

hillside in PLATE IV*b*) provide excellent vantage points for sentries.

In the Homeric account of the ambush there is only one ship manned by the suitors. Yet Homer provides twin harbours for it. This would be a pointless complication if the description were purely fictional. The introduction of this detail suggests that the description is grounded in local topography, and is not merely generic. But there is also an element of fiction in the account. Homer has taken some liberty with the facts. He has conflated the rocky reef of Daskalio-Asteris with the 'twin harbours' and 'windy heights' on Kephallinia. This is a very understandable piece of compression in a story told for dramatic effect. Homer (as I suppose) had taken the trouble to familiarise himself with the scene of the narrative by a visit to Ithaca. The setting of the ambush was an important element in the plot, and he felt the need to locate it with precision. Asteris, the only island in the Ithaca Channel, was as good as a map reference for this purpose.⁹ Asteris had no harbours, but never mind. There were twin harbours close by. There was no need to explain this in burdensome detail to an Ionian audience. It was simpler to say that the harbours were 'within' Asteris, and leave it at that.

Miss Lorimer, while accepting that Homer must have had personal knowledge of Ithaca, proposes a different solution for the Asteris problem.¹⁰ She thinks there was an older stream of the epic tradition in which the setting of Odysseus' homecoming was on Leukas, and supposes that considerable traces of this tradition are still evident in our *Odyssey*, even though for the author (Homer) Ithaca is Ithaki. In keeping with this complicated hypothesis she revives Dörpfeld's view that the description of Asteris fits Arkhoudi, a medium-sized island lying roughly between Ithaca and Leukas.¹¹ At the same time she tries to maintain that for Homer the scene of the ambush was the 'rugged promontory' (Cape Mytikos) at the south of the Bay of Sami (where there is no island!).¹² Of Daskalio she says: 'The inconspicuous rock of Daskalio just south of the Bay of Polis, to which Ithakists pin an uneasy faith, is completely unsuitable in situation and fails to comply with any feature of the description.'

I hope to have shown that this verdict is quite

⁹ An ambush based on the shore of Kephallinia 'inside' Asteris had the following advantages: (a) it was as close as possible to Polis Bay without being on Ithacan soil (where it might be noticed by well-wishers of Telemachos); (b) it afforded a fine prospect of the Ithaca Channel while offering complete concealment to the ambush party. The ambush failed because Telemachos landed out of sight of the watchers on the S.E. corner of Ithaca. His ship then came round the east side of the island and slipped into Polis Bay before it could be intercepted.

¹⁰ *Homer and the Monuments*, 499–501.

¹¹ As Shewan, *Homeric Essays* 36–58, has demonstrated in great detail, Arkhoudi fits the Homeric description of Asteris far less well than Daskalio does, and the placing of the ambush at Arkhoudi generates insoluble difficulties in regard to Telemachos' homeward voyage.

¹² In this she is in fact reviving a suggestion first made by Sir William Gell in his *Geography and Antiquities of Ithaca* (1807) 79.

unfounded. In situation Daskalio is eminently suitable for the requirements of the narrative, and for Homer's poetic purposes. It complies far better than Arkhoudi with three of the four features he assigns to it. And the twin harbours are still to be seen within half a mile of it.

J. V. LUCE

Trinity College, Dublin

Solon, Fragment 25¹

Fr. 25.6–9D οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον οὐδ' ἐπαύσατο
πρὶν ἀνταράξας πῖαρ ἐξεῖλεν γάλα.
ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων ὥσπερ ἐν μεταχμίῳ
ὄρος κατέστην.

7 πῖαρ Plut.: πῦαρ pap. *Ath. Pol.* ἀνταράξας . . . ἐξεῖλε
pap., coniecerat Gildersleeve: ἂν ταράξας ἐξεῖλε Plut.

Solon is answering his critics (Aristotle, *Ath. Pol.* 12.5). The *demos* has never had it so good. The 'bigger and stronger men', *μειζόνους καὶ βίαν ἀμείνωνες*, also have cause to thank him. For if anyone else had had this office, 'he would not have restrained the *demos*, nor would he have stopped, before', etc. Plutarch (*Vit. Sol.* 16) introduces the lines in almost the same words.

V. 7 is difficult. Bergk and others construe: 'until, having stirred up the milk, he had taken the cream'. There are two objections to this. Firstly, the word order would involve an interlacing of main and participial clauses which Greek normally eschews.² Bergk claims that Solon is peculiar in the freedom of his hyperbaton,³ but the examples he quotes (*fr.* 1.43–5 and 23.5D) are not of this type and are very much easier.⁴ Secondly, the sense: 'it is not usual to stir up milk when it is wanted to skim off cream'.⁵ Linforth⁶ recognised the force of this argument, and concluded, in the light of the ancient evidence, that *πῖαρ* refers to butter.⁷

¹ *Fr.* 25D, Bgk. = *fr.* 37 West. References hereafter are to Diehl. I am indebted to Professor A. Andrewes, Mr G. W. Bond, Mr W. G. Forrester and Professor H. Lloyd-Jones for valuable advice and criticism.

² 'A part of a sentence the verbal centre of which is a *participium coniunctum*, provided that it serves to describe a self-contained action, forms a syntactical colon on its own', which cannot be interlaced with the main sentence (Fraenkel, *Agamemnon*, p. 512, from 'Kolon und Satz, I', *NGG*, 1932, 202 = *Kl. Beitr.* i 78). Fraenkel's view is contested by Page in his note on *Ag.* 1127; but see *PCPS* n.s. 21, 1975, 82–8.

³ 'Solet passim Solo verborum traiectione satis licenter uti' (*PLG*⁴ ii 54).

⁴ As Arthur Platt points out (*J. Phil.* 24, 1896, 256).

⁵ F. G. Allinson in *AJP* 1, 1880, 458; 'Laval's centrifugal apparatus had not yet been invented', A. Platt (*loc. cit.* [n. 4]).

⁶ I. M. Linforth, *Solon the Athenian*, 1919, 193.

⁷ It is clear from Hdt. 4.2, Hippocr. *de Morb.* 4.51, Anaxandr. 41.8 that butter-making was regarded as a barbarian activity (*cf.* Casaubon *ap.* Schweighäuser on Athen. 447d). Linforth disarmingly remarks: 'we must conclude that Solon became acquainted with this Scythian practice in the course of his travels, and referred to it in a rather obscure metaphor; or that butter-making, though not mentioned in literature, was not unknown to the Attic peasants'.

In the face of these difficulties, Platt tried to make sense of the papyrus reading *πυαρ. πῦαρ* means 'beestings', the rich milk of a cow with a new-born calf. The crust of cream which forms on the beestings is regarded by some as a delicacy, and its formation is accelerated by stirring; the milk beneath the crust is of no value.⁸ Platt therefore translates: 'until, having stirred up the beestings, he had got rid of the milk'; 'an evil-hearted and selfish man would not have stopped the confusion till things had got into such a condition that they might be likened to beestings, stirred up till the cream and milk were utterly separated', whereas a good legislator wants to keep them mixed together.

Sandys and Linforth rightly dismiss this interpretation as far-fetched; besides, the sense of *ἐξείλεν* seems to be secured by *Il.* 11.550 *ἐκ πῖαρ ἐλέσθαι*. A more plausible solution is to understand *δῆμον* with *ἀνταράξας*⁹ and take *πῖαρ* as an adjective, as it probably is at *Od.* 9.135:¹⁰ 'until, having stirred the people up, he had filched the rich cream'. This is improved by taking both *πῖαρ* and *γάλα* as nouns governed by *ἐξείλεν*, 'he had filched the cream from the milk'.¹¹ This may be the right answer, but there are two slight difficulties: (i) *ἀνταράξας* is detached from the metaphor, but it is an odd coincidence that the word is particularly used of liquids; (ii) *ἐξελεῖν* is not elsewhere used in the active to mean 'filch', though passive ('deprived') at *Hdt.* 3.137, *Th.* 6.24, etc.; we should certainly expect the middle here.

It is sometimes assumed that we have here to do with the 'evil-hearted and acquisitive man', *κακοφράδης τε καὶ φιλοκτήμων ἀνὴρ*, out for his own gain, of whom Solon says in *fr.* 24.21 that he would not have restrained the *demos*, *οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον*. These words conclude the first quotation by Aristides (ii. 185-6 K) and have been thought to lead directly into *fr.* 25.6-7; but Linforth is certainly right in saying that in *fr.* 24.22 *οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον* is followed directly by *εἰ γὰρ ἤθελον*. All we know about the subject of the sentence in *fr.* 25.6-7 from the introductory remark of Aristotle and Plutarch is that he would have made a worse job of reforming the constitution than Solon did; v. 7 need not then imply that he would have feathered his own nest.¹²

The words in v. 7 could in themselves mean: 'before, having stirred it up, he had ruined the rich milk'. But the Homeric *ἐκ πῖαρ ἐλέσθαι* makes against this translation of *ἐξείλεν*, and there is no reason why stirring should have this effect. A better sense results if, with Linforth, we take both *πῖαρ* and *γάλα* as nouns governed by *ἐξείλεν*, and translate: 'before, having stirred it up, he had deprived the milk of its cream',¹³ that is, by mixing up the cream

with the milk and so dissipating it. This pays due regard to the Homeric model, and gives the active its proper force: he deprived the milk of its cream, but not in the sense that he filched it for himself.¹⁴

The cash value of the metaphor, then, is this. An immoderate reformer, by giving the *demos* its head, would have so stirred up the existing order as to deprive the state of its best element, viz. the aristocracy, which would be disintegrated and lose its identity—a process which Cleisthenes was to initiate by his own methods. Similar fears about the result of drastic reforms are attributed to Solon in Plutarch's paraphrase of the poem to Phocus (*Sol.* 15 [= *fr.* 33a W]: *οὐ μὴν ἀπωσάμενος τὴν τυραννίδα τὸν πραότατον ἐχρήσατο τρόπον τοῖς πράγμασι, οὐδὲ μαλακῶς οὐδ' ὑπέικων τοῖς δυναμένοις οὐδὲ πρὸς ἡδονὴν τῶν ἐλομένων ἔθετο τοὺς νόμους, ἀλλ' ἦ μὲν ἄριστον ἦν, οὐκ ἐπήγαγεν ἰατρειάν οὐδὲ καινοτομίαν, φοβηθεὶς μὴ συγγέας παντάπασιν καὶ ταράξας τὴν πόλιν ἀσθενέστερος γένηται τοῦ καταστήσαι πάλιν καὶ διαρμόσασθαι πρὸς τὸ ἄριστον*. Solon would not risk upsetting the established order beyond restoration by immoderate reforms. *συγγέας . . . πάλιν* needs little adjustment to fit the metre,¹⁵ and there is no reason to doubt that *ταράξας*, which exactly matches *ἀνταράξας* in *fr.* 25.7, is Solon's own word.¹⁶

Solon was not of course simply a supporter of the establishment; he would hardly have enjoyed the confidence of the *demos* if he had been. Aristotle, who knew more of the poems than we do, says that he always put the whole blame for the *stasis* on the rich (*Ath. Pol.* 5.3), and open hostility towards them appears in, e.g. the poem he there quotes, *fr.* 4.4-8, or *fr.* 3.11 ff. Other poems, on the other hand, are not particularly well-disposed towards the *demos* (e.g. *fr.* 5.7 ff.). In general this difference in attitude is doubtless to be explained by Solon's changing circumstances: at first he is championing the poor against the oppression of the rich, later he is defending himself against the charge of not going far enough in his reforms. In any particular poem his attitude will depend on its political aim: whom he is addressing, which side he is concerned to conciliate. Solon in fact refers in the Phocus poem to his own conciliation of the rich (*fr.* 23.15 *κωτίλλοντα λείως*), and the poem is addressed to the rich, though in no very conciliatory tone. In *fr.* 24 he is claiming that he has done all that he promised to do without the violence and bloodshed which would have resulted from the leadership of a self-interested man, who 'would not have restrained the *demos*'. Solon, then, did restrain it, and though the opening may be

¹⁴ The double accusative is in fact found only with the sense 'deprive', cf. *E. Alc.* 69, *IA* 972. Elsewhere the verb is middle with this construction, but cf. *ἀφελεῖν τί τινα*, also found, though rarely, with the sense 'deprive' (*S. Phil.* 933), alongside the normal *ἀφελέσθαι τί τινα* in this sense. Alternatively, we can take *πῖαρ γάλα* = 'cream' (see p. 2), *ἐξείλεν* = 'got rid of' (cf. *E. H.F.* 153-4, with *Hipp.* 18): 'before, by stirring it up, he had got rid of the cream', i.e. by dissipating it. The interpretation suggested below holds either way.

¹⁵ E.g. *συγγέας τε καὶ ταράξας παντάπασιν τὴν πόλιν, κτλ.*

¹⁶ The relevance of this passage, and of *fr.* 5.5-6 below, was pointed out to me by Mr W. G. Forrest.

⁸ *Art. cit.* (n. 3), Platt's authority was a farmer's wife.

⁹ So Buchholz (see Allinson, *loc. cit.* [n. 4]) and A. Masaracchia, *Solone*, 1958, 357.

¹⁰ So Allinson, Platt, Leaf on *Il.* 11.550; but Buttmann, Lexilogus s.v., Monro ad loc., Allen and Halliday on *h. Ven.* 30 take it as a noun.

¹¹ A suggestion of Sandys adopted by Linforth, though both take *ἀνταράξας* with *γάλα*.

¹² As the imaginary speaker of *fr.* 23.1-7 says he himself would have done.

¹³ Since *γάλα* is governed by both *ἀνταράξας* and *ἐξείλεν*, this rendering does not involve an interlacing of main and participial clauses (cf. n.2 above).

aimed at the *demoi*, these lines at least are a self-justification or reassurance addressed to the rich. In *fr.* 25.6 οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον we have the same phrase, though not the same emphasis on self-interest: Solon is again concerned to conciliate the *ἔσθλοί*. It is therefore entirely appropriate that he should call them the 'cream', whose loss to the state would be its ruin.

The Phocian poem touches *fr.* 25.6–7 at another point: the word *πίαρ* recalls *πίερα χθών*, the rich land which Solon refused to confiscate and redistribute (*fr.* 23.18–21):

ἄ μὲν γὰρ εἶπα, σὺν θεοῖσιν ἦνυσσα,
ἀλλὰ δ' οὐ μάτην ἔερδον, οὐδέ μοι τυραννίδος
ἀνδάνει βία τι βέζειν οὐδὲ πειράς χθονός
πατρίδος κακοῖσιν ἔσθλοῦς ἰσομοιρίαν ἔχειν.

The *κακοί* are the poor, the opposition *ἔσθλοί* / *κακοί* being the same as *ἀγαθός* / *κακός* in *fr.* 24.18 (cf. E. *Suppl.* 434–5) and *μείζους* / *δήμος* in *fr.* 25.17. The poem is more hostile to the rich he is here addressing than *fr.* 24, 25, but the self-justification is rather similar. The rich suspected him before his reforms, and were angry with him afterwards, since they hoped to exploit the situation for their own gain, and he did not look after their interests. This criticism he rejects: 'I did what I promised', he says, 'but I did nothing irresponsible: I did not allow the poor to have equal shares with the rich'. The word *πίερα* here might suggest an economic rather than a political interpretation for *fr.* 25.7: an immoderate reformer would make such a hash of the economy as to deprive it of its wealth and prosperity.¹⁷ What was in fact the relative importance of political and economic measures in Solon's reforms I leave it to others to determine. As far as the Greek of *fr.* 25.7 goes, a political interpretation seems to me to be rather more straightforward, and to accord better with the part of the Phocian poem paraphrased by Plutarch. An economic interpretation cannot, however, be ruled out, and indeed need not be excluded by the other. Solon, for all his radical measures, doubtless held that national prosperity depended on the continued wealth of the aristocracy, the *παλαιόπλουτοι*, so that political upheaval spelt economic ruin.

The remainder of Aristotle's quotation (*fr.* 25.8–9) is somewhat puzzling:

ἐγὼ δὲ τούτων ὡσπερ ἐν μεταίχμιῳ
ὄρος κατέστην.

¹⁷ 'Rich' is not quite accurate for *ἔσθλοί*, since their status was determined by other factors besides wealth—Solon himself was *τῆ μὲν φύσει καὶ τῆ δόξῃ τῶν πρώτων* (i.e. *ἔσθλός*), *τῆ δ' οὐσίᾳ καὶ τοῖς πράγμασιν τῶν μέσων* (*Ath. Pol.* 5.3)—and the terms *ἀγαθός* and *κακός* can sometimes be independent of wealth (*fr.* 4.15 *πολλοὶ γὰρ πλουτοῦσι κακοί, ἀγαθοὶ δὲ πένονται*). But wealth is normally the important determinant, and renderings such as 'nobles', 'upper classes', 'aristocracy', 'establishment' are misleading in other ways. It does not follow that Solon had the same attitude towards all the rich; he no doubt distinguished between the *παλαιόπλουτοι* and the profiteers (*Ath. Pol.* 6).

¹⁸ *Si monumentum requiris, circumspice*. One must, however, be careful, in speaking of the 'economy' of early Attica, not to read too many modern overtones into the word.

It is natural to explain *ὄρος* in terms of the *ὄροι* . . . *πολλαχῆ πεπηγότες* which Solon claims to have removed, thus easing the plight of the poor (*fr.* 24.6). In the simile of the Achaean wall at *Il.* 12.421 ff., the rival armies are compared to men disputing over boundary-marks:

ἀλλ' ὡς ἀμφ' οὖροισι δὴ ἀνέρε δηριάσθον,
μέτρ' ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες, ἐπιξύνω ἐν ἀρούρη,
ὅτ' ὀλίγω ἐνὶ χώρῳ ἐρίζητον περὶ ἴσης,
ὡς ἄρα τούς διεέργον ἐπάλλεϊες.

If the *ὄροι* of *fr.* 24 are boundary-stones, as is often assumed, the metaphor in *ὄρος κατέστην* seems straightforward enough: Solon was the boundary-stone between the two sides. But *μεταίχμιον* means 'no-man's-land', which mixes the metaphor: no-man's land is not the place for a boundary-stone. Solon might indeed have in mind the Homeric simile, and rely on his readers to take the allusion: he is the *ἐπαλλεῖς*, the bulwark between the warring factions. If so, the metaphor is not a very happy one, as the Achaean wall was not conspicuously successful in keeping the combatants apart.

Wade-Gery, moreover, has shown good reason for thinking that the *ὄροι* of *fr.* 24 are not boundary-stones at all, but 'pawn-stones', records of contracts or mortgages;¹⁹ a sense of *ὄρος* common in the fourth century and implied, as he says, in the phrase *εἰς ὄρος* at *Thuc.* 4.92, 4²⁰. He argues that the sense 'pawn-stone' is hard to derive from 'boundary'; both derive from the sense 'mark'. *ὄρος* is not, in fact, to be distinguished etymologically from *οὖρος*, 'guardian', 'protector', as in *οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν*; both are related to *servare*, <*σφορ*>ος.²¹ Thus *οὖρος* in *οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν* and *οὖρος ἀρούρης* is not only spelt the same, it is the same word; the root meaning common to both is 'watcher'. *ὄρος κατέστην*, then, means 'I stood as a watcher' in the space between their spears. The *ὄροι πολλαχῆ πεπηγότες* are 'watchers' of the land (though the original sense might not have been so vividly present as this translation implies).

Wade-Gery's conclusion, that the *ὄροι* of *fr.* 24 were contracts, has been widely accepted; his etymological premise has not.²² But this premise is not necessary for his argument; the later evidence, and the gain in political and economic sense, is sufficient to make his interpretation of *ὄροι* . . . *πεπηγότες* preferable. Nor is it necessary for his interpretation of *ὄρος κατέστην*. We have merely to

¹⁹ H. T. Wade-Gery, 'Horos', in *Mélanges Gustave Glotz*, 1932, 877 ff.

²⁰ Pagondas warns the Boeotians: 'others fight about their frontiers (*περὶ γῆς ὄρων*), but we, if we are beaten, will have one horos-pillar stuck up affecting all our land and admitting of no argument; for the Athenians will come by force and possess all that is ours'. *εἰς ὄρος* cannot mean 'one boundary-stone': it means one contract-pillar, 'a record which admits of no further argument' (Wade-Gery, *op. cit.* 881–2).

²¹ As F. Sommer, *Griechische Lautstudien*, 1905, 112 (cited by Wade-Gery), posits for *οὖρος* (in *οὖρος Ἀχαιῶν*).

²² Cf. Frisk, s.v. *ὄρος, οὖρος*. I am not competent to make any judgment on my own account. 'Pawnstones' is perhaps too narrow, since the *ὄροι* may have recorded terms of service as well as mortgages.

write *οἶρος κατέστην*; scarcely a change, since *οἶρος* could well be an incorrect interpretation of *ΟΡΟΣ*.²³

Is 'watcher', however, right for *οἶρος* here? It makes sense in the context of *ἐν μεταχειμῖω*, though neutral observers in military situations are perhaps more familiar to us than they were to Solon.²⁴ But he saw his rôle as a rather more active one. Perhaps 'guard' is better: Solon was the watchdog of the constitution he had framed, as the Areopagus is later described by Aeschylus and Aristotle.²⁵ (*καθίσταμαι* is *vox propria* of guards taking up their posts; cf. S. O.C. 356, and see LSJ s.v. B.2.) The analogy of *οἶρος Ἀχαιῶν*, however, favours 'guardian', 'protector'. Two passages of Euripides are relevant here: at *Held.* 803, when Hyllus issues his challenge to single combat,

ἔσται μέσοισιν ἐν μεταχειμῖοις δορός,²⁶

and at *Pho.* 1361, when Eteocles and Polyneices engage,

ἔστησαν ἐλθόντ' ἐς μέσον μεταίχμιον.

The contestants who take their stand in no-man's-land are the champions of their respective sides. So too a protector or guardian is most naturally a protector or guardian of one side, as Nestor is *οἶρος Ἀχαιῶν* and Achilles *οἶρος Αἰακιδᾶν*. Solon does indeed claim elsewhere that he is the impartial protector of both sides (*fr.* 5.5-6):

ἔστην δ' ἀμφιβαλὼν κρατερόν σάκος ἀμφοτέροισιν,
νικᾶν δ' οὐκ εἶασ' οὐδέτερος ἀδίκως.

But this can hardly be the sense in *fr.* 25. *τούτων* could certainly depend on *οἶρος* rather than *μεταχειμῖω*, but the meaning would need to be more explicit, e.g. *ἀμφοῖν . . . οἶρος*.

But does *τούτων* necessarily refer to both sides? At the end of *fr.* 24, quoted just before in Aristotle, Solon claims to have benefited both the *demos* and the more powerful. Aristotle goes on: *εἰ γὰρ τις ἄλλος, φησί, ταύτης τῆς τιμῆς ἔτυχεν, οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον, κτλ.* (cf. *Plut., Sol.* 16 *καίτοι φησὶν ὡς εἴ τις ἄλλος*

²³ Solon would have written *οἶρος* as *ΟΡΟΣ* (possibly *ΟΥΡΟΣ*, but the impure diphthong *ou* was regularly written *o* in saec. vi and earlier saec. v Attic orthography; see Meisterhans, *Grammatik der attischen Inschriften*³, 1900, para.11c), and *οἶρος* as *ΗΟΡΟΣ* (words with initial aspirate are occasionally spelt without *H* in vase-paintings, but so rarely that it is probably due to negligence; see Kretschmer, *Griechische Vasenschriften*, 1894, para. 137, cf. p. 190). For anyone transcribing the poems after Ionic spelling came into use for literary texts (say c. 450), the only correct interpretation of *ΟΡΟΣ* in *fr.* 25 would be *οἶρος*, since Solon was not the mountainous queen of the Laestrygones (*Od.* 10.113), and *οἶρος* was always spelt with an aspirate (in fact *ΗΟΡΟΣ* appears regularly in inscriptions long after heta had become otherwise obsolete). The transcription of *ΟΡΟΣ* as *οἶρος* would therefore be strictly incorrect, but little more than a misinterpretation: a mistake all the more easily made because of Solon's well-known preoccupation with *δρος*.

²⁴ Mr G. W. Bond suggests that 'umpire' is the sense required.

²⁵ *Eum.* 706 *φρούρημα γῆς*; *Ath. Pol.* 4.20 *φύλαξ τῶν νόμων*.

²⁶ Hence Jaeger proposed *δορός* for *οἶρος*, a conjecture with little to recommend it.

ἔσχε τὴν αὐτὴν δύναμιν, κτλ.) We cannot be sure how long the gap was in Solon's poem, but from Aristotle's paraphrase it is likely enough to have been quite short, e.g. *ταύτης γὰρ ἄλλος ὡς ἐγὼ τιμῆς τυχὼν*. Clearly *τούτων* (*ἐν μεταχειμῖω*) could refer to both sides, though *ἀμφοῖν* would perhaps be easier. But clearly, also, *τούτων* (*οἶρος*) could equally well refer to the faction just mentioned, the *ἐσθλοί* (cf. n. 17); and if my interpretation of *πῖαρ ἐξείλεν γάλα* is right, *τούτων* has an even closer reference in *πῖαρ*, the cream of the state. The argument is inconclusive, especially as the gap in Solon's poem may be longer than Aristotle seems to indicate. But there is perhaps a pointer in *οὐκ ἂν κατέσχε δῆμον*. I argued above from this phrase that in *fr.* 25 (esp. 6-7) Solon is concerned to conciliate the rich. I suggest that 7-8 show the same concern: that Solon says 'I took post in no-man's-land as protector of the *ἐσθλοί*'; and that he is here emphasising not his impartiality, as in *fr.* 5, but his achievement in securing social justice without disrupting the established order.

T. C. W. STINTON

Wadham College, Oxford

A Fragment by Onesimos

(PLATE IVc)

The purpose of this note is to make known a fine pair of joining fragments, one in the Louvre, the other in a private collection in Oxford, which come from the outside of a cup by Onesimos. The Louvre fragment, Cp. 11342, listed in the second edition of J. D. Beazley's *Attic Red-figure Vase-Painters* but not previously figured, gives part of a male leaning to the right on a knotted stick.¹ He is draped in an himation with a two-line border pattern. His chest is frontal but he twists to the right, his right arm reaching across and down to the right, while his left, comfortably tucked in the material of the himation, rests on the top of the stick. The new Oxford fragment adds the head of the youth, his right shoulder and the tops of two of the billows of the himation as it passes over the upper part of the left arm.

Both fragments show, inside and out, a delicate tracery from the action of roots, but their surfaces are in good condition. On the Oxford fragment the relief lines for the tip of the nose and part of the lips have unfortunately flaked off and on the Louvre part the point of the chin has similarly been lost, but pale indented lines show where all once were. Dilute glaze has been used for the inner markings of the body and for the fuzz on the youth's cheek. One might note in passing a detail of the dilute glaze which is not visible in the photograph: the dilute glaze which marks the lower edge of the right shoulder blade on the Louvre part can be seen to continue on the Oxford fragment. Added red has been used for the head-band and the inscription. An ancient repair hole clips the top edge of the youth's head. The lip of the cup has a reserved line inside and out. The cup must have been a large one with a diameter of perhaps about 32 cm; the preserved part of the rim measures 5.3 cm in length.

¹ *ARV*² p. 327/97.