

고대 그리스 역사의 소개

스파르타

- ✓ **Instructor:** Prof. Donald Kagan
- ✓ **Institution:** LearnersTV
- ✓ **Dictated:** 강우리, 이병찬, 임보라, 박지영, 김지수

🔊 [0:00]

Before I start on the today's topic, which is 'A Greek Tyranny.'

I've been asked to say word on the subject well to answer the question really as best as I can.

If the hoplite fair line was so stunningly successful in the pretty of the sixth, fifth, fourth end of the centuries B.C.

Why was it that other people other than Greeks, once you came in contact with them, so when they were victimized by it, why didn't they adopt it?

But let me make it perfectly clear, like all the other interesting questions in this course, I cannot give you a firm answer.

I can only give you opinions.

But then whole subject now is so wonderfully more controversial than it was probably ever before in history because everything now in history that bears on the western world and its relationship with some other worlds is part of a Greek political assort by those people who are eager to pull down anything that seems to be admirable or special or positive about the past and I needed to say it really was bad, or to say wasn't so terrific or it didn't exist.

So that's the context in which not the student's question but the larger question getting kicked around these days.

Well I think part of the reason for unhappiness about it is I think the answer lies in the character precisely of the polis the fact that it had an ethos.

A set of values which placed so powerfully at the center of the mines of the citizens, the notion that the combination of a courage and a military setting which was the inheritance from [? 2:11] homo.

And the new ideology of devotion to the polis as the most important kind of



commitment that a citizen could have produced an attitude which was that it was the job of a man who was a citizen of polis beyond anything else to fight bravely in the wrath of his army.

And as it happened they developed, I think this latter part of the story is simply accidentally happened that they developed this technique which employ the weapons and defensive armors that they had and then because they had those things and because this ethos was present it was possible to put together this fighting unit which was the phalanx which depended so enormously heavily upon the commitment to the commonality to the common cause that was characteristic of the polis.

🔊 [3:20]

Now, every state of every kind, every people, every try they have some degree of this kind of commitment to one another or say they wouldn't exist as a unit but there are really very sharp differences of degree in terms of how powerfully this commitment really affects people.

You might even find that in the same you would find in the same people at different times in their history.

The power of this idea and this commitment and it's so beyond than idea, somehow should've really bread and train into the bones of every Greek man and polis beginning sometime I would say in the seven century or earlier and carrying for so long as polis remain autonomous and independent unit.

So if you look that Greeks against the Persians is the best case we have because the Greeks fought the Persians more than they fought other non-Greek people.

And the Persians were very formidable.

Let's remember the Persians had defeated every other power there was in the world that they knew and controlled and dominated a vast empire by anybody [? 4:40] standards and certainly by the standards by the worlds which they knew.

So for the Greeks to defeat the Persians there was nothing routine about that.

That was always going to be surprising and needing explanation.

So really a way to focus to questions that I'm addressing is how come the Persian didn't do it.

And there I think in that case the answer is not so very hard because the Persian empire was a composite unit made up of lots of places and vast numbers of people who had been conquered by the Persians.

And whose relationship to the great king of Persia was really in an almost technical sense that of slaves.



They needed to do, they had to do, they respected to do whatever the Persian king told them to do.

Now it was not fanatical and it is not make a request that typically were impossible for people to do.

In fact, the Persian rule over there conquered people was in many ways easier and more generous and less intrusive than other people's.

For instance, the realm of religion, the Persian did not bother, didn't interfere with people's exercise of religion those of you who have read book called old testament will remember that the Persian show up at important places and they get treated very nicely.

🔊 [6:08]

There are bad Persians too here or there.

But he gets put down.

But the Persian's treat and Persian were among the people who treated the Jews very well because they didn't care what the Jews did in their religious life.

So long as they did the two important and essential things of the Persian's required which was, you had to do military service for the king at his demand and you had to pay taxes.

If you did those things you may have no trouble that's all you had to worry about from the Persians.

Well, okay.

Why didn't the Persians then adopt it because the great part of their army wasn't Persian, even.

So the kinds of a reasons that's necessary for this kind of fighting wasn't motivated by most of these people

A second reason was the Persians themselves and their Aryan allies [? 07:01] them ease had achieved their success militarily as cavalymen and that was their nature, and that was what they practiced and elevated to the highest levels.

So that the best Persians fought in a cavalry.

They had infantry and some of their infantry was relatively very good.

But their wasn't that kind of all that matters in a polis basically I'm exaggerating only very slightly is how you fight in the infantry and it haply that question is so bad



because when we get to the story of Spartans, which comes after our story of the tyrants.

I'll read to you some of the poetry which was the material with which the Spartans were trained.

And you'll quickly see why the Greek ethos, the Greek feeling of absolute commitment voluntary absolute commitment even at the risk of your life for the polis was the central, most important force in society.

So the answer is essentially a moral commitment based upon training and a belief.

It's why the Greeks did this and plus historical accident of their having developed that technique.

It should be pointed out that there were people in the ancient of their east before the Greeks ever came to be anything who had closely ordered armed infantry soldiers, the Assyrians are a very good example.

But if you examine Assyrian fighting it's not quite same thing, as the Greek fighting.

And if I knew more about Assyrian fighting, I might be able to say still more but I don't know how much it's actually known in detail.

But there was obviously an element in Greek story which went beyond merely equipment and order and so on.

🔊[9:00]

It had to do what was in their heads.

And I think you know if you know about warfare in the in the modern world, even right today, so much of how what determines whether armies succeed or fail in their missions, has to do with what's in their head.

Every army, I think, let's say every good army even is good at certain things and they are trained and their culture prepares them if they are successful to do certain kinds of things.

If you take them and make them fight in a different way until they are able to make an adjustment which are sometimes never they can't fight with that same skill.

And so there was a very close union, I would say and I come back to say to smarter guy than I've said a long ago, there is a close connection between nature of the society that produces and uses the military force and the kind of fighting that military force can do.

I'm really just giving you a little ref on a tune written by [? 10:08] Eron Starbonback in his day when he connects closely the character, I think I mentioned it the other day,



the character of a regime and the character of the fighting.

I did tell you about that you know, it's going to be cavalry based, it's going to be aristocratic or [? 10:24]...

🔊[10:25]

If it's going to be knavery based, going to be democratic and so on, and so forth.

So I hope that it some help in dealing with that question.

Let's turn out precisely to this phenomenon which is Greek tyranny.

Tyranny emerged in a seventh century B.C. maybe it might...

No I think not anything before that.

And it emerges I would think for many of the same reasons and it responses of some of the same developments that I described for you in talking about the great burst of colonization that began in the eighth century in the Greek world.

All of those tumultuous troubling, changing forces that right working society right work, bringing about this new kind of regime which lasted from one to three generations among the Greeks before it faded away.

It was a transitional phase in Greek society rather than one that lasted for a terribly longtime.

But it was not trivial as I say in some cases one for three generations.

Okay, what is tyranny?

Let's begin with the word.

The word 'tyrannia' is tyranny the word 'tyrannous' is tyrant and etymologically that the word is not a Greek word.

🔊[12:01]

It was a borrowed word that the Greek took from somebody else and then applied it to certain elements that emerged in their society.

Chances are it was borrowed from Lydia that kingdom in the Asia minors that was in land from the Greek settlements on the coast.

And the first Lydian king of whom we here that could fit as the first tyrant from Greek perspective was a man called 'Gyges' who ruled in Lydia for something like the years 685 to 657 something like that.



The first time the word tyrannous or some version of it appears in Greek that we have comes in the fragments of the poet [?12:56] Archilacus.

And he is a fascinating character and we do have fortunately a few nice fragments of his poetry, in fact for the first time in the last couple of decades for the first time, since they were lost be actually have a full lyric poem by Archilacus.

But in any case he has this better poetry that is preserved in late writers' collection, which says 'I don't care for the wealth of golden 'Gyges', nor have I ever envied him, I am not jealous of the works of the God's, and I have no desire for lofty tyranny.'

This is the where the word 'tyranny' comes into the picture.

And even in that small collection of words, he gets some idea what the Greeks meant by tyranny.

They were talking about tremendous power from their perspective and its golden Gyges, and that's not an accident they mean wealthy Gyges.

Tyrants are people who have lots of wealth and lots of power and they also rule, in one translation that poets give for [? 14:26] tyrannydous, is for lofty despotism.

That is he rules, not as equally rules not as legitimate a king, he rules as a master ruling slaves is the implication of that.

It comes from Greek's perspective, it comes from the east, it is not native Greek, it is something new in the Greek experience.

They haven't had kings like that, even in their legends.

So that's going to be a central idea, that surrounds the concept of tyranny.

🔊[15:03]

The Greek word comes closes to it but it doesn't do same job is 'Monarchos', our 'Monarch' that simply means a ruler who is one, a single ruler.

You need words for that in Greek, because that's not the natural thing in Greece as you know already, every regime that we have discussed from the [? 15:26] Homeric world and on, post the bronze age, shows multiple kings in the early [? 15:38], yes there's the generalism that all you remembers Agamemnon but everybody there was a king not just one king, so that's the Greek way of looking the things.

Whereas the rest of the world it if the Greek said they've only known, anywhere you look into the rest of the world the typical regime is monarchy of one kind or not.

Absolute power, nobody in Greek has absolute power in a Greek point of view but kings else where do.



But there's another sense that attaches for the Greek to the world tyrannous or tyrannea, and that is that the power is not legitimately acquired.

The Greeks could understand that there would be somebody called [16:22] the Basillaus and that the reason he was Basillaus was that his father was and that the regime of that state is royal and this is the perfectly legitimate regime.

The Greeks although they don't practice kingship during the period that we studied they don't regard that is illegitimate form of regime.

Kingship is legitimate.

The tyranny is not.

I want to spell that out for you but before we get to my spelling it out for you.

Let me give you few more characteristic that set it that comes to have by classical times in the minds of the Greeks.

It is as I say, despotically exercise it is not legitimate and one aspect of it is not being legitimate is that it is not responsible.

A tyrannous does not have to explain himself and nobody would dare insist that he do.

He need not consult anybody if he doesn't want to.

He doesn't need to have the approval of anybody.

All of that makes him illegitimate, irresponsible as another word I think that fits into the picture, because we shall see the suddenly by the classical period the Greeks felt any regime to be legitimate must be responsible in a technical term, sense, it must be answerable to somebody.

Because all human beings was the philosophical core in this idea are not to be trusted by complete power.

They will abuse it with violence and violence very often mean sexual violence but it will take every other form as well.

And let's go back to Archilacus' few words which are so rich and telling us so much about.

This is 'I'm not jealous of the works of the God's.' what's that guy's dealing with anything?

Well because the Greek view of Tyranny was that tyrants and one of the things wrong with tyrants is that they see themselves as rivaling the Gods.



As thinking themselves to be divine and at least thinking that they could as though they were gods and because they have the power and wealth and have no responsibility to anybody, presumably they can't, and this is the one of things makes them terrible.

Because when they do this act of behaving as though they were God is what the Greeks one of those things Greek said 'hubris.'

🔊[18:59]

This arrogant this violent arrogant kind of exercise of power.

Now, that is the way things looked fundamentally in the classical period, but even in the classical period there was a remnant of, what I think and most guys I think would agree, was the special characteristic of the idea in its earlier day which was not so much how evil the tyranny was.

Cause the earlier day it was not clear to say they thought it was, but because of the fact that it was not legitimately acquired.

It was not part of the normal way things happen that I've mentioned this to you earlier the good example of that is [?19:52] Oedipus tyrannous, Oedipus the king, Oedipus... notice they don't usually, nobody translates Oedipus the tyrants and they are right not to do so because it mislead us way we think the tyrants is always bad there is no good tyrant but, so that you will often see it translated Oedipus rex into the Latin but rex means king.

So Oedipus the king is okay.

Actually it's not bad to say Oedipus rex because that the Romans had this idea the kings were bad so little bit of that glittering around the edge, but the Greek says not there at the beginning , okay.

Probably the contemporaries of 'Gyges' and of the tyrants who came after him in Greece probably didn't use the term, yet .

Probably sprang up at a later time.

But we can't be sure of that.

For the Greeks originally mention something must more neutral without this great moral baggage to carry with it.

It simply meant more than anything else two things one man rule well [? 20.59] I would raise I'd always right but, you can imagine the people [?21:01] and the fact that it man unconstitutional it did not come about in a way that follow tradition which was what Greek constitutions were traditional sets of law and customs.

🔊[21:15]

That's the general picture.

Let's take a look at tyranny as it emerges in Greece.

And we don't know very much about it here is another one of these cases where we are dependent on later sources we have no, I think I'm right to saying, nothing really contemporary at all that speaks about any tyrant.

And so that's the problem but we have to deal with that and then there are very limited tales that I told about them so that we have to piece together a lot of information ask ourselves what is that all mean.

In any case the first tyrant named in the Greek tradition is a man called [? 21:58] Fidam of Argus who is mentioned by Erostrugle in his politics and he says some interesting things come back in an hour, here are some of the facts or legit fads that surround fight on in a Greek tradition.

One said he is the king of Argus and Argus you know in their Homeric tradition is a very big powerful important place.

Argus come includes [?22:24] 마이씨니 and all of that.

So this would be a king of a large and important area.

That these the [?22:36] 알치하이브스 was a king of Argus were engaged in a conflict with Sparta as the who would be the dominant force in the Peloponnesus and they fought a battle at a place called [? 22:50] Hysiae in the era 668 in which the [? 22:52]알치하이 under fight on defeated the Spartas and really defeated them wasn't just a little squarish, they were now the top dog as the proven by the following other alleged facts about what's going on here.

[? 23:12] Phyton got himself elected chairman president of the Olympic Festival.

That was the tremendous honor and it indicated deference to him and scholars suggested that really happened would've suggested they would... Argus and Phyton where they dominate force in the Peloponnesus.

And further evidence this is a rather better evidence I think ever them that is the fact I don't hesitate to use that fact that fight of Argus apparently imposed a system of uniform weights and measures on the entire Peloponnesus.

And those remained the weights and measures employed in the Peloponnesus, thereafter so that they were called the [?24:00] Phytonian measures.

🔊[24:09]



You don't do that if you are not in effective control of the region nothing is more basic than determining something like that.

So I think that lends considerable possibility to the general story.

It is also said that he was a leader of the army which was hoplite army and that his success is depended upon its successful leadership of hoplite army well that fits in first general interpretation at scholarship used about the arise of tyrants.

It is nobody claims that it's universal.

But one feature that seems to be plausibly present is that the new way of fighting in the hoplite fair line which was to turn out to be decisive.

Well that brought about that leaders who were very good leaders of hoplite fair lengths and should they decide to seize power in any state where they had been doing the leadership they could typically count on their army.

The army they had led to assist them.

All which makes obvious sense you going to get the best fighting force surround and you like and you're popular and you want to be a boss that's your best shot.

So tradition also lends some small support to the important idea that maybe that's how Phyton brought himself to the king ship.

Before I depart I just feel it necessary to make one small point I said weights and measures there are elements in ancient tradition that also say that Phyton was the first man I want to put it very carefully and literally because it's the part of the argument.

He was the first man who strike silver coins on the island of the [? 25:52] Gyna, coins have not been present in Greece prior to this time.

And the most well informed and professionally skilled and capable people and almost everybody who studies the subject says this is false there were no coins in Greek would yet and there are going to be any for a very long time afterwards.

So this is merely a myth.

I'm sorry to say that in spite the fact that I'm not an expert or a numismatist that everybody's against me they're all wrong.

I won't put you through the pain listening to this argument.

But just keep in the back of your mind one day somebody's going to find hard evidence that I'm absolutely right about this and so then you can tweak and say "ah ha" because that's it.



But right now no sensible person has any credit in the field at all believes me.

There are about two or three people maybe.

That's about it, Okay.

🔊[27:00]

Another very interesting important element about Phyton [? 27:04] Aristotle he was a king who became a tyrant by now you know the Greek word he was Basillaus, who became tyrannous.

Now how do you do that?

You would think the man was king and it implies the legitimacy how do you become an illegitimate like a tyrant?

And we can only speculate but I think what we've learn already about the early Greek kings in [? 27:32] those towns in head any was that they were Homeric kings, they were not really monarchs.

They were not really powerful rulers.

They did not simply dominated everybody and give orders.

They were maybe the most striking of the best connected or the best descendents, a bunch of noble man who were roughly equal.

Well if we imagine the way Phyton began, and then I'm just making up the story you understand then he himself let the [? 28:04] 알자이 페이렌스 to this tremendous successes defeating the Spartans, establishing Argus as a president of the Olympic games giving weights measures and having help us maybe coins to the people of the Peloponnesus.

And then began to act as though he really was the boss, because he could.

And people recognize that and said you know he is not just king anymore he has made himself a tyrannous something like that wouldn't make sense of Aristotle statement.

Now this raises the question which is to be raise whenever we think about tyrants coming to [?28:51] Greece.

Okay he wants to be king, he's popular and all of these things and what is it take?

Well it takes military force because there were people who were going to resist.

🔊 [29:03]

And so I would suggest again nothing original about this that the positive connection with the hoplite army now emerges in these days has to be part of the story.

Why would this hoplites to support a tyranny?

It doesn't really accord with their own long range interest or the autonomy and the independence that so clearly apart.

What it is to be hoplite farmer well I think the best answer would be that.

That's what have to be done to break the monopoly of power and influence of the all aristocracy.

Which would have been presumably resisting the changes in society that were part of that hoplites uprising that development of hoplite and movement of hoplite community.

🔊 [29:59]

And so they joined with a leader who had what it took to make it work and to destroy the power of the aristocracy and to create a new kind of state with a new kind of constitution.

But the first step would have been a tyranny.

Because that's the way they got to where they had to go in the first incidence.

Now, this is easy to connect again theoretically, because we just don't have that kind of hard evidence.

So, we make it possible, be sure.

With the join this hoplite development with other changes that are occurring in society, that is to say, the economic change that means trade is becoming more and more important and so as a simple industry.

So, that there now people in society who by virtue of what they do to make a living get ahead, don't fit into the traditional Aristocratic system, who don't have what they want in terms of influence power, recognition, because they hasn't been a place for such people before, and the people who are in charge are not to give it away very readily.

And so they might very well also assist, let us imagine, hoplite farmers as being that guys you define it for the most part, but joined and supportive by these other elements in society who need a change for the same reason.

And that fits rather nicely with where we find the earliest colonies.

Argos is a special place, but Argos was in addition to being a fine agriculture area.

It also, from early time, had a commercial activity.

So that would be good.

But on top of that, next three towns that I am going to mention has been very active in colonization, you are familiar with that from our last talk.

Corinth.

And a little town that I have mentioned before, but it's right next to Corinth.

And I am surely that it was the part of same set of developments that we described there.

A place called Sicyon also has an early time tyrannical family.

And Megara, which is located, I should say Sicyon is sort of to the south and to the west of Corinth and Megara is to the north and to the east of the Corinth.

It's right on and around the east most of Corinth.

That's these some of the early states that have tyrants come into being, just as these are the states that are very, very active in the colonial movement.

If we go away from the main land again, Miletus has a tyrant at a fairly early time just as you would expect because it fits into the whole picture.

And you don't have tyrannies very early, if at all in places like Athens, we will have a famous tyrant but that will come later.

🔊 **[33:01]**

Thebes will not have a tyrant, inspired mythologies surrounding Oedipus.

Sparta, of course never has the tyrant.

So, all of this is sort of reasonable support for the interpretation that most scholars take.

So you have all of this stuff, that pressure growing in population, new groups challenging the aristocracy, hoplites among them.

If you go to Corinth, the story of establishment of tyranny there involves an individual called Cypselus.

And the stories that are told about Cypselus fit pretty decently into what we have been talking about.

He is specifically called a [? 33:43] polemarch, which means the war archon, the war leader, commander of the army and a, and a Corinth at that time would have been hoplite army.

But he was not a king like a Python, he was, according to the myth, I shouldn't say a myth, because it isn't a myth, according to the legend, no, it's not really even a legend, let's say tradition.

According to the tradition, Cypselus was a descended from mixed marriage between a patrician an aristocrat and somebody who was not.

So, that, that's a very sort of typical historical development.

People who become a revolutionaries and trouble makers are often people on the margin but who have by birth, some kind of connection or think they have some kind of connection with a higher ranks in annoyed , irritated, angry, jealous, and therefore likely to take the trouble to seize power.

[? 34:56] I mean Napolian descended some kind of course you can aristocracy.

Of course, the French thought that was a, what is it when a word it contradicts itself?

What's the word?

No, not paradox.

Oxymoron, that's right.

The French thought that it was an oxymoron.

Of course, it can be aristocrat.

Ridiculous.

But nobody, that was his feeling and that kind of French attitude help, I think, explain the drive that he had to get ahead that he really did.

Anyway, Cypsoles was one of that the group in Corinth that I might point out, was an unusual polis before the emergence of the tyranny, because most polis is as best we can figure it out, they had their aristocracy that consisted of many many many many families.

But Corinth had the narrowest of all aristocracies.

One family who are called the Bacchiads completely monopolizes the regime.

🔊[36:07]

So that meant that there would be easier when who started to make trouble to find help against them promote rather powerful people who were in other states likely to be part of the regime.

But here were cut out.

And so Cypsoles joins, comes, puts together his force of military folks with some folks were discontented and finally attacks the Bacchiads either kill them or draw them into exile.

And then there is establishes his own regime which is in fact one of the most successful tyrannies, at least it is judged by the most basic thing, how long did they left.

Cypsoles in effect died in bed leaving the tyranny to his son and then his son had another son who became tyrant and he was driven out finally and he was the last of them.

So, the Cypsoles tyranny is a very successful.

Why do we know something about him?

The colonization which had already, Corinthian had already started, but really took, real whole in the time of Cypsoles and so Corinth is colonizing quite vigorously in the time of Cypsoles tyranny.

Mostly out in the west, because they, that's sort of empty territory for the Greek point of view, and so you'll see Corinthian colony stretching out along the shore, the north shore of the gulf of the Corinth.

And north shore is less Greek and more barbaric than south shore which is Peloponnesians.

And then, if you go to the, to the, to the end of the Greece, as far west as you go, and make a right turn, and head up into the asiatic region.

Sorry.

That I want it to see is beyond that, that asiatic, Corinthian colonies are right along in there.

They suggest that, I think that is supported by other archaeological evidence, that commerce was one of the things that was very important for Cypsoles and Corinth is booming from commercial economic point of view and years of Cypsoles tyrants.

None of that is surprising, all of this is very characteristic of this phase of Greek tyranny that we are talking about.



In addition to that, we know that Cypsoles, like just about all the tyrants, used his power to do something that the Greek government normally did not do.

Namely, collect taxes from their people.

You have to understand that the idea that of taxation being normal would have gotten a Greek [? 39:01] forming at them out.

🔊 **[39:03]**

When there is no tyranny, there is no taxes.

No direct tax, I should say.

The normal form of taxation that existed in the Greek world, when it was in it, independent polis based is simply customs duties on trade.

But the hoplite farmer wasn't going to be taxed.

Paying taxes is what barbarians did to their kings.

Very powerful feeling.

People like that in America today are used to be called republicans.

Um, another, of course, you might, no surprise that Cypsoles is descendance.

Just like the other tyrants were very wealthy.

They undoubtedly wealthily seized, when they took power, there is also wealth that they could enjoy from the tremendous income that would come from the booming commerce.

And then finally, taxation, just put it right smack from somebody's hand into theirs.

And so, tremendous wealth is another picture that goes with this.

Um, if you go to Sicyon, another element comes into the picture which may or may not have occurred in other tyrannical town.

We do not know that it played a role in Sicyon.

There, the founder of the tyranny was man called Orthagoras.

[? 40:36] And again, one thing we are told about him is that he was polemarch, leader of the [? 40:36] fail 아잉쓰.

So we understand that.

Another story says that he was a cook.

And they didn't mean a [? 40:48] 스코피에이 anything like that, I mean that was not a high ranking position.

And so, I think the implication was he came from very low source.

We don't know what to do with that.

It sounds surprising but maybe it's true.

Anyway we get down to the point where one of his descendants is a still tyrant.

I think it's a son, Cleisthenes of Sicyon.

When you want to keep that name in your mind, then you want to keep it straight, they will, they will be a descendant of that guy who will be an Athenian whose name is Cleisthenes, who will not only be later but totally different, not a tyrant, quite different from that.

So, just remember that this is Cleisthenes of Sicyon, as what supposed to Cleisthenes, Athenians.

Well, a picture that Herodotus was one of our main sources here, the main source, I guess, gives us is one of in Sicyon, political oppression of a kind that we haven't run into yet, because it is based on, really on Athenic origin, Athenic differences.

Here we see, I think without any question, a case of the pre-Dorian Greeks have been defeated and conquered by Dorians and have been, these groups have been kept separate throughout the centuries and one with top dog when the other is under dog.

What you, what is happened obviously is that part of the tyrants come into power must have been in reverse of that situation, because the, the leading forces are, um, anti Dorian, very powerfully anti Dorian.

They hate Argos because Argos is in the [? 42:57] 알거씨?utterseat?, the great leader of the Peloponnesians.

And the [? 43:07] wrong guys, and did, of course, Argos in their day, Dorian city.

And, I should you don't have to go back to the other section [? 43:10] ?? I mean back to the days of, of a python the urge ?? that was ruled Sicyon presumably.

If a python was in charge, well they didn't like that.



They had achieved, I've presumed, an overthrow of that.

So, their entire Argos and entire Dorian, and they, they introduced changes in the
troupe [? 43:26]

If you go to any Dorian town in the Greek world, there are three trawons, they have
the same names in all Dorian towns.

And that's the way the world is organized.

So what will they do?

[? 43:46] These guys, the Orthagorids changed the tribes, that's interesting, too,
because we will see that Cleisthenes is Athenian, does the same thing.

That's amazing, that's very rare.

[? 43:58] And we are talking about changes in tribal things; you are getting at the
most, oldest possible memories and traditions, and beliefs and associations that
permitted peoples have.

So when you [? 44:12] fessing? with that you really making a great problem.

But you will see in a moment, what's driving this sort of thing.

Instead of having three tribes thereafter from once the Orthagorids got their head 4.

But they changed the names of the old three.

The old three now are called; I'm translating the Greek words, ass man, pig man and
swine man.

[? 44:44] Whereas the non Dorians were the archilaoi ; leaders of the people.

You can see very objective said of names and evaluations.

[? 44:54] So, you've got vengens here.

You've got group long annoyed, long angered feeling of oppress taking out their
hatred when the victory comes in.

🔊 [45:00]

Taking out their hatred when the victory comes in.

But once you're past this peculiarity, this particular ethnic conflict in this town, that
had such an important effect, you'll find that the tyrants are pretty much like all the
other tyrants.



They have great wealth, and we will come back in just a moment to indicate how striking that was, they engage in conspicuous display which is what tyrants also do and they are filled with a tremendous ego, a terrific sense of their own importance and self, the kind of things that make [?45:41]Achilleus say, you know, I'm not going to try to have vi with the gods the way these tyrants do.

Well the story that [?45:48] Aritutus tells and I think you will enjoy it, in his wonderful prose, if you haven't gotten to it yet, here's uh Clisthenes of Sicyon now is in charge.

We're in the six century B.C. And he has a daughter and he wants her to have the very best husband that there was available in Greece just like your parents.

They felt the same way as your parents do.

So but he was going to see to it if it's going to work out.

By the way, he himself was a very significant figure.

And once again this makes him not so unusual among the tyrants.

He entered in the Olympic competition and in those days and probably forever in the Olympic games, I mean the ancient Olympic games, the most prestigious, the most important contest, was the four horse, horse race, chariot race.

For one thing, you couldn't do that unless you're very rich

So that meant that the noblest and wealthiest people were competing against one another in this.

But he was the winner in the four horse chariot race which made him an international celebrity on top of all the other things he had going for him.

And so he decided by god he was going to have the best guy in Greece be his daughter's husband.

He invites all the most, the best aristocratic, richest, handsomest, most athletic guys in all of Greece to come to Sicyon and spend a year at his expense and treated royally all that time to compete for the hand of his daughter.

And so they all arrive and [?47:45]Aritutus reads off the names of all of these amazing young man who'd come to the competition, pretty much I think copying Homer's list of the ships in the Iliad.

And they come.

 **[48:00]**

Well after the bulk of this year, it is clear.



Two finalists are emerging.

One of them is called Hippoclydis.

And the other is called Megaclis. Megaclis we'd better take seriously because he's an Athenian and he will be the ancestor of Clisthenes of Athens later on.

But anyway, they're competing in every respect and we're down to the last kinds of things and it looks like the Hippoclydis has the edge.

He seems to be the number one candidate.

And he has quite a few belts at the party when we're reaching the final stages of all this and next he jumps up on a table and he begins dancing wildly.

I mean like beyond what is seemed to be seemly dancing we expect a young nobleman to be a good dancer.

But this guy is doing stuff that nobody ever heard of.

And this is making Clisthenes a little nervous.

I mean who is this guy?

What's happening here?

And then he flips upside down and begins to dance on his hands with his feet flipping around in the air.

At which point, [49:15]Arititus tells us, Clisthenes speaks up and says, "Son of [49:23]Tysender you have danced your bride away."

He lost.

And Megaclis got to marry [49:34] ?

Well, what are we to believe of that tale?

I don't know but this much I think is clear.

Such a legend does not come from nothing.

The picture is first of all of a man who is fabulously wealthy.

Think of the kind of entertaining he is said to have done.

Also fabulously full of himself.

Just imagine saying my daughter will only marry the very best young man there is



and you will all have to go out there and compete for her hand and I'll tell you who she's going to marry, and who can then act the way he did.

I think that's a picture that he probably was.

Extreme in all of these respects and that kind of situation was part of the tale.

So let me just sum up some things.

Untraditional route to power is important.

[?50:33]Gyges, perhaps you remember the story of [?50:35]Gyges was sort of the prime minister of the King of Lydia and the king had this incredibly beautiful wife and he was terribly proud of her.

And so he said to [?50:53]Gyges you can't believe how gorgeous my wife is. [?50:56] Gyges says of course she is wonderfully beautiful.

🔊 [51:00]

But you can't tell with her clothes on for god's sake.

He says come on, come with me.

[?51:03]Gyges says, no no no please your majesty.

And he says, come with me. So there's Gyges hidden behind the curtain and here's his wife disrobing.

And indeed she was as advertised.

And the king goes out.

Gyges would have slipped away but the queen spots him.

And of course, she's totally disgraced.

She's deeply embarrassed as to put it very very mildly.

And so she says to him, unless you do what I tell you, I will tell my husband that you sneaked in and did this and then he will kill you.

But what I want you to do is to kill him and marry me.

That's how you can make it.

What could [51:55]Gyges do?

And so he did.

That's how he became king.

This is not your normal constitutional procedure.

Even in Lydia. So that's Gyges.

Python I've talked to you about already.

The [52:13] Agnese of Megorra i haven't mentioned that he comes to power by force with the use of soldiers and same thing's true for [52:20]Kipsulus.

All these tyrants get there by means that are not traditional.

They have personal power, whatever else is going on they have the military and the military gives them what they need in the way of command.

They have to have, the founder of the dynasty at least has to have skill in order to be a soldier, he has to be a good talker to get people to go along with him.

He's got to have talent. It's not the easiest thing to do to overthrow a traditional regime and make yourself the boss.

So that he would have had this cause.

But he's got to have support out there from various elements that I mentioned to you.

Prestige from some great deal whatever it might be, military victory or athletic victory perhaps, and when he has wealth, once he's acquired wealth, he can use it further to strengthen his position and they typically do because he introduces something new.

Mercenary soldiers.

It's one thing to seize the power with the help of the hoplites, to hold on to it, you're going to need something more solid than that.

First of all hoplites don't stick around in uniform they go back and work their fields.

So they're not around to suppress anything that needs to be suppressed most of the time.

But beyond that tyrants grow unpopular.

You know this is one of the great rule in politics in any system.

The one question in the minds of people who have anything to do with.

 **[54:02]**



And that is what have you done for me lately.

Any benefit that people might have achieved from the establishment of tyranny gets to be taken for granted after a while.

And then, why is this guy taking taxes from me?

Why is he such a big shot and I'm not?

That's just going to be inevitable.

And so if you're going to keep your power and keep people down, you can't just rely on the citizen body.

And so tyrants typically hire foreigners to serve as mercenaries for them.

Now another thing is that while these tyrannies last it is typical that they should accomplish very significant things that most anybody would agree, or positive contributions to the life of the community they ruled.

You find economic prosperity is one of the things that is characteristic of these regimes.

Diversified economies is support trade and industry and sometimes even agriculture.

The spread of wealth to new groups with much more money around

There are people who don't fit into the old system in which the land was simply dominated by the aristocrats and where there was no other way to make any money or gain any wealth.

So all of that is happening.

And of course many of the kings sorry of the tyrants foster and engage in colonization which has all the benefits I mentioned last time as well.

Now there is another thing that's characteristic of tyrannies.

When they make themselves tyrants they come to live whether they did before or not.

In what is the major city of that whole Polis.

The capital city so to speak.

It's always be the place where it would have the special, you know where the acropolis is and therefore the worship of the gods take place.

There's worship of the gods everywhere but that's the special place for them.



There was always the special place that's become the center of the community and as a result because of where the tyrant is that's where all the action is, people begin to move into that capital city if they leave the land of their fathers.

And some number of them in fact do.

If you're going to conduct commercial activity, if you're going to conduct factory work, and if you're going to be somehow involved in the various acts of the government, and things that have to do with the tyrant, you want to be there.

And the tyrants have courts and so people come to be in the court of the tyrant.

So what you have is a kind of urbanization that is characteristic of this period.

Well if you're going to have more people living in this town than ever did before, there's all sorts of things you need.

🔊 [57:05]

Number one, no question number one, water supply.

How do you supply people with enough water to meet their needs when they weren't there before, and the answer is you have to bring water in to the city by a variety of ways.

Any way that you really can.

They do aqueducts of certain kind they dig wells and have fountains coming from those wells they build fountain houses to cover those fountains.

They bring a water supply.

Also if you're going to have this common place where a lot of people are going to live where they didn't live before, drainage is essential or else you'll have terrible disease breaking out.

It's not that they were sciences and knew about germs, it's just that you know when there's a lot of people there, and there's a lot of water lying around, people seem to die.

So you don't have to be a genius for that.

There are sewer systems introduced by these tyrants which never existed before.

And since they are trying to encourage trade, there was always a place, I shouldn't say there was always, but at some point of the development of the Polis, there merged a kind of central place in the city called Agora which was a place that people came together for different purposes.



It looks like in the beginning, political meetings, meetings of the assembly for instance might take place in the Agora.

It pretty early, seem to have had some sort of religious significance and then over time not at the beginning though, they became commercial centers and if you use the word Agora in Greece today, you're talking about a shop because that's how much that come to be the thing.

But we need to keep in mind that it is a religious center, becomes a civic center and it also was of course a commercial center as well.

So the Agora has come from these tyrannical periods.

Public buildings are created by the tyrant for whatever use he needs, but he might be building court houses, he might be building places for magistrates to stay things like that.

But also, he has a tendency to try to make them very attractive very impressive so that people will be impressed with him for having done so.

You know the phenomenon.

People like to have their name on a building.

I'm told that they will actually give you millions and millions of dollars to put their name on a building.

🔊 **[60:01]**

I'm told that there are places where they will leave and give you lots of money to put their names on bathroom stoves.

But, only the tyrants in their day would have been rich enough to do the kind of thing which we're talking about, including, this is a very large thing I believe, temples.

The Greeks have been building temples, I'm sure, for a long time.

But, essentially, out of wood.

But, now people having the kind of wealth ever been accumulated by these tyrants, they begin to build them of stone and where possible, of very fine stone such as marble.

And, I think we have to imagine the construction of such a building in all town like anyone with Greek city states head.

It would, would have a tremendous impact.



This is something I like to pass on to when you think about the Greeks.

Here's one of the places where they are so stunningly different from us.

We need to make an imagine activity leap to understand what's going on.

Remember this is a world that has got no, next to no writing.

This is, there are few, lot, there are some people who know how to write.

But it's not part of life.

And, of course there is no paper.

So, I mean, they just get more writing out of your life for the most part.

But, also, there are, there's no movies, no television, there's no radio.

There's no newspaper.

There are very few buildings.

Now, of suddenly, up pops, let's go to [? 61:41] carnes.

And, suddenly up pops is incredible thing, made of stone, a temple to the gods decorated beautifully, painted typically blue and red and gold with the big statue of the goddess.

And anybody in town can go by and look at that.

That would have made a sensational experience.

And, people would have been talking about it and various elements of detail forever in a day.

And, they would not forget who it was that constructed that temple?

So, that's an example of what I'm talking about.

Beyond that, the tyrants were patrons of the arts, by which I mean architects, sculptors, painters, painters of this [? 62:39]. but base painters as well, potters of very special kinds, but that's not all.

Also, poets, singers, [? 62:49].players, all of those kinds of entertainments which had been monopolized by the aristocracy to the degree that exists at all would now be broadly, more broadly available and the tyrants' took pride in bringing the worlds' best to their cities and allowing it at least some of them to hear and see what was going on.

🔊 [63:17]

Let me get to the essence of more specific, we have more specific information about it.

So, that is all part of a story that would have made the tyrannies much more widely supported and much not, not so easy to knock over as you might think.

People would have had many, many reasons for gratitude to the tyrants and would have been very pleased by much of what the tyrants were doing.

Of course, all aristocrats would have been typically very unhappy about everything they were doing because they have been cut out.

But if you got everybody else, their feelings, I think, would have been mixed because first, I don't know which came first, but they would be impressed and enjoyed these positive things.

But, they would also be troubled by something that was counter to their own traditions and to central elements of their own beliefs and concerns.

I keep thinking about those half-life farmers who have grown to be confident and independent, desired to be [? 64:26] autonomous, didn't want to be told about what to do.

And yet there was somebody who was doing just that.

So this is the conflict that there is.

And in fact what we see is a steady decline in the popularity of tyrannies from generation to the generation.

The founder of the tyranny, he's probably still popular when he dies and he did it, most people are very conscious of what he achieved. He's a glorious figure.

But his son is only tyrant because he was his son.

It doesn't come from his personal qualities.

And, one it becomes more and more aware of shortcomings and fewer and fewer people are interested in achievements even though they may do wonderful things.

And by the time you get to the third generation, that's the end.

The third generation of tyranny gets thrown out if you made it, made it that far.

And when the tyranny is overthrown, the typical successor to the tyrannical regime is an oligarchy.



I would say it would include many of the [? 65:42] oligarstic crats who had the best land in the greatest wealth and indeed chances are those people would be the leaders of the new regime but they would very quickly because it was not a monarchy of any kind, they would very quickly form into factions that would be competing with one another based on what kinds of different things, would compete with one another, the leader of each faction for becoming the leading faction, the dominant figures in the state.

🔊 [66:15]

But, also this is more important, the really fundamental thing is typically almost always, the half-life class of independent farmer would have participated in this regime.

He would have been a full-fledged citizen.

Fighting would be done chiefly by the [?66:38] fair rankers with these folks doing the fighting.

These men would be the economic backbone of the community, turning out the grain, and the wine, and the herb oil, what other else, vegetables that they had to produce, and being the independent fellows that they were.

And finally, they would have played a part in the political life of the city.

Here it would vary from town to town.

You might have a relatively narrow oligarchy in which the council was what counted , and that would be typical.

The council would count, but it might be very narrowly defined.

Or it could be very broadly defined where it might include all the [? 67:22] half-life or something in between.

But not ever until we got to Athens, where you get a democracy, the definition being that every adult male who is born of native parents is a citizen and who has some significant political rights.

That doesn't come yet.

You have an oligarchy meaning, sure of that, but with the variations I've indicated.

[? 67:51]Carnes, for instance after they get rid of the tyrant finally, is, becomes famous and the Greek tradition for the moderation, and therefore the longevity and peacefulness of its oligarchic regime.

I think we should imagine that the became a hoplite city, not that they didn't have



aristocrats who had wealth and importance, but that the hoplites, really played the central part in the picture.

And I think just to raise the question, remember I raised it about colonization, I mean raised about tyranny, what would the contributions made by this development in Greek history to the life of Greece?

And they were many.

Obviously, economical growth and the way I've pointed out, social change up to a certain point, but certainly doing a way forever with the aristocracy of birth as the normal basis for citizenship and participation in the state.

And I would go further.

🔊 **[69:01]**

I would say that by destroying that and substituting for some kind of economic basis for what role it played, they actually opened the door for a form of government that didn't come in many places, but did come in some.

And I'm talking about a Greek democracy.

Let me review finally to the question of how did Greeks think about tyranny after tyranny was gone because it played a terrific role in Greek thinking and had a lot to do with the way the Greeks felt about their relations with foreign powers and their own regimes.

One thing I just said and passing and come back to next time, and that is Sparta because of its behavior in the 6th century and a little bit into the 5th, developed a reputation as being the state that was the enemy of tyranny.

They never developed a tyranny, and indeed they often fought against tyrants.

And that was when tyranny was gone, that would seemed to be a great credit to them, and helped explain how did it happen that Sparta emerged and rose to the level as the leader of Greeks which they suddenly were at the time of Persian wars.

Beyond that so, the picture that comes down to us, it's all, it will be a double picture in which opposite elements exist, but certainly the dominant one is negative.

Tyrannies are arbitrary.

They are violent.

Tyrants are arrogant.

They do not permit free speech which by the way the Greeks placed, the Greek democrats placed in a very central place in important things that are necessary for



men, a Greek citizen, a person who is not barbarian.

The ability to come forward into the center of political life and speak your mind.

When you didn't have that to some considerable degree, you were a slave.

And tyrants didn't permit that.

There was no true political life for citizens.

They were, they were de facto subjects of this tyrant who himself was an irresponsible, not responsible to another body and therefore potentially dangerous and in very easily could become a despot which is a Greek word.

Herodotus uses tyranny as a critically, well you know by and large he depicts the king of the Persia who finally invades Greece first in [? 72:03].

🔊 [72:04]

These men are tyrants because they fit precisely the categorization of tyranny as the Greeks know it.

In [? 72:14] play, Prometheus bound, Zeus himself is seen to be a tyrant.

And the word is used of him by characters in the play.

For the same reason, he's punishing Prometheus for his good deeds towards men, which make men more divine than they would otherwise be.

Zeus is very angry, that's because he gave them fire.

Zeus is very, very angry with him.

And he blocks him up, chains him into a rock in the Caucasus Mountains, while birds are pecking away at his liver forever and ever, a typical Greek hell of the worst kind.

And, we are let in what we have of that play to think Zeus doing terrible things.

He's behaving tyrannically, that is not good even for the king of the gods.

Plato, of course, will regard tyranny later on as a terribly evil thing and because of his antidemocratic prejudice, we will say tyranny is the natural outcome of democracy because people can't rule themselves, they are not confident to do so and it's only a matter of time before some strong violent, selfish men makes himself tyranny.

It is a distinguishing feature in Greek thought.

Tyranny or monarchy, these are not appropriate for a free man.



That is to say, Greeks, they felt we are, by nature, free and they couldn't be free so long as there was tyranny.

But tyranny was in fact the natural way of life for Barbarians who were not by nature free men.

So, it's helpful, and this is a form of ethnocentric stuff, but that, Greeks were very, very spelled out, very carefully thought about, very carefully.

And if you say why do you say that, well, they would, might hold to, deep down they might hold what we would call sort of racial prejudices, but I think they would have made a better case for it.

They would have said to be a free man as Aristotle said, you need to live in a Polis because that's the only place it's possible to live as a free man.

So, because Greeks chose to live in a Polis, they are free.

People who choose to live as the slaves of monarchs and tyrants, that's because they are natural slaves.

And that prejudice is very deep.

And so, when the Greeks [? 74:51] having to fight the Persians, there's a lot more going on than just we are being invaded and we have to defend our land.

🔊 [75:01]

Next time, I will look at the great exception to all of things we have been talking about, Sparta, the state like no other Greek state.