Chapter 1

Solon the Peacemaker*

William Allan

We cannot separate 'Solon the poet' from 'Solon the politician', and the role of the poet as a public figure in archaic Greece is nowhere clearer than with him. As archon in 594/3 BC, Solon introduced reforms that affected almost every area of the Athenian state, and later tradition celebrated him as a wandering wise man and one of the Seven Sages. Thus Solon's reputation for wisdom and moderation[1] led Herodotus, for example, to depict his encounter in Sardis with Croesus, king of Lydia, who fatally ignores Solon's reflections on the dangers of excessive wealth and the uncertainty of human life (Hdt 1.29-33).[2]

The egalitarian thrust of Solon's legal, economic, and political reforms make him a key figure in the development of democracy at Athens.[3] By weakening the power of the wealthy elite and their inherited privileges, and by focusing on the cohesion and benefit of the community as a whole, Solon laid the foundations for the classical concept of the free Athenian citizen, who is expected to play a part in running the city.[4] By the late fifth century Solon had become a quasi-legendary figure honoured in hero-cult,[5] hailed by some as the founding hero of Athenian democracy, by others as the guardian of a more conservative ancestral constitution (or *patrios politeia*). Although such attempts to co-opt Solon's authority have influenced his presentation in the ancient sources, I would agree with P.J. Rhodes that there is likely to be more history than myth in the surviving accounts of his laws and reforms.[6]

In the surviving fragments we see Solon using all his skills as a poet to persuade his audience of the need for change and the wisdom of his policies.[7] Most of Solon's poems were composed for performance at symposia, but we cannot rule out performance in more public settings – for example, at public meetings or city festivals. In any case, it is striking how, unlike Alcaeus or Theognis, for example, who address an audience that share their social and political views, Solon balances the competing demands of different sections of Athenian society, and uses all his rhetorical skill to persuade his listeners to accept his political and ethical values.[8]

Solon's success in achieving such a balance is mirrored in his later fame as a διαλλακτής – that is, as a 'reconciler' or 'mediator' between the warring factions of Athens. The Aristotelian *Constitution of Athens* explains his rise to power as follows:

---

* This chapter began as a paper for the 'Peace and Reconciliation' panel at the Celtic Conference in Classics in Edinburgh (June 2014). I would like to thank Dr Eoghan Moloney for the invitation to speak on the panel. The fragments of Solon follow the text and numeration of West (1989) (unless otherwise noted).

[1] The latter a recurring idea in his political poems: see esp. fr. 4c, 5, 6, 7, 36, 37.

[2] It is possible that Solon encountered Croesus at the start of his reign (560 BC), but not (as Herodotus has it) within ten years of his archonship (*c.* 594/3-584/3 BC).

[3] Solon's main economic reforms came in response to growing tensions between rich Athenian overlords and poor farmers. Solon's solution, commonly known as the 'shaking-off of burdens' (or *seisachtheia*: see on fr. 36 below), probably meant that the farmers were no longer obliged to render up a sixth of their produce to their overlords; it also liberated those Athenians who had been enslaved for debt, repatriated those who had been sold abroad, and made the future practice of enslavement for debt illegal (*cf.* Stanley (1999) 210-18, Harris (2002), Forsdyke (2006) 347). Solon's political reforms were geared to extending decision-making power beyond a narrow aristocratic elite. He created a new council (βουλή) of 400 members to consider business for the assembly. He also divided the citizenry into four classes based on the size of their annual harvest; although only the three highest classes could hold political office, the poorest were allowed to attend the assembly and thus have a say in the running of the state.

[4] *Cf.* Manville (1990) 124-56, Lewis (2006) 6.

[5] Kearns (1989) 198.

[6] Rhodes (2006) 259.

[7] As regards the chronology of the poems, some political pieces are likely to predate Solon's archonship (e.g. 4, 4a, 4c), while others are evidently later because they defend his reforms (5, 34, 36, 37) or boast of having resisted the chance to become a tyrant (32-3).

[8] With a historically significant figure like Solon it is particularly tempting to interpret the primary narrator in a simple biographical manner, but while Solon's poetry clearly draws on his own experiences as a politician and legislator, he too must fashion a convincing authorial persona. Solon's self-presentation underlines his role as a moderate and impartial reformer, not a revolutionary, and by drawing on the language, ethics, and theology of Homer and Hesiod (especially in fr. 4 and 13), Solon imbues his commitment to justice and communal values with the authority of traditional wisdom.

τοιαύτης δὲ τῆς τάξεως οὔσης ἐν τῇ πολιτείᾳ, καὶ τῶν πολλῶν δουλευόντων τοῖς ὀλίγοις, ἀντέστη τοῖς γνωρίμοις ὁ δῆμος. ἰσχυρᾶς δὲ τῆς στάσεως οὔσης καὶ πολὺν χρόνον ἀντικαθημένων ἀλλήλοις, εἵλοντο κοινῇ διαλλακτὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα Σόλωνα, καὶ τὴν πολιτείαν ἐπέτρεψαν αὐτῷ.

While the state was organized in this way, and the many were enslaved to the few, the people rose against the notables. The strife was fierce, and they held out against one another for a long time. Eventually the two sides agreed to appoint Solon as reconciler and archon [594/3 BC], and entrusted the state to him. ([*Ath. Pol.*] 5.1-2, trans. P. J. Rhodes)

The aim of this paper is to consider how Solon recasts traditional imagery of warfare and violence in order to bolster his persona as a 'reconciler' and peacemaker. Perhaps the first thing to stress is that Solon is pleading for *internal* peace and the avoidance of civil war – he is not opposed to warfare *per se*, as the fragments of his poem *Salamis* make clear (fr. 1-3):

αὐτὸς κῆρυξ ἦλθον ἀφ' ἱμερτῆς Σαλαμῖνος,
κόσμον ἐπέων ὠιδὴν ἀντ' ἀγορῆς θέμενος.

I have come as a herald from lovely Salamis, adopting song, an ordered form of words, instead of speech.

εἴην δὴ τότ' ἐγὼ Φολεγάνδριος ἢ Σικινήτης
ἀντί γ' Ἀθηναίου πατρίδ' ἀμειψάμενος·
αἶψα γὰρ ὰν φάτις ἥδε μετ' ἀνθρώποισι γένοιτο·
"Ἀττικὸς οὗτος ἀνήρ, τῶν Σαλαμιναφετέων".

In that case I'd rather be from Pholegandrus or Sicinus rather than Athens, exchanging my homeland, for soon this report would spread among men: 'This man's an Athenian, one of those Salamis-ceders.'

ἴομεν ἐς Σαλαμῖνα μαχησόμενοι περὶ νήσου
ἱμερτῆς χαλεπόν τ' αἶσχος ἀπωσόμενοι.

Let us go to Salamis to fight for the lovely isle and clear away harsh disgrace.

Solon's poem (originally 100 lines long, according to Plutarch, *Sol.* 8.2) engages forcefully with Athens' war against Megara for control of Salamis. As in the martial elegies of Callinus and Tyrtaeus, the speaker of *Salamis* stages a dramatic call to arms. Only three fragments (eight lines in total) survive, but they are enough to show Solon's skilled use of persona and emotion, building on the elegiac tradition of martial exhortation.

Thus he poses as a quasi-herald (κῆρυξ) in fr. 1: the image evokes the sacred inviolability and trust invested in the role of herald,[9] encouraging the audience to see Solon as a credible messenger acting in the best interests of Athens. Line 2 ('adopting song, an ordered form of words, instead of speech') plays on the incongruity of a singing herald and emphasizes that Solon's message will be all the more memorable for being in verse. Since κόσμος denotes civic order and good government,[10] the phrase κόσμον ἐπέων further supports Solon's claim to be offering sound political and military advice.[11] In fr. 2 Solon's quotation of anonymous criticism mirrors the use of τις-speeches in Homer[12] and evokes the shame of losing Salamis. His sarcastic neologism Σαλαμιναφέτης ('one of those Salamis-ceders') gives

[9] *Cf.* κήρυκες Διὸς ἄγγελοι ἠδὲ καὶ ἀνδρῶν, *Il.* 1.334; κήρυκες ... Διΐ φίλοι, 8.517.
[10] E.g. πόλεων κόσμοι, Pl. *Prt.* 322c.
[11] For praise of poetry sung κατὰ κόσμον, *cf. Od.* 8.489, *Hom. Hymn Herm.* 433.
[12] A particular concern of Hector's in the *Iliad*: e.g. 6.459-61, 22.106-10.

the imaginary insult a punchy, humiliating ending. Finally, in fr. 3, as is typical of the martial exhortation of Callinus and Tyrtaeus (*cf*. Call. fr. 1, Tyrt. 10, 11) the strong language of disgrace (χαλεπόν τ' αἶσχος)[13] motivates the call to arms.

So *external* war is fine, the problem is the civil war threatening Athens, which forms the background to all of Solon's surviving political poetry. Let's begin with fr. 4:

ἡμετέρη δὲ πόλις κατὰ μὲν Διὸς οὔποτ' ὀλεῖται
αἶσαν καὶ μακάρων θεῶν φρένας ἀθανάτων·
τοίη γὰρ μεγάθυμος ἐπίσκοπος ὀβριμοπάτρη
Παλλὰς Ἀθηναίη χεῖρας ὕπερθεν ἔχει·
αὐτοὶ δὲ φθείρειν μεγάλην πόλιν ἀφραδίηισιν
ἀστοὶ βούλονται χρήμασι πειθόμενοι,
δημου θ' ἡγεμόνων ἄδικος νόος, οἷσιν ἑτοῖμον
ὕβριος ἐκ μεγάλης ἄλγεα πολλὰ παθεῖν·
οὐ γὰρ ἐπίστανται κατέχειν κόρον οὐδὲ παρούσας
εὐφροσύνας κοσμεῖν δαιτὸς ἐν ἡσυχίηι
. . . . . .
πλουτέουσιν δ' ἀδίκοις ἔργμασι πειθόμενοι
. . . . . .
οὔθ' ἱερῶν κτεάνων οὔτε τι δημοσίων
φειδόμενοι κλέπτουσιν ἀφαρπαγῆι ἄλλοθεν ἄλλος,
οὐδὲ φυλάσσονται σεμνὰ Δίκης θέμεθλα,
ἣ σιγῶσα σύνοιδε τὰ γιγνόμενα πρό τ' ἐόντα,
τῶι δὲ χρόνωι πάντως ἦλθ' ἀποτεισομένη,
τοῦτ' ἤδη πάσηι πόλει ἔρχεται ἕλκος ἄφυκτον,
ἐς δὲ κακὴν ταχέως ἦλυθε δουλοσύνην,
ἣ στάσιν ἔμφυλον πόλεμόν θ' εὕδοντ' ἐπεγείρει,
ὃς πολλῶν ἐρατὴν ὤλεσεν ἡλικίην·
ἐκ γὰρ δυσμενέων ταχέως πολυήρατον ἄστυ
τρύχεται ἐν συνόδοις τοῖς ἀδικέουσι φίλους.
ταῦτα μὲν ἐν δήμωι στρέφεται κακά· τῶν δὲ πενιχρῶν
ἱκνέονται πολλοὶ γαῖαν ἐς ἀλλοδαπὴν
πραθέντες δεσμοῖσί τ' ἀεικελίοισι δεθέντες
. . . . . .
οὕτω δημόσιον κακὸν ἔρχεται οἴκαδ' ἑκάστωι,
αὐλειοι δ' ἔτ' ἔχειν οὐκ ἐθέλουσι θύραι,
ὑψηλὸν δ' ὑπὲρ ἕρκος ὑπέρθορεν, εὗρε δὲ πάντως,
εἰ καί τις φεύγων ἐν μυχῶι ἦι θαλάμου.
ταῦτα διδάξαι θυμὸς Ἀθηναίους με κελεύει,
ὡς κακὰ πλεῖστα πόλει Δυσνομίη παρέχει·
Εὐνομίη δ' εὔκοσμα καὶ ἄρτια πάντ' ἀποφαίνει,
καὶ θαμὰ τοῖς ἀδίκοις ἀμφιτίθησι πέδας·
τραχέα λειαίνει, παύει κόρον, ὕβριν ἀμαυροῖ,
αὐαίνει δ' ἄτης ἄνθεα φυόμενα,
εὐθύνει δὲ δίκας σκολιάς, ὑπερήφανά τ' ἔργα
πραΰνει· παύει δ' ἔργα διχοστασίης,
παύει δ' ἀργαλέης ἔριδος χόλον, ἔστι δ' ὑπ' αὐτῆς
πάντα κατ' ἀνθρώπους ἄρτια καὶ πινυτά.

Our state will never be destroyed by the dispensation of Zeus or the intentions of the blessed gods: such a stout-hearted guardian, daughter of a mighty sire, Pallas Athene,

[13] For Homeric *aischos* and its root meaning of 'ugliness', see Cairns (1993) 54-5.

> holds her hands over it. But the citizens themselves are prepared to destroy a great city by their foolish actions, persuaded by wealth, and the mind of the people's leaders is unjust, who are certain to suffer much for their great insolence. They do not know how to restrain excess or conduct the joyful festivities of the banquet in peace ... and they grow rich, relying on unjust deeds ... sparing neither sacred nor public property, they steal by plunder all they can, nor do they respect the venerable foundations of Justice, who, silent, knows present and past, and in time assuredly comes to exact punishment. This is already coming upon the whole city as an inescapable wound, and swiftly it falls into vile slavery, which rouses strife within the tribe and sleeping war, destroyer of many's lovely youth. At the hands of its enemies the much-loved city is swiftly being torn apart in gatherings of those who wrong their friends. These evils roam at large among the people, and many of the poor are headed to foreign lands, sold and bound in shameful bonds ... And so the public ill comes home to everyone, and the courtyard doors refuse to hold it back any longer, but it leaps over the high wall, and finds him out for sure, even if he seeks refuge in the innermost recess of his room. This is what my heart bids me teach the Athenians: Lawlessness brings the city countless ills, but Lawfulness reveals all that is well ordered and fitting, and many a criminal it puts in shackles. It makes the rough smooth, curbs excess, weakens insolence, and shrivels up the budding flowers of delusion; it straightens out crooked judgements, restrains arrogant behaviour, ends discord and the anger of bitter strife. Under its power all men's affairs are fitting and rational.

Though the transmitted text lacks some verses, the lacunae are unlikely to be large, and it is the second longest piece of Solon's to have survived (fr. 13, the so-called *Elegy to the Muses*, being by far the longest). One of the most striking features of fr. 4 is the way it applies the language of epic warfare to *stasis*, and so suggests that the dichotomies of war versus peace, and enemy versus self, do not work in contemporary Athens.

The poem opens in lines 1-4 with the ultimate reassurance for an Athenian audience, the protection of their 'guardian' (ἐπίσκοπος) goddess. The epithet ὀβριμοπάτρη is unique to Athena and triggers the audience's awareness of her role in epic as Zeus' favourite child and the enforcer of his will,[14] enhancing the status of both Athena and her favourite city. χεῖρας ὕπερθεν ἔχει is a familiar gesture of divine protection:[15] Athena, then, will assuredly oppose the city's enemies. However, this turns out to be a red herring as the speaker turns our attention to internal enemies in lines 5-8, with the implication that even divine protection cannot help if you are fighting your own people.

Lines 9-10 focus on typical benefits of peace ('the festivities of the banquet'), but make clear that the citizens are not capable of enjoying them. Solon is thus undermining the traditional dichotomy of war versus peace – one might think, for example, of the city at war and the city at peace depicted on Achilles' shield, where there are two modes: either you are at war, where there is bloodshed, but also divine support and opportunity to win glory; or you are at peace, where there is law and order, and the pleasures of stable life such as weddings and feasts (*Il.* 18.490-540). But Solon departs from this by suggesting that in his world, though the Athenians are formally at peace, they have civil strife, which disrupts the dichotomy of enemy versus self and is harder to manage.

Lines 12-16 describe the greediness of the Athenian elite, but do so using the language of a sacked city (note especially ἀφαρπαγῆι, 'by plunder', line 13),[16] where the enemy run amok and plunder shrines (here the shrine of *Dikē* herself). Since this pillaging is internal, there is no 'us' versus 'them' as in a real war, and the selfishness of the factions is condemned.

As lines 17-22 make clear, the greediness of the leading citizens produces 'slavery' (18), i.e. the oppression of the *dēmos* by the powerful elite, whose consequence is στάσιν ἔμφυλον (19), 'strife within the tribe', as rival aristocratic factions compete for money and power.[17] In lines 21-2 the language of friends and enemies stresses the horror of civil war: the city's enemies (ἐκ … δυσμενέων) are its own cit-

[14] E.g. *Il.* 5.747, *Od.* 3.135; *cf.* Allan (2006) 20-1.

[15] E.g. *Il.* 24.374, where Priam thinks a god may be helping him, but ironically does not understand how.

[16] Fr. 34.1 similarly uses ἁρπαγή of internal plundering.

[17] στάσις in the sense 'civil war' is first attested here.

izens, and the damning word φίλους (i.e. their fellow Athenians) is delayed for maximum effect. In the description of *stasis* itself in lines 19-20, the metaphor of war awakened from its 'sleep', familiar from epic,[18] is made more sinister by being applied to internal violence, while the destruction of ἐρατὴν … ἡλικίην evokes (typically Homeric) pity for the loss of 'lovely youth', but in a context of civil war which makes their killing peculiarly shocking.

Overall, then, fr. 4 applies the language of epic warfare to *stasis*, and suggests that in Solon's Athens the dichotomies of war versus peace, and enemy versus self, do not work. Thus the solution, at the end of the fragment, is not heroic martial endeavour, under the protection of the gods, but Eunomia – that is, a divine (and abstract) peacemaker or reconciler, replacing the function of a warrior. At line 32 Eunomia restores the *kosmos* ('order') which in line 10 was one of the hallmarks of peace (κοσμεῖν ... ἐν ἡσυχίηι). And in lines 37-8 Eunomia finally resolves the discord and strife (*dichostasiē* and *eris*) besetting the city.

The manipulation of epic language and war imagery to support Solon's role as reconciler is even more evident in fr. 5:[19]

δήμωι μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον γέρας ὅσσον ἀπαρκεῖ,
τιμῆς οὔτ' ἀφελὼν οὔτ' ἐπορεξάμενος·
οἳ δ' εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀγητοί,
καὶ τοῖς ἐφρασάμην μηδὲν ἀεικὲς ἔχειν·
ἔστην δ' ἀμφιβαλὼν κρατερὸν σάκος ἀμφοτέροισι,
νικᾶν δ' οὐκ εἴασ' οὐδετέρους ἀδίκως.

I gave the people as much privilege as is sufficient for them, neither detracting from their honour nor giving more; and as for those who had power and were admired for their wealth, I also made sure they suffered no indignity. I took my stand holding my mighty shield over both, and did not allow either side an unjust victory.

The piece is carefully structured not only to reflect the idea of balance[20] – each group is given equal attention: 1-2 on the δῆμος, 3-4 on the elite – but also to underline Solon's active authority and concern for all Athenians: he is the agent of the main verbs (ἔδωκα, ἐφρασάμην, ἔστην, εἴασ'), and the final couplet is devoted to his success in preventing 'an unjust victory' for either side. The poem is thus calculated to appeal to as wide a swathe of the Athenian audience as possible.

The language of *timē* and *geras* in the opening couplet likens Solon to the ideal Homeric leader, who (unlike Agamemnon) knows how to apportion honour and privilege so as to create social harmony. But it is the concluding couplet that refashions martial imagery most strikingly, as Solon shields *both* sides in the conflict, stressing his fairness and concern for all Athenians.[21] By uniting all citizens under one shield, and by raising the possibility of civil strife – especially in the 'unjust victory' (νικᾶν ... ἀδίκως, 6) of one side over another - the image emphasizes Solon's success as a mediator. ἔστην (5), in emphatic first position, focuses our attention on Solon, while the epic-sounding κρατερὸν σάκος characterizes him as a resolute protector.

This defensive shield metaphor will also have reminded the sixth-century BC audience that we're all part of the same hoplite line. The idea of protecting your comrade with the shield evokes the behaviour of the good hoplite, but Solon is able to cover *both* sides with his shield, whereas a real hoplite could cover only one comrade. Solon, then, is not only a good Homeric leader but also a kind of super-hoplite, on whom everyone depends – thus closer to the epic hero in that regard than to the hoplites, where the point

[18] *Cf. Il.* 20.31 (of Zeus) πόλεμον δ' ἀλίαστον ἔγειρε.

[19] In line 1, I prefer the *Ath. Pol.*'s ἀπαρκεῖ to Brunck's ἐπαρκεῖν (accepted by West); *cf.* Mülke (2002) 186-7.

[20] As Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010) 283 observes in her introduction to fr. 5, 'Plut. *Sol.* 14.4 recalls how the maxim "what is balanced does not provoke war" (τὸ ἴσον πόλεμον οὐ ποιεῖ) helped Solon to find favor with the rich and the poor alike.'

[21] Solon's skilful adaptation of military language here is often underappreciated by commentators. Campbell (1982) 245 remarks 'the metaphor "covering both sides with my stout shield" is not particularly happy', while Gerber (1970) 134 observes 'Solon clearly means that he protected both groups by his legislation, but the imagery used does not seem very appropriate.'

is that everyone is equally dependent on one another.[22] So the imagery of war in fr. 5 communicates Solon's role as an outstanding and impartial protector, whose achievement has been to save the Athenians from unjust (i.e. internal) violence.

We find similarly bold use of the imagery of violence and protection at the end of fr. 36, which is one of the most fascinating surviving examples of the political use of iambus in the archaic period:

ἐγὼ δὲ τῶν μὲν οὕνεκα ξυνήγαγον
δῆμον, τί τούτων πρὶν τυχεῖν ἐπαυσάμην;
συμμαρτυροίη ταῦτ' ἂν ἐν δίκηι Χρόνου
μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων Ὀλυμπίων
ἄριστα, Γῆ μέλαινα, τῆς ἐγώ ποτε
ὅρους ἀνεῖλον πολλαχῆι πεπηγότας,
πρόσθεν δὲ δουλεύουσα, νῦν ἐλευθέρη.
πολλοὺς δ' Ἀθήνας πατρίδ' ἐς θεόκτιτον
ἀνήγαγον πραθέντας, ἄλλον ἐκδίκως,
ἄλλον δικαίως, τοὺς δ' ἀναγκαίης ὑπὸ
χρειοῦς φυγόντας, γλῶσσαν οὐκέτ' Ἀττικὴν
ἱέντας, ὡς δὴ πολλαχῆι πλανωμένους·
τοὺς δ' ἐνθάδ' αὐτοῦ δουλίην ἀεικέα
ἔχοντας, ἤθη δεσποτέων τρομεομένους,
ἐλευθέρους ἔθηκα. ταῦτα μὲν κράτει
ὁμοῦ βίην τε καὶ δίκην ξυναρμόσας
ἔρεξα, καὶ διῆλθον ὡς ὑπεσχόμην·
θεσμοὺς δ' ὁμοίως τῶι κακῶι τε κἀγαθῶι
εὐθεῖαν εἰς ἕκαστον ἁρμόσας δίκην
ἔγραψα. κέντρον δ' ἄλλος ὡς ἐγὼ λαβών,
κακοφραδής τε καὶ φιλοκτήμων ἀνήρ,
οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον· εἰ γὰρ ἤθελον
ἃ τοῖς ἐναντίοισιν ἤνδανεν τότε,
αὖτις δ' ἃ τοῖσιν οὗτεροι φρασαίατο,
πολλῶν ἂν ἀνδρῶν ἥδ' ἐχηρώθη πόλις.
τῶν οὕνεκ' ἀλκὴν πάντοθεν ποιεόμενος
ὡς ἐν κυσὶν πολλῆισιν ἐστράφην λύκος.

The aims for which I called the people together, which of these had I failed to achieve before I stopped? May I call as my best witness in the verdict of Time the mighty mother of the Olympian gods, black Earth, whose boundary-markers, fixed far and wide, I removed – slave before, now she is free. And to Athens, to their homeland founded by the gods, I brought back many who had been sold, some illegally, some legally, and others who had fled out of compelling need, no longer speaking the Attic tongue, so far and wide their wanderings. And others suffering shameful slavery right here, trembling at their masters' whims, I set free. These things I achieved by my power, combining force and justice, and I carried out all my promises. I wrote laws for the lowly and the noble man equally, creating straight justice for all. If another had wielded the goad as I did, an unscrupulous and greedy man, he would not have restrained the people. If I'd been willing to do what the people's opponents wanted then, or in turn what the others had in store for them, this city would have been bereft of many men. So, defending myself on all sides, I turned about like a wolf amid a pack of dogs.

[22] van Wees (2004) 166-83 doubts the existence of the hoplite phalanx in the early archaic period. But even if he is right (and many do not share his scepticism), Solon's image of the protecting shield has a strong epic pedigree (take, for example, Teucer's tactic of taking shelter beneath Ajax's tower shield, *Il.* 8.266-72). The psychology and ideology of hoplite warfare in classical Athens, as discussed by Crowley (2012), continues this traditional insistence on mutual protection.

As in the elegiac fr. 5, Solon here defends his policies as being in the best interests of all Athenians, and boasts of his resistance to the extreme demands made by both the δῆμος and their wealthy opponents. By focusing on the liberation of the Athenian land (3-7) and its citizens (8-15), Solon foregrounds the damage to Athenian society caused by greed, debt and enslavement for it, and presents his unbiased reforms as having prevented civil war (22-5).[23] But it is the concluding simile (26-7) that I want to draw attention to here, a simile that places Solon at the centre of events in a dramatically striking way.

Solon's wolf simile is highly ironic and stresses the ingratitude of the Athenians who assail him because of his reforms. Although Solon worked for the whole community, their reaction has forced him into the role of the wolf, while the two sides, the δῆμος and its opponents, have united (like a dog pack) to attack him, despite their incompatible interests. As with the shield simile of fr. 5, the animal simile here evokes Homeric epic, and adapts epic imagery to suit the new and disturbing context of civil war. In contrast to the shield simile, however, where Solon stands in the middle protecting both sides, here he is forced into the middle because he is under attack from all sides. Once again there is play on 'who is the enemy?': in fr. 5 the implication was 'no one, we're all on the same side', but here Solon is being treated as if he were the enemy, despite his beneficent behaviour. As in the other poems we've looked at, the citizens are incapable of distinguishing self from enemy.

Solon's simile in fr. 36 only becomes clear with the final word (λύκος), enhancing its impact. Since the wolf can have positive as well as negative associations in Greek thought, Solon's image works in different ways, but all to his advantage. As an animal known for its independence – one might compare the fable (346 Perry) of the 'free' wolf, who rejects the easy but 'slavish' life of the dog – it highlights Solon's courage in sticking to his principles and refusing to serve either side. On the other hand, the wolf's reputation as a selfish predator (even turning on its fellow wolves to get its prey: *cf*. *Il.* 4.471-2) emphasizes Solon's unfair treatment as an outsider, as he, the saviour of his community, is attacked by the group (the dog pack) and cast in the role of the anti-social animal.

My final example of the transformation of martial imagery comes from fr. 37 ([*Ath. Pol.*] 12.5), where Solon rebukes both sides for complaining that they did not get what they wanted:

καὶ πάλιν ὀνειδίζων πρὸς τὰς ὕστερον αὐτῶν μεμψιμοιρίας ἀμφοτέρων·

> δήμωι μὲν εἰ χρὴ διαφάδην ὀνειδίσαι,
> ᾗ νῦν ἔχουσιν οὐποτ' ὀφθᾳλμοῖσιν ἂν
> εὔδοντες εἶδον …
> ὅσοι δὲ μείζους καὶ βίην ἀμείνονες,
> αἰνοῖεν ἄν με καὶ φίλον ποιοίατο. 5

εἰ γάρ τις ἄλλος, φησί, ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς ἔτυχεν,

> οὐκ ἄν κατέσχε δῆμον, οὐδ' ἐπαύσατο
> πρὶν ἀνταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα·
> ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων ὥσπερ ἐν μεταιχμίωι
> ὅρος κατέστην. 10

Again, reproaching both parties for the complaints they made afterwards:

> If I am to reproach the people openly, I say that what they now have they would never even have dreamt of ... And those who are bigger and stronger should praise me and call me friend.

For if some other man, he says, had obtained this position,

---

[23] *Cf*. Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010) 481-2 on 36.23: 'ἐναντίος is attested as a noun for the first time here; it was mainly predicative in Homer and Hesiod. When used in a hostile sense it focuses on the physicality of staying or moving 'in front' / 'against', and thus better than other more abstract designations of the enemies (like ἐχθροί, πολέμιοι, etc.), it graphically evokes the turmoil of the civil war.'

> He would not have restrained the people, nor have stopped until he'd churned the milk and lost the cream. But I took my stand in the middle ground between them like a boundary-marker.

In the concluding image, a striking mixed metaphor, Solon compares himself to a ὅρος ('boundary-marker') set in the μεταίχμιον ('the place between two armies'). The word μεταίχμιον is first attested here, but the idea of a space between two armies is a traditional feature of epic, and evokes those scenes where a warrior comes forward to challenge an opponent to face-to-face combat (e.g. Paris' ill-advised challenge to the Achaeans at the start of the fighting in the *Iliad*, a challenge met by Menelaus, *Il.* 3.21-9). Here, by contrast, Solon is coming out into the middle to reconcile the two sides, who are depicted as warring enemies.

The area between two armies is, of course, meant to be crossed since that is where, in normal circumstances, victory is sealed and glory won, but this is a civil war, and the paradoxical image of a boundary-marker set in the μεταίχμιον emphasizes the unacceptability of internal conflict. At line 6 of fr. 36 Solon boasted of removing the boundary-markers (ὅρους) from the land of Attica.[24] Here in fr. 37, however, Solon himself is the boundary, in a positive sense, between the warring factions (the δῆμος and the ruling elite). The image of the ὅρος thus works on many levels: it suggests there is a genuine distinction between the two parties, but also emphasizes that their conflict is best resolved not by civil war but by peaceful agreement (i.e. a lawful boundary-marker), a symbol of reconciliation embodied by Solon himself.

In conclusion, we can see Solon using two strategies in particular to communicate the importance of his role as peacemaker: the first is the way he applies military language and metaphors to political situations and relationships in order to highlight the evils of *stasis*:[25] the second is the way he recasts traditional imagery of warfare and violence in order to highlight his efforts, and his success, as a 'reconciler' (διαλλακτής) of the warring parties. As Nestor says in the *Iliad*, 'Clanless, lawless, hearthless is the man who loves the horror of war within his own people' (ἀφρήτωρ ἀθέμιστος ἀνέστιός ἐστιν ἐκείνος | ὃς πολέμου ἔραται ἐπιδημίου ὀκρυόεντος, 9.63-4). Solon's poetry builds on this basic truth, and recasts traditional epic imagery so that his audience, in the shadow of civil war, will grasp the benefits of peace and reconciliation.

[24] Some have doubted the traditional interpretation of ὅροι as markers of mortgaged land and a sign of indebted 'sixth-parters' or *hektēmoroi*, but see de Ste. Croix (2004) 107-28. In any case, line 7 of fr. 36 makes clear that the stones symbolize (in Solon's view) a damaging state of servitude between small farmers and their overlords.

[25] In addition to those discussed above, note the ἕλκος ἄφυκτον ('inescapable wound') afflicting the city (fr. 4.17), the ῥύματα ('defences') of the demagogues (fr. 11.3), and Solon's rejection of tyranny due to *aidōs* and *kleos* (fr. 32.3-4), which will ensure his political *victory*: πλέον γὰρ ὧδε νικήσειν δοκέω | πάντας ἀνθρώπους (fr. 32.4-5).

Works cited

Allan, W. (2006) 'Divine justice and cosmic order in early Greek epic', *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 126: 1-35.

Blok, J.H. & A. P. M. H. Lardinois (2006) *Solon of Athens: New historical and Philological Approaches*. Leiden.

Cairns, D.L. (1993) *Aidōs: The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*. Oxford.

Campbell, D.A. (1982) *Greek Lyric: A Selection of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry* 2nd edn. Bristol.

Crowley, J. (2012) *The Psychology of the Athenian Hoplite: The Culture of Combat in Classical Athens*. Cambridge.

de Ste. Croix, G.E.M. (2004) *Athenian Democratic Origins*. Oxford.

Forsdyke, S. (2006)'Land, labor and economy in Solonian Athens: breaking the impasse between archaeology and history' in Blok and Lardinois (2006) 334-350.

Gerber, D.E. (1970) *Euterpe: An Anthology of Early Greek Lyric, Elegiac and Iambic Poetry*. Amsterdam.

Harris, E.M. (2002) 'Did Solon abolish debt-bondage?', *CQ* 52: 415-430.

Kearns, E. (1989) *The Heroes of Attica*. London.

Lewis, J. (2006) *Solon the Thinker: Political Thought in Archaic Athens*. London.

Manville, P.B. (1990) *The Origins of Citizenship in Ancient Athens*. Princeton.

Mülke, C. (2002) *Solons politische Elegien und Iamben (Fr. 1-13; 32-37 West): Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung, Kommentar*. Munich.

Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (2010) *Solon the Athenian: the Poetic Fragments*. Leiden.

Rhodes, P.J. (2006) 'The reforms and laws of Solon: an optimistic view' in Blok & Lardinois (2006) 248-260.

Stanley, P.V. (1999) *The Economic Reforms of Solon*. St Katharinen.

van Wees, H. (2004) *Greek Warfare: Myths and Realities*. London.

West, M.L. ed. (1989) *Iambi et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati* 2nd edn. Oxford.