

CITIZENSHIP IN ANTIQUITY

Civic Communities in the Ancient Mediterranean

Edited by
Jakub Filonik, Christine Plastow,
and Rachel Zelnick-Abramovitz

First published 2023

ISBN: 978-0-367-68711-3 (hbk)

ISBN: 978-0-367-68712-0 (pbk)

ISBN: 978-1-003-13873-0 (ebk)

Chapter 47

THE USES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE POST-ROMAN WEST

Javier Martínez Jiménez and Robert Flierman

CC-BY-NC-ND 4.0

DOI: 10.4324/9781003138730-56

The funder for this chapter is Netherlands Organisation for Scientific Research NOW

THE USES OF CITIZENSHIP IN THE POST-ROMAN WEST

Javier Martínez Jiménez and Robert Flierman

When the West-Roman Empire came to an end in the late fifth century, there had been roughly a millennium's worth of civic traditions in the West. In many cases, these traditions had pre-Roman, local origins. The Roman conquest had introduced new models of citizenship to incorporated territories, which had profoundly influenced, but never quite replaced, local civic traditions. As a result, citizenship had by the late Roman period become a deeply ingrained concept in the understanding of politics and identity in the provinces of the Western Empire, and neither the disappearance of the Roman state nor the emergence of the successor kingdoms could erase the relevance of civic culture.

It has been a recurrent shortcoming in the historiography of Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages to dismiss the importance of citizenship after the fall of Rome (cf. Rose 2021a; Pohl 2018) because of the implicit assumption that citizenship in this period referred either to the vestiges of an outdated Roman citizenship or to a Christian spiritual model of civic belonging that focused first and foremost on a world to come (see Rose in this volume). Building on recent attempts to reassess this orthodoxy,¹ this chapter presents an overview of the ways in which citizenship and civic language continued to be useful and meaningful in the post-Roman Latin West, covering the period from the fourth until the seventh century CE. It will start with a first section that briefly outlines the state of affairs in the late Roman Empire, when Roman citizenship still functioned within the legal and political framework of a Roman state. We will then move to the post-Roman West, for which we will address three successive points. In the second section, we discuss the continued use and development of Roman citizenship as a legal category *after* the disintegration of the West-Roman Empire; in the third section, the diverse and widespread role of local citizenships in the former Roman territories of the West; and in the last one, the appropriation and re-purposing of civic language in Christian discourse, the aims of which, we submit, were by no means exclusively spiritual (see Rose in this volume).

It deserves to be underlined that social identity in the early Middle Ages (as in Antiquity) was multi-layered (Halsall 2007; Pohl 2013; Reimitz 2015). Individuals could combine multiple identities, the salience of which depended on context and circumstances.

Being a citizen did not preclude other identities, nor would it have been relevant in all social interactions. However, as this contribution will show, citizenship continued to be a valid mode of identification and self-definition across the post-Roman West.

The Roman civic order in the late Roman Empire

The history of Roman citizenship is often told as a story of decline and dwindling relevance (Sherwin-White 1973; Nicolet 1980). What had once been a status of privilege aspired to by many but held by few devolved over the centuries into a self-evident accompaniment to free status, the lowest common denominator among the non-servile inhabitants of the Roman world. The consecutive stages of the process are well known: the collapse of citizen participation under the Principate; the emergence in the second century CE of a new social distinction among the free inhabitants of the Empire between those with means and standing (*honestiores*) and those without it (*humiliores*) (Garnsey 2004: 140), replacing citizenship as a marker of legal protection and entitlement; and finally, the Antonine Constitution of 212 (see Besson in this volume), through which the Emperor Caracalla extended citizenship status to all his free subjects, the point of no return on the road towards obsolescence (Ando 2016; Imrie 2018; Besson 2020). In this traditional narrative, indeed, Roman citizenship did not die with the collapse of the West-Roman Empire but several centuries before it. That Roman citizenship changed over time and became less relevant as a political identity and privileged legal status need not be disputed. But the focus on decline has served to obscure areas of life in the late Roman world in which Roman citizenship continued to be meaningful, even gained new momentum, that is, as a gateway to Roman private law, as a barrier separating citizens from aliens and slaves, and as a legal framework for marginalizing religious transgressors and others living under a stigma of infamy.² We will explore these areas in turn.

In terms of rights and privileges, the citizen of the fourth century CE undoubtedly found himself in a weaker position than the citizen of the first century BCE. It bears repeating, all the same, that the erosion of many such rights predated the late imperial period and that some had in practice been inaccessible to the majority of citizens from early on (Wallace-Hadrill 2020: 7). The right to vote in Rome's public assemblies and stand for office – the participatory side of Roman citizenship – had always been difficult to exercise for citizens residing outside of Rome (Lavan 2019: 22–31). In this sense, Rome's political institutions had ceased functioning as an avenue of genuine participation by the citizen body long before Augustus co-opted these institutions into the imperial system (Ando 2010).

Other civic rights show an equally slippery trajectory, even if the chronology varies. The citizen's traditional exemption from the poll and land taxes levied in the provinces was not fully abandoned until Diocletian's tax reforms in the late third century (Corbier 2005: 365). Yet previous emperors had already made serious inroads on it, by introducing new taxes on inheritance and manumission targeted at citizens, and by handing out citizenship grants to provincials that kept pre-existing tax obligations intact. It is quite conceivable, in fact, that the Antonine Constitution of 212 had also come with such a *salvo iure gentium* clause (Blanco-Pérez 2020). We know from the trials of the Apostle Paul that Roman citizenship could offer protection against public beatings, torture, and execution, while also allowing the citizen to appeal to the emperor in the face of unwarranted violence by a magistrate (*Acts* 22:22–29, 25:10–13; Adams 2009). Formally, these rights continued to be associated with citizenship at least until the

second century CE. After that, they appear to have become privileges of rank, of being a member of the *honestiores* (which did not necessarily require citizenship). In practice, as Peter Garnsey has rightly stressed, a citizen's ability to escape physical punishment or to appeal to the emperor would always have been contingent on social standing and influence (Garnsey 1970: 260–71). There were certain types of crime, moreover, such as treason, magic and, from the fourth century onwards, heresy, that could result in torture no matter one's status or standing (Garnsey 1970: 103–152).

Without doubt, the most persistent right tied to Roman citizenship was access to Roman private law, which governed such crucial areas of life as marriage, property, commerce, and inheritance (Garnsey 2004: 138; Besson 2017: 209–215; Atkins 2018: 67). Naturally, the significance of such access would have differed for each citizen. The Romans accepted and even facilitated the use of alternative legal systems in the localities of the Empire, and there is plenty of evidence to suggest that even those with citizenship status continued to avail themselves of this option long after 212 (see, e.g., Humfress 2013; Mathisen 2014; Ando 2016). Still, not having access to Roman law, or being deprived of such access by way of punishment, could have severe economic and social repercussions, as we will see shortly.

Beyond the erosion of the citizen's legal rights, the decline of Roman citizenship as a valid marker of differentiation is often linked to its increasing universality: when virtually everyone was a Roman citizen after 212, it naturally stopped being a salient form of identification. Recent scholarship has nuanced this claim on two counts. First, that the late Empire continued to be inhabited by a large and diverse body of non-citizens. Slaves, for one, had not been enfranchised by the Antonine Constitution and remained a ubiquitous presence in the late Roman household (Grey 2011). If anything, the increasing use of Roman law in the wake of 212 resulted in an unprecedented outpour of imperial rescripts and juridical literature on the correct procedures regarding slavery and manumission (Harper 2011: 367–390). Such material calls our attention to another category of non-citizen that survived into the late Empire and even beyond: the Junian Latin (Corcoran 2011). This was a type of free status acquired when a slave was freed outside the formal rules and regulations set for manumission. While Junian Latins enjoyed limited access to Roman law (Koops 2013: 116), they were barred from making a will, meaning that upon death, their property reverted to their former master (or the public treasury). 'They live as free men, but die as slaves', as one Christian commentator put it (Salv. Mass. *Ad eccl.* 3.7.34; Harper 2011: 465–467). A final group of non-citizens were the so-called *dediticii*, which included both manumitted slaves with criminal records and enemies of Rome who had surrendered unconditionally. It is a matter of ongoing debate whether the Antonine Constitution contained a provision explicitly excluding the *dediticii* from its citizenship grant (see for discussion Imrie 2018: 66–72). Certain is that the *dediticii* persisted into the late Empire, as yet another category of free person deemed unfit for citizenship status (Wallace-Hadrill 2020: 8).

A second case against the universal character of Roman citizenship in the late Empire can be found, paradoxically enough, within the citizenship body itself, among the citizens who lived under a form of legal disability. As shown by Jane Gardner, this technically covered the majority of citizens in the Roman world, ranging from women and children to freedmen and the so-called *infames* (Gardner 1993). In the Republican period, *infamia* had been a status reserved for tried criminals; a civic demotion for those crimes that did not incur total loss of liberty (Harper 2013: 47–49). By the third century CE, the stigma of *infamia* had become inherent to morally dubious occupations like gladiators, pimps, prostitutes, tavern owners, and undertakers. *Infames*, like the other legally disabled

groups mentioned above, were citizens, but were denied certain rights in the public and private sphere, for example, they could not act as accusers in a trial, they could not stand for office, they were not allowed to marry high-ranking citizens, and the children born from *infames* women could not be legitimized (*CTh* 4.6.3; Kuefler 2007).

The disenfranchisement of morally compromised citizens took on new urgency under Constantine I and his Christian successors, who began to legislate against individuals and groups perceived to fall short of the newly emerging Christian orthodox norms (Lo Nero 2001). This was not a strictly linear development, nor was it born out of a single-minded imperial ambition to redefine Roman citizenship along Christian lines (Noethlichs 2006; Humfress 2008; Escribano Paño 2009; Flierman and Rose 2020). Programmatic statements were certainly made on occasion, such as Theodosius I's famous *cunctos populos* of CE 380, which declared that all peoples under Roman rule should live in accordance with the Nicæan Creed (*CTh*, 16.1.2; 16.2.25). By and large, however, imperial legislation was reactionary and situational: emperors were prompted by petitioners or decided for their own strategic reasons to intervene in the status, rights, and freedoms of certain groups of unorthodox citizens, often within the confines of specific cities such as Rome and Constantinople. This could take various forms (Flierman and Rose 2020: 74–76). Some measures were aimed at closing down avenues of religious and political participation: heretics and pagans were denied the right to hold religious ceremonies (*CTh*, 16.5.3–4; 16.5.6; 16.10.2; 16.10.25) and banned from enlisting in the imperial service (*CTh*, 16.5.29; 16.10.21). A second line of attack was to deny religious deviants access to vital areas of Roman private law. Theodosius I forbade apostates and Manichaeans to make a will or receive an inheritance (*CTh*, 16.7.1; 16.5.7). His son Honorius went further still, denying Manichaeans and affiliated heretical groups the right to own, buy, or sell, and confiscating their property in the process (*CTh*, 16.5.40). A third approach was to altogether ban religious deviants from civic space, a treatment that was reserved, above all, for the ‘disease’ of heresy with its ‘polluting’ influences (Escribano Paño 2018: 70–73; 2009: 46–47). Officials were ordered to throw heretics out of their cities (*CTh*. 16.5.12–14, 16.5.18, 16.5.20, 16.5.29–30, 16.5.62). Some heretical leaders who were deemed particularly dangerous to public order found themselves permanently banished to remote islands under a formal sentence of *deportatio*, which came with complete loss of citizenship status (*CTh*. 16.4.3; 16.5.34; 16.5.45; 16.5.57–58; Washburn 2012: 30–60). Through such incremental acts of marginalization, Christian emperors sought to refashion the Roman civic body, yet another indication that the continued salience of Roman citizenship in the late Roman period relied heavily on its potential to exclude and to draw up legal, social, and spatial boundaries.

The inherent complexities of the late Roman civic order are perhaps best seen in the way the traditional non-Roman (the ‘barbarian’) was integrated into the Roman administration. The Roman army had always relied on recruits from beyond the frontier to bulk up numbers, and this was particularly true in the late Roman period, when the reform of the army created a military administration separate from the civilian one. This, on the one hand, kept senators from leading troops, but on the other, meant that non-Roman leaders rose to unprecedented positions of political and civic prominence, obtaining the rank of senator and even consul (Halsall 2007: 101–111). By this period, however, military service in itself did not grant citizenship, which had traditionally been one of the main ways for foreigners to obtain *civitas Romana*. Instead, barbarian veterans acquired the status of freeborn (*laetus* or *gentilis*) upon being discharged, through which they were incorporated within the late Roman civic order but without

the full rights of the citizen, *de facto* operating as many of the other non-elite free inhabitants of the Empire (Liebeschuetz 1998: 138; Mathisen 2006: 1022–1038).³ In the late fourth and fifth centuries, this system was pushed to new limits, when the Roman army, rather than recruiting barbarian individuals into their ranks, began to incorporate entire groups as military units under a treaty (*foederati*). In terms of civic prerogatives, this shifted the balance in favour of the barbarians, for even if these troops and their families did not achieve citizen status by virtue of service, they obtained other privileges that many citizens did not enjoy, above all a public salary and exclusion from taxation (Faber 2013: 125–128). Moreover, while many of these groups (Visigoths, Burgundians, Vandals, etc.) were Arian Christians, their federate status meant that they were not in danger of suffering the civic impediments imposed on other heretics.

Over the course of the fifth century, Rome gradually lost control over its western provinces (Figure 47.1). Barbarian kings – many of whom had previously served as



Figure 47.1 Map of Europe in the 480s CE. ©2021 Mappa mundi cartography.

generals in the Roman army – took over as the new authorities on the ground, supported by provincial elites who preferred the opportunities offered by a local barbarian court over allegiance to a distant emperor. Roman administrative and legal institutions did not immediately collapse upon the emergence of these post-Roman kingdoms. In some, they continued more or less unhampered. But Roman citizenship in the West was no longer guaranteed by a single Roman state. The effect, as we will see, was fragmentation: the significance of being a Roman citizen came to be contingent not just on social rank and moral behaviour, but also on the polity in which one resided.

Roman citizenship and legal Romanness after Rome

Under the late Empire, Roman citizenship had functioned as a legal status, providing access to Roman private law and other (legal) actions and instruments denied to non-citizens. This legal understanding of Roman citizenship persisted into the early Middle Ages. Indeed, from a strictly legal perspective, we can assume that most of the new kingdoms established on Roman territory over the course of the fifth century continued to be inhabited by large populations of Roman citizens for several generations. Yet the meaning of such citizenship and the political framework in which it functioned underwent significant changes. Most importantly, Roman citizens now found themselves under barbarian rule and their legal position defined by barbarian law, or more often, by Roman law that was sanctioned by a barbarian ruler. As a result of this, such prestige and benefits as had still been attached to citizenship status under the late Roman Empire came to be subjected to further erosion. The Roman citizen continued to have access to Roman legal procedure and law, with its refined juridical instruments for property-transactions and inheritance (Esders 2018: 329–331). Up to the seventh century, elite Romans also continued to dominate the new civil bureaucracy and the higher offices of the Catholic Church (see, e.g., Patzold 2014; Liebeschuetz 2015: 211; Bjornlie 2016). Yet such rights and entitlements were offset by drawbacks; for example, Romans carried a heavier tax burden than non-Romans and would often find themselves excluded from the most prestigious military and administrative offices (Amory 1997: 53–54; Halsall 2018: 55).

Their precise situation came, at any rate, to vary from kingdom to kingdom. In Ostrogothic Italy, Roman law was open to all subjects, whether they were Romans or Goths (Lafferty 2013: 54–100), while in northern Gaul, the position of the Roman citizen was from early on defined by Frankish rather than Roman law, which treated it as a second-rate legal status (Bothe 2018). In Britain, rapid de-Romanization meant that Roman citizenship quickly ceased to be a meaningful legal category at all, though the language of citizenship remained a powerful rhetorical resource (Jones 2001). Roman citizenship, in short, persisted into the early Middle Ages but lost its uniform character.

How did one become a Roman citizen in this rapidly decentralizing post-Roman world? As before, the most straightforward route was through descent, by being born to two parents with citizenship status (Esders 2018: 327). The majority of free inhabitants of the late Empire had been Roman citizens, and so as a result were their descendants who lived under barbarian rule (Mathisen 2006: 1036–1038). For many in the early Middle Ages, Roman citizenship thus functioned as a default status: a self-evident concomitant to being a free member of the non-barbarian population, to being a *Romanus*. A second route to citizenship was through manumission. Manumission into citizenship had been an established Roman practice. It was an area of

Roman law, moreover, on which jurors and legislators had always lavished special care and attention (Gardner 1993: 7–51). Early medieval legislators continued to be preoccupied with this area of Roman law, but they developed it in diverging directions that reflected the needs and circumstances of the different successor kingdoms. A seventh-century East-Frankish law code, for example, took care to distinguish between three different forms of manumission, only one of which would result in Roman citizenship (*LR*, 64 [61]; Bothe 2018: 361). In late Visigothic law, by contrast, it seems to have been standard procedure to free all slaves to the status of Roman citizen (*Form. Visig.* 2–6).

Significantly, early medieval laws and formularies used the term *cives Romani* almost exclusively in the context of manumission (Rio 2009: 67–164).⁴ In other contexts, they simply referred to Romans (*Romani*) as a legal category distinct from Franks, Goths, or even *barbari*. Such usage suits the rhetorical purpose of these law codes, establishing a neat legal landscape inhabited by distinct peoples or ethnic groups. Moreover, because Roman citizenship was largely transmitted through descent, it was possible and perhaps even logical to conceptualize ‘the Romans’ as just another ethnic group (cf. Pohl 2018: 24–33). Overall, it would seem that these legal texts were trying to adapt the late Roman legal framework to the new circumstances, and while most of the implications of Roman citizenship were preserved, these had to fit in a world where the Romans were no longer in charge. In such a world, Romanness as a legal status (the traditional domain of citizenship) no longer needed to be expressed with civic language, hence *Romani* rather than *cives Romani*.

When it came to defining the civic rights of these *Romani*, the ‘Roman outside a Roman state’ conundrum solicited different responses across the West. Moreover, the legal situation of *Romani* was under constant renegotiation. Take, for instance, the *Liber Constitutionum*, a collection of royal laws issued by the Burgundian kings before their kingdom fell to the Franks in the 530s (Wood 2016: 4–7). To an extent, these laws express what has been called a ‘legal dualism’, with Burgundians and Romans being entitled to different legal procedures. Cases between two Romans should be heard by Roman judges who should apply Roman law (*LC, Prima Constitutio* 8). Yet social and legal interaction between Romans and Burgundians was clearly expected to occur: when a case involved members of both groups, royal rather than Roman law was to be applied (*LC, Prima Constitutio* 13). Interestingly, the royal laws of the *Liber Constitutionum* show a sense of legal parity. Knocking out the teeth of a freeborn Roman required the same monetary compensation as knocking out those of a Burgundian freeman (*LC*, 26). Rank (as defined by gender, age, office, and free status) was deemed more important than Romanness. The legal situation in the Burgundian kingdom was, at any rate, open to change. The laws collected in the *Liber Constitutionum* covered several decades. There are signs that by the time the code was redacted c. 516, ethnic barriers were starting to crumble and legislation was taking on a more territorial character (Amory 1993: 8–10). The label *populus noster* (our people), at first a synonym for Burgundians in royal legislation, could by the early sixth century cover all inhabitants of territories subject to the king.

The laws of the Visigothic kingdom present us with a more long-term perspective on the regional development of Roman citizenship. Like in the Burgundian kingdom, the Visigothic kings initially addressed the needs of their Roman and Gothic subjects with both royal edicts and updated Roman law. Euric’s *Code* is the first example of compiled royal edicts (dated to the 470s). These were created to address the specific

circumstances derived from the Gothic settlement and, as such, applied to the whole population. His son Alaric II issued his *Breviary* in 506, collecting excerpts and titles from various late imperial law codes, accompanied by *interpretationes* explaining their relevance and meaning in a contemporary setting. Among the Roman laws incorporated in the *Breviarium*, and updated for continued use, was a fourth-century imperial edict forbidding intermarriage between Roman citizens and barbarians (*CTh* 3.14.1; Liebeschuetz 1998: 139–140). This claim of segregation was not fully upheld in practice even in 506 (Mathisen 2006: 1030–1032), and subsequent generations took steps to dismantle this legal fiction. Firstly, when Liuvigild lifted the ban on intermarriage in the 570s, partly because it had already been disregarded left and right (*LV* 3.1.1), and then more definitively with the conversion to Catholicism of his successor Reccared. It is unclear whether Goth and Roman were still two different legal categories at that point: Liuvigild's *Codex Revisus* is usually considered to have applied across the kingdom (Alvarado Planas 2011). Goth and Roman were still useful rhetorical labels to underline certain aspects of identity: in the eyes of contemporaries, someone like Claudius, the duke of Visigothic Lusitania in the 580s and 590s, was a Roman aristocrat where his lineage and legal status were concerned, a Catholic when he cracked down on his Arian neighbours, and a Goth when he led a victorious army against the Franks (*VPE*, 5.10.6–7; John Bicl. *Chron.* 218; Buchberger 2017: 59–61). By the mid-seventh century, however, when Recceswinth promulgated his *Liber Iudiciorum* (or *Lex Visigothorum*), the aim was to create a unifying Catholic narrative for the kingdom (Kelly 2016–2017). In this code, royal law became default territorial law, reducing Roman citizenship to a basic free status without any further legal or civic advantages.

In Burgundy and Spain, Roman citizenship gradually transformed. In other regions, like northern Francia, it was actively marginalized and replaced. The Merovingian kings never issued a law code that applied to their whole kingdom. Rather, as Merovingian authority came to spread over Gaul and the surrounding regions, they maintained the legal systems they found in place. Thus, in Aquitaine, late antique Roman and Visigothic practices remained dominant, while in post-conquest Burgundy the 'dual' legal system developed under the Burgundian kings was allowed to persist (Esders 2018: 333–334). The Frankish heartlands in northern and eastern Gaul did give rise to their own law codes, which applied to both Franks and Romans. Significantly, these codes consistently relegated Romans to an inferior legal position (Bothe 2018). As early as the fifth century, the *Lex Salica* established the *wergild* (monetary compensation) of a free land-owning Roman at half that of a Frankish freeman, effectively placing the former at the level of Frankish *liti* (freedmen). The seventh-century *Lex Ripuaria* continued this line (c. 40 [36]), while simultaneously limiting the accessibility of Roman legal status. Replacing personal with territorial law, the *Lex Ripuaria* treated all those born in Ripuaria (the Rhineland region around Cologne) as Ripuarians, regardless of the background of their parents or ancestors (Figure 47.2). The principal road to Roman legal status that was left open in the seventh-century Rhineland was through manumission: a slave freed under Roman law would become a *civis Romanus* (c. 64 [61]). However, as a freedman, he would also have an inferior *wergild* and social status under the *Lex Ripuaria*. Laws like this were part of a wider process of ethnic engineering taking place in northern Gaul, which made it more advantageous, socially and legally, to identify as Frank than as Roman (Reimitz and Esders 2021; Halsall 2018: 51–56). And indeed, by the seventh century, Frankish identity had become the norm above the Loire, even among those whose ancestors had considered themselves Roman citizens (Halsall

The uses of citizenship in the post-Roman West



Figure 47.2 Map of Europe in the 620s CE.

2003: 47). By this period, in northern Gaul, citizenship was used to highlight local and Christian forms of belonging rather than the legal status associated with Romanness.

If Merovingian Gaul sees the marginalization of Roman citizenship and the discontinuity of legal Romanness, post-Roman Italy is an example of the contrary. During the Ostrogothic period, both Goths and Romans lived under the same Roman common law (*Var.* 8.3; 9.18.2: *Gothis Romanisque apud nos ius esse commune*). This is a pattern very similar to the Burgundian/Visigothic system. It is generally agreed in the literature that the Ostrogoths (and Theoderic in particular) tried to consolidate Roman provincial law in Italy (*Var.* 9.19.1), maintaining Roman citizenship as a legal and social category distinct from Ostrogoths, who acted as a separate military ‘caste’ under the pre-existing late Roman social ranking system (Lafferty 2013: esp. 56–57, 157). Roman citizenship was thus preserved on terms that were highly similar to those of the late

Roman Empire (with all Italic provincials being Roman citizens). This legal landscape fitted the rhetoric of continuity cultivated by the Ostrogothic monarchy (esp. *Var.* 1.1; Cellurale 2011; Wallace-Hadrill 2022).

The East-Roman emperor Justinian thought differently. In the early 530s, he launched a military campaign against the Ostrogothic Kingdom, signalling clearly that he did not consider the Amal dynasty legitimate continuators of the West-Roman imperial order. Two decades of destabilizing warfare brought only parts of Italy under East-Roman control. Following a strategy he had recently pursued in Vandal Africa (*Nov. app.* 7.11), Justinian sought to reintroduce ‘untarnished’ Roman law in these conquered Italian territories. The *Pragmatica sanctio* of 554 acknowledges that Italy and the Empire are part of the same body (*unum corpus*) and, as such, it was to be under direct imperial law (*iura insuper vel leges codicibus nostris insertas, quas iam sub edictali programme in Italiam dudum misimus, obtinere sancimus*). This implied the imposition of Justinian’s recently published *Corpus iuris civilis* and, with it, the confirmation of Roman citizenship as the main form of civic and legal identity in Byzantine Italy. From the middle of the sixth century onwards, Roman citizenship in Italy was defined once more by a Roman state (Greatrex 2000; Cellurale 2011; more generally on Roman citizenship in the East, Chrysos 2003: 126–130).

With the disintegration of the Empire in the West, Roman citizenship entered a prolonged process of fragmentation. It continued to be a legal status that could confer certain rights and privileges, but its precise implications and importance differed from kingdom to kingdom, as this brief survey of the legal codes has shown. In some kingdoms, Roman citizenship developed into a default rank for free subjects of the king, whereas in others it quickly dissolved into a secondary status. In still other regions, it stopped being a meaningful category at all. The gradual erosion and regionalization of legal Romanness in the early Medieval West did open up other avenues of civic expression. Even under the Empire, Roman citizenship had been only one form of civic belonging. Citizenship had originally denoted membership of a city. Indeed, even Roman citizenship had never abandoned its link to the city of Rome (cf. Maskarinec 2013). It is to this local understanding of citizenship and its renewed salience in the post-Roman West that we now turn.

The relevance of locality

Already in the first century BCE, Cicero had highlighted the conundrum of dual citizenship within the Roman system in his discussion of the two *patriae* (Farney 2007: 2–8). In his *De legibus*, Cicero mentions that town dwellers have two fatherlands (*municipibus duas esse censeo patrias*), ‘one by nature (*naturae*) and one by citizenship (*civitatis*)’ (*Cic. Leg.* 2.5). Of course, Cicero referred specifically to the situation of the Italians, newly enfranchised in the wake of the Social Wars, but his take remained relevant during the imperial period. As Rome extended its political control over the Mediterranean, it incorporated cities with local citizenships into its administrative order, leading to a complex structure of incorporated towns, allied cities, and colonial foundations. It was in Rome’s nature to preserve local civic orders and this did not change with the *Constitutio Antoniniana* which, as we have seen, preserved local judicial particularities (Girdvainyte 2014: 39–41; Andrades Rivas 2017: 66–67).

With the political disintegration of the Empire in the West, the local dimensions of citizenship and civic language became more pronounced. In early medieval contexts,

citizens are frequently defined as members of an urban community. For Isidore of Seville, for instance, that great compiler of late antique knowledge and scholarship, the link between citizen and city was easy and self-evident (*Etym.* 9.4.2–6):

Citizens (*cives*) are called such because they live together (*quod in unum coeuntes vivant*) so they may live more honourably and safer. The house is the dwelling of one family, just like the city is of one people (*sicut urbs unius populi*) ... the people (*populus*) is the totality of the citizens, including the city elders (*senioribus civitatis*).

Isidore was indulging in archaizing definitions: Cicero had defined the citizen along very similar lines (cf. *Cic. Resp.* 1.25.40). Yet it was more than antiquarianism: across the West, we have numerous examples of civic language used both to identify individuals as members of an urban community and to define municipal communities as a whole from the fourth century onwards (Mathisen 2006: 1016).

Already in the fourth century, Ausonius underlined in his writings his status of *civis* and his rank of *consul* of Bordeaux (*Auson. Ordo nob. urb.* 20), even if he was an imperial tutor and consul in 379. Other examples of individuals being identified as local citizens can be found in funerary inscriptions. From the fourth century we know of Aur(elius) Aeliodorus, a citizen of Tarsus and neighbour of Seville (*civis Tarsus Cili-cia(e) commorans Ispali*; ICERV 196), and Eustacius from Trier, who is described as a *civis Surus* (RICG I.32b). The examples become more common in the post-Roman period: Cantiori(us), citizen of Gwynedd (*Vene{d}otis cive(s)* [sic]; Charles-Edwards 2012: 177) in northern Wales, Rustecius of Gévaudan (*cive Gabaletana*; Merten 2018: 83–84) buried in Trier, Alethius of Lyon (*ordine princeps Lugduni ... [c]ivis qui fuerit*; RICG 15.11), and Samon of Toulouse (*civis Tolosianus*; *AE* 1978: 422). Significantly, in all these cases the inscriptions were not found in the town or region of which citizenship was claimed. We are dealing with outsiders who were buried away from their hometown, in another city or region, yet nevertheless considered it useful to identify themselves as citizens of their former community. We encounter a similar mechanism of identifying an individual by his community in chronicles and other written sources of the period. Here, however, it is the narrators who describe individuals as citizens in order to identify where they come from, like Sidonius Apollinaris' friend Lampridius (*Sid. Apoll. Epist.* 8.9.3), Agrippinus of Narbonne (*et comes et civis*; Hydat. 212), Lupus of Tours (*urbis Turonicae civis*; *Greg. Tur. Hist.* 5.13), or the British martyrs Julius and Aaron (*legionum urbis cives*; *Gildas*, 2.10). Highlighting the connection between an individual and their community through citizenship was a relatively common phenomenon. Whether it was done by the individuals themselves, or by another witness, it has to be understood in a context where belonging to a civic community was politically and socially relevant.

Naturally, identifying an individual as belonging to a different community presupposes that the local community defines itself as such, and that it uses community affiliation and belonging as a way of distinguishing the 'us' from the 'them'. It is clear from the sources that urban populations are seen as citizens and described in terms of citizenship. To name a few, Hydatius, Sidonius, Cassiodorus, Gregory of Tours, Venantius Fortunatus, and Isidore of Seville all use *cives* to describe townfolk in their writings. The same can be inferred from council acts (e.g., Orleans V [549], 3; Tours II [567], 5, Toledo IV [633], 19) and Visigothic law (e.g., *LV* 1.13, 1.2.4).⁵ In a period when

individual and group definitions were under constant re-assessment due to processes of state formation and ethnogenesis (Halsall 2007; Pohl 2018), locality appears as a salient layer of identity, which makes sense because place-based identities are more resilient to historical change and provided continuity in a time of rapid transformation. Townsfolk in this period looked at their local urban environment as a point of reference, because their cities offered a defining connection with the past and links to an established community in a time of rapid change. City dwellers shared amongst themselves localized memories and traditions in ways that outsiders did not and could not understand (Martínez Jiménez 2020).

Politically-active urban communities that defined themselves in civic terms continued to exist throughout the late Roman and post-Roman centuries. The administrative changes implemented by Diocletian and Constantine had transformed local government and tax collecting (Ward-Perkins 1997), but there was still a municipal rule in the fourth century that was the focal point of local, civic life (*contra* Liebeschuetz 1992). In the late Empire, the local *cursus honorum* formed the civil stepping-stones from which to access a position in the imperial bureaucracy (Curchin 2014). Most municipal duties fell on the *curiales* (the old *decuriones*), the members of the town council who kept cities running with their liturgies and *ex officio* payments. The duty towards local councils was closely regulated, with imperial legislation punishing those *curiales* who moved to another city without paying their dues (cf. *CTh* 12.1.9 and 12.1.12). But beyond the elite, enfranchised urban populations were still envisaged as part of the civic body, for technically, at least, the city was ruled by the *consilium primatum municipumque*, the ‘decision of the notables and town dwellers’ (*CTh* 12.1.4).

This situation continued into the early Middle Ages, as is perhaps best exemplified by Ostrogothic Italy, where the degree of rupture with the Roman imperial past was less evident than elsewhere in the West. Cassiodorus refers recurrently to civic language in his letters (Cosentino 2018; Wallace-Hadrill 2022). His letters appeal to the citizens’ love for their hometown (e.g., *Var.* 1.21.1: *amor patriae*), to their local duty (3.10, 7.44), and even to civic charity (3.49: *caritas civica*), but his sixth-century view is perhaps best encompassed in the conclusion of one of his letters (9.2): ‘to every citizen, their [own] city is the state (*unicuique civi urbs sua res publica est*)’.

These letters were addressed to the members of the town councils, who are described as the *primarii civitatis, ordo, maiores, seniores* or *senatores*, although they are usually referred to in the modern literature as the *curiales*; the backbone of municipal government. There is, in fact, plenty of evidence for urban administration elsewhere in the West. Municipal magistrates appear in Visigothic legislation (Curchin 2018; Fernández 2020); they are not only prominent in Salvian (Wallace-Hadrill 2019) but also present in Gaul into the eighth century (Barbier 2014). Local government should be seen behind the maintenance and regulation of municipal infrastructure, like water supplies (Marano 2015; Martínez Jiménez 2019), road and drainage systems (Ruiz Bueno 2018), and civic centres (Esmonde Cleary 2013: 100–123; Heijmans 2018). Even the dismantling or transformation of spectacle buildings must have happened under some degree of supervision (Underwood 2019: 149, 181–194). Local councils might have also been involved in the construction of *palatia* and other late antique administrative buildings that substituted the old basilicas, like those of Mérida, Barcelona, or perhaps Wroxeter, where a new timber building with a possible public function was built on the forum (Crabtree 2018: 20–36; Fafinski 2021; Martínez Jiménez et al. 2018: 170–173).

The devotion of urban elites towards their city is an example of community commitment that underlines the deep connection between townscapes and their inhabitants (Lalli 1992). These municipal leaders might have invested their time and resources out of *amor patriae* or *caritas civica*, as Cassiodorus suggests, but we have to remember that the citizen body was their power base. Traditional magistracies might have disappeared (substituted by centrally-appointed figures like the count), but local citizens still played a role in nominating, electing, and approving officers. Late Roman civic positions like the *defensor civitatis*, the *adsertor pacis*, the *numerarius* (LV 12.1.2), and even counts (*comites*) were in many cases dependent on popular support in this period. This sometimes resulted in clashes between factions, as portrayed in colourful detail by Gregory of Tours (*Hist.* 5.48, 8.58, 8.18). In many cases, local citizenship and a local *cursus honorum* were a prerequisite for these higher offices (Fernández 2020). The same could be said about episcopal elections. The ancient church fathers had emphasized that a new bishop should have the *consensus* (agreement) of the community, meaning the clergy of the vacant see and its citizens. This norm continued to be upheld in early medieval church councils.⁶

Even if the post-Roman centuries did not witness the same level of private munificence and elite display (like statue dedications) as before, this does not mean that cities did not form active political communities, as we have seen. Furthermore, local citizenships were not only a way of defining urban communities by their own right, but they also served to represent the community against the central administration. Even in second-ranking cities without a clear display of late antique civic architecture, citizenships existed as the basis for town councils, which acted as intermediaries between the city and the monarchy, and it is through this interaction with the central administration that local citizenships were validated.

Cassiodorus' administrative correspondence is an oft-cited example of direct interaction between the royal, central government and the local, municipal powers. But this was the standard throughout the West. In Gaul and Spain, we see cities sending emissaries (usually bishops) to the court to demand justice or claim privileges like tax exemptions (Greg. Tur. *Hist.* 5.28, 9.30; *Var.* 3.40, 42, 4.20; Toledo XIII, can. 3). Post-Roman kings also demanded oaths of allegiance from cities and offered levies (citizen militias) to the royal armies (Greg. Tur. *Hist.* 2.37, 4.30; Jul. Tol. *Hist. Wamb.* 8). It is commonly accepted in the literature that cities were key to the functioning of the successor kingdoms. This implies, on the one hand, that municipal governments collaborated with the royal administration, and on the other hand, that kings acknowledged *civitates* as urban communities. In fact, in the Visigothic kingdom, the monarchy was responsible for promoting secondary towns to city status and for the foundation of cities *ex novo* in those areas where there were no pre-existing urban communities (Martínez Jiménez et al. 2018: 173–178).

Urban populations in the post-Roman centuries used local citizenships to link themselves to their past and to validate their position as a civic community. Citizenship was a way of marking belonging and distinguishing alterity. Powerful and salient though such local civic affiliations could be, they were not exclusive. Early medieval identity, as already said, was multi-layered, and so by extension was early medieval citizenship. Many of the local citizens discussed in this section would in a legal context have identified as Romans. In fact, even their membership of an urban community was open to multiple interpretations. For Christians, their true *patria* was said not to be on earth but beyond. They should aim to be citizens of the City of God, the Heavenly Jerusalem.

This Christian interaction with the language of citizenship, and its paradoxical implications, will be the focus of the next section.

Christian definitions of citizenship

Throughout the post-Roman West, Christian authorities turned to the language of citizenship to address and shape their communities (Rose 2021a and in this volume). The Roman world had generated a rich Latin discourse on citizenship which early medieval Christians had no trouble appropriating, re-purposing, and reshaping. By 500 CE, this was no longer uncharted territory, of course. Medieval authors could draw inspiration and guidance from an extensive patristic legacy, most importantly the Latin translations of the Bible. Indeed, the Scriptures proved to be an authoritative resource for early medieval thinking about the city and the citizen, but also an ambivalent one, generating multiple and potentially contradictory models of Christian belonging.

The biblical world is a world of cities and citizens (Wilson 1986; Dale et al. 2012: 361–379). From *Genesis* to *Revelation*, the foundational stories of Christianity tend to be set in an urban landscape. As a model for Christian thinking about citizenship, two biblical themes proved particularly influential (Ottewill-Soulsby 2022). First, the focus on the city as a locus of sin *and* salvation. The Bible commences with a number of iconic stories involving cities, almost all of which carry negative associations: Caïn founding the first city after his fratricide (*Genesis* 4:17); the vain effort of the Tower of Babel (*Genesis* 11:4); and the depravities of Sodom (*Genesis* 18:24). Indeed, in the eyes of the prophets, even Jerusalem, the City of God, became a sinful city under Israel's kings, worthy of the destruction that befell her at the hands of Babylon (*Isaiah* 1:21, 64:10; *Jeremiah* 6:6, 19:8–15; *Ezekiel* 24:6–9). Yet as stressed by those same prophets, she also carried within her a unique promise of future restoration (*Isaiah* 1:26, 62:7–12; *Jeremiah* 33:13–16; *Ezekiel* 40–48). According to the Christian theology, the fulfilment of this promise was set out in *Revelation*, with its elaborate description of the New Jerusalem descending from heaven to serve as an eternal dwelling place for the faithful – a city perfectly proportioned in accordance with ancient urban ideals (*Revelation* 3:12, 21:2–27; Haverfield 1913: 55).

A second and related theme was the Bible's subversive approach to belonging, particularly the suggestion that to become a citizen of the Heavenly Jerusalem one had to be prepared to live as a stranger on earth. The roots of this idea went back to ancient Israelites' frequent displacements in the Old Testament (*Genesis* 12:10, 15:13, 23:3–4; *Exodus* 22:21, 23:9), but the suggestion was cultivated to a fuller extent in the New Testament epistles. In 1 Peter, the apostle famously addresses his dispersed Christian audience as 'foreign visitors and resident aliens' (1 Peter 2:11: *advenas et peregrinos*), implying that, on some fundamental level, being a Christian meant being an outsider (Dunning 2009: 12). At the same time, as the apostle Paul suggested in another paradigmatic phrase, embracing Christ brought access to a new and infinitely more meaningful civic identity: 'Now therefore you are no more guests and foreign visitors: but you are citizens with the saints and members of God's household' (*Ephesians* 2:18–19: *ergo iam non estis hospites et advenae sed estis cives sanctorum et domestici Dei*).

The scriptural ideal of alien citizenship made for a 'marvellous paradox', yet its practical implications for Christian society were far from straightforward (Greer 1986: 39). Nor was it a paradox that patristic authorities like Augustine were necessarily keen on

resolving, preferring instead to develop a complex theory of dual belonging (Vanderjagt 2013). Evidently, the principal loyalty of the Christian was to a world to come: the Heavenly Jerusalem, the *civitas caelestis*, the *patria superna*. This sense of belonging to the city beyond is clearly visible also in the development of funerary rites and eulogies, which from Venantius Fortunatus (*Carm.* 4.7, 4.27, 7.12.50) to Bede (*Hist. Eccl.* 1.26, 4.23) celebrate the *civitas caelestis*. But allegiance towards the City of God did not absolve the Christian from earthly duties and obligations. ‘Without a road the traveller cannot reach the fatherland’, Caesarius of Arles assured his episcopal congregation in sixth-century Gaul (*Sermo* 190.3: *sine via redire ad patriam non poterat peregrinus*). For Caesarius, travelling the road not just meant keeping to the correct faith and abstaining from sin; it also involved public charity and actively partaking in the urban liturgy. In other words, reaching the heavenly homeland required civic participation on earth (Rose 2021b).

Caesarius implicitly calls our attention to another paradoxical feature of the Christian ideal of alien citizenship: its ambivalent relationship to other ‘earthly’ forms of community. Christianity had universal aspirations that transgressed political and territorial boundaries. Membership of the City of God was defined not by birth or law, as with Roman citizenship, but by baptism, virtue and, depending on one’s theological leanings, divine election. ‘The heavenly city’, as Augustine put it, ‘calls forth citizens from all peoples and assembles a society of strangers from all languages, with little care for differences in customs, laws and institutions’ (*De civ. D.* 19.17: *haec ergo caelestis civitas...ex omnibus gentibus cives evocat atque in omnibus linguis peregrinam colligit societatem, non curans quidquid in moribus legibus institutisque diversum est*). Yet in practice, Christian civic ideals tended to be asserted and acted out in the context of specific earthly communities.

Far from standing in opposition to Roman or local civic affiliations, therefore, Christian models of citizenship came to exist alongside them and even to be mapped onto them. We have seen already how from the fourth century onwards, Christian emperors started experimenting with making Christian orthodoxy a precondition for exercising full legal rights, working towards a polity in which a Roman citizen was, by definition, a Christian. We see something similar happening in the late antique and early medieval city, where bishops like Caesarius sought to remodel the civic community and its constitutive practices along Christian lines. Building projects, food-donations, funerals, festivals, elections for office, the ransoming of citizens from captivity, they all continued into the Middle Ages. But such ‘urban dramas’ increasingly revolved around Christ, the bishop, and the saints (Loseby 1996: 64–67; with Rapp 2014 on the East-Roman world).

A few more words need to be said here about the saints, for they proved in many ways the perfect embodiment of the Christian civic ideal, with all its inherent tensions and paradoxes (Brown 2013: 109; Rose, this volume). Take the hagiographical corpus surrounding the enigmatic saint Severinus, who was active in late fifth-century Noricum – modern central Austria and northern Slovenia (Figure 47.1) – right when it transformed from a Roman province into barbarian territory. As recalled by his hagiographer Eugippius, Severinus was notoriously evasive about his own social standing and background. When a friendly priest had finally plucked up the courage to ask the saint where he was from, Severinus had first responded with a very Roman joke – do you think I am a runaway slave? – only to follow up with a stern Augustinian reprimand: earthly ties meant little to a servant of God; his sole focus should be on good works and, divine grace permitting, ‘to be enrolled as a citizen of the heavenly fatherland’ (Eugip. *Ep.* 9.20: *supernae patriae civis adscribi*). Understandably, no one

dared ask Severinus about his *terrena patria* thereafter. Yet despite the sentiments of its protagonist, the *Vita Severini* is a text deeply concerned with earthly citizenship, to the extent that it can be read almost as a blueprint for how to act as a civic community in a rapidly de-Romanizing world (see, e.g., Wood 2001; Diesenberger 2001; Ward-Perkins 2005: 17–20). The saint's efforts were almost exclusively centred on Noricum's towns and cities (*oppida, civitates*), whose citizens (*cives, Romani*) he assisted against barbarian raids, natural disasters, and theological fallacy. Again and again, the fate of the *cives* is shown to have depended on how well they followed the saint's instructions to perform a list of public duties. Most of these duties were of the type invoked also by the bishops of Arles – charity, poor-relief, paying tithes, ransoming captives, communal fasting, and praying – but they could extend beyond explicitly Christian activities. In one notable episode, the saint instructed the citizens of Lauriacum to collectively man the city walls at night, thereby miraculously scaring off the barbarian force lying in hiding in the vicinity (Eugip. *VS* c. 30). Even if holy men like Severinus preferred themselves to live as strangers on earth, they inspired civic behaviour, in person and through the 'persuasive literature' (Kreiner 2014: 2) that developed around them.

The late antique and early medieval city constituted a crucial site for the development of Christian civic ideals. Yet it should be underlined that such ideals did not necessarily require an urban landscape. By way of conclusion, let us turn to sub-Roman Britain, arguably the most de-urbanized of the former territories of the Empire (Fafinski 2021), which nonetheless gave rise to striking examples of Christian civic discourse. There is the well-known letter of admonition that St Patrick wrote to the Romano-British warlord Coroticus and his men sometime in the fifth century (Thompson 1980). Though Christians themselves, they had dared to kill some Christian captives and sell others as slaves to the pagan Scots and Picts. For Patrick, this constituted a profound betrayal of all sorts of communal ties – political, religious, and moral – which he encapsulated using the language of citizenship: 'on account of their evil deeds, I do not say "to my fellow-citizens", nor "to the fellow-citizens of the Roman saints", but "to the fellow-citizens of daemons"' (*Epistola ad Corotici*, c. 10: *non dico civibus meis neque civibus sanctorum Romanorum sed civibus daemoniorum ob mala opera ipsorum*; see Snyder 1998: 77–78; Charles-Edwards 2012: 227).

We encounter still more elaborate use of civic rhetoric in the work of Gildas. Writing in the early sixth century in the wake of the continental migrations to Britain, Gildas crafted a multi-layered invective – part historical narrative, part letter of exhortation, part biblical florilegium – in which he hectored Britain's moral failings. Rather than frame the Britons in ethnic terms, he consistently described them as citizens (*cives*) of a shared homeland (*patria*) (Flierman and Welton 2021; Turner 2009). Inspired by the scenes of urban destruction found in the Old Testament, he framed this *patria* as a land of once splendid cities, which had been reduced to ruin due to their citizens' vice. His hopes for the future were similarly scriptural. If the Britons and their leaders would return to virtue, that is, if they would re-embrace military valour, Christian charity, and loyalty to each other and to God, they could avoid further disaster and save the *patria*. God willing, it might make them citizens of Heavenly Jerusalem (Gildas, c. 110: *deus ... municipes faciat ... civitatis Hierusalem caelistis*).

Gildas stands as a final example to the potency of civic rhetoric in the early Medieval West and the ease with which Christian authorities harnessed such rhetoric for their own ends. From southern Gaul and Italy to Pannonia and Britain, Christian bishops,

preachers, and historians came to redefine what it meant to be a citizen from a biblical and Christian perspective. The resulting models of citizenship could be made to stand in opposition to other political and civic loyalties or they could be mapped onto them, reconceptualizing the city or the polity along new religious lines. Regardless, such Christian rhetoric came to have a profound, and by no means exclusively spiritual, impact on the communities of the late Roman and post-Roman world. The Christian might have his true homeland in the hereafter with the angels and the saints, but reaching this homeland required an earthly civic performance, which in breadth and scope, if not in form, could be remarkably similar to the demands placed on the ancient citizen.

Conclusions

Early medieval approaches to citizenship and civic language were profoundly shaped by late Roman civic traditions. There had existed many forms of citizenship in the Roman world, many of which continued into the early Middle Ages. But they did not remain unaltered. This is exemplified by the diverging trajectories of Roman citizenship in the early Medieval West. Their shared point of departure was the late Roman civic system. Without the presence of a Roman state to promote, define, and uphold a uniform understanding of what it meant to be a Roman citizen, however, legislators across the West were free to develop their own legal understanding of Roman citizenship and its associated rights and duties. By the seventh century, Roman citizenship could thus simultaneously denote being a free subject of the Visigothic kings and being a second-rate inhabitant of northern Gaul.

In truth, there were as many forms of Roman citizenship in the early Medieval West as there were successor polities. The early medieval city, meanwhile, constituted another fertile ground for claims of civic identity and belonging. And here, too, citizenship could entail different and potentially competing things. Being a citizen of a city still signified local civic values and municipal responsibilities. But such loyalty to one's city was complicated by other allegiances: just as Roman citizenship had been an indicator of belonging to a Roman state, post-Roman urban communities carried financial and military obligations towards the new barbarian rulers. Finally, urban citizenship was increasingly influenced also by Christian ideals of community: being a citizen meant performing Christian rituals and duties under the supervision of bishops and saints. In fact, while it was in cities that Christianity's impact on civic ideals was most concrete, this impact could extend beyond urban contexts. Framing Christians as *cives* whose principal *patria* was the Heavenly Jerusalem was a rhetorical strategy that was employed also, and quite spectacularly so, in the more de-urbanized regions of the early medieval world.

Citizenship, in short, was not a marginal phenomenon in the early Medieval West. Nor was it a mere left-over from the Roman period, passively received and slowly allowed to peter out. Post-Roman societies found in the concept and language of citizenship a powerful resource that they engaged with actively, on their own terms and for their own specific needs. There was continuity in such engagements, certainly, as well as profound change and even breakdown. But even in the most de-Romanized of the successor kingdoms, the citizen remained a recognizable and meaningful category, which could convey diverse and sometimes contradictory claims of belonging.

Abbreviations

- AE* = *L'Année épigraphique*
Bede Hist. Eccl. = Bede, *Historia ecclesiastica*
Caes. Arel. Sermo = Caesarius of Arles, *Sermones*
CTh = *Codex Theodosianus*
Epistola ad Corotici = Patrick, *Epistola ad Corotici milites*
Eugip. Ep. = Eugippius, *Epistula ad Paschasium*
Eugip. VS = Eugippius, *Vita Severini*
Form. Arv. = *Formulae Arvernenses*
Form. Bit. = *Formulae Bituricenses*
Form. Tur. = *Formulae Turonenses*
Form. Visig. = *Formulae Visigothicae*
Gildas = Gildas, *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*
Greg. Tur. Hist. = Gregory of Tours, *Histories*
Hydat. = Hydatius, *Chronica subita*
ICERV = J. Vives (1963). *Inscripciones Cristianas de la España Romana y Visigoda* (Barcelona)
Isid. Hisp. Etym. = Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*
John Bicl. Chron. = John of Biclar, *Chronica*
Jul. Tol. Hist. Wamb. = Julian of Toledo, *Historia Wambae regis*
LC = *Liber Constitutionum sive Lex Gundobada*
LR = *Lex Ripuaria*
LRB = *Lex Romana Burgundionum*
LV = *Lex Visigothorum*
MGH Conc = *Monumenta Germaniae Historica, Concilia*
RICG = H. Marrou, et al. (1975–). *Recueil des Inscriptions Chrétiennes de la Gaule antérieures à la Renaissance carolingienne* (Paris)
Salv. Mass. Ad eccl. = Salvian of Marseilles, *Ad ecclesiam*
Var. = Cassiodorus, *Variae*
Ven. Fort., Carm. = Venantius Fortunatus, *Carmina*
VPE = *Vitae Sanctorum Patrum Emeritensium*

Notes

- 1 See Brélaz and Rose (2021); Flierman and Welton 2021; Ottewill-Soulsby and Martínez Jiménez (2020); Wallace-Hadrill (2020); Welton (2020).
- 2 Overall discussed in Garnsey (2004), Lo Nero (2001), Mathisen (2006), Wallace-Hadrill (2020).
- 3 Cf. other non-veteran Barbarians living within the Empire using Roman law (Dolganov 2019).
- 4 For specific examples, *LR* c. 64 [61]; *LRB* 3; *LV* 12.2.13–14; *Form. Visig* 2–6; *Form. Arv.* c. 3–4; *Form. Bit.* c. 9; *Form. Tur.* c. 12.
- 5 Gallic councils compiled in Maasen (1883); Hispanic councils compiled in Martínez Díez and Rodríguez (1966–2002).
- 6 Toledo IV [633], 19; Orleans IV [538], 3; Orleans V [549], 2; Paris [556], 8, etc.; cf. Castellanos (2003) and Loftus (2011).

Bibliography

- Adams, A. (2009) 'Paul the Roman citizen: Roman citizenship in the ancient world and its importance for understanding Acts 22:22–29', in S.E. Porter (ed.) *Paul: Jew, Greek, and Roman* (Leiden) 309–326

- Alvarado Planas, J. (2011) 'A modo de conclusiones: el *Liber Iudiciorum* y la aplicación del Derecho en los siglos VI a XI', *Mélanges de la Casa de Velázquez* 41–2, 109–127
- Amory, P. (1993) 'The meaning and purpose of ethnic terminology in the Burgundian laws', *Early Medieval Europe* 2.1, 1–28
- (1997) *People and identity in Ostrogothic Italy, 489–554* (Cambridge)
- Ando, C. (2010) 'Citizenship, Roman' in M. Gagarin (ed.) *The encyclopedia of ancient Greece and Rome* (Oxford)
- (2016) 'Introduction. Sovereignty, territoriality and universalism in the aftermath of Caracalla' in C. Ando (ed.) *Citizenship and Empire in Europe, 200–1900: the Antonine Constitution after 1800 years* (Stuttgart) 7–27
- Andrades Rivas, E. (2017) 'La transformación de la ciudadanía romana en el fin del Imperio', *Revista de Estudios Histórico-Jurídicos* 39, 61–83
- Atkins, J.W. (2018) *Roman political thought* (Cambridge)
- Barbier, J. (2014) *Archives oubliées du haut moyen âge: les gesta municipalia en Gaule franque (VIe – IXe siècle)* (Paris)
- Besson, A. (2017) 'Fifty years before the Antonine Constitution: access to Roman citizenship and exclusive rights', in L. Cecchet and A. Busetto (eds) *Citizens in the Graeco-Roman world: aspects of citizenship from the archaic period to AD 212* (Leiden) 199–220
- (2020) *Constitutio Antoniniana: l'universalisation de la citoyenneté romaine au 3^e siècle* (Basel)
- Bjornlie, M.S. (2016) 'Governmental administration', in J. Arnold, M.S. Bjornlie, and K. Sessa (eds) *A companion to Ostrogothic Italy* (Leiden) 47–72
- Blanco-Pérez, A. (2020) 'Salvo iure gentium: Roman citizenship and civic life before and after the Constitutio Antoniniana', *Al-Masāq* 32.1, 4–17
- Bond, S. (2014) 'Altering infamy: status, violence, and civic exclusion in Late Antiquity', *ClAnt* 33, 1–30
- Bothe, L. (2018) 'From subordination to integration: Romans in Frankish law' in Gantner et al. (2018) 345–369
- Brélaz, C. and E. Rose (eds) (2021) *Civic identity and civic participation in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages* (Turnhout)
- Brown, P. (2013) *The rise of Western Christendom: triumph and diversity, A.D. 200–1000*, 2nd edn (Malden, MA)
- Buchberger, E. (2017) *Shifting ethnic identities in Gaul and Spain, 500–700* (Amsterdam)
- Castellanos, S. (2003) 'The significance of social unanimity in a Visigothic hagiography: keys to an ideological screen', *JECS* 11.3, 387–419
- Cellurale, M. (2011) 'Romani y Gothi en Italia; la comunione de derecho en la Republica Unida de Justiniano', *Rev. Derecho Privado* 21, 21–40
- Charles-Edwards, T. (2012) *Wales and the Britons* (Oxford)
- Chrysos, E. (2003) 'The Empire, the *gentes* and the *regna*', in H.-W. Goetz, J. Jarnut and W. Pohl (eds) *Regna and gentes: the relationship between late antique and early medieval peoples and kingdoms in the transformation of the Roman world* (Leiden) 13–20
- Corbier, M. (2005) 'Coinage and taxation: the state's point of view, A.D. 193–337' in A. Bowman, A. Cameron, and P. Garnsey (eds) *The Cambridge Ancient History*, vol. 12 (Cambridge) 327–392
- Corcoran, S. (2011) "'Softly and suddenly vanished away": the Junian Latins from Caracalla to the Carolingians' in K. Muscheler (ed.) *Römische Jurisprudenz - Dogmatik, Überlieferung, Rezeption: Festschrift für Detlef Liebs zum 75. Geburtstag* (Berlin) 129–152
- Cosentino, S. (2018) 'Istituzioni curiali e amministrazione della città nell'Italia ostrogota e bizantina', *AntTard* 26, 241–254
- Crabtree, P. (2018) *Early Medieval Britain: the rebirth of towns in the post-Roman West* (Cambridge)
- Curchin, L. (2014) 'The role of civic leaders in late antique Hispania', *SHHA* 32, 281–304
- (2018) 'Curials and local government in Visigothic Hispania' *AntTard* 26, 225–240
- Dale, A. et al. (2012) *Encyclopedia of the Bible and its reception*, vol. 5: *Charisma – Czaczkes* (Berlin)
- Diesenberger, M. (2001) 'Topographie und Gemeinschaft in der Vita Severini', in W. Pohl and M. Diesenberger (eds) *Eugippius und Severin. Der Autor, der Text und der Heilige* (Vienna) 77–97
- Dolganov, A. (2019) 'Reichsrecht and Volksrecht in theory and practice: Roman justice in the province of Egypt (P. Oxy. II 237, P. Oxy. IV 706, SB XII 10929)' *Tyche* 34, 27–60

- Dunning, B. (2009) *Aliens and sojourners: self as other in Early Christianity* (Philadelphia)
- Escribano Paño, M.V. (2009) 'The social exclusion of heretics in Codex Theodosianus XVI', in J.-J. Aubert and P. Blanchard (eds) *Droit, religion et société dans le Code Théodosien* (Geneva) 39–66
- (2018) 'Superstitiosa coniuratio soluat: Jovinian's exile in Cod. Thds. 16.5,53 (398)', in D. Rohmann, J. Ulrich, and M. Vallejo (eds) *Mobility and exile at the end of antiquity* (Berlin) 69–90
- Esders, S. (2018) 'Roman law as an identity marker in post-Roman Gaul (5th–9th centuries)', in Gantner et al. (2018) 325–344
- Esmonde Cleary, S. (2013) *The Roman West, AD 200–500: an archaeological study* (Cambridge)
- Faber, E. (2013) 'How foreign soldiers became more important than Roman citizens: the development of difference in status between Julius Caesar and Theodosius I', in D. Álvarez, R. Sanz, and D. Hernández (eds) *El espejismo del bárbaro. Ciudadanos y extranjeros al final de la Antigüedad* (Castellón) 115–130
- Fafinski, M. (2021) *Roman Infrastructure in Early Medieval Britain: the adaptations of the past in text and stone* (Amsterdam)
- Farney, G. (2007) *Ethnic identity and aristocratic competition in Republican Rome* (Cambridge)
- Fernández, D. (2020) 'Transformaciones institucionales y liderazgo cívico en la Hispania post-imperial', in A. Carneiro, N. Christie and P. Diarte (eds) *Urban transformations in the late antique West: materials, agents, and models* (Coimbra) 259–279
- Flierman, R. and E. Rose, (2020) 'Banished from the company of the Good: Christians and aliens in fifth-century Rome' *Al-Masāq* 32.1, 64–86
- Flierman, R. and M. Welton (2021) 'De Excidio Patriae. Civic discourse in Gildas' Britain' *EME* 29.2, 137–160
- Gantner, C., C. Grifoni, W. Pohl and M. Pollheimer (eds) (2018) *Transformations of Romanness: Early Medieval regions and identities* (Berlin)
- Gardner, J. (1993) *Being a Roman citizen* (London)
- Garnsey, P. (1970) *Social status and legal privilege in the Roman Empire* (Oxford)
- (2004) 'Roman citizenship and Roman law in the late Empire', in S. Swain and M. Edwards (eds) *Approaching Late Antiquity: the transformation from early to late Empire* (Oxford) 133–155
- Girdvainyte, L. (2014) *Roman law, Roman citizenship, Roman identity? Interrelation between the three in the late Republic and the early Empire*, MA diss. Leiden (unpublished)
- Greatrex, G. (2000) 'Roman identity in the sixth century', in S. Mitchell and G. Greatrex (eds) *Ethnicity and culture in Late Antiquity* (Swansea) 267–92
- Greer, R. (1986) 'Alien citizens: a marvellous paradox', in P. Hawkins (ed.) *Civitas: religious interpretations of the city* (Atlanta) 39–56
- Grey, C. (2011) 'Slavery in the late Roman world', in K. Bradley and P. Cartledge (eds) *The Cambridge world history of slavery*, vol. 1 (Cambridge) 482–509
- Halsall, G. (2003) *Warfare and society in the barbarian West 450–90* (London)
- (2007) *Barbarian migrations and the Roman West, 376–568* (Cambridge)
- (2018) 'Transformations of Romanness: the North Gallic case', in Gantner et al. (2018) 41–58
- Harper, K. (2011) *Slavery in the late Roman world, AD 275–425* (Cambridge)
- (2013) *From shame to sin: the Christian transformation of sexual morality in Late Antiquity* (Cambridge, MA)
- Haverfield, F. (1913) *Ancient town planning* (Oxford)
- Heijmans, M. (2018) 'L'entretien des centres civiques dans les provinces occidentales de l'Empire (IVe-VIIe siècles)' *AntTard* 26, 73–84
- Humfress, C. (2008) 'Citizens and heretics: late Roman lawyers on Christian heresy', in E. Iricin-schi and H. Zellentin (eds) *Heresy and identity in late Antiquity* (Tübingen) 128–142
- (2013) 'Thinking through legal pluralism: 'forum shopping' in the later Roman Empire', in J. Frans, J. Duindam, and J. Harries (eds) *Law and Empire: ideas, practices, actors* (Leiden) 223–250
- Imrie, A. (2018) *The Antonine Constitution: an edict for the Caracallan Empire*, Impact of Empire 29 (Leiden)

- Jones, M. (2001) 'The legacy of Roman law in post-Roman Britain', in R. Mathisen (ed.) *Law, society, and authority in Late Antiquity* (Oxford) 45–57
- Kelly, M. (2016–2017) 'Recceswinth's *Liber Iudiciorum*: history, narrative and meaning' *Visigothic Symposia* 1, 110–130
- Koops, E. (2013) 'Masters and freedmen: Junian Latins and the struggle for citizenship', in G. de Kleijn and S. Benoist (eds) *Integration in Rome and in the Roman world*, Impact of Empire 17 (Leiden) 105–126
- Kreiner, J. (2014) *The social life of hagiography in the Merovingian Kingdom* (Cambridge)
- Kuefler, M. (2007) 'The marriage revolution in Late Antiquity: the Theodosian code and later Roman marriage law', *Journal of Family History* 32.4, 343–370
- Lafferty, S. (2013) *Law and society in the age of Theoderic the Great: a study of the Edictum Theoderici* (Cambridge)
- Lalli, M. (1992) 'Urban-related identity: theory, measurement, and empirical findings', *Journal of Environmental Psychology* 12, 285–303
- Lavan, M. (2019) 'The foundation of Empire? The spread of Roman citizenship from the fourth century BCE to the third century CE', in K. Berthelot and J. Price (eds) *In the crucible of Empire: the impact of Roman citizenship upon Greeks, Jews and Christians* (Leuven) 21–54
- Liebeschuetz, W. (1992) 'The end of the ancient city', in J. Rich (ed.) *The city in Late Antiquity* (London) 1–49
- (1998) 'Citizen status and law in the Roman Empire and the Visigothic kingdom', in W. Pohl and H. Reinitz (eds) *Strategies of distinction: the construction of ethnic communities* (Leiden) 131–152
- (2015) 'Goths and Romans in the Leges Visigothorum', in W. Liebeschuetz (ed.), *East and West in Late Antiquity* (Leiden) 202–217
- Lo Nero, C. (2001) 'Christiana dignitas: new Christian criteria for citizenship in the later Roman Empire' *Medieval Encounters* 7, 146–164
- Loftus, S. (2011) 'Episcopal elections in Gaul: the normative view of the Concilia Galliae versus the narrative accounts', in J. Leemans and S. Keough (eds) *Episcopal elections in Late Antiquity* (Berlin) 423–436
- Loseby, S. (1996) 'Arles in Late Antiquity: "Gallula Roma Arelas" and "Urbs Genesis"', in N. Christie and S. Loseby (eds) *Towns in transition: urban evolution in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages* (Aldershot) 45–70
- Maasen, F. (ed.) (1883) *Concilia Aevi Merovingici*, MGH Conc 1 (Hannover)
- Marano, Y. (2015) "'Watered... with the life-giving wave": aqueducts and water management in Ostrogothic Italy', in P. Erdkamp, K. Verboven, and A. Zuiderhoek (eds) *Ownership and exploitation of Land and natural resources in the Roman World* (Oxford) 150–169
- Martínez Díez, G. and F. Rodríguez (eds) (1966–2002) *La colección canónica hispana*, 6 vols. (Madrid)
- Martínez Jiménez, J. (2019) *Aqueducts and urbanism in Post-Roman Hispania* (Piscataway, NJ)
- (2020) 'Urban identity and citizenship between the fifth and seventh centuries', *Al-Masāq* 32.1, 87–108
- Martínez Jiménez, J., Sastre de Diego, I., and Tejerizo-García, C. (2018) *The Iberian Peninsula 300–850: an archaeological perspective* (Amsterdam)
- Maskarinec, M. (2013) 'Who were the Romans? Shifting scripts of Romanness in early medieval Italy', in W. Pohl and G. Heydemann (eds) *Post-Roman transitions: Christian and barbarian identities in the early Medieval West* (Turnhout) 297–364
- Mathisen, R. (2006) 'Peregrini, barbari, and cives romani: concepts of citizenship and the legal identity of barbarians in the later Roman Empire', *AHR* 111, 1011–1040
- (2014) 'The citizenship and legal status of Jews in Roman law during Late Antiquity (ca. 300–540 CE)' in J. Tolan (ed.) *Jews in early Christian Law: Byzantium and the Latin West, 6th–11th centuries* (Turnhout) 35–53
- Merten, H. (2018) *Die frühchristlichen Inschriften aus St. Maximin bei Trier* (Trier)
- Nicolet, C. (1980) *The world of the citizen in Republican Rome* (London)
- Noethlichs, K.L. (2006) 'Revolution from the top? Orthodoxy and the persecution of heretics in imperial legislation from Constantine to Justinian', in C. Ando and J. Rüpke (eds) *Religion and law in classical and Christian Rome* (Stuttgart) 115–25

- Ottewill-Soulsby, S. (2022) 'Hunting diligently through the volumes of the ancients: Frechulf of Lisieux on the first city and the end of innocence', in J. Martínez Jiménez and S. Ottewill-Soulsby (eds) *Remembering and forgetting the ancient city* (Oxford) 225–246
- Ottewill-Soulsby, S. and Martínez Jiménez, J. (2020) 'Cities and citizenship after Rome: introduction', *Al-Masāq* 32.1, 1–3
- Patzold, S. (2014) 'Die Bischöfe im Gallien der Transformationszeit. Eine sozial homogene Gruppe von Amtsträgern?', in S. Brather, H.U. Nuber, H. Steuer, and T. Zotz (eds) *Antike im Mittelalter. Fortleben, Nachwirken, Wahrnehmung* (Ostfildern) 179–193
- Pohl, W. (2013) 'Introduction – Strategies of identification: a methodological profile', in W. Pohl and G. Heydemann (eds) *Strategies of Identification: ethnicity and religion in early Medieval Europe* (Turnhout) 1–64
- (2018) 'Introduction: early medieval Romanness – a multiple identity', in Gantner et al. (2018) 3–40
- Rapp, C. (2014) 'City and citizenship as Christian concepts of community in Late Antiquity', in C. Rapp and H. Drake (eds) *The city in the classical and post-classical world: changing contexts of power and identity* (New York) 153–166
- Reimitz, H. (2015) *History, Frankish identity, and the framing of Western ethnicity, 550–850* (Cambridge)
- Reimitz, H. and Esders, S. (2021) 'Legalizing ethnicity: the remaking of citizenship in post-Roman Gaul (6th–7th centuries)', in Brélaz and Rose (2021) 295–332
- Rio, A. (2009) *Legal practice and the written word in the early Middle Ages: Frankish Formulae, c.500–1000* (Cambridge)
- Rose, E. (2021a) 'Citizenship discourses in Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages', *FMS* 55, 1–21
- (2021b) 'Reconfiguring civic identity and civic participation in a Christianizing world: the case of sixth-century Arles' in Brélaz and Rose (2021) 271–294
- Ruiz Bueno, M. (2018) 'La desarticulación del callejero hispanorromano: cambios en la infraestructura viaria y de saneamiento entre los siglos II y VII d. C.', *AEA* 91, 143–162
- Sherwin-White, A.N. (1973) *The Roman citizenship*, 2nd edn (Oxford)
- Snyder, C. (1998) *An age of tyrants: Britain and the Britons, A.D. 400–600* (Stroud)
- Thompson, E.A. (1980) 'St. Patrick and Coroticus' *JThS*, n.s. 31.1, 11–27
- Turner, P. (2009) 'Identity in Gildas' *De Excidio et Conquestu Britanniae*', *Cambrian Medieval Celtic Studies* 58, 29–48
- Underwood, D. (2019) *(Re)using ruins* (Leiden)
- Vanderjagt, A. (2013) 'Political thought', in K. Pollmann and W. Otten (eds) *The Oxford guide to the historical reception of Augustine* (Oxford) 1561–1569
- Wallace-Hadrill, A. (2019) 'Salvian of Marseilles and the end of the ancient city', in J. Andreu and A. Blanco (eds) *Signs of weakness and crisis in the western cities of the Roman Empire (c. II-III AD)* (Stuttgart) 223–232
- (2020) 'Civitas Romana: the fluidity of an ideal', *Al-Masāq* 32.1, 18–33
- (2022) 'The cities of Cassiodorus: the resilience of urban values', in S. Ottewill-Soulsby and J. Martínez Jiménez (eds) *Remembering and forgetting the ancient city* (Oxford) 23–44
- Ward-Perkins, B. (1997) 'The cities', in A. Cameron and P. Guernsey (eds) *The Cambridge ancient history*, Vol. XIII: 'The late Empire, AD 337–425' (Cambridge) 371–410
- (2005) *The fall of Rome and the end of civilization* (Oxford)
- Washburn, D. (2012) *Banishment in the later Roman Empire, 284–476 CE* (London)
- Welton, M. (2020) 'The city speaks: cities, citizens, and civic discourse in the Late Antiquity and the early Middle Ages', *Traditio* 75, 1–37
- Wilson, R. (1986) 'The city in the old testament', in P. Hawkins (ed.) *Civitas: religious interpretations of the city* (Atlanta) 3–15
- Wood, I. (2001) 'The monastic frontiers of the *Vita Severini*', in W. Pohl and M. Diesenberger (eds) *Eugippius und Severin. Der Autor, der Text und der Heilige* (Vienna) 41–51
- (2016) 'The legislation of Magistri Militum: the laws of Gundobad and Sigismund', *Clio* 10, 1–16