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I. Ancient beliefs (1)

Domestic religion

For quite a number of centuries, mankind has accepted a religious doctrine only on two conditions: one is that it announces a unique god; the other is that it is addressed to all men and is accessible to all, without systematically rejecting any class or race. But this early religion fulfilled neither of these two conditions. Not only did she not offer a unique god for the worship of men; but still his gods did not accept the worship of all men. They did not present themselves as being the gods of mankind. In this primitive religion each god could only be worshiped by a family. Religion was purely domestic.

The worship of the dead was in no way like that which Christians have for the saints. One of the first rules of this cult was that it could only be returned by each family to the dead who belonged to it by blood. Funerals could only be performed religiously by the next of kin. As for the funeral repast, which was then repeated at specific times, the family alone had the right to attend, and any foreigner was severely excluded. It was believed that the deceased accepted the offering only from the hand of his own; he only wanted worship from his descendants. The presence of a man who was not of the family disturbed the rest of the spirits. Therefore the law forbade foreigners to approach a tomb.

It followed from there that in Greece and Rome as in India, the son had the duty to make the libations and the sacrifices to the manes of his father and of all his ancestors. To fail in this duty was the bravest impiety that could be committed, since the interruption of this worship brought down the dead and destroyed their happiness. This neglect was no less than a real parricide multiplied as many times as there were ancestors in the family.

The sacred fire, which was so closely associated with the worship of the dead, was also essential to belong uniquely to each family. He represented the ancestors; he was the providence of a family, and had nothing in common with the fire of the neighboring family, which was another providence. Each household protected its own and repelled the stranger.

All this religion was enclosed within the walls of each house. The worship was not public. All the ceremonies, on the contrary, were kept very secret. Carried out in the midst of the family alone, they were hidden abroad.

For this domestic religion, there were neither uniform rules, nor common ritual. Each family had the most complete independence. No external power had the right to regulate its worship or its belief. There was no other priest than the father; as a priest he knew no hierarchy.

This religion could only be propagated by generation. The father, by giving life to his son, gave him at the same time his belief, his worship, the right to maintain the hearth, to offer the funeral meal, to pronounce the prayer formulas. The generation established a mysterious bond between the child born to life and all the gods of the family. These gods were his very family, theoi engeneis; it was his blood, theoi suvaimoi. The child thus brought at birth the right to adore them and to offer them sacrifices; as also, later, when death had deified him himself, he was to be reckoned in his turn among these gods of the family.

But it should be noted this peculiarity that the domestic religion was only propagated from male to male.

The belief of the early ages, as found in the Vedas and seen in all Greek and Roman law, was that the reproductive power resided exclusively in the father. The father alone possessed the mysterious principle of being and transmitted the spark of life. It resulted from this old opinion that it was the rule that the domestic worship always passed from male to male, that the woman participated only through the intermediary of her father or her husband, and finally only after the death the woman did not have the same part as the man in the worship and in the ceremonies of the funeral meal. This has resulted in other very serious consequences in private law and in the constitution of the family; we will see them later.

II. Family

1. Religion was the founding principle of the ancient family (2)

The principle of the ancient family is not only generation. [The individual belongs to a group, lineage or family. It is part of an organic unit, whose most immediate vehicle is the blood and which develops in space as in time. This unity is not "naturalistic", is not determined and created only by natural, biological and physiological processes. Rather, these processes constitute its outward appearance, the necessary but not sufficient condition. There is a "life" of life, a mystical force of blood and of race. It is beyond the forces of the life of individuals, who, at death, dissolve in it or who, by new births, emerge from it; it is therefore vitae mortisque locus - a place which includes life and death and which, therefore, is beyond both.

What proves it is that the sister is not in the family what the brother is, it is that the emancipated son or the married daughter ceases completely to be part of it, there are finally several dispositions. important aspects of Greek and Roman laws that we will have the opportunity to examine later.

The principle of the family is not natural affection either. Because Greek law and Roman law take no account of this feeling. He can exist in the depths of hearts, he is not. nothing in the right.

What unites the members of the ancient family is something more powerful than birth, than feeling, than physical strength; it is the religion of the home and of the ancestors. It makes the family form a body in this life and in the next. The ancient family is a religious association even more than an association of nature. Also we will see later that the woman will not really be counted there until the sacred ceremony of marriage will have initiated her to worship; that the son will no longer count, if he has renounced worship or if he has been emancipated; that the adopted child will, on the contrary, be a real son there, because, if he is not related by blood, he will have something better, the community of worship; that the legatee who refuses to adopt the cult of this family, will not have the succession;that finally kinship and the right to inheritance will be regulated, not according to birth, but according to the rights of participation in worship such as religion has established them.

The ancient Greek language had a very significant word for a family; we said epistion, a word which literally means what is near a home. A family was a group of people who were allowed by religion to invoke the same home and offer the funeral meal to the same ancestors.

2. The right to property

There are three things which, from the earliest age, we find founded and firmly established in these Greek and Italian societies: domestic religion, the family, the right to property; three things which had between them, at the origin, a manifest relation, and which seem to have been inseparable.

The idea of ​​private property was in religion itself. Each family had its home and its ancestors. These gods could be worshiped only by her, protecting only them; they were his property.

Now, between these gods and the soil the men of the old ages saw a mysterious connection. Take the focus first. This altar is the symbol of sedentary life; its name alone indicates it.

And the family, which by duty and by religion always remains grouped around its altar, attaches itself to the ground like the altar itself. The idea of ​​domicile comes naturally. The family is attached to the home, the home is attached to the ground; a close relationship is therefore established between the soil and the family. There must be her permanent home, which she will not dream of leaving, unless an unforeseen necessity compels her to do so. Like the home, it will always occupy this place. This place belongs to him; it is his property, property not only of a man, but of a family whose different members must come one after another to be born and die there.

Two foci represent distinct divinities, which never unite and which never merge; this is so true that even marriage between two families does not establish an alliance between their gods. The home must be isolated, that is to say, clearly separated from everything that is not itself; the stranger must not approach him at the moment when the ceremonies of worship are being accomplished, nor even that he has seen him. This is why we call this god the hidden god, muchioi, or the inner god, Penates. For this religious rule to be fulfilled, it is necessary that around the hearth, at a certain distance, there is an enclosure. It does not matter whether it is formed by a hedge, by a wooden partition, or by a stone wall. Whatever it is, it marks the limit which separates the domain of one home from the domain of another home.This enclosure (herchos) is considered sacred. It is impiety to cross it. The god watches over her and keeps her in his custody; therefore we give this god the epithet of hercheios. This enclosure traced by religion and protected by it is the most certain emblem, the most indisputable mark of the right to property.

The sacred enclosure that the Greeks call herchos and the Latins herctum, it is the rather extensive enclosure in which the family has its house, its flocks, the small field that it cultivates. In the middle rises the protective hearth. Let us go down to the following ages: the population arrived as far as Greece and Italy and they built cities. The dwellings have come closer; however, they are not contiguous. The sacred enclosure still exists, but in smaller proportions; it is most often reduced to a small wall, a ditch, a furrow, or a simple free space a few feet in width. In any case, two houses must not touch each other; joint ownership is reputedly impossible. The same wall cannot be common to two houses; for then the sacred enclosure of the domestic gods would have disappeared. In Rome,the law fixes the width of the free space which must always separate two houses at two and a half feet, and this space is dedicated to the "god of the enclosure." "

It resulted from these old religious rules that community life could never be established among the elders. The phalanstery was never known there. Even Pythagoras failed to establish institutions that the inner religion of men resisted. Neither does one find, at any time in the life of the ancients, anything resembling the promiscuity of the village which was general in France in the twelfth century. Each family, having its gods and its cult, must also have had its particular place on the ground, its isolated home, its property.

Domestic religion, either in life or in death, separated each family from all the others, and severely excluded all appearance of community. Just as the houses should not be contiguous, the tombs should not touch each other; each of them had, like the house, a sort of insulating enclosure.

How evident is the character of private property in all of this! The dead are gods who belong to a family and which it alone has the right to invoke. These dead have taken possession of the soil; they live under this little mound, and no one, except family, can think of mingling with them. No one, moreover, has the right to dispossess them of the land they occupy; a tomb, among the ancients, can never be destroyed or moved; the most severe laws defend it. So here is a piece of land which, in the name of religion, becomes an object of perpetual property for each family. The family appropriated this land by placing their dead there; it settled there forever. The living offspring of this family can legitimately say: this land is mine.She is so much his that she is inseparable from him and he has no right to let go of her. The ground where the dead lie is inalienable and imprescriptible.

It is quite obvious that private property was an institution that domestic religion could not do without. This religion prescribed to isolate the domicile and also to isolate the burial; living together was therefore impossible. The same religion commanded that the hearth should be fixed to the ground, that the tomb was neither destroyed nor moved. Remove property, the home will be wandering, families will mingle, the dead will be abandoned and without worship. Through the unshakeable home and permanent burial, the family took possession of the land; the earth has been somehow imbued and permeated by the religion of the home and of the ancestors. Thus the man of the old ages was exempted from solving too difficult problems. Without discussion, without work, without a shadow of hesitation,he arrived suddenly and by virtue of his beliefs alone in the conception of the right of property, of that right from which all civilization springs, since through it man improves the earth and himself becomes better.

It was not the laws that first guaranteed the right to property, it was religion. Each domain was under the eyes of the domestic deities who watched over it. Each field was to be surrounded, as we have seen in the house, by an enclosure which clearly separated it from the estates of other families. This enclosure was not a stone wall; it was a strip of land a few feet wide, which was to remain uncultivated and which the plow was never to touch. This space was sacred: Roman law declared it imprescriptible; he belonged to religion. On certain days marked in the month and in the year, the father of the family went around his field, following this line; he pushed victims before him, sang hymns, and offered sacrifices.By this ceremony he believed he had awakened the benevolence of his gods towards his field and his house; Above all, he had marked his right to property by taking his domestic cult around his field. The path taken by the victims and the prayers was the inviolable limit of the domain.

Base property on labor law, man can relinquish it. Base it on religion, he will no longer be able to do so: a bond stronger than the will of man unites the earth to him. Besides, this field where the tomb is, where the divine ancestors live, where the family must forever worship, is not the property of a man only, but of a family. It is not the currently living individual who has established his right to this land; it is the domestic god. The individual has it only as a deposit; it belongs to those who are dead and to those who are to be born. She is part of this family and can no longer be separated from it. To separate one from the other is to alter a cult and offend a religion.

If man could not, or could only with difficulty, relinquish his land, all the more reason should he not be deprived of it in spite of himself. Expropriation for public utility was unknown among the ancients. Confiscation was only practiced as a consequence of the end of exile, that is to say when the man stripped of his title of citizen could no longer exercise any rights on the soil of the city. Expropriation for debts is never found in old city law either.

The right of property having been established for the accomplishment of a hereditary cult, it was not possible that this right was extinguished after the short existence of an individual. Man dies, worship remains; the hearth must not be extinguished nor the tomb abandoned. The domestic religion continuing, the right of property must continue with it.

Two things are closely related in the beliefs as in the laws of the ancients, the worship of a family and the ownership of that family. So it was a rule without exception in Greek law as in Roman law, that one could not acquire property without worship, nor worship without property.

From this principle came all the rules of inheritance law among the elders. The first is that, since domestic religion is, as we have seen, hereditary from male to male, property is also hereditary. As the son is the natural and obligatory continuator of worship, he also inherits property. By this, the rule of heredity is found; it is not the result of a simple agreement made between men; it derives from their beliefs, from their religion, from what is most powerful over their souls. What causes the son to inherit is not the personal will of the father. The father does not need to make a will; the son inherits his full rights, ipso jure heres exstitit, says the jurisconsult. He is even a necessary heir, heres necessarius. He has neither to accept nor to refuse the inheritance. The continuation of ownership,like that of worship, is for him an obligation as much as a right. Whether he wants it or not, the succession is his responsibility, whatever it may be, even with its charges and debts. The benefit of inventory and the benefit of abstention are not allowed for the son in Greek law and did not appear until very late in Roman law.

3. The right of inheritance

at. The son inherits, not the daughter

The rule for worship is that it is transmitted from male to male; the rule for inheritance is that it follows worship. The daughter is not fit to continue the paternal religion, since she marries and that by marrying she renounces the cult of the father to adopt that of the husband. It therefore has no title to the inheritance; if it happened that a father left his property to his daughter, the property would be separated from the cult, which is not admissible.

b. The birthright

The old religion differentiated between the elder son and the younger: “The elder, said the ancient Aryas, was begotten for the performance of duty to the ancestors, others were born of love. By virtue of this original superiority, the elder had the privilege, after the death of the father, of presiding over the ceremonies of domestic worship; it was he who offered the funeral meals and pronounced the prayer formulas; “For the right to say prayers belongs to the one of the sons who was the first to be born. The eldest was therefore the heir to the hymns, the continuator of the cult, the religious head of the family. From this belief flowed a rule of law: the eldest alone inherited property.

III. Authority in the family

1. Principle and nature of paternal power among the ancients

The family did not receive their laws from the city. If it had been the city that had established private law, it is probable that it would have made it quite different from what we have seen. It would have regulated the right of property and the right of succession according to other principles; for it was not in his interest that the land be inalienable and the patrimony indivisible.

Private law existed before it. When she began to write her laws, she found this right already established, alive, rooted in mores, strong in universal adherence. She accepted it, being unable to do otherwise, and she only dared to change it in the long run. The old law is not the work of a legislator; on the contrary, it imposed itself on the legislator. It was in the family that he was born. It emerged spontaneously and fully formed from the ancient principles which constituted it. It arose from the religious beliefs which were universally accepted in the primitive age of these peoples and which exercised the empire on the intelligences and the wills.

A family is made up of a father, a mother, children, slaves. This group, however small it may be, must have its discipline. To whom then will the primary authority belong? To the father ? No. There is something in every house that is above the father himself; it is domestic religion, it is this god that the Greeks call the master hearth, hestia despoina, that the Latins call Lar familiaris. This inner divinity, or, what amounts to the same thing, the belief that is in the human soul, is the least questionable authority. It is she who will fix the ranks in the family.

The father is the first near the home; he lights it up and maintains it; he is its pontiff. In all religious acts he fulfills the highest function; he slaughters the victim; his mouth pronounces the formula of prayer which must draw upon him and his family the protection of the gods. Family and worship are perpetuated through him; he alone represents the whole series of ancestors and from him must emerge the whole series of descendants.

Religion does not place women so high. The woman, in truth, takes part in religious acts, but she is not the mistress of the home. She does not take her religion from birth; she was only initiated into it by marriage; she learned from her husband the prayer she says. She does not represent the ancestors since she does not descend from them. She will not become an ancestor herself; placed in the tomb, she will not receive a special worship there. In death as in life, she counts only as a member of her husband.

Never having a home of her own, she has nothing that gives authority in the house. She never commands; she is never even free or in control of herself. She is always near another's home, repeating another's prayer; for all acts of religious life he needs a leader, and for all acts of civil life a tutor.

Let's move on to the child. Here nature speaks for itself quite loudly; she wants the child to have a protector, a guide, a master. Religion is in accord with nature; she says that the father will be the leader of the cult and that the son will only have to help him in his holy functions. But nature requires this subordination only for a certain number of years; religion demands more. Nature gives the son a majority: religion does not grant him any. According to ancient principles, the home is indivisible and property is like it; the brothers do not separate when their father dies; all the more reason cannot they detach themselves from him during his lifetime. In the strictness of primitive law, the sons remain linked to the father's household and consequently subject to his authority; as long as he lives, they are minors.

It is understandable that this rule could not have lasted until the old domestic religion was in full force. This endless subjugation of the son to the father soon disappeared in Athens. It survived longer in Sparta, where the heritage was always indivisible. In Rome, the old rule was scrupulously preserved: the son could never maintain a private household during the lifetime of the father; even married, even having children, he was always in power.

Thanks to domestic religion, the family was a small organized body, a small society which had its Head and its government. Nothing in our modern society can give us an idea of ​​this fatherly power. In this antiquity, the father is not only the strong man who protects and who also has the power to be obeyed; he is the priest, he is the heir of the home, the continuator of the ancestors, the stem of the descendants, the depositary of the mysterious rites of worship and of the secret formulas of prayer. All religion resides in him.

2. The moral of the family

The religion of these early ages was exclusively domestic; morality was too. Religion did not say to man, by showing him another man: here is your brother. She said to him: here is a stranger; he cannot participate in the religious acts of your home, he cannot approach the tomb of your family, he has other gods than you and he cannot unite with you through a common prayer; your gods reject his worship and regard him as their enemy; he is your enemy too.

In this home religion, man never prays to the divinity on behalf of other men; he only invokes it for himself and his family. A Greek proverb has remained as a memory and a vestige of this ancient isolation of man in prayer. In Plutarch's time, people used to say to the selfish: you sacrifice at home, Hestia thueis. It meant: you move away from your fellow citizens, you have no friends, your fellow human beings are nothing to you, you only live for you and yours. This proverb was indicative of a time when all religion was around the home, when the horizon of morals and affection did not extend beyond the narrow circle of the family.

If this religion is absolutely ignorant of the duties of charity, at least it outlines for man with admirable clarity his family duties. It makes marriage compulsory; celibacy is a crime in the eyes of a religion which makes the continuity of the family the first and holiest of duties. But the union which it prescribes can only be accomplished in the presence of domestic divinities; it is the religious, sacred, indissoluble union of husband and wife.

This domestic morality prescribes still other duties. She tells the wife that she must obey, the husband that she must command. She teaches them both to respect each other. Women have rights; because it has its place in the home; it is she who is responsible for ensuring that it does not go out. It therefore also has its priesthood. Where it is not, domestic worship is incomplete and insufficient.

As for the son, we have seen him subject to the authority of a father who can sell him and condemn him to death. But this son also has his role in worship; it fulfills a function in religious ceremonies; his presence, on certain days, is so necessary that the Roman who has no son is forced to adopt a fictitious one for those days, so that the rites can be performed.

3. People in Rome and Greece

We find among the Roman jurisconsults and Greek writers traces of an ancient institution which seems to have been in great force in the early years of Greek and Italian societies, but which, having weakened little by little, left only barely perceptible remains in the latter part of their history. We are talking about what the Latins called people and the Greeks genos.

The gens, as we shall see later, formed a body whose constitution was entirely aristocratic; it is thanks to its internal organization that the patricians of Rome and the Eupatrides of Athens for a long time perpetuated their privileges. So when the popular party gained the upper hand, it did not fail to fight this old institution with all its might. If he could have wiped her out completely, it is likely that we would not have remembered her at all. But it was singularly lively and rooted in manners, it could not be made to disappear altogether. So we contented ourselves with modifying it: we removed from it what made its essential character and only its exterior forms were left, which in no way hampered the new regime.Thus in Rome the plebeians imagined forming gentes in imitation of the patricians; in Athens an attempt was made to upset the genea, to merge them together and to replace them by demes which were established in their likeness.

Nothing is more closely related than the limbs of a people. United in the celebration of the same sacred ceremonies, they help each other in all the needs of life. The whole people answer for the debt of one of its members; it redeems the prisoner, it pays the condemned man's fine. If one of her family becomes a magistrate, she contributes to pay the expenses incurred by any magistracy.

at. The gens is the family still having its original organization and unity

Everything presents people to us as united by a birth link.

The gens is naturally derived from the domestic religion and the private law of the old ages. What does this primitive religion prescribe? May the ancestor, that is to say the man who was the first to be buried in the tomb, be perpetually honored as a god, and that his descendants gathered each year near the sacred place where he rests, offer him the funeral meal. This hearth always lit, this tomb always honored with a cult, this is the center around which all the generations come to live and by which all the branches of the family, however numerous they may be, remain grouped in a single bundle. still the private law of those old ages? By observing what authority was in the old family, we saw that the sons did not separate from the father;by studying the rules of inheritance, we found that, thanks to the birthright, the younger brothers did not separate from the older brother. Home, tomb, heritage, all of this was originally indivisible. The family was therefore. Time did not dismember her. This indivisible family, which developed through the ages, perpetuating its cult and its name from century to century, it was truly the ancient people. The gens was the family, but the family having retained the unity which its religion commanded it, and having attained all the development which the old private law allowed it to achieve.The family was therefore. Time did not dismember her. This indivisible family, which developed through the ages, perpetuating its cult and its name from century to century, it was truly the ancient people. The gens was the family, but the family having retained the unity which its religion commanded it, and having attained all the development which the old private law allowed it to achieve.The family was therefore. Time did not dismember her. This indivisible family, which developed through the ages, perpetuating its cult and its name from century to century, it was truly the ancient people. The gens was the family, but the family having retained the unity which its religion commanded it, and having attained all the development which the old private law allowed it to achieve.

This admitted truth, everything that ancient writers tell us about people, becomes clear. This close solidarity that we noticed earlier between its members is no longer surprising; they are parents by birth. This worship which they practice in common is not a fiction; it comes to them from their ancestors. As they all originally had the same undivided patrimony, it was a custom and even a necessity for the whole people to answer for the debt of one of its members, and to pay the prisoner's ransom or fine of the condemned. All of these rules were established by themselves when the people still had their unit; when it dismembered, they could not disappear completely.Of the ancient and holy unity of this family there remained persistent marks in the annual sacrifice which brought together its scattered members, in the name which remained common to them, in the legislation which recognized them rights of inheritance, in the customs which enjoined them to help each other.

b. The family (people) was initially the only form of society

What we have seen of the family, its domestic religion, the gods it made for itself, the laws it gave itself, the birthright on which it was based, its unity, its development from age to age until forming the people, its justice, its priesthood, its internal government, all of this necessarily brings our thought to a primitive era when the family was independent of any higher power, and where the city did not exist not yet.

Look at this domestic religion, these gods who only belonged to a family and exercised their providence only within the confines of a house, this cult which was secret, this religion which did not want to be propagated. , that ancient morality which prescribed the isolation of families: it is obvious that beliefs of this nature could only have originated in the minds of men at a time when large societies were not yet formed. If religious sentiment was satisfied with such a narrow conception of the divine, it is because human association was then narrow in proportion. The time when man only believed in domestic gods is also the time when there were only families.

It is in this state that the whole Aryan race seems to have lived for a long time.

Each family has its religion, its gods, its priesthood. Religious isolation is its law; his worship is secret. In death itself or in the existence that follows it, families do not mix; each one continues to live apart in her own tomb, from which the stranger is excluded. Each family also has its property, that is to say its part of the land which is inseparably attached to it by its religion; her gods Terms guard the enclosure, and her Manes watch over her. The isolation of the property is so obligatory that two domains cannot confine one to the other and must leave between them a strip of earth which is neutral and which remains inviolable. Finally, each family has its head, as a nation would have its king. It has its laws, which undoubtedly are not written, but which religious belief engraves in the heart of every man.She has her inner righteousness above which there is no other to call upon. Everything that a man needs strictly for his material life or for his moral life, the family possesses in itself. He needs nothing from the outside; it is an organized state, a self-sufficient society.

But this family of the ancient ages is not reduced to the proportions of the modern family. In large societies the family breaks up and shrinks; but in the absence of any other society, it expands, it develops, it ramifies without dividing. Several younger branches remain grouped around an older branch, near the single hearth and the common tomb.

Yet another element entered into the composition of this ancient family. The reciprocal need that the poor have of the rich and that the rich has of the poor, made servants. But in this kind of patriarchal regime, servants or slaves, it's all one. We can in fact see that the principle of free, voluntary service, which can cease at the convenience of the servant, can hardly agree with a social state where the family lives in isolation. Besides, domestic religion does not allow a foreigner to be admitted into the family. The servant must therefore by some means become a member and an integral part of this family. This is achieved by a sort of initiation of the newcomer into domestic worship.

But by the very fact that the servant acquired worship and the right to pray, he lost his freedom. Religion was a chain that held him back. He was attached to the family for his whole life and even for the time after death.

His master could bring him out of low bondage and treat him as a free man. But the servant did not leave the family for that. As he was bound to her by worship, he could not part from her without impiety. Under the name of freedman or under that of client, he continued to recognize the authority of the chief or boss and did not cease to have obligations towards him. He only married with the permission of the master, and the children born to him continued to obey.

A certain number of small client and subordinate families were thus formed in the bosom of the large family. The Romans attributed the establishment of the clientele to Romulus, as if an institution of this nature could be the work of a man. The clientele is older than Romulus. It has also existed everywhere, in Greece as well as throughout Italy. It was not the cities that established and regulated it; on the contrary, as we shall see later, they have gradually diminished and destroyed it. The clientele is an institution of domestic law, and it existed in families before there were cities.

It is clear that the client was for a long time a servant attached to the boss. But then there was something that made his dignity: it was that he took part in worship and that he was associated with the religion of the family. He had the same home, the same parties, the same sacra as his boss.

The clientele is a sacred bond which religion has formed and which nothing can break. Once a client of a family, you can no longer detach yourself from it. The clientele is even hereditary.

We see from all this that the family of the most ancient times, with its elder branch and its younger branches, its servants and its clients, could form a very large group of men. A family, thanks to its religion which maintained its unity, thanks to its private law which made it indivisible, thanks to the laws of the clientele which retained its servants, succeeded in forming in the long run a very extended society which had its hereditary chief. . It is from an indefinite number of societies of this nature that the Aryan race appears to have been composed during a long succession of centuries. These thousands of small groups lived isolated, having little relationship with each other, having no need of each other, not united by any link, neither religious nor political, each having its own domain, each its internal government, each its gods. .

V. The city

1. The phratry and the curia; the tribe

The smallness of this primitive society corresponded well to the smallness of the idea that had been formed of the divinity. Each family had its gods, and man conceived and worshiped only domestic deities. But he was not to be satisfied for long with these gods so far below what his intelligence can reach. If he still needed many centuries to come to represent himself of God as a unique, incomparable, infinite being, at least he had to approach imperceptibly to this ideal by enlarging his conception from age to age and by gradually moving backwards. horizon whose line separates for him the divine Being from the things of the earth.

The religious idea and human society would therefore grow at the same time.

Domestic religion forbade two families to mingle and blend together. But it was possible that several families, without sacrificing anything of their particular religion, unite at least for the celebration of another worship which was common to them. This is what happened. A number of families formed a group, which the Greek language called a phratry, the Latin language a curia. Was there a birth link between the families of the same group? It is impossible to say. What is certain is that this new association did not take place without a certain broadening of the religious idea. At the very moment when they united, these families conceived a divinity superior to their domestic divinities, which was common to them all, and who watched over the whole group. They raised an altar for him,lit a sacred fire and instituted a cult.

There was no curia, no phratry, which did not have its altar and its protective god. The religious act was there of the same nature as in the family. It consisted essentially of a meal made together; the food had been prepared on the altar itself and was therefore sacred; we ate there while reciting some prayers; the divinity was present and received its share of food and drink.

The tribe, like the family and the phratry, was constituted to be an independent body, since it had a special cult from which the stranger was excluded. Once formed, no new family could be admitted there. Neither could two tribes merge into one; their religion opposed it. But just as several phratries had united in a tribe, several tribes could be associated with one another, on condition that the worship of each of them was respected. The day this alliance was made, the city existed.

So human society, in this race, has not grown like a circle that would gradually expand, gradually gaining. On the contrary, they are small groups which, formed a long time in advance, have joined together. Several families formed the phratry, several phratries the tribe, several tribes the city. Family, phratry, tribe, city, are moreover societies exactly similar to each other and which were born from each other by a series of federations.

It should even be noted that as these different groups joined together in this way, none of them lost either its individuality or its independence. Although several families were united in a phratry, each of them remained constituted as at the time of its isolation; nothing had changed in her, neither her worship, nor her priesthood, nor her right to property, nor her interior justice. Curies then joined; but each kept its worship, its meetings, its festivals, its leader. From the tribe they passed to the city, but the tribes were not therefore dissolved, and each of them continued to form a body, almost as if the city did not exist. In religion there remained a multitude of small cults above which a common cult was established; in politics,a host of small governments continued to function, and above them a common government arose.

The city was a confederation. This is why it was obliged, at least for several centuries, to respect the religious and civil independence of tribes, curies and families, and that it did not first have the right to intervene in the particular affairs of each of these little bodies. She had nothing to do with the interior of a family; she was not the judge of what was happening there; she left to the father the right and the duty to judge his wife, his son, his client. It is for this reason that private law, which had been established at the time of the isolation of families, was able to subsist in the cities and was not modified until very late.

Thus the city is not an assembly of individuals: it is a confederation of several groups which were constituted before it and which it allows to exist. We see in the Attic orators that each Athenian is part of four distinct societies at the same time; he is a member of a family, a phratry, a tribe and a city. He does not enter all four at the same time and on the same day, like the Frenchman who from the moment of his birth belongs at the same time to a family, a town, a department and a country. The phratry and tribe are not administrative divisions. Man enters these four societies at different times, and he ascends, in a way, from one to the other. The child is first admitted into the family through the religious ceremony which takes place ten days after birth. Few years later,he enters the phratry by a new ceremony which we have described above. Finally, at the age of sixteen or eighteen, he presents himself to be admitted into the city. That day, in the presence of an altar and in front of the smoking flesh of a victim, he takes an oath by which he undertakes, among other things, to always respect the religion of the city. From that day on he was initiated into public worship and became a citizen.From that day he was initiated into public worship and became a citizen.From that day on he was initiated into public worship and became a citizen.

2. The city

City and town were not synonymous with the ancients. The city was the religious and political association of families and tribes; the city was the meeting place, the home of this association.

We should not have the idea of ​​ancient cities given to us by those we see rising today. They build a few houses, it's a village; imperceptibly the number of houses increases, it is a town; and we end, if need be, by surrounding it with a ditch and a wall. A city, among the ancients, was not formed in the long run, by the slow increase in the number of men and buildings. A city was founded all at once, all in one day.

But the city had to be constituted first, and it was the most difficult and usually the longest work. Once the families, the phratries and the tribes had agreed to unite and to have the same worship, immediately the city was founded to be the sanctuary of this common worship Also the foundation of a city was it always a religious act.

3. The gods of the city

We must not lose sight of the fact that, among the ancients, what made the bond of any society was a cult. Just as a domestic altar kept the members of a family grouped around it, so the city was the gathering of those who had the same protective gods and who performed the religious act at the same altar.

This city altar was enclosed within the enclosure of a building that the Greeks called prytaneum and that the Romans called the temple of Vesta.

There was nothing more sacred in a city than this altar, on which the sacred fire was always kept. It is true that this great veneration weakens early in Greece, because the Greek imagination allowed itself to be drawn into the side of the most beautiful temples, the richest legends and the most beautiful statues. But it never weakens in Rome. The Romans did not cease to be convinced that the fate of the city was attached to this home which represented their gods. The respect which one paid to the Vestals proves the importance of their priesthood. If a consul encountered one in its path, he would lower his beams in front of her. On the other hand, if one of them allowed the fire to go out or defiled the cult by failing in its duty of chastity, the city which then believed itself threatened with losing its gods,avenged himself on the Vestal by burying her alive.

Just as the cult of the domestic hearth was secret and the family alone had the right to take part in it, so the cult of the public hearth was hidden from strangers. No one, if he was not a citizen, could attend the sacrifice. The mere gaze of the stranger soiled the religious act.

Each city had gods who belonged only to it. These gods were usually of the same nature as those of the early family religion.

Each city had its body of priests who did not depend on any foreign authority. Between the priests of two cities there was no link, no communication, no exchange of teaching or rites. If we went from one city to another, we found other gods, other dogmas, other ceremonies. The elders had liturgical books; but those in one city were unlike those in another. Each city had its collection of prayers and practices which it kept very secret; she would have thought she was compromising her religion and her destiny if she had let strangers see it. So religion was all local, all civil, to take this word in the old sense, that is to say special to each city.

In general, man only knew the gods of his city, honored and respected only them. Anyone could say what, in a tragedy of Aeschylus, a foreigner said to the Argiennes: “I do not fear the gods of your country and I owe them nothing. "

Each city was waiting for his salvation of his gods. They were called into danger, they were thanked for a victory. Often, too, they were blamed for a defeat; they were reproached for having poorly fulfilled their role of defenders of the city. They sometimes went so far as to overturn their altars and throw stones at their temples.

4. City government. The king

at. King's religious authority

We must not imagine a city, at its birth, deliberating on the government it is going to give itself, seeking and discussing its laws, combining its institutions. This is not how laws were found and governments were established. The political institutions of the city were born with the city itself, on the same day as it; each member of the city carried them within himself; for they were germinating in the beliefs and religion of every man.

Religion prescribed that the home should always have a supreme priest; she did not admit that priestly authority was shared. The domestic hearth had a high priest, who was the father of the family; the hearth of the curia had its curion or phratriarch; each tribe also had its religious leader, whom the Athenians called the king of the tribe. The religion of the city was also to have its supreme priest.

This priest of the public hearth bore the name of king. Sometimes it was given other titles; as he was, above all, a priest of the prytaneum, the Greeks readily called him prytane; sometimes still they called him archon. Under these various names, king, prytane, archon, we must see a character who is above all the head of the cult; he maintains the hearth, he makes the sacrifice and pronounces the prayer, he presides over religious meals.

b. King's political authority

Just as in the family authority was inherent in the priesthood and as the father, as head of the domestic worship, was at the same time judge and master, so the city's high priest was also its political head. The altar, to use Aristotle's expression, gave him dignity and power.

The constitutive rules of this monarchy were very simple and it was not necessary to search for them for long; they flowed from the very rules of worship. The founder, who had established the sacred hearth, was naturally its first priest. Heredity was the constant rule, originally, for the transmission of this cult; whether the home was that of a family or that of a city, religion prescribed that the care of maintaining it should always pass from father to son. The priesthood was therefore hereditary and power with it.

A well-known feature of the ancient history of Greece is a striking proof that the kingship originally belonged to the man who had established the hearth of the city. We know that the population of the Ionian colonies was not composed of Athenians, but that it was a mixture of Pelasgians, Aeolians, Abantes, Cadmeans. Yet the homes of the new cities were all set by members of the religious family of Codrus. It resulted from it that these colonists, instead of having for chiefs men of their race, the Pelasgians a Pelasgian, the Abantes an Abante, the Aeolians an Aeolian, all gave the kingship, in their twelve cities, to the Codrides. Certainly these personages had not acquired their authority by force, for they were almost the only Athenians there was in this numerous agglomeration.But since they had installed the fireplaces, it was up to them to maintain them. The royalty was therefore undoubtedly referred to them and remained hereditary in their family. Battos had founded Cyrene in Africa: the Battiades were there for a long time in possession of the royal dignity. Protis had founded Marseille: the Protiades, from father to son, exercised the priesthood there and enjoyed great privileges.

So it was not the force that made the chiefs and the kings in these ancient cities. It would not be true to say that the first who was king there was a happy soldier. Authority arose from home worship. Religion made the king in the city, as it had made the head of the family in the house. Belief, the indisputable and compelling belief, said that the hereditary priest of the home was the depositary of holy things and the guardian of the gods. How can one hesitate to obey such a man? A king was a sacred being; Basileis hieroi, says Pindar. We saw in him, not quite a god, but at least "the most powerful man to ward off the wrath of the gods," the man without whose help no prayer was effective, no sacrifice was accepted.

This semi-religious and semi-political royalty was established in all the towns from their birth, without effort on the part of the kings, without resistance on the part of the subjects. We do not see at the origin of ancient peoples the fluctuations and struggles that mark the painful birth of modern societies.

The peoples established the republican regime; but the name of king, far from becoming an insult, remained a venerated title. We are in the habit of saying that this word was odious and despised: a singular error! the Romans applied it to the gods in their prayers. If the usurpers never dared to take this title, it was not that it was odious, it was rather that it was sacred. In Greece the monarchy was repeatedly reestablished in the towns; but the new monarchs never believed they had the right to call themselves kings and were content to be called tyrants. What made the difference between these two names was not the most or the least of the moral qualities that were to be found in the sovereign; a good prince was not called a king and a bad tyrant. It was religion that set them apart from the other.The primitive kings had served as priests and had held their authority at home; the tyrants of the later era were only political leaders and owed their power only to force or election.

5. The citizen and the foreigner

The citizen was recognized by his participation in the cult of the city, and it was from this participation that all his civil and political rights came to him. If we renounced worship, we renounced rights. We spoke above of the public meals, which were the main ceremony of national worship. Now in Sparta whoever did not attend, even though it was through his fault, immediately ceased to count among the citizens. In Athens, anyone who did not take part in the feast of the national gods lost the right of citizenship. In Rome, it was necessary to have been present at the holy ceremony of lustration to enjoy political rights. The man who had not attended, that is to say who had not taken part in the common prayer and the sacrifice, was no longer a citizen until the following chandelier.

If we want to give the exact definition of a citizen, we must say that it is man who has the religion of the city. The foreigner, on the contrary, is the one who has no access to worship, the one whom the gods of the city do not protect and who does not even have the right to invoke them. Because these national gods want to receive prayers and offerings only from the citizen; they repel the foreigner; entry to their temples is forbidden to him and his presence during the sacrifice is a sacrilege. A testimony to this ancient feeling of repulsion has remained with us in one of the principal rites of Roman worship; the pontiff, when he sacrifices in the open air, must have his head veiled, "because it is not necessary that before the sacred fires, in the religious act which is offered to the national gods, the face of a foreigner is shows in the eyes of the pontiff;the auspices would be disturbed. A sacred object, which momentarily fell into the hands of a stranger, immediately became profane; he could only recover his religious character by an expiatory ceremony. If the enemy had seized a city and the citizens came to recapture it, it was necessary above all that the temples be purified and all the hearths extinguished and renewed; the gaze of the stranger had soiled them.the gaze of the stranger had soiled them.the gaze of the stranger had soiled them.

It is thus that religion established between the citizen and the foreigner a deep and indelible distinction. This same religion, as long as it was powerful over souls, forbade communicating citizenship rights to foreigners.

No one could become a citizen in Athens, if he was a citizen of another city. For there was a religious impossibility in being a member of two cities at the same time, as we have seen that there was one in being a member of two families. You couldn't be of two religions at the same time.

Participation in worship brought with it the possession of rights. As the citizen could attend the sacrifice which preceded the assembly, he could also vote there. As he could make the sacrifices in the name of the city, he could be a prytan and an archon. Having the religion of the city, he could invoke the law and perform all the rites of the procedure.

The foreigner, on the contrary, having no part in religion had no rights.

Neither in Rome nor in Athens the foreigner could be owner. He couldn't get married; at least her marriage was not recognized, and her children were considered bastards. He couldn't make a contract with a citizen; at least the law recognized no value in such a contract. Originally he was not allowed to trade. Roman law forbade him to inherit from a citizen, and even a citizen to inherit from him. The rigor of this principle was pushed so far that if a foreigner obtained the right of Roman citizenship without his son, born before that time, having the same favor, the son became towards the father a foreigner and could not inherit. from him. The distinction between citizen and foreigner was stronger than the natural bond between father and son.

This religion did not allow the foreigner to become owner, because he could not have a share in the religious soil of the city. It allowed neither the foreigner to inherit from the citizen nor the citizen to inherit from the foreigner; because any transmission of goods entailed the transmission of a cult, and it was as impossible for the citizen to fulfill the cult of the foreigner as abroad that of the citizen.

You could welcome the stranger, watch over him, esteem him even if he was rich or honorable; one could not give him a part in religion and law. The slave, in some respects was treated better than he; because the slave, member of a family whose worship he shared, was attached to the city through the intermediary of his master; the gods protected him. So Roman religion said that the tomb of the slave was sacred, but that of the stranger was not.

The word homeland among the ancients meant the land of the fathers, terra patria. The homeland of each man was the part of the ground which his domestic or national religion had sanctified, the ground where the bones of his ancestors were deposited and which their souls occupied. The little homeland was the family enclosure, with its tomb and its hearth. The great homeland was the city, with its prytaneum and its heroes, with its sacred enclosure and its territory marked by religion. "Sacred land of the fatherland," said the Greeks. It was not an empty word. This ground was truly sacred to man, for it was inhabited by his gods. State, City, Country, these words were not an abstraction, as with the moderns;they really represented a whole body of local deities with daily worship and powerful beliefs on the soul.

This explains the patriotism of the ancients, an energetic feeling which was for them the supreme virtue and to which all other virtues ended. All that man could have more expensive was merged with the fatherland. In her he found his good, his security, his right, his faith, his god. By losing her, he lost everything. It was almost impossible that the private interest was at odds with the public interest. Plato says: it is the homeland which gives birth to us, which nourishes us, which raises us. And Sophocles: it is the homeland that preserves us.

Such a homeland is not only a home for man. May he leave these holy walls, may he cross the sacred limits of the territory, and he no longer finds for himself any religion or social bond of any kind. Everywhere other than in his homeland he is outside regular life and the law; everywhere else it is without God and outside the moral life. There alone he has his human dignity and his duties. He can only be a man there.

The possession of the country had to be very precious; for the ancients could hardly imagine a more cruel punishment than to deprive man of it. The ordinary punishment for great crimes was exile.

Exile was properly the prohibition of worship. To banish a man was, according to the formula also used among the Greeks and the Romans, to forbid him fire and water. By this fire, we must understand the sacred fire of the hearth; by this water, the lustral water which was used for the sacrifices. Exile therefore put a man out of religion.

6. Of the municipal spirit

What we have seen so far of old institutions and especially old beliefs has given us an idea of ​​the deep distinction that there was always between two cities. Neighboring as they were, they still formed two completely separate societies. Between them there was much more than the distance which separates two cities today, much more than the border which divides two states; the gods were not the same, neither the ceremonies, nor the prayers. The worship of a city was forbidden to the man of the neighboring city. It was believed that the gods of a city rejected the tributes and prayers of anyone who was not their fellow citizen.

It is true that these old beliefs have over time been modified and softened; but they had been in their full force when the societies were formed, and these societies have always kept the imprint of them.

We can easily see two things: first, that this religion specific to each city must have constituted the city in a very strong and almost unshakable manner; it is indeed marvelous how long this social organization, in spite of its faults and all its chances of ruin, has lasted; secondly, that this religion must have had the effect, during long centuries, of making impossible the establishment of a social form other than the city.

Each city, by the requirement of its very religion, had to be absolutely independent. Each had to have its own particular code, since each had its own religion and it was from religion that the law flowed. Each was to have its sovereign justice, and there could be no justice greater than that of the city. Each had its religious festivals and calendar; the months and the year could not be the same in two cities, since the series of religious acts was different. Each had its own particular currency, which originally was usually marked with its religious emblem. Each had its weights and measures. We did not admit that there could be nothing in common between two cities.The line of demarcation was so deep that one hardly imagined that marriage was allowed between inhabitants of two different cities. Such a union always seemed strange and was long considered illegitimate. The laws of Rome and that of Athens are obviously reluctant to admit it. Almost everywhere the children born from such a marriage were confused among the bastards and deprived of the rights of citizenship. For marriage to be legitimate between inhabitants of two towns, there had to be a special agreement between them (jus connubii, epilamia).Almost everywhere the children born of such a marriage were confused among the bastards and deprived of the rights of citizenship. In order for marriage to be legitimate between inhabitants of two towns, there had to be a special agreement between them (jus connubii, epilamia).Almost everywhere the children born from such a marriage were confused among the bastards and deprived of the rights of citizenship. In order for marriage to be legitimate between inhabitants of two towns, there had to be a special agreement between them (jus connubii, epilamia).

Each city had around its territory a line of sacred landmarks. It was the horizon of his national religion and his gods. Beyond these limits other gods reigned and another cult was practiced.

When these principles weakened (and they did not weaken until very late in the common mind), it was no longer time to establish a new form of state. The division was consecrated by habit, by interest, by inveterate hatred, by the memory of old struggles. There was no more going back to the past.

Each city was very keen on its autonomy; it thus called a whole which included / understood its worship, its right, its government, all its religious and political independence.

It was easier for one city to subjugate another than to join it. Victory could make all the inhabitants of a city taken as many slaves; she could not make them fellow citizens of the victor. Confusing two cities into a single state, uniting the conquered population with the victorious population and bringing them together under a single government, this is never seen among the ancients, with one exception, which we will discuss later. If Sparta conquers Messenia, it is not to make the Spartans and the Messenians a single people; it expels the whole race of the vanquished and takes their lands. Athens uses the same with regard to Salamis, Aegina, and Melos.

Bringing the vanquished into the city of victors was a thought that could not occur to anyone. The city had gods, hymns, festivals, laws, which were its precious heritage; she was careful not to share it with the vanquished. She didn't even have the right to do so; Could Athens allow the inhabitant of Aegina to enter the temple of Athene Poliad? that he addressed a worship to Theseus? that he took part in the sacred meals? that he maintained, like prytane, the public hearth? Religion defended him. So the defeated population of the island of Aegina could not form a single state with the population of Athens. Not having the same gods, the Eginetans and the Athenians could not have the same laws, nor the same magistrates.

But couldn't Athens at least, by leaving the vanquished city standing, send magistrates within its walls to govern it? It was absolutely contrary to the principles of the ancients for a city to be governed by a man who was not a citizen of it. Indeed the magistrate had to be a religious leader and his main function was to perform the sacrifice in the name of the city. The foreigner, who did not have the right to make the sacrifice, could not therefore be a magistrate. Having no religious function, he had no regular authority in the eyes of men. Sparta tried to put its harmostesses in the cities; but these men were not magistrates, did not judge, did not appear in the assemblies. Having no regular relationship with the people of the cities, they could not keep up for long.

The result was that any victor was in the alternative, either to destroy the conquered city and to occupy its territory, or to leave it all its independence. There was no middle ground. Either the city ceased to be, or it was a sovereign state. Having its worship, it was to have its government; she only lost one by losing the other, and then she no longer existed.

This absolute independence of the ancient city could only cease when the beliefs on which it was founded had completely disappeared. After ideas had been transformed and several revolutions had passed over these ancient societies, then it was possible to conceive and establish a larger state governed by other rules. But for that, men had to discover other principles and another social bond than those of the old ages.

7. On the omnipotence of the State; the ancients did not know individual freedom

In a society established on such principles, individual freedom could not exist. The citizen was subject in all things and without any reserve to the city; it belonged entirely to him. The religion which gave birth to the State, and the State which maintained religion, supported each other and were one; these two powers combined and confused formed an almost superhuman power to which soul and body were equally subjugated.

There was nothing in the man that was independent. His body belonged to the state and was dedicated to its defense; in Rome military service was due until fifty years old, in Athens until sixty, still in Sparta. His fortune was always at the disposal of the state; if the city needed money, it could order the women to deliver their jewelry to it, the creditors to give up their debts to it, the owners of olive trees to give it free of charge the oil they had made.

The state had the right not to tolerate that its citizens were deformed or counterfeit. Consequently he ordered the father to whom such a child was born to put it to death. This law was found in the ancient codes of Sparta and Rome. We do not know if it existed in Athens; we only know that Aristotle and Plato inscribed it in their ideal legislations.

The State did not admit that a man was indifferent to his interests; the philosopher, the man of study, did not have the right to live apart. It was an obligation that he voted in the assembly and that he be a magistrate in his turn. At a time when discord was frequent, Athenian law did not allow citizens to remain neutral; he had to fight with one or the other party; against those who wanted to stay away from factions and be calm, the law pronounced the penalty of exile with confiscation of property.

The state did not readily allow free education to exist alongside its own. In Athens there was a law which forbade instructing young people without authorization from the magistrates; another law specifically prohibited the teaching of philosophy.

The man had no choice of his beliefs. He had to believe and submit to the religion of the city.

It is therefore a singular error among all human errors to have believed that in ancient cities man enjoyed freedom. He didn't even have the idea. He did not believe that there could be a right vis-à-vis the city and its gods. We will soon see that the government has changed form several times; but the nature of the state has remained much the same, and its omnipotence has hardly been diminished. The government was called by turns monarchy, aristocracy, democracy; but none of these revolutions gave men real freedom, individual freedom. To have political rights, to vote, to appoint magistrates, to be able to be an archon, this is what we called freedom; but man was none the less enslaved to the state. The ancients, and especially the Greeks,the importance and the rights of society were always exaggerated; this is undoubtedly due to the sacred and religious character that the company had originally assumed.

VI. Revolutions

Certainly one could not imagine anything more solidly constituted than this family of ancient ages which contained within itself its gods, its cult, its priest, its magistrate. Nothing stronger than this city which also had within itself its religion, its protective gods, its independent priesthood, which commanded the soul as much as the body of man, and which, infinitely more powerful than the State of today, united in itself the double authority that we see shared today between the State and the Church. If a company was built to last, this is it. It had, however, like everything human, its series of revolutions.

We cannot say in general when these revolutions began. We can imagine that this period was not the same for the different cities of Greece and Italy. What is certain is that from the seventh century BC this social organization was discussed and attacked almost everywhere. From that time on, it only supported itself with difficulty and by a more or less skilful mixture of resistance and concessions. She struggled thus for several centuries, in the midst of perpetual struggles, and finally she disappeared.

The causes which destroyed it can be reduced to two. One is the change which has taken place in the long run in ideas as a result of the natural development of the human mind, and which, by erasing the ancient beliefs, has at the same time caused the social edifice to collapse as these beliefs. had raised and could only support. The other is the existence of a class of men who found themselves placed outside this organization of the city, who suffered from it, who had an interest in destroying it and who waged war on it relentlessly.

So when the beliefs on which this social regime was based weakened, and the interests of the majority of men were at odds with this regime, it must have fallen. No city has escaped this law of transformation, no more Sparta than Athens, no more Rome than Greece. Just as we have seen that the men of Greece and those of Italy originally had the same beliefs, and that the same series of institutions were deployed among them, we will now see that all these cities have gone through the same revolutions.

It is necessary to study why and how the men moved away by degrees from this ancient organization, not to fall, but to advance on the contrary towards a broader and better social form. For beneath an appearance of disorder and sometimes decadence, each of their changes brought them closer to a goal they did not know.

1. Patricians and clients

So far we haven't talked about the lower classes and we don't have to talk about them. Because it was a question of describing the primitive organism of the city, and the lower classes counted absolutely for nothing in this organism. The city was constituted as if these classes had not existed. We could therefore wait to study them until we had arrived at the time of the revolutions.

The ancient city, like any human society, presented ranks, distinctions, inequalities.

It is important to find out on what principles this division of classes was based. We will thus be able to see more easily by virtue of which ideas or of what needs the struggles will engage, what the lower classes will claim and in the name of what principles the upper classes will defend their empire.

We have seen above that the city was born from the confederation of families and tribes. However, before the day when the city was formed, the family already contained within itself this distinction of classes. In fact, the family was not dismembered; it was indivisible as the primitive religion of the home. The eldest son, succeeding the father alone, took over the priesthood, property, authority, and his brothers were towards him what they had been towards the father. From generation to generation, from elder to elder, there was always only one head of the family; he presided over the sacrifice, said the prayer, judged, governed. To him alone, originally, belonged the title of pater; because this word which designates the power and not the paternity, could not apply then only to the head of the family. His sons, his brothers, his servants, all called him that.

Here then is in the intimate constitution of the family a first principle of inequality. The eldest is privileged for worship, for succession, for command. After several generations, in each of these great families, younger branches naturally form which are, by religion and by custom, in a state of inferiority vis-à-vis the elder branch and who, living under its protection , obey his authority.

Then this family has servants, who do not leave it, who are hereditary attached to it, and over whom the pater or patron exercises the triple authority of master, magistrate and priest. They are called by names which vary from place to place; that of clients and that of thetes are the best known.

Here is another lower class. The client is below, not only the supreme head of the family, but also the younger branches. Between them and him there is this difference that the member of a younger branch by going up the series of his ancestors always arrives at a pater, that is to say at a head of the family, at one of those divine ancestors whom the family invokes in their prayers. As he descends from a pater, he is called in Latin patricius. The son of a client, on the contrary, so high that he goes back in his genealogy, only ever reaches a client or a slave. He did not have a paternity among his ancestors. Hence for him a state of inferiority from which nothing can get him out.

The distinction between these two classes of men is evident with regard to material interests. The property of the family belongs entirely to the chief, who, moreover, shares it with the younger branches and even with the clients. But while the younger branch has at least an eventual right to the property, in the event that the older branch should die out, the client can never become the owner. The land which he cultivates he has only in deposit; if he dies, she returns to the boss; Roman law of later eras has retained a vestige of this ancient rule in what was called jus applicationis. The client's own money is not his; the boss is the real owner and can seize it for his own needs.It is under this ancient rule that Roman law says that the client must endow the boss's daughter, that he must pay the fine for him, that he must provide his ransom or contribute to the costs of his magistracies.

The distinction is even more evident in religion. The descendant of a father alone can perform the ceremonies of family worship. The client attends; the sacrifice is made for him, but he does not do it himself. Between him and the domestic divinity there is always an intermediary. He cannot even replace the absent family. That this family comes to be extinct, the customers do not continue the worship; they disperse. Because religion is not their heritage; it is not of their blood, it does not come to them from their own ancestors. It is a borrowed religion; they have the enjoyment, not the property.

Let us remember that according to the ideas of the old generations the right to have a god and to pray was hereditary. The holy tradition, the rites, the sacramental words, the powerful formulas which determined the gods to act, all of this was transmitted only with blood. It was therefore quite natural that, in each of these ancient families, the free and ingenuous part which really descended from the first ancestor should be the only one in possession of the priestly character. The patricians or eupatrides had the privilege of being priests and of having a religion which belonged to them in their own right.

Thus, even before one had left the family state, there was already a distinction of classes; the old domestic religion had established ranks.

When the city was then formed, nothing was changed in the internal constitution of the family. We have even shown that the city, at the beginning, was not an association of individuals, but a confederation of tribes, curies and families, and that, in this kind of alliance, each of these bodies remained this that he was before. The leaders of these small groups united among themselves, but each of them remained absolute master in the small society of which he was already the leader. This is why Roman law so long left the pater with absolute authority over the family, omnipotence and the right of justice with regard to clients. The distinction between classes, born in the family, therefore continued in the city.

The city, in its early years, was only the meeting of heads of families.

We must not imagine the city of these ancient ages as an agglomeration of men living pell-mell within the enclosure of the same walls. In the early days, the city was hardly a place to live; it is the sanctuary where the gods of the community are; it is the fortress which defends them and which their presence sanctifies; it is the center of the association, the residence of the king and the priests, the place where justice is administered; but men don't live there. For several generations still, men continued to live outside the city, in isolated families who shared the countryside. Each of these families occupies its canton, where it has its domestic sanctuary and where it forms, under the authority of its father, an indivisible group. Then, on certain days,if it concerns the interests of the city or the obligations of common worship, the heads of these families go to the city and assemble around the king, either to deliberate or to assist at the sacrifice. If it is a war, each of these leaders arrives, followed by his family and his servants (sua manus); they are grouped by phratries or by curies and they form the army of the city under the orders of the king.

2. The plebeians

We must now point out another element of the population which was below the clients themselves, and which, initially tiny, imperceptibly acquired enough strength to break the old social organization. This class, which became more numerous in Rome than in any other city, was called the plebs there. We must see the origin and character of this class to understand the role it played in the history of the city and the family among the ancients.

The plebeians were not the customers; the historians of antiquity do not confuse these two classes between them.

What makes the essential character of the plebs is that they are foreign to the religious organization of the city, and even to that of the family. By this we recognize the plebeian and we distinguish him from the client. The client at least shares the cult of his boss and is part of a family, of a people. The plebeian, originally, has no worship and does not know the holy family.

What we have seen above of the social and religious state of the ancient ages tells us how this class came into being. Religion was not spreading; born into a family, she remained there as if locked up; each family had to make its belief, its gods, its worship. But we must admit that there were, in those times so distant from us, a great number of families where the spirit did not have the power to create gods, to adopt a doctrine, to institute a cult, to invent the hymn and the rhythm of prayer. These families naturally found themselves in a state of inferiority vis-à-vis those who had a religion and could not unite in society with them; they did not enter the curies or the city. Even later it happened that families who had a cult lost it,either by neglect and forgetting the rites, or after one of those faults which prohibited man from approaching his home and from continuing his worship. It must also have happened that clients, guilty or badly treated, left the family and renounced their religion; the son who was born of a marriage without rites, was reputed to be bastard, like the one born of adultery, and the religion of the family did not exist for him. All these men, excluded from families and excluded from worship, fell into the class of homeless men, that is to say, into the plebs.was considered a bastard, like one born of adultery, and the religion of the family did not exist for him. All these men, excluded from families and excluded from worship, fell into the class of homeless men, that is to say, into the plebs.was considered a bastard, like one born of adultery, and the religion of the family did not exist for him. All these men, excluded from families and excluded from worship, fell into the class of homeless men, that is to say, into the plebs.

This class is found next to almost all ancient cities, but separated by a dividing line. Originally, a Greek city is twofold: there is the city proper, polis, which usually rises on the top of a hill; it was built with religious rites and it contains the sanctuary of the national gods. At the foot of the hill there is an agglomeration of houses, which were built without religious ceremonies, without sacred walls; it is the domicile of the plebs, who cannot live in the holy city.

One word characterizes these plebeians: they are homeless; they do not have, at least originally, a domestic altar. Their adversaries always reproach them for not having ancestors, which certainly means that they do not have ancestor worship and do not have a family tomb where they can carry the funeral meal. They have no father, pater, that is to say, they would go back in vain through the series of their ancestors, they would never meet a head of a religious family there. They have no family, gentem non habent, that is to say, they only have the natural family; as for that which religion forms and constitutes, they do not have it.

Sacred marriage does not exist for them; they do not know the rites. Not having the home, the union that the home establishes is forbidden to them. Also the patrician who knows no other regular union than that which binds the husband to the wife in the presence of the domestic divinity, can he say when speaking of plebeians, connubia promiscua habent more ferarum.

No family for them, no paternal authority. They can have over their children the power that strength gives; but this holy authority with which religion invests the father, they do not have.

For them the right to property does not exist. For all property must be established and consecrated by a home, by a tomb, by gods terms, that is to say by all the elements of domestic worship. If the plebeian owns a land, this land does not have the sacred character; she is profane and does not know the boundaries.

For plebeians there is no law, no justice; for the law is the judgment of religion and the procedure is a set of rites. The client has the benefit of city law through the intermediary of the boss; for the plebeian this right does not exist.

For plebeians there are no political rights. They are not first and foremost citizens and no one among them can be a magistrate.

But what most clearly separates the plebeian from the patrician is that the plebeian does not have the religion of the city. It is impossible for him to be invested with a priesthood. The plebs are a despised and abject population, outside religion, outside the law, outside society, outside the family. The patrician can only compare this existence to that of the beast, more ferarum. The contact of the plebeian is impure.

We see how many classes, in the primitive age of cities, were superimposed on each other. At the head was the aristocracy of the heads of the family, those whom the official language of Rome called patres, whom the clients called reges, whom the Odyssey called basileis or anachtes. Below were the younger branches of the families; still below, the clients; then lower, much lower, the plebs.

But none of the social forms that man imagines and establishes are immutable. Many men had an interest in destroying a social organization which was of no benefit to them.

3. The first revolutions

at. Political authority is taken from kings

We have said that originally the king had been the religious leader of the city, the high priest of the public hearth, and that to this priestly authority he had joined the political authority, because it had seemed natural that the man who represented the religion of the city was at the same time the president of the assembly, the judge, the chief of the army. By virtue of this principle it had happened that all that there was power in the state had been united in the hands of the king.

But the heads of the families, the patres, and above them the heads of the phratries and the tribes formed beside this king a very strong aristocracy. The king was not the only king; each pater was like him in his gens; it was even in Rome an ancient custom to call each of these powerful patrons by the name of king; in Athens, each phratry and each tribe had its leader, and beside the king of the city there were the kings of the tribes, phylobasileis. It was a hierarchy of chiefs, all having, in a more or less extended domain, the same attributions and the same inviolability. The king of the city did not exercise his power over the entire population; the interior of the families and all the clientele escaped its action. Like the feudal king, whose subjects were only a few powerful vassals,this king of the ancient city only commanded the chiefs of tribes and gentes, each of whom individually could be as powerful as he, and who together were much more so. We may well believe that it was not easy for him to make himself obeyed. Men must have had great respect for him, because he was the head of the cult and the keeper of the hearth; but they doubtless had little submission, because he had little strength. The rulers and the ruled were not long without realizing that they did not agree on the measure of obedience that was due. Kings wanted to be powerful and fathers didn't want them to be. A struggle therefore began, in all the cities, between the aristocracy and the kings.and which together were much more. We may well believe that it was not easy for him to make himself obeyed. Men must have had great respect for him, because he was the head of the cult and the keeper of the hearth; but they doubtless had little submission, because he had little strength. The rulers and the ruled were not long without realizing that they did not agree on the measure of obedience that was due. Kings wanted to be powerful and fathers didn't want them to be. A struggle therefore began, in all the cities, between the aristocracy and the kings.and which together were much more. We may well believe that it was not easy for him to make himself obeyed. Men must have had great respect for him, because he was the head of the cult and the keeper of the hearth; but they doubtless had little submission, because he had little strength. The rulers and the ruled were not long without realizing that they did not agree on the measure of obedience that was due. Kings wanted to be powerful and fathers didn't want them to be. A struggle therefore began, in all the cities, between the aristocracy and the kings.but they doubtless had little submission, because he had little strength. The rulers and the ruled were not long without realizing that they did not agree on the measure of obedience that was due. Kings wanted to be powerful and fathers didn't want them to be. A struggle therefore began, in all the cities, between the aristocracy and the kings.but they doubtless had little submission, because he had little strength. The rulers and the ruled were not long without realizing that they did not agree on the measure of obedience that was due. Kings wanted to be powerful and fathers didn't want them to be. A struggle therefore began, in all the cities, between the aristocracy and the kings.

Everywhere the outcome of the struggle was the same; royalty was conquered. But we must not lose sight of the fact that this primitive royalty was sacred. The king was the man who said the prayer, who made the sacrifice, who finally had by hereditary right the power to attract on the city the protection of the gods. One could not therefore dream of doing without a king; one was needed for religion; one was needed for the salvation of the city. So we see in all the cities whose history is known to us, that we did not first touch the priestly authority of the king and that we were content to remove political authority. This was only a kind of appendix which the kings had added to their priesthood; she was not holy and inviolable like him. It could be taken from the king without the religion being endangered.

Royalty was therefore preserved; but, stripped of its power, it was no more than a priesthood.

b. Same revolution in Athens

We saw above what had been the primitive state of the population of Attica. A certain number of independent and unrelated families divided the country among themselves; each of them formed a small society governed by a hereditary chief. Then these families came together and from their association the Athenian city was born. Theseus was credited with having completed the great work of the unity of Attica. But traditions added and we can easily believe that Theseus must have broken a lot of resistance. The class of men who opposed him was not that of the clients, the poor, who were distributed among the towns and villages. Rather, these men rejoiced at a change which gave their leaders a ruler and provided themselves with recourse and protection.Those who suffered from the change were the heads of families, the heads of towns and tribes, the basileis, the phylobasileis, those eupatrides who had by hereditary right the supreme authority in their genos or in their tribe. They defended their independence as best they could; lost, they regretted it.

At least they retained all they could of their old authority. Each of them remained the all-powerful leader of his tribe or his genos. Theseus could not destroy an authority which religion had established and which it made inviolable. There is more. If we examine the traditions which are relative to this period, we see that these powerful Eupatrids did not agree to join together to form a city except by stipulating that the government would be truly federative and that each of them would take part in it. There was indeed a supreme king; but as soon as common interests were at stake, the assembly of chiefs had to be convened and nothing of importance could be done without the consent of this sort of Senate.

These traditions, in the language of subsequent generations, were expressed more or less as follows: Theseus changed the government of Athens and made it republican from monarchy. So speak Aristotle, Isocrates, Demosthenes, Plutarch. In this somewhat deceptive form there is a true fund. Theseus did indeed, as tradition says, “put sovereign authority in the hands of the people. Only, the word people, daemos, which tradition has preserved, did not have in the time of Theseus an application as extensive as that which it had in the time of Demosthenes. This daemos or body politic was certainly then only the aristocracy, that is to say all the heads of the genae.

Theseus in establishing this assembly was not intentionally innovative. The formation of the great Athenian unity changed, in spite of himself, the conditions of government. Since these Eupatrids, whose authority remained intact in the families, were united in the same city, they constituted a powerful body which had its rights and could have its demands. The king of the small rock of Cecrops became king of all Attica; but instead of having been absolute king in his small town, he was no longer anything more than the head of a federative state, that is to say the first among equals.

A conflict could not be long in breaking out between this aristocracy and royalty. “The Eupatrids regretted the truly royal power that each of them had exercised until then in their village. It seems that these warrior-priests put religion forward and claimed that the authority of local cults was diminished. If it is true, as Thucydides says, that Theseus tried to destroy the prytanées of the towns, it is not surprising that religious sentiment rose up against him. We cannot say how many struggles he had to endure, how many uprisings he had to suppress by skill or by force; what is certain is that he was in the end defeated, that he was expelled from Athens and that he died in exile.

The Eupatrids therefore won; they did not do away with the kingship, but they made a king of their choice, Menestheus. After him the family of Theseus seized power and kept it for three generations. Then it was replaced by another family, that of the Melanthids. This whole time must have been very troubled; but the memory of civil wars has not been clearly preserved to us.

The death of Codrus coincides with the definitive victory of the Eupatrids. They did not yet abolish royalty; for their religion forbade them; but they deprived him of his political power.

At the end of three centuries, the Eupatrids found this religious royalty even stronger than they wanted, and they weakened it. It was decided that the same man would only be invested with this high priestly dignity for ten years. Moreover, people continued to believe that the old royal family was the only one capable of fulfilling the functions of archon.

About forty years passed thus. But one day the royal family soiled themselves with a crime. It was alleged that she could no longer fulfill the priestly functions; it was decided that in the future the archons would be chosen outside her and that this dignity would be accessible to all eupatrides. Forty years later, to weaken this royalty or to divide it into more hands, it was made annual and at the same time it was divided into two distinct magistracies. Until then the archon was at the same time king; henceforth these two titles were separated. A magistrate named archon and another magistrate named king shared the attributions of the old religious royalty. Responsibility for ensuring the perpetuity of families, authorizing or prohibiting adoption, receiving wills,to judge in matters of real estate, all things in which religion was interested, was devolved to the archon. The charge of performing the solemn sacrifices and that of judging in matters of impiety were reserved for the king. Thus the title of king, a sacred title which was necessary for religion, was perpetuated in the city with sacrifices and national worship. The king and the archon, together with the polemarch and the six thesmothetes, which had perhaps existed for a long time, completed the number of nine annual magistrates, which became accustomed to call the nine archons after the name of the first of them. them.sacred title which was necessary for religion, was perpetuated in the city with sacrifices and national worship. The king and the archon, together with the polemarch and the six thesmothetes, which had perhaps existed for a long time, completed the number of nine annual magistrates, which became accustomed to call the nine archons after the name of the first of them. them.sacred title which was necessary for religion, was perpetuated in the city with sacrifices and national worship. The king and the archon, together with the polemarch and the six Thesmothetes, which may have existed for a long time, completed the number of nine annual magistrates, which became accustomed to call the nine archons after the name of the first of them. them.

2. The aristocracy rules the cities

The same revolution, in slightly varied forms, had taken place in Athens, in Sparta, in Rome, in all the cities whose history is known to us. Everywhere it had been the work of the aristocracy, everywhere it had the effect of suppressing political royalty while allowing religious royalty to exist. From this time and during a period whose duration was very unequal for the different cities, the government of the city belonged to the aristocracy.

This aristocracy was founded on both birth and religion. It had its principle in the religious constitution of families. The source from which it derived were these same rules that we observed above in domestic worship and in private law, that is to say the law of inheritance of the home, the privilege of elder, the right to say the prayer attached to birth. Hereditary religion was the title of this aristocracy to absolute domination. She gave him rights that seemed sacred. According to old beliefs, he alone could own the land, which had a domestic cult; he alone was a member of the city, which had in him the religious character which made the citizen; he alone could be a priest, who came from a family having a cult;he alone could be a magistrate, who had the right to perform the sacrifices. The man who had no hereditary cult had to be the client of another man, or if he did not resign himself to it, had to remain outside all society. For many generations it did not occur to men that this inequality was unjust. No one thought of constituting human society according to other rules.

In Athens, from the death of Codrus to Solon, all authority was in the hands of the Eupatrids. They were the only priests and the only archons. Only they dispensed justice and knew the laws, which were not written down and whose sacred formulas were passed down from father to son.

These families kept as much as possible the old forms of the patriarchal regime. They did not live together in the city. They continued to live in the various cantons of Attica, each on its vast domain, surrounded by its many servants, governed by its Eupatrid chief and practicing in absolute independence its hereditary worship. The Athenian city was for four centuries only the confederation of these powerful heads of families who assembled on certain days for the celebration of central worship or for the pursuit of common interests.

This political regime in Rome lasted only a few years. In Greece, on the contrary, there was a long age when the aristocracy was mistress. The Odyssey presents us with a faithful picture of this social state in the western part of Greece. We see in fact a patriarchal regime very similar to that which we have noticed in Attica. A few large and rich families share the country; many servants cultivate the soil or tend the flocks; life is simple; the same table brings together the chief and the servants. These chiefs are called by a name which in other societies became a pompous title, anaktes, basileis. It is thus that the Athenians of the primitive time called basileus the head of the genoset that the customers of Rome kept the custom of calling rex the head of the gens. These heads of families have a sacred character;the poet calls them divine kings. Ithaca is very small; it nevertheless contains a large number of these kings. Among them there is indeed a supreme king; but it is of little importance and does not seem to have any other prerogative than that of presiding over the council of chiefs. It even seems from certain signs that he is submitted for election, and we can see that Telemachus will only be the supreme leader of the island if the other leaders, his equals, wish to elect him. Ulysses returning to his homeland does not seem to have any other subjects than the servants who belong to him in his own right; when he has killed some of the chiefs, their servants take up arms and support a struggle which the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.it nevertheless contains a large number of these kings. Among them there is indeed a supreme king; but it is of little importance and does not seem to have any other prerogative than that of presiding over the council of chiefs. It even seems from certain signs that he is submitted for election, and we can see that Telemachus will only be the supreme leader of the island if the other leaders, his equals, wish to elect him. Ulysses returning to his homeland does not seem to have any other subjects than the servants who belong to him in his own right; when he has killed some of the chiefs, their servants take up arms and support a struggle which the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.it nevertheless contains a large number of these kings. Among them there is indeed a supreme king; but it is of little importance and does not seem to have any other prerogative than that of presiding over the council of chiefs. It even seems from certain signs that he is submitted for election, and we can see that Telemachus will only be the supreme leader of the island if the other leaders, his equals, wish to elect him. Ulysses returning to his homeland does not seem to have any other subjects than the servants who belong to him in his own right; when he has killed some of the chiefs, their servants take up arms and support a struggle which the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.It even seems from certain signs that he is submitted for election, and we can see that Telemachus will only be the supreme leader of the island if the other leaders, his equals, wish to elect him. Ulysses returning to his homeland does not seem to have any other subjects than the servants who belong to him in his own right; when he has killed some of the chiefs, their servants take up arms and support a struggle which the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.It even seems from certain signs that he is submitted for election, and we can see that Telemachus will only be the supreme leader of the island if the other leaders, his equals, wish to elect him. Ulysses returning to his homeland does not seem to have any other subjects than the servants who belong to him in his own right; when he has killed some of the chiefs, their servants take up arms and support a struggle which the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.the servants of these take up arms and support a struggle that the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.the servants of these take up arms and support a struggle that the poet does not dream of finding blameworthy.

3. Second revolution: changes in the constitution of the family; the birthright disappears; the people dismember

The revolution which had overthrown royalty, had modified the outward form of government rather than changed the constitution of society. It had not been the work of the lower classes, who had an interest in destroying the old institutions, but of the aristocracy who wanted to maintain them. It was therefore not made to overturn the ancient constitution of the family, but to preserve it. The kings had often had the temptation to raise the lower classes and to weaken the gentes, and it was for this that the kings had been overthrown. The aristocracy had operated a political revolution only to prevent a social revolution. She had taken power in her hands, less for the pleasure of dominating than to defend against attacks her old institutions, her ancient principles, her domestic worship,his paternal authority, the regime of the gens and finally the private law that primitive religion had established.

This great and general effort of the aristocracy therefore responded to a danger. Now it appears that despite his efforts and even his victory, the danger remained. The old institutions began to falter and serious changes were to be introduced in the intimate constitution of families.

The old regime of gens, founded by domestic religion, had not been destroyed the day the men passed to the regime of the city. They had not wanted to or had not been able to give it up immediately, the chiefs insisting on retaining their authority, the inferiors not immediately having the thought of freeing themselves. We had therefore reconciled the regime of the gens with that of the city. But they were, at bottom, two opposing regimes, which one could not hope to ally forever and which were to go to war one day or another. The family, indivisible and numerous, was too strong and too independent for the social power not to feel the temptation and even the need to weaken it. Either the city was not to last, or it was to break up the family in the long run.

The old people with their unique home, their sovereign ruler, their indivisible domain, are well understood as long as the state of isolation lasts and there is no other society than it. But as soon as the men are gathered in city, the power of the old chief is inevitably lessened; for at the same time as he is sovereign at home, he is a member of a community; as such, general interests oblige him to make sacrifices, and general laws command obedience. In his own eyes and especially in the eyes of his inferiors, his dignity is diminished. Then, in this community, however aristocratically constituted, the inferiors count for something, if only because of their number. The family which includes several branches and which goes to the fair surrounded by a crowd of customers,naturally has more authority in common deliberations than the small family, which has few arms and few soldiers. Now these inferiors do not take long to realize the importance they have and their strength; a certain sense of pride and the desire for a better fate are born in them. Add to this the rivalries of heads of households struggling for influence and mutually seeking to weaken each other. Add further that they become greedy for the magistracies of the city, that in order to obtain them they seek to make themselves popular, and that in order to manage them they neglect or forget their little local sovereignty. These causes produced little by little a sort of relaxation in the constitution of the people; those who had an interest in maintaining this constitution were less keen on it;those who had an interest in modifying it became bolder and stronger.

The strength of individuality that there was initially in the family is gradually weakening. The birthright, which was the condition of his unity, disappeared. We should probably not expect any ancient writer to provide us with the exact date of this great change. It is probable that it did not have a date, because it did not come true in a year. It took place in the long run, first in one family, then in another, and little by little in all. It ended without realizing it, so to speak.

One can well believe also that the men did not pass of a single leap from the indivisibility of the patrimony to the equal division between the brothers. There was probably a transition between these two regimes. Things may have happened in Greece and Italy as in the old Hindu society, where religious law, after having prescribed the indivisibility of the patrimony, left the father free to give some portion of it to his younger sons, then , after having demanded that the elder should have at least a double share, allowed that the partition be made equally, and even ended up recommending it.

The birthright therefore disappeared everywhere: a considerable revolution which began to transform society. The Italian people and the Hellenic genos lost their original unity. The different branches separated; each of them henceforth had its share of property, its domicile, its separate interests, its independence. Singuli singulas familias incipiunt habere, said the jurisconsult. There is in the Latin language an old expression which seems to date from this period: familiam ducere, they said of the one who broke away from the people and was going to make a separate strain, as they said ducere coloniam of the one who left the metropolis and was going far away to found a colony. The brother who had thus separated from the elder brother now had his own home, which he had probably lit in the common home of the people,as the colony lit its own in the prytaneum of the metropolis, the people retained only a sort of religious authority with regard to the different families which had become detached from it. His cult had supremacy over their cults. They were not allowed to forget that they came from this people; they continued to bear his name; on set days, they gathered around the common hearth, to venerate the ancient ancestor or the protective divinity. They even continued to have a religious leader, and it is likely that the eldest retained his privilege for the priesthood, which long remained hereditary. Apart from that, they were independent.They were not allowed to forget that they came from this people; they continued to bear his name; on set days, they gathered around the common hearth, to venerate the ancient ancestor or the protective divinity. They even continued to have a religious leader, and it is likely that the eldest retained his privilege for the priesthood, which long remained hereditary. Apart from that, they were independent.They were not allowed to forget that they came from this people; they continued to bear his name; on set days, they gathered around the common hearth, to venerate the ancient ancestor or the protective divinity. They even continued to have a religious leader, and it is likely that the eldest retained his privilege for the priesthood, which long remained hereditary. Apart from that, they were independent.they were independent.they were independent.

This dismemberment of the people had serious consequences. The ancient priestly family, which had formed such a united group, so strongly constituted, so powerful, was forever weakened. This revolution prepared and facilitated further changes.

4. Customers free themselves

at. What customers used to be like and how they changed

The ancient family included, under the authority of a single head, two classes of unequal rank: on the one hand, the younger branches, that is to say individuals naturally free; on the other, the servants or clients, inferior by birth, but brought closer to the chief by their participation in domestic worship. Of these two classes, we have just seen the first emerging from its state of inferiority; the second also aspires early to free itself. She succeeds in the long run; the clientele changes and eventually disappears.

What we know with the most certainty about the client is that he cannot separate himself from the boss or choose another, and that he is linked from father to son to a family. If we didn't know that, it would be enough to believe that his condition should not be very mild. Let us add that the client does not own the land; the land belongs to the patron who, as head of a domestic cult and also as a member of a city, has only the right to own it. If the client cultivates the soil, it is in the name and for the benefit of the master. He does not even have ownership of movable objects, his money, his nest egg. The proof is that the boss can take it all back, to pay his own debts or his ransom. So nothing is his. It is true that the boss owes him subsistence, to himself and to his children;but in return he owes his work to the boss. We cannot say that he is precisely a slave; but he has a master to whom he belongs and to whose will he is subject in everything. He is a customer all his life, and his sons have them after him.

In the state of isolation in which the family had lived for a long time, the clientele had been able to form and maintain themselves. Domestic religion was then all-powerful over the soul. The man who was its priest by hereditary right appeared to the lower classes as a sacred being. More than a man, he was the intermediary between men and God. From his mouth came the mighty prayer, the irresistible formula which attracted the favor or the anger of the deity. Before such a force it was necessary to bow; obedience was commanded by faith and religion. Besides, how would the client have had the temptation to free himself? He saw no other horizon than this family to which everything attached him. In her alone he found a calm life, an assured subsistence; in her alone, if he had a master,he also had a protector; in her alone, finally, he found an altar which he could approach, and gods whom he was allowed to invoke. To leave this family was to place oneself outside all social organization and all rights; it was losing one's gods and renouncing the right to pray.

But the city being founded, the customers of the different families could see each other, talk to each other, communicate their desires or their grudges, compare the different masters and foresee a better fate. Then their gaze began to extend beyond the family compound. They saw that apart from her there was a society, rules, laws, altars, temples, gods. Leaving the family was therefore no longer an irremediable misfortune for them. The temptation grew stronger every day; the clientele seemed to be a heavier and heavier burden, and people ceased to believe that the authority of the master was legitimate and holy. There was then in the hearts of these men an ardent desire to be free. Doubtless we do not find in the history of any city the memory of a general insurrection of this class.If there were armed conflicts, they were shut up and hidden within the walls of each family. It was there that, for more than a generation, there were vigorous efforts for independence on the one hand, and implacable repression on the other. A long and dramatic story unfolded in each house which today is impossible to trace. What can only be said is that the efforts of the lower class were not without results. Little by little, an invincible necessity forced the masters to give up something of their omnipotence. When authority ceases to appear fair to subjects, it still takes time for it to cease to appear fair to masters; but that comes in the long run, and then the master, who no longer believes in his legitimate authority, defends it badly or ends up giving it up.Add that this lower class was useful, that his arms, by cultivating the land, made the wealth of the master, and by bearing arms, made his strength in the midst of family rivalries; that it was therefore wise to satisfy it, and that interest united with humanity to advise concessions.

Originally the clients lived in the master's house, cultivating the common domain together. Each of them was later assigned a particular plot of land. The client must have been happier already. No doubt he was still working for the benefit of the master; the earth was not his, it was rather he who was hers. Anyway, he cultivated her for many years in a row and he loved her. There was established between her and him, not this bond which the religion of property had created between it and the master but another bond, the one that work and even suffering can form between the man who gives his trouble and the land that bears fruit.

There came a time when he no longer cultivated for the master, but for himself. Under the condition of a royalty, which was perhaps at first variable, but which then became fixed, he enjoyed the harvest.

But this field where her life flowed henceforth, where all her labor and all her enjoyment were, was not yet her property. Because this client did not have in him the sacred character which made that the ground could become the property of a man. The lot it occupied continued to bear the holy milestone, the god Term that the master's family had once placed. This inviolable terminal attested that the field, united to the master's family by a sacred bond, could never belong to the freed customer.

The client, who became the owner, suffered from not being an owner and aspired to become one. He set his ambition to remove from this field, which seemed to him well through labor law, the sacred boundary which made it forever the property of the former master.

We can clearly see that in Greece the customers achieved their goal; by what means, we ignore it. How much time and effort it took them to get there, one can only guess.

b. The clientele disappears in Athens: work of Solon

This kind of revolution is clearly marked in the history of Athens. The overthrow of royalty had the effect of reviving the genos regime; the families had resumed their life of isolation and each had begun again to form a small state whose head was a eupatride and as its subjects the crowd of customers. This regime seems to have weighed heavily on the Athenian population; because she had a bad memory of it. The people considered themselves so unhappy that the preceding period seemed to them to have been a sort of golden age; he regretted kings; he came to imagine that under the monarchy he had been happy and free, that he had enjoyed equality then, and that it was only from the fall of kings that inequality and suffering had start. There was an illusion there, as people often have;popular tradition placed the beginning of inequality where the people had begun to find it odious. This clientele, this sort of serfdom, which was as old as the constitution of the family, was made to date from the time when men first felt its weight and understood its injustice. Yet it is quite certain that it was not in the seventh century that the Eupatrids established the hard laws of clientele. They only kept them. In this alone was their fault; they maintained these laws beyond the time when the populations accepted them without moaning; they maintained them against the wishes of men. Perhaps the Eupatrids of this time were less harsh masters than their ancestors had been; yet they were hated more.

It seems that even under the domination of this aristocracy, the condition of the lower class improved. Because it is then that we clearly see this class obtaining possession of lots of land under the sole condition of paying a royalty which was set at one-sixth of the harvest. These men were thus almost emancipated; having a home and no longer under the eyes of the master, they breathed more easily and worked for their benefit.

But such is human nature that these men, as their lot improved, felt more bitterly what was left of their inequality. Not being citizens and having no part in the administration of the city undoubtedly affected them poorly; but not being able to own the land on which they were born and died affected them much more. Let us add that what was bearable in their present condition lacked stability. Because if they were really owners of the land, yet no formal law guaranteed them neither this possession nor the independence which resulted from it.

Serious questions were therefore agitated in Attica for a succession of four or five generations. It was hardly possible for the men of the lower class to remain in that unstable and irregular position to which insensible progress had led them; and then one of two things, or losing this position, they had to fall back into the bonds of hard clientele, or decidedly freed by a new progress, they had to rise to the rank of landowners and free men.

It was Solon who granted these wishes as far as possible. Before him, most of the inhabitants of Attica were still reduced to precarious possession of the land and could even fall back into personal servitude. After him, this large class of men can no longer be found: the right to property is accessible to all; there is no longer any servitude for the Athenian; families of the lower class are forever free from the authority of the Eupatrid families. There is a great change here, the author of which can only be Solon.

It is true that if we stuck to the words of Plutarch, Solon would only have softened the legislation on debts by depriving the creditor of the right to enslave the debtor. But it is necessary to look closely at what a writer who is so posterior to this time, tells us of these debts which troubled the Athenian city like all the cities of Greece and Italy. It is hard to believe that there was such a circulation of money before Solon that there must have been many lenders and borrowers. Let us not judge these times by those which followed. There was then very little commerce; the exchange of claims was unknown and loans must have been quite rare. What a pledge the man who owned nothing. would he have borrowed? It is hardly the custom in any society to lend to the poor. We tell the truth,on the faith of Plutarch's translators rather than Plutarch himself, that the borrower pledged his land. But assuming that this land was his property, he could not have pledged it; for the mortgage system was not yet known at that time and was in contradiction with the nature of the right to property. In these debtors of which Plutarch speaks to us, we must see the former clients; in their debts, the annual royalty which they must pay to the old masters; in the servitude into which they fall, if they do not pay, the old clientele which recaptures them.for the mortgage system was not yet known at that time and was in contradiction with the nature of the right to property. In these debtors of which Plutarch speaks to us, we must see the former clients; in their debts, the annual royalty which they must pay to the old masters; in the servitude into which they fall, if they do not pay, the old clientele which recaptures them.for the mortgage system was not yet known at that time and was in contradiction with the nature of the right to property. In these debtors of which Plutarch speaks to us, we must see the former clients; in their debts, the annual royalty which they must pay to the old masters; in the servitude into which they fall, if they do not pay, the old clientele which recaptures them.

Solon perhaps suppressed the royalty, or, more probably, reduced the number to such a rate that redemption became easy; he added that in the future the lack of payment would not make the plowman fall back into bondage.

He did more. Before him, these former clients, who had become owners of the land, could not become owners; for on their field still stood the sacred and inviolable boundary mark of the former patron. For the emancipation of the land and of the cultivator, this landmark had to disappear. Solon overturned it: we find the testimony of this great reform in a few verses by Solon himself: “It was an unexpected work,” he said; I accomplished it with the help of the gods. I attest to the Mother goddess, the Black Earth, from which I have torn off the boundaries in many places, the land which was a slave and which is now free. In doing so, Solon had accomplished a considerable revolution. He had put aside the ancient religion of property which, in the name of the immobile god Term, held the earth in a small number of hands.He had torn the earth from religion to give it to work. He had suppressed, with the authority of the Eupatrid on the ground, his authority over man, and he could say in his verses: "Those who on this earth suffered cruel servitude and trembled before a master, I have them. free facts. "

IV. Third revolution: the plebs enter the city

General history of this revolution

The changes which had taken place in the long run in the constitution of the family brought about others in the constitution of the city. The old aristocratic and priestly family found itself weakened. The birthright having disappeared, it had lost its unity and its vigor; most of the clients having freed themselves, she had lost most of her subjects. The men of the lower class were no longer distributed among the gentes; living apart from them, they formed a body among themselves. By this the city changed its appearance; instead of having previously been a weakly linked assembly of as many small states as there were families, the union was made, on the one hand between the patrician members of the gentes, on the other between the men of lower rank. There were thus two great bodies present,two enemy companies. It was no longer, as in the preceding epoch, an obscure struggle in each family; in every town there was open war. Of the two classes, one wanted the religious constitution of the city to be maintained, and for both the government and the priesthood to remain in the hands of the sacred families. The other wanted to break down the old barriers that placed her outside of law, religion and political society.of religion and political society.of religion and political society.

In the first part of the struggle, the advantage lay with the aristocracy by birth. In truth, she no longer had her former subjects, and her material strength had fallen; but he still had the prestige of his religion, his regular organization, his habit of command, his traditions, his hereditary pride. She did not doubt her right; in defending herself, she believed she was defending religion. The people had only their great number on their side. He was embarrassed by a habit of respect which it was not easy for him to shake off. Besides, he had no leaders; he lacked every principle of organization. He was originally an unrelated multitude rather than a strong, well-made body. If we remember that men had found no other principle of association than the hereditary religion of families,and that they did not have the idea of ​​an authority which did not derive from worship, we will easily understand that this plebs, who were outside worship and religion, could not first have formed a regular society, and that it took a long time to find in it the elements of a discipline and the rules of a government.

This lower class, in its weakness, saw no other means of fighting the aristocracy at first than to oppose the monarchy.

In towns where the working class was already formed in the days of the ancient kings, she supported them with all the strength at her disposal, and encouraged them to increase their power. In Rome, she demanded the reestablishment of kingship after Romulus; she had Hostilius appointed; she made Tarquin the elder king; she loved Servius and she regretted Tarquin the Superb.

When kings had everywhere been vanquished and the aristocracy became mistress, the people did not limit themselves to regretting the monarchy; he longed to restore it in a new form. In Greece, during the sixth century, he generally succeeded in giving himself leaders; not being able to call them kings, because this title implied the idea of ​​religious functions and could be carried only by priestly families, he called them tyrants.

Whatever the original meaning of this word, it is certain that it was not borrowed from the language of religion; one could not apply it to the gods, as one did of the word king; it was not pronounced in prayers. It meant something very new among men, an authority that did not derive from worship, a power that religion had not established. The appearance of this word in the Greek language marks the appearance of a principle that previous generations had not known the obedience of man to man. Until then, there had been no other heads of state than those who were the heads of religion; these alone commanded the city, who made the sacrifice and called on the gods for it; by obeying them,one obeyed only the religious law and one made an act of submission only to the divinity. Obedience to a man, the authority given to this man by other men, a power of origin and of an entirely human nature, this had been unknown to the ancient Eupatrids, and it was not conceived until the day when the classes inferior rejected the yoke of the aristocracy and sought a new government.

But it should be noted that, if the people in Greece and in Rome sought to raise the monarchy, it was not by a real attachment to this regime. He loved tyrants less than he hated the aristocracy. The monarchy was for him a means of victory and revenge; but never this government, which emerged only from the law of force and was not based on any sacred tradition, did not have roots in the hearts of the populations. They gave themselves a tyrant for the sake of the struggle; power was then left to him out of recognition or out of necessity; but when a few years had passed and the memory of the harsh oligarchy had faded, the tyrant was let down. This government never had the affection of the Greeks; they only accepted it as a momentary resource,and while waiting for the popular party to find a better regime and to feel the strength to govern itself.

The lower class gradually grows. There are progress which are accomplished obscurely and which nevertheless decide the future of a class and transform a society. Around the sixth century BC, Greece and Italy saw a new source of wealth spring up. The earth was no longer sufficient for all human needs; tastes were directed towards beauty and luxury; even the arts were born; then industry and commerce became necessary. Little by little a movable wealth was formed; coins were minted; the money appeared. But the appearance of money was a great revolution. Money was not subject to the same conditions of ownership as land; he was, according to the jurisconsult's expression, res nec mancipi;he could pass from hand to hand without any religious formality and reach the plebeian without obstacle. Religion, which had left its mark on the balance, could do nothing about money.

The men of the lower classes then knew another occupation than that of cultivating the land: there were artisans, navigators, heads of industry, traders; soon there were rich among them. Singular novelty! Previously, the heads of the gentes could alone be owners, and here are former clients or plebeians who are rich and who display their wealth. Then, luxury, which enriched the common man, impoverished the Eupatrid; in many cities, notably in Athens, part of the aristocratic body was seen to fall into poverty. But in a society where wealth is on the move, the ranks are very close to being overthrown.

Another consequence of this change was that in the people themselves distinctions and ranks were established, as is necessary in any human society. A few families were in sight; some names grew little by little. A sort of aristocracy arose among the people. The plebs let themselves be guided by this elite which they were proud to have in them. She gave up having tyrants as soon as she felt that she possessed in her bosom the elements of a better government. Finally, wealth became for some time, as we shall see later, a principle of social organization.

There is one more change that needs to be talked about, as it greatly helped the lower class to grow; it is that which took place in the military art. In the first centuries of the history of cities, the strength of the armies was in the cavalry. The real warrior was the one who fought on a chariot or on horseback; the infantryman, of little use in combat, was little esteemed. Hence the old aristocracy everywhere reserved the right to fight on horseback; even in some towns the nobles gave themselves the title of knights. The celeres of Romulus, the Roman knights of the first centuries were all patricians. Among the ancients the cavalry was always the noble weapon. But little by little the infantry took on some importance.Progress in the manufacture of weapons and the birth of the discipline allowed him to resist the cavalry. This point obtained, it immediately took the first rank in the battles, for it was more maneuverable and its maneuvers easier; the legionaries, the hoplites made henceforth the force of the armies. Now the legionaries and the hoplites were plebeians. Add that the navy grew, especially in Greece, that there were battles at sea and that the fate of a city was often in the hands of its rowers, that is to say plebeians. Now the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.it immediately took the first rank in the battles, for it was more maneuverable and its maneuvers easier; the legionaries, the hoplites made henceforth the force of the armies. Now the legionaries and the hoplites were plebeians. Add that the navy grew, especially in Greece, that there were battles at sea and that the fate of a city was often in the hands of its rowers, that is to say plebeians. Now the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.it immediately took the first rank in the battles, for it was more manageable and its maneuvers easier; the legionaries, the hoplites made henceforth the force of the armies. Now the legionaries and the hoplites were plebeians. Add that the navy grew, especially in Greece, that there were battles at sea and that the fate of a city was often in the hands of its rowers, that is to say plebeians. Now the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.Now the legionaries and the hoplites were plebeians. Add that the navy grew, especially in Greece, that there were battles at sea and that the fate of a city was often in the hands of its rowers, that is to say plebeians. Now the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.Now the legionaries and the hoplites were plebeians. Add that the navy grew, especially in Greece, that there were battles at sea and that the fate of a city was often in the hands of its rowers, that is to say plebeians. But the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.But the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.Now the class which is strong enough to defend a society is strong enough to conquer rights and exercise legitimate influence. The social and political state of a nation is always related to the nature and composition of its armies.

Finally, the lower class also succeeds in having its religion. These men had in their hearts, one can suppose it, this religious feeling which is inseparable from our nature and which makes us a need of the worship and the prayer. They therefore suffered to see themselves removed from religion by the ancient principle which prescribed that each god belonged to a family and that the right to pray should only be transmitted through blood. They also worked to have a cult.

Once the lower class had completed these various advances, when there were rich people, soldiers, priests, when it had everything that gives man a sense of his worth and his strength, when finally she had forced the upper class to count her for something, it was then impossible to keep her out of social and political life, and the city could not remain closed to it any longer.

The entry of this lower class into the city is a revolution which, from the seventh to the fifth century, filled the history of Greece and Italy. The efforts of the people have won everywhere, but not everywhere in the same way or by the same means.

The nobility was no more than a memory. The great families continued to piously keep the domestic worship and the memory of the ancestors; but that was all. There were still men who amused themselves by counting their ancestors; but we laughed at these men. We kept the custom of inscribing on some tombs that the deceased was of noble race; but no attempt was made to revive a regime that had fallen forever. Isocrates says with truth that in his time the great families of Athens no longer existed except in their tombs.

Thus the ancient city was transformed by degrees. Originally, it was the association of a hundred heads of families. Later the number of citizens increased, because the younger branches obtained equality. Later still, the freed customers, the plebs, all that crowd which for centuries had remained outside religious and political association, sometimes even outside the sacred city walls, broke down the barriers that were imposed on it. opposed and entered the city, where she was immediately mistress.

Solon, by changing the political constitution, had allowed all the old religious organization of Athenian society to exist. The population remained divided into two or three hundred genea, twelve phratries, four tribes. In each of these groups there was still, as in the previous time, a hereditary cult, a priest who was an Eupatrid, a leader who was the same as the priest. It was all the remnants of a past that hardly disappeared; hence the traditions, customs, rules, distinctions that had existed in the old social state were perpetuated. These frameworks had been established by religion, and they in turn maintained religion, that is, the power of great families. There were in each of these frames two classes of men,on the one hand the Eupatrids who inherited the priesthood and the authority, on the other the men of an inferior condition, who were no longer servants or clients, but who were still retained under the authority of the Eupatrid by religion. In vain the law of Solon said that all Athenians were free. The old religion seized the man on leaving the Assembly where he had freely voted, and said to him: You are linked to a eupatride by worship; you owe him respect, deference, submission; as a member of a city, Solon made you free; but as a member of a tribe, you obey a eupatride; as a member of a phratry, you still have a eupatride for your leader; in the family itself, in the genos where your ancestors were born and from which you cannot come out, you still find the authority of a eupatride.What was the use of political law making this man a citizen, if religion and morals persisted in making him a client? It is true that for several generations many men were outside these frameworks, either that they had come from foreign countries, or that they had escaped from the genos and the tribe to be free. But these men suffered in another way; they found themselves in a state of moral inferiority vis-à-vis other men, and a sort of ignominy attached to their independence.or they had escaped from the genos and the tribe to be free. But these men suffered in another way; they found themselves in a state of moral inferiority vis-à-vis other men, and a sort of ignominy attached to their independence.or they had escaped from the genos and the tribe to be free. But these men suffered in another way; they found themselves in a state of moral inferiority vis-à-vis other men, and a sort of ignominy attached to their independence.

There was therefore, after Solon's political reform, another reform to be made in the domain of religion. Cleisthenes accomplished this by suppressing the four ancient religious tribes, and replacing them with ten tribes which were divided into a number of demes.

These tribes and demes resembled the ancient tribes and g¡nh in appearance. In each of these constituencies there was a cult, a priest, a judge, meetings for religious ceremonies, assemblies to deliberate on common interests. But the new groups differed from the old ones in two essential points. First, all the free men of Athens, even those who had not been part of the ancient tribes and genena, were distributed among the cadres formed by Cleisthenes: a great reform which gave worship to those who still lacked it, and which brought into a religious association those who had previously been excluded from any association. In the second place, the men were distributed in the tribes and in the demes, no longer according to their birth, as formerly, but according to their domicile.Birth counted for nothing; men were equal there, and there were no longer any privileges. The worship, for the celebration of which the new tribe or the deme gathered, was no longer the hereditary worship of an old family; we no longer gathered around the hearth of a eupatride. He was no longer a former Eupatrid whom the tribe or the deme worshiped as divine ancestor; the tribes had new eponymous heroes chosen from among the ancient characters whom the people had remembered well, and as for the demes, they uniformly adopted as protective gods Zeus guardian of the enclosure and paternal Apollo. From then on there was no longer any reason for the priesthood to be hereditary in the deme as it had been in the genos; neither was there any so that the priest was always a eupatride.In the new groups, the dignity of priest and leader was annual, and each member could exercise it in turn. This reform was what completed the overthrow of the aristocracy of the Eupatrids. From that moment there was no longer a religious caste; no more birth privileges, neither in religion nor in politics. Athenian society was completely transformed.

Now the suppression of the old tribes, replaced by new tribes, to which all men had access and were equal, is not a fact peculiar to the history of Athens. The same change was made in Cyrene, Sicyon, Elis, Sparta, and probably in many other Greek cities. Of all the means suitable for weakening the old aristocracy, Aristotle saw no more effective than this. “If we want to found democracy,” he said, “we will do what Cleisthenes did among the Athenians; we will establish new tribes and new phratries; the hereditary sacrifices of families will be substituted by sacrifices in which all men will be admitted; the relations of men among themselves should be confused as much as possible, taking care to break all previous associations.When this reform is accomplished in all the cities, we can say that the old mold of society is broken and that a new social body is formed. This change in the frameworks that the old hereditary religion had established and that it declared immutable, marks the end of the religious regime of the city.

V. Changes in private law; the code of the Twelve Tables; Solon's code

But now the company has changed. The patriarchal regime that this hereditary religion had created dissolved in the long run into the city regime. Insensibly the people are dismembered, the younger is detached from the elder, the servant of the chief; the lower class grew; she is armed; it ended up defeating the aristocracy and conquering equality. This change in the social state was to bring another change in the law. Because as much the Eupatrids and the patricians were attached to the old religion of the families and consequently to the old law, as much the lower class had of hatred for this hereditary religion which had long made its inferiority, and for this ancient right which had oppressed it. . Not only did she hate him, she didn't even understand him.As she did not have the beliefs on which it was based, this right seemed to her to have no basis. She found him unfair, and therefore it was impossible for him to stand still.

If we look at the time when the plebs grew up and entered the body politic, and compare the law of that time to primitive law, serious changes first appear. The first and most salient is that the law has been made public and is known to all. It is no longer that sacred and mysterious song that one said to each other from age to age with pious respect, that priests alone wrote and that only men of religious families could know. The law emerged from the rituals and books of priests; he has lost his religious mystery; it is a language that everyone can read and can speak.

Something even more serious manifests itself in these codes. The nature of the law and its principle are not the same as in the previous period. Previously the law was a judgment of religion; it passed for a revelation made by the gods to the ancestors, to the divine founder, to the sacred kings, to the magistrate-priests. In the new codes, on the contrary, it is no longer in the name of the gods that the legislator speaks; the Decemvirs of Rome received their power from the people; it is also the people who invested Solon with the right to make laws. The legislator therefore no longer represents the religious tradition, but the popular will. From now on the law has for principle the interests of men, and for foundation the assent of the greatest number.

Hence two consequences. First, the law is no longer presented as an immutable and indisputable formula. By becoming human work, it recognizes itself subject to change. The Twelve Tables say: “What the people's votes last ordered is the law. "

The other consequence is this. The law, which previously was a part of religion and was therefore the heritage of sacred families, was henceforth the common property of all citizens. The plebeian could invoke it and take legal action.

Thus the law changed in nature. Therefore it could no longer contain the same prescriptions as in the previous period. As long as religion had held sway over him, he had regulated the relations of men among themselves according to the principles of that religion. But the lower class, which brought other principles to the city, understood nothing either of the old rules of property rights, or of the old right of inheritance, or of the absolute authority of the father, or of the kinship of 'agnation. She wanted it all to go away.

We know that two codes of laws were drawn up in Athens, at the distance of thirty years, the first by Dracon, the second by Solon. That of Dracon was written at the height of the struggle between the two classes, and when the Eupatrids were not yet defeated. Solon wrote his just as the lower class won out. The differences are therefore great between the two codes.

Dracon was a eupatrid; he had all the sentiments of his caste and "was educated in religious law." He does not seem to have done anything other than writing down the old customs, without changing anything. Its first law is this: “We must honor the gods and heroes of the country and offer them annual sacrifices, without deviating from the rites followed by the ancestors. The memory of his murder laws has been preserved; they prescribe that the culprit be removed from the temple, and forbid him to touch the lustral water and the vessels of the ceremonies.

His laws appeared cruel to subsequent generations. They were in fact dictated by an implacable religion which saw in any fault an offense against the divinity, and in any offense against the divinity an irremissible crime. Theft was punishable by death, because theft was an attack on the religion of property.

A curious article which has been preserved to us of this legislation shows in what spirit it was made. It only granted the right to prosecute a crime to the relatives of the deceased and members of his genos. We can see how the genos was still powerful at that time, since it did not allow the city to intervene ex officio in its affairs, even to avenge it. The man still belonged to the genos more than to the city.

In all that has come down to us about this legislation, we see that it only reproduced old law. It had the harshness and stiffness of the old unwritten law. One can believe that it established a very deep demarcation between the classes; for the lower class always hated it, and at the end of thirty years it demanded new legislation.

Solon's code is quite different; we see that it corresponds to a great social revolution. The first thing we notice is that the laws are the same for everyone. They do not distinguish between the Eupatrid, the simple free man, and the thete. These words are not even found in any of the articles that have been preserved to us. Solon boasts in his verses of having written the same laws for adults and for children.

Like the Twelve-Tables, the code of Solon departs in many points from ancient law; on other points he remains faithful to him.

Very ancient law had prescribed that the eldest son was the sole heir. Solon's law departs from it and says in formal terms: “The brothers will share the patrimony. "But the legislator did not yet stray from the primitive law so far as to give the sister a share in the succession:" the division, he said, will be between the sons. "

There is more: if a father leaves only a daughter, the only child can not be inherited; it is always the closest agnate who has the succession. In this Solon conforms to the old law; at least he succeeds in giving the daughter the enjoyment of the patrimony, by forcing the heir to marry her.

Kinship by women was unknown in old law; Solon admits it in the new law, but placing it below the kinship by the males.

Thus women begin to have inheritance rights, but lower than those of men; the law formally states this principle: "the males and the descendants by the males exclude the women and the descendants of the women." At least this sort of kinship is recognized and makes its place in the laws, certain proof that natural law begins to speak almost as loudly as the old religion.

Solon again introduced something very new into Athenian legislation, the testament. Before him, goods necessarily passed to the nearest agnate, or in the absence of agnats to the gennetes (gentiles), this was due to the fact that the goods were not considered as belonging to the individual, but to the genos. In Solon's time people began to conceive of the right of property differently; the dissolution of the old genos had made each domain the proper property of an individual. The legislator thus allowed the man to dispose of his fortune and to choose his legatee. However, by suppressing the right that legenos had had over the property of each of its members, it did not suppress the right of the natural family; the son remained a necessary heir; if the dying left only one daughter,he could choose his heir only on the condition that this heir would marry the girl; without children, the man was free to test at his fancy. This last rule was absolutely new in Athenian law, and we can see by it how many new ideas were formed about the family.

The primitive religion had given the father a sovereign authority in the house. Ancient Athens law went so far as to allow him to sell or kill his son. Solon, conforming to the new customs, set limits on this power; we know with certainty that he forbade the father to sell his daughter, and it is likely that the same defense protected the son. The paternal authority was going to weaken, as the ancient religion lost its empire: which took place earlier in Athens than in Rome. So Athenian law did not content itself with saying, like the Twelve Tables: "after a triple sale the son will be free." He allowed the son who had reached a certain age to escape his father's power. Morals, if not laws, imperceptibly came to establish the majority of the son, even during the lifetime of the father.We know of a law of Athens which enjoins the son to feed his father who is old or infirm; such a law necessarily indicates that the son can possess, and consequently that he is freed from the paternal power. This law did not exist in Rome, because the son never had anything and always remained in power.

For women, Solon's law still conformed to ancient law, when it forbade her to make a will, because the woman was never really the owner and could only have usufruct. But she deviated from this ancient right when she allowed the woman to take back her dowry.

VI. New principle of government; public interest and suffrage

The revolution which overthrew the domination of the priestly class and raised the lower class to the level of the former heads of the gentes, marked the beginning of a new period in the history of cities. A sort of social renewal is taking place. It was not just one class of men replacing another class in power. It was the old principles that were set aside, and new rules that would govern human societies.

It is true that the city preserved the external forms which it had had in the preceding time. The republican regime continued; the magistrates almost everywhere kept their old names; Athens still had its archons and Rome its consuls. Nothing was changed either in the ceremonies of public religion; the meals of the prytaneum, the sacrifices at the beginning of the assembly, the auspices and the prayers, all this was preserved. It is quite ordinary for man, when he rejects old institutions, to want at least to keep them outside.

Basically, everything was changed. Neither institutions, nor law, nor beliefs, nor manners were in this new period what they had been in the previous one. The old regime disappeared, bringing with it the rigorous rules it had established in all things; a new regime was founded, and human life changed its face.

Religion had been the sole principle of government for many centuries. Another principle had to be found which was capable of replacing it and which could, like it, govern societies by protecting them as much as possible from fluctuations and conflicts. The principle on which the government of the cities was founded henceforth was the public interest.

We must observe this new dogma which then made its appearance in the minds of men and in history. Previously, the superior rule from which social order was derived was not interest, it was religion. The duty to perform the rites of worship had been the social bond. From this religious necessity arose, for some the right to command, for others the obligation to obey; from there had come the rules of justice and procedure, those of public deliberation, those of war. The cities had not wondered if the institutions they created were useful; these institutions were founded because religion had so willed. Interest or convenience had not helped to establish them; and if the priestly class had fought to defend them,it was not in the name of the public interest, but in the name of religious tradition.

But in the period we are entering now, tradition no longer holds sway and religion no longer rules. The regulatory principle from which all institutions must henceforth draw their strength, the only one which is above individual wills and which can oblige them to submit, is the public interest. What the Latins call res publica, the Greeks to choinon, this is what replaces the old religion. This is what now decides institutions and laws, and it is to this that all the important acts of the cities relate. In the deliberations of senates or popular assemblies, whether we are discussing a law or a form of government, a point of private law or a political institution, we no longer wonder what religion prescribes, but what demanded by the general interest.

A word is attributed to Solon which characterizes the new regime fairly well. Someone asked him if he thought he had given his country the best constitution; “No,” he replied; but the one that suits him best. Now it was something very new to no longer ask of forms of government and of laws but relative merit. The ancient constitutions, founded on the rules of worship, had proclaimed themselves infallible and immutable; they had had the rigor and inflexibility of religion. Solon indicated by this word that in the future political constitutions should conform to the needs, customs, and interests of the men of each era. It was no longer a question of absolute truth; government rules should now be flexible and variable. It is said that Solon wished, and at most,may its laws be observed for a hundred years.

The prescriptions of the public interest are not as absolute, as clear, as obvious as those of a religion. We can always discuss them; they don't notice at first. The simplest and safest way to find out what the public interest required was to assemble the men and consult them. This process was considered necessary and was almost daily employed. In the preceding epoch the auspices had paid almost all the expense of the deliberations; the opinion of the priest, of the king, of the sacred magistrate was all-powerful; we voted little, and rather to accomplish a formality than to make known the opinion of each one. Henceforth we voted on all things; it was necessary to have the opinion of all, to be sure of knowing the interest of all. Suffrage became the great means of government.He was the source of institutions, the rule of law; he decided what was useful and even what was right. He was above magistrates, even above the law; he was the sovereign in the city.

The nature of government also changed. Its essential function was no longer the regular performance of religious ceremonies; it was above all constituted to maintain order and peace within, dignity and power without. What had once been in the background, moved to the fore. Politics took precedence over religion, and the government of men became a human matter.

VII. An aristocracy of wealth tries to constitute itself; establishment of democracy; fourth revolution

The regime which succeeded the domination of the religious aristocracy was not first of all democracy. The new regime was established with some solidity only where an upper class immediately found itself to take in hand, for a time, the power and moral authority which escaped the Eupatrides or the patricians. Thus Solon did not believe he could make us forget the old distinction founded on hereditary religion, only by establishing a new division which was founded on wealth. He divided men into four classes, and gave them unequal rights; it was necessary to be rich to reach the high magistracies; you had to be at least one of the two middle classes to have access to the Senate and the courts.

What could this new aristocracy be? Hereditary religion being ruled out, there was no other element of social distinction than wealth. Wealth was therefore asked to fix ranks, minds not immediately admitting that equality had to be absolute.

Thus the political rights which, in the preceding epoch, were inherent at birth, were, for some time, inherent in fortune. This aristocracy of wealth was formed in all the cities, not by the effect of a calculation, but by the very nature of the human mind, which, coming out of a regime of profound inequality, did not achieve everything. immediately to complete equality.

It should be noted that this aristocracy did not base its superiority solely on its wealth. Everywhere she was keen to be the military class. She undertook to defend the cities at the same time as to govern them. She reserved for herself the best weapons and the greatest share of perils in the combat, wanting in this to imitate the noble class which she replaced. In all the wealthiest cities formed the cavalry, the wealthy class composed the body of hoplites or legionaries. The poor were excluded from the army; at the most, they were used as velites and peltasts, or among the rowers of the fleet. The organization of the army thus responded with perfect accuracy to the political organization of the city. The dangers were proportioned to the privileges,and material strength was in the same hands as wealth.

The wealthy class did not keep the empire as long as the old hereditary nobility had kept it. His titles to domination were not of the same value. She did not have that sacred character with which the former Eupatrid was invested; she did not reign by virtue of beliefs and by the will of the gods. She had nothing in her which would have taken hold of conscience and which would force the man to submit. Man does not bow down except to what he believes to be the right or what his opinions show him to be strong above him. He had been able to bow for a long time before the religious superiority of the Eupatrid who said the prayer and possessed the gods. But wealth did not impose on him. In the face of wealth, the most ordinary feeling is not respect, it is in life. The political inequality that resulted from the difference in fortunes,Soon there appeared an iniquity, and the men labored to make it disappear.

Besides, the series of revolutions, once started, was not to stop. The old principles were overturned, and there were no longer any traditions or fixed rules. There was a general feeling that things were unstable, which meant that no constitution was able to last much longer. The new aristocracy was therefore attacked as the old had been; the poor wanted to be citizens and made an effort to enter in their turn into the body politic.

But when you read Greek history, you notice with some surprise how weakly the new aristocracy defended itself. It is true that she could not, like the Eupatrids, oppose to her adversaries the great and powerful argument of tradition and piety. She could not call the ancestors and the gods to her aid. She had no foothold in her own beliefs; she had no faith in the legitimacy of her privileges.

She had the strength of arms; but this very superiority ends up failing him. The constitutions that States give themselves would undoubtedly last longer if each State could remain in isolation, or if at least it could always live in peace. But war disrupts the cogs of constitutions and hastens change. But between these cities of Greece and Italy the state of war was almost perpetual. It was on the wealthy class that military service weighed most heavily, since it was they who occupied the first rank in the battles. Often, on returning from a campaign, she returned to the city, decimated and weakened, consequently unable to stand up to the popular party.

In Taranto, for example, the upper class having lost most of its members in a war against the Japyges, democracy was immediately established in the city. The same fact had happened in Argos, some thirty years before: following an unsuccessful war against the Spartans, the number of true citizens had become so small, that it had been necessary to give the right of citizenship to a crowd of pèrièques. It was so as not to have to fall into this extremity that Sparta was so sparing of the blood of true Spartans. As for Rome, its continual wars largely explain its revolutions. The war first destroyed his patriciate; of the three hundred families that this caste numbered under the kings, barely a third remained after the conquest of Samnium. The war then reaped the primitive plebs,that rich and courageous plebs who filled the five classes and who formed the legions.

One of the effects of the war was that the cities were almost always reduced to giving arms to the lower classes. This is why in Athens and in all the maritime cities, the need for a navy and the battles at sea gave the poor class the importance that the constitutions denied it.

The thetes raised to the rank of rowers, sailors, and even soldiers, and having in their hands the salvation of the country, felt themselves necessary and became bold. Such was the origin of Athenian democracy. Sparta was afraid of war. We can see in Thucydides his slowness and his reluctance to enter the campaign. She allowed herself to be drawn into the Peloponnesian war in spite of herself; but how much she has made to withdraw from it! It was because Sparta was forced to arm its upomeiodes, its neodamodes, its mothaces, its laconians and even its pilots; she knew very well that any war, by giving arms to these classes which it oppressed, put it in danger of revolution and that it would have to, on the return of the army, either endure the law of its pilots, or find a way to have them slaughter silently.

It is therefore beyond doubt that the war gradually bridged the distance that the wealthy aristocracy had placed between itself and the lower classes. In this way it soon happened that the constitutions found themselves at odds with the social state and that they had to be modified. Besides, we must recognize that any privilege was necessarily in contradiction with the principle which then governed men. The public interest was not a principle capable of allowing and maintaining inequality for a long time. It inevitably led societies to democracy.

This is so true that it was necessary everywhere, a little earlier or a little later, to give all free men political rights. As soon as the Roman plebs wanted to have their own comitia, they had to admit the proletarians there, and could not pass the division into classes. Most of the cities thus saw the formation of truly popular assemblies, and universal suffrage was established.

Now the right of suffrage then had an incomparably greater value than that which it can have in modern States. Through him the last of the citizens put his hand in all affairs, appointed magistrates, made laws, administered justice, decided on war or peace and drafted treaties of alliance. This extension of the right to vote was enough for the government to be truly democratic.

VIII. Rules of democratic government; example of Athenian democracy

As the revolutions took their course and we moved away from the old regime, the government of men became more difficult. There needed more detailed rules, more numerous and more delicate cogs. This can be seen from the example of the government of Athens.

The Athenians, as Thucydides says, did not believe that speech harmed action. On the contrary, they felt the need to be enlightened. Politics was no longer, as in the previous regime, a matter of tradition and faith. It was necessary to reflect and weigh the reasons. Discussion was necessary; for every question was more or less obscure, and words alone could bring the truth to light. The Athenian people wanted every case to be presented to them in all its different aspects and to be clearly shown the pros and cons. He was very attached to his orators; it is said that he remunerated them in money for each speech given in the tribune.

In Sparta eloquence is hardly known. It is because the principles of the government are not the same. The aristocracy still governs, and it has fixed traditions which exempt it from debating at length the pros and cons of each subject. In Athens, the people want to be educated; it is decided only after a contradictory debate; he only acts as long as he is convinced or thinks he is. To set in motion universal suffrage, it is necessary to speak; eloquence is the domain of democratic government. Also the orators early take the title of demagogues, that is to say of city leaders; it is they who make it act and determine all its resolutions.

Rich and poor; democracy perishes; popular tyrants

When the series of revolutions had brought equality between men and there was no longer any reason to fight for principles and rights, men waged war for interests. This new period in the history of cities did not begin for all at the same time. In some it followed very closely the establishment of democracy; in others it only appeared after several generations who had known how to govern themselves calmly. But all the cities, sooner or later, fell into these deplorable struggles.

As we moved away from the old regime, a poor class had formed. Previously, when every man was part of a genos and had his master, misery was almost unheard of. The man was fed by his leader; the one to whom he gave his obedience, owed him in return to provide for all his needs. But the revolutions, which had dissolved the genos, had also changed the conditions of human life. The day when the man had freed himself from the bonds of the clientele, he saw the necessities and the difficulties of existence rise up before him. Life had become more independent, but also more laborious and prone to more accidents. Each had henceforth taken care of his well-being, each his enjoyment and his task. One was enriched by his activity or his good fortune, the other had remained poor.Inequality of wealth is inevitable in any society that does not want to remain in the patriarchal state or in the tribal state.

Democracy did not do away with misery; on the contrary, it made her more sensitive. The equality of political rights further highlighted the inequality of conditions.

As there was no authority which rose above the rich and the poor at the same time, and which could force them to remain in peace, it would have been to wish that the economic principles and the conditions of work were such that the two classes were forced to live in harmony. It would have been necessary, for example, that they needed each other, that the rich could only get rich by asking the poor for his work, and that the poor found the means to live by giving his work. to the rich. Then the inequality of fortunes would have stimulated the activity and intelligence of man; it would not have given birth to corruption and civil war.

But many cities were absolutely lacking in industry and commerce; they therefore did not have the resource to increase the sum of the public wealth, in order to give it somewhere to the poor without robbing anyone. Where there was trade, almost all the profits were for the rich, owing to the exaggerated price of money. If there was industry, the workers were slaves.

The poor had equal rights. But assuredly his daily sufferings made him think that equality of fortunes would have been much preferable. But it was not long without realizing that the equality he had could help him acquire that which he did not have, and that, master of votes, he could become master of wealth.

He began by wanting to live off his suffrage right. He was paid to attend the assembly, or to judge in the courts. If the city was not rich enough to meet such expenses, the poor had other resources. He was selling his vote, and because the opportunities to vote were frequent, he could live. In Rome, this traffic was done regularly and in broad daylight; in Athens, we hid better. In Rome, where the poor did not enter the courts, he sold himself as a witness; in Athens, as judge. All this did not pull the poor out of their misery and throw them into degradation.

These expedients not being sufficient, the poor man used more energetic means. He organized a regular war on wealth. This war was first disguised in legal forms; the rich were charged with all public expenditure, they were overwhelmed with taxes, they were made to build triremes, they wanted them to give feasts to the people. Then the fines were multiplied in the judgments; the confiscation of property was pronounced for the slightest faults. Can we say how many men were condemned to exile simply because they were rich? The fortune of the exile went to the public treasury, from where it then flowed, in the form of a triobol, to be shared among the poor. But all this was not yet enough: for the number of the poor was constantly increasing.The poor then came to use their right to vote to decree either an abolition of debts or a mass confiscation and general upheaval.

In previous times the right to property had been respected, because it was based on religious belief. As long as each patrimony had been attached to a cult and had been deemed inseparable from the household gods of a family, no one had thought that one had the right to strip a man of his field. But in the days when the revolutions have brought us, those old beliefs are abandoned and the religion of property is gone. Wealth is no longer sacred and inviolable ground. It no longer appears to be a gift from the gods, but a gift from chance. We have the desire to seize it, by stripping the one who possesses it; and this desire, which once would have seemed an impiety, begins to appear legitimate. We no longer see the superior principle which enshrines the right of property;each one feels only his own need and measures his rights over him.

In every city the rich and the poor were two enemies who lived next to each other, one coveting wealth, the other seeing his coveted wealth. Between them no relation, no service, no work which unites them. The poor could only acquire wealth by robbing the rich. The rich man could only defend his property by extreme skill or by force. They looked at each other with hateful eyes. In every town there was a double conspiracy: the poor conspired out of greed, the rich out of fear. Aristotle says that the rich took this oath among themselves: "I swear to always be the enemy of the people, and to do them all the harm I can." "

There were no more rules; yet democracy can only live amidst the strictest and best observed rules. We no longer saw real governments, but factions in power. The magistrate no longer exercised authority for the benefit of peace and law, but for the benefit of the interests and desires of a party. The command no longer had any legitimate titles or sacred character; obedience was no longer voluntary; always constrained, she always promised herself revenge. The city was no longer, as Plato said, but a collection of men, part of which was mistress and the other a slave.

Democracy with the rich in power had become a violent oligarchy; the democracy of the poor had become tyranny. From the fifth to the second century before our era, we see in all the cities of Greece and Italy, Rome excepted again, that the republican forms are endangered and that they have become odious to a party. Now we can clearly distinguish who are those who want to destroy them, and who are those who would like to keep them. The rich, more enlightened and more proud, remain faithful to the republican regime, while the poor, for whom political rights are less valuable, readily assume a tyrant as their leader. When this poor class, after several civil wars, recognized that their victories were of no use, that the opposite party always came back to power,and that after long alternatives of confiscations and restitutions, the struggle was always to be recommenced, it imagined establishing a monarchical regime which was in conformity with its interests, and which, by forever compressing the contrary party, would assure it for the future benefits of his victory. She thus created tyrants. From that moment, the parties changed their names: they were no longer an aristocrat or a democrat; we fought for freedom, or we fought for tyranny. Under these two words, it was again wealth and poverty that were at war. Liberty meant government where the rich had the upper hand and defended their fortunes; tyranny indicated exactly the opposite.it imagined establishing a monarchical regime which was in conformity with its interests, and which, by forever compressing the contrary party, would assure it for the future the benefits of its victory. She thus created tyrants. From that moment, the parties changed their names: they were no longer an aristocrat or a democrat; one fought for freedom, or one fought for tyranny. Under these two words, it was again wealth and poverty that were at war. Liberty meant government where the rich had the upper hand and defended their fortunes; tyranny indicated exactly the opposite.it imagined establishing a monarchical regime which was in conformity with its interests, and which, by forever compressing the contrary party, would assure it for the future the benefits of its victory. She thus created tyrants. From that moment, the parties changed their names: they were no longer an aristocrat or a democrat; one fought for freedom, or one fought for tyranny. Under these two words, it was again wealth and poverty that were at war. Liberty meant government where the rich had the upper hand and defended their fortunes; tyranny indicated exactly the opposite.one was no longer an aristocrat or a democrat; one fought for freedom, or one fought for tyranny. Under these two words, it was again wealth and poverty that were at war. Liberty meant government where the rich had the upper hand and defended their fortunes; tyranny indicated exactly the opposite.one was no longer an aristocrat or a democrat; we fought for freedom, or we fought for tyranny. Under these two words, it was again wealth and poverty that were at war. Liberty meant government where the rich had the upper hand and defended their fortunes; tyranny indicated exactly the opposite.

It is a general fact, and almost without exception in the history of Greece and Italy, that the tyrants leave the popular party and have the aristocratic party as their enemy.

Digest de Fustel de Coulanges, La Cité antique , 2nd edition, Paris Librairie de L. Hachette et Cie, 1866, by BK

(1) The term "belief" is somewhat unfortunate, inasmuch as, with the advent of Christianity, it has taken on the meaning of more or less rational adherence to the truth or reality of something. The Latin verb credere meant "to trust," "to trust," "to add faith, or, in another sense," to entrust on loan. " Originally, neither the Greek nor the Roman "believed" in his gods; as established by G. Dumézil (Roman Ideas), deos credere meant "" to believe in the existence of gods or gods ", and not to have in them a movement of pious confidence". It will be necessary to wait for Christianity so that, under the influence of Hebrew and Greek origins, creeds and fides receive the values ​​which are familiar to us. Instead of "ancient beliefs", it would be more accurate to speak of "ancient traditions".

(2) the word “religion should especially not be understood here in the Judeo-Christian sense of a determined set of beliefs and dogmas defining the relationship of man with the sacred. The founding principle of the ancient Indo-European family is pietas, a term which, in turn, should not be confused with simple piety. While piety, in the Abrahamic sense, is synonymous with fervent attachment to God and respect for the beliefs and duties of religion, pietas is an essential quality of public and private order, immanent and transcendent; is more the one who recognizes and fulfills his duties towards the family, the clients, the State and the gods; is more the one who acts in accordance with the law, with justice, in an ordered society where each one gives his due to his superiors: the children to the parents,parents to the people, people to the state and the state to the gods. The pietas consists in maintaining a living, continuous and deep contact with the deep strength of the lineage, of the race (seehttps://evolaasheis.wordpress.com/2016/04/14/la-mystique-de-la-race-dans-la-rome-antique/ ). Moreover, pietas towards the gods is devoid of any notion of obedience to the gods. The very idea of ​​commandment, of a rule of conduct expressing the divine will and which believers are bound to respect, is foreign to the ancient Roman. “The gods do not have to be obeyed, but to be appeased. Their worship does not consist of hymns of praise and thanksgiving to Jupiter's intrinsic goodness, but of a series of ceremonies and sacrifices performed in accordance with sacred custom, where what counts are much less the feelings of the worshiper than the performance of rites with meticulous respect for tradition. "(<http://unamsanctamcatholicam.blogspot.fr/2010/06/sacral-kingship-emperor-as-pius-and.html> )

Freedom: a concept of slaves (2)

Posted on October 1, 2013 by Elements of Racial Education

Philosophy appeared and gradually overturned all the rules of traditional politics. It was impossible to touch the opinions of men without also touching the fundamental principles of their government.

Primitive religion was altered, but this was not exactly the work of time; the idea of ​​divinity was transformed, but it was not transformed by force of circumstances; the domestic hearth lost its prestige, but it did not naturally lose it; the center of the towns, the prytaneum, fell into disrepute, but it did not fall there, so to speak, of itself; men ended up realizing that the different gods they called by the name of Jupiter might well be one and the same god, but the men who did notice were not all of the same ancestry as those who had founded Argos; men understood that the gods no longer each belonged to a family or a city and that, on the contrary, they all belonged to the "human race" and all watched over the universe,but the men who understood it were far from being all of the same stock as those who had founded Sparta. The poets went from city to city and taught, instead of the traditional hymns of the city, new songs in which there was no question of the Lares gods nor of the Poliad deities and in which the legends of the great gods of the earth and of the land were told. sky; and domestic or national hymns were forgotten in favor of this new poetry, which was not the fruit of the racial genius of the Hellenes, but of art and imagination.new songs in which there was no question of the Lares gods or of the Poliad divinities and in which the legends of the great gods of the earth and of the sky were told; and domestic or national hymns were forgotten in favor of this new poetry, which was not the fruit of the racial genius of the Hellenes, but of art and imagination.new songs in which there was no question of the Lares gods or of the Poliad divinities and in which the legends of the great gods of the earth and of the sky were told; and domestic or national hymns were forgotten in favor of this new poetry, which was not the fruit of the racial genius of the Hellenes, but of art and imagination.

The first philosophical schools in Greece

The first philosophical schools which shone in Greece were four in number: the Ionian sect, the Italic sect, the Eleatic metaphysicians and the Eleatic physicists.

The Ionian school was born in Miletus, then capital of Ionia. It was founded by Thalès de Millet (v. 625– id . 547 before our era). The philosophers who succeeded him are Anaximander of Miletus (v. 610- id . 546 BC), Anaximene de Millet (v. 585– id. 525 BC), Anaxagoras of Clazomenes (500- 428 BC), Diogenes of ApoIlonia (c. 460-390 BC) and Archelaus of Milet (5th BC), one of Socrates' masters. The Ionian school had imported to Greece the physical study of nature and its philosophy already bears the imprint of the ideas subsequently developed by the Portico. The gods were for the Ionian philosophers only phenomena or material beings, which they sought to explain. Whether he was a pantheist or a deist, Thales, like his disciple Anaximander, recognized only the infinite, which contains everything in itself; for him, water is the universal principle; he still admits the existence of demons and heroes; some are the souls of animate bodies and in a way the individualization of animal forces;the others are souls freed from the bodily envelope and who retain in their new life their good or their bad qualities. In the gods, Anaximander sees, like the later Stoics, only stars. Anaximenes recognized no other god than air; Diogenes of Apollonia too, unless it was time. Anaxagoras seems to be the first philosopher who in some way distinguished between spirit and matter. Archelaus's confused ideas are a mixture of the theories of Anaximenes and Anaxagoras.Anaxagoras seems to be the first philosopher who in some way distinguished between spirit and matter. Archelaus's confused ideas are a mixture of the theories of Anaximenes and Anaxagoras.Anaxagoras seems to be the first philosopher who in some way distinguished between spirit and matter. The confused ideas of Archelaus are a mixture of the theories of Anaximenes and Anaxagoras.

The Italic school was founded by Pythagoras of Samos (c. 570– i d . 480 before our era). There are still Empedocles of Agrigento (490-430 BC), Ocellus of Lucania (5th BC), Archytas of Taranto (428- 347 BC), Philolaos (c. 485 - id. 385 BCE) and Alcméon of Crotone (6th BCE). Pythagoras was a pantheist and perhaps a materialist, although of a purified and mystical materialism. He recognized two generating causes of the facts of the universe, destiny and God. We do not know what exactly he meant by the first; perhaps it was the harmonic laws of the universe. As for God, he was a supreme, unchanging and infinite intelligence, whose attributes were productive force and moral qualities. But he did not conceive of this God as completely immaterial, since he compared his substance to a purified light; nor did he see it as distinct from the universe. Empedocles of Agrigento admitted no other gods than the four elements; he was a materialist because he considered that the soul, like the universe,was only one compound of these four substances. Ocellus of Lucania believed in the eternity of matter. Philolaos explained everything by mathematical laws or by blind forces. For Alcmeon of Croton, the deities were the sun, the moon, the stars and the soul.

“Heraclitus of Abdera, who does not belong precisely to any sect, wrote, in obscure style, very faint ideas. For him, God, the primitive element, finally the universe, everything was fire. He made this substance the substratum, the principle and the motor of all things ”(1).

The metaphysical eleatic school, which emerged from that of Pythagoras, was headed by Xenophanes of Colophon (v. 570- id . 475 before our era). The other philosophers of this sect were Parmenides of Elea (v. 515 - id. 450 BCE), Mélissos of Samos (Vth BCE) and Zeno of Elea (490-430 BCE). Xenophanes regarded the divine substance as spherical, having nothing in common with man, seeing and hearing everything, but not breathing; and, on the other hand, he affirmed that the universe was spirit, eternity and prudence. Like Parmenides and Zeno of Elea, he accuses the mythological accounts of being the carriers of a crude anthropomorphism contrary to morality. He does not want the forms and organs of man to be attributed to the deities. Besides his hostility to polytheism, his spiritualist pantheism is found in Parmenides of Elea, for whom god was a sort of circle surrounding the sky; in Mélissos of Samos who admitted only an uncreated, imperishable, one and indivisible substance and denied the reality of material facts;with Zeno of Elea, his disciple.

The main representatives of the Eleatic school of physics are Leucippus of Miletus (c. 460 - 370 before our era) and Democritus of Abdera (460-370 before our era). Leucippe recognized absolutely only three things, atoms, the notion of which he borrowed from Mochos de Sidon, empty space and motion. The combination, separation and agitation of atoms explained all the peculiarities of bodies, all the faculties of the soul, all the phenomena of nature. Democritus gave the name of God sometimes to a spirit enclosed in a circle of fire, sometimes to the images of objects and to the act by which our spirit represents them; at other times, to nature which produces these images; at other times he seemed to deny the possibility of an eternal and unchanging being, on the pretext that there was nothing that could remain in the same state.Ultimately, he admitted no other God than matter, our mind and perceptions, or admitted none.

Some, subjecting all the facts to rational appreciation and starting from individual observation to explain the formation of the universe, substituted for popular beliefs a system created by them, which was more or less in contradiction with the conceptions of the people. . The others, apparently accepting the religion of their contemporaries, sought to attach to it a metaphysical and cosmogonic system drawn from their own theories and which then became the starting point for changes in beliefs and worship; they undertook, in the name of "divine wisdom" of which they considered themselves the only interpreters, not to overturn, but to reform theological notions and religious forms, so as to bring them into line with their philosophical principles.The philosophy of some tended to directly destroy traditional religion; the philosophy of others to undermine it (2).

The first philosopher to undertake the overhaul of the theogony was Therecydes of Syros (sixth before our era). He was preceded by others who prepared the reform movement of which he was the main instigator. At the beginning of the 6th century, Bias of Priene, Chilon of Sparta, Cleobule of Lindos, Pittacos of Mytilene, Anacharsis, Epimenides of Knossos especially, had spread teachings whose main purpose was to modify traditional religion. Epimenides had introduced changes in the liturgy and wrote a treatise on sacrifices. His writings testify to a mystical tendency and a disposition to make purifications and expiations predominate in worship. Epimenides had been initiated into the Cretan mysteries, in which this germ had appeared.

The mystical character of Epimenides' philosophy is found even more clearly in Pythagoras. Disciple of Pherecydes, he continued the work of his master. His views on theogony, liturgy and morals provoked a veritable religious revolution, the effects of which were profound and lasting. Pythagoras' favorite maxim was that you should always start with the gods: his gods were essentially the Asian deities of Orphism. "Pythagoras, having the vague conception of the Supreme Being, scorned the local cults, and this was enough for him to reject the old modes of government and try to found a new society" (3). During the two centuries which followed the publication of his doctrine,a number of Greek colonies adopted legislation which derived from the teachings of the Pythagorean school. Strangers to the polis, the Pythagoreans formed communities, in which women were not only admitted, but could reach a high rank. The dietary rule that Pythagoras prescribed to his disciples recalls the dietary observances of the law of Moses and even more those which were traditionally found in Syria and Egypt. He introduced into Greek religion the Orphic doctrine of metempsychosis and, at the same time, the ideas of abstinence and mortification which were linked to this Asian doctrine. He rejected and condemned the mythology of Homer and Hesiod, which he went so far as to present as having been condemned to Tartarus.An early Christian in more than one respect, he said that man should "revere the divinity as his parents, his friends", but, as the hour of Christianity had not yet come, one of his disciples Perictioné hastened to add that there could be no greater crime than ingratitude towards parents. Pythagoras' ideas on marriage are reminiscent of Christianity by their individualistic consensualism. The prophecies and miracles attributed to him during his lifetime relate him to the prophets and religious legislators, of whom Asia offers many examples.hastened to add that there could be no greater crime than ingratitude towards parents. Pythagoras' ideas on marriage are reminiscent of Christianity by their individualistic consensualism. The prophecies and miracles attributed to him during his lifetime relate him to the prophets and religious legislators, of whom Asia offers many examples.hastened to add that there could be no greater crime than ingratitude towards parents. Pythagoras' ideas on marriage are reminiscent of Christianity by their individualistic consensualism. The prophecies and miracles attributed to him during his lifetime relate him to the prophets and religious legislators, of whom Asia offers many examples.

The doctrine of Empedocles, born in Agrigento, an island where Pythagoreanism had made many followers, presents a certain number of analogies with it; in Agrigento he played a political role which enabled him to put it into practice. When the tyrant of this city died, he persuaded his fellow citizens to establish political equality. His material conception of divinity revealed a pantheism analogous to that of the Ionians and Eleatics; he criticized the anthropomorphism of poets and rejected fables which gave too human an idea of ​​divinities.

Heraclitus Ephesus did the same and interpreted the myths with the help of natural phenomena; his contempt for what he considered to be a cult of the deified elements could only throw him out of religion. One sees in him a tendency towards a universal fatalism and a mechanical dualism which contrasts with the spiritualism of Pythagoras. Its philosophy is not without analogy with the purely physical conceptions that the Ionian school had of "primordial reason".

The research of the Ionian philosophers had focused exclusively on the explanation of the phenomena of the material world; Pherecydes, Anaximander and Thales had been astronomers and physicists. Heraclitus carried their research further, by transposing them from the level of "natural" philosophy to that of moral philosophy. He posits reason as the sole criterion of truth, not this or that individual reason, but a divine and universal reason. “We must, he said, confide in general reason. Whenever we come into communion with her, we are right; and in the false, on the contrary, whenever we abandon ourselves to our individual sense ”. Reason, once deified and figuratively sovereign, would end up dethroning the literal sovereign.

Heraclitus' influence on the ideas of his time was less profound than that of Anaxagoras, master of Euripides of Salamis, of the future professor of Socrates, Prodicos of Céos (c. 470-399 before our era) and of men the most illustrious of the century of Pericles. Anaxagoras professed a more radical and more spiritualistic monotheism than that of Pythagoras. He “understood the God-Intelligence who reigns over all men and all beings. By deviating from old beliefs, he also moved away from the old policy. As he did not believe in the gods of the prytaneum, he did not fulfill all his duties as a citizen either; he fled the assemblies and did not want to be a magistrate. His doctrine harmed the city ”(4). It was Anaxagora who was the first tomoved the seat of Ionian philosophy from the western coast of Asia Minor (Ephesus, Clazomenes, Lampsaque, Miletus, etc.) to Athens. Accused of impiety, he escaped prison only thanks to the intervention of Pericles and went to end his days in Lampsaque. But his teaching had had too much echo in Athens not to change people's minds.

Prodicos, his pupil, reduced all the gods to simple personifications of the forces of nature; a sophist, he tried to undermine all the bases of the ancient theogony.

Sophists

The great place that the Sophists occupy in Plato's work shows that they exercised a great influence on the minds of their time. Philostratus, in his Lives of the Sophists, distinguishes three Sophistics: the old one, whose founders were Gorgias (5th century BC) and Protagoras (v. 490– id. 420 BC); the second, of which Aeschine (390-322 BC) was the first master; the third, which is the teaching of rhetoric since the end of the century of Alexander.

Greek philosophy, in its early days, was divided into two great opposing movements: on the one hand, the two Ionian empirical schools, that of Miletus and that of Abdera; on the other, the idealistic schools of Croton and Elea. Now the Sophists were all attached to one or other of these sects. Brilliant dialecticians, they supported the pros and cons with the same impudence. The common work of these men of such different training "consists in pushing the principles of each school to the extreme and putting them in opposition with the principles of all the opposing schools." And what is the ultimate goal for which they aspire? Is it to bring out of this contradiction a new, broader and more fruitful principle? No, and nothing is further from the all negative spirit that animates them.Is it to shut yourself up in absolute abstention? No more, and it is here that we must distinguish sophistry from skepticism.

The peculiar character of skeptical philosophy in Greece, as everywhere else, is to affirm nothing concerning the nature of things, and to confine itself in this respect to an absolute reserve, in an unshakeable abstention. The Sophists, on the contrary, were the boldest, the most assertive, the most cutting of men. They made a profession of doubting nothing, of ignoring nothing, of knowing the last word of all things. Only, and this is a new trait which separates them from the skeptics, the sophists, in displaying their cutting edge science, had as their goal, not truth, but success; not the good of men, but their own good. So the sophistry, without having the depth of a true school of skepticism, was in a sense more dangerous ”(5). What essentially characterizes sophistry,it is not the spirit of doubt, which only appeared in Greece with Pyrrho, it is the spirit of negation. The Sophists admitted no absolute truth, no fixed principle and maintained that everything depends on opinion. Protagoras of Abdera (490–420 BCE), a disciple of Democritus, doubted the gods and gave man as the measure of all things. By professing the principle that the law merges with the useful, the sophists repeated what tyrants and demagogues said, thus preparing the ruin of morality which remained without a transcendent point of support. Their school had found many admirers. Critias (c. 460-403 BC) presented the belief in gods as an invention of statesmen. Protagoras of Abdera openly questioned the existence of the gods.Diagoras de Mélos (5th century BC) positively denied the existence of any divinity. Prodicos de Céos, without being an atheist, saw in the Greek gods only earth, water, stars, to which popular credulity lent a power and a will; he claimed that men had placed in the ranks of the gods things from which they derived some use.

The Sophists were shaking the foundations of the so-called "philosophical certainty"; but the Pythagoreans, the Ionian school, and the Eleatics had asserted so many contradictory notions that it was impossible for a school not to be born to sweep away their shaky system; sophism arose out of the quarrels to which a dogmatism founded on subtleties gave rise. He thus prepared the ground for the philosophy of Socrates (470-399 before our era). It was necessary that the sophists had shown the dogmatic absurdities of the other philosophical sects for Socrates to lay the foundations of his method.

Socrates

Socrates, abandoning philosophical speculations on religion and physical research on manners, concentrated all his efforts on morality, to which he endeavored to give "rational" bases. He taught man to come down to himself and judge the value of his actions; for him, man was everything: Socrates spent his time examining himself and examining others, external things were of no importance and therefore he took no part in public affairs. It is for man and in relation to man that all the rest must be studied and it is the laws of his intelligence which determine the nature and the relations of all beings. Without being as exclusive as Socrates,all his disciples and even all the philosophers who came after him saw in man the most essential object of philosophy, the center of science and the goal of all speculation. For him, morality was the whole of philosophy, science was merged with wisdom, and all speculation had to have a practical, that is to say, moral end. Socrates relates morality to divine things. While philosophy suppressed the gods or invented a metaphysical or mathematical God, Socrates revealed the moral God. As moral reform could not be accomplished without touching on mythology, he sought to strip the gods of all ideas of imperfection, passion, injustice, and he reached the concept of the supreme god. Only the knowledge of this supreme God could make man virtuous.As the idea of ​​progress was foreign to the Greek mind, Socrates could only get his reforms through by presenting them as a return to the supposed wisdom of ancient times. For example, the Greek religion recognized demons - that is, deities born from the commerce of gods with mortals - and assumed that gods and men were continually in communication; Socrates, admitting that a god - his "familiar demon" - spoke to him directly, did not seemingly deviate from the religion of the state; in reality, the God of Socrates was only an interior voice, which was itself only the consciousness of the Stagirite. Socrates prides himself on having a deep respect for the laws, preaches obedience to authority, pretends to admit that the laws are of divine institution and to respect the gods of the motherland,but, above the laws of the city-state, it shows laws supposedly engraved by God in the reason of all men and which prescribe the same things in all countries. Its morality is subversive in that it not only regulates, like the Greek political law of the time, the obligations of citizens among themselves and towards the State, but that it seeks to establish a universal morality, the duties which would bind all men to each other; this is precisely why Socrates proclaimed himself a citizen of the world. He laid in Greece the foundations of the doctrine of universal brotherhood, which, after having been professed by the Platonists and consecrated by Christianity, later gave birth to "natural law", the doctrine of which was not developed until the modern era. Moreover,Socrates connects the Pythagorean belief in the immortality of the soul to the doctrine of the divine part of man and of the "life-giving reason of the universe", so that the idea arises in him, in the logical extension of his morality, that immortality is the rewardpost-mortem of the just. The Greeks, who, on the one hand, did not feel bound by humanity and only recognized mutual obligations within the framework of treaties and, on the other hand, did not see each other as equals, nor in the life, nor in death, condemned him.

Plato

The megaric school, so named from the city of its founder, Euclid of Megara (c. 450–380 BCE), continued the teachings of Socrates. He endeavored to strengthen the union of the monotheistic principle and of morality, presenting God as the supreme reason from which good flows. Plato (427-347 BCE) took up Socrates' philosophy and dealt traditional mythology with a blow from which it never recovered. He combined some of the theories of Pythagoras with those of Cratylus (5th century BC) and Heraclitus and thus composed a body of doctrine in which he inserted the morals of Socrates. His influence exceeded that of all his predecessors, especially since his teachings already existed in a state of confused feelings among a large number of his contemporaries.The Platonic doctrine constitutes a sort of religion in its own right, leaving no question, of a moral, political, theological or social nature, outside its field. Platonism is based on reason and inner consciousness. He adopts the monotheism of Anaxagoras and Socrates. He is also far from atheism and pantheism. God is incorporeal and incomprehensible and he is the primary source of all existence. God is "the father of all things". After having created him, after a type which existed in him from all eternity, he sustains and brings to life the world, which is his visible manifestation. God is perfect. Therefore virtuous man finds in this eternal God the model he seeks; he who wants to be happy and righteous must attach himself to him and strive to imitate him. Anyway,the creature is subject to divine law. The Platonic conception of divinity thus closely links religion to utilitarian morality. At least two of the Platonic theological virtues run directly counter to Greek customs, that of charity and that of hospitality. Plato wants charity to be moralizing and to make hospitality abroad an obligation: “The foreigner, being without relatives and friends, interests men and gods more. "(6)" For foreigners there must be homes near the temples, where they will find generous hospitality. The priests and the neo-cores will take care that nothing is lacking ”(7). Plato even threatens with a heavenly punishment those who fail to fulfill this holy obligation. “I was a stranger and you took me in; naked, and you clothed me ”,Jesus will say later (8). By an inconsistency that his commentators have been little to point out, Plato demands that the State does not allow any foreign divinity to enter the city.

Plato's morality completes the teachings of Pythagoras, removing their ascetic character to make it a social morality.

At the time of Plato, there are two great systems: that of Heraclitus and Parmenides of Elea. Heraclitus reduced nature to movement and phenomenon; Parmenides limited it to absolute rest and to being absolutely simple. Heraclitus denied permanence and unity; Parmenides denied the very possibility of change and plurality. Plato unites and accords the two principles, until then rivals, of the one and the many. All things are made up of two elements, the finite and the infinite. Infinity intrinsically has neither unity nor immutability; it is the future of Heraclitus. The finite, on the contrary, is one. These two principles correspond to the two degrees of knowledge, opinion and science. Reminiscence takes us from opinion to science, from the infinite to the finite. The first object of knowledge is the phenomenon.In all phenomena, there is something one and the same which gives them stability. The principle of this unity is the idea, that is to say the essence. Platonic ideas are the very essence of things, what is real, eternal and universal in things. Just as they are eternal and absolute, they can only reside in things through participation that is difficult to understand. They are separate from things and exist in themselves. They form a world apart, the world of the intelligible, which is to the sensible world what reason is to opinion. Their common substance, that which gives their essence to all, is the idea of ​​good, that is to say God himself. It is the goodness of God that determined Him to transform matter (infinity) and to form and organize the world.The existence of gods is only admitted out of complacency for traditions. The gods are only intermediate causes between God and the world, who participate more than men in the divine nature, obey God and accomplish according to his designs the inferior works of the organization of the world. God being the principle of all things, the gods of Olympus are no more than his creatures. In order to make their reduction to the rank of more or less terrestrial beings less shocking, Plato identified them with celestial bodies. There were superior gods and vulgar gods, called demons. The cosmogony of the Athenian philosopher had so many demons below the Supreme God that the ancient mythology was transformed into demonology. Plato might well assure that the gods were worthy of veneration; In practice,since mythology showed gods acting dishonestly or guilty, and their actions being interpreted from a moral point of view, this greatly reduced the number of those to whom it was appropriate to worship. The Greek religion was thus reduced to the cult of imperfect or perverse demons, whose nature was, so to speak, infected and above whom hovered only the supreme God, whose name they had usurped. Now, the fathers of the Church gave to demons the same characters as those found among the Platonists; the evil gods of these became the demons of Christianity; their beneficent gods, his angels. Christians then used Plato's demonology to overthrow polytheism, the foundations of which it had already undermined.

The soul is the first of the works of God. It is formed of two parts, the same and the other. The same is something divine; the other participates in divisible and bodily nature. The human soul is united with a body, from which it is essentially distinct. The body participates in what is transient and multiple; the soul, to that which is eternal. The immortality of the soul, with its pains and its rewards, is the natural sanction of its morality. Faithful to the teachings of Orphism and Pythagoreanism, he regards the body as the prison of the soul; death is hailed as the liberator of the soul and the greatest good to which the wise man can aspire. The gradation he establishes in future punishments is reminiscent of the paradise, purgatory and hell of Catholic theology.His vision of the tortures of Tartarus responds to Christian hell. The natural objects of the soul are the essences, the ideas; when she lets herself be carried away by the body, she becomes confused and no longer sees anything correctly; when it manages to free itself from the ties of the body, on the contrary, it rediscovers the purity and serenity of its nature; it rests in the contemplation of what is eternal, thereby testifying that it is of the same nature. The soul is endowed with various faculties, intelligence or reason, the heart or courage, desire or appetite. Only reason has the right to command, it alone has sovereignty; appetite, that is to say unreasonable passions, is a blind force; in the conflict between reason and appetite, courage takes part for reason.Reason commands both courage and appetite. There are two types of love: one, coarse and earthly, aspires only to sensible enjoyment; the other, noble, has for its object beauty, not so much bodily beauty as moral, intellectual, divine beauty. This love awakens in us by reminiscent of the sight, in the sensitive world, of some vestiges of the beauty which the soul thirsts for by virtue of its divine nature.

Good, for Plato, does not have an exclusively moral character. Eudemonist, he often reduces the idea of ​​good to that of happiness. Not without a certain utilitarianism, he adds to it from time to time, a trait common to all ancient philosophy, that of the useful, of the advantageous. In any case, the supreme good always includes moral good and happiness. Plato, without confusing, like the sophists, good with pleasure, nevertheless admits that pleasures, pure pleasures as opposed to mixed pleasures, are necessary for good. The two elements of good are pleasure and intelligence; but the best part is in the intelligence, which controls and tempers it. Again, this is only the idea of ​​a relative good and not of the good in itself, the principle of all goods. It is to this absolute, eternal good that justice is attached. Justice,contrary to what the sophists claim, this is not an opinion which changes according to the place and the time. There is certainly a difference between justice according to the law and justice according to nature, but justice according to nature is not true justice, because it confuses morality with force, good with enjoyment. True justice was not instituted by human laws; it is this, on the contrary, which is the principle of human laws, supposed, it should be noted, to be the same for all men, without distinction of race or sex. Happiness consists in the relationship of the soul with justice and order. Hence, for example, the idea, stated in theThere is certainly a difference between justice according to the law and justice according to nature, but justice according to nature is not true justice, because it confuses morality with force, good with enjoyment. True justice was not instituted by human laws; it is this, on the contrary, which is the principle of human laws, supposed, it should be noted, to be the same for all men, without distinction of race or sex. Happiness consists in the relationship of the soul with justice and order. Hence, for example, the idea, stated in theThere is certainly a difference between justice according to the law and justice according to nature, but justice according to nature is not true justice, because it confuses morality with force, good with enjoyment. True justice was not instituted by human laws; it is this, on the contrary, which is the principle of human laws, supposed, it should be noted, to be the same for all men, without distinction of race or sex. Happiness consists in the relationship of the soul with justice and order. Hence, for example, the idea, stated in thebe the same for all men, regardless of race or sex. Happiness consists in the relationship of the soul with justice and order. Hence, for example, the idea, stated in thebe the same for all men, regardless of race or sex. Happiness consists in the relationship of the soul with justice and order. Hence, for example, the idea, stated in theGorgias, that it is more beautiful, better and even more advantageous to suffer from an injustice than to commit one, an idea which is not without recalling the moral cynico-Christian precept which wants that "To the one who strikes you on one cheek presents the other cheek. Whoever takes your coat, let your tunic also be taken. Give to whoever asks you, and do not ask for the one who steals from you… ”But justice, although the highest of virtues, is not virtue in itself. Plato distinguishes four main aspects of virtue, which is one in itself: prudence, courage, temperance and justice, which Christianity will call the cardinal virtues. The principle of this division is found in the psychology of Plato. Each of the faculties of the soul has its own virtue. The virtue of reason is prudence; the virtue of the heart is courage,subordinate to reason; the only virtue of which the appetite is susceptible is to be docile to the orders of reason: it is temperance. As for justice, it envelops and sums up all the others in its unity. The principle of the division of virtues is also found in Plato's policy. According to Plato, the city-state finds its origin in the need that men have for each other. It is divided into four classes: laborers, artisans, each of whom has the function of working and obeying; warriors and magistrates, respectively responsible for the defense and government of the city. Prudence is the virtue of the magistrate; courage, the attribute of warriors; temperance consists in the subordination of the lower classes to the upper classes;justice resides in the performance by each class of its proper function and in the harmonious cooperation between each of them in view of a single goal. Unity is the real good of States. As much as these conceptions fit perfectly into the framework of traditional Greek politics, so seditious is the view expressed in theRepublic , according to which the two obstacles to this unity are family and property, which Plato regards as principles of division and hostility. (9) Everything must be common: goods, women, children. The community can only be realized if the government is in the hands of the philosophers. In short, Plato's politics are a destructive critique of Athenian politics.

Aristotle

This poses a problem, from a traditional Greek and even Indo-European point of view, with Aristotle, more than his politics, aristocratic in its broad outlines, his metaphysics, his physics, his "theology", "extremely little sentimental and hardly religious. », (10) it is its psychology and its ethics. With regard to the physical study of nature, “the Aristotelian conception reflects the Greek spirit remarkably well. What dominates her is the disdain of the infinite, this rebellious, formless notion. Hellenic thought considers perfect only what is completed, defined, and therefore limited, which forms a harmonious and organic whole. “Only a few isolated thinkers, like Anaximander, spoke with veneration of the holiness of the infinite. But oriental influences will soon impose this point of view, which,since Christianity and also since certain advances in modern science, it has become ours: it is rather for us the infinite which generates the finite; it is the latter which is a pure negation and limitation of the former. It is not the only time that religious, social or scientific suggestions have brought modern thought to the antipodes of [the Greek spirit] ”(11).

For all the philosophers of antiquity, happiness is the goal of action; they differ only on the means of achieving it. Aristotle's morality is eudemonistic, not abstract, like that of Socrates, but empirical: it follows from universal experience that the goal of all our actions is happiness. Only Aristotle's empiricism prevents him from falling into the egalitarianism of abstract morality. Virtue is the top of the hierarchy of moral values. But, objectively, she finds herself in a happy medium between two extremes, excess and lack. “This happy medium must be defined by reason: it must be proportionate to each individual”. (12) Aristotle, in morality as elsewhere, strives to respect the specific characteristics of each individual. “Without doubt, the virtue of the city is the same virtue as that of the individual:but far from there being only one morality, there is one for each sex, one for the subjects of a monarchy and another for the citizens of a republic; there is justice for friends and justice for strangers, it is not the same between parents, brothers or co-religionists ”(13). Likewise, justice, which is based on equality, applies variously to social and individual relationships. “Social or distributive justice establishes the equality between the two relations of four terms: two things and two persons; it is a geometric proportion. Thus the justice in the distribution of the honors of a city is not a leveling, because it is unjust to give equal things to two unequal men, or vice versa ... When it comes to individuals, to judge an exchange, performance of a contract, adultery,an injury or a murder, the arbitrator, on the contrary, disregards the inequalities of men and considers only things, in order to restore equality, for example through compensation. It is an arithmetic proportion between two terms only ”(14). Morality, the Judeo-Christian basis of what the moderns call "justice", has no place indiké , in these two degrees of diké . In these two justices, "it is above all a matter of a difference, very important for a Greek, between social morality and individual morality, and a refutation of demagoguery or leveling communism" (15).

Despite everything, Aristotle's morality reflects in many respects the various aspects of the Greek ideal of his time: "eurythmy in the maximum development of all human faculties ..." (16) Certainly, "We are far from this cynical, Stoic, Christian or Kantian asceticism, for whom morality consists in fighting against nature ”, (17) but we are just as far from what constituted the exclusive attribute of the noble in archaic Greece, arété ( by aristoi, "The best"), virility, superhuman in essence, of the warrior. All the so-called classical philosophy tends to intellectualize arété , a tendency which, after having developed in Homer himself (18) and having asserted itself in Xenophanes' claim to make it a purely intellectual quality, reaches its culmination. in Aristotle, where it becomes a moral virtue and, what is more, a moral virtue in principle common to all individuals.

Aristotle does not dissociate politics from morality and it is the best of his morality which is found in his politics. The ethnos finds its perfect form only in the city. The family is the essential element of the city. It is not a question of community of women and children, nor of equality between men and women. “… The husband is a protector for his wife, just as he is a monarch with regard to his children, thanks to his superior reason. The woman can deliberate, but not order. When it has too many rights, it can ruin a state, as Sparta is an example ”(19). As for domestic slavery, when it enshrines natural inequalities, it is in the order of things. In this case, it is in the interest of the slave himself and, in any case, of the city that he be ruled by a master. In fact,all barbarians are destined for obedience; all Greeks, in command. Aristotle's ideal of government is the idealization of the Athenian constitution. Its policy enshrines the contemporary social state, with its traditional division of social classes, its traditional conception of the family, its contempt for work, slaves and women. The fact remains that all of this rested in Aristotle on the fragile basis of eudemonism: fragile, because, as F. Nietzsche clearly saw, it is a sign of regression when eudemonistic values ​​begin to come to the fore.his traditional conception of the family, his contempt for work, slaves and women. The fact remains that all of this rested in Aristotle on the fragile basis of eudemonism: fragile, because, as F. Nietzsche clearly saw, it is a sign of regression when eudemonist values ​​begin to come to the fore.his traditional conception of the family, his contempt for work, slaves and women. The fact remains that all this rested in Aristotle on the fragile basis of eudemonism: fragile, because, as F. Nietzsche clearly saw, it is a sign of regression when Eudemonist values ​​begin to come to the fore.

Alongside the religious philosophy of Pythagoras, Empedocles and Plato, which, under the pretext of purifying the cult, had only contributed to undermining it, other philosophies were born and spread which, in less disguised forms , sowed doubt in minds, shook the fundamental notion of gods, inspired contempt for rites and sacrifices and reduced morality to the individual, his conscience and his needs. They appeared during the period of spiritual, intellectual and cultural decadence which followed the placing under the supervision of the Greek States by the Macedonians. It was in these times of war that “the overthrow of all legitimate and national government in Greece was being prepared and accomplished; [... that] the murder,artifice and fraud were regarded as lawful and ordinary means of rising or maintaining power; [that,] finally the property was all the more uncertain, more shaky, as the fortune was more considerable. Now, when we know that the best part of Greek mores had their roots in political life, we must then expect a decadence of mores which pervades almost the entire Greek nation, which erases the ancient civic character, of which it does not. traces remained only in a few isolated, and so to speak, hidden corners, and which finally shake even domestic life ”(20). To fully understand this period, we must pay attention to two other factors: the hybridization, operated by the Macedonian domination,between the Greeks and the “various peoples of Macedonia (21) and later the softened Orientals; [hybridization] which gave to the Greek character, on the one hand, a ferocity and cruelty which had remained foreign to it until then, at least in degree; and on the other hand, a mixed spirit of freedom and servility… ”To this must be added the arrival in power of popular tyrants everywhere in Greece“ and the power acquired by fierce and predatory Aetolians ”, Pelasgians (22). “The other circumstance that should be noted is the refinement of the arts of living, which from then on turned more and more towards the pleasures of luxury” (23). Morals were so corrupt, impiety so widespread, that when the Macedonian general Demetrius I Poliorcetes settled in Athens in 307 BC, he was greeted there by this ithymbe:"The other gods are far from here, or have no ears, or do not exist, not or pay no attention to us at all. While you, we see you present, neither in wood nor in stone, but very real. The history of Athens from then on became more and more confused and tumultuous; demagogues, flatterers of Demetrius, or tyrants reigned over Athens during the war of the diadochs, depending on whether the armies of Demetrius or those of Cassandra were victorious in Greece. There were only three things left that sustained Athens and enabled it to delay its ruin: the memory of its past glory; the art, "which no other city in the world possessed to the same degree as Athens, of procuring the most refined pleasures, and of satisfying the most delicate tastes, which attracted and retained in Athens a crowd of foreigners "(24); and,finally, the philosophical schools of which it was the seat. Moreover, these last two points "are properly one, because delicate pleasures have a great deal of affinity with scientific culture" (25).

Cynicism

Cynicism was a product of this period. Cynics attacked and ridiculed religion and, in general, everything that made up the ancient city. They left very few writings, so that it was by practice rather than by doctrine that they exerted an influence on mores.

Ancient writers describe cynicism as a philosophy whose object was virtue. This term had for the cynics neither the original sense of virility, nor the Aristotelian sense of habitual disposition with which the individual goes voluntarily towards the good. In fact, what they called virtue was considered by many ancient writers to be the height of immorality. Diogenes (c. 413–327 BCE), the prototype of the cynics, “asked the community of women, not even speaking of marriage, but of the coupling of a man who has seduced a woman with the woman who consents to it. "(26). He masturbated in the public square and approved of incest. Cynicism advocated “living according to nature, and in this it was not much different from most contemporary schools of philosophy; however,he was distinguished by the meaning he gave to the above-mentioned precept. “It was generally believed that, as men are endowed with reason and bullies are not, what was natural for a bully was not natural for a man. But the cynics believed that men could learn what was natural by observing and imitating bullies ”(27).

"Nature", for cynics, was synonymous with animal instincts. In fact, the cynics held inferior animals to be superior to men in certain respects, not least because they did not need shoes, clothing, shelter, and prepared food; and, in this regard; they encouraged men to imitate them as much as possible. Hence the large number of allegorical accounts of animals in cynical literature. One of the animal models to follow was “… The“ masturbating fish ”… indeed, the fish deposits its semen where the need surprises it, without worrying about looking for the suitable partner, by rubbing itself on the first object that comes along. This is how the cynic practices: he eats, copulates or masturbates wherever he wants, that is to say, for the purposes of demonstration, most often in public ”(28).The dog is however the main model, so to speak fetish, of the cynics and, what is more, "not the guard dog, the companion or hunting dog, but the homeless and ownerless vagrant" (29) . The ownerless stray dog ​​was free and as such cynics considered him worthy of imitation. Poverty was an important cynical "virtue"; it allowed cynics not to worry about property and to have a nomadic life, like that of the stray dog.Poverty was an important cynical "virtue"; it allowed cynics not to worry about property and to have a nomadic life, like that of the stray dog.Poverty was an important cynical "virtue"; it allowed cynics not to worry about property and to have a nomadic life, like that of the stray dog.

The object of cynicism was happiness, and the cynic sought happiness through freedom. Cynical freedom is the "absence of desires". Crates of Thebes (365-285 BCE) believed that pleasure was a form of slavery; cynics, as a student of cynicism points out with a significant touch of irony, retained this idea, but did not always put it into practice, so much so that the idea spread that cynicism was hedonism and that made it possible to make many recruits (30). The letters of Diogenes Laërte and Crates give the impression that the cynics then formed a known and numerous sect.

Cynical freedom is also "the absence of fear, anger, sadness and any other emotion, [the] absence of submission to religion and morals, to government and institutions, to public opinion, [the] absence of respect for property, [the] absence of obligation to reside in a specific locality, to take care of his wife and children ”(31), to marry (32) and even to procreate (33). The quest for freedom made the cynic extremely individualistic; this quest was personal and the cynic had no loyalty to family, homeland or race. Ahead of his time, Diogenes spoke of the “human race”. Cynical morality was the first to completely abandon the ideal of the city-state. She denied the country;Diogenes boasted of having no citizenship anywhere and Crates boasted that his own homeland was contempt for the opinions of others.

Cynicism, "by destroying respect for existing religions, by ignoring distinctions of race and nationality and by instituting an order of wandering preachers who claimed exceptional freedom of speech", largely contributed to pave the way for a religion which synthesized all the most subversive elements of ancient philosophy: Christianity.

In Christianity, it is anachoretism that most immediately reflects cynical practice. The cynical "virtues" were the qualities that made it possible to achieve freedom. The most important of these qualities was apatheia , associated with adiaphora (indifference) and karteria (endurance). The karteriacan be considered the physical form of apatheia . It was obtained by hardening practices (34): it was necessary, for example, to roll in the hot sand, to kiss snow-covered statues, to walk barefoot in the snow and to endure the heat of summer, the cold of in winter, hard beds and lack of food. To find his "true nature", the cynic "had to go through the athletoi (contests, fights), the ponoi (the suffering; the intensity of the athletoi ; the level of suffering and physical effort necessary to lead these fights, these trials) and talaiporia(misery), terms which all refer to athletics, the Olympic Games and their mythical founder, Heracles, the main human model of the cynics (35). The twelve labors of Heracles were athlete ; according to a cynical and stoic allegory, Heracles accomplishes them for the good of humanity. He killed the Nemean lion with his bare hands, slaughtered the birds of Lake Stymphalia and rid the earth of monsters and criminals, so great was his philanthropia . It was hard work, athletos... "(36) Just as the cynic had to undergo intense training in order to succeed in renouncing worldly ambitions, in enduring physical pain and in freeing himself from his desires, so the Christian" was exhorted to suppress his carnal desires and to behave on the contrary as an “peerless athlete”, an “athlete of God” and a “great athlete” who was put to the test to accomplish the divine will. "The harder the labor, the greater the profit" and the price was immortality and eternal life! The last monks of the Egyptian desert followed the same principle: they saw themselves as athletae Dei, when they trained themselves to be continents, to repress human passions, anger, desire and to renounce the world ”(37). What was able to seduce the anchorites in cynicism was “the fact that it allows asceticism to be taken further: this is no longer limited to spiritual exercises or a few bodily practices; it is entirely and at all times centered on the body, in a moral perspective. Spiritual exercises accord with doctrines and religions which believe only in the immortality of the soul. Christianity affirms the resurrection of bodies. What suits him is the asceticism which emphasizes the body. Thanks to these bodily-type ascetic practices, the Christian is already living the life that God wants for a body ”(38). The mortification of the anchorite of Syria and Egypt, like theponoi of the cynical ascetic, was not without ostentation, without exhibitionism: just as the cynical ascetic "displayed himself proudly while proudly defying others" (39), so, later, Simon the Stylite came regularly to the market to display the wounds with which his body was covered as a result of the wounds he had inflicted on himself ad gloriam christi . The attire and the very way of life of the monks also recall those of the cynics. Tertullian asserts that the first Christian preachers adopted the mantle of the Cynics ( De Pallio6). The portrait that Basil of Caesarea sketches of Gordius, the typical Christian ascetic and athlete, evokes the physical appearance of the cynics: "the spiky hair, a long beard, a torn coat, the thinness of his whole body, a stick that he carried a satchel which covered all his shoulders, imprinted on his whole person I know not what horrible, at the same time as the divine grace which shone within him spread outside and made him venerable. "(40) A great connoisseur of Christian asceticism like Origen qualifies" Antisthenes, Diogenes and Crates as champions of pagan asceticism and compares them to the Hebrew prophets; more radically still, he assimilates them implicitly to Christ ( C. Cels . 2.41, 7.7; cf. 6.28). »(41) Julian the Emperor also compares them with the Galilean (Against the Cynic Heraclius ) (42). Cynicism, like monasticism, presented itself, to use C. Préaux's expression, as a "counter-culture".

Certainly, with the exception of the politician, legislator, and cynical poet Cercidas de Méagalopolis (c. 290– c. 220 BCE) who applied his ideas to a doctrine of social reform and the cynics of Alexandria in the second century BCE , whose dissolution of manners in no way ceded to the fervor of the

seditious speeches they held to the youth in the streets, (43) no cynic tried to replace the existing order with a new system. The politeiacynical, the "cynical state", was still nothing other than a "moral state": the state of cynic (44). The cynic “did not seek so much the establishment of a new social principle as the destruction of all civic ties and the abolition of all social restrictions. It aimed at a return to nature in a sense that makes nature the negation of civilization. The cynical philosopher, dirty, full of wit, contemptuous, shameless, insolent as no one, is the first example of a proletarian philosopher ”(45). The cynics had spilled oil on a long smoldering fire. They had paved the way for those who would aim to overthrow and destroy the principles of civilization for good.

Stoicism

“Diogenes became a Stoic hero and played, in their literature, the role of the wise model” (46), even if, to use a most happy expression, it was Diogenes without the barrel. For Juvenal, the only distinction between the Cynics and the Stoics is in the mantle they wear. In fact, the doctrines of the Stoics did not contain much that had not already been taught by their predecessors. Stoicism only emphasized certain aspects of the doctrine of their predecessors and pushed their conceptions to their logical consequences. He generalized them and made them a way of life, an “art of living”.

The Stoics were much more daring than previous philosophers in religious matters. Zeno annihilates all the primitive and innate notions about the gods and, by an attempt at exegesis based on physics, Chrysippus brings all the divinities back to being only the phenomena of material nature. And first of all, the Stoics no longer want us to distinguish between gods and goddesses, because, for them, the gods have no sex and are only natural manifestations of the supreme God, Zeus, life, who itself emanates from the ether, the universal principle. This supreme God is a subtle, creative fire which penetrates the world, governs it, which is its soul and life, its primordial reason or, as the Stoics say, "spermatic reason". The physical world, the universe, is its sensible form;for there is no active principle without a substance to receive it, any more than there is form without animating and forming principle. The gods are sparks of the animating fire, which shine in every part of the world, where they are found. In spite of or because of their pantheism, the Stoics established with force the existence of God and preserved with these physical gods, with this god-world, a true personality; they attributed to them virtues and moral qualities which one could not attach to impersonal beings. Their school is one of those which has most accredited the notion of a beneficent deity ruling the universe. Because the God-all is not for them without a certain consciousness of oneself and nature, which is its manifestation, is, in their eyes, essentially good,as much in its general constitution as in the individual forms that it takes, the agents by which it exercises its action and to which men give the name of gods. Although the Stoics out of prudence conformed to the practices of the cult of the city, they regarded their accomplishment as unnecessary. In morality, their deep sense of the duties of the individual has often been praised; it would be laudable, from the traditional Greek point of view, if it had focused on the obligations of citizens among themselves and towards the state; because, on the contrary, it was based on the cosmopolitan spirit of solidarity between all men, it was to prove eminently fatal to the city-state.Although the Stoics out of prudence conformed to the practices of the cult of the city, they regarded their accomplishment as unnecessary. In morality, their deep sense of the duties of the individual has often been praised; it would be laudable, from the traditional Greek point of view, if it had focused on the obligations of citizens among themselves and towards the state; because, on the contrary, it was based on the cosmopolitan spirit of solidarity between all men, it was to prove eminently fatal to the city-state.Although the Stoics prudently conformed to the practices of the cult of the city, they regarded their accomplishment as unnecessary. In morality, their deep sense of the duties of the individual has often been praised; it would be laudable, from the traditional Greek point of view, if it had focused on the obligations of citizens among themselves and towards the state; because, on the contrary, it was based on the cosmopolitan spirit of solidarity between all men, it was to prove eminently fatal to the city-state.it was based on the cosmopolitan spirit of solidarity between all men, it was to prove eminently fatal to the city-state.it was based on the cosmopolitan spirit of solidarity between all men, it was to prove eminently fatal to the city-state.

The wise man does not have to live for himself; he must see himself as a member of the human city in general and think about the interests of all rather than his own. One of the most pernicious initiatives of Stoicism in matters of morality consisted in accrediting that, in deeds, it is less fact than intention that must be considered, which paradoxically opened the door to irresponsibility. Thus, the Stoic doctrine exalted "human freedom" and made all the virtue depend on men and not on the gods; it put the sage above the common law, rejecting anything that seemed to relate to religious scruples, such as respect for the dead, the sacred character of funerals. Stoicism did not immediately gain a popularity which could have endangered public religion. By its nature,it remained the prerogative of a small number; but it slowly infiltrated each other's morals and, by dissipating the conveniences whose observation serves to maintain good social order, it weakens the civic bond.

Since the intellectual upheaval caused by the Peloponnesian War at the end of the fifth century BC, the institutions which regulated public and private life had been damaged in their prestige and in their authority. The sophists, on the one hand, Euripides, Socrates, Plato on the other, had strongly shaken the ancient traditions; Evhémère's rationalism dealt them an even more formidable blow. Anxiety and confusion had taken hold of souls, so much so that philosophy, once a luxury, now appeared to be a necessary shelter. For the great number, Platonism was too ideal, Peripateticism too scientific, Cynicism was too brutal, too crude. A place remained to be taken for a doctrine that was both more accessible and outwardly more respectable.

The Stoic school of philosophy was founded in the third century BC by Zeno of Cition (334-262 BC). It takes its name from the portico ( stoa) from Athens where its founder taught, Three periods ago. With Cléanthe (330-232 before our era) and his disciple, Chrysippus de Soles (v. 280-206 before our era), Zeno of Cition is one of the philosophers of what is traditionally called the old Stoicism. Panaetius of Rhodes (185-112 BC), Zeno of Tarsus (2nd century BC), Antipater of Sidon (2nd century BC and Posidonios of Apamea (c. 135– v. 51 BC) are the two main representatives of Middle Stoicism. Seneca (v. 4 BCE - 65 CE), Epictetus (50-125 CE) and Marcus Aurelius (121– v. 180 CE) are the principal agents of so-called imperial stoicism; it was at this time that, deserting pure speculation, Stoicism increasingly sought to become a school of practical life, a moral doctrine,religious and political and it is in this capacity that he exercised a considerable influence on Roman society; moving further away from pure speculation, Arrian (85– c. 146 AD) and Marcus Aurelius brought Stoicism closer to Christianity. During these five centuries, the Stoicism knew evolutions but, in spite of differences, the Stoics remained faithful to the philosophy of Zeno of Cition.

Philosophy was defined by the Stoics as "the knowledge of divine and human things". Stoic philosophy was divided into three branches: logic, which deals with the form and expression of knowledge; physics, from the matter of knowledge; and ethics, of the use of knowledge. The logic borrowed much from that of the philosophers of the school of Megara and Aristotle; physics was marked by the conceptions of Heraclitus of Ephesus; ethics were deeply influenced by cynics and by Socrates.

At first glance, the logic of the Stoics seems imbued with an entirely sensualist character. They proclaim the famous principle, which made such a great fortune in the "Middle Ages" under the protection of the name of Aristotle:Nihil est in intellectu quod non prius fuerit in sensu- there is nothing in the understanding which was not previously in the sensation. Reason itself, that higher part of the soul, is meaning. The Stoics undoubtedly recognized that the sensation is the very foundation of knowledge, but this entirely passive sensation is in their eyes only the matter to which the spirit will apply. Excited by the impression of external things, the spirit, essentially active, sets in motion, takes hold of the multitude of confused, fleeting, peculiar impressions which experience provides it and draws from them sound judgments and arguments. unassailable, general truths, principles, in a word knowledge worthy of a being made to understand and explain the universe. Above sensation is placed judgment, a synthesis of sensations; above judgment,comprehensive representation,phantasia katalêptikê , synthesis of judgments; above all, the universal and definitive synthesis: science. These various degrees of knowledge are nothing else than the successive efforts of the mind rising from the particular to the general, by virtue of the essential activity which constitutes it. This sketch of Stoic logic highlights the great part that the Stoics, despite their sensualism, had for the mind - perhaps it would be appropriate to speak more of "mind" - in the formation of ideas.

Stoic physics is also not as materialistic as it first appears. The world, or nature, is a whole of which individuals constitute the parts. The world has two principles, one active ( materia ), the other passive ( causa). They are both bodily in nature. But, among the Stoics, materia designates, not material objects, but the passive substance which serves as the basis for all qualities and all determinations; caused, the active force which animates and sets in motion this substance. Stoic physics is thus more pantheistic than materialistic. God is the active and formative force in matter and, as such, he is necessarily linked to it (47). "God is mixed with matter, traversing it entirely, giving it structure and form and organizing it into a world" (48). In his physical aspect, God is the living force which rules the world and, in his moral aspect, the all-pervading reason. From a moral point of view, God is “the eternal reason which governs the whole universe and penetrates all matter; he is the beneficent providence which takes care of everything as well as of the individual; he is wise, and the principle of natural law which commands good and defends evil; he punishes the violation of the law and rewards the good;he is perfect and endowed with a happy conscience ”. From the physical point of view, “he is the driving force of matter, the general nature without which nothing happens; it is destiny which subjects all things to the necessary laws of the relation of cause and effect; he is the necessity of all things ”(49).

The Stoics "agree in saying that God is the world, that is to say, matter endowed with a certain quality or form with the active force contained therein" (50). God did not produce the world by a free determination of his will; he was a part of it; it was contained there. But he operated on matter by an intrinsic force, as the necessity of nature and matter permitted. There is therefore in the universe an immutable and eternal law, a chain of causes and effects, such that all that has been could not be otherwise, that all that is cannot be otherwise and that all that will be cannot be otherwise: this is fate. Everything is subject to destiny, including God, since God also follows this order of things. Even though he is the soul of the world, he cannot change matter. Our souls,subject to fate, however, they are only so much and according to their nature; the outside forces may well put them to the test, if they are fundamentally good, they will persevere in virtue. If, on the contrary, they are born rude and ignorant, they will willingly lead to vice and error, unless something happens that instructs and improves them. This belief in fatalism was relatively new in Greece, where the conception of fate had remained unclear until then. Initially, fate was conceived as "a necessity which sometimes imposes itself on the gods, sometimes expresses their will, sometimes is exercised only on the tragic hero, who, in this remains exceptional, sometimes weighs on every man. Further, rather than an exact determination of all the events of each existence,tragic fate [represented] generally a few spectacular events fixed in advance and therefore inevitable (fall of a kingdom, tragic death of a king, etc.) without knowing whether it includes the date ”(51). It seems that the concept of fate, as a power external to the human will, which would rule the universe, by fixing irrevocably the course of the events, entered in the "Greek" philosophy under the influence of the teachings of the astrologers Persians and Chaldeans who began to proliferate in Attica from the fourth century BC Chrysippus, posing that destiny is "the reason of the universe", or "the reason of things administered in the world by providence ”, rationalized it, systematized it.

This materialistic and fatalistic pantheism partly explains why the Stoics did not tackle theogony. They contented themselves with interpreting it and transforming the mythical theogony and the civil theogony into a physical theogony. This is how Zeus, present in the ether, became the cause of life; Hephaestus was present in the fire; Hera in the air; Poseidon in the water; Demeter or Cybele in the earth.

The pantheism of Stoic physics is inextricably linked to their ethics, both cosmic and naturalistic. In life, it is essentially the end that you have to look at. The end can be considered under three aspects: the object, the means and the end. The end of man is to conform to the laws of nature, or, in Chrysippus and Zeno, to the laws of reason. These two moral principles are identical, since nature is nothing other than the "universal reason" which orders everything; to conform one's behavior to the course of nature is to see oneself as a part of the larger whole and to contribute to its harmony. God is the main part of nature; the soul of man is a particle of God; the law of nature or of God is the general rule by which everything is coordinated, moved and vivified; live in accordance with nature,to imitate God, to follow the general order, it is the same thing under different expressions. Nature is all that is good and beautiful. Virtue, like nature, has both of these qualities. Happiness results. To live well, to love the beautiful, to practice the good, to be happy, are one and the same thing. Virtue has its origin in the human soul; a particle sprung from God, it tends of itself to imitate the principle of its emanation. Sovereign happiness is not in the things of the body, but in that of the soul. Nothing that is outside of a man can add to his happiness. Bodies, pleasures, dignities, glory are things outside of man and his power and can harm his happiness, if he is attached to it. The highest degree of wisdom lies in distinguishing between what is good and what is bad.In things, there are some which are good, others bad, still others which are indifferent. One thing is good relative to the nature of an individual; a reasonable man can only be happy with objects analogous to reason. What is useful and honest is good. The useful consists in conforming to the end of the whole of which one is a part. Virtue is the real good, the really useful thing. Evil is a deviation from the general reason at all.Evil is a deviation from the general reason at all.Evil is a deviation from the general reason at all.

The soul is free; nothing external affects it, nor can it constrain it. Relatively to the whole, it is subject to destiny, it cannot act other than it acts, according to the universal bond which unites the universe and its parts. As soon as she has been marked by the image of good, she desires it. Desires follow knowledge or opinion of things. Knowledge of good depends on knowledge of universal order. Desires based on opinion are a source of trouble. Vice arises from ignorance of the things that constitute virtue. There are two types of virtues: one theoretical, the other practical. Prudence, temperance, courage and justice are virtues of the first order. The duties relating to oneself, the duties relating to the neighbor and the duties relating to God, virtues of the second order.Apathy is the supreme goal of all that man owes himself; he who has succeeded is wise. The sage examines his actions and his speeches; he admits his faults and sets out to correct them. His particular study is that of himself. He despises life and its distractions; he fears neither suffering, nor misery, nor death. He loves his fellows, he even loves his enemies; all men are equal in his eyes. He lives in the world, as if nothing of his own. The testimony of his conscience is the first he seeks. If he does good, he takes no pride in it and, if he sees evil doing, he does not allow himself to be moved. He keeps his serenity in all circumstances.he admits his faults and sets out to correct them. His particular study is that of himself. He despises life and its distractions; he fears neither suffering, nor misery, nor death. He loves his fellows, he even loves his enemies; all men are equal in his eyes. He lives in the world, as if nothing of his own. The testimony of his conscience is the first he seeks. If he does good, he takes no pride in it and, if he sees evil doing, he does not allow himself to be moved. He keeps his serenity in all circumstances.he admits his faults and sets out to correct them. His particular study is that of himself. He despises life and its distractions; he fears neither suffering, nor misery, nor death. He loves his fellows, he even loves his enemies; all men are equal in his eyes. He lives in the world, as if nothing of his own. The testimony of his conscience is the first he seeks. If he does good, he takes no pride in it and, if he sees evil doing, he does not allow himself to be moved. He keeps his serenity in all circumstances.as if nothing of his own. The testimony of his conscience is the first he seeks. If he does good, he takes no pride in it and, if he sees evil doing, he does not allow himself to be moved. He keeps his serenity in all circumstances.as if nothing really belonged to him. The testimony of his conscience is the first he seeks. If he does good, he takes no pride in it and, if he sees evil doing, he does not allow himself to be moved. He keeps his serenity in all circumstances.

At first glance irreproachable, the morality of the Stoics turns out to be false, however, when its main principles are considered in their existential application. The Stoics, following the cynics, saw life as a violent struggle between two bitter, irreconcilable enemies, passion and freedom. In this struggle, freedom must be victorious and it can only be through the absolute destruction of passion, the principle of which in the human soul is considered, as it will be by Christianity, as essentially bad. . This is the hallmark of the Stoic conception of life. Before the Stoics, several philosophers had theorized on the way for man to contain the brutality of appetites, to stifle bad passions, to establish in the soul the government of reason;but what neither Pythagoras, nor Socrates, nor Plato had ever taught, is that the very principle of the passions, that is to say, the sensibility, had to be, not subordinate and contained, but annihilated. Therein lies the fundamental flaw in Stoic morality, for sensitivity cannot be annihilated: it can only be overcome. Any attempt to annihilate sensitivity inevitably results in a backlash: whoever wants to play the angel plays the beast.Any attempt to annihilate sensitivity inevitably results in a backlash: whoever wants to play the angel plays the beast.Any attempt to annihilate sensitivity inevitably results in a backlash: whoever wants to play the angel plays the beast.

It seems that most of the Stoics succeeded in avoiding these excesses in life; what is certain is that they did not all escape the consequences of their principle. For example, Chrysippus, indifferent to everything, exhorted to take human corpses for food and defended prostitution; "Consider animals and you will learn by their example that there is none of this that is immoral and unnatural" (52). In the eyes of the Stoic moralists, these were nothing but indifferent things in themselves, local practices absolutely indifferent to the sage.

Another of the Stoics' excessive and false theories is that man can be his own good, under the auspices of "reason." Aristotle had defined the slave by nature as a being who had just enough reason to understand and carry out an order. Cicero maintained that reason was common to men, but that right reason was common only to men and gods. In Marc-Aurèle (IV, 4, 1), all men participate in the common reason: to what extent? He doesn't say so, which leaves the door open for them to all participate equally. Epictetus deduces the existence of the world community, the cosmic city, from the fact that God and men are parents and men are sons of God (53). The theme of the unity of the human race is common to many Stoic texts:“The soul is a part of the divine logos; it follows that all men belong to the same race and that this one is divine. We read inThe Hymn to Zeusof Cléanthe: "For we are of your race", which does not apply only to a few elite individuals, but to all men, because all have received the gift of speaking. All human beings therefore belong to the same family: free men and slaves, men and women, Greeks and barbarians ”(54). "The Stoics were probably not the first to assert that men are by nature similar, but no one before them had so clearly founded this similarity on the possession of reason, nor made the unity of mankind a thesis. major ”(55). The Stoics developed the cosmopolitanism of cynics and sophists into a doctrine of the common kinship of all men as rational beings (56). Marc-Aurèle may recall that “Universal intelligence is sociable.So she created the lower beings in view of the higher beings, and the higher beings, she grouped them by harmonizing them with each other ”(Meditations , V, 30), this hierarchy relies only on the wind. Just as all men are united and equal in the cosmos, in "universal reason", so all men will not be long in being united and equal in Jesus Christ. The Stoics in general may well declare that, even if all men were virtuous in principle and all men could become wise in principle, there were very few wise men in reality, nothing prevented the first slave by nature to come from to think of himself as a wise man. History has shown that those who were sensitive to the egalitarian and universalist message of Stoicism were not as fatalistic as the Stoics.

The sage, according to the Stoics, should feel himself a citizen of the world and be indifferent to the politics of city-states. “None of the existing governments suited him, because in all governments the choice of rulers was due to the vagaries of fortune and not to their moral value. What value could the laws of a state have for one who had learned to be a law for himself, however useful they were to the scoundrels and the madmen? (57) Stoicism was not, however, apolitical. Zeno had posited that the sage, unless there were serious obstacles, should be concerned with public affairs. If Cleanthes and Zeno refused the citizenship rights that Athens offered them, it is not forbidden to think that it was because, as we have just seen, the government of Athens, no more than the other governments of time,did not suit them.

Philosophical systems remained little known to the Romans until the beginning of the second century; occupied in war and conquest, they had neither the leisure nor the inclination to meditate on the mysteries of life and of nature. The ancestral traditions and ritual customs of public life, the rigor of the training, with its appeals to all the venerable associations of the past, the spirit of belonging to a clan and the fervor of patriotic zeal, provided the Romans with rules precise, that the law and the religion imposed. A new era dawned for them, when their legions crossed the seas and their generals and statesmen came into contact with the civilizations of the East. The ruling families began to study Greek language and literature and,Despite vehement accusations by conservatives like Cato the Elder against the alien breed of dilettantes and sophists, the rhetoricians settled in Rome. There is no doubt that the civil wars which devastated Rome from 88 to 30 BC favored the diffusion of philosophical thought; minds, weary of turmoil and conflict, unable to invest their energy in public affairs, turned to moral theories to which they had not even paid attention until then; following the battle of Pharsalus, the norms and values ​​of their class or their party had been undermined and, no longer having the necessary vigor to revitalize them, they began to seek another rule of life.

Stoicism, when it passed from the Greek world to the Latin world, became more political and much more legal. From Labéon to Caius and Ulpien, the magistrates acquired in Stoicism applied themselves to passing laws tending to attenuate civil law, to erase the distinction between Roman law and provincial law, to give primacy to "natural" rights. and personal on those of the company. "The edict that the lender published every year had little other aim than to restrict ancient law and, when this magistrate came down from his seat, you would have said that he was transmitting his thoughts to the one who took his place. humanitarian ”(58). The principles of Stoic theory could not fail to discourage the zeal of patriots and the efforts of statesmen.

In Rome, Stoicism met Christianity. Christianity and Stoicism, particularly that of Seneca and Epictetus, have many points of similarity. At the time of Jerome, the ascetic spirit had taken an important place in the Church; many withdrew from the world, of which they despaired; in Seneca they found a moralist who seemed to disdain city life as much as they did; who sought to deprive himself of the "pleasure of the flesh" and to get rid of "the pride of life" by the most severe self-denial, by meditation and detachment from life. The doctrine of divine rewards and punishments after death, the belief in personal immortality, the idea that sin resided in intention as much if not even more than in action, which Seneca had drawn from Plato;the practice of introspection, the habit of listening to the voice of his conscience and of confessing, which he had adopted in his youth by following the school of Pythagoras; all this must have whipped them. They also found in Seneca most of the terms of their own theological vocabulary; hissacer spiritus reminded them of the “Holy Spirit” of the Christian trinity; his peccatum corresponded to the sin of which all men are guilty; his salus , to the salvation of which all men are capable; his caro was the body with all its carnal passions, which can only be transfigured ( trasfigurari ) by grace, which they assimilated to his sacramentum , while his caritas was for them synonymous with charity. Christian charity, taken up almost as it is by the Republic in modern times, including the command to love one's enemies, is found in broad outline in the Epictetus Talks .

No one denies the points of resemblance between Stoic morality and Christian morality. The question is, who is the debtor? As, with the exception of Seneca, all members of the Roman Stoic school are posterior to Christianity, it seemed easy to decide, and indeed some have not failed to argue that Stoicism did not only plagiarizes Christianity. This reasoning, which seems unstoppable, is in reality flawed and specious, for the good and simple reason that most of the Stoic elements which are found in Christianity do not belong strictly to Stoicism, but to earlier philosophical currents to which the Stoic school only borrowed them. For example, the Sophists, long before the Stoics and Christians, posited that men are brothers.Forgiveness of insults was preached long before Seneca and theSermon on the Mount . Socrates, in the Crito , declares that it is not permissible for a man offended by one insult to take revenge for another; Plato says that it is better to suffer evil than to commit it. Chastity, long before Epictetus and Paul of Tarsus, was not lacking in praise: “Chastity,” says Tibullus, “pleases the gods; show up with clean clothes and with your clean hands draw water from the fountain. The dogma of the de facto equality of men and women had been proclaimed by cynics long before it was proclaimed by Seneca and Gregory of Naziance ( Orat. 37, 6-7). The conformity of Christian morality with that of most ancient philosophies has, moreover, been pointed out by a large number of Church fathers and ecclesiastical authors. Lactantius said that if all the "truths" taught by the philosophers were collected, they would constitute a body of doctrine that would not differ much from Christian doctrine.

Philosophy, an imported product

The first glance at the distinctive features of Greek civilization reveals not only that Stoicism is an imported doctrine, but also that all schools of philosophy, whether born in Athens or elsewhere, are foreign doctrines. to the Achaean spirit and even, to a certain extent, to the mentality of the Greek in love with science, poetry, eloquence, arts and therefore already partly orientalized of the century of Pericles. Stoicism may have some affinities with the Roman character, it differs in the essential. The stoic knows how to die, but no longer knows how to die smiling like Leonidas and his companions at Thermopylae and, above all, he no longer knows how to die for the country. The Stoics proclaimed themselves citizens, but citizens of the world. Stoicism could form excellent cosmopolitans,that is, poor citizens. Stoicism is Romanity without a sense of homeland and, without a sense of homeland, Romanity is nothing.

Aristotle asserts that philosophy originated among the barbarians. Later, the Syrian Jamblique will still maintain that “Pythagoras, Plato, Eudoxus, and most of the ancient sages of Greece drew from the keepers of the sacred mysteries, the true and legitimate doctrine… The opinions of these philosophers agree with the traditions of the Chaldeans and the teaching of the prophets of Egypt… The answer to your philosophical doubts is traced to us on these ancient columns of Mercury, the reading of which taught philosophy to Pythagoras and Plato. "

The study of historical origins and intellectual accredits and confirms the non-Greek character and, a fortiori, not Roman philosophy.

Greece received her doctrines "from the three sources which poured out upon her her primitive populations and her civilization." They first came to him from the countries watered by the Euphrates and the Tanais: the sons of Shem and Japheth were their propagators; then, they descended from the heights of the Himalayas with these peoples of India that we see crossing the north of Asia and Europe; finally, they were transported by the colonies which, starting from the banks of the Nile, came to settle in Greece ”(58). These doctrines, thus transplanted, united and modified on certain points, constituted the fund of doctrines which Greece adopted and preserved. In Attica, they were grafted onto the teachings of the mystery religions, for the most part imbued with the beliefs and dogmas of the Pelasgic peoples,that is to say, the colored peoples who preceded the Hellenes on the soil of Hellas.

Three factors contributed to the infiltration of Eastern doctrines, the first external, the other two internal.

First, during the second millennium, there was a migration of the peoples of the Middle East towards the Mediterranean basin, accompanied by the syncretic fusion of their different cults. Originally, “every people, every city of Greece had its own cult, and national cult generally arose in the same way as the nation itself. A certain number of families or tribes had gathered in a city, the cults recognized by each of them had grouped together in a body of rites which constituted the religion of the nation, the religion of the State. These national gods extended their protection sometimes to the inhabitants of the entire city, sometimes to those of the whole province, sometimes even to those of the whole race… Each city, each race placed all its confidence in its gods,to whom it lent more power, more virtue than to those of cities and foreign races ”(59). But "A general circulation and like a current of tribes and cults had formed early between the two extremities of the Semitic world, and had taken its direction from east to west, from the countries of the Tigris and the Euphrates towards the shores of the Mediterranean and the Persian Gulf to the Arabian Gulf, with the migrations of the Chanaanites or Phoenicians, the Hebrews, the Ammonites, the Mohabites and the Edomites. India, China, Ethiopia and Egypt had also yielded to the force of this current which tended to bring all the nations together ”(60). These migrations, which were very frequent in the early days of Hellenic history, contributed singularly to bringing to the most diverse places the worship of the same divinities."Often, on entering a new country, a deity associated with a god of the country and, from contact with their cult, resulted in more or less extensive alterations for religion which were not long in giving it a new character. and special. The ancient national gods retained for a long time, in the devotion of the inhabitants, a place which it would have been difficult to deprive them of. For the long protection they had exercised over a city persuaded its citizens that there were no safer and more efficient guardians than they; and it was in the acropolis, that is, in the citadel, the oldest part of each city, that their sanctuaries and their images were located. This firm confidence that the members of a state, the inhabitants of a city, had in the power of their paternal gods,explains why it was generally forbidden for a citizen of Athens to go and carry his gods elsewhere. It was only over matters pertaining to the worship of national divinities, to the traditions linked to them, that the State exercised its control and authority. Apart from this public and hereditary cult, established by law, practiced at all times by the fatherland, fixed by immemorial usage, devotion remained free to feed on fables and foreign opinions, on poetic fictions which soon gave rise to birth to new cults; and it is thus that so many foreign myths were introduced into Greece, and particularly in Athens, despite the defenses which were soon raised in this regard ”. (61)It was only over matters pertaining to the worship of national divinities, to the traditions linked to them, that the State exercised its control and authority. Apart from this public and hereditary cult, established by law, practiced at all times by the fatherland, fixed by immemorial usage, devotion remained free to feed on fables and foreign opinions, on poetic fictions which soon gave rise to birth to new cults; and it is thus that so many foreign myths were introduced into Greece, and particularly in Athens, despite the defenses which were soon raised in this regard ”. (61)It was only over matters pertaining to the worship of national divinities, to the traditions linked to them, that the State exercised its control and authority. Apart from this public and hereditary cult, established by law, practiced at all times by the fatherland, fixed by immemorial usage, devotion remained free to feed on fables and foreign opinions, on poetic fictions which soon gave rise to birth to new cults; and it is thus that so many foreign myths were introduced into Greece, and particularly in Athens, despite the defenses which were soon raised in this regard ”. (61)devotion remained free to feed on fables and foreign opinions, on poetic fictions which soon gave birth to new cults; and it is thus that so many foreign myths were introduced into Greece, and particularly in Athens, despite the defenses which were soon raised in this regard ”. (61)devotion remained free to feed on fables and foreign opinions, on poetic fictions which soon gave birth to new cults; and it is thus that so many foreign myths were introduced into Greece, and particularly in Athens, despite the defenses which were soon raised in this regard ”. (61)

The second factor is the interbreeding between the Greeks and the aboriginal peoples (62). Archaic Greece is presented as half Ibero-Pelasgic, half Semitic. It is not until, according to some historians, the nineteenth century, according to others the sixteenth, according to still others the thirteenth or the ninth century BC, to find the first trace of so-called Indo-people there. Europeans (63). Very probably already colored with yellow blood on their arrival in Attica, they were not long in mingling with the aboriginal populations. “No country presents, in primitive times, more traces of ethnic convulsions, sudden displacements and multiplied immigration. People came there in troops from all corners of the horizon, and often just to pass or see themselves so attacked,that he had to be immediately confused among the victors and lose his name. While, at all times, bands saturated with black flocked either from the islands or from the continent of Asia, other populations mixed with yellow elements, Slavs, Celts, descended from the north under a thousand denominations imbued with ideas. all specials ”(64). From the beginning of the eighth century BC, "there is no longer any trace of unmixed settlements of the Hellenic Arians in the whole of Hellas" (65). At the time of Herodotus, "Greece was itself an Asian country, and the policy which interested it most was developed at the court of the great king" (66). The Athenians, writes Strabo, had "a taste for foreign fashions." “In their own opinion, the Greeks made much more of what they called, no doubt, in their language,the conquests of civilization, that is to say the imports of gods, dogmas, Asiatic rites, and monstrous reveries from neighboring coasts, that of the Ariane simplicity once professed by their religious male ancestors. They inquired with predilection about what had been thought and done in Asia. They mingled themselves to the best of their ability in the affairs, interests, and quarrels of the great continent, and, although imbued with their own importance, as any small people must be, although even calling the entire universe barbarous, outside from them, their gaze was not detached from Asia ”(67).They inquired with predilection about what had been thought and done in Asia. They mingled themselves to the best of their ability in the affairs, interests, and quarrels of the great continent, and, although imbued with their own importance, as any small people must be, although even calling the entire universe barbarous, outside from them, their gaze was not detached from Asia ”(67).They inquired with predilection about what had been thought and done in Asia. They mingled themselves to the best of their ability in the affairs, interests, and quarrels of the great continent, and, although imbued with their own importance, as any small people must be, although even calling the entire universe barbarous, outside from them, their gaze was not detached from Asia ”(67).

Finally, the opening of Greece to trade under Solon's impetus, followed by the conquest of Asia by Alexander, corresponded to its direct exposure to the ideas of Asia. These foreign myths did not enter Greece by air. They were introduced there by foreigners and women. Attica had begun to be influenced by Asian cults in the seventh century BC, mainly as a result of the development of trade relations between the peoples of the opposite shores of the Mediterranean. Women “were the main brokers of this shady cult; this is why Plato, in his Laws, forbids domestic chapels, where he complains that women, always inclined to superstition, than individuals dominated by the fear of a vision,go in secret to bring prayers and wishes to a host of gods, heroes and demons. "(68) Strabo adds that everyone agrees in recognizing women as the authors of these superstitions," as those who invite us by their example to render a more sought-after worship to the divinity, and to solicit by prayers and his help from the holidays. The laws introduced against the introduction of foreign rites had little effect, especially from the fifth century BC.The laws introduced against the introduction of foreign rites had little effect, especially from the fifth century BC.The laws introduced against the introduction of foreign rites had little effect, especially from the fifth century BC.

There came a time when the cosmopolitan Metics class, which since Solon's legislation had dominated commerce and industry, with the exception of mining, imported goods and conceitedly mistook their extraordinary business acumen for intelligence. , (69) was no longer satisfied with money as a means of action and ended up setting its sights on the liberal and intellectual professions, then on art and literature. "The metics," says us, "tongue hanging out, tail wagging, G. Glotz, showed there the same qualities of practical intelligence as in industry, commerce and banking. They founded the main schools of rhetoric, created philosophical systems with a realistic tendency (sic), they were the best lawyers,fashioned already modern music and became extremely popular comedy writers. They invaded, transformed and appropriated all the spheres in which, while making money and making a name for themselves, they could express their feelings and spread their ideas ”(70). The Academy, the school of the disciples of Plato and his successors, was not long an exception. From Carnéades, born in Cyrene, a Greek city in North Africa, the Academy would be directed by non-Athenian scholarcs… The other schools were entirely directed by foreigners: no Athenian would ever manage to manage the peripatetic school ” (71). Having taken control of all the schools, the Métics brought in their co-religionists from abroad to practice there.“Most of the philosophers who taught in Athens before Socrates and after Plato came from abroad. They exerted a strong influence on the moral and social evolution of the Athenian people. They brought with them all the ideas that were being developed outside of Greece, especially those that were most suited to those who had freed themselves from local traditions and were eager for practical novelties. Teachers living off their profession and wishing to live comfortably from it, they presented themselves as importers and sellers of intellectual raw materials. Thus, the metics invaded the economic domain in Athens and, soon after, introduced their ideas into public and private life. They systematically occupied all the lines of thought that started from the center of the fallacy ”(72).

Later, the conquest of Asia, by increasing the relations of the Greeks with the barbarians, opened a wide door to imports from outside, made easier by the natural tolerance of polytheism, which did not reject any religious conception. The Greeks, not being able to imagine that there was another religion than theirs, believed to find their Gods, under other names, among foreign nations, without realizing that it was the divine idea itself which differed deeply in them from what it was everywhere else. The deities of Phrygia, Syria and Egypt gradually invaded Greece, most often by merging with the Hellenic gods, sometimes also by retaining their foreign physiognomy. The natural taste of the Greeks for novelty multiplied these borrowings,which ended up altering the primitive character of the national religion ”(73).

Egypt and the Middle East have long attracted poets, scholars and philosophers from Greece. Regarding Egypt, they went there “in order to learn the letters and sciences of this nation.” [Diodorus] Go there in turn Orpheus, Museum, Melampus, Daedalus, Homer, Lycurgus, Pythagoras, Democritus, Eudoxus the mathematician. According to the Egyptian stories reported by Proclus, Plato's successor at the Academy, the latter was received at Heliopolis by the priest Ochalpi; at Sebennyte, by the priest Ethymon; in Sais, by the priest Panténeit; and the latter would be the one referred to in the Timaeus, "this dialogue, the basis of which is a mixture of Greek and Egyptian, Chaldean and Pythagorean traditions ..." Plato himself advocates, in the Philèbe, the grammatical discoveries of a Egyptian,named Teuth there and he makes it clear that he knew them in Egypt. He seems to have known some Thracians who taught the immortality of the soul. Pythagoras studied Egyptian civilization at Thebes, where “he endured everything with admirable patience, ablutions, fasts, shaved body, even circumcision, an operation so repugnant to the Greeks; he is then initiated and admitted to enter the sanctuary of Egyptian science, surrounded by so many mysteries, superstitions and even terrors ”(74). There was for master Eunachis the Heliopolitan, then Nazarate the Assyrian. He also went to the East. Herodotus had already indicated the relations of Greece with Egypt. He presented the latter as "the first homeland of most of the deities, rites and ceremonies which constituted the religion of the Greeks".“When Diodorus speaks of the borrowings made from Egypt by the poets, scholars and philosophers who traveled through it, he reproduces the same ideas. This influence has been partially contested; but it seems difficult to us to dispute the trips that Diodorus mentions: these portraits, these places, these buildings which in his time still bore the names of the Greeks whose memory they still remember, are too striking proofs of their passage. We see Herodotus, not only in connection with the priests of Egypt, but traversing all the countries which he describes, showing us their peoples constantly in contact, and their doctrines becoming, like their products, the object of an active and incessant exchange. Always and everywhere the scientists of Greece and its traders are on the main roads of humanity, in search, some,wealth; the others, ideas. Thus the Ionian School crossed the coasts of Asia Minor in Greece, and Thales, its founder, stayed in Egypt under the reign of Amasis, was initiated into the science of the priests of Thebes and Memphis, probably visited Phenicia "which relations of origin and trade brought closer to Chaldea, another center of priestly science" (75).

Regarding Asia, Democritus, born in Thrace, “was the disciple of Magi and Chaldeans left by Xerxes during his stay in Abdera to educate the son of his host… they taught him theology and astronomy "(76). He "visited Persia to receive the teaching of the Chaldeans there" (77); “Demetrius, in his book of the Authors of the same name, [says] that Democritus went to Egypt to find the priests of that country; that he learned both geometry. Others assure that he went to the Indies, that he conversed with Gymnosophists, and made a trip to Ethiopia. ”(78) Plato also teaches us that the astronomical observations of the Chaldeans were widespread in all places and particularly in Greece; in the Charmide, he recalls certain doctrines and some medical recipes of the Thracians., the peripatetician, talks about the relations of Aristotle, his teacher, with a Jew from Coele-Syria, while they were staying on the coasts of Asia.

“What relationship did the Greek philosophers have with the Hebrews? To solve this… problem, we must first observe the attitude of these latter in the midst of the ancient world, the way in which they mingled with the movement of humanity; and their efforts to propagate their doctrines. Let's start by noting the geographic position of this people. “He was,” says Léland, “in an advantageous position to be seen and observed, to spread around him the knowledge of his religion and of its laws. It was placed at the center of the known universe, between Egypt and Arabia on one side, Syria, Chaldea and Assyria on the other; there, where the first monarchies were raised, and from where science and the arts spread in the West. He was also in the vicinity of Tire and Sidon, those famous ports of the universe,whose navigators and merchants roamed all the beaches and all the countries of the known world, and went to form colonies in the most distant countries.

We know that the people of God did not stand still in these centers of civilization. His mission is to bring Jehovah's name, his doctrine, and the traditions passed down to him from his fathers to all aspects. Traveler, victor or captive, he will therefore go everywhere, never ceasing to propagate the teachings of God.

We cannot follow him in all his camps; but let us take, as the starting point of our remarks, a date which seems important to us. Alexander, in 332, entered Jerusalem: he was given the book of Daniel; there he read his glorious history, and immediately he authorized the Jews to live everywhere in accordance with their laws.

About this time Greek philosophy was personified in Aristotle. Plato, Socrates, Pythagoras had appeared; but also ... the doctrine of the Hebrews had preceded them in Egypt, in the country of Chanaan and in the deserts of Arabia, in Tire, in Nineveh, in Sidon, in Babylon, in all these great centers which were to traverse later the philosophers of Greece. And the closer she drew to their time, the more she had become involved in the events that had agitated the world, upset empires, changed dynasties. If the conquerors of the Hebrew people reigned by the sword, they were nonetheless under the influence of its doctrine, recalling to their palaces, placing it at the head of their kingdom, and even on the throne; she thus became the soul of their advice.

How could these beliefs of a people that one found everywhere, victorious or captive, as if sometimes annihilated, but always resuscitated, not attract the attention of the philosophers of Greece?

Everything was full of the doctrine of the Jews: the places, times, events that followed one another Pythagoras and Plato could therefore have known it without having to look for it in the Bible, or without conversing directly with the Prophets: they found it in the 'the air they breathed and the current that carried them.'

Most of the historians who show us Plato and Pythagoras "in Egypt, in Chaldea and in Phenicia, among the Syrians and in Babylon, did not, it is true, pronounce the names of the Jews. But we must first remember that this people then lost their nationality; that he lived in exile and captive, tributary or foreigner, in the centers of which we speak. On the other hand, we often understood Palestine in Syria; at other times, as illustrious scholars have proved, this last country was, along with those which were attached to it, designated under the name of Assyria; Palestine would even have been given the name of Phenicia. Besides, all the writers of Greece have not kept silent on the direct relations of their philosophers with the Jews. Hermippus, after Josephus,would have written that Pythagoras “imitated the Jews and the Thracians and appropriated their science. He would have added: "It is said that he transferred many Judaic laws into his philosophy" (79). Undoubtedly, the connections which one wanted to establish between the two doctrines are not always happy: sometimes the texts are forced and Plato is too Christianized. "These reservations made, the propagation in the ancient world of Hebrew traditions and doctrines, the passage of the Greek philosophers in the countries where they were widespread, their contact with the Jews and with these doctrines, the influence of the latter on their ideas and on certain details of their systems seem unmistakable to us ”(80).Undoubtedly, the connections which one wanted to establish between the two doctrines are not always happy: sometimes the texts are forced and Plato is too Christianized. "These reservations made, the propagation in the ancient world of Hebrew traditions and doctrines, the passage of Greek philosophers in the countries where they were widespread, their contact with the Jews and with these doctrines, the influence of the latter on their ideas and on certain details of their systems seem unmistakable to us ”(80).Undoubtedly, the connections which one wanted to establish between the two doctrines are not always happy: sometimes the texts are forced and Plato is too Christianized. "These reservations made, the propagation in the ancient world of Hebrew traditions and doctrines, the passage of Greek philosophers in the countries where they were widespread, their contact with the Jews and with these doctrines, the influence of the latter on their ideas and on certain details of their systems seem unmistakable to us ”(80).the passage of the Greek philosophers in the countries where they were widespread, their contact with the Jews and with these doctrines, the influence of the latter on their ideas and on certain details of their systems seem to us unmistakable ”(80).the passage of the Greek philosophers in the countries where they were widespread, their contact with the Jews and with these doctrines, the influence of the latter on their ideas and on certain details of their systems seem to us unmistakable ”(80).

With Stoicism at the end of the fourth century BC, it was the Semitic spirit that entered Athens, where the ground had been prepared by the tendency of previous schools of philosophy to increasingly favor the moral on metaphysics. This tendency was perfectly suited to the moralism of the Semites. Hellenic thought, such as we find echoes of it in Aristotle, was essentially objective. Under the impetus of the Phoenician Zeno, Socratic subjectivism, which had fed on Heraclitean relativism and the pragmatism of the sophists, intensified and, for the first time on Hellenic soil, the moral conscience of the individual became the center and the starting point for everything. "This point of view, with the various ideas which are concomitant to it, such as the abstract duty, the feeling of guilt,introspection, the feeling of lack, moral instruction, is what we know in the Psalms of David and subsequently in the writings of Saint Paul… ”(81).

Stoicism also betrays Semitic influences, more precisely Chaldean, in its physics and its cosmology. It was in Chaldea that astronomy and astrology were born. The Chaldeans, by observing and studying the sidereal universe, had noticed certain coincidences between terrestrial phenomena and the revolution of the stars and were not long in recognizing a divine necessity in them. They drew from it the idea of ​​the divine character of the stars and their fatal influence on events and on human life. . In its astronomical aspect, the idea of ​​fatality passed into Greek thought in the form of the philosophical concept of heimarmene; in its astrological aspect, it constituted the divinatory art.

Heraclitus was the first to define heimarmene . "For him, theheirmarméné is either a principle of becoming, a cosmic law, or the divine logos which, by penetrating everything, governs the universe. For the Atomists, Leucippus and Democritus, it is presented as a mechanical necessity which drives the atoms from which everything is made. For Pythagoras and Empedocles, it takes on the mythical aspect of an infernal and wicked goddess and the philosophical aspect of a harmonious and constitutive force of the cosmos ... It is with the Stoics that determinism became the central idea of a system. Zénon, Cléanthe, Chrysippe conceived the heimarménélike a structure of the world, a knot of causes which bind beings together in an immutable order, or like a force, a tension, a vital and divine breath which presides over the organization of the whole down to the smallest detail. It is a necessity from which no one can escape, neither the god, nor man, nor the world ”(82). The cult of the stars “does not come from Greece, but from the East where it was formed from the combination of Chaldeanism and the religion of the Magi after the conquest of Babylon by Cyrus. The celestial world is organized on the type of the court of the Achaemenids: the universe is dominated by a great king with his satellites and his intermediaries. This court, this "kingdom of heaven" becomes the Stoic City. Ten years after the death of Alexander (June 10, 323), Zeno of Cyprus arrived in Athens, son of Manasseh, a characterized Semite.He is influenced by Crates, but rejects the cynical city of Besace and the return to the life of the animals. Cynical nihilism through it becomes something positive: the suppressed homeland expands into cosmopolitanism; it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of heaven led by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a "City of the World". Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure… ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and in the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).but rejects the cynical city of Besace and the return to the life of animals. Cynical nihilism becomes through it something positive: the suppressed homeland expands into cosmopolitanism; it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of the sky directed by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a “City of the World”. Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure… ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and in the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).but rejects the cynical city of Besace and the return to the life of animals. Cynical nihilism becomes through it something positive: the suppressed homeland expands into cosmopolitanism; it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of the sky directed by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a “City of the World”. Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure… ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and in the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).Cynical nihilism becomes through it something positive: the suppressed homeland expands into cosmopolitanism; it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of the sky directed by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a “City of the World”. Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure… ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and in the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).Cynical nihilism through it becomes something positive: the suppressed homeland expands into cosmopolitanism; it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of heaven led by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a "City of the World". Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure… ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and in the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of the sky directed by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a “City of the World”. Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure ... ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).it is the resumption of the old Chaldéopersic conception of a government of the sky directed by the superior god and his assessors, the idea of ​​a “City of the World”. Greek morality combines in this Semitic Cypriot with Eastern mysticism, philosophy with the fatalistic astrology of Chaldea. The Stoic independence of the sage has an oriental allure… ”(83) Moreover, in the first century BC and in the first century AD, Stoicism had many eminent astrologers (for example, Manilius, born in North Africa ; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).in the first century BCE and the first century CE, Stoicism had many prominent astrologers (e.g., Manilius, born in North Africa; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).in the first century BCE and the first century CE, Stoicism had many prominent astrologers (e.g., Manilius, born in North Africa; Chaeremon, an Egyptian priest).

In Hellenistic historiography, astrology, both "scientific" and divinatory, represented the "foreign wisdom" that the Greeks had borrowed from the ancient barbarian nations. “Astrology is an oriental religion, which, transplanted to Greece, a country of physicists and reasoners, has taken on the appearance of a science. Intelligible as a religion, it borrowed from astronomy principles, measures, arithmetic and geometric speculations, also intelligible, but proceeding from pure reason, and no longer from the complex mixture of feelings which is the practical reason of religions. Semitic. "(84)" It was in Greece that the oriental soul of astrology was provided with all its instruments of persuasion, armored itself with mathematics and philosophy."" It did not take much more than a century to transform Eastern astrology into Greek astrology, the latter infused into the former and still keeping, as a mark of origin, the name Chaldean or Egyptian "(85) . Introduced into the Greek world by the Chaldean priest Berosus, in the first third of the second century BC, Eastern astrology found there a favorable ground for its development, "a pre-existing layer of intellectual debris, of doctrines hastily built up, quickly pulverized. by the shock of other systems, and which, powerless to establish a scientific conception of the universe, nevertheless agreed to recognize certain general principles, withdrawn from the need for a demonstration by a kind of intrinsic evidence,rather vague, moreover, to serve to link together the most incoherent parts of astrology disguised as science. These principles can be reduced, in the end, to the one that contains them all, the idea of ​​the essential unity of the world and the mutual dependence of its parts ”. The precursors of Greek astrology - Thales, Anaximander, Pythagoras, Heraclitus, Empedocles, Plato, Aristotle - are all philosophers. There is no trace of astrology in Homer. The schools of philosophy did not show the less disdain for astrology, and it "would have been eliminated from the world of reasoning and reduced to the clientele of simple souls ... if it had not met allies and supporters of the Stoics. tireless collaborators, experienced in all the subtleties of dialectics,who had linked their cause to his and supplied it with arguments, answers, distinctions, loopholes. This alliance was concluded from the outset, when Berosus imported Chaldean dogmas into Greece and when Zeno founded the school of the Portico. Since then, the Stoics, dogmatic by nature and attached to their particular orthodoxy, neither wanted nor could deny systematized astrology, which was made largely of their doctrines ”(86). The introduction to Rome of the sciences of the East, more particularly those of Babylon and Chaldea "only increased the superstitions of the crowd and the hazardous speculations of the sages. Until then, astrology had only had for food philosophical disputes and the unintelligent faith of the vulgar ”(87).The role of Stoicism consisted in making astrology lose its sulphurous character by shaping it and providing it with rational dogmas, in order to sell it to the ruling classes. It was Posidonios who made astrology respectable in Rome. “Under the guarantee of such a renowned scholar, who had, as a teacher, the clientele of the Roman aristocracy, the people of the world, until then defiant or indifferent, could admit to being adepts of astrology. Once in fashion, the curiosity of dilettantes aroused a crowd of practitioners who no longer wanted to have anything in common with the Chaldeans of the crossroads, people who were experts in handling numbers and geometric figures and who again claimed the title. of mathematicians, fallen into escheat since the disappearance of the Pythagorean schools. »From the first century BC,“… Astrological ideas were beginning to enter the mundane circulation, to slip into the intellectual baggage of minds of average culture. They entered it, astronomy and astrology mingled, through literature, where the catasterisms multiplied to satiety by the Alexandrians, the descriptions of the sky in the fashion of Aratus appeared to the Romans to be quite new subjects and stimulated their restive imagination; they entered it especially, and by a wider opening, when the encyclopedist of the time, Varro, and his contemporary P. Nigidius Figulus, fervent follower of all the occult sciences, had made available to the general public the main rules of the art of mathematicians. The comet which appeared at the death of Caesar must have greatly hastened the propaganda ”(88). Under the principate of Augustus, astrology was fashionable.It became fashionable to be told fortune-tellers using thebabylonii numeri or by mathematici . Later, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Caracalla, Septimius Severus were followers of astrological consultations, while being aware of the subversive character of astrology, which appears clearly in the episode of The War of the Jews where the erroneous interpretation of a heavenly phenomenon by the Jews contributes to the outbreak of the Jewish revolt against Rome. The idea that political power was in relation to the course of the stars imposed itself on most emperors (89).

The Greeks were not unaware that there were civilizations older than theirs and that philosophy in general came to them from people they called barbarians. One of them was the Indian civilization, which the Greeks knew more or less vaguely before the conquest of part of India by the armies of Alexander. Greece had very early communications with India by the ways of Syria and Persia. The relations between the inhabitants of Ionia and those of the countries situated in the east of Asia Minor were so frequent and numerous that a permanent exchange of ideas cannot be excluded between these Greeks and the Indians who lived then in Persia. The first Greek authors to speak of India are Herodotus, Hecataeus of Miletus, Ctesias of Cnidus and Scylax of Caryanda;the last three actually went there, as did other Greek historians and geographers later. Diogenes Laërte says of Democritus: "there are those who assure us that he went to the Indies, that he conversed with Gymnosophists [gymnosophistoi]" (90). Hippolyte: “Democritus, son of Damasippus, [conversa] with the Gymnosophists among the Indians. "(91) Pyrrhon d'Elis, the founder of the skeptical school, followed Anarxaque, his teacher," among the gymnosophists of India and the magi, from which he drew his remarkable philosophy, introducing the idea that one cannot know any truth, and that one must suspend judgment… ”(92) A priori, it is therefore not surprising that there are similarities between certain teachings of Indian philosophy and certain theories of Greek philosophy. The main ones are monism,supposed to be common to Vedanta and, for example, to Heraclitus and Thales; atomism, considered to be the work of the Vaisheshika school of philosophy and, for example, of Democritus of Abdera; the doctrine of transmigration, supposedly common to the Samkhya and, for example, to Pythagoras, Plato and Empedocles; in general, "the analogies between the Samkhya and Pythagorean philosophy are obvious" (93); and, as, on the one hand, all the Indian philosophical doctrines had preceded the Greek philosophies in which some of their elements were found and, on the other hand, Greek philosophers had visited India, while no philosopher Indian had visited Greece, it was logical to deduce that Indian philosophy had influenced Greek philosophy,unless they had developed independently of each other. From the resemblances to which we have just alluded and which concern questions of a physical and metaphysical order, it is appropriate to pass to the similarities in the field of morality, since this study concerns the influence of philosophy on the destruction of Greek religion and politics. Two Indian schools of philosophy are involved. The first is that of Charvaka, named after its founder; its followers are “wandering dialecticians, who sell their advice to individuals and princes. Slingers with regard to traditional religion, they do not believe in the validity of moral rules either. They discover and use the relativity of both things and opinions;they excel at pleading pros and cons with equal skill. Some are only rhetoricians; others are the ancestors of logicians; others have metaphysical dogmas of materialist appearance: these people who, admitting only what is perceived, take the empirical world for absolute reality ... All do not present themselves as skeptics, but even those who display certainties are like the skeptics of the title of deniers, Nâstikas, in that they despise and mock virtue or piety ”(94); the Greek sophists are their counterpart. The second is that of the gymnosophists: “Onesicrite reports that Alexander sent him to the sophists to confer with them. This prince was told that they were naked, that they practiced enduring fatigue, that they enjoyed great consideration,that they did not come at the invitation of anyone, but that they were obliged to go to their homes when they wished to attend their exercises or their talks. According to this information, Alexander, judging that it was neither convenient for him to go to them, nor to force them, against their customs, to come to him, sent them Onesicrite. This one found at 20 stadia of the city fifteen naked men, some standing, others sitting or lying in various postures: each of them remained motionless in the same position until the end of the day, and then returned to the city. What seemed most painful to Onesicrite was to be constantly exposed to the sun, the ardor of which was so strong, that no one could hardly walk barefoot on the ground during the middle of the day. He conversed with one of those Brachmans named Calanus,the same who followed Alexander to Persia, and who ended his days by burning himself at a stake, according to the custom of his country. He was then lying on stones. Onesicrites approached him and, after having greeted him, told him that he was sent by the king to hear their wise speeches and to report them to him; that he was ready to listen to him, if nothing prevented him from granting him this favor. Calanus, seeing that Onesicrite was wearing a cloak and had his head covered with a hat and his feet shod, at first mocked him; then he gave her [a speech]. After this speech, Calanus proposed to Onesicrite, if he wanted to listen to him, to undress, and to lie down naked on the same stones [as him]. Onesicrite finding himself greatly embarrassed by such a proposal, Mandanis, the oldest and most educated of the Brachmans, spoke.He first reproached Calanus for the insolent manner in which he had treated the stranger, especially after having himself censured the insolence; then he made Onesicrite approach, and spoke to him in these terms: “Besides, all my speeches tend to prove that the best precepts are those which deliver the groin from the charms of pleasure and the attacks of pain; that this is very different from pain, for the latter is the friend of man, instead of pain being his enemy; that we exercise our body to give more vigor to our soul, and put ourselves in a position to appease the dissensions of men, by giving them, in public or in particular, all kinds of salutary advice ”” (95). Here we find a number of cynical ideas: the achievement of apathy through exercise and deprivation, life conforming to nature,contempt for tradition, shamelessness and a class of wise men entitled to receive gifts from others and not to exercise manual labor (96).

Some "Indians, ..., says Herodotus, are nomads and eat the pulpits raw; they are called Padeans: they put into practice, it is said, the customs: when one of their own is sick, if it is a man, his closest friends kill him, saying that if they let him consume by evil, his flesh would be lost to them; He thinks to deny that he is ill, his friends who do not share his opinion kill him and make him dear. The consumption of "raw flesh" was also attributed to cynics.

The reason the cynics adopted a distinctive costume seems to be related to their claim to form a distinct class of "sages" with special privileges. However, it was contrary to Greek traditions to claim the status of sage (97) and, before the appearance of the cynics, there was no class of “wise” in Greece. It is probable that this idea of ​​a fully-fledged class of "sages" originated from India, where, as has just been indicated, the gymnosophists formed one. The gymnosophists, like the Charvakas, in India preceded the cynics in Greece, so that the influence, if there was one, could only be exerted from east to west. No cynic, except Onesicrite, would have visited India. However, Diogenes, because he was originally from Sinope,a city situated on the road between India and Greece, was well placed to obtain information from Indian travelers and traders passing through it on the customs and ideas of their country.

Philosophy was originally foreign to the Greeks and Romans, and likewise most philosophers

were of foreign origin.

The founders and the first apostles of the new sect were indeed foreigners, who came from very diverse countries, which, for the most part, were Semitic colonies. The Milesian school takes its name from the Ionian city of Miletus, where Thales, Anaximander and Anaximene originated. Geographical origin is one thing, ethnic origin is another. The coastal towns of Asia Minor had ethnic Greek minorities. If the extraction of Anaximander and Anaximenes is unknown, Thales, according to Herodotus and Clement of Alexandria, was however "of Phoenician descent"; that he could have been a Milesian by birth, as Diogenes Laërte asserts, does not change anything. It was in Ionia that "the old blood, the old Aegean spirit had survived best" (98).The physical type of the Aegans gives a precise idea of ​​their racial pedigree: “the color of the skin of the men is red-brown, some of them have straight noses and yet aquiline or eagle noses are not uncommon; Their hair is curly ”(99). Xenophanes, born in Colophon in Ionia, would be, according to Plato, the founder of the Eleatic school, which takes its name from Elea, a former Phoenician counter in southern Italy, where this philosopher would have settled after the invasion of Ionia by the Persians. Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy of modern materialism (100).“Men's skin color is red-brown, some of them have straight noses, and yet aquiline or eagle noses are not uncommon; Their hair is curly ”(99). Xenophanes, born in Colophon in Ionia, would be, according to Plato, the founder of the Eleatic school, which takes its name from Elea, a former Phoenician counter in southern Italy, where this philosopher would have settled after the invasion of Ionia by the Persians. Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy of modern materialism (100).“Men's skin color is red-brown, some of them have straight noses, and yet aquiline or eagle noses are not uncommon; Their hair is curly ”(99). Xenophanes, born in Colophon in Ionia, would be, according to Plato, the founder of the Eleatic school, which takes its name from Elea, a former Phoenician counter in southern Italy, where this philosopher would have settled after the invasion of Ionia by the Persians. Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy to modern materialism (100).Xenophanes, born in Colophon in Ionia, would be, according to Plato, the founder of the Eleatic school, which takes its name from Elea, a former Phoenician counter in southern Italy, where this philosopher would have settled after the invasion of Ionia by the Persians. Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy to modern materialism (100).Xenophanes, born in Colophon in Ionia, would be, according to Plato, the founder of the Eleatic school, which takes its name from Elea, a former Phoenician counter in southern Italy, where this philosopher would have settled after the invasion of Ionia by the Persians. Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy to modern materialism (100).Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy to modern materialism (100).Before Leucippe de Millet - the founder of the atomist school - and Democritus of Abdera - his pupil -, the philosophical doctrine according to which matter is formed of atoms was developed by Phoenician Mochos of Sidon, whose cosmogony does not has nothing to envy to modern materialism (100).

The principal broker of the ideas of Eastern doctrines in Attica is Pherecides of Syros, whose views, drawn largely from the Asian source, exerted a notable influence on Hellenic mythology. He had attempted to explain and systematize Greek theogony with the help of naturalistic conceptions. The religious character offered by the doctrines of Pherecydes is found in those of a large number of Greek philosophers of the same period. Corax, the inventor of rhetoric, was Sicilian. Athens, Smyrna and Ephesus were the main Sophistic centers, but the overwhelming majority of those traditionally included among the early Sophists came to Athens from Asia Minor: from Byblos, Gadara, Tire, Emesa, Tarsus, of Tyana, of Side, of Perge, of Aphrodisias, of Thyatira, of Cnidus, of Nicomedia,Amastris, Périntes, Ainos, Larissa. Protagoras was originally from Abdera, where he "was a disciple of the Magi ..." (101), "fanatic worshipers of Mithres, Ormuz and Arimane, who completely sacked the temples of other gods and who had engaged the kings from Persia to burning those of Ionia and Attica… ”(102); Gorgias of Sicily; Anaxagora, from Asia Minor. The members of the second sophistry were Syrians. The sophists often put forward their uprooting. Aristippus boasted of being "a stranger everywhere". Some distinguished sophists, like Gorgias, came to Athens as ambassadors; others went into exile there. Uprooted, they were nomads and, like all nomads left to fend for themselves in countries which, unlike modern republics, neither assist them nor subsidize them,they sold wind: "they wandered from town to town, welcomed everywhere, escorted everywhere by a large number of disciples who, jealous of rising to the top places by the aid of eloquence, paid dearly for their lessons, and 'supplied after them with general notions and commonplaces' (103). The custom of giving private lessons for a salary had been introduced by Corax of Syracuse, who was passed for the inventor of rhetoric; the use of teaching publicly was introduced by the Sophists.The custom of giving private lessons for a salary had been introduced by Corax of Syracuse who passed for the inventor of rhetoric; the use of teaching publicly was introduced by the Sophists.The custom of giving private lessons for a salary had been introduced by Corax of Syracuse, who was passed for the inventor of rhetoric; the use of teaching publicly was introduced by the Sophists.

The cynics were also mostly foreigners. The founder of the sect, Antisthenes, was the son of an Athenian and a Thracian slave. He taught in the Cynosarge, a gymnasium dedicated to Hercules and reserved for the education of bastards. Deprived, like his cronies, of Athenian nationality because of his birth, he was predisposed to cosmopolitanism and indifference to questions of rank and status. Diogenes, as we have already mentioned, was from Sinope, from where his father, a crooked banker, was banished. Diogenes of Sinope, according to tradition, had not landed in Greece, where they had both been exiled, that the oracle of Delphi, where he had gone, ordered him to "paracharattein nomisma", that is - that is to say to "change (falsify) the currency" in the proper sense and to "change (falsify) the laws,customs ”in the figurative sense (104). At the end of his life, he was reportedly captured by pirates, who took him to the island of Crete and sold him to a wealthy Corinthian named Xeniades. His disciple, Monimus of Syracuse, would have been a slave, that - the world is small - of a banker; Bion of Borysthenes (325-255 BCE) was the son of a prostitute and a freedman, a salt fish merchant; the latter, having committed indelicate, was sold as a slave to an orator who, on his death, bequeathed to Bion all his goods, which he sold, to come and do philosophy in Athens. Menippus, another of the many slaves who became philosophers, was born in Gadara in Coélé-Syria, just like, two centuries later, the poet Méléagre, who, a cynic before his time, declared: "May I be a Syrian, is there any wonder? O Stranger,we inhabit only one homeland, the world: one Chaos engendered all mortals. ".

Zeno was from Cition in the island of Cyprus. The Greeks, the oldest inhabitants of the city, had subsequently mingled a large Phoenician colony. The philosopher himself seems to have received the mocking nickname of "little Phoenician". "He begins in life by being a trafficker and until the end we see him dealing with these financial speculations for which the Phoenician race had a remarkable aptitude and an invincible propensity" His biographers indicate that his swarthy face exuded oriental asceticism . And like the master, the most illustrious of his disciples are Greeks from outside: Perseus was also born in Cition, Cleanthus in Assos in Troad, Ariston in Chio, Herillus in Carthage, Boethus in Sidon, Spherus in the edges of Borysthene, Diogenes the Babylonian on those of Tigris. Chrysippus in Soles in Cilicia.The successors of Chrysippus are Zeno of Sidon and Diogenes of Babylon; the latter had for disciple Antipater of Tarsus, master of Panetius of Rhodes, himself master of Posidonius of Apamea in Syria. To the list of Stoics from Tarsus we can add Nestor, Athenadorus, Cordylion, Heraclides. From Seleucia comes Diogenes; of Epiphany (today Hama in Syria) Euphrates; of Scythopolis Basilides; of Ascalon Antibius; of Tyr Antipater, etc. Thus, Greece proper is not represented in the school, except by some obscure third or fourth order characters. “We are looking in vain for an outstanding Stoic who is Athenian in heart and mind and that is understandable; the sense of moderation was to a too high degree the prerogative of this elite race ”(105). Epictetus was most likely of Jewish origin (106).As for the Manual of Epictetus, it was taken up almost literally, in a Christianized form, in the service of monastic asceticism ”(107).

This "elite race", which, due to more and more mixtures, was no longer one, opposed a resistance to philosophy and its by-products which was virile only among the best of its elements. . The Presocratics had been for the most part influential political actors, combining an ethereal and abstruse contemplation of the cosmos with a very marked political commitment (108), so much so that, at the end of the fifth and the beginning of the fourth century, they began to be severely criticized. First, the scientific studies of cosmologists were criticized for focusing on distant phenomena and leading to theories which are not verifiable. Then, to respond in no way to the needs of society and to be useless for the education of the citizen. Finally,it was argued that the theories of the philosophers were ungodly and contrary to traditional values ​​(109). The ancients regarded atheists, that is to say those who did not recognize the divinities who were the object of public worship, "as so many poisoners, enemies and destroyers of society" (110). During the fifth century BC, several philosophers publicly declared themselves atheists. Diagoras de Melos, a freed slave, disciple of Democritus, was decreed to be captured by the Athenians and, as he had fled in the meantime, a price was placed on his head. Theodore of Cyrene, disciple of Protagoras of Abdera and tutor of Plato, was banished and died in exile assassinated by Athenian agents. Protagoras of Abdera was also banished and his books were burned in public. An Athenian,Sophocles of Sounion, proposed a law prohibiting the creation of a philosophical school without the express authorization of the Athenian Assembly on pain of death (111).

“All the philosophers had to flee Athens, but they returned the following year, when a Peripatetician, Philo, accused Sophocles' law of illegality, [considering it a violation of the freedom of religious association] (112) and won the case ”(113). Athens thus again became the only home port where philosophers and rhetoricians felt safe in the Greco-Roman world, where there were fewer and fewer avenues to rise up against their unpatrioticism and their impiety. Most statesmen, “unless they had spent their whole life in the camps, were educated in the schools of the philosophers… Philosophy had become a need for well-educated people. The philosophers were then considered the best orators, and usually employed for this reason by the Athenians,to embassies and other affairs ”(114). Against the astrologers, the emperors, starting from Tiberius, promulgated edicts and they drove them out of Rome. “Already, half a century earlier, at a time when the imminence of the foreseen conflict between Antoine and Octave overexcited the imaginations, Agrippa had driven astrologers and magicians from the city. At the end of his reign, Augustus had forbidden all kinds of diviners to consult behind closed doors or concerning death, even without closed doors. Persecuted, the astrologers immediately became interesting people, and, even expelled from Italy, they could be consulted by correspondence. It was thus that the most frivolous women, the most incapable of understanding even the rudiments of astrology, fell in love with the great suspect art in the police. They do not give up their other superstitions,said Juvenal, but it is in the Chaldeans that they have the most confidence. Faced with this general training, the jurisconsults applied or allowed to sleep, depending on the case, the repressive laws. (115) Women, of course, also fell in love with philosophy, particularly the courtesans; there were even some who did philosophy. Cato, who rightly feared that art and intellectualism would soften his compatriots, was the last Roman statesman who showed prejudice towards the philosophers: he had two Greek philosophers who had been sent to embassy in Rome.(115) Women, of course, also fell in love with philosophy, particularly the courtesans; there were even some who did philosophy. Cato, who rightly feared that art and intellectualism would soften his compatriots, was the last Roman statesman who showed prejudice towards the philosophers: he had two Greek philosophers who had been sent to embassy in Rome.(115) Women, naturally, also fell in love with philosophy, particularly the courtesans; there were even some who did philosophy. Cato, who rightly feared that art and intellectualism would soften his compatriots, was the last Roman statesman who showed prejudice towards the philosophers: he had two Greek philosophers who had been sent to embassy in Rome.

“… Already,” he declared, “we have entered Greece and Asia, where one finds all the attractions of pleasure; we are already touching the treasures of kings - the more I fear that we do not get hold of these things, but that it is they who get hold of us. "
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(1) M. Viridet, Des Sophistes grecs , Geneva, 1843, p. 43.

(2) It goes without saying that none of these philosophical systems was entirely false; and even, for some, they included lessons in conformity with reality; for example, the Pythagorean idea that the union which was formed between a soul and a body, far from being the result of a fortuitous competition, had as its foundation the convenience of the soul and the joined body, unfortunately mixed with conceptions very close to the Eastern doctrine of reincarnation, the racist theory of traditional orientation formulated by J. Evola. The doctrines of the philosophers were a mixture of right and wrong. It must be understood that it is not a question here of judging the value of this or that philosophical system in itself,but of the influence which the various philosophical doctrines of Greco-Roman antiquity had as key ideas on the traditional Hellenic spirit, on the field of politics and manners as well as to determine the race of the spirit in which they germinated.
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(8) Today, € 8,500 of retirement benefits per year are granted by the so-called “secular” French Republic to any foreign resident who has never worked in France under the solidarity allowance for the elderly ”; any Algerian parent residing in France can receive family allowances for their children, born in Algeria, who decide to join them, even if the children in question have entered France without any family reunification procedure, etc. [ <http://www.observatoiredessubventions.com/2011/des-etrangers-peuvent-toucher-une-retraite-en-france-sans-avoir-jamais-cotise/> ; <http://www.defrancisation.com/allocations-familiales-incroyable-decision-qui-favorise-immigration/>] This is hardly to be overstated, given the growing number of, let's say not leaders, but politicians and officials who are themselves of foreign origin. In Noir Chirac (2002), François-Xavier Verschave indicated that the employees of the town hall of Paris were half of foreign origin at the time.

(9) In The Laws , on the contrary, he recognizes property and the family, but the restrictions he places on these concessions almost empty them of all substance: property does not belong to the individual, but to the State, it is forbidden for women to bring a dowry into the household

(10) “The God of Christians… is that of a cosmopolitanism with egalitarian aims. In Aristotle, the link which suspends the World from the Divinity is a law of finality, not a law of love, as Christianity wills it: for this attraction is not and cannot be reciprocal, and God is not a father, and men, whom he did not create, do not have to treat each other as brothers ”. Charles Labo,Aristotle , Paris, Mellottée, 1922, p.33.

(11) Ibid., P. 36-37. “God, in Aristotle, is essentially finished. For us moderns, on the contrary, Infinity is the height of Perfection and the divine attribute par excellence. Now, this opposition of Perfection and infinity ceased and their union began in Plotinus (III century AD). But the Bible, Philo the Jew (1st century BC and AD) and Numenius had prepared this change, while the Neopythagoreans and Plutarch (IP century AD) delayed it ” (H. Guyot, Les réminiscences de Philon le Juif chez Plotin; critical study , Paris, F. Alcan, 1906, p. V)

From Thales to Democritus, the philosophers hesitate between the Infinity of the First Principle and the determination of the First Principle: Anaximander of Miletus - who is the first to introduce the term infinity into speculation - and Anaximenus of Milet declare that the First Principle is infinite (air), while Heraclitus, after having declared that the first and only substance is intelligent, limited and mobile fire, substituted it for water, for the indeterminate and for the air of the Milesians. The eleatic school accuses even more than the Ionian philosophy the hesitation between the determination and the infinity of the first principle. With Thais and the first Pythagoreans, Parmenides and Philolaos, Empedocles and Democritus, the first principle is determined; infinity is imperfection itself. In a second period, from Plato to the Stoics,perfection and infinity are opposed and, in this, it is still something of the Hellenic spirit that subsistsnolens volens among these philosophers. However, a reaction was brewing which filled the first epoch with the Doctrines of Anaxagoras and his successors seen in this aspect. Then, the Skeptics will again reject the spirits towards the Absolute and the Indeterminate by invalidating the value of the understanding. Finally, a higher notion of the Divinity will be formed with a Seneca, a Musonius Rufus, an Epictetus, a Marcus Aurelius. Philo will then introduce into Greek speculation the Jewish notion, if not of Infinity, at least of divine Indeterminacy; but - we must admit - this speculation was prepared to receive this notion ”. ( ibid . p. 32)

(12) Ibid ., p. 71.

(13) Ibid ., P. 72.

(14) Ibid ., P. 74.

(15) Ibid .

(16) Ibid ., P. 79.

(17) Ibid .

(18) See Werner Jaeger, Paidea , Oxford University Press, vol. 1, p. 5.

(19) Charles Labo, op. cit ., p. 81-82.

(20) H. Ritter, C.-J. Tissot, History of Philosophy , Paris, Ladrange, vol. 3, 1835, p. 346-47.

(21) Justin, Complete Works , VII. 1, 1; according to this historian, the primitive population of Macedonia was Pelasgian; According to Herodotus, the Pelasgians who lived in the region of Pindus called themselves Macedonians.

(22) Iliad , IX, 529-533.

(22) H. Ritter, C.-J. Tissot, ., p. 4.op. cit ., p. 347.

(23) Ibid .

(24) Ibid ., P. 351.

(25) Ibid ., P. 352.

(26) Diogenes Laërte, VI, 72.

(27) Farrand Sayre, The Greek Cynics , 1948, p. 3.

(28) Jacques Fontanille, Le cynisme: du sensible au la risible , <http://www.unilim.fr/pages_perso/jacques.fontanille/textes-pdf/Acynisme.pdf> .

(29) Farrand Sayre, op. cit

(30) In fact, cynical asceticism does not "consist in depriving oneself of what one considers to be desirable, but in considering as undesirable what one appropriates to satisfy one's needs: immediate conjunction with the with regard to valuables, rather than disjunction with respect to valuables. The essence of cynical asceticism will therefore consist, paradoxically, in a strategy for satisfying basic needs: food and sexual needs must be satisfied before they are transformed into desires. »D. Bertrand, Semiotics and humor , Z'éditions, 1993, p. 12.

(31) Farrand Sayre, op. cit ., p. 7.

(32) Pseud. Diog., Epist . 47, 1-6; M. Billerbeck, Epiktet. Von Kynismus, Brill, Leyden, 1978, p. 131.

(33) Diogène Laërte, VI., 29, in M. Clément, Le Cynisme à la renaissance d'Erasme à Montaigne , Geneva, Droz, 2005, p. 141.

(34) On the contrary, some authors, such as Seneca and Lucien de Samosate, describe cynics as relaxed and lazy individuals.

(35) Heracles is most likely a figure of Semitic origin. It should be noted that dogs were sacrificed to him in Tire. See V. Bérard, On the Origin of Arcadian Cults , Paris, Thoruin & Fils, Editeurs, 1894, p. 268 sq.

(36) WD Desmond, Cynics , Berkeley, University of California Press, 2008, p. 153-54. This did not prevent cynics from viewing traditional athlete exercises as "unnecessary ponoi ”.

(37) Stephen Benko, Pagan Rome and the Early Christians , Bloomington, Indiana University Press, 1985, p. 48. <http://www.abbaye-saint-benoit.ch/saints/basile/homelies/016.htm>

(38) Michel Soëtard, Valeurs dans le stoïcisme : du Portique à nos jours , Presses Universitaires de Lille, 1993, p. 86-87.

(39) Jules Bourque, Humor and Philosophy: From Socrate to Jean-Baptiste Botul , Paris, L'Harmattan, p. 33; see also Epictetus, Encheiridion , 46-47 ; Plutarch, Custom of the Spartans , 233, 16.

(40) Basil of Caesarea, Panegyric of the martyr Gordius , 253-254,; according to Gregory of Nazianze, Basil of Caesarea had the same appearance. The resemblances between the two sects were not only formal. Several Fathers of the Church, including Jerome and Gregory of Nazianze, did not hide their admiration for cynics. The second, after having listened to the cynical adventurer Maximus, recognized that, "under a foreign guise, his philosophy was that of the Christians" (Or., XXV., In PG 35, 1197-1226).

(41) WD Desmond, op. cit., p. 219.

(42) The most virulent critics of Christianity in antiquity, such as Lucien, Aelius Aristide and the Emperor Julian, hardly made the difference between the cynics and the members of the various Christian sects; in fact, cynics, such as Peregrinus and Maximus Hero, converted to Christianity; Lucien attributes the authorship of many Christian books to Peregrinus. (R. Bracht Branham, M-.O Goulet-Cazé, The Cynics: The Cynic movement in Antiquity and its Legacy, Berkeley, University of California Press, 1996, p. 19) In the “Middle Ages”, Christian authorities like Thomas Aquinas (Summa Theologiae II.Q 186 A.3), James the Great and John of Wales cited the cynics with approval. For the good mouth, a play on words on the Latin name of the Dominicans (domini canes) makes them “dogs of God”.

(43) Iason Xenakis, Epictetus: Philosopher-Therapist, 1969, The Hague, Martinus Nijhoff,

1969, p. 120.

(44) R. Bracht Branham and M-.O Goulet-Cazé, op. cit., p.111.

(45) Marcus Aurelius, Marcus Aurelius Antoninus to himself: an English translation with introductory study on stoicism and the last of the Stoics, translated by Gerald H. Rendall. London, Macmilan, 1898, p. 18.

(46) P. Garnsey, Ideas of Slavery from Aristotle to Augustine, Cambridge, Cambrige University Press, 1996, p. 132.

(47) See H. Ritter and C.-J. Tissot, op. cit., p. 476-77.

(48) Alexandre d'Aphrodise, Du Mixture, 225.1-2, in P.-M. Morel, Epicurus: nature and reason, Vrin, 2009, p. 55-56.

(49) See H. Ritter and C.-J. Tissot, op. cit., p. 483-84.

(50) H. Ritter and C.-J. Tissot, op. cit., p. 486. (55) Robert Muller, The Stoics: Liberty and World Order, Vrin, p. 108.

(51) Jean Joël Duhot, La Conception stoïcienne de la causalité, Vrin, 1989, p. 244.

(52) Plutarch, from stoic. repugn., c. 22.

(53) P. Garnsey, op. cit., p. 142.

(54) Michel Soëtard, op. cit., p. 13-14.

(56) Antiphon says: “For long ago… when the Earth, our mother, set apart the race of mortals, she formed us all to have the same appearance. It is indisputable that in the portico one learned to consider all men as linked by a common bond of kinship to nature and to universal reason, to condemn for the same reason between members of the same nation any distinction of castes, finally, to make no difference, at least in theory, between the laws of barbarian countries and those of Hellenic countries. »(G. Huit, The Greek Origins of Stoicism, Paris, A. Fontemoing, 1900 p. 9).

(57) WW Capes, Stoicism, London, Society for promoting Christian knowledge; New York, Pott, Young, & co. p. 17-18.

(58) Joseph d 'Avenel (baron), Le Stoïcsme et les stoïciens, General Society of Catholic Bookstores, 1886, p. 96. (59) Victor Hébert-Duperron, Essay on polemics and philosophy by Clément d'Alexandrie, A. Durrand, 1865. p. 90. (60) Ibid., P. 90. (61) LFA Maury, op. cit., p. 8-9. (62) Arthur Kemp, Genetic Evidence for racial mixing in Ancient Greece , <http://www.solargeneral.org/wp-content/uploads/library/genetic-evidence-for-racial-mixing-in-ancient-greece.pdf> .

(59) See A.-S. Morin, Examen du Christianisme, Degorge-Cadot, 1865.

(63) The theory of the invasion of Greece by peoples of Indo-European origin in the second millennium BC, built and extolled in the nineteenth century, is no longer relevant, no doubt in part to because of the fact that it was also extolled by various German racists in the first half of the twentieth century, but also because the archaeological finds, at least those which are published and made available to the general public, would not have made it possible to establish it. A 1943 study of the skulls and bones found at the Agora, however, made it possible to establish the appearance of new elements in this region around 1100 BC (Demargne Pierre, Bulletin d'archéologique. Civilizations préhelléniques (1939-1945). In Revue des Études Grecques, t. 58, fasc. 274-278, 1945 [p. 228-267] In general, the opposition of spirit,culture and religion between the Greeks and the other peoples of the Homeric period is clearly the sign of racial opposition, without for that it is necessary to deduce from it that the Greeks of the Homeric period formed peoples of pure race. A. de Gobineau saw it clearly who, noting the opposition of character between Achilles and Ulysses, recognizes in the latter "the type of the hardened Greek of Phoenician; here is the man who would certainly name, in his genealogy, more Chanaanian mothers than Arian women. Courageous, but only when necessary, clever by preference, his tongue is golden, and any reckless who listens to him plead is seduced. No lie frightens him, no deceit embarrasses him, no perfidy costs him. He knows everything. " On the other hand,it is his Aryan blood which speaks in "His ease of comprehension ... astonishing ... his tenacity [without limits] in his projects". Essay on the inequality of human races, vol. 2, Paris, Firmin-Didot, 1853, p. 415.

(64) Arthur de Gobineau, op. cit., p. 419.

(65) Ibid., P. 402.

(66) Ibid., P. 423.

(67) Ibid., P. 424-25.

(68) LFA Maury, op. cit., vol. 4, p. 72.

(69) See G. Glotz, Ancient Greece at Work, Hildesheim, Georg Olms Verlag, 1987, p. 187.

(70) Ibid. p. 190.

(71) DS Richter, Cosmopolis, Oxford University Press, p. 57. (73) L. Ménard, Du polythéisme hellénie, Paris, Charpentier, 1863, - p. xxii-xxiii. (74) A. Laugel, Pythagore sa doctrine et son histoire, Revue des Deux Mondes, T.52, 1864, <https://fr.wikisource.org/wiki/Pythagore,_sa_doctrine_et_son_histoire_d%E2%80%99apr%C3%A8s_la_critique_allemande> .

(72) G. Glotz, op.cit ., Pp. 187-88.

(75) Victor Hébert-Duperron, op. cit., p. 93.

(76) Herodotus, IX, 34.

(77) Ibid. IX, 35.

(78) According to Lucius Junius Moderatus Columella, Agriculture, 7, 5, 17, it is to “Bolos de Mendes, illustrious author of Egyptian nationality, whose works [are] entitled in Greek Handmade works ”Who wrote the works which“ are falsely attributed to Democritus ”; “The representatives of this literature [among whom another Egyptian, Pélésis]… borrowed from the apocryphal books of the ancient Persians Zoroaster and Ostanes, of the Jew Dardanos, of the Phoenician Mochos or of the magician of Egypt Apollobéchès”; see J. Salem, Democritus: grains of dust in a ray of sunshine, Vrin, “Bibliothèque d'Histoire de la Philosophie”, 1996.

(79) Victor Hébert-Duperron, op. cit., p. 97-101.

(80) Ibid., P. 111. Along with this insidious influence, the Jews engaged in genuine anti-Athenian propaganda in Attica even from the beginning of the second century BC. In the texts written in Greek by the Jews of that time, the Greek gods were often described "not as less than nothing, but as evil demons that really existed - a belief which the early Church steadfastly nurtured and preached." “Even works intended for the Jewish public contain polemics against polytheism and attacks on pagan customs…” (see M. Radin, The Jews Among the Greeks and Romans, Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1915, chap. 11: “The Jewish propaganda”.

(81) Sir Alexander Grant, The Ethics of Aristotle: Illustrated with Essays and Notes, London, John W. Parker & Son, 1874.

(82) E. Nowak, The Christian in the Face of Suffering: Study on the Thought of John Chrysostom, Editions Beauchesne, 1973, p. 52-53.

(83) Recherches philosophiques, vol. 2, Boivin & cie, p. 538, 1933. In this context, it is not illegitimate to relate Stoic apatheia to the detachment shown by the Jews of the Diaspora towards the societies in which they live; see S. Žižek, The Puppet and the Dwarf: The Perverse Core of Christianity, Cambridge, MA, MIT Press, 2003, chap. 2; JP Charrier, The construction of the backworlds: La Philosophie Captive 1, L'Harmattan, 2011, chap. 4. In the same vein, it has been observed that the representation of the Babylonian rabbis is comparable in several respects to that of the sophists and rhetoricians of the second and third centuries AD, who were mostly from the party eastern part of the Roman Empire. Among the well-known sophists of the second century, there are Asiarchs and high priests.(Glen W. Bowersock,Greek Sophists in the Roman Empire , <http://www.wosco.org/books/Philosophy/Greek_Sophists_in_the_Roman_Empire.pdf> )

(84) Auguste Bouché-Leclercq, Les precurseurs de l'astrologie grecque , http: //www.mediterranee-antique .fr / Authors / Files / ABC / Bouche\_Leclercq / Astrologie / Grecque / Astrologie.htm .

(85) Ibid.

(86) Ibid.

(87) Ibid.

(88) Ibid.

(89) See Power, divination & predestination in ancient Rome, PUFC, 1999, p. 273.

(90) Diogenes Laërte, 9, 35.

(91) Hippolyte, Refutationes, 1.13.

(92) Diogenes Laërce, Pyrrhon (Isolated and Skeptics) ,<http://ugo.bratelli.free.fr/Laerce/IsolesSceptiques/Pyrrhon.htm>.

(93) See Alain Daniélou, History of India, Fayard, 1983.

(94) Paul Masson-Oursel, Philippe Stern, H. de Willman-Grabowska, Ancient India and Indian Civilization, La Renaissance du Livre, 1933 .

(95) Strabo, XV, 45. According to Apollonius of Tyana, there were other gymnosophists in Africa, on a mountain of Ethiopia; see François Sabbathier, Dictionary for the intelligence of classical, Greek and Latin authors, Paris, Delalain, 1776.

(96) Gymnosophistoi, or simply sophistoi, is the term by which the Greeks designated the philosophers of India; the question has still not been resolved, if even it has been approached, of knowing why this term, which had become pejorative in Greece since Plato had unmasked the fallacy in his Sophist (around 360 BC) and that Socrates was also opposed to the Sophists, was and never ceased to be applied by the Greeks to philosophers whom they extolled for the most part as models of wisdom. (98) HR Hall, Ancient History of the Near East, Meuthen & Company Limited, 1932, p. 79. (99) S. Wachsmann, Aegeans in the Theban Tombs, 1987, Peeters, Louvain, p. 41-42.

(97) Diogenes Laerce, 1, 28-33.

(100) Prophetically, he said: “Matter is made up of infinitesimal particles enveloped in much void. These particles are tomes rather than atoms. But disaggregated, these tomes produce a fire capable of burning a city ”).

(101) Philostrate, Vie des sophistes 1, 10.

(102) M. Viridet, op. cit., p. 31.

(103) M.-N. -S. Guillon, General history of ancient and modern philosophy, vol. 1, Paris, Depélafol, 1835.

(104) See David Rankin, Sophists, Socratics and Cynics, Routledge Revivals, 2014 (1st ed., Croom Helm Lmt, 1983), p. 230, Louisa Shea, The Cynic Enlightenment: Diogenes in the Salon, The John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2010, p. 9 and James Miller (ed.), Lives of the Eminent Philosophers: by Diogenes Laertius, translated by Pamela Mensch, Oxford University Press, 2018.

Paracharattein to nomisma is a play on words, because nomismameans both “currency” and “that which is established by usage, law, nomos”. It is significant that Diogenes the Cynic compared his philosophy to the “falsification of money”. Tradition reports that he or his father was actually guilty of this crime. According to one version, Diogenes would have been banished from his native city, Sinope, because his father, Hicésias, to whom the State had entrusted his money, would have falsified the currency ”(Diogenes Laërte, 6.20). According to another version, Diogenes' father entrusted him with state money and he would have falsified it, as a result of which his father would have been imprisoned and would have died in prison, while Diogenes would have taken the powder of escampette (cf. R. Bracht Branham, M.-O. Goulet-Caze, op. cit., p. 56).

In "De Ε apud Delphos", Plutarch reports that an inscription in the shape of an epsilon was engraved on the door of the temple of Delphi and gives several different explanations, which shows that it was no longer understood by his. time. According to him, it was necessary to look for its meaning, not in the form, but in the pronunciation of the letter: "e'i" (/ ej /), which is either a verbal form ("you are"), or a conjunction ( if). In any case, it is not insignificant that this inscription, on some of the coins and amulets where it was engraved in antiquity ( <http://www.john-uebersax.com/delphi/delphi1.htm>), looks like the Euro symbol and that the oracle of Delphi asked Diogenes to “paracharattein nomisma”, that is to say, literally, “to change (falsify) the currency” and, in the clean, "to change (falsify) laws, customs".

(105) C. Eight, op. cit. ; A. Fontemoing, 1900, p. 7.

(106) This extract from his Manual eloquently proves it: “Why claim to be a Stoic? He said to an individual who was not practicing. "Why fool the crowd? Why do you play the Jew when you are Greek? Don't you know why so-and-so is said to be a Jew, a Syrian, or an Egyptian? Usually, when you see someone being half this, half that, you say, He's not a Jew, but he's playing the Jew. It is only when a man takes the spirit of the baptized and the sectarian, that he is really a Jew, and that he is named after him. It is the same with us: we have not been baptized; we are Jews in name and not in fact. Our mind does not respond to our language… ”(Les interviews d'Épictète collected by Arrien, Didier & cie, 1862, p. 111).

(107) JP Migne, Patrologia Graeca 79, 1285.

(108) Evangeline Z. Lyons, Hellenic Philosophers as Ambassadors to the Roman Empire: performance, parrhesia, and power , <http://deepblue.lib.umich.edu/bitstream/2027.42/84456/1/ezl_1.pdf> .

(109) Michael Gagarin, The Oxford Encyclopedia of Ancient Greece and Rome, New York, Oxford University Press, 2010 vol. 1, p. 22.

(110) CF Nonnotte, Dictionnaire philosophique de la religion, t. 1, Besançon, Gauthier, 1818, p. 69.

(111) L. O'Sullivan, The Law of Sophocles and the Beginnings of Permanent Philosophical Schools in Athens, Rheinisches Museum für Philologie, 145, 2002, p. 251.

(112) Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, Antigonos von Karastos, Philologische Untersuchungen 4, Berlin, 1881, p. 271.

(113) Collective, Greek knowledge: critical dictionary, Flammarion, 1996, p. 239.

(114) H. Ritter and C.-J. Tissot, op. cit., p. 353.

(115) Auguste Bouché-Leclercq, Astrology in the Roman world , <http://www.mediterranee-antique.fr/Auteur/Fichiers/ABC/Bouche_Leclercq/Astrologie/Romaine/Astrologie.htm> .

A serious helping hand has been given to us by the Works of Denis Diderot in the clear exposition of the often confused doctrines of the philosophers and philosophical schools of antiquity and often made even more confused by their modern exegetes. For the sake of clarity, we have not hesitated to paraphrase it widely, the aim here not being to create a work of originality, but to expose the material as exactly as possible.