Introduction

Dante's allegorical journey through Hell, Purgatory and Paradise—*The Divine Comedy*—was written by Italy's supreme poet during his melancholic years of forced political exile, while coming to know, away from Florence, "how salt is the taste of another's bread, and how hard the path to descend and mount by another man's stairs."[1] The most famous Florentine citizen in history—a White Guelph, "born and grew up on the fair stream of Arno, at the great town"[2] and so actively involved in Florentine political affairs as to achieve the position of prior (one of the six highest magistrates)—was obliged to take the road of exile after the opposing faction of the Black Guelphs took power in 1301. Charged with graft and hostility against the pope, he was sentenced to death and, consequently, never returned to his birthplace, dying in the city of Ravenna in 1321. Throughout his life, he defined himself, frequently, as "*Florentinus et exul inmeritus*" (a Florentine and an undeserved exile) and made reference, recurrently, in his works, to his profound longing for return as well as to his severe disapproval of his co-citizens' warring hostile politics.[3]

Almost five and a half centuries after Dante's death, in the historical context of the Italian Risorgimento and of the Roman Question, the famous General and Left Deputy Giuseppe Garibaldi contemplated, in a nervous state of mind and probably under the influence of the most radical wing of his party, taking an extreme measure as a way of discrediting the Italian king's government and of countering its action against him: to acquire American citizenship and thus lose automatically his Italian *status civitatis* and parliamentary position. More precisely, irritated by the Italian government's decision to arrest him and confine him at Varignano after the disastrous campaign against French and Papal troops at Mentana in 1867, Garibaldi asked the American consul at La Spezia, William T. Rice, whether he could be recognized as an American citizen.[4] In this way, he could then invoke the protection of his new state and be rescued from the "unjust" act the Italian government and the

Savoy monarchy had performed against his person. Eventually, though, Garibaldi's decision to acquire a foreign nationality on mere instrumental political grounds was not realized in practice. In fact, the general did not pursue the matter further—thus, avoiding a probable scandal that would surely have widened the already large breach that divided the revolutionary Left from the moderate Right on the Roman Question.[5]

The biographical episodes concerning Dante Alighieri on the one hand and Giuseppe Garibaldi on the other draw attention, from different angles, to an "invisible factor" linking the exiled poet to medieval Florence and the arrested general to the 1861 Kingdom of Italy. This intangible "umbilical cord" connecting individuals to a political community—be that a Greek *polis*, the Roman empire, the Christian medieval city-state, or the modern territorial nation-state—has an age-old name going back to ancient times: citizenship.[6]

How can one define this concept? Debate has emerged around this notion in numerous disciplines and from various perspectives, but so far no universally accepted definition has been formulated.[7] Indeed, citizenship has meant and continues to mean a variety of things. Jurists, for instance, see it primarily as a legal status, tend to call it synonymously with the term "nationality" and refer basically to state membership—that is, the formal membership of a person in a political community.[8] By contrast, liberal political thinkers perceive it particularly as a status enjoyed equally by everyone who is a member of a state's citizenry, emphasizing the justification of the individual's entitlements and the equality of all citizens as rights-bearing persons.[9] This latter view, though, has attracted criticism. And in fact, so-called communitarians have shifted their attention to the primacy of the community and to the individual's active participation in the business of rule, thus defining citizenship as a role that the *civis* assumes by participating in the determination of the common good—that is, by "ruling and being ruled," as Aristotle's *zoon politikon*.[10] In addition to these perspectives, the notion under consideration has been conceived as being, and providing, an identity: thus, seen through the lens of psychology, it is an important expression of individual self-understanding because it helps us define ourselves as well as determine to whom we are alike and from whom we are different.[11] Finally, as sociologists have persuasively argued, it is also an identity that provides a source of unity, of shared solidarity and of social inclusion thanks to its "integrative function" vis-à-vis previously excluded groups within mainstream society.[12]

Undoubtedly, all these theoretical debates draw attention to a fundamental factor: citizenship is a multifaceted and dynamic idea that defies any single and unilateral explanation. Broadly speaking, it can be seen as an institution that, as Pietro Costa has already argued, is made up of five fundamental elements: the individual, rights, duties, sense of

belonging and political community.[13] These are five large parameters that delimit the concept and can be regarded as "the core components of citizenship" and "the elemental structures of its semantic field."[14] Most importantly and as a contribution to the ongoing theoretical discussions, citizenship is an evolving notion that adjusts and adapts itself to a variety of historical epochs, political regimes and diverse societies. For this reason, it possesses a plethora of semantic meanings that vary according to the context in which the concept has developed. This is why, to use Costa's terminology based on studies concerning the logic of language, it is not unfounded to see citizenship as "an indexical expression," namely, shifting from context to context; it is a word defining different things at different times, making the concept highly flexible in historical perspective.[15]

Recently, there has been an explosion of interest in this theme. The plethora of publications, the emergence of specialized journals such as *Citizenship Studies*—which is currently leading the international debate on academic analysis of this topic—as well as the increasing discussions within the various national political arenas and the international press demonstrate the current topical importance of the subject. In fact, a venerable institution, citizenship is also a contemporary topic constantly emerging and reemerging within current affairs because it is an issue that touches, directly or indirectly, on a variety of fundamental questions. For instance, it is an element that follows the birth, life and death of states (the process of statehood); it contributes to the existence and survival of nations (the process of nationhood); it is linked to many political, socioeconomic, cultural and military matters including international emigration and immigration, accommodation of minorities, allocation of welfare benefits, identity, national security. Finally, from a specifically European point of view, the topic has also acquired much relevance following the epochal recent events of the creation of post-Soviet nation-states, German reunification and the deepening and widening process of EU integration.

From a scholarly perspective, this ongoing interest is clearly testified by the existence of an extensive and growing literature. For example, the classical works of Derek Benjamin Heater and Peter Riesenberg as well as the edited publication of Danilo Zolo and the studies of Salvatore Veca and Enrico Grosso are just a few examples of a very long list.[16] Authors from distinct academic backgrounds have been intrigued by so many diverse facets of citizenship that one can now find a wealth of analysis pertaining to a wide spectrum of civic matters, ranging from a person's moral right to become a citizen of a state[17] to new conceptualizations of citizenship models as "transnational" or "postnational" membership within a globalized world[18]; from the extension of citizenship rights to minority groups for recognition of cultural difference within

contemporary political entities[19] to whether patriotism is the name of a virtue or the name of a vice[20]; alongside pages on how symbolic historical reparations such as apologies can be acts of inclusionary, but also exclusionary, politics of cultural citizenship.[21]

So although the notion has been the object of much and multisided inquiry, the specific research field concerning "national citizenship in historical perspective" is still at its inception and has so far focused mainly on the French, German and British experiences.[22] Lately the Scandinavian countries too have been studied from a citizenship and nationhood viewpoint, with the inclusion of a short historical account.[23] Yet the existing literature regarding this specialized field is still lacunary as far as the Italian case study is concerned, and relatively few English-language publications are available on the topic. Italy's *status civitatis* has in fact been examined mainly by Italian legal scholars, sociologists and political scientists[24] while Italian contemporary historians have so far concentrated in particular on citizenship and migration issues as in Guido Tintori's rigorous research.[25] Also, the concise English-language accounts that have discussed the Italian historical experience are limited in scope as they examine only specific aspects. Ferruccio Pastore, for instance, has mainly focused on the way Italian governmental policies concerning nationality have been closely determined by questions of historical emigration and impacted on contemporary immigration.[26] Turning to the context of European integration and to the link between citizenship and identity in post–World War Two republican Italy, scholar Mathias Koenig-Archibugi has studied notions of nation building and the practice of Italian citizenship within a setting of partisan mediation and ideological polarization.[27] Finally, the research carried out by Pamela Ballinger has brought to light the little-known question of Italian repatriation and decolonization after the Second World War with a special focus on nationhood and citizenship issues.[28] However, no in-depth monographic analysis has been carried out to date on Italian citizenship and national identification that could provide readers with a much-needed comprehensive examination, in historical perspective and not limited to an Italian-language readership.

Our book takes up this challenge since it aims at filling the scholarly lacuna. As a history of Italian national citizenship, it necessarily has an "*a quo*" and an "*ad quem*." The *a quo* of our historical journey (i.e., the starting point) is the 1861 birth of the unified Italian kingdom—that is, the political unification of the country under the Savoy monarchy. The *ad quem* (i.e., the point of arrival) is 1950, representing the first period after the end of Savoy Italy and the birth of the Italian Republic. By taking these two historical years as the beginning and end of our voyage, this work focuses on the genesis of Italian monarchical subjecthood in 1861, on its historical developments throughout the liberal and fascist eras and

on its end in 1946 with proclamation of the Republic of Italy and the birth and first developments of postwar Italian republican citizenship.

This broad periodization, covering almost ninety years of national history and going across pre- and post-1922 Italy, has been chosen in order to emphasize origins and evolutions of our theme, analyzed in the *longue durée*. This is an approach that allows researchers to stress continuities and discontinuities in their historical narratives, and in this way contribute to a wider historiographical debate that has been taking place especially among Italian historians since the end of the Second World War. These academic discussions, also explained in detail by Stefan Berger and Roberto Pertici,[29] touch on national history writing and its links with national identity formation following an "uncomfortable past" as the Duce's dictatorship and the tragedy of the Second World War. In particular, whereas some Italian historians such as Benedetto Croce, Adolfo Omodeo and Luigi Salvatorelli have argued about a basic discontinuity between Fascism and the Italian nation-state created by the Risorgimento, other historians such as Antonio Gramsci and Fabio Cusin (as well as Piero Gobetti and Guido Dorso, before them) have interpreted Fascism as the logical outcome of Italian national history.[30] Since the debate has been enriched throughout the postwar decades with a plurality of other historical discourses and national narratives,[31] it can be fruitful to provide, with our book, further findings about continuities and discontinuities between liberal and fascist Ital(ies) with the objective of adding food for thought on this historiographical roundtable.

Largely based on extensive archival research carried out in Italy (at the Archive and Library of the Italian Chamber of Deputies, at the Diplomatic Archive of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, at the Historical Archive of the Italian Army and at the State Central Archive), this study examines the policies, debates and formal notions of citizenship in the peninsula with a view to grasping the vision of Italian national identity that they illuminate. Being a *political* history, this monograph is not a study in the legal theory, doctrine and jurisprudence of Italian citizenship. Instead, by differentiating and analyzing modes of acquisition and modes of exercise of national citizenship, it provides a systematic inquiry of the various citizenship policies and discourses that were successively formulated in the Italian kingdom as a recently unified national state, as a liberal constitutional entity granting differentiated rights to its female and male population, as a country of immigration and of emigration and as a late colonial power. It also covers the citizenship strategies that were introduced by monarchical Italy during the fascist era—this time, as an aspiring totalitarian state forging its female and male citizenry, as an expansionist fascist power aiming at creating a Second Roman Empire, and as an occupied and divided country after 8 September 1943. Third, it

encompasses the initial civic developments in post–World War Two Italy, in this case as a republican state subject to the Allied peace settlement and trying to face its fascist past while embarking on the democratic road. Finally, highlighting precedents, continuities and breaking points within Italian national history, this work incorporates elements of comparison with other European experiences as well, and by drawing numerous times on French, British and German citizenship traditions it aims at bringing out fully the specificity of the Italian case study.

Clearly, the underlying premise of this book, implicitly mentioned at the beginning of the preceding paragraph (i.e., the relationship between citizenship and national identity), calls for further important clarifications—particularly, in light of academic discussions concerning the citizenship-nationhood nexus and involving Rogers Brubaker's and Patrick Weil's findings and writings.[32] Also, the historical perspective of this study combined with European comparisons requires further explanations of two fundamental factors: the historicity of the concept of citizenship as well as the terminological variety that characterizes discourses about "citizenship," "nationality" and "subjecthood" in different languages and countries.

The essential assumption underpinning our inquiry is that citizenship and national identity—citizenship and nationhood—are linked and related to each other in fundamental ways. Citizenship is indeed a precious source for examining and understanding the vision(s) of national self-identification developed in a country; as an academic field of study, it can therefore say a lot about notions and conceptions of the nation as well as notions and connotations of what it means to be part of that specific nation. To explain these assertions, we invite our readers to ponder what we can call "the mirror and pencil metaphors"—constituting and shaping the entire framework of this book on the history of Italian national citizenship and identity. As a *mirror*, citizenship can well reflect nationhood—although at times, and not automatically. More particularly, and bearing in mind Weil's well-demonstrated confutation of Brubaker's argument pertaining to France and Germany,[33] it is important to stress that citizenship principles and norms (i.e., *jus sanguinis*, *jus soli*, naturalization, residence and marriage) do *not* reflect nationhood *in themselves* and *by themselves* because there is no causal link between national identity and nationality laws. In effect, as pertinently illustrated by Weil, enshrinement of the rule of descent and of the territorial principle into a country's citizenship regime is subject to "legal transfers" and "imitations" between and among juridical traditions, across countries and across epochs—"legal transplants" that have nothing to do with concepts of the nation.[34] So, by looking at a citizenship rule, one cannot deduct and presume that such a norm is to be explained and attributed to specific cultural idioms of

national self-identification because juridical principles and legal rules are independent from notions of national identity. Yet—and this is the point we want to make to revive, complicate and extend this lively debate—if one looks not at the norm in itself but at contingent use, appropriation, adaptation and application of a specific membership policy by the authorities of a country within a specific historical context and vis-à-vis different subjects, then one can uncover many interesting insights about concepts and definitions of a particular nation. In other words, a norm might well have been borrowed from another legal tradition and been shaped by the work of jurists, with no connections whatsoever to discourses regarding national belonging. In this respect, more evidence will also be provided from the Italian case study to give further strength to Weil's assertions within a broader European perspective. But when the work of jurists is used for realizing specific political objectives, or is differentially applied in a particular country according to the contexts and the subjects, or is discussed in broad political arenas, then one can indeed come across a reservoir of elements to understand many aspects and languages of national identification. So, it is the use and adoption of an apparently neutral and silent juridical norm within a particular context by specific authorities that, in certain cases, and in tandem with more explicit political and parliamentary debates pertaining to citizenship, can reflect, as a *mirror*, notions of membership in a nation.

Besides being a mirror for historical analysis, citizenship can well be a *pencil* for the historian. In fact, one can argue that citizenship is an academic source that can help the scholar sketch, visualize and draw the contours and content of national identity as they were shaped and defined by citizenship rules, policies and discourses at precise moments of national history. To be Italian, to become Italian and to exercise rights and duties in the peninsula as Italian citizens meant very different things at specific points of the historical journey carried out in this book. Metaphorically, the changing laws and debates concerning citizenship can certainly be useful pencils for researchers when trying to give form to and grasp the historically evolving and changeable meanings of *italianità*. Here, we are actually moving from "the Brubaker-Weil debate" to extend the scope of the citizenship analysis well beyond and incorporate a wider examination of the concept, both as a status in law and as a practice, in relation to the complex notion of national belonging within various historical contexts. In this way, we aim at applying to the Italian case study the broad, multidimensional and fruitful approach recently used to similarly discuss citizenship and national identity in twentieth-century Germany, notably in the collection of essays edited by Geoff Eley and Jan Palmowsky.[35]

So, to return to our two metaphors, both as a mirror and as a pencil for scholars citizenship can indeed shed valuable light on notions and

visions of national identification. It does touch on meanings of Italianhood in a significant way—Italianhood, Italianness, *italianità* and national identity being synonymous terms indicating the collective phenomenon of national belonging, sometimes distinguishable from, more often blurred with, other identities of the self. "National identity and the nation," says Anthony D. Smith, "are complex constructs composed of a number of interrelated components—ethnic, cultural, territorial, economic and legal-political. They signify bonds of solidarity among members of communities united by shared memories, myths and traditions that may or may not find expression in states of their own."[36] Also, as pointed out by Anna Triandafyllidou, as a collective and social identity, national identification is inherently dynamic, interactive, contextual, contested and evolving with time.[37] Our systematic and thorough study of Italian citizenship will attempt to grasp—with the help of mirrors and pencils—such a relational and collective phenomenon. Finally, since we will look at and discuss notions of nationhood in the Italian peninsula, it is pertinent to emphasize from the start the distinction between the terms *national identity* and *national character*, by referring in particular to the recent research by Silvana Patriarca on the history of the discourse(s) about the Italians' national character from the nineteenth century until the present day.[38] As already noted by this scholar, the two expressions have been and are often used interchangeably; yet they do not mean the same thing. In fact, "national character" refers to those objective dispositions made of moral and mental traits of a population (i.e., vices and virtues), while the expression "national identity" tends to incorporate a more subjective dimension of self-identification.[39] In our book, the major focus is on national identity, although at times some references are also made to the national character of Italy's population, especially when our findings might speak directly or indirectly to other scholarly works and related debates.

Having explained and justified the premise of our work, we now discuss two further concluding points concerning our historical perspective enriched with comparisons with other European countries. The first point refers to the aforementioned historical variety of meanings hidden behind use of the same word (citizenship), applied in different epochs. The term *citizenship* has in fact been employed over the centuries to mean numerous things with diverse contents. To take an example: the fourteenth-century medieval Florentine citizenship enjoyed by Dante was very different from the nineteenth-century membership status of Garibaldi as a deputy of the newly created Italian nation-state. Also, if one looks at the situation today, one can add that both statuses differ in many ways from the twenty-first-century citizenship enjoyed, for instance, by Italians in their increasingly multicultural country. The same term—*cittadinanza*

(citizenship)—is employed in the three cases; but in the first, the term refers to collective rights and duties acquired through participation in a guild; in the second, to an individualized legal status enjoyed in a modern territorial kingdom; in the third, to membership within a contemporary democratic republic. A similar argument could indeed be made in reference to how the word *citizenship* was used in post-1861 Italy during the liberal and fascist epochs—studied in this book—or in any other country during other periods. Therefore, it is exactly this historical semantic diversity that calls for the ability of the historian to study "the word (citizenship)" and "the concept attached to that word" in a precise point in history, by analyzing both elements (the word and the concept) within their context and by neutralizing the scholar's human temptation of giving explanations and of making judgments on the basis of his or her contemporaneous conceptions of citizenship.[40]

As for linguistic and terminological varieties across countries, one should bear in mind that the terms *citizenship*, *nationality* and *subjecthood*—all essential for this research on the Italian case study—have been, and are being, applied in some languages either with peculiar meanings or, in certain cases, interchangeably—thus causing confusion and calling for some clarification.[41] Surely, a preliminary overview of these multiple uses—in Germany, Great Britain, France and Italy—is also useful before starting our historical journey in the peninsula.

Historically, in German legal terminology, there has been a fundamental difference between the use of *Staatsbürgerschaft* (meaning active participatory citizenship) and the more neutral term *Staatsangehörigkeit* (referring to formal state membership and deprived of any democratic connotation as the other term has). However, recent legislative bills in Germany tend now to use the two concepts interchangeably. Also and most interestingly, the formal relationship of *Staatsangehörigkeit* has always been dissociated from *Nationalität*—the latter being conceived as ethno-national belonging and referring to nation membership as a pre-political category.[42]

This semantic differentiation between *Staatsangehörigkeit* and *Nationalität*, which still continues in present-day German discourse, has not characterized the history of the same terms in Great Britain and in France. In the English and later British state, the central concept of belonging was not "citizenship" but "subjecthood," the latter being based on the notion of allegiance owed by the subject to the Crown. The term *citizenship* has in fact lacked any relevant role, and even though it was used in English during the Middle Ages to denote the relationship of the individual to a city, it has remained a vague and fluid notion on the state and national levels. This was due in particular to the usual practice of replacing the ancient Roman concept of "citizen" with the English word *subject* while

trying to accommodate Roman law into English legislation. So, absent in national discourse for centuries, the term *citizenship* would be introduced for the first time in British law only in 1948 with formulation of a new "citizenship of the United Kingdom and colonies" alongside the various citizenships of the self-governing dominions—and most confusingly, from a terminological point of view, within the framework of (one) unifying "British nationality" (the latter being used, since 1914, as a synonym with "subjecthood"). The English legal term *nationality* has, in fact, kept a neutral and different meaning from the German concept of *Nationalität*, replacing basically the word *subjecthood*—although, in international law, the English word *nationality* is also used interchangeably with *citizenship*, meaning state membership; thus explaining why today "British subjects," "British citizens" and "British nationals" could be one and the same category of people.[43]

In France, by contrast, the words *citoyen* (citizen) and *sujet* (subject), which had coexisted without any confrontation for centuries, were separated in abstract terms with the events of 1789. In fact, following the French Revolution, the notion of *citoyen*, as the active and participatory individual, was idealized and put at the core of the new revolutionary nation—now making the term indissoluble from the concept of popular sovereignty while delegitimizing the word *sujet* and using it pejoratively with a connotation of passivity. The terminological issue, though, which concerns us here, was to be complicated by the fact that the word *citoyen* was not deprived of a certain ambiguity due to an inherent "duality" that, formulated by the Abbé Sieyès and enshrined in a 1789 law, "divided" the concept of citizenship into "passive" and "active" variants. The first linked all citizens without distinction to the political nation; the second was reserved only for those who were eligible to participate in formulating the laws of the nation via political suffrage.[44] In addition to this, the word *nationalité* (nationality), applied before 1789 as meaning national feelings, from the 1880s became a legal term used in the same sense as the German *Staatsangehörigkeit*—that is, in the sense of state membership. So the French words *nationalité* and *citoyenneté* came to be used as synonyms—thus leading to a semantic fusion made possible because of the political definition of French nationhood and the fusion of the concepts of state, nation and sovereign people that took place in 1789 and that distinguished the French experience from its German counterpart.[45]

Finally, in the Italian language the word *cittadinanza* (citizenship) seems to have appeared for the first time in the fourteenth century as meaning the quality of citizen in a city; it is only at the end of the eighteenth century, following the French Revolution, that the term acquired the signification of being a member of a modern sovereign state.[46] By contrast, the relatively more recent term *nazionalità* (nationality), used

since the nineteenth century, came to be applied with a peculiar double meaning that was to be retained in post-unification Italy as well. In particular, as will emerge clearly from this study, it was used as synonymous with "citizenship" (meaning juridical state membership) but also as a general cultural term indicating "the belonging of an individual to a nation" ("*appartenenza alla nazione*") in analogy with the German use of *Nationalität* and deprived of any legal connotations. Moreover, in the chapters that follow, historical evidence demonstrates that in the post-1861 Savoy kingdom the words *sudditanza* (subjecthood), *cittadinanza* and *nazionalità* were very often applied interchangeably—thus making any possible semantic differentiation an interesting historical task.

Clearly, all these uses (abuses and misuses) of the words under consideration should be borne in mind. Also, the fact that these terms have been applied, and still are, as synonyms should be taken into account. Finally, it is important to remind our readers that unless clearly specified and explained, we have also employed the words interchangeably, as was largely done in liberal and fascist Italy; however, in many instances we have made a great effort to convey the historicity of a term by attempting to give its exact meaning as it was shaped in a particular context of Italian history. In this way, even though "the terminological problem" persists, at least we have faced it rather than avoid it. After all, writing in the Middle Ages, the Italian jurist Bartolus of Saxoferrato argued that "today [in the fourteenth century] we use this vocabulary [citizenship] broadly and improperly."[47] Surely, his comment is still very much valid for us as well, living in the twenty-first century.

Ready, now, to start our historical journey, we can delineate its detailed content. The book is divided into nine chapters, arranged in chronological and thematic order. Chapter One explores, for the first time in the scholarly literature as far as we are aware, the origins of Italian monarchical subjecthood and focuses on the 1859–1865 period since the territorial annexations that ultimately led to proclamation of the Italian kingdom in March 1861 and final approval of the first national Italian Civil Code in 1865 marked the genesis of Italian national citizenship in a profound way.

After bringing to light the birth of Italian monarchical subjecthood, this study then analyzes its historical evolution throughout the liberal decades (Part One) and during the fascist era (Part Two). Part One (Chapters Two through Five) covers the years from 1866 to 1922. In particular, Chapter Two explores Italian national citizenship from a female and a male perspective, thus focusing on gender issues, making Italian women

visible within our history and redressing an important imbalance that has characterized citizenship studies for a long time. Chapter Three investigates citizenship policies vis-à-vis Italy's categories of foreigners (i.e., *Italiani non regnicoli* and non-Italian aliens), looking at the country's little-known historical immigrants and discussing the related notions of alienhood and Italianness. To complete this picture, the citizenship provisions and debates pertaining to Italian emigrants and to their settled communities abroad are the subject of Chapter Four, which not only adds further insights on the concept of *italianità* but also links Italy's civic policies concerning emigration with those that were introduced vis-à-vis immigration. Finally, by exploring the developments that took place following liberal Italy's expansionism in Africa and in the Mediterranean Sea, Chapter Five examines the nonmetropolitan dimension of Italian citizenship and looks at how the Italian state incorporated the native populations living in its African colonies, at the partially unknown policies vis-à-vis those living in its Mediterranean occupied territories and at the discourse(s) formulated on these civic issues before Mussolini took power.

After analyzing the historical evolution of Italian citizenship in the liberal period, this study concentrates on the major continuities and breaking points pertaining to the citizenship issues and provisions that characterized the Italian peninsula during the entire fascist era—therefore not only throughout the Duce's ventennium (1922–1943) but also during the relatively less-studied six hundred days of the Republic of Salò (1943–1945). These twenty-three years of Italian history are covered in Part Two (Chapters Six through Eight)—avoiding the usual (and antihistorical) hole that is made by jumping over the republican experience of Salò and going directly from the fascist ventennium to the 1946 birth of the Italian Republic. Chapters Six and Seven concern the years of Mussolini's premiership and dictatorship in the peninsula, from October 1922 to July 1943. More particularly, female citizenship and its male counterpart are explored and discussed in Chapter Six, where, in line with the corresponding chapter on liberal Italy, emphasis is put on gender issues within the specific historical context of fascism. Leaving the peninsula, Chapter Seven is then entirely devoted to the citizenship system introduced by Mussolini in Italy's African colonies and to the still largely neglected civic accommodation of the populations living in all the European Mediterranean lands that were annexed or occupied by the regime until 1943. The aim is to discuss legislation and official discourse in comparison with the previous liberal colonial variant. Finally, by focusing on citizenship issues in the Italian peninsula following the fall of Mussolini's regime, the armistice of September 1943 and the division of the country, Chapter Eight delves into the civic developments of those controversial months of Italian history up to the end of World War Two.

Having gone through liberal and fascist Ital(ies), this study then concludes our historical account on post-unification Italian monarchical subjecthood by dealing with the latter's death and by discussing the birth and first developments of Italian democratic republican citizenship. This is the topic of Chapter Nine, which examines the end of Italian subjecthood following the referendum of June 1946, the gradual shrinking of Italian citizenship due to the 1947 peace settlement with the Allies and the first defining characteristics of postwar Italian republican *status civitatis*.

From monarchical subjects to republican citizens and in comparison with other Europeans, the Italians have gone through a complex and fascinating process of national self-identification, which, analyzed in all chapters in its dynamic, evolving and sometimes contested forms, will then be discussed fully in the conclusion of the book.