

I. EDITORIAL

Mare Nostrum's new issue makes an effort to foster a regional international debate. Although geographically near, it seems that there is little interaction among Latin American classicists. Hence we offer a modest attempt at changing this state of affairs. The current edition is dedicated to a debate between Brazilian and Argentinian scholars about the relationship between state and politics in the ancient world, particularly with regard to the Athenian democracy.

The starting point of the discussion is the article by Diego Paiaro (Universidad Nacional de General Sarmiento/Universidad de Buenos Aires/CONICET), *Polis, state and citizens of Athenian democracy as indivisible community*, in which the author presents a comprehensive overview of the debate concerning the relationship between polis and state, as well as its limitations. Subsequently, Paiaro offers a more complex and nuanced interpretation of the problem, based on the idea of the body of citizens as an “indivisible community”, in close engagement with Pierre Clastres’ work. To Paiaro, “the *pólis* developed in a dynamic way through a tension never completely resolved between *state practices* that ensured exclusion/domination/subordination, on the one hand, and *anti-state practices* which prevented them [*state practices*], on the other.”

Priscila Gontijo Leite (Universidade Federal da Paraíba) comments Paiaro’s article by establishing connections between past and present concerning themes related to political organization and popular participation. Leite’s main aim is to demonstrate how lessons of the past can offer answers to the growing of neoliberal and ultraconservative trends in the various spheres of society, as well as to the great disenchantment of Brazilian population regarding politics, particularly since 2016 with the ousting of President Dilma Rousseff. Marcelo Campagno (Universidad de Buenos Aires/CONICET) also establishes comparative relations between past and present, but he focuses on the social and political organizations both of democratic Athens and of communities in the Ancient Near East. Campagno calls attention to the good use Paiaro makes of Clastres’ concept of “indivisible community” in his analysis of the community of citizens, in which Paiaro explains that socio-economic differences do not necessarily equal legal and political differences – a situation which consequently produces homogeneity of the civic body. But Campagno goes further when he suggests that to interpret the civic body as indivisible community historicizes the formation of the community of citizens insofar as its functioning logic relates with the logic of an earlier

world without the presence of the state. César Sierra Martín (Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona) also begins his comment to Paiaro's article with comparisons, by emphasizing a progressive substitution of the European Union as a supranational entity for a return to the Europe of nations. The author then reflects upon the concept of "indivisible community" and its relations with both Athens' autochthonous political identity and the problem of tyranny. Sierra Martín is our only contributor outside the group of Brazilian and Argentinian academic institutions.

Marta Mega de Andrade (Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro) approaches the debate from the perspective of the territory as an inhabited space, and by putting emphasis on the issue of power instead of the state. In this way, Andrade expands the debate about Pierre Clastres' political anthropology and proposes an alternative way to understand *non coercive power* and politics without state. Then the author demonstrates how this alternative interpretation is fundamental to the study of the role of women in Athenian politics.

Julián Gallego (Universidad de Buenos Aires/CONICET) highlights a controversial aspect of Paiaro's argument by suggesting that there is a type of state logics in the functioning of the Athenian community of citizens. Norberto Luiz Guarinello (Universidade de São Paulo), on his turn, points out that: the city and period studied in the article are atypical; Athens never was an egalitarian society even with the exclusion of slaves, women and foreigners; the comparison between Athenian political leaders and South American political leaders studied by Pierre Clastres does not stand up.

This debate then closes with Diego Paiaro's final remarks on the issues raised about his article.

In the review section we have three contributions. The first, by Juliana Bastos Marques (UNIRIO), deals with the work *Classics: Why It Matters* by Neville Morley. It is followed by a review of Robert Drews' most recent work, *Militarism and the Indo-Europeanization of Europe*, by Renan Falcheti Peixoto (MAE- USP). Finally, the volume concludes with the review offered by Helton Lourenço (UFOP) on the book *Varro the Agronomist: Political Philosophy, Satire and Agriculture in the Late Republic* by Grant A. Nelsestuen.

We wish you all a good reading.