

New Classicists

Issue 2 January 2020

‘The popular in
Classical Antiquity’

“Solon” and his people

Sherry Huang



“Solon ”and his People: The afterlife of an archaic political personage in late democratic Athens

Sherry Huang – Texas Tech University

This paper demonstrates the internal conflicts in the narrative of the “Solon myth”- the archaic poet turned into the founding-father of Athenian democracy. It does so by juxtaposition of the *Weltanschauung*¹ of Solon fr. 4 and its reception in the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines. I argue that this *Weltanschauung*, consisting in a hostile dichotomy between the πόλις (*polis*, city-state) and its people, undermines the legitimacy of the people as the locus of sovereignty with its anti-democratic and pro-tyrannical implications. The ideological discrepancy between two “Solons”, one from Solon fr. 4 and the other presented by Demosthenes and Aeschines, internally motivates the paradigm shift of Solon’s image. The hostile dichotomy of Solon fr. 4 turns into a concentric moral structure in the courtroom speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines, where morality of the individual is the pivot of civic order, a viable analog to the management of household and the well-being of the *polis*.

This article contributes to the understanding of “popular²” in Ancient Greece in two ways: firstly, this article investigates the reception of Solon by engaging with oratory material such as Demosthenes and Aeschines, “popular” due to its interactive nature and the anticipation to be persuasive for the people; secondly, this article looks into the premises of popular politics, in particular the moral implications of the people as the locus of sovereignty: “the people” as individuals and a community entail distinctive approaches to the moral foundation of *polis*.

Methodology and textual issues

Although some agree that there is more truth than myth in Solon,³ the scarcity of evidence has meant that further efforts to pursue a completely historical Solon behind his poems have been to no avail.⁴ Nevertheless, textual analysis of Solonian fragments

¹ An all-inclusive worldview that does not stay as opinion, but also motivates certain engagements with the real world. Laden with German philosophical tradition, this word denominates the connotations and denotations of Solonian fragments, and the political “cosmos” constructed by the language and structure of the text, i.e. how Solon perceives the relationship between the gods, human and the dynamics of civic life. All lyric poetry texts are from West (1971).

² Popular in the sense of being carried on by “the people” as a whole rather than restricted to politicians or political parties.

³ Raaflaub (1994: 98-102); Rhodes (2006: 259); Allan (2018: 115).

⁴ Lardinois (2006: 33); Stehle (2006: 110-11); Blaise (2006: 128-31).

has continued to be fruitful.⁵ The intertextuality between Solon and other archaic poetry contributes to our understanding of Solonian fragments.⁶

This article approaches the Solonian fragments in a structuralist manner. Firstly, central to my reading of Solon fr. 4 is the comparison of two words commonly signifying “the people” in archaic Greek language: ἀστοί (*astoi*, townsmen/citizens) and δῆμος (*demos*, “the people”);⁷ the nuances in signification of *astoi* vis-à-vis *demos* are defined by the relational nature of meaning. Secondly, by interpreting the semic codes (e.g. binary structures, parallelism) of Solonian language, I demonstrate the hostile dichotomy in Solon fr. 4 between *polis* and populace, established through the overlapping of a series of binary structures: sacred and secular, public and private, and community and individual. Last but not least, “Solon” shall be perceived as one consistent authorial persona only from the perspective of reception, acknowledging that the authorial persona of Solonian poetry would have been perceived as the historical and authentic Solon by fourth-century Athenians. Getting to the bottom of the “Solonian question” may satisfy certain “antiquarian” interests but is mostly irrelevant to the purpose of this article.⁸

There are three reasons to focus on Solon fr. 4: firstly, this poem is quoted by Demosthenes, which confirms its widely accepted authenticity in fourth-century Athens; second, focusing on one poem avoids the question of availability of material to fourth-century audiences when one cross-examines fragments from different sources. Finally, this poem includes all political agencies essential to Solon: the gods, humans, the lawgiver, and an extensive narrative of civil strife, which demonstrates Solonian political etiology and ontology.⁹ As a result, Solon fr. 4 could produce an all-inclusive Solonian *Weltanschauung*. This methodology overcomes the textual obstacles of Solonian fragments, which have led to a generally fragmented reading of Solon. The rest of the Solonian corpus serves as supporting evidence of the language system in which Solon fr. 4 operates. The question of whether such Solonian *Weltanschauung* generated by Solon

⁵ Jaeger (1966: 75-100); Henderson (1982: 26-29); Anhalt (1993: 67-114); Irwin (2005: 91-110); Henderson (2006: 130-4); Irwin (2006: 44-72); Stehle (2006: 82-111); Blaise (2006: 115-128); Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 217-266); (Allan 2018: 115-28).

⁶ With Theognis of Megara, Irwin (2006: 51-72); Stehle (2006: 108), Anhalt (1993: e.g. 81-3, 90); with Homeric poetry, Anhalt (1993: 83-5); Blaise (2006: 114-31); Allan (2018: 115-28); with Hesiodic tradition, Blaise (2006: 114-31).

⁷ Another word, πολίτης (*polites*), also signifies “citizen” or, as an adjective, “belonging to, connected with one’s city or country”. It is not discussed here for two reasons: first, it is not used in Solonian fragments; second, although it is used in other archaic lyric poetry and Homeric poetry, its use is relatively limited in the time relevant to this discussion, for example, one occurrence only in the entire collection of epigrams in CEG 462. *Astos* almost exclusively appear in plural until the second half of fifth century. (Blok 2005: 15) There is no occurrence of it in the singular in the entire lyric poetry corpus in West (1971) and only one in CEG 13. Therefore, this paper will not discuss its meaning in the singular.

⁸ Cf. Blaise (2006: 128-31).

⁹ Solon fr. 1-3 focuses on the secular aspect of politics, while the authorial persona is only the poet, instead of lawgiver; fr. 13 is extensive on the fate of the mortals vis-à-vis the will of gods, but neglects the dynamics of civic life; fr. 27 is wisdom for personal life without transcendent connotations; fr. 36 emphasizes the solution for civic strife, rather than etiology.

fr. 4 alone applies to the rest of Solonian fragments cannot be addressed in this article but is certainly a direction for future examination of this paper's primary hypothesis.

The *Weltanschauung* of Solon fr. 4

Solon fr. 4 was considered too long by both Wilamowitz in 1893 and then by Jaeger in 1926 to have been recited in full in the court. Rowe convincingly argues the opposite on the basis of its thematic relevance to Demosthenes' argument.¹⁰ Either way, there is no doubt about the authenticity of this poem.¹¹ I would like to start with the idea of "the people". Two words in fr. 4 potentially mean "the people": *astoi* (the plural form of *astos*) in line 6, and *demos* in line 7 and line 23. To determine what is signified specifically by *astoi* in Solon. fr. 4, it is necessary to look at the rest of Solonian fragments and lyric poetry.¹² "*astoi*" appears only once elsewhere in Solon, in fr. 10.¹³ In this context, *astoi* is the general public who would witness Solon's political struggles. The use of this word in Solonian fragments is minimal,¹⁴ but the sense of being the audience of certain performative activities and representative of public opinion within a political context is shared by Solon's contemporaries.¹⁵ For example, in Archilochus fr. 172, the *astoi* is the witness to Father Lycambes' behaviors, the source of the opinion of it being γέλως (*gelos*, laughable, ridiculous);¹⁶ in Tyrtaeus fr. 12, 35-40,¹⁷ the brilliant warrior stands out among *astoi*; Xenophanes, fr. 2, 1-6, the *astoi* witness the athletic competition.¹⁸ Therefore, although not used very much by Solon, the usage of *astoi* is rather unified throughout lyric poetry corpus: it signifies the populace as a whole that offers opinion as audience and witness towards a certain figure among them.

¹⁰ Rowe (1972: 441-9).

¹¹ This paper follows the texts in the critical edition of West and its numbering system.

¹² Cf. Noussia-Fantuzzi 2010: 225.

¹³ Solon. fr. 10: μανίην μὲν ἐμὴν βαιὸς χρόνος ἀστοῖς, δείξει, ἀληθείης ἐς μέσον ἐρχομένης. (Indeed a short time will reveal (the truth about)/ my madness, when it comes to the public.)

¹⁴ The use of *astoi* closest to the one in Solon is in Thgn. 41 in a dichotomy between *astoi* and ἡγεμόνες (*hegemones*, the leaders): the people are sound-minded, while their leaders are heading for the worst deeds. The meaning of the *Theognidea* lines is the opposite of Solon's lines.

¹⁵ Cf. Thgn. 24, where *astoi* is used most literally as "audience within the *polis*".

¹⁶ πάτερ Λυκάμβη, ποῖον ἐφράσω τόδε/ τίς σάς παρήειρε φρένας/ ἧς τό πρὶν ἠρήρησθα. νῦν δὲ δὴ πολὺς/ ἀστοῖσι φαίνεαι γέλως (Father Lycambes, what is this you propose?/ Who unhinged your mind, which was sound before./ Now indeed you seem ridiculous to the people). (Archil. fr. 172) Cf. Archil. fr. 13, where the word *astoi* is used in combination with *polis*; Archil. fr. 133, where *astoi* are the crowd that decide whether to respect a powerful figure when he is alive and dead.

¹⁷ εἰ δὲ φύγη μὲν κῆρα τανηλεγέος θανάτοιο,/ νικήσας δ' αἰχμῆς ἀγλαὸν εὖχος ἔλη,/ πάντες μιν τιμῶσιν ὁμῶς νέοι ἠδὲ παλαιοί,/ πολλὰ δὲ τερπνὰ παθῶν ἔρχεται εἰς Ἄϊδην:/ γηράσκων δ' ἀστοῖσι μεταπρέπει, οὐδέ τις αὐτὸν/ βλάπτειν οὔτ' αἰδοῦς οὔτε δίκης ἐθέλει. (But if he escapes the doom of death that brings long woe,/ and victoriously makes splendid boast of war,/ all will honor him, both the young and the old,/ and much delight of his misfortune will come to Hades;/ but growing old he is distinguished among the people,/ no one is willing to harm him either in justice or in respect.) *Astos* appears in line 39, which is adapted in the *Theognidea* line 937.

¹⁸ ἀλλ' εἰ μὲν ταχὺτι ποδῶν νίκην τις ἄροίτο/ ἢ πενταθλεύων, ἔνθα Διὸς τέμενος/ πᾶρ Πίσαιο ῥοῆς ἐν Ὀλυμπίῃ, εἴτε παλαιοῶν/ ἢ καὶ πυκτοσύνην ἀλγινόεσσαν ἔχων,/ εἴτε τὸ δεινὸν ἄεθλον ὃ παγκράτιον καλέουσιν,/ ἀστοῖσιν κ' εἴη κυδρότερος προσορᾶν,...(But if one should claim victory of five-exercise contest/ for the swiftness of foot, there in the precinct of Zeus/ by the stream of Pisa in Olympia, either being in wrestling/ or painful boxing, or the fearful contest which they call pancration,/ he is to be perceived more glorious among the people,...)

Demos is another piece of vocabulary that signifies “the people”. Compared to *astoi*, it is much more common in Solonian fragments; it is coined by Solonian poetry and his political thoughts differently from the rest of lyric poetry corpus. Within Solonian fragments, *demos* tends to be part of a binary structure, usually with a more powerful and wealthy group.¹⁹ In Solon. fr. 5, *demos* and οἱ δ’ εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀγῆτοί (those who hold power and is admirable for their fortune) are two parties affected by Solon’s policy.²⁰ In Solon. fr. 6, the two poles of the binary structure are *demos* and the ἡγεμόνες (*hegemones*, the leaders).²¹ Solon. fr. 9 features double dichotomy between *demos* and ἀνδρῶν (δ’ ἐκ) μεγάλων ([by] great men), as well as *demos* and μονάρχου (sole ruler).²² Another dichotomy in Solon. fr. 37 forms between *demos* and ὅσοι δὲ μείζους καὶ βίην ἀμείνονες (“those who are greater and more powerful”).²³ However, as we move away from Solonian tradition, *demos* starts to signify the populace as a whole, rather similar to *astoi* in its usage. Thgn. 43-50 contains the notion of the *demos* seduced by the depraved, resonating with Solon fr. 9. Nevertheless, left outside of the dichotomy between ἀγαθοὶ ἄνδρες (the good people) and κακοῖσιν ἀνδράσι ([to] the bad people), *demos* seems to refer to the populace as a whole in this case.²⁴ In Thgn. 233-234, *demos*, with the epithet as κενεόφρονι δήμῳ ([over] an empty-minded populace), is the populace as a whole overshadowed by one ἐσθλὸς ἀνὴρ (excellent man);²⁵ same epithet reappears in Thgn. 847-850, in a similar context of tyrannical references, where *demos* is the

¹⁹ Solon. fr. 36 would be the only exception in this case, where in a civil strife scenario similar to Solon. fr. 4, *demos* implies a more complicated power relations involving the lawgiver, the citizenry, and conflicting parties. (Solon. fr. 36 18-26)

²⁰ δήμῳ μὲν γὰρ ἔδωκα τόσον γέρας ὅσον ἀπαρκεῖν/ τιμῆς οὐτ’ ἀφελῶν οὐτ’ ἐπορεξάμενος/ οἱ δ’ εἶχον δύναμιν καὶ χρήμασιν ἦσαν ἀγῆτοί, καὶ τοῖς ἐφρασάμην μηδὲν ἀεικέες ἔχειν/ ἔστην δ’ ἀμφιβαλῶν κρατερόν σάκος ἀμφοτέροισι,/ νικᾶν δ’ οὐκ εἶσ’ οὐδετέρους ἀδίκως. (for I give the people their privilege as much as is sufficient/ neither taking away nor giving too much;/ but those who hold power and is admirable for their fortune,/ I show that they will not suffer unseemly...)

²¹ δήμος δ’ ὧδ’ ἂν ἄριστα σὺν ἡγεμόνεσσιν ἔποιτο,/ μῆτε λίην ἀνεθείς μῆτε βιαζόμενος. (So the best people follow their leader,/ neither to loose nor too constrained.)

²² ἐκ νεφέλης πέλεται χιόνος μένος ἠδὲ χαλάζης,/ βροντῆ δ’ ἐκ λαμπρῆς γίγνεται ἀστεροπῆς/ ἀνδρῶν δ’ ἐκ μεγάλων πόλις ὄλλυται, ἐς δὲ μονάρχου/ δήμος αἰδρήν δουλῶσύνην ἔπεσεν./ λίην δ’ ἐξάρανετ’ <οὐ> ῥάδιόν ἐστι κατασχεῖν/ ὕστερον, ἀλλ’ ἤδη χρή <τινα> πάντα νοεῖν. (The might of snow and hail comes from a cloud,/ and thunder comes from bright lightning;/ but the city is destroyed by great men, and the people/ falls into the slavery of a sole ruler because of ignorance.)

²³ δήμῳ μὲν εἰ χρῆ διαφάδην ὀνειδίσαι,/ ἢ νῦν ἔχουσιν οὐποτ’ ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ἂν/ εὐδοντες εἶδον . . / ὅσοι δὲ μείζους καὶ βίην ἀμείνονες,/ αἰνοῖεν ἂν με καὶ φίλον ποιοῖατο./ εἰ γάρ τις ἄλλος, φησί, ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς ἔτυχεν,/ οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δήμον, οὐδ’ ἐπαύσατο,/ πρὶν ἀνταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα./ (while if it is necessary to openly criticize and displease the public,/ they will never see in their dreams/ what they have now.../and those who are greater and more powerful,/ would speak nice of me, and make friends with me;/ for if someone else had received this honor,/ he would not restrain the people nor would he stop,/ before he stirred up the fat and took it from the milk.) (Solon. fr. 37 1-10)

²⁴ οὐδεμίαν πῶ, Κύρν’, ἀγαθοὶ πόλιν ὄλεσαν ἄνδρες/ ἀλλ’ ὅταν ὑβρίζειν τοῖσι κακοῖσιν ἄδη,/ δῆμόν τε φθείρωσι δίκας τ’ ἀδικοῖσι διδῶσιν/ οἰκείων κερδέων εἵνεκα καὶ κράτεος,/ ἔλλπεο μὴ δηρὸν κείνην πόλιν ἀτρεμίεσθαι,/ μῆδ’ εἰ νῦν κείται πολλῇ ἐν ἡσυχίῃ,/ εὐτ’ ἂν τοῖσι κακοῖσι φίλ’ ἀνδράσι ταῦτα γένηται,/ κέρδεα δημοσίῳ σὺν κακῷ ἐρχόμενα. (Never yet, Curnus, did good people destroy a city;/ But whenever it pleases the bad to commit wanton violence/ and they corrupt the people and give judgment to the unjust/ on account of private benefit and power,/ expect that that city would not keep quiet for long,/ and not if it lies in great rest now,/ when these things become dear to the bad people/ approaching profit with public evil.)

²⁵ ἀκρόπολις καὶ πύργος ἐὼν κενεόφρονι δήμῳ./Κύρν’, ὀλίγης τιμῆς ἔμμορεν ἐσθλὸς ἀνὴρ. (An excellent man is acropolis and tower over an empty-minded populace,/ Curnus, he partakes a small portion of honor.)

populace to be put under the yoke of one powerful ruler;²⁶ In Thgn. 947-948, *demos* and ἀδίκους ἀνδράσι ([by] the unjust men) are two sources of deviation as one brings order to his country, yet it is not clear whether they are two groups that are different in nature.²⁷ In Callinus fr.1, 16, *demos* is the witness to one's life and death.²⁸ Used alongside λαῶ (laoi, "people"), *demos* in this case signifies something similar to *astoi*. In Tyrtaeus fr. 4. 9, *demos* is the populace that benefits when θεοτιμήτους βασιλῆας (god-honored kings), πρεσβυγενέας γέροντας (the elders), and δημότας ἄνδρας (the commoners) all follow the divine counsel of Φοῖβος (*Phoibos*, epithet of Apollo).²⁹ In Tyrtaeus fr. 12, *demos* is the populace of the polis, used in the exact same context as *astoi*.³⁰ Therefore, it is fair to say that the connection between the signifier *demos* and the signified as those of lower classes in a dichotomy with the rich and powerful is peculiarly Solonian. In most fragments of other lyric poets, *demos* signifies the populace as a whole, similar to *astoi*.

To summarize the discussion above on *astoi* and *demos*, *astoi* does not commonly occur in Solonian language, but as attested in the rest of archaic lyric poetry, it signifies the general public that is usually passively involved in the political life of the polis. *Demos* in Solonian fragments, unlike in the rest of lyric corpus, usually denotes a very peculiar group of the populace characterized by lower social class in a binary structure against those powerful and wealthy.³¹ In other words, only in Solonian fragments do the two signifiers function differently: *astoi* represents the public, while *demos* denotes class struggle.

²⁶ λάξ ἐπίβα δῆηω κενεόφρονι, τύπτε δὲ κέντρω/ ὄξεϊ, καὶ ζεύγλην δύσλοφον ἀμφιτίθει./ οὐ γὰρ ἔθ' εὐρήσεις δῆμον φιλοδέσποτον ὧδε/ ἀνθρώπων ὀπόσους ἠέλιος καθορᾷ. (Step upon the empty-minded people with foot, poke them/ with a sharp goad, and put a yoke that's hard to bear on them./ for you will not find a people of all men that loves a master/ so much wherever under the sun.)

²⁷ πατρίδα κοσμήσω, λιπαρὴν πόλιν, οὐτ' ἐπὶ δῆμω/ τρέψας οὐτ' ἀδίκους ἀνδράσι πειθόμενος. (I will bring order to my country, the shiny city, neither turning/ towards the people, nor seduced by the unjust people.)

²⁸ πολλάκι δῆϊοτητα φυγῶν καὶ δοῦπον ἀκόντων/ ἔρχεται, ἐν δ' οἴκω μοῖρα κίχεν θανάτου./ ἀλλ' ὁ μὲν οὐκ ἔμπης δῆμω φίλος οὐδὲ ποθεινός./ τὸν δ' ὀλίγος στενάχει καὶ μέγας, ἦν τι πάθη./ λαῶ γὰρ σύμπαντι πόθος κρατερόφρονος ἀνδρὸς/ θνήσκοντος, ζῶων δ' ἄξιος ἡμιθέων./ ὥσπερ γὰρ πύργον μιν ἐν ὀφθαλμοῖσιν ὀρῶσιν./ ἔρδει γὰρ πολλῶν ἄξια μούνοσ ἐών. (many times when he returns fleeing from the conflict of battle/ and the thud of spears, but the fate of death reaches to him at home./ But it is neither dear to the people, nor is it desirable./ but the small and great lament him, if he dies the other way./ for the regret of a brave man's death is for all men, and/ he is like a demigod while alive; for in their eyes they see him/ as a tower, for he single-handedly does the work of many.) (Callinus fr. 1. 14-21)

²⁹ ἄρχην μὲν βουλῆς θεοτιμήτους βασιλῆας./ οἷσι μέλει Σπάρτης ἡμερόεσσα πόλις./ πρεσβυγενέας τε γέροντας· ἔπειτα δὲ δημότας ἄνδρας/ εὐθείαις ῥήτραις ἀνταπαμειβομένους/ μυθεῖσθαι τε τὰ καλά καὶ ἔρδειν πάντα δίκαια/ μηδὲ τι βουλευεῖν τῆδε πόλει σκολιόν./ δῆμου δὲ πλήθει νίκην καὶ κάρτος ἔπεσθαι./ Φοῖβος γὰρ περὶ τῶν ὧδ' ἀνέφηνε πόλει. (The beginning of the counsel is from the god-honored kings,/ to whom the lovely city of Sparta is the concern./ and to those elders; then the commoners./ answering with straight ordinance,/ both say good things and do all just things./ not give any crooked counsel to the city./ and the victory and power follow the people./ for Phobos declared concerning these things to the city.) (Tyrtaeus fr.4. 3-10)

³⁰ οὐ γὰρ ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς γίγνεται ἐν πολέμῳ./ εἰ μὴ τετλαίῃ μὲν ὀρῶν φόνον αἱματόεντα/ καὶ δηῖων ὀρέγοιτ' ἐγγύθεν ιστάμενος./ ἦδ' ἀρετῆ, τόδ' ἄεθλον ἐν ἀνθρώποισιν ἄριστον/ κάλλιστόν τε φέρειν γίγνεται ἀνδρὶ νέω./ ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόλῃ τε παντὶ τε δῆμῳ. (For a man is not good in war./ if he had not suffered, watching blood-red murder/ and reached forth to strike, standing nigh./ This is excellence, this is the best prize and/ the most beautiful for man to win in the world./ This is the common good for the city and its people,..)

³¹ On other significations of *demos* in Solon, see Irwin (2006: 46-9).

In the case of Solon. fr. 4, both *demos* and *astoi* are used, but *demos* is only used without its denotation on class struggle. In line 7, *demos* is used in the idiomatic phrase δῆμου θ' ἡγεμόνων (*demou t' hegemonon*, the leaders of “the people”) marked in various archaic poets. The phrase itself comprises the typical Solonian dichotomy of *demos* and *hegemones*, but the idiomatic nature of the phrase among lyric tradition mitigates the Solonian signification of *demos*. In line 23, *demos*, as in ἐν δήμῳ (in *demoi*), is best understood as “domestically”, antonym of “γαῖαν ἐς ἀλλοδαπήν” (*gaian es allodapen*, in foreign land).³² With specific choice of *astoi*, Solon deliberately moves the focus of the language away from class struggle within the *polis* denoted by *demos*, the Solonian signifier. Avoiding the use of *demos* on its own as the typical Solonian signifier discussed above sends a clear message: Solon blames the entire populace, not just *demou t' hegemonon*, certainly not the commoners of lower social class, for the moral corruption which later causes στάσις (*stasis*, discord).³³

In fr. 4, the populace is the initiator, participant, and victim of the civil strife.³⁴ First, the *astoi*, and *demou t' hegemonon* is particularly seduced by greed, the moral corruption that leads to civil strife. In fr. 4.5-6, the operative word πειθόμενοι resonates with Thgn. 194 in meaning “seduced by money”, instead of “relying on their wealth”.³⁵ Solon employs the vocabulary from an aristocratic context to express the public’s materialistic desire.³⁶ Such a quality is shared by the “*demou t' hegemonon*” in lines 7-12 of fr.4. Although *demou t' hegemonon* are placed in a more elitist scenario of banqueting, the depravity of the *astoi* and *demou t' hegemonon* is of similar nature - greed and the shortsightedness of failing to see the consequence of moral corruption.³⁷ Secondly, both the elites and the commoners, the common binary structure in Solonian fragments, suffer from the civil strife caused by their mutual moral corruption. Solon fr. 4, 20, “ὄς πολλῶν ἐρατὴν ὤλεσεν ἡλικίην (which destroys the lovely youth of many)” describes the suffering of the elite class, as Noussia-Fantuzzi points out, “Solon’s use of the epithet ἐρατὴν (*eraten*, lovely), whose etymology suggests an undertone of eroticism, stresses the aesthetic quality of the young dead, which specifically belonged to the ideal of the life of the aristocracy”.³⁸ The fates of the young dead aristocrats are again echoed by those sold into slavery in line 23-25, naturally the poor.³⁹ To summarize, in Solon. fr. 4, there

³² Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 252).

³³ Irwin (2006: 64) points out that these lines mirror Thgn. 39-42, but it also contrasts Thgn. 39-42: *astoi* are σαόφρονες (*saophrones*, soundminded) according to Theognidea, unlike *hegemones* that seeks evil deeds.

³⁴ Irwin points out that these lines identify both *astoi* and *hegemones* are responsible for destroying the polis, “through a mixture of greed, injustice and hybris” Irwin (2006: 65-66). Cf. also Anhalt (1993: 99) quoting Massaracchia.

³⁵ Noussia-Fantuzzi, (2010: 225).

³⁶ Another example of the “transgression” of Solon. Irwin (2006: 40-51)

³⁷ Cf. Stehle (2006: 85).

³⁸ Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 249).

³⁹ This parallelism resembles the balance demonstrated in Solon. fr. 5 by Elizabeth Irwin. (2006: 44-51) The transfer of elite military language to a civil war context is discussed by Allan (2018: 116-27).

is parallelism among different social classes within in the polis, with regards to both moral corruption and sufferings.⁴⁰

The theme of civil strife emerges as the overarching dichotomy from the overlapping of a series of imageries in binary structures – civil strife is the clash between the polis,⁴¹ as a political entity blessed with divine justice⁴², and the populace, the collection of individuals in public space who also each occupies their private homes. First in fr. 4. 12, Solon identifies the property plundered and stolen as “ἱερῶν (*hieron*)”, “sacred public”, and “δημοσίων (*demosion*)”, “secular public”.⁴³ In this scene, the corrupted populace violates the public property of polis by plundering and theft. These two actions are essentially means of privatization, i.e. the populace takes the public property of the *polis* as their own. Three binary structures are established: sacred versus secular, public versus private and *polis* versus the populace.

After the populace does its damage to the *polis*, citizens of various social classes suffer in the ensuing civil strife.⁴⁴ Then the *polis* strikes back, with δημόσιον κακὸν (*demosion kakon*, public evil) entering a private household by crossing over the ἔρκος (*herkos*, fence), which is the boundary between the public and private realm in civilized society.⁴⁵ The conflicts between the *polis* and its populace invade the private household. The populace is no longer disturbed by the civil strife as a community, but as individuals. Another three sets of binary structures thus appear: public and private, the community and the individual, and again, *polis* and the populace.

Therefore, as these binary structures within this Weltanschauung overlap with each other, *polis* and “the people” emerge as the core of the conflict; each of these entities has two aspects. Polis is both sacred and secular: the sacred aspect includes sacred property, fates designated by the gods, and divine justice as way of revenge, while its secular aspect consists of public property and the public space where the citizens carry out political activities and the civil strife first starts. The populace also holds two dimensions: the

⁴⁰ A balancing parallelism and “pendulum structure” according to Henderson (1982: 27).

⁴¹ Cf. Anhalt (1993: 75).

⁴² Blaise (2006: 115-19) argues that Dike is portrayed in fr. 4 as a secular agency, unlike its traditional role as a mere agent of Zeus’ will. cf. also Anhalt (1993: 71). However, the argument does not necessarily deny the divine nature of Dike: first of all, it is acceptable for mythical characters to bear seemingly contradictory tales concerning their activities, while the Homeric and Hesiodic tradition of divine genealogy predominantly prevails; secondly, as Dike is described as “who knows what goes on and what happened before”, Dike bears the divine knowledge distinctive from the shortsightedness of the mortals. The newly added agency of Dike echoes the “transgressive” nature of the Solonian poetics as argued by Irwin (2006: 40-51).

⁴³ On the tradition of two categories of public property devoted for secular and sacred purposes, see Connor (1988: 161-6); cf. Rousset (2013: 123), where Rousset argues for an overlap in these two categories and a “possible co-ownership and joint possession between god and city”.

⁴⁴ Solon. fr. 4.19-25.

⁴⁵ Cf. Henderson (1982: 28); Anhalt (1993: 109-110).

moral corruption and the suffering from divine justice as a community;⁴⁶ as the civic strife develops, everyone in the polis is confronted by δημόσιον κακὸν ἐν μυχῶ ἢ θαλάμου (public evil in the innermost corner of the bedroom) individually.⁴⁷ In the public space of the polis, the parallelism among the populace in both depravity and sufferings is demonstrated within the framework such as *astoi* versus *demou t' hegemonon*, or the aristocrats versus commoners, even though the word choice avoids the signification of a Solonian class struggle. However, the difference between social classes diminishes, and the framework is no longer in use, when individual becomes the direct victim of *demosion kakon*. The conflict underlying the linguistic message that “*demosion*” *kakon* is now in the “private” household further indicates the complete breakdown of normal civic order.

The overlap of the polis and its populace forms the political hub of the Solonian *Weltanschauung*: the people dwell in the public space of polis as a community. The gods ensure the survival of the polis with Dike’s revenge as a deterrent against each individual of the populace.⁴⁸ This dynamic equilibrium between the divine will and the people is achieved through their engagement within the public space of the polis. Yet it is fragile, once broken by the moral corruption of the populace, the polis and the populace turn against each other, the civil strife as Solon describes breaks out.

A Democratic Solon in the making

How can the citizenry hold sovereignty and execute public authority, i.e. establish a democracy, if itself is a threat to the polis?⁴⁹ Solon fr. 4 contains such vigilance against the populace for its potential to cause civil strife and disturb the civic order. The idea of the citizenry causing civil strife and thus threatening the fate of polis leads down a dangerous path towards a forceful regime, i.e. tyranny. If Solon considers the people as the source of moral corruption endangering the polis, then the path to good politics is to discipline civic activity;⁵⁰ the teachings of the lawgiver in the poem usually entail external

⁴⁶ Solon. fr. 4.19-25.

⁴⁷ It has been argued that this language is the Homeric formula for the most private part of one’s household, and typically related to the intimate husband-wife scenario; cf. Adkins (1985: 121); Anhalt (1993: 109-10); Irwin (2006: 67) and Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 255).

⁴⁸ Solon. fr. fr. 4.1-4, 14-16. This is my answer to the question of whether the political realm for Solon is secular or supernatural: as many have argued, politics is strictly directed by divine intervention in Homer and Hesiod; it appears different in Solon: Anhalt (1993: 69-73) notices the transition; Blaise (2006: 115-19) argues that politics is the battleground for mortals only. However, according to my analysis, it is the crossover of the divine and the secular. The parallelism between the divine and the secular is remarkable: the will of gods at the beginning and Dike as the divine force that stirs up the civil strife, and the end of the narrative with the voice of the lawgiver, and Eunomia as the solution to calm the conflicts.

⁴⁹ For a definition of democracy, and political theories related, I here follow the concept of “basic democracy” in Ober (2018: 1-5).

⁵⁰ Solon. fr. 4.32-39. Cf. Raaflaub (1994: 109-11).

force to implement in reality. Solon's entangled relationship with tyranny in the literary traditions indicates that the proximity between Solon and ideology of archaic tyranny was recognized. Irwin points out that the rhetoric of taming the undisciplined desire of the citizens is featured in discourses of tyranny; this juxtaposition urges Solon to repeatedly denounce tyranny in his poetry.⁵¹ Later sources still note Solon's close relationship with Pisistratus, the infamous tyrant.⁵² Therefore, a paradigm shift in Solonian *Weltanschauung* is inevitable to pave the way for the myth of Solon as the founding father of democracy.

In the speech *On the Dishonest Embassy*, Solon's poem is adduced as evidence for Demosthenes' criticism against Aeschines' claim concerning the statue of Solon in Salamis:

...εὖ γὰρ οἶδ' ὅτι πάντες ἐκπεπλεύκατε εἰς Σαλαμίνα καὶ τεθεωρήκατε τὴν Σόλωνος εἰκόνα, καὶ αὐτοὶ μαρτυρήσαίτ' ἂν ὅτι ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τῇ Σαλαμινίων ἀνάκειται ὁ Σόλων ἐντὸς τὴν χεῖρα ἔχων. τοῦτο δ' ἐστίν, ὃ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὑπόμνημα καὶ μίμημα τοῦ Σόλωνος σχήματος, ὃν τρόπον ἔχων αὐτὸς διελέγετο τῷ δήμῳ τῶν Ἀθηναίων.

For I know well all of you have sailed to Salamis and looked at the statue of Solon, and could witness for yourselves that Solon stands in the agora of Salamis holding his hand inside his robe. This, men of Athens, is the reminder and memorial of Solon's bearing, which he typically held when he was speaking to the people of Athens. (Aeschin. *Against Timarchos*, 25)

Demosthenes refutes Aeschines by revealing the true origin of the statue:

καίτοι τὸν μὲν ἀνδριάντα τοῦτον οὓπω πεντήκοντ' ἔτη φάσ' ἀνακεῖσθαι Σαλαμῖνιοι, ἀπὸ Σόλωνος δ' ὁμοῦ διακόσι' ἐστὶν ἔτη καὶ τετταράκοντ' εἰς τὸν νυνὶ παρόντα χρόνον, ὥσθ' ὁ δημιουργὸς ὁ τοῦτο πλάσας τὸ σχῆμα οὐ μόνον οὐκ αὐτὸς ἦν κατ' ἐκεῖνον, ἀλλ' οὐδ' ὁ πάππος αὐτοῦ.

And yet the Salamians say that the statue have not been up for fifty years yet, in total that is two hundred and fifty years in time from Solon to now, so that not only the craftsman who formed the gesture of the statue is not contemporary with Solon, but neither was his grandfather. (Dem. *On the Dishonest Embassy*, 251)

To further refute Aeschines' image of Solon, and to attack his intention of bringing Solon up, Demosthenes provides his own narrative of Solon in his performance:

ἐκεῖνος μὲν γ' ἀφεςτηκυίας Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων καὶ θάνατον ζημίαν ψηφισαμένων, ἂν τις εἶπη κομίζεσθαι, τὸν ἴδιον κίνδυνον ὑποθεῖς ἐλεγεία ποιήσας ἦδε, καὶ τὴν μὲν χώραν <ἀν>έσωσε τῇ πόλει, τὴν δ' ὑπάρχουσαν αἰσχύνην ἀπήλλαξεν.

⁵¹ Irwin (2006: 72-74).

⁵² Beneker (2012: 1-2).

With the Salamians revolting and Athenians voting to have death as penalty, if anyone should suggest Salamis to be recovered, (Solon) personally took the risk by composing and reciting an elegiac poem, which allows him to recover Salamis for the city and save it from humiliation. (Dem. On the Dishonest Embassy, 252)

It was common practice among orators to use public monuments to aid the visualization of one's argument,⁵³ in this case, the interpretation of Solon's statue altered the performative context of Solon in the public imagination. As Stehle points out, the audience implied by Solon's poems are unusual among lyric poets.⁵⁴ Ambivalent traces of elite values and an audience of general public are present. Nevertheless, according to Aeschines, the audience of Solon's speech concerning Salamis is the *demos*. Similarly, Demosthenes places Solon in the agora campaigning for the recovery of Salamis. Furthermore, Demosthenes offers Solon's poem as proof of Solon's real intention. Demosthenes suggests that Solon's transgressive performance⁵⁵ at Salamis finds its true expression in Solon fr. 4. As Demosthenes adduces this poem to refute Aeschines, Solon's poetry is placed in a more specific public performative context through Demosthenes' narrative and the recitation.

In the final section of *Against Ctesiphon*, Aeschines urges his audience to imagine Solon standing on the platform where Solon delivered his speech to the public:

... ὑπολαμβάνετε ὁρᾶν ἐπὶ τοῦ βήματος, οὗ νῦν ἐστηκὼς ἐγὼ λέγω, ἀντιπαρατεταγμένους πρὸς τὴν τούτων ἀσελγείαν τοὺς τῆς πόλεως εὐεργέτας, Σόλωνα μὲν τὸν καλλίστοις νόμοις κοσμήσαντα τὴν δημοκρατίαν, ἄνδρα φιλόσοφον καὶ νομοθέτην ἀγαθόν, σωφρόνως, ὡς προσῆκον αὐτῷ, δεόμενον ὑμῶν μηδενὶ τρόπῳ τοὺς Δημοσθένους λόγους περὶ πλείονος ποιήσασθαι τῶν ὄρκων καὶ τῶν νόμων.

Imagine you see on this stage, where I stand now while speaking, the benefactor of the city stretched side by side against the licentiousness of these people: Solon, who arranged the best of laws for the democracy, a philosopher and a good lawgiver, urging you with decency, as befits him, under no circumstances to set more value on Demosthenes' arguments than on your oaths and the laws. (Aeschin. In Ctes. 257)

Instead of imitating Solon's posture, Aeschines directs the Solon in the audience's imagination to imitate him, to take his place in a public platform as an orator. Aeschines

⁵³ Westwood (2013: 7-9).

⁵⁴ Stehle (2006: 82-102). There is no doubt that Solon is familiar with the references related to symposium and elite culture, as Noussia-Fantuzzi (2010: 230-1) suggests.

⁵⁵ Irwin (2006: 40-51).

borrowing the authority of Solon for his attack against Demosthenes, and Solon enters the public space, leaving the symposia, the more common context of lyric poetry.

While arguing against each other, the intertextuality between Demosthenes and Aeschines illustrates the image of Solon at this time. Both Demosthenes and Aeschines argue that the archaic lawgiver had a strong interest in regulating citizens' private lives. Aeschines mentions Solon as the first of lawgivers paying great attention to decent behaviors:

σκέψασθε γάρ, ὧ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι, ὅσῃν πρόνοιαν περὶ σωφροσύνης ἐποιήσατο ὁ Σόλων ἐκεῖνος, ὁ παλαιὸς νομοθέτης, καὶ ὁ Δράκων καὶ οἱ κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους ἐκείνους νομοθέται. πρῶτον μὲν γὰρ περὶ τῆς σωφροσύνης τῶν παίδων τῶν ἡμετέρων ἐνομοθέτησαν, καὶ διαρρήδην ἀπέδειξαν, ἃ χρὴ τὸν παῖδα τὸν ἐλεύθερον ἐπιτηδεύειν, καὶ ὡς δεῖ αὐτὸν τραφῆναι, ἔπειτα δευτέρον περὶ τῶν μειρακίων, τρίτον δ' ἐφεξῆς περὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἡλικιῶν, οὐ μόνον περὶ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν, ἀλλὰ καὶ περὶ τῶν ῥητόρων.

Behold, fellow Athenians, how much emphasis that Solon, that ancient lawgiver, put on morality, as did Draco and other lawgivers at that time. First, they establish laws to protect the decency of our children, and they appointed explicitly what were to be practice for the freeborn boy, and how he was to be brought up; then they legislated for the lads, and thirdly for those of other age in order, not only private citizens, but also the public speakers. (Aeschin. In Tim. 1.6)

First, *sophrosune* (*sophrosune*, moderation), the word used of the moral requirements emphasized by Solon, is of the same root as that used in In Ctes. 257 to describe Solon's manner in his imagined public speech. Linguistic resonance shows consistency in Aeschines' understanding of Solon. Second, the idea that there are proprieties for men of each age naturally reminds one of Solon fr. 27, which talks about the specific feature of men of each age. According to Aeschines, prostitution, which Timarchos is accused of, is the major violation of decency that Solon values as a premise of civil activities. Prostitution places the autonomy of one's body under the power of another, thus undermining the existential foundation of individuals. Demosthenes also suggests in *Against Leptines* that Solon established laws so that citizens have the right to execute absolute power over their private property, which can be seen as the extension of their own body:

εἰ γὰρ ὁ μὲν Σόλων ἔθηκεν νόμον ἐξεῖναι δοῦναι τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ὧ ἂν τις βούληται, ἐὰν μὴ παῖδες ὧσι γνήσιοι, οὐχ ἴν' ἀποστερήσῃ τοὺς ἐγγυτάτῳ γένει τῆς ἀγχιστείας, ἀλλ' ἴν' εἰς τὸ μέσον καταθεῖς τὴν ὠφέλειαν ἐφάμιλλον ποιήσῃ τὸ ποιεῖν ἀλλήλους εὖ...

For if Solon made a law that every man can leave his property to whomsoever he wanted, if there is no legitimate child, not for the purpose of depriving the next of kin of their rights, but so that by making the prize open to everyone he might motivate people in doing good one to another...(Dem. Lept. 102)

According to Demosthenes, Solon believes that kindness among citizens is to be cultivated by the actions of citizens themselves, while laws are only the catalyst of such a process. Granted autonomy over their own body and property for all citizens is recognized as Solonian by both Demosthenes and Aeschines. The autonomy of the individual is considered not only to benefit the individual himself, but also to convey positive externalities.

In Solon fr. 4, political activities within the *polis* are presented through the framework of social classes. However, neither Demosthenes nor Aeschines mentions Solon's opinion concerning social classes or political parties; according to Demosthenes and Aeschines, Solon emphasizes the private household as the framework for regulating the society. First, the emphasis on private household is reflected in the law regulating women's behavior. Aeschines, in *Against Timarchos* attributes a law regulating women's behavior to Solon:

ὁ δὲ Σόλων ὁ τῶν νομοθετῶν ἐνδοξότατος γέγραφεν ἀρχαίως καὶ σεμνῶς περὶ τῆς τῶν γυναικῶν εὐκοσμίας. τὴν γὰρ γυναῖκα ἐφ' ἧ ἂν ἀλῶ μοιχός, οὐκ ἐᾷ κοσμεῖσθαι, οὐδὲ εἰς τὰ δημοτελῆ ἱερὰ εἰσιέναι, ἵνα μὴ τὰς ἀναμαρτήτους τῶν γυναικῶν ἀναμειγνυμένη διαφθείρῃ· ἐὰν δ' εἰσὶ ἢ κοσμηῆται, τὸν ἐντυχόντα κελεύει καταρρηγνύναι τὰ ἱμάτια καὶ τὸν κόσμον ἀφαιρεῖσθαι καὶ τύπτειν, εἰργόμενον θανάτου καὶ τοῦ ἀνάπηρον ποιῆσαι, ἀτιμῶν τὴν τοιαύτην γυναῖκα καὶ τὸν βίον ἀβίωτον αὐτῇ κατασκευάζων.

But Solon, the most famous of lawgivers, has written in archaic and revered manner concerning orderly conduct of the women. For the woman involved in adultery, he does not allow her to adorn herself, nor even to enter the public sanctuary, in order that she does not corrupt innocent women around her. But if she does attend, or does adorn herself, he commands that any man who meets her shall tear off her garments, take away her ornaments, and beat her (only he may not kill or severely injure her); for the lawgiver seeks to disgrace such a woman and make her life not worth the living. (Aeschin. In Tim. 183)

Women are excluded from political life and public space, but they are emblematic of the private household.⁵⁶ Thus, the law regulating the loyalty of the woman also ensures the stability and security of the household, especially in cases where it is breached by another individual, for example, adultery. Punishments for women entering the public space after committing adultery indicate that it is not just perceived as a private issue, as all men were allowed to execute the penalty in public, and thus it transcends the realm of

⁵⁶ Lys. 1 is very often cited for women's living and what is happening inside a private household. For women's access to public space and their place in private household, see Wolpert (2001: 416-18).

the private household into the public space of *polis*.⁵⁷ The security of the private household becomes a common interest of both the community and the individual, which resonates with Solon. fr. 4 in understanding the communal and private dimensions of the populace.

Not only is the nuclear family a concern for the “Solon” of the fourth-century Athenian courtroom, but so are the members of the extended family. Demosthenes mentions a law of Solon that Timocrates has jeopardized in his scheme of benefiting the criminals:

λεγόντων γὰρ τῶν νόμων οὐς ἔθηκε Σόλων, οὐδὲν ὅμοιος ὢν τούτῳ νομοθέτης, ἂν τις ἀλῶ κλοπῆς καὶ μὴ τιμηθῆ θανάτου, προστιμᾶν αὐτῷ δεσμὸν, κἄν τις ἀλοὺς τῆς κακώσεως τῶν γονέων εἰς τὴν ἀγορὰν ἐμβάλλῃ, δεδέσθαι, κἄν ἀστρατείας τις ὄφλη καὶ τι τῶν αὐτῶν τοῖς ἐπιτίμοις ποιῆ, καὶ τοῦτον δεδέσθαι, Τιμοκράτης ἅπασι τούτοις ἄδειαν ποιεῖ, τῇ καταστάσει τῶν ἐγγυητῶν τὸν δεσμὸν ἀφαιρῶν. The laws established by Solon, a lawgiver completely different from this man, state: if a man is convicted of theft, and not punished with a death sentence, he shall suffer imprisonment; that if a man guilty of mistreating his parents enters the agora, he shall go to jail; and that if a man, having been convicted of shirking military service, continues to exercise the rights of citizenship, he also shall be imprisoned. Timocrates offers impunity to all these offenders, for he abolishes imprisonment if they pay the bail. (Dem. Against Timocrates, 103)

Mistreating one’s parents posthumously is also forbidden:

καὶ μὴν κάκεῖνος τῶν καλῶς δοκούντων ἔχειν νόμων Σόλωνός ἐστι, μὴ λέγειν κακῶς τὸν τεθνεῶτα, μηδ’ ἂν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐκείνου τις ἀκούῃ παιδῶν αὐτός.

Indeed among the brilliant laws of Solon there is one that prohibits speaking bad about the dead, even if by one of his children. (Dem. Lept. 104)

The mistreatment of parents is listed alongside other crimes that are attached with extremely harsh punishments. The three crimes are three levels of violations: theft is the violation of property as well as a moral corruption of an individual; the maltreatment of (extended) family members, the violation of the harmony of family, which resembles the harmony of the polis; and finally, failure to fulfill one’s public duty to the polis, the violation of one’s civic duty. To Demosthenes and Aeschines, civic affairs on three levels are also comparable and intertwined with parallelism. Demosthenes, arguing that people in public office should be held up to the same standard as private citizens, told this anecdote about Solon:

βούλομαι τοίνυν ὑμῖν κάκεῖνο διηγῆσασθαι, ὃ φασὶ ποτ’ εἰπεῖν Σόλωνα κατηγοροῦντα νόμον τινὸς οὐκ ἐπιτήδειον θέντος. λέγεται γὰρ τοῖς δικασταῖς αὐτὸν

⁵⁷ The same idea is attested in Lys. 1, that the private issue of οἶκος (*oikos*, household) can be transformed into the public issue of polis. Wolpert (2001: 422)

εἰπεῖν, ἐπειδὴ τᾶλλα κατηγορήσεν, ὅτι νόμος ἐστὶν ἀπάσαις, ὡς ἔπος εἰπεῖν, ταῖς πόλεσιν, ἐὰν τις τὸ νόμισμα διαφθεῖρη, θάνατον τὴν ζημίαν εἶναι. ἐπερωτήσας δ' εἰ δίκαιος αὐτοῖς καὶ καλῶς ἔχων ὁ νόμος φαίνεται, (213) ἐπειδὴ φῆσαι τοὺς δικαστὰς, εἰπεῖν ὅτι αὐτὸς ἠγεῖται ἀργύριον μὲν νόμισμ' εἶναι τῶν ἰδίων συναλλαγμάτων εἵνεκα τοῖς ἰδιώταις εὐρημένον, τοὺς δὲ νόμους ἠγοῖτο νόμισμα τῆς πόλεως εἶναι. δεῖν δὴ τοὺς δικαστὰς πολλῶ μᾶλλον, εἴ τις ὁ τῆς πόλεως ἐστὶ νόμισμα, τοῦτο διαφθεῖρει καὶ παράσημον εἰσφέρει, μισεῖν καὶ κολάζειν, ἢ εἴ τις ἐκεῖν' ὁ τῶν ἰδιωτῶν ἐστίν. (214) προσθεῖναι δὲ τεκμήριον τοῦ καὶ μεῖζον εἶναι τὰδίκημα, τὸ τοὺς νόμους διαφθεῖρειν ἢ τὸ ἀργύριον, ὅτι ἀργυρίῳ μὲν πολλὰ τῶν πόλεων καὶ φανερώς πρὸς χαλκὸν καὶ μόλυβδον κεκραμένῳ χρώμεναι σφύζονται καὶ οὐδ' ὀπιούν παρὰ τοῦτο πάσχουσιν, νόμοις δὲ πονηροῖς χρώμενοι καὶ διαφθεῖρεσθαι τοὺς ὄντας ἔωντες οὐδένας πώποτ' ἐσώθησαν.

I also want to tell you a saying said to be from Solon, when he was prosecuting a man for an inexpedient law. It is said that he told the judges, upon finishing the rest of his speech, that there is a law in all city-states that if someone counterfeited money, the penalty is death. He then asked the jury whether they consider this law just and good; and when the jury said yes, he stated that coinage was created by private individuals for private exchanges, yet laws were the currency of the city-state; therefore, if someone debased the currency of city-states, and brought in counterfeit, the jury is supposed to despise and punish that man much more than one who does the same thing to the currency of private individuals. To prove it to be a worse crime to debase laws than private currency, he added that many states openly using silver alloyed with copper (as currency) survive and suffer no harm thereby; but that no nation that uses bad laws or allows the debasement of existing laws has ever escaped the consequence. (Dem. Against Timocrates, 212-214)

Through a word play of coinage (νόμισμα, *nomisma*) and law (νόμος, *nomos*), he suggests that coinage plays the same role in one's private life as the role law plays in a *polis*' public life: both play the role of a medium. Coinage circulates among individuals as a medium of transaction of monetary value in private realm; similarly, the law mediates transactions of interests in public space among individuals. Both are functional only based upon the integrity of the medium itself, which shall be damaged by the forgery of the coinage and the corruption of the legal system. While forgery of the coinage does damages to the order of private life, the same damage is magnified and casted upon the civic order of public life when the debasement of legal system happens. This anecdote shows Solon considering the principle on private and public level isomorphic and comparable to one another. Furthermore, such reasoning anchors the power of the law to regulate public affairs deeply in its resemblance to the morality of private life. Thus, morality of private individuals become the pivot of political legitimacy.

The new *Weltanschauung* reinvented Solonian tradition to create a new etiology of public morals based on individual morality. The structure turns from a dichotomy between *polis* and the populace into a concentric structure between one's private life, one's household, and the *polis*, in both Demosthenes and Aeschines. The principle of

personal life and private household can be extrapolated to political activities in public realm. This concentric moral structure in the new Solonian *Weltanschauung*, with citizens being the pivot, bespeaks the mutual interests shared by the individual, his household, and the *polis*.

Conclusion

As Aeschines reminds the jurors at the beginning of *Against Timarchus*, the laws protect the citizens and the *politeia*.⁵⁸ The citizens, once they have sworn the oath and joined the juror, also become the guardians of the laws. The hostility and vigilance in Solon fr. 4 between the *polis* and its people, as demonstrated by the reading provided by the first section of this paper, are resolved by a new *Weltanschauung* in its reception with reciprocal relationship between the citizenry, the law, and the *polis*. The challenge to a civic order in Solonian polis, according to Solon fr. 4, is the inevitable depravity of the populace, which brings about implications dangerously close to the ideology associated with archaic tyranny. Through juxtaposition of Solonian fragments and reception of Solon in Demosthenes and Aeschines, it becomes clear that depravity of the populace as obstacle to good civic order is resolved when Demosthenes and Aeschines lay the foundation of civic order on the moral of the individual, the center of the concentric moral structure where the principles governing the private life can also be extrapolated to the realm of the household and the public space of the *polis*. This is a case of how the need for justification of the moral possibility of democracy shapes the reception of Solon, even though a democratic image of Solon ultimately contradicts the *Weltanschauung* of Solon fr. 4.

This new *Weltanschauung* befits the legal procedure of democratic Athens. The fate of Athens in Solon fr. 4, which was designated by the gods and defended by divine justice when violated, is now sustained by the democracy and the laws. The gods no longer take an active role in protecting the *polis*. The process of stirring up civil strife in the public space and then persecuting citizens to their household has been replaced by the established courtroom practice and persecution of individuals directly responsible. This is how Solon fr. 4 is received in Demosthenes' *On the Dishonest Embassy*.⁵⁹ Demosthenes reads Solon fr. 4 as gods' will to preserve the city. Political activities are no longer doomed with moral corruption of the populace that leads to civil strife, but maintain harmony in the public space through scrutiny of personal morality, which we might call "moral individualism". This new "moral individualism" is both positive and practical: while those who fail the public office are held responsible through legal

⁵⁸ Aeschines, *Against Timarchos*, 5-7.

⁵⁹ Dem., *On the Dishonest Embassy*, 256.

procedures, the challenge against democracy is not due to the inevitable moral corruption of the populace, but merely the moral dysfunction of certain individuals.

As Athenian democracy chose Solon as its founding father among archaic cultural personages⁶⁰, a new Solon comes to life through the speeches of Demosthenes and Aeschines. A Solon who sees individuals practicing good morality as the pivot of good politics. The paradigm shift of Solon's image into the one in Demosthenes and Aeschines, an image that provides moral justification for democracy and reveals certain agency within political discourse in the formation of democratic ideology. The direction of political discourse is not determined by the connotations of the texts associated with its iconic figure, but rather goes its own way and, in turn, shapes its iconic figure and the reception of the related texts.⁶¹ I would not go so far as to call it Freudian "collective unconsciousness" or even Hegelian "Zeitgeist" at work for such process, but "the people" has its own will.

⁶⁰ Mossé (1979: 242-59).

⁶¹ In this case, the iconic figure of Athenian democracy is Solon. Although the texts associated with Solon, in this case fr. 4 particularly, has the potential to bring about anti-democratic connotations, democratic Athens still manages to shape Solon into the "founding-father-of-democracy" figure, along with a new "Solonian philosophy".

References

- Adkins, A. W. H., (1985) *Poetic Craft in the Early Greek Elegists*; Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Aeschines, *Aeschines Against Timarchos*; N. R. Fisher, ed., 2001 Oxford: Clarendon.
- Aeschines, *Aeschines*; C. Carey, trans., 2000 Austin, TX: University of Texas press.
- Allan, W., (2018) 'Solon and the Rhetoric of Stasis', *Mouseion*; 15(1), 3rd ser., 113-129.
- Anhalt, E. K., (1993) *Solon the singer: Politics and poetics*; Lanham (MD.): Rowman and Littlefield.
- Beneker, J., (2013) *The Passionate Statesman: Eros and politics in Plutarch's Lives*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Blaise, F., (2006) 'Poetics and Politics: Tradition re-worked in Solon's 'Eunomia' (Poem 4)', *Solon of Athens: New historical and philological approaches*; Leiden: Brill, pp. 114-133.
- Blok, J., (2005) 'Becoming Citizens. Some Notes on the Semantics of "Citizen" in Archaic Greece and Classical Athens', *Klio*, 87(1), 7-40.
- Blok, J., & Lardinois, A. P., (2006) *Solon of Athens: New historical and philological approaches*; Leiden: Brill.
- Connor, W. R., (1988) '«SACRED» AND «SECULAR»: Ἱερὰ καὶ ὄσια and the Classical Athenian Concept of the State', *Ancient Society*; 19, 161-188.
- Demosthenes, *Demosthenes, On the False Embassy*; D. M. MacDowell, eds., 2000 Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Demosthenes, *speeches 18 and 19*; H. Yunis, trans., 2005 Austin: University of Texas Press.
- Demosthenes, *speeches 20-22*; E. M. Harris, trans., 2008 Austin: University of Texas Press.

- Demosthenes, speeches 23-26; E. M. Harris, trans., 2018 Austin, TX: University of Texas Press.
- Figueira, T. J., (1986) *Theognis of Megara: Poetry and the polis*; Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Halberstadt, M., (1955) 'On Solon's "Eunomia" (Frg. 3 D)', *The Classical Weekly*; 48(15), 197-203.
- Henderson, W. J., (1982) 'The Nature and Function of Solon's Poetry: Fr. 3 Diehl, 4 West', *Acta Classica*; 25, 21-33.
- Henderson, W., (2006) 'The Imagery of Solon: Fr. 4 West (3 Gentili-Prato)', *Acta Classica*, 49; 129-136.
- Irwin, E., (2005) *Solon and Early Greek Poetry: The Politics of Exhortation*; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Jaeger, W., (1966) 'Solon's Eunomia.' In A. M. Fiske (trans.), *Five Essays*; Montreal: Mario Casalini, pp. 75-100.
- Kremmydas, C., (2013) *Commentary on Demosthenes Against Leptines*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Lardinois, A. P., (2006) 'Have we Solon's verse?', *Solon of Athens: New historical and philological approaches*; Leiden: Brill, pp. 15-35.
- Linforth, I. M., (1919) *Solon the Athenian*; Berkeley.
- Martina, A., (1968) *Solon: Testimonia veterum collegit Antonius Martina*; Romae.
- Mossé, C., (2004) 'How a Political Myth Takes Shape: Solon, 'Founding Father' of the Athenian Democracy' (R. Ireland trans.), In P. J. Rhodes (ed.), *Athenian Democracy*; Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, pp. 242-259.
- Nagy, G., & Noussia-Fantuzzi, M. (2015). *Solon in the Making: The Early Reception in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries*; Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter.
- Noussia-Fantuzzi, M., (2010) *Solon the Athenian, the poetic fragments*; Leiden: Brill.
- Ober, J., (2018) *Demopolis: Democracy before liberalism in theory and practice*; Cambridge, U.K.: Cambridge University Press.

- Raaflaub, K. A., (1994) 'Legend or Historical Personality? Solon reconsidered', In J. T. Papademetriou (ed.), *Acta: The First Panhellenic and International Conference on Ancient Greek Literature*; Athens pp. 97-117.
- Rhodes, P. J., (2006) 'The reforms and laws of Solon: An optimistic view', *Solon of Athens: New historical and philological approaches*; Leiden: Brill pp. 248-260.
- Rousset, D., (2013) 'Sacred Property and Public Property in the Greek City', *The Journal of Hellenic Studies*; 133, 113-133.
- Rowe, G. O., (1972) 'A Problem of Quotation in Demosthenes Embassy Speech', *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association*; 103, 441-449.
- Stehle, E., (2006) 'Solon's self-reflexive political persona and its audience', *Solon of Athens: New historical and philological approaches*; Leiden: Brill pp. 79-113.
- West, M. L., (1971) *Iambi Et Elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum Cantati*; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Westwood, G. A., (2013) *History and the making of the orator in Demosthenes and Aeschines* (doctoral dissertation); University of Oxford.
- Wolpert, A., (2001) 'Lysias 1 and the Politics of the Oikos', *The Classical Journal*; 96(4), 415-4.

