

**Chapter 1 : V. Maurizio Giangliulo, The Emergence of Pisatis**

*Maurizio Giangliulo, University of Trento, Department of Humanities, Faculty Member. Studies Ancient Greek Philosophy, Presocratic Philosophy, and Pythagoreanism.*

Collana Studi e Ricerche n. Reviewed by Stefania Giombini, Universitat de Girona stefania. This book is the output of the third of these meetings. After a brief preface by de Luise, which presents its contents, Mario Vegetti, in his introduction, focuses on five basic answers given by the Greeks, in the V and IV centuries B. The volume is composed of six different sections, adding Basileia to the five principles identified by Vegetti. Maurizio Giangliulo deals with some paradoxes of Athenian democracy, in two parts. In the first, he discusses what he considers the first paradox of Athenian democracy, viz. In the second part, he discusses the paradox of slavery, which is the essential prerequisite for Athenian democracy since it allowed the lower classes not to be subjects to the higher ones. Regarding the first topic, Giangliulo focuses especially on the Ekklesia, which he finds limited since it included only a small percentage of the citizens entitled to participate. Giangliulo argues that this is not a matter of citizenship but rather of the concept of democracy if one accepts that democracy means the participation of all the citizens. The Episteme section comprises an essay by de Luise on the development of the Platonic idea of political power associated with episteme. Recreating the idea of the knowledge that must belong to the ruler, de Luise outlines a clear path of interpretation from Republic to Statesman, which begins with praise of knowledge as an instrument that leads to power, and later the idea that the legitimacy of power based on knowledge necessarily requires a review of the archetype of the polis and a new type of ruler who can, with his knowledge, place himself above ordinary, low level political practice. This essay is followed by the quite long one by Alberto Maffi on the principle of majority, which opens the Nomos section. Maffi returns to a theme he has previously discussed, 3 though from another point of view. At the beginning, he focuses on defining the peculiarities of the principle of majority in judicial and political practice: To counterbalance the political strength of the minority, Aristotle introduces a series of corrective actions, which pursue an ideal political balance between rich and poor. Since the role of the latter is not binding in oligarchies, the principle of majority is effective more on a consultative level than on a deliberative one. In the politeia, instead, the principle of majority preserves its effectiveness within a deliberation sphere. Maffi outlines a new interpretation of the fourth book of Politics based particularly on the value which Aristotle places on the highest possible participation of the citizens in deliberations. Silvia Gastaldi also discusses the Aristotelian Politics, where the best constitution is the one by the mesoi, but they are not numerous enough to effectively form their own government. Therefore, it will be necessary to fall back on the politeia, with a mixed constitution involving both democrats and oligarchs. However, the politeia does not work since agreement between opposite parties does not seem achievable, nor has historically ever been achieved. One of the most interesting essays of the volume closes the Nomos section. She shows that it has different meanings in these two works: In Laws, dogma does not mean decree, as many have thought, but is rather the idea of a law that must be received and digested and come from a god or from somebody who has knowledge; thus it is a conviction, a firm belief, and therefore it has the ambition to be in its right formulation, in other words how it should be. In Minos, dogma is a decision of the city that comes from a poll, from a direct expression of the citizens: With a second device, which identifies Hades as the final judge, the outcome is the same, but in this passage col. From this, Piergiacomi claims that Diogenes intends to criticize the myth Socrates tells to Calicles in Gorgias, although the criticism of the Socratic myth does not imply that Diogenes is endorsing the perspective offered by Calicles. In fact, the Epicureans never show disregard towards the nomoi and do not support the act of committing injustice. The volume ends with an essay by Federico Zuolo on the unstable nature of tyranny. For Plato, the tyrant is violent and irrational; Xenophon presents a tyrant with a certain level of self-awareness that cannot be expressed in the outer dimension of power; Aristotle offers a more neutral discussion, since tyranny, even if reprehensible, is nevertheless a form of government. Aristotle and Xenophon seem more realistic than Plato because they believe that a change of appearance for the tyrant is possible, even though not a change of his inner being. As should be clear, the volume is full of

perspectives and observations, which sometimes intertwine with one another and sometimes exhort the reader to meditate further. Thus, the aim of this book appears totally fulfilled. Table of Contents Fulvia de Luise, Prefazione. Un percorso di riflessione comune, 7 Gli autori, 13 Mario Vegetti, Introduzione. Ripensare i paradigmi del pensiero politico: A fourth and a fifth meeting recently took place: Sul libro terzo della Politica di Aristotele, Turin, May 11th–12th Still, it is important to consider that democracy and participation are not interchangeable notions, as it is also evident nowadays in contemporary democracies, starting with the one recognized as reliable, the United States of America. On the principle of majority Maffi has also published:

**Chapter 2 : The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus (, Hardcover) | eBay**

*CV MAURIZIO GIANGIULIO! Professor of Greek History - University of Trento (Italy)! | Personal details, education and experience!! | 1 Personal details.*

Maurizio Giangiulio, *Democrazie greche: Atene, Sicilia, Magna Grecia*. The scope of the book is much more restricted, as the author himself acknowledges "it does not deal with political theory nor discuss current topics", p. Giangiulio limits himself to describing the ways in which democratic regimes came about and either endured or ended in five major Greek cities. Athens, Syracuse, Croton, Thurii and Tarentum were governed by democracies for longer and shorter periods, but in each case an ideological opposition to gross social and economic inequality along with tangible measures to prevent it were prerequisites for a functioning democracy. The first three chapters constitute, effectively, "Part 1: He begins with a review of the historiographical tradition, with roots in the 18th century, that has produced a widespread belief that the Greek poleis, Athens above all, were naturally egalitarian and structurally disposed toward democracy. Giangiulio places himself firmly in the camp of Kurt Raaflaub and others for whom Athenian democracy began in earnest with Ephialtes and Pericles in the 5th BCE, but even Raaflaub is too linear for him. He is certainly right to observe that "This process was long, complex, and troubled, and the results were never assumed. Attainment of democratic structures took place only in some cases, far from numerous, and passed through various intermediate phases He is right to differentiate isonomia from demokratia and to emphasize the work required to create a "new order" *passim*. But he will rightly receive pushback from scholars with a nuanced evolutionary view of ancient Greek political institutions, for whom the "long, complex, and troubled" process is exactly what they believe led to democracy in its fullest form. They will find little advantage in posing the questions as Giangiulio does, or in employing the nebulous concepts of "structural break" and "political integration". In Chapter 2, Giangiulio identifies the Persian Wars of the early fifth century BCE as the fundamental cause of a crisis within Greek aristocracies, which led among other things to a fully functioning democracy in Athens. The reconstruction of Athens after Salamis and Plataia, in the 5th BCE, was therefore the true birthplace of Athenian democracy in name and in reality, a "new political culture" that gave all citizens a share in communal decision-making processes. Chapter 3 presents democratic Athens in its glory, beginning with the revolution, as Giangiulio would have it, of Ephialtes and Pericles that brought it into being. The institutions sortition, jury pay, etc. Two things stand out in this chapter. First, the fourth century receives rather little attention and later centuries none at all, which is surprising given the amount of work being done these days on polis institutions after Alexander. More positively, this chapter is where Giangiulio actually begins to develop his argument about the tensions between socioeconomic inequality and political equality in a democracy. Athenian democracy succeeded more or less for years on his count both because social and economic elites accepted that all citizens would participate in political processes, and because non-elites newly endowed with political clout accepted that there would be inequalities in wealth and status among citizens. The aristocrats did not often exclude the masses from communal decision-making, and the masses did not often murder the rich or seize their property. The second part of the book turns to the Western Greek world to examine democracies in Sicily and southern Italy, some of them quite short-lived. In Chapter 4 Giangiulio takes on Syracuse, where democracy existed between ca. 480 and 400 BCE. In Chapter 5 we go to Croton, where democracy arose in the 5th century BCE as the product of a popular revolt against the Pythagoreans though nothing is known of Crotoniate democracy in action. In Chapter 6 Giangiulio argues that the democratic regime in Thurii lasted nearly 25 years after its foundation in the 5th century BCE before succumbing to an oligarchic takeover, not the 10 years sometimes supposed. In Chapter 7 we see the democracy of Tarentum at its birth in the 5th century BCE and at its apex under Archytas in the mid-fourth century. Giangiulio presents the histories of these cities with a focus on different degrees of equality in economic, social, and political spheres, though it has to be said that he uses a more lenient definition of democracy for the western Greek cities than for Athens, which he will not allow to have been a democracy before Ephialtes. This is a thought-provoking book with an elegant and appealing principal theme, which does in a very understated way what great books in the Classics do: Only in a handful

of places does Giangiulio point out the relationships explicitly, but the book is rich in suggestive ideas and implications. This tendency to leave connections implicit, admirable in avoiding polemic, unfortunately extends to the argumentation of the book as well; the chapters devoted to the case studies are almost entirely self-contained, and while there are sporadic cross references, and themes of equality and inequality can be detected throughout, there is no unifying idea aside from the proposition that socioeconomic inequality was in tension with political equality. It is an interesting proposition, but something more in the way of analysis would have been welcome. How and why did western Mediterranean democracy differ from Aegean democracy? Did the context in which democracy arose post-war reconstruction at Athens and Tarentum, popular revolt at Syracuse and Croton, Athenian policy at Thurii affect its structure or its success? The definition of who was a citizen changed frequently in each city—“to what degree was the size and makeup of the citizen body a factor in political, social, and economic dynamics? A concluding section of some sort would have been a place for Giangiulio to show us what is to be learned about Greek democracy from studying his examples. Some readers may try to, anyway. This book is not actually intended for scholars of Greek democracy, though they may find it engaging. It is, as Giangiulio says himself, aimed "at the educated reader and at the engaged student, [and] confronts problems of Greek history in the Classical period, without indulging in sophistication and jargon" p. That may be the reason why the text often eschews traditional references keyed to specific ideas or positions in favor of short and rather casual bibliographic essays, organized by chapter and section, which precede the final list of works cited. In-text citations are often too vague to be useful e. The book is short; Giangiulio stops himself more than once from pursuing important questions further; nowhere does he explain why he has chosen to discuss the democracies of Magna Graecia as opposed to those of mainland Greece and the Aegean world. All of this suggests that the ideal audience is composed of amateurs rather than students or active scholars. The book is well produced and includes a full bibliography on ancient democracies, though I have already noted that the references to this bibliography are not likely to be very helpful. Those contents are intriguing if not always conclusive or new. Readers desiring a stimulating series of explorations with gestures toward the extant bibliography on Greek democracy will be quite satisfied; those in search of more conventional thesis-and-evidence scholarship would be better served by any number of the recent volumes and monographs on the topic. In the first place, it identifies a central tension in any democracy that tolerates socioeconomic distinctions. Second, it shows that the histories of several Greek democracies can be read as struggles to accommodate that tension. Third, it provides a series of case studies showing that, in the classical Greek world, democracies tended to lose out to oligarchies—the ideological commitment to political equality tended to give way before the commitment to social and economic capital accumulation did. This warning should be no less alarming for having been delivered almost surreptitiously in an otherwise redundant book of Greek history. I only found three: To name just three examples: *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. The Greek Polis and the Invention of Democracy: A politico-cultural transformation and its interpretations. Chichester, West Sussex, U. *Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*.

*Prof Giangiulio Maurizio: Appunti e Documenti pubblicati dagli studenti che hanno frequentato i suoi corsi. I materiali caricati riguardano gli insegnamenti di storia greca, cultura classica nel.*

In lieu of an abstract, here is a brief excerpt of the content: Center for Hellenic Studies, Ethnicity emerged as an important issue in classical studies in the late s. As such, the contributors scrutinize expressions of ethnicity in the Peloponnese during the late fifth and early fourth centuries B. While I believe that this volume has much to offer scholars of the political history of ancient Greece, I have serious concerns with the overarching critical understanding of the concept of "ethnicity" throughout the volume a problem that I feel is compounded by the lack of an introduction and conclusion. I will address these concerns after summarizing the main arguments of each contribution. Peter Funke gives the political background to the dissolution of the Peloponnesian League, arguing that political processes in place before the decisive Battle of Leuctra B. He concludes that the political world of the Peloponnese was "ethnicized" from the late fifth century onwards. Ethnicization, according to Funke, is a political process, "the tendency to overstep the narrow borders of the polis" in an attempt at "founding or recovering the identity of the group beyond the polis" Klaus Freitag examines whether or not ethnicity was a factor in the relations between the Achaeans and the Spartans. He concludes that ethnic arguments were insignificant in this context. James Roy analyzes the development of political identities in Elis. He argues that Elis incorporated perioikic communities that had cultivated local ethnic identities and that the resultant multiple layers of ethnic affiliations led to tensions. Thus, Roy illustrates the contested nature of Elian identity. Claudia Ruggeri presents the rise and fall of the Triphulioi. This ethnic group emerged in B. She shows that the ethnogenesis of the Triphulioi was articulated through the construction of a common mythic past which was founded on the [End Page ] arrival of the Minyans in deep prehistory, while the incorporation of Triphylia into Arcadia was articulated through a mythic genealogy in which Triphylos, a son of Arkas, appears. In the political realm this means that the descendants of Triphylos, the Triphulioi, came to be viewed as an Arcadian tribe. Maurizio Giangiulio discusses the ethnic Pisatis, which emerged during the fourth century and was applied to the inhabitants of the Alpheios valley. Maria Pretzler details the process whereby Arcadian identity was created and traces its development within the context of the foundation of an Arcadian state after the Battle of Leuctra. Again, in the wake of the Battle of Leuctra, Nino Luraghi emphasizes the existence of competing versions of the Messenian past in his discussion of the rise of Messenian identity and the Messenian state during the early fourth century. Luraghi argues that Messenian identity had already emerged in exile during the fifth century and that this identity was articulated lavishly in pan-Hellenic settings. The Boeotian version excluded the indigenous population from the Messenian past and stood in stark contrast to the Messenian version of the past which, evidenced for instance by eponymous heroes and cults, re-invested earlier Laconian culture with new meaning rather than eradicating it. Eric Robinson examines whether the ethnicization of politics in the early fourth

*Maurizio Giangiulio Douketios was the military and political leader of the Sikels who, after the fall of the tyrants of Syracuse ( bce), tried to unite the natives of southeastern Sicily into a.*

Many would have shared the opinion expressed by Georg Busolt that Pisatis and Triphylia were to the Eleans what Messenia was for the Spartans. Everything was to be explained by admitting that before the sixth century the Pisatans had been an autonomous ethnic group. It comes as no surprise, then, that the conception advanced in by Benedictus Niese did not find acceptance. Niese boldly tried to challenge the consensus root and branch, arguing that in the archaic age an autonomous Pisatan polity did not exist beside Elis, and that the ancient accounts of the struggles between the Pisatans and the Eleans are to be taken as late invention. Pisatan studies are now on the move. The time has come to interpret the literary record in the context of the events of the late classical age, rather than to see it in the light of a receding historical background. It is widely held, now, that our information about archaic Greek historyâ€™as J. In a sense, Busolt was right. Pisatis can really be seen as some sort of Messenia. But the reason is not that in both of them an ethnic group brought into subjection could finally gain its independence, rather that in both casesâ€™si parva licet The Pisatans, who maintained that they were the first to have had control of the sanctuary, celebrated the Olympic Games. It is in this context that the political community of the Pisatans came to take shape; or to put it more precisely, that Pisa was constituted as an independent state, [ 18 ] as the epigraphic evidence seems to show beyond any doubt. More than one inscription makes clear that the Pisatans concluded international treaties. A decree of the Arcadian Confederacy, which ratifies a bilateral alliance between Pisa and Akroreia on one side, and the Arcadians on the other confirms that Pisa was backing the Arcadian Confederacy. As for the Pisatan state itself, the decrees and the treaties show that it now had formal mechanisms by which it made decisions; and civil magistracies were in place three hellanodikai which had the same name as the Elean ones, but differed from them in number and prerogatives. More specifically, what needs to be better understood, as Nielsen remarked quite recently, [ 26 ] is the reason why the Pisatans did not join the Arcadian Confederacy, [ 27 ] as the Triphylians did, [ 28 ] and contented themselves with concluding an alliance with it. In other words, why did the Arcadians not suggest the Pisatans should become Arcadians, when they had incorporated the Triphylians into the confederacy and made the Triphylian eponym Triphylos one of the sons of Arkas? It may be suggested that the true reason is that Pisatan identity was especially attached to Olympia, and that the Olympian traditions could not be appropriated by the Arcadians any more than the sanctuary itself. So the Arcadian Confederacy gained control of the sanctuary by closely linking to itself the puppet state of the Pisatans and their newly constructed traditions that focused on Olympia. It is usually claimed that the Arcadians could not make the Pisatans into Arcadians and that this is precisely the reason why they kept the Pisatans outside the confederacy: On one side, the Pisatan puppet state which was claiming the sanctuary was to be related to the Arcadians, but could not be identified with them; on the other, the Olympian sanctuary itself was to be credited with an Arcadian identity: It is widely held that it embraced Pisatis, [ 32 ] that is to say the area which stretched from the Alpheios River to Mt. The name Pisa itself gives an interesting clue. But there is more to it than that, because it is actually far from clear that at the time of Pisatan independence a full fledged notion of Pisatis as a sub-regional unit was already in place. I would surmise that the notion of Pisatis itself is of learned origin and that it goes back to the Hellenistic age, perhaps to Demetrius of Skepsis. It becomes apparent, at this point, that the problem of the group identity of the Pisatans needs to be reconsidered. It can in fact be shown that such identity was constructed in the fourth century, but to take it to be merely a side effect of the formation of the Pisatan state would be simplistic. It seems more complex processes were involved. Pisatan Identity in the Making As for Pisatan identity, one cannot help but be struck by its attachment to Olympia. It comes as no surprise, then, that when the Elean-Arcadian war came to an end, in , and the Eleans took charge of the sanctuary again, they too asserted their claims to Olympia: As for the Pisatan palaiiai apodeixeis, we can only guess at their content, but it is worth noticing that a well-informed source reports that the first founder of the Olympic Games had been Pisos, the eponymous hero of Pisa. So, we can safely assume that stories about

the role played by Pisos in the prehistory of the Olympic Games were an integral part of the palaiiai apodeixeis which the Pisatans circulated. According to Apollodorus the Pisatans maintained that when the Trojan War broke out they were hieroi tou theou. But the Eleans too claimed to be a people sacred to Zeus since the time when they took possession of the land, as Ephorus reports. In this way the Pisatans not only placed special emphasis on their association with Olympia, but claimed for themselves as well an extraordinary religious quality. Now, as for the origin of the Pisatan muthikai and palaiiai apodeixeis, their specific reference to Olympia makes clear that the Pisatan presidency of the Olympic Games in needed a convincing set of charter-myths. This is confirmed by the genealogy of the Pisatan founder of the Games. In fact, Pisos is provided with a wife called Olympia, who is known in mythology as the daughter of the Arcadian eponym Arkas. There remains an important point which deserves our attention. Certain hints actually suggest that the invention of a Pisatan tradition may be seen to have extended to Pisatan prehistory as a whole, rather than being limited only to the origins of the Olympic Games. This process involved, in particular, stories about Pisos, Salmoneus and Oinomaos: Now, the Argonautic myth played a role in archaic Corinth, [ 49 ] and the funeral games for Pelias are a common subject in archaic art. But how are we to explain the fact that Pisos, in particular, is one of the competitors? I would surmise that Pisos was displayed on the chest because he was important at Olympia, and that the same holds true for Pelops, Hippodamia and Oinomaos. If it is so, we are faced with an attempt to establish a link between Pisos and the Aeolids. We should also take into account the possibility that in the fourth century the Pisatans appropriated and manipulated older mythological narratives centered on Oinomaos. We should assume, then, that when the Pisatans gained independence, they recovered those narratives and used them to articulate the newly constructed Pisatan identity. We must now consider whether the sense of identity developed by the Pisatans in the fourth century is to be taken as an ethnic consciousness. But it is crucially important both to focus on what distinguishes the ethnic group from other social groups and to trace the features on which the perception of cultural uniqueness of a given group is based. From this point of view, not all of the features by which we can identify ethnic groups are to be taken as being crucial to the present discussion. As is well known, Anthony Smith isolated six identifying marks of an ethnic group: To turn now to the Pisatans, the first point to be made is that the genealogical details about Pisos we are dealing with do not appear to reflect, except to a limited extent, the recognition of a putative shared ancestry. It is reasonable to doubt that the Pisatans possessed a real myth of descent. As for the connection to a territory, one should notice that no emphasis is given to the region where the Pisatans as a group reside, to the homeland of the ethnic group. And if we keep in mind that places are crucial for cultural memory, it becomes most relevant that there is no Pisatan homeland featuring as lieu de memoire, as Pierre Nora would have it. Apparently, the notion of a region called Pisatis emerged only later. It was Olympia, instead, that had a mythical and symbolic quality for the Pisatans, but even Olympia was not seen as a proper sacred centre of a homeland. It is not so much that Olympia was the centre of the Pisatan world, as that Olympia and Pisa were seen by the Pisatans as two sides of one and the same coin. One could say, in this connection, that Pisatan identity mainly consisted in claiming Olympia as Pisatan. All in all, one has the impression that Pisatan ethnic identity remained underdeveloped and feeble. This impression becomes stronger when we ask ourselves to what extent the Pisatans possessed a shared history. We have seen that the Pisatans claimed to have founded the Olympic Games, that Oinomaos probably was of paramount importance for their identity, and that some Pisatan communities traced their origins back to him. On the other hand, there is no trace of a Pisatan genealogical history, nor, for instance, of any attempt to claim Nestor and his kingdom as Pisatan. It remains to be investigated whether Pisatan traditions about the history of the Olympic Games had existed. But before looking in detail at this problem, it deserves to be emphasised that the picture we have been drawing so far does not easily fit in with the hypothesis that in the fourth century the Pisatan independent state was built upon a Pisatan identity rooted in a receding past and a well established ethnic consciousness. We should rather admit that it is the newly constituted Pisatan polity that played a decisive role in shaping a Pisatan group identity. We have seen that Pisatan identity is a fourth-century cultural construct. Now, it is crucial to determine when it took shape. The role played by the formation of an independent Pisatan polity in is apparent, but there are hints that a Pisatan identity started gradually to emerge earlier, in the first decades of

the century. We should take into account, then, what happened at the beginning of the century. When the Spartan-Elean war broke out, [ 69 ] the Alpheios valley, both to the north and to the south of the river, was thrown into turmoil, and many communities which had the status of subordinate allies of the Eleans, seceded from them. Apparently, a subordinate Pisatan community acting as such did not exist, but the war set in motion an important development. According to Xenophon Hellenica 2. Xenophon says that some people were raising a claim to the presidency against the Eleans, but the Spartans did not trust these rival claimants because they were rustic and would not be competent to preside over the sanctuary. Niese maintained that this passage of Xenophon, which is now widely held to be reliable, [ 76 ] could not have been written before and that it has to be taken as a late insertion. Therefore, the Spartan-Elean war can be regarded as a fitting historical context for the origins of the quarrel. The claims to the Olympian sanctuary had evidently been triggered by the Spartan intervention and by the liberation of many subordinate allies of the Eleans. It is probable that, given a situation of such unrest, the communities of what became Pisatis began to feel different from the Eleans. So, the crisis of the Elean mini-empire was making way for new identities and new political organizations. It was in those years, it seems, that the idea of questioning the Elean right to control Olympia was emerging for the first time. Moreover, one gets the impression that the Elean right to control Olympia was the burning issue of the first decades of the century. Constructing the Past As is well known, until recently scholarship used to take for granted that an historical Pisatan tradition dating back at least to the seventh century existed, which the Eleans felt themselves compelled to manipulate. Of course, Elean traditions did exist which presupposed both the Elean presidency of the Olympic Games and the Elean rule over the Pisatans and the neighbouring communities. Probably they were not unlike the tradition reported by Pausanias 6. For both Apollodorus and the ancient chronographic tradition Pisatan control of Olympia was long-lasting. As is well known, these traditions bulk large in modern discussions. The Pisatans would have controlled the sanctuary from time immemorial, then, in the early sixth century, the Eleans would have conquered Pisatis and taken in charge the Olympics; but, in order to provide justification for their conquest, they would have represented themselves as the founders of the Games who had been unlawfully stripped of control of Olympia by the Pisatans. Now, this view of the traditions we have been discussing so far is based on two assumptions that turn out to be very questionable. The first is that there existed an unchanging Pisatan tradition dating back at least to the seventh century, which the Eleans felt themselves compelled to manipulate. The second is that the Eleans could not deal with the genuine memories which recorded Pisatan control of Olympia before the Elean conquest simply by omitting them. So the Elean tradition could not help but reinterpret the historical situation and the tradition, obviously a Pisatan one, which recorded it. As for the first assumption, one should admit that, given the Elean conquest of Pisatis in the early sixth century and its incorporation into the Elean state, two centuries later nothing would have prevented the Eleans from disposing of the early Pisatan history of Olympia. But this view of Elean-Pisatan relations and of the overall character of the alleged Pisatan tradition does not fit the evidence well. For instance, both the early-fifth century grant of Chaladrian citizenship to Deukalion, [ 83 ] where Pisa features as a place-name, and the mentions of Pisa in Pindar and Herodotus, [ 84 ] do not imply a Pisatan community. If previously an independent Pisatan community had existed, it surely would have left more substantial traces in the historical record. In other words, it seems probable that we are dealing with an intentional construction of the past whereby the Eleans intended to facilitate the incorporation of the Pisatan polity into the Elean state. From this point of view, it may be useful to pay attention to a whole series of traditions about the mythical and historical past of Olympia which, instead of taking the Pisatans and the Eleans as two conflicting communities, speak of their relationship in conciliatory terms. We should refer at least to the account of the foundation of the Olympic Games by the Spartan Lycurgus, the Elean Iphitos and the Pisatan Cleosthenes [ 85 ] and to the story of the Sixteen Women, who settled by arbitration the feud between Eleans and Pisatans. We are dealing with narratives which, as Massimo Nafissi remarked, [ 88 ] fit well the historical context of the years following the end of Pisatan independence in , when we see Olympia under Elean control and the Eleans backing the Spartans.

**Chapter 5 : The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus - Paperback - Nino Luraghi - Oxford University Press**

*Maurizio Giangiulio is the author of Memorie Coloniali ( avg rating, 1 rating, 0 reviews, published ), Le opere e le testimonianze ( avg rati.*

Atene, Sicilia, Magna Grecia. Giangiulio limits himself to describing the ways in which democratic regimes came about and either endured or ended in five major Greek cities. Athens, Syracuse, Croton, Thurii and Tarentum were governed by democracies for longer and shorter periods, but in each case an ideological opposition to gross social and economic inequality along with tangible measures to prevent it were prerequisites for a functioning democracy. He begins with a review of the historiographical tradition, with roots in the 18th century, that has produced a widespread belief that the Greek poleis, Athens above all, were naturally egalitarian and structurally disposed toward democracy. Giangiulio places himself firmly in the camp of Kurt Raaflaub and others for whom Athenian democracy began in earnest with Ephialtes and Pericles in the 5th century BCE, but even Raaflaub is too linear for him. Attainment of democratic structures took place only in some cases, far from numerous, and passed through various intermediate phases. In Chapter 2, Giangiulio identifies the Persian Wars of the early fifth century BCE as the fundamental cause of a crisis within Greek aristocracies, which led among other things to a fully functioning democracy in Athens. Chapter 3 presents democratic Athens in its glory, beginning with the revolution, as Giangiulio would have it, of Ephialtes and Pericles that brought it into being. The institutions sortition, jury pay, etc. Two things stand out in this chapter. First, the fourth century receives rather little attention and later centuries none at all, which is surprising given the amount of work being done these days on polis institutions after Alexander. More positively, this chapter is where Giangiulio actually begins to develop his argument about the tensions between socioeconomic inequality and political equality in a democracy. Athenian democracy succeeded more or less for years on his count both because social and economic elites accepted that all citizens would participate in political processes, and because non-elites newly endowed with political clout accepted that there would be inequalities in wealth and status among citizens. The aristocrats did not often exclude the masses from communal decision-making, and the masses did not often murder the rich or seize their property. The second part of the book turns to the Western Greek world to examine democracies in Sicily and southern Italy, some of them quite short-lived. In Chapter 4 Giangiulio takes on Syracuse, where democracy existed between ca. 480 and 400 BCE. In Chapter 5 we go to Croton, where democracy arose in the 5th century BCE as the product of a popular revolt against the Pythagoreans though nothing is known of Crotoniate democracy in action. In Chapter 6 Giangiulio argues that the democratic regime in Thurii lasted nearly 25 years after its foundation in the 5th century BCE before succumbing to an oligarchic takeover, not the 10 years sometimes supposed. In Chapter 7 we see the democracy of Tarentum at its birth in the 5th century BCE and at its apex under Archytas in the mid-fourth century. Giangiulio presents the histories of these cities with a focus on different degrees of equality in economic, social, and political spheres, though it has to be said that he uses a more lenient definition of democracy for the western Greek cities than for Athens, which he will not allow to have been a democracy before Ephialtes. This is a thought-provoking book with an elegant and appealing principal theme, which does in a very understated way what great books in the Classics do: Only in a handful of places does Giangiulio point out the relationships explicitly, but the book is rich in suggestive ideas and implications. This tendency to leave connections implicit, admirable in avoiding polemic, unfortunately extends to the argumentation of the book as well; the chapters devoted to the case studies are almost entirely self-contained, and while there are sporadic cross references, and themes of equality and inequality can be detected throughout, there is no unifying idea aside from the proposition that socioeconomic inequality was in tension with political equality. It is an interesting proposition, but something more in the way of analysis would have been welcome. How and why did western Mediterranean democracy differ from Aegean democracy? Did the context in which democracy arose post-war reconstruction at Athens and Tarentum, popular revolt at Syracuse and Croton, Athenian policy at Thurii affect its structure or its success? The definition of who was a citizen changed frequently in each city—”to what degree was the size and makeup of the citizen body a factor in political, social, and economic dynamics? A concluding section of

some sort would have been a place for Giangiulio to show us what is to be learned about Greek democracy from studying his examples. Some readers may try to, anyway. This book is not actually intended for scholars of Greek democracy, though they may find it engaging. That may be the reason why the text often eschews traditional references keyed to specific ideas or positions in favor of short and rather casual bibliographic essays, organized by chapter and section, which precede the final list of works cited. In-text citations are often too vague to be useful. The book is short; Giangiulio stops himself more than once from pursuing important questions further; nowhere does he explain why he has chosen to discuss the democracies of Magna Graecia as opposed to those of mainland Greece and the Aegean world. All of this suggests that the ideal audience is composed of amateurs rather than students or active scholars. The book is well produced and includes a full bibliography on ancient democracies, though I have already noted that the references to this bibliography are not likely to be very helpful. Those contents are intriguing if not always conclusive or new. Readers desiring a stimulating series of explorations with gestures toward the extant bibliography on Greek democracy will be quite satisfied; those in search of more conventional thesis-and-evidence scholarship would be better served by any number of the recent volumes and monographs on the topic. In the first place, it identifies a central tension in any democracy that tolerates socioeconomic distinctions. Second, it shows that the histories of several Greek democracies can be read as struggles to accommodate that tension. Third, it provides a series of case studies showing that, in the classical Greek world, democracies tended to lose out to oligarchies—the ideological commitment to political equality tended to give way before the commitment to social and economic capital accumulation did. This warning should be no less alarming for having been delivered almost surreptitiously in an otherwise redundant book of Greek history. I only found three: To name just three examples: *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. The Greek Polis and the Invention of Democracy: A politico-cultural transformation and its interpretations. Chichester, West Sussex, U. *Popular Government in the Greek Classical Age*.

### Chapter 6 : Bryn Mawr Classical Review:

*Democrazie greche. Atene, Sicilia, Magna Grecia* by Maurizio Giangiulio and a great selection of similar Used, New and Collectible Books available now at [racedaydvl.com](http://racedaydvl.com)

### Chapter 7 : Storia d'Europa e del Mediterraneo in SearchWorks catalog

Maurizio Giangiulio, author of *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, on [LibraryThing](http://LibraryThing) [LibraryThing](http://LibraryThing) is a cataloging and social networking site for booklovers [Home Groups](http://HomeGroups) [Talk](http://Talk) [Zeitgeist](http://Zeitgeist).

### Chapter 8 : Iamblichus, On the Pythagorean Life | Editions Wiki | FANDOM powered by Wikia

*Claudia Ruggeri, Triphylia from Elis to Arcadia V. Maurizio Giangiulio, The Emergence of Pisatis VI. Maria Pretzler, Arcadia: Ethnicity and Politics in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries BCE VII. Nino Luraghi, Messenian Ethnicity and the Free Messenians VIII.*

### Chapter 9 : Gela Research Papers - [racedaydvl.com](http://racedaydvl.com)

*This video is unavailable. Watch Queue Queue. Watch Queue Queue.*