

Conceptus "citizen" and "subject": dynamics and prospects of development

Yuri Bokov^{1,*}

¹ Volgograd State University, 100, Universitetskiy av., 400062, Volgograd, Russia

Abstract. The study revealed the etymology, historical, legal development, the essence and content of the concepts of "citizen" and "subject", "citizenship" and "allegiance". An important influence on the content of these terms is derived from the concept of "civic spirit", which absorbs the political will and attitude of the state towards its citizens, citizens towards the state and society. Citizenship is not static and is a dynamically developing legal and social institution from allegiance to post-national, global, supranational, ecological and digital citizenship, but not to new allegiance. For the concept "citizen", the democratic vector of development is the enrichment of a person's status not only with rights but also with the actual content of a citizen-state relationship: from a city dweller to a person who is subject to authority and has full democratic legal status, high index and competences of civic spirit and having a stable legal relationship with the state (as a rule, the republican form of government). In a moral sense, it is obvious that, if a citizen sees democracy in the order that best corresponds to his views, then, from the point of view of an equitable distribution of the burden, everyone should contribute to it.

1 Introduction

Conceptus *citizen* and *subject*, *citizenship* and *allegiance* traditionally attract the attention of researchers from various scientific fields. There is no unified approach to the use and content of the designated terms. This circumstance was caused, including the historical variability of the content of these categories, which depends on the form of government, political regime, and other factors. The relevance of the study evidenced by a need to constantly democratize the legal status of a person as a citizen of the state. The semantics and practices of implementing the categories *citizen* and *subject*, *citizenship* and *allegiance* are not quite uniform as there are many positions regarding the definition of etymology, moral and ethical and legal content, dynamics and vector of its development. The question of the relationship between *citizenship* and *allegiance* is controversial. Important areas of scientific thought are issues of responsible behavior of a citizen, his ability and possibility to participate in the government, *postnational*, *global*, *supranational*, *digital*, and *ecological* citizenship, etc.

2 Materials and methods

The purpose of the work consists in studying the dynamic development of semantics and practices of the concepts *citizen* and *subject* in the modern world. The author attempts to determine the dynamics of the further functioning of the citizenship phenomenon "from allegiance to citizenship", "from citizenship to" on the

basis of the historical and legal development of the world community.

Work hypothesis in most cases, the category *citizen*, is wider than just *subject*, rollback to the status of a *subject* is not allowed. The rules of development of the state and law include dynamically occurring democratization of the relationship between the state and the individual. A person, by one's active actions as a subject of civil society, must take actions aimed not at losing his current status of a *citizen* as a subject of management and not at returning to a *subject* or a *loyal subject* as an object of management, but to develop oneself as full-fledged person actively involved in the events.

Conducting the research on the concepts *citizen* and *subject*, *citizenship* and *allegiance*, the author complements them and expresses his position on their use, content and development. The rationale for this point of view is given that citizenship is not static as it is a dynamically developing legal and social institution: from allegiance to postnational, global, supranational, ecological and digital citizenship, but not to new allegiance. The problems of legal statuses *citizen* and *subject* are raised, and their characteristic features are revealed. The paper attempts to provide answers to topical questions: What caused the rejection of the use of the terms *subject* and *allegiance* both in politics and in law? Does it follow from the status of a *citizen* that a person who possesses them should also possess additional practices and competencies (e.g. serving the Motherland and the people, taking care of the public good, actively participating in government)? How to determine the willingness and ability to be a citizen?

* Corresponding author: bokov@volsu.ru

The fundamental methods of scientific knowledge used by the author are methods of analysis: systemic, etymological, linguistic, historical, legal, and others. The etymological analysis will determine the meaning of terms. Linguistic analysis of literary texts and the method of historicism will be indispensable in studying the development dynamics of the content of the studied concepts. The formal legal method is aimed at disclosing the regulatory component. It is also important to determine the methodology for analyzing the content of the concepts *citizenship*, *allegiance*, and *civic spirit*.

3 Results and discussion

Regarding the origin of the concept *subject*, linguists-etymologists believe that it goes back to the Latin adjective *subditus*, the loan translation of which is Polish *poddany* (subject), *poddanstwo* (allegiance) which has then become Russian [1]. Latin *sub*, *dit*, *us* were translated to the Polish *pod*, *dan*, *y* [2].

In the Polish-Russian dictionary *poddany* (subject) is translated as 1. subject; 2. bonded peasant.

V. Dahl defines the term *subject* by subordination, subjection to the government, the sovereign, and *allegiance* as the “state of the subject” [3]. S.I. Ozhegov, adds the concept of *allegiance* another meaning “the belonging of a person to any state” [4]. The Complete Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian language states that “allegiance is the affiliation of a person to the population of any state with a monarchical form of government” [5]. An outdated meaning of this term denotes that this is a person who is in personal economic dependence on someone else [6], “the one who submits to the power of the master, the master in his domain” [7].

The edict of the Russian Governing Senate “On the oath promise of foreigners, who want to swear allegiance to Russia” (August 27, 1747), established the obligation to take the oath of allegiance when accepting citizenship, which said: “I want a faithful, kind and obedient slave and forever subjects ... to be and nowhere ... not to move abroad and not to join the foreign service.” Thus, the obligation to be a kind and an obedient slave who does not have the right to change his allegiance was imposed on the *subject* of regulation. There was nothing to say about any equality in the legal statuses of subjects, the extent of the rights of a person depended on his belonging to a social group, the categories of subjects were singled out. Migration outside the state of any subject reduced the collection of taxes and the state was deprived of the opportunity to demand performing any other duties from this person.

In the Polish-German dictionary, the term *poddany* (*subject*) is translated as *untertan*. A *subject* is translated as *Untertan*, *Untergebener*, *Staatsangehöriger*, and *allegiance* – as *Untertänigkeit*, *Staatsangehörigkeit* from Russian into German [1, 8]. *Untertan* is thus a subject or a loyal subject [9].

If we turn to the study of German linguistic literature devoted to the historical development of Germany, then, we can meet another term for allegiance *Untertanenschaft*. D. Grieshaber points out that

Untertanenschaft (*allegiance*) provided restrictions on the legal status of a person and his rights [10]. The Volga Germans Monthly in 1924 published documents dated to the 18th century, which also used the term *Untertanenschaft* (*allegiance*) and talked about German citizens leaving the allegiance when the move to Russia and release Germanic subject [11, 12].

The reference book of the origin and etymology of words indicates such use of the term *untertan*: “the dependence of the subjects, as well as their broad confidence in the government, distinguished German society from other Western European states” [13]. R. Krueger, describing the development of Germany, emphasized that “... a person was endowed with a non-essential volume of rights of a subject but not a citizen” [14]. In the Complete German-Russian dictionary there are two possible translations of this word: 1) subject (obsolete); 2) dependent, bonded peasant [15]. The authors of the dictionary designated the term subject as an outdated that is clearly confirmed by regulatory legal acts of Germany.

In Prussia, before the beginning of the 19th century, the term *Prussian subjects* (*Preußens Untertanen*) was actively used in acts of legislation. For example, the Civil Code (Josephinischen Gesetzbuch (01. 11. 1786)) § 1 established that all subjects of Prussia are not only protected by the laws of the state and must comply with them [16].

But after a century the expression *Prussian subject* became practically offensive, its use in legislative acts was discontinued. In 1869, only because of the use of the term *untertan* by the Prussian Landtag, the draft law “On the Acquisition and Loss of the Title of the Prussian subject (*untertan*)” was rejected. The conciliation commission, in which this draft was submitted from the chamber for revision replaced the term subject in the title and in the text with the expression *Prussian*. The Chamber of Deputies supported the amendment. The government did not agree to the changes the bill required by the Chamber [17].

The following speech was made at the meeting of the Frankfurt National Assembly on June 2, 1848: “Own subjects ... are no longer *subjects* in Germany since the people ventured to win their freedom on the barricades. “Own subjects”! And it is we who choose the assemblies, prescribing sovereign laws for kings and emperors we are the *subjects* of His Majesty the Prussian king?” [18].

The use of the term subject *untertan* in relation to Prussia is found in the works Karl Marx, for example, in the article “Notes on the Newest Prussian Censorship Instructions” he indicates “the subject of the Prussian state” (*der Untertan des preußischen Staates*) [19]. On September 4, 1848, K. Marx sent a letter to the Interior Minister of Prussia in which he pointed out: “I consider it completely unacceptable that the local royal district office ... uses the word *subject* in the notice sent to me while the previous and current ministry expelled this definition from all official documents, replacing it with the name “citizens of the state” [20].

In the English translation of this work of the Marxism founder instead of the German term *untertan* the English term *subject* is used. The authors of the Polish-English

dictionary refer to the word *poddany (subject)* as a *subject*, which is defined as a person under the authority of a monarch or a member of a country with a monarchical form of government. The English-Russian dictionary indicates the translation of the term *subject* as *citizen*, “the subject of the crown” (“the subject of any state”).

V. Muller defines *subject* as subordinate [21]. In the English-law dictionary, the first meaning of the word “*subject*” is defined as *subject* [22]. The etymology dictionary contains information that the word *subject* originates from the common Slavic *gordianin*, formed from *OTgordb* (later - *city*). Its original meaning is “*townsman*”. At the end of the XVIII century, it became defined as a person who is a subject of the state [2]. A. Shaposhnikov defines a *subject* as a person who is allegiance and indicates that in the XVI-XVII centuries the term *poddanny (subject)* was used. The author also points out that one cannot exclude the possibility of the formation of a word from Common Slavic *under tribute* [23]. In the dictionary of associations *Rerayt* the following synonymous adjectives are cited as synonyms for the word *subject*: subordinate, dependent, cognizable, dependent [24].

Summarizing the marked positions, we can conclude the following. The concept of *subject, allegiance* is characterized by two main features: a) the presence of subordination, subjection to the state will, and in the pre-democratic period there is a significant limitation in legal status (up to identification with slavery); b) an indication of the affiliation of a person to a state with a monarchical form of government.

As synonyms for *subject* and *allegiance* referred to as *citizen, citizenship*. We will try to figure out how reasonable this is.

In the law encyclopedic dictionary states: “In monarchical states, as a rule, citizenship terminologically corresponds to allegiance” [25].

M. Vasmer came to the conclusion that the word *citizen (Bürger)* came from the Church Slavonic language. It was formed from the word *townsman*. Derivative is *citizenship (Bürgerrecht)*, tracing paper Greek πολιτης [26].

V. Dal characterizes a *citizen*, firstly, through such concepts as *city dweller, townsman*, “a member of a community or people consisting of one common government”; secondly, it indicates that “citizenship is the state of a citizen; title, his rights and obligations” [27]. S.I. Ozhegov concludes that the concept of *citizen* has two meanings: 1) “a person belonging to the permanent population of a given state, enjoying its protection and endowed with a set of political and other rights and duties”; 2) an adult, as well as a form of addressing him [4].

In the Complete Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian language, the concept of *citizen* is characterized as a person not only belonging to the population of any state but also enjoying all the rights provided by the laws of this state and performing all the duties established by the laws of this state [5].

A more extensive interpretation of the concept of *citizen* can be found in the dictionary of T. Efremova,

which additionally concludes that this is a person serving the homeland, the people, caring for the public good [6].

D. Diderot emphasized: “Hobbes does not make any difference between a *subject* and a *citizen*; this is true if the word *subject* is understood in its exact sense, and the word *citizen* is in its broadest meaning, and if one considers that the *subject* is put to the sovereign in the same attitude as a *citizen* to laws alone. Both are equally manageable, but one is an individual and the other is a moral entity. The name *citizen* is not appropriate for those living in subjection or in disunity; this implies that living in a completely natural state, as sovereigns, and completely deprived of this state, as slaves, cannot be considered as *citizens* at all, if we assume that a reasonable society is possible, which has an immutable moral essence that stands above the sovereign’s physical personality” [28].

Involuntarily I recall the words from the poem of the Great Russian poet N. Nekrasov, “The Poet and the Citizen”: “You may not be a poet, but you must be a citizen.” The last line of the poem became a popular expression. This is the apotheosis of the poem. The author emphasizes in them that the *citizen* is the one to whom the interests of society are not alien.

Does it follow from the concept of *citizen* that a person who has the status of citizenship should serve the Motherland and his people, cares about the public good, and actively participate in the government? If you answer this question in the affirmative, then, of course, you can talk about the existence of a civil society in which each person respects the rights and freedoms of another.

Depending on the context, the English word *citizenship* can be translated as both *citizenship* and *allegiance*. In the English-American theory of the concept of *citizen*, which corresponds to *citizen* and *subject* is clearly distinguished. Thus, both a *subject* and a *citizen* are solely *citizenship*, not *allegiance*.

Citizen is 1) *citizen, female citizen*; 2) *townsman, townswoman; citizenship - citizenship* [21]; *citizen* [22, 29]. The term *national* has become widespread, which can literally be translated as a person with a certain national identity. In the practice of the colonial states, the term *citizenship* was initially used only in relation to persons with political and civil rights in full. The indigenous people of the colonies were classified as persons with legal affiliation to this state (*nationals, ressortissants, etc.*). The collapse of colonialism led to a change in the original meaning of these terms, to the multiplicity of their use [30].

The legal status of a Great Britain *subject* as a *citizen* of the United Kingdom and the colonies was enshrined in the *British Nationality Act* of 1948 and was further developed under the *British Nationality Act* 1981. Note that in the 1948 *British Nationality Act* the term *British citizens* are used more than 100 times and the *British subjects* about 10 times. In the current *British Nationality Act* of 1981, the term (*British citizens*) is used more than 100 times, and (*British subjects*) only once (in §11) and at the same time only that *British subjects* become *citizens* of the United Kingdom and colonies.

Clause “C” and “I” of Part 1 of Article 3 of the Convention between the Government of the Russian

Federation and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (02/15/1994) "On avoidance of double taxation ..." defines that the term *citizen* means: with reference to the United Kingdom - any British citizen or any British subject who is not a citizen of any other country or territory of the British Commonwealth, provided that he has the right to reside in the United Kingdom.

Citizen is *Bürger* or *Staatsbürger* [8]. *Bürger* is 1) citizen; 2) city dweller; 3) philistine [9].

The term *Unionsbürgerschaft* ("European Union Citizenship") is used in the Treaty on European Union ("Vertrag über die Europäische Union") as equivalent to citizenship. Based on the provisions of this document, it can be concluded that "European citizenship is added to national citizenship, establishing a real and effective postnational political community" [31].

In the regulations of monarchical German states (XIX-XX centuries), as well as in the current regulations of the Federal Republic of Germany, when characterizing persons with citizenship, the concepts of *Bürger* or *Staatsbürger* are used, which are translated as *citizen* and not *Untertan - subject*.

"In monarchist states," wrote V. Hessen, "the attitude of allegiance is conceived as the attitude of the individual towards the monarch; and this attitude is called allegiance. On the contrary, in the Republican states, the attitude of allegiance, as the attitude of an individual to the state, and not to the authority in the state, is called citizenship. The individual is a subject in monarchies and a citizen in the republics" [17].

G.V. Chicherin in his report on union citizenship emphasized: "Declaration of the Rights and Liberties of Man and of the Citizen in 1789 replaced the notion of a subject, i.e. the object of an imposed will, alien to him, compulsory state power by the notion of a citizen, i.e. a participant in the collective will of the people, embodied in the form of state power" [32].

Politicians renouncing the use of the term *subject* as a symbol of political powerlessness officially introduced the term *citizen* with which they associated ideas of a new life, in which a person becomes a legally free person, not only having the right to participate in political life but also actively participating in her.

Many scientists in relation to the monarchical German states also speak not about subjects, but about citizens [30, 33].

At the beginning of the 19th century, Germanic states were monarchical in form of government, but officially they used the term *citizen* rather than *subject*, thus emphasizing the ongoing liberal changes in the regulation of individual status.

In the constitutions of Bavaria, Baden Württemberg and other German monarchies actively used the term *citizen*, *citizenship* (*Staatsbürger*", *Staats-Bürgerrecht*, *Staatsbürgerrecht*) - Constitution of the Kingdom of Bavaria (Verfassung des Königreiches Bayern (26.05.1818)), The Basic Law of the Grand Duchy of Baden (Verfassungsurkunde für das Großherzogtum Baden (22. 08. 1818)), the Constitutional Act of the Kingdom of Württemberg (Verfassungsurkunde für das Königreich Württemberg (25. 09. 1819)).

The Germans saw in the use of the word citizen the danger of counter-revolutionary transformations aimed at reducing significantly increasing among citizens, in contrast to subjects, the volume of political rights.

The concept of *German citizenship* is closely related to the historical formation, the circumstances of the creation of the German Empire as a single state.

Up until 1934, full-fledged single German citizenship did not exist, although we can find references to it in the regulations already in 1848. Thus, the imperial law "On the basic rights of the German people" ("Reichsgesetz, betreffend die Grundrechte des deutschen Volkes" (27. 12. 1848)) used the term *German imperial citizenship* (*deutsche Reichsbürgerrecht*). The base was not the imperial allegiance/citizenship, but the allegiance/citizenship of individual states - Prussian, Bavarian, Thuringian, etc. Subjects/citizens of the German Empire were considered to be persons who were subject to the allegiance of one of the states that were part of it. Only the inhabitants of the imperial lands (Alsace, Lorraine, etc.) consisted of direct allegiance of the empire.

Even during the existence of the Weimar Republic in Germany, a citizen of a separate land was automatically considered a citizen of the empire, but the federal imperial government did not have the right to interfere in the procedure of granting land citizenship. Article 16 of the Weimar Constitution stated: "Officials entrusted with direct imperial administration in lands should, as a general rule, be citizens of this land" (*Landesangehörige*) (Verfassung des Deutschen Reiches (11.08.1919)). A. Hitler legally implemented his ideas, expressed in the extremist autobiographical book "Mein Kampf" ("My Struggle"), that the future populist state conducts a division of the country's inhabitants into three classes: citizens, subjects, and foreigners [Ufa of the Russian Federation (03.24.2010) the book is included in the federal list of extremist materials] [34].

On September 15, 1935, the German Reichstag approved the "Reich Citizenship Act" (*Reichsbürgergesetz*), which in § 2 stipulated that a Reich citizen (*Reichsbürger*) was exclusively a citizen (*der Staatsangehörige*) with German blood or its blood which by its behavior proves that it is ready and able to serve the German people and the Reich by faith (*Reichsbürgergesetz* (15.09. 1935)). Subsequently, the "First Ordinance to the Law on Citizenship of the Reich" (14.11. 1935) divided German citizens into categories: 1) belonging to German or related blood; 2) belonging to racially alien tribes, including those related to prohibited marriages (Erste Verordnung zum Reichsbürgergesetz (14.11. 1935)).

How to determine this readiness and ability to faith serve the people and the state? Where are the boundaries of this behavior? The actions of the Nazis in relation to the mentally ill, deaf-and-dumb, Jews and other categories that became *non-citizens* were condemned by all progressive humanity, including at the Nuremberg trial.

In the Russian Empire, the term *citizen* appeared after the revolutionary transformations of 1917. On November 7, 1917, the appeal of the Military Revolutionary Committee of the Petrograd Soviet of Workers' and

Soldiers' Deputies "To the Citizens of Russia" was made public. The edict of the All-Russian Central Executive Committee (ARCEC) (11.23.1917) "On the destruction of estates and civil officials" said: "... one common name is established for the entire population of Russia - a citizen of the Russian Republic".

Some authors, with reference to all states, including modern Russia use the term *subjects* [35]. In our opinion, this is not reasonable.

In the regulatory legal acts of the Russian Federation, the terms citizenship and allegiance in most cases are used as words synonyms. For example, Part 3 of Art. 96 of the Criminal Procedure Code of the Russian Federation "If the suspect is a citizen or subject of another state ..."; Decree of the Government of the Russian Federation (27.04.2001) N 322 "On approval of the Regulation on the examination ...", etc.

The use of the terms *subject* and *citizen* in the regulatory legal acts of the Russian Federation and international treaties concluded by it depends solely on the form of government of the state: if a monarchy, then a subject; if the republic is a citizen. So in the "Agreement between the Government of the Russian Federation and the Government of the Kingdom of Thailand ..." (13.12.2005); Presidential Decree (27.10.2009) N 1205 "On awarding the Order of Friendship to the subjects of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland"; Decree of the President of the Russian Federation (September 29, 2005) N 1137 "On awarding state awards of the Russian Federation to the subjects of the Kingdom of Belgium" and others.

Note that in the legal acts of many modern monarchical states and in international treaties, instead of the concept of *subject* is used *citizen* (Belgium, Denmark, Spain, Japan). Art. VIII of the current Constitution of Japan: "A Japanese citizen loses Japanese allegiance from the moment he voluntarily accepts the citizenship of a foreign state." Article 15 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (December 10, 1948) states that "everyone has the right to a nationality." The term *citizen* is primarily used in the "Svalbard Treaty" (02/09/1920); "Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons" (09/28/1954); "Convention on the Nationality of Married Women" (01/29/1957); Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness (August 30, 1961); "International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights" (December 16, 1966); "Declaration of human rights in relation to persons who are not citizens of the country in which they live" (12/13/1985) and others.

Only in some official texts of international normative acts in Russian, we met the use of the term *subject*. Thus, in the official Russian text, paragraph 3 of Article 45 of the Hague Convention for the pacific settlement of international disputes (18/10/1907), is used the term *subject* and in the English text is *national*. Paragraph 1 of Annex II Potsdam Conference (08/01/1945) states that the burden of reparations and *war trophies* should not fall on allied subjects, in the English text is *nationals*. Thus, in relation to the citizens of the USSR and the United States,

who were not in the form of government of monarchical states, the term *subject*, more typical of England, was used.

There are also cases when in one international legal act at the same time are used as different terms "*citizen*" and *subject*. So clause "B" of section 9 of article VII of the agreement of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (12/21/1945) states that the salaries and salaries paid by the Bank ... to officials and employees of the Bank who are not local citizens, local subjects or other local residents... are not taxed.

We adhere to the point of view that "the political-legal idea of citizenship is historically closely intertwined with the ideas of equality and popular sovereignty since citizenship was associated with the destruction of the feudal estates and privileges, the right to participate in the exercise of state power. From this point, a citizen ceases to be solely an object of power, becomes a subject of power" [36].

In addition, "feudalism did not know citizenship, it was managed by the institution of allegiance, which meant the powerlessness of the individual before the all-powerful state" [37]. The conquest of the Great French Revolution should be considered the active use of the term *citizen* and the expulsion of references to nationality from the legal acts. The translations of the 1789 Declaration of the Rights and Liberties of Man and of the Citizen in Russian and English confirm the use of the term *citizen* rather than *subject*, although a constitutional monarchy existed in France during this period.

It seems that, on the basis of the foregoing, and taking into account the content of the rights of residents of democratic states, it is more correct to speak not of *subjects*, but of *citizens*. The thesis that the term *allegiance* may well be replaced by the term *citizenship* [36] is completely justified. Thus, in democracies, regardless of the form of government, the disappearance of the term *subject* and the wide use of the term *citizen*.

Sometimes the concept of *citizen* includes some shades of coldness, restraint, callousness, official formality. The thoughts of A. Solzhenitsyn involuntarily recalled, expressed by him in his work "The Gulag Archipelago": "there is not and there can be no other sentence for citizen Ouspenskaya, except for her destruction" *citizen chief*, *citizen overseer*, *citizen head camp item*. In the detective story of V. Pronin "Citizen Chief", the author points out that when addressing the detainee, they say: "Let's go, citizen!". These phrases emphasize the use of the term *Citizen* vertically, "top to bottom". Sometimes the use of the word *citizen* by people equal in legal status signifies readiness for conflict: "You, citizen, what do you need here?" In the continuation, we will quote from the novel "The Twelve Chairs" by I. Ilf, E. Petrov: "Listen, citizen, instead of crying, you might go to the bathhouse".

In Bavaria, in 2018, during the celebration of the bicentennial of its own Constitution, the exhibition "From the Subject to the Citizen" ("Vom Untertan zum Staatsbürger") was organized at public transport stations and other places, which, in our opinion, shows a progressive movement forward. And what will happen

next? What vector will be set for the development of citizenship in the future?

The search for an answer to the question of what the degree of political freedom of citizens is traditionally interested in many researchers [38]. An important task of democracy is the integration of citizens in the activities of the state, in the implementation of state policy [39]. Citizen participation in politics should not be reduced solely to periodic voting. The actual question is about what is the point in the voting of citizens, most of whom are ignorant and incompetent, have they a low level of political knowledge? [40]. It is important to remember that the need for any society is the responsible behavior of a citizen [41].

The phenomenon of citizenship, which arose BC “as a local phenomenon in time and space ... as a result of evolutionary transformations and revolutionary upheavals spread to the whole world as an outstanding achievement of the social, political and spiritual life of society, as one of the effective ways of positioning an individual within a self-organizing collective” [42].

Citizenship is not static; it is a dynamically developing legal and social institution. Citizenship is a dynamically developing system of relations between a person and a state, defined through practice [43, 44]. Quite modern ideas are being actively developed in the scientific literature for developing responsible citizenship is *postnational, global, supranational, ecological* [45, 46]. Some authors point to the development of *global republican citizenship*, whose supporters will adhere exclusively to the ideas of republicanism [47].

One of the directions of development of citizenship is digital citizenship, the study of which is also gaining popularity [48]. If we turn to the provision of public services in electronic form, we can conclude that when they are received, some kind of activity and competence of citizens is needed: you need to register, confirm your identity in the identification center. A non-initiative citizen will not be able to obtain “digital citizenship” and the benefits associated with it.

H. Mann in the novel “Der Untertan” (“The Subject”) portrayed the protagonist cynical, with disgusting thoughts, a slave and fanatical monarch fan [49]. The novel was translated into Russian under the name “Loyal subject”, into English “Man of Straw”.

A citizen as a person must be qualitatively different from a loyal subject. This difference should, first of all, be traced in the scope of rights and freedoms, in the activity and competence of a person. Democratic rulers cannot even afford to think about returning to the institution of the powerless subject.

B. Shumatsky in the book “The New Subject: Populism, Postmodernism, Putin” [50] indicates that a person can easily become an unquestioning subject of consoling populist lies.

Our courageous and courageous ancestors in the revolutionary struggle, despite the difficulties [51], won the right to call themselves citizens. It is important not only to preserve these achievements but also to multiply them, enriching the institution of citizenship, citizen status.

In a moral sense, it is obvious that if a citizen sees the order in a democracy that is most consistent with his views, then from the point of view of an equitable distribution of burdens, everyone must contribute.

Citizenship, civic spirit is essential to ensure a sustainable and democratic environment. But how determine the level of development of these categories? It is reasonable to propose to measure the degree of citizenship by an index of citizenship consisting of certain indicators: membership in the political community; collective responsibilities and rights as a consequence of membership; participation in the social and political process [52], [53].

4 Conclusion

The study revealed the etymology, historical development, the essence and content of the concepts *citizen* and *subject*, *citizenship* and *allegiance*. The use and content of the concepts *subject*, *citizen* depends on the historical period of the formation of society, state.

For the concept of *subject* one can distinguish the following conditional direction of development: from a fully dependent person who pays taxes and is the subject (slave) of the monarch, the object of power; a person who is endowed with a non-essential volume of rights of a subject (unlike a citizen) and belongs to a state with a monarchical form of government; and further to a person belonging to a state with a monarchical form of government and endowed with legal status equal to the status and competencies of a citizen.

For the concept *citizen*, the democratic vector of development is the enrichment of a person’s status, not only with rights, but also the content of a citizen-state relationship: from a city dweller to a person who is a subject of power and has full democratic legal status, high index and civic competence and having a stable legal relationship with the state (in which, as a rule, the republican form of government).

References

1. M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch 2* (Publisher Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1953)
2. G. Krylov, *Etymology Dictionary of the Russian Language* (Poligrafuslugi, St. Petersburg, 2005)
3. V. Dal, *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great 3 Russian Language* (Russian, Moscow, 1978)
4. S. Ozhegov, *Dictionary of the Russian language* (Russian, Moscow, 1989)
5. S. Kuznetsov, *Complete Explanatory Dictionary of the Russian Language* (Norint, Spb., 2000)
6. T. Efremova, *The New Dictionary of the Russian 1 Language* (Russian, Moscow, 2000)
7. A. Evgen'eva, *Dictionary of the Russian language in 4 volumes 1* (Russian, Moscow, 1981)
8. L. Bergston, *Russian-German Law Dictionary* (Linguistics, Moscow, 2000)

9. K. Blattner, *German-Legal Dictionary* (YuNVES, Moscow, 2004)
10. D. Griesshaber, *Die Märzbewegung im deutschen Südwesten und im Rheinland*, Retrieved from: <http://geschichtsverein-koengen.de/Revolution1848.htm> (date of access: 10.04.19)
11. *Wolgadeutsche Monatshefte* **19/20**, 93-97 (1924)
12. *Wolgadeutsche Monatshefte* **21/22**, 117-123 (1924)
13. B. Brigitte, M. Wermke, *Das Herkunftswörterbuch: Etymologie der deutschen Sprache* **7** (Dudenverlag, Berlin, 2013)
14. R. Krüger, *Postgeheimnis, "Datenschutz" und Rohrpost um das Jahr 1900*, *Philatelie* **495**, 26-29 (2018)
15. E. Leping, *Complete German-Russian Dictionary 1* (Russian, Moscow, 1998)
16. H. Conrad, *Rechtsstaatliche Bestrebungen im Absolutismus Preußens und Österreichs am Ende des 18. Jahrhunderts* (Westdeutscher Verl., Köln, 1953)
17. V. Gessen, *Allegiance, its establishment and termination* **1** (Pravda printing house, S.-Pb., 1909)
18. F. Engels, *Vereinbarungsdebatten vom 3. Juni 1848*, *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* **7**, 2 (1848)
19. K. Marx, F. Engels *Werke* **1** (Dietz-Verlag, Berlin, 1983)
20. K. Marx, *Der Konflikt zwischen Marx und der preußischen Untertanenschaft*, *Neue Rheinische Zeitung* **94** (1848)
21. V. Myuller, *English-Russian Dictionary* (Russian, Moscow, 1985)
22. S. Andrianov, *English-Russian Law Dictionary* (RUSSO, Moscow, 2002)
23. A. Shaposhnikov, *Etymology Dictionary of the Modern Russian Language* (Flinta: Nauka, Moscow, 2010).
24. *Dictionary of associations "Rerait"*, Retrieved from: <http://www.reright.ru/analysis/1418852~подданный.html> (date of access: 10.04.19)
25. A. Sukharev, *Legal Encyclopedic Dictionary* (Soviet Encyclopedia, Moscow, 1987)
26. M. Vasmer, *Russisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* **1** (Publisher Carl Winter, Heidelberg, 1953)
27. V. Dal, *Explanatory Dictionary of the Living Great Russian Language* **1** (Russian, Moscow, 1978)
28. A. Lyublinskay, *History in the Encyclopedia of Diderot and d'Alembert* (Nauka, Leningrad, 1978)
29. S. Folomkina, *English-Russian Combinatory Dictionary* (Russian, Moscow, 1998)
30. Y. Bokov, *To the question of the use of the concepts "citizen" and "subject" in scientific sources, Modern problems of science and education* **5** (2012), Retrieved from: <http://science-education.ru/ru/article/view?id=7280> (date of access: 06.04.19)
31. N. Gamebuch, *Institute of German Citizenship in the Context of European Law*, *Tomsk State University Journal* **4**, 74-80 (2013)
32. G. Chicherin, *Report on Union Citizenship*, *Bulletin* **13**, 69 (1924)
33. Y. Bokov, *Electoral rights of citizens of German states in the first half of the XIX century*, *Bulletin of Volgograd State University. Series 9: Studies of young scientists* **5**, 52-59 (2006)
34. *Federal list of extremist materials. Line No. 604*, Retrieved from: https://minjust.ru/ru/extremist-materials?field_extremist_content_value=Майн+Кампф
35. D. Smirnov, *Legal nature of tax liability*, *Taxes* **30**, 171 (2008)
36. V. Kikot, *Russian citizenship* (Law and Law, Moscow, 2003)
37. I. Farber, O. Mironov, V. Kabyshev, *Soviet State Law* (Publishing House of Saratov University, Saratov, 1979)
38. D. Paygina, *Political Regime and Perspectives of its Research in Juridical Science*, *Journal of Russian Law* **11**, 34 (2015)
39. H. Chávez, *Information and citizenship: a governance perspective*, *Investigación Bibliotecológica: Archivonomía, Bibliotecología e Información* **29 (67)**, 134 (2015)
40. T. Fossen, J. Anderson, *What's the point of voting advice applications? Competing perspectives on democracy and citizenship*, *Electoral Studies* **36**, 246 (2014)
41. E. Kenyon, *Troubled belonging: Lived experience and the responsibility of citizenship*, *The Journal of Social Studies Research* **43 (1)**, 47 (2019)
42. L. Maximova, *Evolution of the Phenomenon of citizenship in the context of historical Development of the Western Europe*, *MGIMO Review International Relations* **6**, 41 (2017)
43. J. Hackett, *Activism as a pathway to global citizenship*, *The Social Science Journal* **54 (2)**, 132 (2018)
44. I. Gerasimov, S. Glebov, A. Kaplunovskii, M. Mogilner, A. Semenov, *Citizen subject: the problem of state involvement in the empire and nation*, *Ab Imperio* **4**, 11-22 (2006)
45. J. Häkli, *The subject of citizenship – Can there be a posthuman civil society?* *Political Geography* **67**, 166 (2018)
46. G. Nemțoi, C. Ignătescu, *National Citizenship as Representative of European Citizenship*, *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* **149**, 653 (2014)
47. W. Hansasz, *Toward Global Republican Citizenship?* *Social Philosophy and Policy* **23**, 282-302 (2006)
48. M. Choi, M. Glassman, D. Cristol, *What it means to be a citizen in the internet age: Development of a reliable and valid digital citizenship*, *Computers & Education* **107**, 100 (2017)

49. H. Mann, *Der Untertan* (Claassen, Hamburg, 1958)
50. B. Schumatsky, *Der neue Untertan: Populismus, Postmoderne, Putin* (Residenz Verlag, Salzburg, 2016)
51. K. Jungnickel, “*One needs to be very brave to stand all that*”: *Cycling, rational dress and the struggle for citizenship in late nineteenth century Britain*, *Geoforum* **64**, 362-371 (2015)
52. N. Davis, O. Ergunova, V. Lizunkov, E. Malushko, Phenomenon of migration and its manifestations in the modern world, *European Proceedings of Social and Behavioural Sciences*, **26**, 550-556 (2017)
53. A. Yani, A. Hidayat, *What is the Citizenship Quality of Our Community? Measuring Active Citizenship*, *Public Administration Issue* **6**, 119–133 (2018)