</sup> The primary purpose of the present book, however, is not to analyse the different ways people could participate in the *Romanitas* (to use a late term),<sup>11</sup> but, rather, to study something far less well understood, namely, the impact of the Roman model of citizenship and of the Roman policy of citizenship grants upon other groups and upon their own ways of defining their modes of belonging, be it a local citizenship, an affiliation with an *ethnos*, a membership in a voluntary association, a philosophical school, a mystery cult or a sect of some sort, and so forth. What kind of an impact did the Roman *civitas* have upon the ways people defined themselves and reflected upon the groups they belonged to?

While asking this question, one should bear in mind that Roman citizenship had both institutional and ideological aspects, which made it a powerful tool for Roman imperialism. On the one hand it helped to integrate people into the empire and thus to extend its domination, especially in the West, and on the other hand it was an important theme of Roman imperial propaganda, found in Roman and pro-Roman discourses.<sup>12</sup> Those of Dionysus of Halicarnassus and Aelius Aristides are particularly well-known, so let us quote Dio Chrysostom for a change (and see Adam Kemezis’ article, summarized below).

<sup>9</sup> Ando, *Imperial Ideology*, 10. See Cicero, *De Legibus* 2.5.

<sup>10</sup> See note 2 above.

<sup>11</sup> On this issue, see Hervé Inglebert, *Histoire de la civilisation romaine* (Paris: PUF, 2005), 451–82.

<sup>12</sup> Several ancient sources formulate the idea that the Romans’ “generosity” in granting citizenship played an important role in the successful establishment of their domination. See for instance *SIG* 543 (Philip V of Macedon writing to the Larisaeans); Cicero, *Pro Balbo* 31; Dionysus of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities* 2.16–17; etc.

In his forty-first discourse “To the Apameians, On Concord,” Dio writes:

That city (Rome), while so superior to the rest of mankind in good fortune and power, has proved to be even more superior in fairness and benevolence, bestowing ungrudgingly both citizenship (*politeia*) and laws and offices, believing no man of worth to be an alien, and at the same time safeguarding justice for all alike.<sup>13</sup>

What needs to be emphasized is that Roman citizenship was at one and the same time an effective instrument of Roman imperialism and a significant challenge for the peoples and the communities that came under Rome’s domination, even if Roman citizenship *per se* was not the only way to belong to the Roman *oikoumenē* and to participate in the *Romanitas*.

The nuances of this phenomenon are illuminated in this volume by Lavan. It is true, as he comments in a recent article, that “It is a commonplace of Roman history that Rome’s generosity with its citizenship distinguished it from other ancient city states and played an important role in its success as an imperial power.”<sup>14</sup> But here he shows that the full picture was more complex than what blithe ancient assessments or even some modern reconstructions have posited. Citizenship was not shared universally by local elites; the enfranchisement of discharged soldiers, freed slaves, and communities *en masse*, diffused citizenship broadly across the lower strata of society. Citizenship was just one factor — neither necessary nor sufficient in itself — in the integration of local elites and the stability of different areas of the Empire. In fact, while the imagined community of the *populus Romanus* was conceptually distinct from the undifferentiated non-citizens, this community was itself highly stratified so that the upper class (*honestiores*) eventually had a different juridical status from the lower (*humiliores*), and there were meaningful geographical and cultural and linguistic differences between Roman citizens, as well. That is to say, a conceptual center of Roman citizenship, if not an actual one, defined by Italian origin, Roman ethnic origin and Latinity, retained its force, giving a different practical and abstract significance to “citizenship” in the periphery and the center.

<sup>13</sup> *To the Apameians, On Concord* §9, trans. by H. Lamar Crosby, LCL, 159, slightly modified.

<sup>14</sup> Lavan, “The Spread of Roman Citizenship, 14–212 CE,” 4.



This practical and abstract significance can be seen, first, by viewing the provincial Greeks in their own terms. Anna Heller, in her contribution to this volume, “Greek Citizenship in the Roman Empire: Political Participation, Social Status and Identities,” explicates the complexities of integration and its profound but uneven impact on the civic and social structures in the Greek *poleis* in different regions from the Roman conquest in the second century BCE through the period of High Empire. Under the influence of the Roman model and the advantages that Roman citizenship accorded elites in their local contexts, the cities underwent a gradual process of aristocratization, so that, for instance, the *boulē* became an oligarchical stronghold, even if it was not a directly imitative model of the Roman Senate. Epigraphical evidence testifies to an ever more rigid social hierarchy with legal and political implications, compromising the equal rights and privileges of citizens; *politeia* in honorific texts shifted from political rights to social prestige. This shift in meaning reflects a subtle but crucial distinction between a *grant* of citizenship, integrating the person into the political and civic institutions of the city, and the *possession* of citizenship as one coveted honor among many, whose main importance is to enhance the prestige of the possessor. Social hierarchization — which is expressed in sometimes new Greek terminology for classes of citizens — was enhanced by the grants of Roman citizenship to local elites.

But these grants were not evenly dispersed throughout the Greek cities, nor even universally desired by local elites in every city or region (a phenomenon which also changed over time). It was a dynamic situation, not reducible to a single model or uniform conclusion. Even as Roman domination had a measurable effect on the social hierarchy, political structures and signs of status within *poleis*, the idea of Greek community persisted, and arguably was even strengthened internally by the external pressure of the Empire. Individuals’ involvement in the civic life of their city remained crucial to their identity and their idea of citizenship and belonging. Moreover, the possession of Roman citizenship by Greeks in neighboring cities could in some cases reinforce mutual ties and create a kind of Greek micro-region. Local attachments remained strong even for Greeks who became active in the Roman administration. Thus the introduction of Roman citizenship into the Greek world did not engender a total shift from the “structure de participation” by which Greek

citizenship is characterized (according to Gauthier) to the “structure d’intégration” which is the essential nature of Roman citizenship. Roman citizenship enhanced individuals’ status and strengthened local elites but did not create a coherent political community of Roman citizens in the Greek East.

The notion of Roman citizenship as a new essential component in a culturally and socially elite ruling class in the Empire, lies at the base of attempts by Greek intellectuals to come to grips with the challenge of Roman citizenship and the fact of the Roman Empire. Isocrates had attempted to transform Hellenic identity from ethnic (based on *physis*) to cultural (based on *paideusis*), and indeed Sylvie Honigman has argued that the shift from ethnicity to *paideia* as an essential criterion in the attribution of local Greek citizenships, during the Hellenistic period, was in part a consequence of the integration of the Greek world in the sphere of Roman influence.<sup>15</sup> The Isocratean idea informed the constructions of identity and belonging in Greek orators and writers of the second and third centuries CE, as Adam Kemezis, in his article here, “Beyond City Limits: Citizenship and Authorship in Imperial Greek Literature,” explains in an interpretation of three authors of the period: Dio Chrysostom, Aelius Aristides and Cassius Dio. Through these authors, Kemezis takes us beyond the confines of the actual *poleis* or any civic body existing in reality to an imagined community. For each of the Greek authors, Roman citizenship was both an affirmation and an enactment of class privilege and what they viewed as their personal virtue and responsibility to the larger community.

Dio Chrysostom, in a series of city-speeches which relate very little to their specific urban settings, describes an idealized city in which *homonoia* prevails and the elite citizens are bound not by legal or political obligation nor by their shared ethnic identity but by their own demonstrated virtue. The elite in existing Greek cities create a kind of trans-polis in which they are citizens, and in which actual Roman citizenship functions merely as “the paradigmatic example of the key concept of citizenship as recognition of ethical worth” which in turn legitimates their social status and privilege; the main purpose

<sup>15</sup> Sylvie Honigman, “Permanence des stratégies culturelles grecques à l’œuvre dans les rencontres inter-ethniques, de l’époque archaïque à l’époque hellénistique,” *Pallas* 73 (2007): 125–40.

of their exclusive citizenship was to ensure social harmony. A similar community which does not originate in or is defined by Roman citizenship but includes it as a component of personal worth, is imagined by Aelius Aristides in his Roman Oration. Aristides' community is more Roman than Dio's — after all, his speech is supposed to have been given in Rome — but still defines citizenship as a degree of excellence which is appropriately awarded and utilized. Thus “in Aristides' implicit aristocratic worldview, the virtues by which the Romans define the citizen community are closely tied to elite social class”. In both of these conceptions, Roman citizenship has a different essence and function from the reality in which the authors actually lived.

Both Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides would have been horrified by Caracalla's universal grant of Roman citizenship in 212, which eliminated the exclusivity in the privilege together with the opportunity to philosophize about it as a symbol of virtue unifying the ruling elite. The historian Cassius Dio, whose life and professional career were the fulfillment of the ideals in the oratory of Dio and Aristides, did live through that pivotal moment and dismissed the empire-wide enfranchisement as a ploy for increasing revenues by an emperor whom he clearly despised. Cassius Dio had his own notion of the ideal Roman citizenship, reflecting what he thought was an essentially Augustan ideal, which rigidified traditional social hierarchy, ensuring both the status, privileges and responsibilities of narrow the ruling class, on the one hand, and internal peace and harmony, on the other. In Dio's view, this loyal ruling elite had been created in the East through judicious extension of Roman citizenship, and Caracalla's single act brought that whole structure down.

So much for Greeks. The challenge of and reaction to Roman citizenship were different for other groups in the Empire who had little chance, and sometimes little desire, to become Roman citizens before 212. In the case of the Jews, from their first direct contact with Rome as an independent civic body in the second century BCE and continuing through the first century CE, the question is the influence that Roman models had on their conception and practice of citizenship. This is the question taken up by Katell Berthelot in her paper, “Judaism as ‘Citizenship’ and the Question of the Impact of Rome”. She rejects the idea that the Hasmoneans created a state for which “citizenship” was a relevant concept, and therefore they did not — could not — enroll the Judaized Idumeans as “Judean citizens”

(a phrase which is merely a metaphor); nevertheless, integrating defeated enemies into the polity was new and has to be accounted for.

Morton Smith argued in an article published in 1978 that the conversion of the Idumeans and the Itureans under the Hasmoneans is to be explained by the impact, upon the leaders of Judea, of the Roman policy of granting citizenship to Rome's former enemies. Berthelot points out the serious chronological problem in this theory, since the Rome that the Hasmoneans knew had practically reversed its policy of integrating the conquered, exhibiting a political stinginess that would soon lead to the Social War (and see again Lavan's article here). Yet in a later period, when Rome had established its power absolutely over Judea and the former Hellenistic kingdoms, Philo and Josephus were both so inspired by the discourse about the "generous" Roman policy of integrating foreigners into the Roman polity that they used this kind of discourse to describe the Jewish attitude towards proselytes. These two important Jewish Greek writers described Jewish "citizenship" as reflecting, aside from the essential notion of ancestry, virtue and piety as expressed in the observance of common laws. Thus, to return to the two basic patterns of citizenship as construed by Gauthier, both Philo and Josephus conceived of Jewish affiliation in Roman terms, as a polity of integration rather than participation. This is sensible for several reasons: Jews were scattered throughout the Roman world, so that the Mosaic *politeia* could not require or imply common political procedure; both authors were responding to the pro-Roman discourse current in their time, as evidenced e.g. in Dionysius of Halicarnassus; and Philo and Josephus lived in an vivid and immediate Roman reality, they had *inter alia* Roman audiences in mind.

It is instructive, at this point, to consider "one specifically Jewish conceptualization of boundary-crossing, affiliation, and communal identity," as Paula Fredriksen puts it in her paper, "How Do the Nations Relate to Israel? Family, Ethnicity, and Eschatological Inclusion in the Apostle Paul". Paul of course was a Roman citizen by birth, according to Acts, and knew how to use his rights, for instance by appealing to the emperor (*provocatio ad imperatorem*). His participation in the Roman *civitas* was through his local civic inscription in the city of Tarsus, and he certainly had a good knowledge of Greek

culture. He also belonged to the *ethnos* of the *Ioudaioi*, and ultimately became one of the leading members of a Jewish sect which turned into a new “religion”. Despite his contentious reference to a Christian *politeuma* (see below), Paul in general avoids the language of citizenship when speaking of Gentiles converting to Christianity but rather uses the Roman concept of adoption to describe their attachment to the community, in order to legitimize them as heirs to the kingdom of heaven. The adopting father is none other than God himself, which not only usurps other lines of inheritance and binds cult members together, but also further unifies the Christian family by the spiritual bond of common worship. This Roman metaphor sits side by side in Paul’s thought with a more strictly biblical idea of descent from Noah that distinguishes Israel and the Gentiles within the same eschatological community.

Still, Paul claimed, in a singular passage, that Christians had a “*politeuma* in heaven” (Philippians 3:20). The puzzle of this expression is unraveled by Peter Oakes in his article here, “The Christians and their Politeuma in Heaven: Philippians 3:20 and the Herakleopolis Papyri”. Oakes rejects, in turn, previous solutions which propose to blur the specificity of *politeuma* and translate it as “citizenship” or a large-scale “commonwealth”. Significantly, he also points out the difficulty of interpreting Paul’s expression as a deliberate counterpoise to the Jewish *politeuma* in Philippi, in parallel to the *politeuma* of Herakleopolis in Egypt, documented in the papyri. It is true that from the Hellenistic period onwards, many Jews, both in Judea and in the Diaspora, were attracted to the Greek civic model, and either tried to adopt it for themselves — as illustrated by the creation of Antiocheia in Jerusalem at the beginning of the 2<sup>nd</sup> century BCE, before the Maccabean uprising, or indeed by the creation of *politeumata* in the Diaspora such as that in Herakleopolis<sup>16</sup> — or used the vocabulary of citizenship to speak about membership with the people of Israel. But as Oakes contends, this is not a useful model to

<sup>16</sup> The exact number and nature of Jewish *politeumata* is hotly disputed, and in any case membership in a *politeuma* was not a citizenship, but rather a membership in an association. Nevertheless, the constitution of Jewish *politeumata* should be included in the analysis of the ways Jews interacted with Greek civic institutions and political realities. Oakes cites recent bibliography, as well as Gilles Dorival (notes 48 and 49) in the present volume.

understand Paul's expression. Rather, the *politeuma* referred to by Paul is a central governmental institution with wide influence and authority over a population beyond defined borders. This insight enables Oakes to argue that Paul meant to create in the minds of his listeners an innovative idea of heavenly citizenship, unrestricted by earthly impediments, thus uniting an otherwise differentiated Christian community: without earthbound distinctions of Roman citizenship or social status in Philippi, all Christians could serve the Christian community on equal footing and stand strong against hostile pressures from within Philippi itself.

Yet if Philo was the first explicitly to define the Jewish community or the Jewish people as a *politeia*, and if Paul offered a revised version of heavenly citizenship, how, before 212 CE, did Jews in the Diaspora who were not Roman citizens define their collective identity? Or how, after 70 CE, did Jews who *were* Romans articulate such conflicting affiliations? Or finally, how, after 212 CE, did Jews react to the imposition of Roman citizenship on all free men (with the exception of the *dediticii*)? In particular, one wonders whether it affected the rabbis, and what their response to the new Roman policy was. These questions are approached from two entirely different angles in the papers by Oded Irshai and by Yair Furstenberg.

In an innovative argument, Irshai, in his piece, "How do the nations relate to Israel? Rabbis, the conversion of *goyim*, and the *Constitutio Antoniniana*," demonstrates that the rabbis of the second to fourth centuries CE, while sharply distinguishing between Jews and Gentiles, and between the Jewish community and Roman custom and culture, drew heavily on it for the idea of an all-inclusive community well adapted to accepting foreigners. That is, the earlier generations of the rabbis used a Roman model to conceptualize and deal practically with Gentiles, even if they viewed themselves as an oppressed minority rather than a hopeful apocalyptic community. The rabbis' model was universal inclusion inspired by Caracalla's universal enfranchisement and the real relief and calm it brought to Jews under Roman rule. They sharply distinguished between Jews and non-Jews (*goyim*) but still devised ways, inspired by Rome's inclusive policy, to bring them into the community.

Roman policies and practices regarding citizenship also had an impact on rabbinic *halakhah* regarding the definition of insider/outsider in

another, more specific context, as shown by Yair Furstenberg in his article, “The Rabbis and the Roman Citizenship Model: The Case of the Samaritans”. The inveterate, ethnic enmity that Jews felt against Samaritans in the Second Temple period, and that has biblical roots, was modified in early rabbinic texts to a form and procedure of acceptance in the community, with certain legal restrictions. Furstenberg argues that by (re-)conceiving the Jewish community as a legal community, according to Roman definitions and norms, the rabbis created a process by which Samaritans could be given an intermediate legal status, with a prohibition on marriage and severe restrictions on commercial transactions with Jews and acquiring land in the Land of Israel — i.e., very much like the restrictions on *conubium* and *commercium* for partial citizens in the Roman system. Thus the rabbis abandoned a strict ontological distinction between Jews and others and adopted rather a more subtle and gradated system for classifying others, and as Furstenberg suggests, they used the Roman concept of different levels of participation in the legal community while retaining dominance and control in their own hands.

The Jewish communities in both the foreground and background in rabbinic literature are by and large fairly insular and inward-looking, self-sufficient, managing their own legal, social and administrative affairs. This impression stems as well from exemptions of civil service claimed by Jews in the Theodosian Code, and some Jewish communities known from other non-rabbinic evidence certainly can be described as divorced from the civic life of the Empire around them. Two extreme instances are seen in archaeological and epigraphic remains of the synagogal communities at Ein Gedi and Rehov, which testify to remote Jewish communities entirely focused on their own laws and business — in the case of Ein Gedi, the by-laws of the community, and in the case of Rehov, Jewish agricultural laws in the Land of Israel — and for whom Roman citizenship and participation in the Roman Empire do not seem to have been important to their identity or internal functions.<sup>17</sup> Other synagogues, even in Israel (such as those

<sup>17</sup> For Ein Gedi, see *Corpus Inscriptionum Iudaeae/Palaestinae* IV, 3851; for Rehov, J. Naveh, *On Stone and Mosaic* (Tel Aviv: Israel Exploration Society, 1978), 79–85 (Hebr.), and for a detailed discussion of the halakhic inscription, dealing primarily with agricultural laws, Y. Sussman, “The Halachic Inscription from the Beth She’an Valley,” *Tarbiz* 43 (1973–74): 87–158 and *Tarbiz* 44 (1974–75):



along the coast, in Caesarea, Ashkelon and Gaza), appear from their physical remains and art to have been more cosmopolitan, but close study of inscriptions, especially the large number of Jews advertising their civic titles, indicates that Jewish participation in municipalities throughout the Empire was more willing and energetic than the legal sources have led us to believe. This is the thesis argued by Capucine Nemo-Pekelman, “The involvement of the Jews in municipal life during the Late Roman Empire”. By re-reading, against epigraphical evidence of Jews serving in the imperial administration, the seven imperial constitutions which deal with Jews’ asking for exemption from curial duties, Nemo-Pekelman shows that in a significant number of cases, Jews performed civic functions in parallel to their responsibilities in the synagogue, and used election as decurion for advancement to higher honors, including the highest offices in the municipality. It is possible to conclude that there were clear benefits of parallel and mutually strengthening careers in the municipality and synagogue, since “ascending through the ranks of one helped their chances of success in the other”. There were even cases of Jews who requested exemption from serving in their local *curia* in order to pursue careers in the senatorial order and imperial bureaucracy.

Naturally, there are attested cases of Jews asking for exemptions from local curial service by claiming the privileged status as clergy, for the privilege of the status and also in order not to impair their standing within the synagogal community, but by the fourth century, the Christian imperial administration in the West had stopped granting these exemptions to Jews (in contrast to a more generous policy in the East). In Late Antiquity, Christian authorities in the West imposed on Jews and Jewish communities in another way, as well. One of the main claims by Samuele Rocca in his article, “From Collegium to Ecclesia: The Changing Outer Framework of the Jewish Communities in Roman Italy,” is that later Roman law compelled the Jews to adopt “a communitarian organization, molded on that of the Christian Church”. This marked a shift from the period of the early empire, according to Rocca, when the form of Jewish communities

193–95 (Hebr.); idem, “The Inscription in the Synagogue at Rehob,” *Tarbiz* 45 (1976): 213–57 (Hebr.); F. Vitto, “Rehob,” in *New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land IV*, ed. E. Stern (Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society, 1993), 1272–74.



in Italy resembled that of the *collegia licita* and were formally under the patronage of the Roman emperor (or in some cases, a Herodian prince with Roman citizenship).

Similar and yet different questions arise in connection with the Christians: how did Christians who were Roman citizens articulate their different affiliations? From the very beginnings of Christianity, some Christians appropriated the vocabulary of citizenship to speak about membership in the Church. The role played by the imperial context and by Paul's own Roman citizenship in the writings of the apostle is disputed and many-faceted; some idea of the complexity of this topic is displayed in the articles by Paula Fredriksen and by Peter Oakes, as we have already seen.

Unlike the case of some Jews, the Christians who were Romans were not exempted from their religious duties towards the gods of Rome until Galerius's edict in 311 CE. Moreover, Caracalla's policy particularly emphasized these religious duties, which were then the main element that defined Roman citizenship (together with taxes).<sup>18</sup> Only from 311 and above all 313 CE onward would the Christian faith become compatible with one's religious duties as a Roman citizen. Both before and after this turning point, one may ask in which ways Christian authors both opposed the Roman model of citizenship or *communis patria* and remained indebted to it.

The use of civic vocabulary, in metaphors or by way of analogy, becomes especially important only in later Christian writings, such as the *Epistle to Diognetus*, the work of Origen and that of Augustine. These authors tend to consider Christians as "citizens" of the heavenly Jerusalem or of the City of God rather than as citizens of local communities. Gilles Dorival, in his close linguistic study here, "Christian Redefinitions of Citizenship," outlines the development of political vocabulary in both Jewish and Christian lexica, showing how the polity gained strong religious connotations, so that Christians were envisioned as citizens of a heavenly city that is superior to and supersedes earthly cities. Similarly, Hervé Inglebert explores the question posed in the title of his article, "How to Define the Citizenship of the City of God: An Augustinian Problem" — a question made especially

<sup>18</sup> See Hervé Inglebert, "Citoyenneté romaine, Romanités et identités romaines sous l'empire," in *Idéologies et valeurs civiques dans le monde romain : Hommage à Claude Lepelletier* (Paris: Picard, 2002), 241–60, esp. at 242–45.

difficult by the crumbling of the political structures in Augustine's time, when the meaning of actual citizenship was dwindling accordingly. Earlier, when the Roman Empire was stable, Christians had truly valued the possession of Roman citizenship and the "generous" Roman policy in granting citizenship to numerous inhabitants of the Empire, as Inglebert has already demonstrated elsewhere.<sup>19</sup> But Roman citizenship and its connection to Christian identity became more problematic with the dismantling of the Empire. Augustine's solution was to redefine citizenship in the city of God as Christian ethics. This concept transcended the dismal reality, allowing Christians to feel a sense of belonging to a timeless Christian ideal. By grounding the citizenship of the City of God in ethos rather than in law, Augustine succeeded in making the Church autonomous vis-à-vis the evolution and the ultimately unhappy fate of the Christianized but still earthly Roman empire.

<sup>19</sup> See Hervé Inglebert, "Christian Reflections on Roman Citizenship (200–430)," in Clifford Ando (ed.), *Citizenship and Empire in Europe 200–1900: The Antonine Constitution after 1800 years*, Potsdamer Altertumswissenschaftliche Beiträge 54 (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2016), 99–112.

