

## The Case of Multiple Citizenship Holders in the Graeco-Roman East

*Andreea Ștefan*

τίς πόθεν εἰς ἀνδρῶν;

Who art thou among men, and from whence?<sup>1</sup>

Ἐγὼ ἄνθρωπος μὲν εἰμι Ἰουδαῖος, Ταρσεύς τῆς Κιλικίας, οὐκ ἀσήμου πόλεως πολίτης.

I am a Jew, from Tarsus in Cilicia, a citizen of no insignificant city.<sup>2</sup>



The choice of these two quotations may at first glance look peculiar as it creates a dialogue that never happened. In fact, these quotations bridge together periods of time, areas and cultures that are as distant as they can get in Hellenic antiquity: the first quotation has Queen Arete questioning Odysseus about his identity in *Odyssey* 7.<sup>3</sup> The second, by contrast, has Paul of Tarsus, who writes in Greek several centuries later, introducing himself as a Jew.<sup>4</sup> Paul's words bring me straight to my topic, as they point to the fact that citizenship was of the utmost importance in defining one's identity in Graeco-Roman antiquity. On presenting himself, Paul decides to stress his citizen status, which is stated immediately after his ethnic origin. It should be noted that his statement of identity is to some extent topographical, as ethnonyms bear an implicit refer-

---

1 Translated by A.T. Murray.

2 Translated by the Rainbow Missions.

3 Hom. *Od.* 7.238.

4 *Act. Ap.* 21.39.

ence to a place of origin,<sup>5</sup> and ancient citizenship automatically directs to a polis. Considering that Tarsus is presented as an important centre, the choice of identifying himself as one of its citizens stresses the prestige it brings to the individual.

## 1 Framing Citizenship in the Greek East under Roman Rule: A Conceptual Problem

What did citizenship mean in the Greek cities of Asia Minor under Roman rule? Did it have a homogeneous meaning that expressed identical realities from one polis to another within the boundaries of the Empire? It probably did not, although some consistent similarities must have existed. To speak about citizenship within Graeco-Roman communities, as well as to try to comprehend most of the ancient realities that have a modern counterpart, is a tricky and slippery matter. Modern concepts bear meanings shaped over the course of centuries, in contexts sometimes very different from the original ones.<sup>6</sup> A working definition of citizenship would therefore be necessary.

Considering that citizenship can be approached from a variety of perspectives,<sup>7</sup> here I have chosen to discuss its ties with individual and group identification. The dichotomy between individual and group derives from the fact that '*civitas Romana* est d'abord, pour les provinciaux de l'Empire qui en bénéficient, un statut personnel et une communauté de droit, la *politeia*, pour un Grec, renvoie à l'appartenance à une communauté autonome au sein de laquelle il exerce ses droits politiques et qui est le lieu nécessaire de sa vie publique'.<sup>8</sup> Thus, I take citizenship as being essentially 'a shared membership in a political community'.<sup>9</sup> From this perspective, citizenship can be discussed as the result of a collective decision; in terms of identity, it contributes to the creation of a social identity. I am here referring to social identity as defined by Anthony Appiah,<sup>10</sup> according to whom social identity has the following structure. First of all, there must be a label *L* for the identity and a rough social agreement on what being an *L* means. Secondly, individuals who fit within the social conception of *L* must identify themselves as *LS*; this means that participation in the category

5 Laurence (1998) 5.

6 For an up to date discussion, see Karolewski (2010) 7–22.

7 Some cited under note 5, in Karolewski (2010) 8.

8 Heller and Pont (2012) 13.

9 Karolewski (2010) 8.

10 Appiah (2005) 67–69.

of *L* should affect one's self-understanding, emotions and actions. Thirdly, other people must treat as *Ls* those who identify themselves as *Ls*. Fourthly, a social identity, as defined under these conditions, must be significant in both ethical and political life.

However, this viewpoint, perfectly operational when investigating citizenship in relationship to its emitting polis or *civitas*, does not give much insight into the meanings attached to an acquired second, and, on occasion, third, or even fourth citizenship. For what can it tell us about grants of Roman citizenship in the free Greek cities of the East? In the vast majority of cases, the bestowing of Roman citizenship was not the result of a collective decision; neither did it contribute, as far as the new Roman citizen was concerned, to creating a sense of membership in a community with other Romans. In most cases one remained local, a citizen of a polis, a Greek, or, as we have seen earlier, an ethnic Jew. Therefore, it seems far more useful to consider these types of citizenship in terms of their contribution to the way an individual identified himself, investigating how and in what circumstances citizenship(s) helped shape the distinct identity of the person who benefited from it/them. I will deal with citizenship in terms of its contribution to individual identity in the third part of this paper.

## 2 Local Citizenship and Social Identity in the Graeco-Roman East

Most of the Greek cities of the East continued to enjoy internal autonomy, even after the Roman conquest, as *civitates liberae*, or on the grounds of other legal agreements.<sup>11</sup> Under the new ruler, they perpetuated their former institutions and, most importantly, their civic bodies. Usually based on residence and kinship,<sup>12</sup> citizenship in the Greek *poleis* was, in democratic regimes, highly participatory, and usually exclusive.<sup>13</sup> With the Roman conquest and its subsequent support of aristocratic regimes, however, this situation rapidly evolved towards limiting the access of ordinary citizens to assemblies and giving the ruling bodies to the elites.<sup>14</sup> Most likely, it is in this context, and finding support in the practice of granting honorary Roman citizenship, as Julien Fournier<sup>15</sup>

11 Sherwin-White (1973) 174–189.

12 Blok (2013) 164–167.

13 Gauthier (1985) 197–206. However, see the cases of *sympoliteia* treated by Lasagni in this book.

14 See recently Heller (2009).

15 Fournier (2012) 89.

supposes, that the practice of accumulating multiple local citizenships established itself in the Greek East.

Cities had to adapt to these new realities. Therefore we have to raise the question of how Greek citizenship(s) worked under Roman rule. Although the legal content of citizenship did not formally change, or at least does not appear to have changed, the restriction of participation in decision-making to the elites must have affected the functioning of the civic bodies as wholes. A.N. Sherwin-White<sup>16</sup> was not alone in believing that the leading elites of the cities in the East formed a distinct class, the *honestiores*, who are to be identified with those citizens that Aelius Aristides defined as τὸ μὲν χαριέστερόν τε καὶ γενναιότερον καὶ δυνατώτερον ‘the more accomplished, noble, and powerful people’.<sup>17</sup> The epigraphic evidence supports this interpretation by illustrating the increasing interest of local elites in joining the ranges of the two Roman *ordines*, especially from the second half of the 1st century AD onwards.<sup>18</sup> Thus, it seems legitimate to ask, alongside Anna Heller,<sup>19</sup> whether the Roman system of *ordines* was ever implemented in the East. Her answer is negative, but the fact that citizenship evolved into something like ‘une citoyenneté à deux vitesses’ was nonetheless a *de facto* reality in the *poleis*. Ordinary citizens, though not completely excluded from the public life of their cities, faced drastic limitations in their political participation.

In order to have a better grasp of the social implications these restrictions had, it seems useful to apply J.K. Davies’ viewpoint and analyse the citizen body as a twofold identity, i.e. both a ‘descent group’ and an ‘interest group’ insofar as the citizens are a group sharing special economic privileges.<sup>20</sup> In what follows, ‘descent group’ is used with a restricted meaning: it does not refer to a shared (mythical) origin. Rather, it takes as a starting point the fact that citizenship normally passed from one generation to the next. The ethnic name linked to a polis covers, to some extent, common origins. The following analysis focuses on two main types of sources that spread the official discourse of the polis, i.e. the orations of prominent *rhetoires* and public decrees, for they closely mirrored the image of citizens as a social group and contributed in building a shared citizen-identity.

The civic body appears frequently in the works of the Second Sophistic. Some of the speeches of these authors focused on ‘classical’ themes, and they

16 Sherwin-White (1973) 313.

17 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 14.213, translated by C.A. Behr.

18 See Demougin (1999)—equestrian order; Birley (1997)—senatorial order.

19 Heller (2009).

20 Davies (1978) 105–121.

aimed at entertaining an audience, while others treated contemporary matters. Some of them were meant to appease civic strife or conflicts between neighbouring *poleis*, or offering solace to calamity-stricken communities. Authors such as Dio Chrysostom and Aelius Aristides repeatedly addressed the citizens of the cities in which they delivered their speeches by the long-established formula *andres*, followed by the proper adjective indicating the polis. The formula covered in classical times all the citizens of a polis. But what meaning could it still convey in the second century AD? Was it a mere literary reminiscence used as a rhetorical ornament, or did it preserve some content?

Aelius Aristides addresses the Spartans as ἄνδρες Λακεδαιμόνιοι in *On Behalf of Making Peace with the Athenians*,<sup>21</sup> the Athenians as ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι in the first four *Leuctran Orations*,<sup>22</sup> the Thebans as ἄνδρες Θηβαῖοι in the two speeches *To the Thebans: Concerning the Alliance*.<sup>23</sup> Although it cannot be denied that such appeals are steeped in the classical rhetoric tradition, the fact that this formula applies to the crowds that actually gathered to listen to these speeches makes us wonder whether it was just a rhetoric *topos*. These appeals to the audience reinforced the self-awareness of the communities. Still, one may have some doubts about who listened to a *rhetor* like Aristides or Dio. It is legitimate to wonder whether orators delivered their speeches before the gathering of all citizens, as their way of addressing the audience seems to imply, or if they addressed only restricted groups. These may be the members of the *boule*, or the *gerousia*, who gathered in one of those beautifully adorned, at times exceedingly spacious, *bouleuteria* that grace most of the Greek cities in Roman times.

Depending on the topic, it is possible to conjecture when the *rhetores* addressed a restricted part of the citizen body, let's say the decision-making elite, or spectators who paid a fee to be entertained on various topics, be they locals and citizens or foreigners in transit, or else the wider citizen group of a polis. Unfortunately, the *rhetores* themselves did not leave many explicit references as to who made up their audience. But I would argue that the surviving orations were addressed mainly to the whole citizen body. Some of them, like Dio's *First Tarsic Discourse*<sup>24</sup> and most of the discourses on 'classical' themes, fall into the category of oratory for entertainment and were offered on special occasions by the leading elite to the whole civic body. I will now move on directly to the first and last categories of speeches, i.e. the speeches delivered to one part or to

21 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 32.399, 400, 401, 405.

22 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 33.411, 413, 425, 426; 34, 435; 35, 448; 36, 476.

23 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 38.477, 481, 486, 488; 39. 491, 499, 500, 502, 503, 504.

24 D. Chr. 33.

the whole of the citizen body, of interest here as they were addressed to people because of their citizen status.

An example of speech directed towards a restricted part of the citizen body is Dio's oration *To the Apameans on Concord* in which he directly addressed the *boule*: ὦ βουλή καὶ τῶν ἄλλων οἱ παρόντες οἱ μετριώτατοι.<sup>25</sup> "Members of the Council and you other most fair-minded gentlemen here present".<sup>26</sup> Also other discourses on urgent political matters, such as Dio's *To the Nicomedians on Concord with the Nicaeans*,<sup>27</sup> or the one delivered in his native city *On Concord with the Apameans*, and Aelius Aristides' *Rhodian Oration*,<sup>28</sup> were most probably given before the *boule*. Discourses such as Dio's *Address of Friendship for his Native Land on its Proposing Honours for him*<sup>29</sup> or his *In Defence of his Relations with his Native City*,<sup>30</sup> in response to a decision of the *boule* or as a way of defending himself before the same city council, are clearly speeches intended for the ruling elite. By contrast, the category of speeches addressing all citizens includes orations like Aristides' *Oration to the Rhodians on Concord*.<sup>31</sup> There the *rhetor* mediates between the two parts of the civic community, the elite and the ordinary citizens. In addition, eulogies such as the *Panathenaic Oration*<sup>32</sup> must have also addressed a broader public.

To sum up, from the use of the formula *andres* + ethnic adjective we can deduce the following about citizens as a descent group. First of all, the formula was deeply rooted in the rhetoric tradition and therefore it is often no indicator of who the audience actually was. The exact meaning has to be determined for each oration. Secondly, it often implies an effective restriction of the citizen body to its active parts, such as the *boule* or the *gerousia*. In fact, in orations dealing with important matters, this formula concerned almost exclusively the groups of people involved in decision-making. Here we can include formulae such as ἄνδρες Νικομηδεῖς.<sup>33</sup> and ἄνδρες Προυσαεῖς,<sup>34</sup> etc. Thirdly, this restriction in meaning had not been completed by the second century AD, as there

25 D. Chr. 24.

26 Translated by H. Lamar Crosby.

27 D. Chr. 21.

28 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 43.

29 D. Chr. 27.

30 D. Chr. 28.

31 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 44.

32 Ael. Ar. *Orat.* 13.

33 D.Chr. 21.1, 5, 7, 21, 29, 38, 44.

34 D.Chr. 26.12.

are still instances in which it encompasses the entire citizen body.<sup>35</sup> Fourthly, although the political content of such formulae had already diminished, we can safely assume that the syntagma still conveyed a deep feeling of belonging to one's homeland, so poignantly illustrated by Dio's case: though he had strong citizen-ties with other Bithynian cities like Nicomedia, and Apamea,<sup>36</sup> he never uses ἄνδρες πολῖται when delivering a speech before these communities. It only appears in his lectures before the Prousians, and Prousa was his hometown.<sup>37</sup>

One particular case, that of the Pontic city Olbia/Borysthenes, attested both literary and epigraphically, sheds further light on citizens as a descent group. As it happens, the citizens of this particular polis are known under two ethnic denominations. One, Ὀλβιοπολίτης, based on the actual name of the polis, is most common in the decrees issued by the polis,<sup>38</sup> and in honorific decrees celebrating benefactors from Olbia.<sup>39</sup> Outside of Olbia, the ethnic name Βορυσθενίτης as applied to citizens from Olbia seems to be quite common. It appears in private inscriptions<sup>40</sup> as well as in the name of people coming from the town.<sup>41</sup> Dio Chrysostom also uses the same ethnic denomination in his speeches, when referring to the Pontic polis and its inhabitants.<sup>42</sup> Indeed, the evidence is scanty and spread over a long time lapse. We can presume, nonetheless, that, officially, the citizen group identified itself as *Olbiopolitai*, whereas in the rest of the Greek world, outside the official context, they were known under the ethnic name derived from the major topographic landmark, i.e. *Borysthenitai*. The choice of ethnonym is meaningful, as the former points to the "Greekness" of the citizens, while the latter stresses their borderline status as both Greeks and barbarians. In fact they are called by a name which is derived from the distant region rather than the polis.

If we regard citizen-communities as interest groups, according to Davies' distinction mentioned before, however, we see that the group is not as com-

35 See, for example, the use of ὦ ἄνδρες Ῥόδιοι and the fictitious address to the contemporary Lesbians, ἄνδρες Λέσβιοι, in Ael.Ar. *Orat.* 44.557, 564, 565 and 570, or that of ἄνδρες Ἀλεξανδρεῖς in D.Chr. 32.86, of ἄνδρες Ταρσεῖς in D.Chr. 34. 1, 7, 37.

36 Jones (2012) 214–218.

37 Cf. D.Chr. 23.1; 27.1; 28.1.

38 E.g. *I.Olbia* 5, 6, 7, 9, 14, dated in the Hellenistic period.

39 *IK Byzantion* 3, see below.

40 *FD* III, 3, 207—from Delphi dated 252/1BC; *SEG* 39, 568—from Amphipolis, dated 4th century BC.

41 See the case of the philosopher Bion, known as Βίων Βορυσθενίτης.

42 D.Chr. 19.

pact as the descent group. One example: as an interest group, citizens periodically received money in public distributions, *dianomai*, a Hellenistic practice that continued under the Roman Empire. From the second century AD onwards these distributions, in the majority of cases connected to euergetic acts, became more frequent and they were often apportioned according to adherence to political groups rather than based on citizenship alone. These uneven distributions were not an innovation developed under Roman rule, but, as Patrice Hamon<sup>43</sup> has shown, they date back to the Hellenistic practice of euergetism, in which specific parts of the civic body were favoured in benefactions. In the decrees of the second century AD, membership of the *boule*, of the *gerousia* etc. could give individuals more rights to be recipients of donations, as attested by the three successive money distributions in the Pamphylian town of Syllion over the course of the second century AD, offered by Megacles, and his mother, Menodora.<sup>44</sup> What seems to matter in these cases is the degree of political participation /distinction of each member of the civic body. An inscription from Histria,<sup>45</sup> dating from the second half of the second century AD, relatively well-preserved, implies that it is impossible to draw more general conclusions from these cases. The decree, honouring the priestess of Cybele *en titre*, Aba, for her multiple benefactions to the city, includes in the second half a list of her distributions (ll. 25 to 45). As in the case of Megacles, Aba's distributions are unequal, but this can be explained only in part through the different degrees of political participation among citizens. The members of the *boule* and of the *gerousia* belong to the first class of beneficiaries, i.e. those who receive money, while the representatives of the *phylai* fall into the second class, and they receive only wine distributions. However, as well as the members of the elite, the first class also includes professionals (physicians, teachers), members of religious fraternities (Ταυριασταίς), and individuals chosen by Aba herself (καὶ τοῖς ἰδίᾳ καὶ ἐξ ὀνόματος καλουμένοις). Likewise, the second class also includes professionals (singers and carpenters), members of another fraternity (Ἡρακλειασταίς), as well as people who live on the sacred road (ἱεροπτεῖταις). This final category seems to indicate that the category of persons included depended at least partially on the particular type of event celebrated. This one is related to the cult of Cybele, and, indeed, association with the goddess accounts for some of the professional categories involved.

43 Hamon (2005) 123–130; also Heller (2009) 356.

44 *IGR* III, 800; *IGR* III, 801; *IGR* III, 802.

45 *ISCM* 1, 57.



Despite the unequal character of the distribution of money or food among citizens, distributions were usually approved by the *boule* and by the assembly (ἡ βουλή και ὁ δῆμος). Formally, citizenship was never divided into different degrees. It remained the sole criterion that granted access to the political life of the polis and the first criterion that entitled people to be the recipients of distributions.

What does all this say about the social identity of the masses? First of all, the fact that in the obsolete language of public decrees, the institution of the *demos* was never abolished speaks at least of an artificial preservation of this collective identity. In other words, the label *P* designating citizens of *P polis* was never eradicated, so it could provide, upon specific occasions, the grounds for solidarity and shared identity. This closely mirrors the use of the formula *andres* + personal adjective of the polis in rhetorical language, as we have just seen. Secondly, the *demos* was entitled, precisely on the grounds of its citizen status, to public distributions. In this respect we should ponder on a line, sadly partially lost from Aba's decree: παρεπιδημούντων τινῶν τῶν τε π[ερὶ τὸν] δῆμον δυναμένων και τοῦ πλήθους ὡς ε [...]' of those who live alongside the citizens and the multitude of ...', where the *demos* is distinguished from foreign residents. Recovering the rest of the sentence would have helped us to understand more clearly who the groups excluded from public distributions were. Were they poor citizens, or more likely, were they another class of inhabitants, possibly those deprived of political rights such as foreigners and slaves? Thirdly, the increasing number of donations,<sup>46</sup> partially public, partially private in their nature, points to the fact that, on the whole, the communities felt the need to make up for the exclusion of a part of the citizen body from the political administration of the city. In order to maintain or recreate a shared identity, the elite had to invest in other forms of participation—of which public distributions are an example—ensuring the cohesion and sense of common membership in the civic body.

From the analysis of the two main official discourses of the polis—i.e. public speeches and public decrees—in the imperial period, we can draw a rather coherent image of the citizen body. The discourse of the public decrees proves that citizenship was the basis of political life. The drastically reduced political role of the citizens, also obvious from these texts, was compensated by the creation of other forms of shared interests, among which the economic aspect is salient. Similarly, the perspective conveyed in the works of the *rhetores* reaffirms the role of citizenship as the basic principle of political life, while at the

46 For the epigraphic dossier, see Ferrary and Rousset (1998) 299–301.

same time betraying its decaying state. The sense of belonging to a community and the attachment to one's homeland, *patris*, or, as it appears in legal texts, *origo*,<sup>47</sup> are called upon by *rhetores* to reinforce the social identity of the citizens as a group. Dio Chrysostom's case illustrates this situation convincingly.

I will now move on to another aspect, that is, the manner in which local citizenship coexisted with the widespread practice of accumulating citizenships in the Greek cities of the Roman East.

### 3 Multiple Citizenship and Individual Identity in the *poleis* of the Graeco-Roman East

Local citizenship, as we have seen, still played its role in the public life of the city. However, by the second century AD, an increasing minority could flaunt the granting of citizenships from *poleis* other than their own. This minority gathered together well-connected and wealthy aristocrats, rich merchants, as well as a heterogeneous group that included famous and respected *rhetores*, physicians, architects and artisans, athletes and other performers, whose common denominator was the fact that they were all professionals. These granted *politeiai* were not just honorific: they entailed, as Philippe Gauthier<sup>48</sup> warned us, also important benefits for their holder. In what follows, I will try to offer a few possible answers to the questions that immediately come to mind when faced with the reality of double or multiple citizenships: what purpose did they serve? Since the practice of seeking and acquiring multiple citizenships is usually attested in funerary or honorary inscriptions, I will focus on how some chose to represent themselves, and how they constructed their own public *persona*.

#### 3.1 *The Elite and Its Use of Multiple Citizenship*

The case of the Lycian magnate and benefactor Opramoas, with a minimum of eight recorded cities that had granted him citizenship,<sup>49</sup> offers a good starting point. Evoked on his funerary monument,<sup>50</sup> as well as on several honorary

47 *Dig.* 50.1.6.2 and 50.1.27, pr.; also Fournier (2012) 93.

48 Gauthier (1985) 150–176. On the Greek 'avarice' in awarding citizenship as opposed to Roman generosity, see Gauthier (1974) 207–215.

49 Corydalla, Myra, Patara, Xanthos, Tlos, Telmessos, Limyra and Phaselis, aside Rhodiapolis, his native town, see *TAM* II, 905, 578, 579, 907, 908, 915, 916, 1203; *FdXanth* VII, 66; *IGR* III, 704, 726, also Kokkinia (2012).

50 *TAM* II, 905—consisting of a selection of decrees, recommendations—*martyriai*—sup-

decrees issued by the cities he had assisted financially,<sup>51</sup> these citizenships are a straightforward indicator that they were integrated within a system of rewards and distinctions of the highest level. The Lycian towns record the granting of several citizenships to Opramoas at length<sup>52</sup> on stone, so that the passer-by would read it and be impressed. The listing of citizenships played a role in the process of show-casing the magnificence of the two sides involved: the magnate that had benevolently provided aid (as *euergetes*) to the city, and the city itself that rewarded him by including him in its restricted citizen body. J.A.O. Larsen notes that in Lycian decrees the syntagma πολιτης ἡμῶν ‘our fellow citizen’ could indicate ostentatiously an acquired secondary citizenship.<sup>53</sup> This is not always the case: Ctesicles, also known as Ctasadas the Second, is honoured publicly for holding numerous offices in the name of his sons in Idebessos.<sup>54</sup> The Lycian town is clearly his homeland, as neither him nor his wife and sons have an ethnonym attached to their names. Ctesicles is singled out by his own and his ancestors’ prominence among the Idebessians, and by his position in the province: ἀνὴρ γένει καὶ ἀξίᾳ πρῶτος τῆς πόλεως ἡμῶν, ἐπίσημος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει, ‘man foremost by ancestry and virtue of our town, remarkable also in the nation’. In this case, the fact that Ctesicles can trace his lineage back over several generations among citizens of Idebessos is signalled as an honour for the city along with the fact that he was renowned throughout the entire Lycian region (*ethnos*).

Let us return to Opramoas’ case. The Lycian magnate points out some aspects that seem to apply to members of the elite from different provinces of the Greek East. The listing of citizenships in his honorific decrees is a way of mapping the extent of his influence and social networks. We find, for example, the formula/title πολειτευσαμένος δὲ καὶ ἐν ταῖς κατὰ Λυκίαν πόλεσι πάσαις,<sup>55</sup> “having citizenship in all the cities of Lycia”, that clearly pins down geographically the magnate’s wider influence.<sup>56</sup> The title is a testimony to the public of its holder’s civic prominence in Lycia. It bears a greater weight than the praises commonly in use in this kind of decrees, such as “ἐπίσημος δὲ καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔθνει” “illustrious in the whole *ethnos*” in the Ctesicles decree mentioned above.

---

porting Opramoas’ claim to pre-eminence in Lycia before the emperor, and official letters, see Kokkinia (2000).

51 E.g. *TAM II*, 578–579—Tlos; *TAM II*, 1203—Phaselis; *FdXanth VII*, 66—Xanthos.

52 E.g. 4 lines out of 19 on the Xanthian decree just mentioned.

53 Larsen (1957) 14, 21. On the Lycian League, see Behrwald (2000) and Behrwald (2015).

54 *TAM II*, 838.

55 E.g. *TAM II*, 905, ll. 64–65.

56 Larsen (1957); Kokkinia (2012).

Another rather unique epigraphic sample, issued by the Doric polis of Byzantion and discovered in Olbia, similarly illustrates the practice of representing oneself as a benefactor on a regional scale. In this decree,<sup>57</sup> dating from the mid-1st century AD, the city of Byzantion honours Orontas, son of Ababos, citizen of Olbia, for his Pontic-wide benefactions. Admittedly, Orontas and his father are praised as citizens of Olbia, Ὀλβιοπολείτας, but the inscription only mentions, moreover, the granting of Byzantine citizenship to Orontas and his offspring. In addition to that, there is a phrase that evokes the broader context, the Pontic-wide stage of Orontas' interventions: ἀνδρὸς οὐ μόνον τᾶς πατρίδος, ἀλλὰ καὶ σύνπαντος τοῦ Ποντικῆς πρατιστεύσαντος ἔθνεος 'man foremost not only in his homeland but also among the whole Pontic *ethnos*'. This formula is not a title. In the inscription from Idebessos, the phrase appears in the opening of the decree, alongside other recognitions received by Ctesicles and his son and it applies to the father, but it is integrated also in his son's credentials.<sup>58</sup> In the decree for Orontas, by contrast, the status of 'first', which usually implies 'among fellow citizens', covers both the *patris* and the *ethnos*. Therefore, even more clearly than in the decree honoring Ctesciles, it does not indicate only civic prominence, but also a higher recognition on a broader scale, i.e. the Pontic *ethnos*. Given the local specificity of the Lycian titles,<sup>59</sup> and the differences between Lycia and the Pontic region, I will not push the parallels further. It suffices to say that, during the Imperial period, claims to civic prestige at a regional level were often made by members of the elite and that these claims were often showcased through the accumulation of citizenships from different *poleis*.

One other aspect exemplified by Opramoas' case is that the choice of ethnonyms on display may emphasize a special connection to a city or a region. As Christina Kokkinia<sup>60</sup> has recently suggested, Opramoas' preference in later years for the double ethnic denominations Ῥοδιαπολείτης καὶ Μυρεύς, may be due to a deliberate choice to highlight his ties locally, through connection with his fatherland, Rhodiapolis, and the main city of the area of Lycia he came from, Myra. By contrast, in the early years of his career, the presence of the ethnic designations of this father- and mother-lands, Ῥοδιαπολείτης καὶ Κορυδαλλεύς, should be explained by the need to strengthen his connections to his hometown Rhodiapolis and to the nearby Corydalla, home to his mother and her significant fortune, where he also held office.<sup>61</sup>

57 *IK Byzantion* 3, see Cojocaru (2010); Dana (2012) 262–263.

58 καὶ αὐτὸς ὡσπερ τὰ λοιπὰ τοῦ πατρός 'and him himself like his father for the rest'.

59 See most recently Kokkinia (2012) 332.

60 On Lycian titles, see Kokkinia (2012) 337–338.

61 *TAM* II, 905.

Cases of multiple citizenship holders can also be found in literary records. Depending on the specific context, Dio Chrysostom recalls, in his speeches, one or another of his Bithynian citizenships.<sup>62</sup> As for Arrian of Nicomedia, it is possible to sketch an analogous path to that attested by the epigraphic dossier of Opramoas. By piecing together the scraps of information available for Arrian, for the most part autobiographical, and complementing it with epigraphic material, one can reconstruct his biography: a Roman citizen by birth, as the name seems to imply,<sup>63</sup> Arrian probably started his career by assuming office in Nicomedia, his *patris*.<sup>64</sup> Later on, he directed his attention to the imperial scene, and, in doing so, he availed himself of Roman citizenship, obtaining the consulate in AD 129.<sup>65</sup> Sometime afterwards, he moved to Athens where he and his descendants are listed in the epigraphic records.<sup>66</sup> He received Athenian citizenship as he is registered in the Paiania *demos* and he assumed the office of eponymous archon.<sup>67</sup> The evidence finds support in his later work, where he defines himself as Athenian.<sup>68</sup>

### 3.2 *Professionals as Beneficiaries of Multiple Citizenship*

Whereas for the members of the elite, multiple citizenships were mostly used as a sign of distinction, signalling their holders' influence, prestige and connections in several cities, ordinary citizens, often professionals, sought them for more practical reasons.

I have already mentioned at various points the illustrious multiple citizen-status of Dio Chrysostom.<sup>69</sup> His case is most appropriate in this section, since the orator himself says that he received different *politeiai* by virtue of his profession as a counsellor.<sup>70</sup> His is, of course, not the only example: a funerary inscription, dated late second to early third century AD, from the Moesian city

62 E.g. D.Chr. 21.1—Nicomedia, 24.6—Apamea.

63 Syme (1982) 184.

64 See the biographical material in Photius, *Bibliotheca*, cod. 92, most likely a periphrasis on the introduction to the lost work *Bithynica*.

65 Degrassi (1952) 181.

66 *SEG* 30,159, 1; *IG* 11<sup>2</sup>, 2055; *SEG* 26, 171; *IG* 11<sup>2</sup>, 1773; *IG* 11<sup>2</sup>, 1776; *IG* 11<sup>2</sup>, 4251/3.

67 Cf. *IG* 11<sup>2</sup>, 2055; *SEG* 26, 171.

68 Arr. *Cyn.* 1.4–5.

69 Also Jones (2012).

70 E.g. D. Chr. 21.1. Cf.: Publius Aelius Antoninus Crispinus Metritimos, honoured as *rhetor* by a statue erected at Olympia, singled out in the inscription by his citizen status in Antiochia near Daphne, probably his *patris*, and in Cyzicus (*IvO* 463). Information on this *rhetor* is too scanty to allow any assumption about how he got his citizenships and what use he derived from them. Cf. also Puech (2002) 186–187.

of Tomis mentions an artisan, Pontianus, goldsmith or architect (or both?),<sup>71</sup> whose first ethnonym is lost. Pontianus was not a citizen of Tomis by birth but he received Tomitan citizenship and became a member of the tribe of the *Aicoreoi*. He probably settled in Tomis, where he also died. Further insights into the practice of granting citizenship to professionals is provided by a decree from Olbia, dated AD 198, which commemorates the construction of the public baths in honour of the emperors Caracalla and Geta.<sup>72</sup> In the final part of the inscription, unfortunately with the last lines missing, the architect is mentioned. The name is lost, but the final sentence tells us that he came from Nicomedia, and, at that time, he had Tomitan citizenship (ἀρχιτεκτονοῦν[τος τοῦ δεινός τοῦ δεινός], Νεικορμ[ηδέως] τοῦ καὶ Τομείτ[ου]). Most probably, he had lived and worked in Tomis, where he received his citizenship, before finding work in Olbia. His citizenship-record and his profession suggest that he used his Tomitan citizenship and local connections to find a job in Olbia.<sup>73</sup> We find him mentioned as the chief architect in one of the major construction works in that city.

In some cases, citizenship was conferred as a prize in competitions. Nothing illustrates this situation better than the case of the actor Titus Iulius Apolaustos, citizen of no less than seven *poleis*: πολίτην Ἀντιοχέων τῶν πρὸς Δάφνην, Ἐφεσίων, Ζβυρναίων {Σμυρναίων}, Κυζικηνῶν, Τρωαδέων, Σαρδιανῶν καὶ ἄλλων πολλῶν πόλεων.<sup>74</sup> The list of the cities appears on two honorary decrees along with other recognitions received by the actor, one discovered in Delphi, and the other, dated AD 180/192, is from Ephesus. Considering the impressive number of recognitions he received, Apolaustos must have been very popular at this time, and the list of *politeiai* was the proof of such popularity.

In a world where social relations and solidarity ensured success and, ultimately, the life of the individual, citizenship, which gave access to important social networks, could also help ordinary people from abroad to integrate in a new community and find work. Some cases recorded in peripheral areas of the empire of professionals from more centrally-located places may shed light on this aspect. In fact, among Olbitans, Tomitans, and Histrians, it is not rare to find professionals from abroad. In the second or first century BC a certain Diocles, son of Artemidoros, from Cyzicus is granted Histrian citizenship as a reward for his work as a public physician at Histria.<sup>75</sup> We cannot know if

71 χρυσοχόος Λ[...] [ἀρχι]τεκτόνω[ν, see *IScM* 11, 253, Dana (2012) 257.

72 *IosPE* 1<sup>2</sup>, 174.

73 Also Dana (2012) 257.

74 *FD* III 1, 553; *Ephesos* 1221, also Hijf (2012) 188.

75 *IScM* 1, 26. The inscription is however earlier than the other inscriptions we mentioned.

Diocles decided to settle there and become a local as the above-mentioned Pontius did. Sometimes professionals only stayed for a while and then moved on once a better job was secured, as the case of the Nicomedian architect with Tomitan citizenship working at Olbia suggests. Citizenship did help to enlarge social networks and this holds true for both elites and ordinary people alike.

#### 4 Representation of Multiple Citizen-Status on Public Statues

At this point, I would like to briefly discuss how multiple citizenship was “visually represented”, a question that brings together the initial discussion of citizenship as a form of social identity and the above-mentioned impact of multiple citizenships upon individual identity.<sup>76</sup> I will use as evidence a dossier of sculptural monuments found in their original location, and discuss how they displayed the public *personae* of those who commissioned them. In what follows, I will draw largely upon R.R.R. Smith’s excellent studies and dossiers.<sup>77</sup>

As Smith has convincingly argued, in the coded language of sculpture, clothing strongly reflects social and political status. During the second century AD, the standard representation of the Greek citizen consisted in the civilian *himation*-suit, with a tunic, associated with a standing position.<sup>78</sup> On the other hand, the toga ‘signified simply and forcefully Roman citizenship’, as Smith<sup>79</sup> puts it.

It is worth noting the link between the two different citizenships, Aphrodisian and Roman, displayed by a complex of two statues erected in Aphrodisias around the mid-late second, or early third centuries AD (see images on p. 130 and p. 131) and their inscriptions. The statues represent the local notables L. Antonius Claudius Dometeinus Diogenes and his niece Claudia Antonia Tatiane, both holders of priesthoods and of Roman citizenship. They are located on either side of the main doors of the city’s council building, the *bouleuterion*. The two figures wear Greek outfits, with pronounced citizen-traits in the statue of Dometeinus, represented standing in a *himation* suit, in the arm-sling posture, supported by a box of scrolls behind his feet, and wearing

76 On representation of identity in the Graeco-Roman East, see also Coşkun-Heinen-Pfeiffer (2009).

77 Smith (1998) and (2006). For representation of civic identity on statues of the Hellenistic age, see Ma (2013).

78 Smith (1998) 64.

79 Smith (1998) 65.

a trimmed beard, longer hair—indicating the priesthood—and the crown of the imperial cult. From the inscription, we know that Dometeinus was father of two Roman senators.<sup>80</sup> His niece, Tatiane, wears a mantle over a sleeved blouse or dress, perhaps a reference to Aphrodite, of whom she was priestess.<sup>81</sup> The two inscriptions that accompany the statues insist almost exclusively upon their Roman statuses,<sup>82</sup> that is, the senatorial rank of Dometeinus' sons and the equestrian rank of Tatiane's family and her kinship with the senators, sons of Dometeinus.

The two identities, i.e. the Greek Aphrodisian one betrayed by the outfit, and the Roman one emphasized in the inscriptions are almost completely separated. Indeed, the finding of the statues in their original archaeological context, with the corresponding inscriptions, places them in clear relation with one another and with the civic building whose façade they adorned—the city council. Otherwise, it would have been impossible to guess that the statue representing a clearly 'local, civilian, well-lettered, reserved, rhetorically capable'<sup>83</sup> man was that of a *nomothetes* who took most pride in his senators' sons. Placed at the entrance of the *bouleuterion*, the heart of the civic life of the polis, the local identity of the two figures is obviously the most salient feature on display in the monumental complex. Dometeinus and Tatiane stand out visually as prominent citizens of Aphrodisias. The inscriptions, however, present them as Roman citizens, members of the elite, closely related to, or belonging to, one of the two Roman *ordines*. This complex splendidly illustrates the role Roman citizenship and membership in the *ordines* played in the Roman East: they singled out their holders, distinguishing them among their peer and fellow citizens. Ultimately, the monument was intended for the Aphrodisian public whose citizens had to recognize Dometeinus and Tatiane as their fellow citizens and respect them for acquiring their high foreign status and distinction.<sup>84</sup>

80 Smith (1998) 67. Cf. Smith (2006) 174.

81 Smith (1998) 68.

82 *Aphrodisias* 233, 290. Mylonopoulos (2013) 138–139 also notes that the honorary inscription does not mention the priestly function of Dometeinus and he speaks of a discrepancy between statue and inscription. According to Smith (1998) 68 such function was obvious. On representation of priestly functions on statues in the Hellenistic and Roman period, see Horster-Klöckner (2013).

83 Smith (1998) 67.

84 Unfortunately, the cases in which statues are found *in situ* and their relation to the archaeological context is clear are rare. We could add to the list Celsus' library in Ephesus, Herodes Atticus' *nymphaeum* at Olympia, Philopappus' funerary monument in Athens,



## 5 Conclusions

At the end of this survey, we can draw some conclusions as to the practice of accumulating multiple citizenships. First of all, the situation outlined by the examples cited above reflects the total suppression of an important characteristic of citizenship, be it Roman or Greek, that of exclusivity, completed by the second century AD. While in the Late Republic Cicero claimed that *ne quis nostrum plus quam unius ciuitatis esse possit* ‘no one of our people can be a citizen of more than one city’,<sup>85</sup> and, much earlier, Aristotle defined the citizen-status as participation in justice and rule (πολίτης δ’ ἀπλῶς οὐδενὶ τῶν ἄλλων ὀρίζεται μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ μετέχειν κρίσεως καὶ ἀρχῆς ‘A citizen pure and simple is defined by nothing else so much as by the right to participate in judicial functions and in office’),<sup>86</sup> by the second half of the second century AD these views no longer matched the current practices of citizenship. Aelius Aristides praised Romans for their pragmatic use of granting citizenship, which allowed it to coexist with local citizenships in the Greek *poleis* and the duties and rights that they entailed, as his own case shows.<sup>87</sup>

Secondly, the implications of citizenship followed a complex trajectory, which was shaped by both local factors and by the changes brought about by the Roman conquest alike. Inter-community marriages and the spread of the treaties of *epigamia*, the institutionalization of euergetism from the Hellenistic period onwards, the contemporary widespread practice of employing external judges and rewarding them by grants of citizenship<sup>88</sup> are but some of the factors that affected the institution and concept of citizenship in the Greek East during the first two centuries of Roman rule. The granting of Roman citizenship, conferred more easily than citizenship in a Greek polis, which the Greek Dionysios of Halicarnassus<sup>89</sup> admired and praised, created a precedent for double citizenship. But the decisive factor that enabled the accumulation of citizenships in different *poleis* in the Roman East was the fact that the political life of the Greek cities under Roman rule was limited to the administration of their internal affairs. Since the cities could no longer—or hardly ever—wage

---

also discussed in Smith (1998) 70–79. In the case of Philopappus’ monument, Athenian status is celebrated alongside his royal Graeco-Macedonian-Syrian descent, but in sharper contrast with his Roman status.

85 *Balb.* 13.31, translated by C.D. Yonge; also *Leg.* 2.2.5. Cf. Carlà-Uhink’s paper in this book.

86 *Aristot. Pol.* 3.1275a, translated by H. Rackham.

87 *Orat.* 14.213.

88 Heller and Pont (2012) 10–11.

89 *AR* 1.9.4.

war against one another, the issue of loyalty and exclusive membership in only one polis lost its importance.

Citizenship was conferred upon by state decree, discussed in the assembly and sanctioned by the *boule*.<sup>90</sup> However, if the beneficiary decided to exercise the rights that came with it, this could lead to complications: Julien Fournier explores<sup>91</sup> the legal problems that could derive from the simultaneous exercise of two citizenships. More probably, multiple citizenships were sought after for the prestige and privileges they conferred. Roman citizenship was indeed the most valuable, for it offered the right to avoid local trials, a fact that even ordinary people, like veterans, could benefit from. Paul of Tarsus' use of his Roman citizenship is well-known in this respect.<sup>92</sup> Far more important advantages were access to imperial offices and to the *cursus honorum*. Herodes Atticus, Arrian of Nicomedia and Claudius Charax of Pergamum are but some of the most illustrious Greeks to have reached the consulate. In some cases, although this was not regular practice, as A.N. Sherwin-White has shown,<sup>93</sup> the granting of Roman citizenship included immunity from taxation. Even Greek citizenship proved useful to avoid taxes, as Aelius Aristides' case illustrates.<sup>94</sup> But it was not until the universal granting of Roman citizenship with the *Constitutio Antoniniana* of AD 212 and the establishment of the priority of the *origo* over the *domicilium*<sup>95</sup> in claiming the *munera* from citizens, that this legal issue concerning taxation was resolved.

There is, however, one last thing that we should bear in mind whenever we come across listings of citizenships. The impression that these lists served mainly to indicate political influence and prestige is partially due to the nature of our sources. Most of the evidence comes from funerary or honorary inscriptions, which, by their nature, retain only laudatory aspects, and testify to exchanges of mutual generosity between the two parts involved. This applies both to benefactors like Opromoas, and to the numerous cases of victorious athletes discussed by Hijf,<sup>96</sup> for which grant of citizenship come as prizes in competitions together with the award of crowns and statues. In short, while participatory citizenship generated collective identities, the enumeration of multiple citizen-statuses seems to reflect a desire to affirm one's singularity.

90 Gauthier (1985) 197–206.

91 Fournier (2012).

92 Mentioned in various places, e.g.: *Acts* 22.27–29—escapes torture; 25.8–12 asks for trial in Rome.

93 Sherwin-White (1973) 248, 272–277, 291–306, 336, 390–394—on the *Tabula Banasitana*.

94 Ael.Arist. *Orat.* 26. 338, cf. Bowersock (1969) 26–40; Fournier (2012) 90–91.

95 *Dig.* 50.1.17.4; Fournier (2012) 94.

96 Hijf (2012) 183.

## Bibliography

- Appiah, K.A. 2005. *The Ethics of Identity*. Princeton.
- Behrwald, R. 2000. *Der lykische Bund: Untersuchungen zu Geschichte und Verfassung—Bonn*.
- Behrwald, R. 2015. The Lykian League. In *Federalism in Greek Antiquity*, eds. H. Beck and P. Funke. 403–418. Cambridge.
- Birley, A.R. 1997. Hadrian and Greek Senators. *ZPE* 116: 209–245.
- Blok, J. 2013. Citizenship, the Citizen Body, and its Assemblies. In *A Companion to Ancient Greek Government*, ed. J. Blok, 161–175. Chichester.
- Bowersock, G. 1969. *Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire*. Oxford.
- Cojocaru, V. 2010. Von Byzantion nach Olbia: Zur Proxenie und zu den Außenbeziehungen auf der Grundlage einer Ehreninschrift. *Arheologia Moldovei* 32: 41–56.
- Coşkun, A., H. Heinen, S. Pfeiffer, eds. 2009. *Repräsentation von Identität und Zugehörigkeit im Osten der griechisch-römischen Welt*. Frankfurt.
- Dana, M. 2012. Pontiques et étrangers dans les cités de la mer Noire: le rôle des citoyen-netés multiples dans l'essor d'une culture régionale. In Heller—Pont (2012) 249–266.
- Davies, J.K. 1978. Athenian Citizenship: The Descent Group and Its Alternatives. *CJ* 73: 105–121.
- Degrassi, A. 1952. *I Fasti consolari dell'Impero romano dal 30 avanti Cristo al 613 dopo Cristo*. Roma.
- Demougin, S. 1999. L'ordre équestre en Asie Mineure. Histoire d'une romanisation. In *L'ordre équestre. Histoire d'une aristocratie (Ier siècle av. J.-C.–111e siècle ap. J.-C.)*, eds. S. Demougin, H. Devijver and M.-T. Raepsaet-Charlier. 579–612. Roma.
- Ferrary, J.-L. and D. Rousset. 1998. Un lotissement de terres à Delphes au 11e siècle apr. J.-C. *BCH* 122.1: 277–342.
- Fournier, J. 2012. L'essor de la multi-citoyenneté dans l'Orient romain: problèmes juridiques et judiciaires. In Heller—Pont (2012) 79–98.
- Gauthier, Ph. 1974. «Générosité» romaine et «avarice» grecque: sur l'octroi du droit de cité. In *Mélanges d'histoire ancienne offerts à William Seston*. 207–215. Paris.
- Gauthier, P. 1985. Les cités grecques et leurs bienfaiteurs (Ive–Ier siècle avant J.-C.). Contribution à l'histoire des institutions. *BCH Suppl.* 12: 1–236.
- Hamon, P. 2005. Le Conseil et la participation des citoyens: les mutations de la basse époque hellénistique. In *Citoyenneté et participation à la basse époque hellénistique*, eds. P. Fröhlich and Ch. Müller. 121–144. Genève.
- Heller, A. 2009. La cité grecque dépoque impériale: vers une société d'ordres. *Annales. Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 64: 341–373.
- Heller, A. and A.-V. Pont, eds. 2012. *Patrie d'origine et patries électives: les citoyennetés multiples dans le monde grec d'époque romaine*. Bordeaux.

- Heller, A. and A.-V. Pont. 2012. Introduction. In Heller—Pont (2012) 9–22.
- Horster, M. and A. Klöckner eds. 2013. *Cities and Priests. Cult Personnel in Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands from the Hellenistic to the Roman Period*. Berlin—Boston.
- Ma, J. 2013. *Statues and Cities: Honorific Portraits and Civic Identity in the Hellenistic World*. Oxford.
- Mylonopoulos, J. 2013. Commemorating Pious Service: Images in Honour of Male and Female Priestly Officers in Asia Minor and the Eastern Aegean in Hellenistic and Roman Times. In Horster and Klöckner (2013) 121–145.
- Nijf, O. van. 2012. Athletes, Artists and Citizens in the Imperial Greek City. In Heller—Pont (2012) 175–194.
- Jones, C.P. 2012. Joys and Sorrows of Multiple Citizenship: The Case of Dio Chrysostom. In Heller—Pont (2012) 213–221.
- Karolewski, I.P. 2010. *Citizenship and Collective Identity in Europe*. London.
- Kokkinia, C. 2000. *Die Opramoas-Inschrift von Rhodiapolis. Euergetismus und soziale Elite in Lykien*. Bonn.
- Kokkinia, C. 2012. Opramoas' citizenships: The Lycian *politeuomenos*-formula. In Heller—Pont (2012) 327–340.
- Larsen, J.A.O. 1957. Lycia and Greek Federal Citizenship. *SO* 33: 5–26.
- Laurence, R. 1998. Introduction. In *Cultural Identity in the Roman Empire*, eds. R. Laurence and J. Berry, 1–9. London.
- Puech, B. 2002. *Orateurs et sophistes grecs dans les inscriptions d'époque impériale*. Paris.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1973. *The Roman Citizenship*. Oxford.
- Smith, R.R.R. 1998. Cultural Choice and Political Identity in Honorific Portrait Statues in the Greek East in the Second Century A.D. *JRS* 88: 56–93.
- Smith, R.R.R. 2006. *Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias*. Mainz.
- Syme, R. 1982. The Career of Arrian. *HSCP* 86: 181–211.



FIGURE 4.1 *Honoric statue of Lucius Antonius Claudius Dometeinus Diogenes.*  
*Aphrodisias, ca. AD200*

PHOTO BY CAROLE RADDATO (CC BY-SA 2.0)



FIGURE 4.2 *Honoric statue of Claudia Antonia Tatiane. Aphrodisias, ca. AD 200*  
PHOTO BY CAROLE RADDATO (CC BY-SA 2.0)