Eleusis and Solon's *Seisachtheia*

Louise-Marie L'Homme-Wéry

1. Solon's poems and Athenian tradition[1]

In Book I of his *Histories*, Herodotus presents Solon as a legislator who, after having made laws for his fellow-citizens, leaves Athens in order not to be obliged to modify his legislation (1.29). Herodotus does not mention the first part of Solon's political work; for in the iambic trimeters where he gives an account of his achievements, Solon states that he was a liberator before he became a legislator. It was, he said, in order to accomplish the liberation of the "Black Earth" and the men who were enslaved, as she was, that he received the power (κράτος) in Athens.[2] The very structure of his poem emphasizes the distinction that he signals between this liberation and the legislation that followed: the words ταῦτα ... ἔρεξα summarizing the liberation correspond to θεσμούς ... ἔγραψα reminding the audience of the legislation.[3] These verbs, each placed at the

[1] My grateful thanks to Professors M. Gagarin of the University of Texas and K. J. Rigsby of Duke University, who corrected and improved the language of this paper, to Professor P. Somville of the University of Liège, who presided over the jury of my Ph.D. thesis *La perspective éleusinienne dans la politique de Solon* (Bibl. Fac. Phil. et Lettres Université de Liège 268 [Geneva 1996]: hereafter L'HOMME-WÉRY), and to Professor H. van Effenterre of the Sorbonne, whose study "Solon et la Terre d'Éleusis," *RIDA* 24 (1977) 91–129 (hereafter VAN EFFENTERRE), forms the origin of the reflection developed in this thesis and whose advice has guided me throughout its elaboration.

[2] Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 1–17. With respect to the reading χρειοῦς and not χρεῶν at verse 11, and ὁμοῦ and not νόμου at 16: P. J. Rhodes, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia* (Oxford 1993) 175–176.

[3] Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 15–20. On the parallelism between liberation and legislation: Nicole Loraux, "Solon et la voix de l'écrit," in M. Detienne, ed., *Les savoirs de l'écriture. En Grèce ancienne* (Lille 1989) 123–124; L'Homme-Wéry 246–247.

Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies 40 (1999) 109–133

beginning of a verse, show that Solon considers such double work as a personal accomplishment. He also insists on the notion of harmony that enabled him to realize his goals: it is "by harmonizing might and right" that he accomplished the liberation; it is "by fitting fair justice to each man's case" that he wrote Athens' laws. When he emphasizes this harmonizing role, Solon implicitly asserts that he acted in both cases as a poet, a visionary of an ἀλήθεια that is "not forgetting," memory.[4]

However, if the earth's and men's liberation was essential for Solon, why is this liberation not mentioned in the fifth century?[5] Is this silence not surprising at a time when young Athenians learn Solon's poems by heart and chant them at the Apaturia?[6] This study will examine the reasons for this silence, arguing that it led during the fourth century to the formation of two contradictory versions of Solon's liberation in the *Athenian Constitution.* One, faithful to the Atthidographers' viewpoint, defines this liberation as a cancellation of debts, the σεισάχθεια, "liberation from burdens."[7] The other presents the Athenian *demos* before Solon's archonship (594/3)[8] as a multitude of dependents, the ἑκτήμοροι, who did not own the land they cultivated for the γνώριμοι, the city's mighty.[9]

[4] E. K. Anhalt, *Solon the Singer: Politics and Poetics* (Boston 1993) 115–139; M. Detienne, *Les Maîtres de Vérité dans la Grèce archaïque*3 (Paris 1994); L.-M. L'Homme-Wéry, "La notion d'harmonie dans la pensée politique de Solon," *Kernos* 9 (1996) 145–154.

[5] Regarding the fifth-century silence on Solon's political work: A. Masaracchia, *Solone* (Florence 1958) 1–20.

[6] Pl. *Ti.* 21B.

[7] Philochoros *FGrHist* 328F114 and *Ath.Pol.* 6–12. Androtion *FGrHist* 324 F34 defines the *seisachtheia* as a monetary devaluation intended to lower the amount of debts, not to cancel them. The *seisachtheia* was commemorated by an annual sacrifice which may have helped preserve its particular name (Plut. *Sol.* 16.5).

[8] Sosikrates *ap.* Diog. Laert. 1.62. T. J. Cadoux, "The Athenian Archons from Kreon to Hypsichides," *JHS* 68 (1948) 70–123, at 93–99; R. W. Wallace, "The Date of Solon's Reforms," *AJAH* 8 (1983) 81–95.

[9] Similarly Plut. *Sol.* 13.4.

If the *whole land was in a few hands* (ἡ δὲ πᾶσα γῆ δι᾽ ὀλίγων ἦν, *Ath.Pol.* 2), the mass constituted by the *hectemoroi* (whatever the meaning of this word; see below) cannot have encumbered land which they did not own. The indebtedness thesis of chapters 6–12 contradicts that of dependence in chapter 2. This contradiction does not seem to have struck the author of the *Athenian Constitution.* He juxtaposes the two versions, even though he adopts that of the cancellation of debts, asserting that it is supported by the poem of Solon which he quotes (*Ath. Pol.* 12.4). Indeed, Solon in his poem reminds the Athenians that he uprooted from the liberated Earth numerous *horoi,* which were the sign of its enslavement (ὅρους ἀνεῖλον πολλαχῇ πεπηγότας).[10] Consequently, the version of the cancellation of debts appeared plausible in the fourth century, when numerous mortgage stones, called *horoi*, were to be seen all over Attica, testimony to the transferability of land.[11]

If, however, the Aristotelian school, influenced by its epoch, implicitly defined Solon's *horoi* as mortgage stones,[12] the text does not do so explicitly. Moreover, the enslaved land as defined by *Ath.Pol.* 2, *viz.* that cultivated by the *hectemoroi,* excludes mortgage stones: to the contrary, the passage seems to assume that, before Solon's *seisachtheia*, stones were placed on the land of the *hectemoroi* to indicate their dependence.

2. Contemporary research

As a result of the double definition of the *horoi* implied by these rival versions of the *seisachtheia*, contemporary research is

[10] Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 6–7.

[11] M. I. Finley, *Land and Credit in Ancient Athens* (New Brunswick 1951); "Land, Debt and the Man of Property in Classical Athens," *Political Science Quarterly* 68 (1953) 249–269 (= *Economy and Society in Ancient Greece* [London 1981] 62–76); publication of the Agora *horoi*: G. V. Lalonde, M. K. Langdon, M. B. Walbank, *Athenian Agora* XIX (1991).

[12] Plutarch (*Sol.* 15.6), who designates the dominated earth as ὑποκειμένης γῆς, on the basis of Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 6–7, which he quotes, expresses his preference for the mortgage stones thesis.

divided between the thesis of stones placed on the *hectemoroi* plots and that of mortgage stones.[13] If, however, the stones uprooted by Solon are regarded as mortgage stones, *seisachtheia* is defined in fourth-century terms; whereas if the stones indicate the *hectemoroi* plots, Solon would have given the people civic land that previously had been in the possession of the upper class. The latter view contradicts one of Solon's poems belonging to the same historical context as fr.30 G.-P. In this poem, Solon asserts that he refused to become a tyrant and distribute equally the fertile soil of the fatherland. He says he opposed this policy of *isomoiria*, as he did not want the people—the *kakoi*—to own as much land as the aristocrats.[14] This makes it unlikely that he would have given the people civic land which, according to *Ath.Pol.* 2, was deemed to have been "in a few hands." Thus none of the interpretations of the *seisachtheia* that are the based on the *Athenian Constitution* are wholly convincing.

As a result, F. Cassola suggests interpreting Solon by Solon.[15] He emphasizes that Solon's elegy proposing *Eunomia* as the

[13] Both theses were formulated as early as the rediscovery of the *Athenian Constitution.* The thesis of aristocratic stones on *hectemoroi* plots is defended by Fustel de Coulanges, *Nouvelles recherches sur quelques problèmes d'histoire* (Paris 1891) 122–144; that of mortgage stones by P. Guiraud, *La propriété foncière en Grèce jusqu'à la conquête romaine* (Paris 1893) 103–105. They still divide scholars: O. Murray, *Early Greece* 2 (Cambridge 1993) 181–200, follows Fustel de Coulanges, as do M. Dillon and L. Garland, *Ancient Greece* (London/New York 1994) 59–69, and J.-Cl. Poursat, *La Grèce préclassique des origines à la fin du VIe siècle* (Paris 1995) 146–147. Cl. Mossé, ed., *Aristote. Constitution d'Athènes* (Paris 1996) 24, opts for mortgage stones. M.-F. Baslez, *Histoire politique du monde grec antique* (Tours 1994) 74, and Cl. Orieux and P. Schmidt Pantel, *Histoire grecque* (Paris 1995) 111–112, combine both theses by supposing that the stones indicate the charges affecting the harvest of indebted peasants who had become *hectemoroi.* On the advocates of such positions before 1993: L'Homme-Wéry 42–48.

[14] Sol. fr.29b G.-P. (34 W.). Solon is not refusing to distribute lands to benefit his friends, as V. J. Rosivach thought: "Redistribution of Land in Solon, fragment 34 West," *JHS* 112 (1992) 153–157. On the identical context of Sol. fr.30 G.-P. 20–27 and fr.29b: L'Homme-Wéry 111–113.

[15] F. Cassola, "Solone. La terra e gli ectemori," *ParPass* 19 (1964) 26–68; "La proprietà del suolo in Attica fino a Pisistrato," *ParPass* 28 (1973) 75–87; Cl. Talamo, "Solone e il banchetto pubblico," *MGR* 17 (1992) 19–43.

solution to Athens' misfortunes denounces the exactions of the "leaders of the people" (δήμου θ' ἡγεμόνων) who, "without respect for the sacred and public properties, steal and loot, each for his part."[16] Cassola deduces from this that Solon uprooted from formerly public land boundary stones placed by the great landowners for their own profit. Solon would have freed such land for distribution to landless peasants. S. Link follows this view, but claims that Solon, since he opposed the very principle of distribution, did not distribute this land but instead returned it to its former status as open "no man's land" (*Niemandsland*).[17] It should be noted, however, that Solon distinguishes two types of properties abusively exploited by the leaders of the people: sacred properties and public properties.[18] Even if it is imaginable that he would have again allowed free access to public properties, it is not conceivable that he would have done so for the sanctuaries' properties.

Should the lootings committed by the leaders of the people be placed in this context? As underlined by H. van Effenterre,[19] the vocabulary of these verses, as often in Solon, evokes war. Accordingly he proposes to see in the land liberated by Solon territory recovered from an enemy.[20] By uprooting the boundary

16 Sol. fr.3 G.-P. (4 W.) 7, 12–13.

17 S. Link, *Landverteilung und sozialer Frieden im archaischen Griechenland* (*Historia* Einzelschr. 69 [1991]) 13–43. According to Link, the peasants who had access to such public land before its usurpation by the nobles were the *hectemoroi.* Solon would have abolished this status, which implied the payment of a tax to the city, and would have guaranteed access to public land to everyone. Similarly, T. E. Rihll, "EKTHMOPOI: Partners in Crime?" *JHS* 111 (1991) 101–127, supposes that the land freed by Solon would have remained public at the time it was cultivated by the *hectemoroi,* whose status would have been fixed by Dracon's law.

18 On the distinction: L. Migeotte, "Finances sacrées et finances publiques dans les cités grecques," in *Actas del IX Congreso Espanol de Estudios Clasicos* (Madrid 1997) 171–175.

19 van Effenterre 91–129; Cl. Bérard, *La cité des images* (Lausanne/Paris 1984) 110; L'Homme-Wéry 49–60.

20 K. Raaflaub, *Die Entdeckung der Freiheit. Zur historischen Semantik und Gesellschaftsgeschichte eines politischen Grundbegriffs der Griechen* (*Vestigia* 37 [Munich 1985]) 54–55, who opts for the mortgage stones, does not however

stones planted by this enemy, Solon would have demonstrated the liberation of the enslaved land. But this liberation would have resulted in an internal crisis in Athens: for when the leaders of the people—large landowners or aristocrats—abusively laid hands on the reconquered land, without respecting even public and sacred properties, the *demos* requested an equal redistribution. From Solon's elegy *Salamis* it is known that he first won fame in the war against Megara, by calling upon his fellow-citizens to reconquer the island from the Megarians.[21] In this conflict, the defense of the Thriasian plain is necessarily linked with that of the island that commanded its access by sea.[22] The *ge melaina* liberated by Solon could therefore be that of Eleusis, as *melaina* evokes one of its characteristics, the black color of rich grain-bearing lands.[23] Athenian silence in the fifth century about this liberation avoided recalling to themselves an inglorious episode in which their links to Eleusis, so important for Athenian pride, would have been temporarily broken.[24]

3. Dying for Athens in Eleusis: Solon's definition of *olbos* in Herodotus' work

On van Effenterre's thesis, the fifth-century silence regarding the *seisachtheia* ceases to be a problem: Athens still remembered Solon's liberation of Eleusis. Indeed, in Herodotus' Solon-Croesus dialogue (1.30–32), Solon awards the first prize for

---

mention any other example of δουλεύουσα, ἐλευθέρα used of this type of encumbering of land in the archaic period, while he offers numerous instances in which these words designate the domination of a territory by the enemy and its liberation (71–102).

21 Sol. fr.2 G.-P. (1–3 W.); Plut. *Sol.* 8.2 gives the title *Salamis.*

22 van Effenterre 106; *cf.* Ch. Picard, "Les luttes primitives entre Athènes et Éleusis," *RHist* 166 (1931) 13.

23 van Effenterre 112 n.63; *cf.* A. Philippson, *Die griechischen Landschaften* I.3 (Frankfurt a.M. 1952) 861–862. Hom. *Od.* 19.111 already associates the black earth with grain-bearing land.

24 van Effenterre 106. On the idealized image of its history proposed by Athens: N. Loraux, *L'invention d'Athènes. Histoire de l'oraison funèbre dans la "cité classique"*, transl. A. Sheridan (Cambridge [Mass.] 1986), and *La cité divisée* (Paris 1997).

happiness to Tellos, an Athenian who died in Eleusis "in a fight against neighbors." Admittedly the chronology of the two men shows this dialogue to be unhistorical.[25] But beyond the fiction that places Solon in front of the king who symbolizes *olbos* (happiness) as wealth, other meanings of *olbos* emerge, which illustrate Solon's vision of his liberation of Eleusis' Earth.[26]

First, it is his totally happy life that gives Tellos first place among the happy. His name seems to destine him for this, considering his end.[27] Solon insists precisely on such an end: "The end of his life was the most glorious. For in battle between the Athenians and their neighbors at Eleusis he came to the rescue and routed the enemy and died there most nobly; and the

---

After J. Ober, *Fortress Attica* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 84 [1985]) 109

[25] To reconcile the chronology of Croesus who mounts the throne in 561/0 with that of Solon, archon in 594/3, M. Miller, "The Accepted Date for Solon: Precise, but Wrong?" *Arethusa* 2 (1969) 62–86, proposes to dissociate the date of his archonship from that of his legislation. Wallace (*supra* n.8) shows that this dissociation has no foundation.

[26] P. Lévêque, "Olbios et la félicité des initiés," in *Rayonnement Grec. Hommages à Ch. Delvoye* (Brussels 1982) 113–126, studies the various meanings of the word in the archaic period, including in the Eleusinian Mysteries.

[27] Tellos could suggest *to telos*: C. C. Chiasson, "The Herodotean Solon," *GRBS* 27 (1986) 249–262 at 250.

Athenians gave him a public burial where he fell and paid him great honor " (1.30). Solon's praise of Tellos comes close to a funeral oration.[28] But whereas in the fifth century Pericles celebrates collectively warriors fallen in battle,[29] Solon here praises Tellos' heroic deed individually. His personal bravery routed the enemy at Eleusis; and his grave, erected where he fell, ensures him an individual elogium. As a result, he remains close to the heroes of epic. The funerary customs implied in this story differ from those of the fifth century, and this suggests that Herodotus' account reflects Solon and his system of values. If this is so, Tellos is as it were an echo of Solon himself, who liberated the "black earth" of Eleusis when it was under Megarian occupation. Herodotus' Solon refrains from naming the Megarians, calling them neighbors (ἀστυγείτονας). But who is inclined to commemorate the name of the enemy?

But Tellos' death, as celebrated by Solon, is not merely glorious, but the happiest death. Why is this? In Herodotus, Solon does not answer that question, although the choice of Tellos leads us to raise it.[30] The choice of Cleobis and Biton as *olbiotatoi* next after Tellos constitutes of itself an answer, at least if we consider that the heroic deeds of Tellos and those of the Argive twins belong to the same cultic context—a procession

[28] Anaximenes of Lampsakos, *FGrHist* 72 F24, attributes to Solon the invention of the funeral oration.

[29] Thuc. 2.34. On the ideology of death in fifth-century Athens in comparison with epic values: N. Loraux, "Mourir devant Troie, tomber pour Athènes," in G. Gnoli and J.-P. Vernant, edd., *La mort, les morts dans les sociétés anciennes* (Paris 1982) 27–43; on the individual value of the warrior in the archaic epitaphs: G. I. C. Robertson, "Evaluating the Citizen in Archaic Greek Lyric, Elegy and Inscribed Epigram," in L. G. Mitchell and P. J. Rhodes, edd., *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London/New York 1997) 148–157.

[30] Hdt. 1.32–33 continues the Solon-Croesus dialogue, but does not raise that question. Chiasson (*supra* n.27) shows that it is Herodotus' viewpoint that is developed in these chapters, including *inter alia* the idea of misfortune resulting from the divinity's jealousy. Such is not the view of Sol. fr.1 G.-P. (13W.) 29–32, where misfortune results from Zeus' justice; *cf.* J. Christes, "Solons Musen Elegie," *Hermes* 114 (1986) 1–19.

uniting the *astu* to a sanctuary in the *chora.*[31] In the Argive *pompe* Cleobis and Biton take the place of the oxen to draw their mother's carriage to Hera's sanctuary in the *chora.* Their role as *zeugitai* evokes their hoplite status as defenders of their fatherland.[32] Consequently they receive a double happiness in death, the glory of having their statue at Delphi[33] and the definitive sleep in Hera's sanctuary.

If the second episode is centered on the *pompe,* the first also involves one, that associated with the Eleusinian Mysteries, in which ephebes played a crucial role. On Boedromion 14 they escorted the carriage pulled by oxen bringing Demeter's *hiera* from Eleusis to Athens; on Boedromion 19 they brought it back to Eleusis in a procession in which the *mystai* took part.[34] The presence of the ephebes confirms the civic dimension of this procession, the presence of the initiates, its eschatological dimension. By routing the enemy from Eleusinian soil, Tellos had rendered this possible. Like the Argive twins, he had become a model for the ephebes of Athens. In Solon's opinion, however, he ranks ahead of the Argives, who are given the sleep of death by Hera. In contrast to them, he obtains a greater happiness, whose nature is not described by Solon, but which the *Hymn to Demeter* invites us to conceive as Eleusinian.

31 Unitary interpretation of Hdt. 1.30–32, in terms of *pompe*: Ch. Picard, "Déméter et les jumeaux d'Argos," *RHR* 96 (1927) 365–398 at 389–393; L.-M. L'Homme-Wéry, "Solon, libérateur d'Eleusis dans les 'Histoires' d'Hérodote," *REG* 107 (1994) 364–380. On the *pompe* to the Heraion at Prosymna as a sign of Argive sovereignty over the Argolis plain: Fr. de Polignac, *Cults, Territory, and the Origins of the Greek City-State* (Chicago/London 1995) 52–53.

32 In the division into property classes, which *Ath.Pol.* 7.3 mentions as older than Solon, the *zeugitai* are the class between the *hippeis* and the *thetes,* while in Sparta, the *zeugites* is the rank-fellow in the phalanx (Plut. *Pel.* 23.3). A. Andrewes, *The Greek Tyrants* (London 1956) 87; L. H. Jeffery, *Archaic Greece* (London 1976) 93, 107; Rhodes (supra n.2) 137–138 deduces from this that hoplite and zeugite are probably synonyms.

33 The identification of the *kouroi* of Delphi with Cleobis and Biton is disputed by Cl. Vatin, "Monuments votifs de Delphes, V: les Couroi d'Argos," *BCH* 106 (1982) 509–525, and P. Faure, "Les Dioscures à Delphes," *AntCl* 44 (1985) 56–94.

34 On the calendar of the Mysteries *pompe*: F. Graf, "*Pompai* in Greece," in R. Hägg, ed., *The Role of Religion in the Early Greek Polis* (Stockholm 1996) 55–65.

This hymn, composed in Eleusis in the archaic period, ends with the affirmation of the *olbos* of the initiate, whose fate in death is distinct from that of "him who has no part (ἄμμορος) in the Mysteries and never has the fate of those who are alike (ὁμοίων), once he is dead amid the moldy shades."[35] This vocabulary transposes into the hereafter the notion of *homoioi* and that of *meros* which is associated with it in the political claims of the archaic period. It also defines the *olbos* of the initiates by contrast with the fate of non-initiates. Similarly, Solon does not describe the nature of the *olbos* that Demeter gives to Tellos. He invites us to discover it by an implicit comparison with the fate of Cleobis and Biton. Such comparison is still made in Eleusis in the Imperial period, as shown by the funeral epigram of a hierophantid, Isidote: Deo—Demeter—"gave" to her priestess "a sweeter death than pleasant sleep and by all means preferable to that of the young men of Argos":[36]

> δῶκε δέ οἱ θάνατον γλυκυρώτερον ἡδέο[ς] ὕπνου
> πάγχυ καὶ Ἀργείων φέρτερον ἠιθέων.

As emphasized by Picard, this inscription invites us to consider Solon's discourse in the Eleusinian context. Through Tellos, Solon sings his own praise as Eleusis' liberator. Official Athens, however, is reluctant to remember this liberation, the commemoration of which would evoke the Megarian domination. Therefore, in spite of Solon's poem referring to the liberated Earth as Mother, the liberation of Eleusis is not attributed to Solon in the Herodotean tradition.

35 *Hymn.Hom.Cer.* 480–482. The *Hymn* is dated to the archaic period on linguistic criteria: N. J. Richardson, *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Oxford 1974) 5–11; H. P. Foley, ed., *The Homeric Hymn to Demeter* (Princeton 1993) 169–175. Interpretation of these verses: L'Homme-Wéry 70–73.

36 *IG* II² 3632.15–l6; Picard (*supra* n.31) 389–393; J. H. Oliver, "Two Athenian Poets," *Hesperia* Suppl. 8 (l949) 249; K. Clinton, *The Sacred Officials of the Eleusinian Mysteries* (*TAPS* 64 [1974]) 88.

4. The cult of the Mother in the Agora of Athens

In his poem, Solon defines the liberated Earth as μήτηρ μεγίστη δαιμόνων Ὀλυμπίων, "Mighty Mother of the Olympian deities," and asks her to testify to her liberation before the "tribunal of Time."[37] As Solon established a sacred calendar inscribed on the *kurbeis*, he is very likely to have founded a cult to the Great Mother, in order to preserve the memory of his liberation of the Eleusinian soil. Such a cult is not that of Eleusis, in which the Two Goddesses have their Mysteries shown to the initiates, even if they are not Athenians.[38] The cult of the Olympian Mother founded by Solon is reserved for Athenians. It celebrates the Earth of Eleusis, which has become again the Earth of Athens, and identifies it with Rhea, Mother. Aeschylus, in the *Supplices*, refers to this cult when the chorus invokes μᾶ Γᾶ and πᾶ, Γᾶς παῖ, Ζεῦ (889–892). Thus Solon implicitly identifies Ge and Rhea, and to designate this Ge-Mother he uses a term already employed in Thebes *ca* 1200 B.C. for designating Demeter: as Godart and Sacconi have pointed out concerning Aeschylus, *ma-ka, o-po-rei*, and *ko-wa* are in the Theban Mycenaean archives names of gods corresponding to Demeter, Zeus, and Kore.[39] Solon's formula for designating the liberated Earth of Eleusis as Athenian Earth is therefore both new by his identification of Ge-Mother with Rhea, and ancient by his identification of this Mother with Demeter or Deo.[40]

The memory of the cult founded by Solon was long preserved: Julian states that a triad—Deo, Rhea, Demeter—was Mother of the Gods in Athens until the arrival (datable to the second half

[37] Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 3–7.

[38] *Hymn.Hom.Cer.* 480.

[39] L. Godart and A. Sacconi, "Les archives de Thèbes et le monde mycénien," *CRAI* (1997) 889–906.

[40] Deo for Demeter: *Hymn.Hom.Cer.* 47, 492; Soph. *Ant.* 1121; *IG* II² 3632.12. N. Robertson, "The Ancient Mother of the Gods. A Missing Chapter in the History of Greek Religion," in E. N. Lane, *Cybele, Attis and Related Cults. Essays in Memory of M. J. Vermaeseren* (Leiden/New York/Cologne 1996) 239–304, defends the view of the Mycenaean origin of Rhea as Great Mother.

of the fifth century) of a new Mother, Cybele, and the Metroon in the Agora was built in honor of this new Mother to keep Athens' archives.[41] On this site, however, the earliest remains—a rectangular building of two rooms (7 × 15 m.), designated by H. A. Thompson as "C"—date back to Solon's time.[42] Solon also wrote laws with a view to insuring their equal application to base and noble.[43] Consequently, we can suppose that he was the founder of this Metroon, at one and the same time sanctuary of the Mother and center of the public archives, probably kept in "C." This is all more likely as Cleisthenes built a Bouleuterion and a small temple probably consecrated to the Mother in the same place. At the end of the fifth century this Bouleuterion was reserved for the Mother of the Gods and for the archives, once again centralized in this sanctuary to accord with a return to Solon's legislation, while a new Bouleuterion was built as the seat of the *boule.* In this Bouleuterion-Metroon, the dedications are addressed to the Mother of the Gods, not to Cybele.[44] The cult remains therefore traditional, at least in its nomenclature, despite the arrival of Cybele. As a result, even if the official and cultic character of the Metroon site has not yet

[41] Julian *Or.* 5.159a. On the arrival of Cybele: T. L. Shear, "Bouleuterion, Metroon, and the Archives at Athens," in M. H. Hansen and K. Raaflaub, edd., *Studies in the Ancient Greek Polis* (*Historia* Einzelschr. 95 [1995]) 157–189 at 174; L. E. Roller, *In Search of God the Mother. The Cult of Anatolian Cybele* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1999) 170, emphasizes that Solon addresses the Earth, "using cult titles later applied to Meter Kybele and to Rhea, Mother of the Olympians." She believes however that the Earth of Solon's poem is not the Great Mother, represented with tympanon and lions. This iconography of Earth is nevertheless present in sixth-century Athens: L.-M. L'Homme-Wéry, "La notion de patrie dans la pensée politique de Solon," *AntCl* 69 (2000) 21–41.

[42] H. A. Thompson, "Buildings on the West Side of the Agora," *Hesperia* 6 (1937) 203–212; "The Tholos of Athens and its Predecessors," *Hesperia* Suppl. 4 (1940) 8–11, 43–44. *Cf.* J. M. Camp, *The Athenian Agora* (London 1986) 35–39.

[43] Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 18–20.

[44] M. J. Vermaeseren, *Corpus Cultus Cybelae Attidisque* II (Leiden 1982) nos. 3–59.

appeared in the sixth century, as Shear argued,[45] its subsequent evolution bears testimony to its origins, as previously estimated by Thompson.[46] Thus we cannot exclude the possibility that Solon founded a Metroon and perhaps a Bouleuterion at a place which from his time on was probably the site of a new agora.[47]

5. The boundary stone in Solon's poems

While Solon reinforces the union of Athens with Eleusis through the cult of the Mother, he suppresses the memory of Megarian domination by uprooting the stones planted by the Megarians at the frontiers of the Thriasian plain. The view of van Effenterre, that the uprooted stones are Megarian boundary markers, meets the definition of the stones in one of Solon's poems: developing the theme of the tyrant (a title Solon refused), who would distribute equally the fertile soil of the fatherland, he compares his endangered position between the two camps dividing Athens on this vital question to a "stone between two armies": ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων ὥσπερ ἐν μεταιχμίῳ ὅρος κατέστην.[48]

It is in the context of this comparison with his own position that Solon defines the *horos* as boundary stone. In the poem on the *seisachtheia* the comparison between himself and a vulnerable wolf among the city's bitches expresses the same idea of the

[45] T. L. Shear, "Ἰσονόμους τ' Ἀθήνας ἐποιησάτην: The Agora and the Democracy," in W. D. E. Coulson *et al.*, edd., *The Archaeology of Athens and Attica under the Democracy* (Bloomington 1994) 228–231, dates the Metroon to the end of the fifth century.

[46] Thompson (*supra* n.42) supposes that the use of the Bouleuterion as Metroon dates back at least to the time of Cleisthenes, when the temple to the Mother was built. He proposes to see in "C "a center for the archives of the *boule*.

[47] The foundation of a new agora by Solon does not preclude that the old agora, which N. Robertson, "The City Center of Archaic Athens," *Hesperia* 67 (1998) 283–302, sees in the buildings to the north of the Acropolis, continued in use until the time of Cleisthenes.

[48] Sol. fr.31 G.-P. (37 W.) 8–9. On the meaning of *metaichmion*: N. Loraux, "Solon au milieu de la lice," in *Aux origines d'hellénisme … Hommage à Henri van Effenterre* (Paris 1984) 199–214.

threat overhanging him from the two parties' hostility.[49] The background of both poems is the same, so that it is difficult to imagine that the sense of *horos* would be different in them. However, the stone which at the time of the liberation of the territory symbolized Solon's victory becomes the sign of his failure in the internal struggle that follows, so that he will be forced to exile himself.[50] Like a Megarian boundary stone, he is about to be uprooted from his city by his fellow-citizens, even if he is still standing.

In archaic Megara, as in Athens, the general who reconquers a territory signals his victory by uprooting the boundary stones of the enemy. This gesture was celebrated in Megara's agora in Hadrian's time by a copy of a funerary epigram of an archaic hero, Orrhippos, "who liberated his mother country from huge *horoi* when the enemies had separated off abundant earth":[51]

> ὃς δὴ μακίστους μὲν ὅρους ἀπελύσατο πάτρᾳ
> πολλὰν δυσμενέων γᾶν ἀποτεμνομένων.

This Megarian hero's gesture corresponds to that of Solon, who uproots from the Athenian mother country the boundary stones planted by the Megarians. Their removal signals Solon's victory to both the Megarians and his fellow-citizens.[52]

[49] For E. M. Harris, "A New Solution to the Riddle of the *Seisachtheia*," in Mitchell/Rhodes (*supra* n.29) 103–106, the uprooting of the stones by Solon in fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) is similarly a metaphor, meaning that he would put an end to the *stasis.*

[50] Hdt. 1.29–30; *Ath.Pol.* 11; *cf.* L'Homme-Wéry 111–113.

[51] *IG* VII 52; L. Piccirilli, *Megarika. Testimonianze e frammenti* (Pisa 1975) fr.11.166–167; G. Daverio Rocchi, *Frontiera e confini nella Grecia antica* (Rome 1988) 207–208; L'Homme-Wéry 117–120. In Athens the expression ὅροι τῆς πατρίδος in the ephebes' oath refers to boundary stones: L'Homme-Wéry 123–124.

[52] D. Rousset, "Les frontières des cités grecques," *CahGlotz* 5 (1994) 97–126, emphasizes the paucity of *horoi* to delimit boundaries, even in case of conflict and arbitration. The fact that Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36W.) 6 asserts that the *horoi* uprooted by him were planted in many places (πολλαχῇ) does not imply that they were many in absolute numbers, but that the reconquered territory was important.

6. The new boundary: Sacred land and unmarked land

By uprooting these Megarian stones Solon testifies that the land of Attica, limited during the Megarian domination to the Aigaleos, now includes the Thriasian plain up to the Kerata and the Pateras. On the eve of the Peloponnesian War, according to Thucydides, this frontier consisted of a "sacred land" (τῆς γῆς τῆς ἱερᾶς) and an "unmarked land" (τῆς ἀορίστου), which the Athenians accuse the Megarians of cultivating (1.139.2). The *sacred land* is the *Orgas* of the Two Goddesses of Eleusis, an inviolable *temenos* that can be neither cultivated nor exploited nor looted. Situated near the Kerata, bordering the coastal road, at the most sensitive point of the Athenian-Megarian boundary, it stood as witness that the Two Goddesses in their wild domain protect Athens against Megara.[53] Further away, in the Kerata and the Pateras, lay an *unmarked land,* which the Megarians, in concession to Athens, agreed not to cultivate. This mountainous zone is thus artificially fixed in its former status as *eschatia,* a common area for hunting and pasturage.[54] By the constitution of this *methoria ge*[55] in its double aspect of sacred and unmarked land, Athens endeavors to prevent the Megarians from cultivating the boundary area separating them from the Thriasian plain. Thus, the city strives to reduce the risk of a new conflict with Megara.

In its *unmarked area*, this boundary imposes upon the Megarians conditions quite different from those that they had obliged the Athenians to accept when they had "cut off" the Eleusinian land by boundary stones, delimiting it to their advantage. In its *sacred area,* this boundary reminds others that the Two Goddesses protect Athens against the invader. The

[53] Hdt. 6.75; Paus. 3.4.2; *Suda s.v.* ὀργάς; *cf.* J. Ober, *Fortress Attica* (*Mnemosyne* Suppl. 84 [1985]) 108.

[54] An analogous agreement between the Athenians and Boeotians concerning Panacton: Thuc. 5.42.

[55] The area is so defined by Akestodoros, *FHG* II fr.464 (= Plut. *Them.* 13.1).

characteristics of the Athenian-Megarian boundary in the fifth century are the opposite of those imposed by the Megarians on Athens during their domination of Eleusis. We can suppose that they were imposed by Athens on Megara after the liberation of Eleusis, probably by Solon himself.

7. *Agos* and occultation

If in 432/1 Athens forces Megara to respect the border established during Solon's time, is it likely that at the same time Athens does not refer directly to Solon's work of liberation? In fact, Athenians now do not want to remember the Megarian domination, as Herodotus' narrative shows. Solon himself does not mention the oppressors' name in his poem (fr.30). Beyond the reluctance to mention the Megarian domination, the silence would also reflect the fear of an ancient curse, the power of which was considered to be ever present: the "curse of the goddess," ἄγος τῆς θεοῦ. Thucydides (1.126) reveals the nature of this *agos*: on the eve of the Peloponnesian War the Lacedaemonians send embassies to Athens to demand the "driving out" of this curse. They want to have "a very good pretext (μεγίστη πρόφασις) for making war, in case they did not comply." Thucydides then explains its origin. Long ago (in 636 or 632)[56] Cylon had attempted to seize the Acropolis of Athens with the assistance of a military force provided by the tyrant of Megara, his father-in-law Theagenes. The Athenians mobilized en masse from the countryside and besieged the conspirators, with the nine archons in charge of the operation. Then the sacrilege occurred: the rebels were executed after leaving the Acropolis, in violation of human and divine laws, as they had sat as suppliants at the altar on the Acropolis and had received a promise of security. Cylon and his brother, who had fled, were not among the victims, but the Megarians were, as Thucydides

[56] Cadoux (*supra* n.8) 91; Rhodes (*supra* n.2) 79–82; Dillon/Garland (*supra* n.13) 41; L'Homme-Wéry 310–312.

implies without mentioning them explicitly. Similarly, he names neither the murderers nor the offended goddess. Instead he stresses the hereditary character of the curse. After mentioning the murder of some conspirators in the sanctuary of the *Semnai*, outside the Akropolis, he reports that "from that time, they were called accursed and criminals against the goddess (ἐναγεῖς καὶ ἀλιτήριοι τῆς θεοῦ), both they and their descendants"; this proclamation was effective, for the accursed were repeatedly expelled from Athens, first by the Athenians and thereafter by Cleomenes the Lacedaemonian. But "they came back afterwards and their descendants are still in the city."

Since the *agos* is hereditary, it is recurrent.[57] But it recurs at certain times only. Why at such times? Thucydides does not say. Nevertheless, he observes the results that the Spartans expect from recalling it on the eve of the Peloponnesian War. Since Pericles is *enages* by his mother (an Alcmaeonid), they hope, if not to obtain his banishment, at least to discredit him in his city, "where it would be said that his misfortune would be to some extent the cause of the war": ὡς καὶ διὰ τὴν ἐκείνου ξυμφορὰν τὸ μέρος ἔσται ὁ πόλεμος (1.127.2). They expect that the Athenians will attribute the war to the *agos*, which they name "misfortune"; one avoids naming it when suffering from its effects.[58] They expect this reaction because they know the connection previously established at Athens between *agos* and war.

According to Herodotus, in 508/7 the Spartan king Cleomenes on Isagoras' advice dispatched a herald to Athens to call for the expulsion of the Alcmaeonid Cleisthenes and the other *enageis*.[59] This ultimatum, issued before Cleomenes entered

[57] R. Parker, *Miasma. Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*[2] (Oxford 1996) 16–17.

[58] On this euphemism: L. Moulinier, *Le pur et l'impur dans la pensée des Grecs* (Paris 1952) 60–61, 186.

[59] Hdt. 5.70, 72; *cf. Ath.Pol.* 20.2.

Attica, proved its efficacy: Cleisthenes immediately left Athens surreptitiously. But Cleomenes invaded the city, from which he expelled 700 accursed households. The *agos* functioned when Athens and the Thriasian plain were on the verge of invasion.[60] Herodotus, nevertheless, does not connect the war and its resurgence to this circumstance.

Before Solon's archonship, the *agos* already acted in this same context of civil and external war. According to the *Athenian Constitution,* the *enageis* were then disinterred and their descendants condemned to perpetual exile.[61] Plutarch, following the same source, says that Megacles was the eponymous archon at the time of the murder, which explains why the Alcmaeonids were afterwards blamed for the murder.[62] Far from bringing calm, he adds, the condemnation revived troubles in Athens, so that "the Megarians en masse attacked the Athenians, who lost Nisaea and were driven out of Salamis once more" (*Sol.* 12.3–5). These victories necessarily put in doubt Solon's liberation of Eleusis.[63] The *agos* operates in this context. In order to prevent its action, the Athenians summon Epimenides of Phaestus to purify the city.[64]

For Solon this double war results from the *agos,* as we see in his elegy *Eunomia.* After denouncing the usurpations by the Athenian leaders on the reconquered land, he describes the *agos,* without naming it, as an "incurable wound," the cause of

[60] Cleomenes violates the *orgas* at its entrance to the Thriasian plain: Hdt. 6.75; Paus. 3.4.2.

[61] *Ath.Pol.* 1. Thuc. 1.126.12 does not indicate clearly if the exhumation took place after the trial or after the expulsion of the *enageis* by Cleomenes.

[62] Their responsibility remained disputed: Hdt. 5.71, pointing out that at the time of the massacre Athens was ruled by the *prytanes* of the *naukraroi,* exculpates them. This is also the case of Thuc. 1.126.8 who emphasizes the responsibility of the nine archons.

[63] Solon's victory at Eleusis is not mentioned by Plut. *Sol.* 8–9, who describes Solon only as the victor of Salamis. Similarly, Plutarch does not mention that, before the trial of the *enageis,* the Athenians had taken Nisaea, the port of Megara. The continental aspect of the war is kept dark.

[64] *Ath.Pol.* 1; Plut. *Sol.* 12.6–12.

Athens' misfortunes: "Upon the whole city now comes this incurable wound (ἕλκος ἄφυκτον). Swiftly it falls into evil enslavement (κακὴν δουλοσύνην) which revives the fratricidal civil war and the sleeping external war, which destroys many in the beauty of their youth. For under the blows of the enemies, the beloved city is rapidly consumed in conflicts (συνόδοις) that characterize the unjust. Such are the evils which upset the country."[65] Aeschylus in turn uses the term ἕλκος in connection with an *agos* emptying the city of its men:[66]

> πόλει μὲν ἕλκος ἔν τι δήμιον τυχεῖν,
> πολλοὺς δὲ πολλῶν ἐξαγισθέντας δόμων
> ἄνδρας, διπλῇ μάστιγι τὴν Ἄρης φιλεῖ.

For Aeschylus, the *agos* is this civic wound that manifests itself in the exile of many men torn from their homes. This is again the incurable wound described by Solon. The view of the Spartans who in 432/1 expect that the war will revive fear of *agos* in Athens relies on an Athenian belief, already present in Solon's work. For him the *agos* caused the enslavement suffered by Athens in the Thriasian plain and the resulting double war. This implies that this enslavement followed the proclamation of the *agos* in 636 or 632, and that it probably originated in the vengeance of Theagenes for the massacre of his troops and the failure of the attempted tyranny of his stepson in Athens. It is perhaps in the same circumstances that Salamis fell into Megarian hands.[67] Nevertheless, far from attributing this enslavement to political factors, the Athenians attributed it to the

[65] Sol. fr.3 G.-P. (4 W.) 17–23. On the vocabulary in these verses: L'Homme-Wéry 195–210.

[66] Aesch. *Ag.* 640–643. The adjective δήμιον designates ἕλκος as civic, if we take into account that δῆμος and πόλις have the same meaning in the fifth century.

[67] On this point: G. Busolt, *Griechische Geschichte* II (Gotha 1895) 313–322; G. Glotz, *Histoire grecque* I[5] (Paris 1986) 419–420; J. B. Bury and R. Meiggs, *A History of Greece* (London 1975) 122–123.

vengeance of a goddess who had proclaimed through her priests that the murderers of the Cylonians were hers.[68]

In this context, the goddess who formulated the *agos* through her priests was probably not Athena, even though the massacre of her suppliants necessarily offended her, but Demeter, similarly named ἡ θεός in the Mysteries *pompe*.[69] But if in the *pompe* Demeter was the *olbos* goddess for the Athenians, in the context of war the threat to the Thriasian plain evokes the opposite, the *agos tes theou*, linked to the memory of Megarian domination.[70] Consequently, Athens is silent about this domination.

Thucydides alone signals a link betweem *agos* and war; but he attributes this link not to the Athenians but to the Spartans. By sending an embassy to Athens to expel the *enageis*, they seek to renew in Athens the fear of losing Eleusis and its plain. Thucydides does not say whether their attempt had any effect. He does however insist on Megara's preponderant role in the following embassies, which concern first of all the Athenian decree prohibiting the Megarians from using the ports of the Empire and the Attic market. According to the Spartans, peace depends on the cancellation of this decree (Thuc. 1.139). The Megarian decree has replaced the *agos* as a pretext for the war.

[68] The expression ἄγος τῆς θεοῦ occurs only at Thuc. 1.126. Plut. *Sol.* 12.1 has Κυλώνειον ἄγος; Hdt. 5.71 uses no particular expression for this sacrilege. A. Motte, "L'expression du sacré dans la religion grecque," in J. Ries, ed., *L'expression du sacré dans les grandes religions* III (Louvain-La-Neuve 1986) 150–151, showed that, like any *agos*, the *agos tes theou* implies that the divinity concerned takes possession of the author of the sacrilege.

[69] Ar. *Ran.* 400: Iacchos accompanies the Mystai πρὸς τὴν θεόν. They ascend "towards the sacred circle of the goddess, to her flowery grove" (441), while the women and girls "celebrate a nocturnal feast in honor of the goddess" (446). K. Clinton, "The Sanctuary of Demeter and Kore at Eleusis," in N. Marinatos and R. Hägg, edd., *Greek Sanctuaries. New Approaches* (London/New York 1993) 113, 120, considers that "the goddess" is Persephone, but the context of the *pompe* implies Demeter, explicitly mentioned at 384.

[70] At *Hymn.Hom.Cer.* 153–155, 473–479, the presence of the Megarian Diocles among the recipients of the Mysteries and the absence of the Athenian Iacchos would be a sign that the Eumolpids, during the Megarian domination, favored Megara against Athens (L'Homme-Wéry 67–90).

Why is this? Thucydides does not mention it, but in emphasizing hostility towards Megara, revived by the recollection of the *agos,* Sparta necessarily intensifies Athenian fear of losing Eleusis. This fear is not idle, for Eleusis is located on the enemy's route and will become even more vulnerable under Pericles' policy of abandoning the *chôra* in order to defend the *astu*.[71] In this context, the Athenians' answer to Sparta justifying refusal to cancel the Megarian decree is significant: the Megarians' cultivation of "the sacred land and the unmarked land."[72] The Athenians thus implicitly reproach the Megarians for violating the boundary established in Solon's time to keep them from the Thriasian plain; they intend this frontier to be respected. They will not accept the Peloponnesian claims, and will maintain a decree which, beyond its economic aspects, manifests their will not to abandon, in the imminent conflict, the Thriasian plain to the Megarians, allies of the Peloponnesians.[73] If after the invocation of the *agos* the Athenians fear this possibility, that is because they again fear its power. The Spartan maneuver has succeeded: they use the *agos* to induce the Athenians to believe they are responsible for a war which in fact has just been decided upon by the Peloponnesians. Thucydides,

[71] Thuc. 1.143.5. Y. Garlan, *Recherches de poliorcétique grecque* (Paris 1972) 29–33.

[72] Thuc. 1.139. 2. This justification shows that the purpose of the Megarian decree is not, as supposed by G. Cawkwell, *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War* (London 1997) 33, to induce Megara to leave the Peloponnesian League and return to the Athenian alliance, as had been the case between *ca* 461 and 446.

[73] Since the Athenians justify their anti-Megarian policy by the *orgas,* G. E. M. de Ste Croix, *The Origins of the Peloponnesian War* (New York 1972) 225–289, 381–399, proposes to see in the decree against the Megarians a kind of *atimia* decree meant not to destroy them economically but to humiliate them by prohibiting them from using the civic agora of Athens and the ports of the Empire. In this case, *Attike agora* at Thuc. 1.139.1 would designate the Athenian agora and not the whole Attic market. But as observed by Ph. Gauthier, "Les ports de l'Empire et l'*Agora* athénienne: A propos du 'décret mégarien,'" *Historia* 24 (1975) 502, "the juxtaposition of the *limenes* and of *agora* strongly suggests that the decree concerned the *agora*-market." Similarly, R. P. Legon, *Megara* (Ithaca/London 1981) 217.

nevertheless, does not mention it; he explains Spartan motives without indicating the impact on the Athenians.[74]

But the influence of the *agos* on his analysis of the cause of the war appears in his choice of words in declaring its most profound cause, ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις: the Peloponnesians' fear of the Athenian Empire.[75] In this context, ἀληθεστάτη gives πρόφασις its new meaning of "cause," as opposed to its usual meaning as "pretext" seen frequently in Book I, where all factors that might be thought the cause of the war are one by one designated pretexts.[76] To the μεγίστη πρόφασις said of the Spartans' invocation of the *agos* (1.126.1), when they attribute to Athens and particularly Pericles responsibility for the war, Thucydides implicitly opposes his ἀληθεστάτη πρόφασις which holds the Peloponnesians responsible, for it is out of fear that they attacked the Athenian Empire. In this analysis, Athens no longer fears the *agos,* but the Peloponnesians fear Athens. The fear of the *agos,* which is not mentioned, is thus transcended. This occultation leads to silence about the Megarian domination and Solon's liberation of Eleusis. Consequently, in the fourth century the *seisachtheia,* which is this liberation, is defined only by its internal consequences: the liberation of the *hectemoroi* and the indebted.

8. Liberation and legislation

The first term used by the *Athenian Constitution* to define the *hectemoroi,* in chapter 2, is *pelatai.* Since in the Athenian Empire the *pelatai* are native inhabitants who cultivate lands belonging to Athenian citizens,[77] this chapter appears to have kept, at

[74] On silences and omissions in Thucydides' work: Cawkwell (*supra* n.72) 90; T. Rood, *Thucydides. Narrative and Explanation* (Oxford 1998) 136–137.

[75] Thuc. 1.23.6; same expression in 6.6.1 of the truest cause of the expedition to Sicily, as opposed to the reasons given by Athens.

[76] A. Heubeck, "Prophasis und kein Ende (zu Thuk. I 23)," *Glotta* 58 (1980) 222–236; S. Hornblower, *A Commentary on Thucydides* I (Oxford 1991) 65; L'Homme-Wéry 333–356.

[77] Pl. *Euthphr.* 4C–E; *cf.* Ph. Gauthier, "A propos des clérouquies athéniennes," in M. I. Finley, ed., *Problèmes de la terre en Grèce ancienne* (Paris 1973) 163–178.

least in its wording, the memory of a source mentioning the dependence imposed by the Megarians on the Eleusinian peasants.[78] On the other hand, Solon's cancellation of debts attests an economic crisis in Athens, probably made worse by the loss of the Thriasian plain, an important source of Athens' grain. We are reduced to hypothesis regarding the nature of this crisis. Nevertheless, the export of Attic oil, dating back to the end of the eighth century,[79] was certainly increased by the necessity to import grain after the loss of the Thriasian plain.[80] Under these conditions the land of the small peasants probably became attractive for oil exporters and rich landowners who wanted it for olive trees, which after about fifteen years (required for the trees' maturity) could generate large profits.[81] The small peasants, by contrast, could not afford to make such use of their land, which they needed to grow grain; so they were unable to profit from the transformation of Athenian agriculture. Instead they were certainly forced to borrow from the rich at unfavorable conditions during the years of bad harvests, so that their land and eventually their person and the persons of their family passed to their creditors.[82]

78 L'Homme-Wéry 35–48; Cl. Baurain, *Les Grecs et la Méditerranée orientale. Des siècles obscurs à la fin de la période archaïque* (Paris 1997) 488–489. On the contrary, van Effenterre 123–124 proposes to see in the *hectemoros* the *latris* who has a plot to cultivate καθ' ἑκάστην ἕκτην φοράν, every sixth crop.

79 M. Gras, "L'apport des amphores à la connaissance des commerces archaïques en mer Tyrrhénienne," *PACT* 20 (1988) 291–303.

80 Excess oil is the sole product whose export is authorized in Solon's legislation: Sol. fr.65, ed. E. Ruschenbusch, ΣΟΛΩΝΟΣ ΝΟΜΟΙ (*Historia* Einzelschr. 9 [1966]).

81 Sol. fr.1 G.-P. (13 W.) 47–48 mentions the γῆν . . . πολυδένδρεον, cultivated yearly by *latreis.* Sol. fr.90 R. calls the aligned olive-trees *stoichades*; fr.60b R. fixes at nine feet the planting distance of fig- and olive-trees. *Cf.* A. Mele, *Il commercio greco arcaico. Prexis ed emporie* (Naples 1979) 75.

82 Loans sometimes made in weighed silver, not yet in the form of coins: Sol. fr.68 R.; *cf.* J. H. Kroll, "Silver in Solon's Laws," in R. Ashton and S. Hurter, edd., *Studies in Greek Numismatics in Memory of Martin Jessop Price* (London 1998) 225–232. Nevertheless, for the small peasants, the guarantee is probably the crops, before it becomes the land and the person. D. W. Tandy, *Warriors into Traders* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1997) 4–5, underlines the break up of the old solidarity of the *oikos* as a result of trade development beginning in the eighth century.

Solon's *Eunomia* laments that "the poor depart, in large numbers, towards foreign land, sold, bound with insulting chains" (fr.3 G.-P. [4 W.] 23–25). Sold abroad, the indebted peasants were unable to oppose the seizure of their land. Athens was thus being emptied of its men and becoming vulnerable to the enemy. As a result, the return of the expatriates is fundamental for Solon, who mentions it before the liberation of "those who sustained here a shameful enslavement, trembling before their masters' whims" (fr.30 G.-P. [36 W.] 13–15). These can be identified as the Eleusinians, particularly the *hectemoroi* of the Thriasian plain, as Solon draws a parallel between their liberation and that of the Earth, even though he does not specify the name of the *despotai* who oppressed them (8–15).

The reintegration of all those excluded, whether they had been sold abroad, had been obliged to exile themselves, or had suffered the Megarian domination in place, required specific legislation to restore their citizenship (Sol. fr.70 R.). Such legislation was also intended to give them means of subsistence (frr. 56, 78c, 75 R.), for they were not restored to the lands they had lost in forty years of foreign domination and internal crisis. Only the *isomoiria*—the equal distribution of the land—would have made this solution possible, without creating new injustices. Solon, however, rejects this policy wanted by the *demos.* He responds to their desire for equality by promulgating a civic and penal code.[83] With the same purpose of keeping its citizens in Athens, he cancels outstanding debts and abolishes loans secured on the person (fr.69a–c R.), and "he confers on everyone who wishes the right to prosecute on behalf of injured

[83] Sol. fr.30 G.-P. (36 W.) 18–25. Study of Solon's legislation in the framework of archaic legislation: M. Gagarin, *Early Greek Law* (Berkeley/Los Angeles/London 1986) 63–80. According to G. Horsmann, "Athens Weg zur eigenen Währung: Der Zusammenhang der metrologischen Reform Solons mit der timokratischen," *Historia* 49 (2000) 259–277, Solon's increase in value of the capacity measures opens to more citizens access to the upper classes, in the context of the valuation of property required for holding office.

parties."[84] These measures preventing new expatriations continue the politics of repatriation. The *seisachtheia,* however, did not consist exclusively of such measures, as the fourth century believed. First came Solon's liberation of Eleusis, and only afterwards the cancellation of debts and the reintegration in their mother-country of all those excluded. These two measures cease to be contradictory when we consider them as resulting from the liberation of the Eleusis Earth.

December, 2000 University of Liège

[84] Sol. frr.40a–b R. Gagarin (*supra* n.83: 69) shows that the introduction of the γραφή, the public action, along side the δίκη which could only be initiated by the victim or his relatives, makes possible the defense of debtors who have fallen into the hands of their creditors.