GRAIN FOR ANDROS

In a recent article G. Reger has proposed new readings and a new interpretation for IG XII suppl. p. 119, a decree in which the Andrians give thanks to an otherwise unknown Antidotos. We have long understood from the fragmentary text that Antidotos sold the Andrians grain during a shortage. Reger seeks to improve our picture of two features of the transaction: (1) the grain that Antidotos sold the islanders had been reserved by him as rations for mercenaries who manned the local garrison, of which Antidotos was in charge; (2) when prices had risen to 22 drachmas per medimnos Antidotos sold this “military grain” for only five. I argue that the inscription follows a well attested formula, which suggests a different interpretation.

The first four tattered lines are critical. In 1911 Th. Sauciu read them as follows, adding two lines at the start, presumably to illustrate his understanding of the context:

\[ \ldots \ldots \text{επειδή Αντίδωτος} \ldots \ldots \text{οι Ανδριατέος} \]

\[ \text{στρατηγός καταπληκτός έπεις τήν παραλαμβάνε \ τού} \]

1 [σιμπό τὸν μεδίτον μέλη δάμρι τοι ἀνδριατή-]

[τὸν δραχμάν πέντε τοις ἤγγεις τοῖς ἄνδριατοι]

[τὸν σιμπό τοῦ ξηνικοῦ ἐκκοικών \( \text{δύο \ below \ \text{medimnos}} \)

4 [τοι \( \text{τὸ μεδίτο \ οίς \ ἡ \ 

Reger reads as follows:

\[ \ldots \ldots \text{μεδίτο} \ldots \ldots \]

\[ \text{δραχμάν πέντε} \]

\[ \ldots \ldots \text{τοῦ \ ξηνικοῦ \ εικοσθ \ \( \text{δύο \ below \ \text{medimnos}} \)

4 [μη \( \text{μεδίτο οίς \ ἡ \ 

On this reading Antidotos sold grain (τὸ \( \text{μεδίτο} \)) at five drachmas per medimnos when xenikos grain was selling at 22. No previous editor read anything


2 Reger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 317 n. 39: the two lines are fantasy and should be wholly rejected.

3 The last letter at first resembled a nu, though Reger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 317, "would interpret it rather as part of an alpha." Neither of the two photos provided (Reger, Hesperia 63 [1994] pl. 76) permits control. I am unable confirm or refute the new reading in the squeeze held in the IG collection of the BBAW.
after εἴκοσιν, whose final letter is no longer visible. Reger now reads δ[. ]ο[. ]α3. The intrusive nu renders εἴκοσιν δῦο suspect. And in such a fragmentary text it is especially prudent, before we restore Greek, first to establish whether context permits the interpretation. Xenikos sitos (3) must be defined.

Xenikos Sitos

On the new interpretation xenikos means »having to do with the mercenaries«, and the xenikos sitos was grain »intended for the troops«4. The sense of lines 3-4 is judged to be »something like [πολομενόν] ἐν τῇ ἡγοῦσα τοῦ στίου τοῦ ξενικοῦ εἴκοσιν δ[ύο] μὲν [δραχμαί] τοῦ μεδίμνου«5. Thus, 22 drachmas per μεδίμνοι would be (confusingly) both »the current market price« and the price of military rations; the situation is summarized as follows6:

Circumstances unknown to us had led to a drastic price rise for wheat, probably a doubling of the price Andrians normally expected to pay. The garrison troops, as part of the conditions of military rations; the situation is summarized as follows6:

1. Circumstances unknown to us had led to a drastic price rise for wheat, probably a doubling of the price Andrians normally expected to pay. Whether anyone called their food xenikos meant anything to the Andrians but »foreign grain«.

2. Neither does context. The Andrians praised not only Antidotos but also the soldiers for their services to the people and collaboration with Antidotos to increase local supply14. On the proposed interpretation the collaboration for which

3. Xenikos Sitos


7. Losing money, but presumably winning the hearts of his men: the first demand of Eumenes’ (I) mutinying troops at Philetarea and Atalea was grain and money at guaranteed low prices: (OGIS 266.3–4): ἀ[δέ]οματα ἀ ἐπεκειρήσεν ἔμενος Φιλειταρίου τοῖς ἔμμι Φιλειταρίεσσας συμμαχιάς καὶ τοῖς ἐν Αταλείας ἱ[ε]τού τοῦ ἡγούσα οἰκονή τοῦ μεδίμνου δραχμῶν τέσσαρας, οὗτοι τοῦ μετρητοῦ δραχμῶν τέσσαρας.


»intended for the troops«, rather than foreign8. But IG II 1281.8 simply speaks of provisioning a garrison with missiles, grain, and other things useful for safety. Troops ate. Whether anyone called their food xenikos IG II 1281.8 does not say. The only parallel for such »military grain« is restored by Rege1 at IG XI.2 159.A.53–54 (ὁ ξενικὸς σῖτος), a fragmentary account, whose context illuminates neither the restoration nor the proposed meaning9. At IG XII suppl. 347.11.8–9 (ca. 425–412) we find an injunction against Thasian vessels importing ξενικὸν όϊνον to the mainland between Athos and Pachaea10. Here the phrase can hardly mean anything but »foreign wine«11. And wine was not the only other commodity to have been so classified. Strou1’s brilliant restoration, ξ[ε]νικὸν ἄργυρων?, in the Athenian coinage decree of 375/4 may not be certain12, but the phrase is well attested in Attica13. Philology gives no reason to believe that xenikos sitos meant anything to the Andrians but »foreign grain«.

9. G. REGER, Regionalism and Change in the Economy of Independent Delos (Berkeley 1994) 117, suggests that the xenikos sitos at Andros was »grain bought for a foreign garrison«, so that xenikos means both military and foreign; he also suggests that [ὁ συναγοριστής] or [ὁ ἄγορος] could also be correct at IG XI.2 159.A.53–4.

10. ἀπὸ τῶν ὥθεσιν ξενικῶν όϊνον ἐν αὐτοῖς ἐβασκέται ἔναθ Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Παχέαι, as in the Athenian coinage decree of 375/4 may not be certain12, but the phrase is well attested in Attica13. Philology gives no reason to believe that xenikos sitos meant anything to the Andrians but »foreign grain«.

11. Neither does context. The Andrians praised not only Antidotos but also the soldiers for their services to the people and collaboration with Antidotos to increase local supply14. On the proposed interpretation the collaboration for which


13. E.g. IG I 1453. G.11; [BG.11.11], G.17 [BG.12.12] (ca. 449?); IG II 1421.iii.75 (374/3), 1424a.i.183 (369/8), 1428.i.75 (367/6), 1436.i.56 (350/49). Also IG II 1672.iiii iii. fbr. 301 (329/8), with noun suppressed: σύμπλεγμα κεφαλαίων τῆς τῆς τυπῆς τοῦ χρυσοῦ καὶ τοῦ ξενικοῦ. «Foreign» purple gowns: IG II 1514.ii.49, 1516.i.26, 1517.B.fr.aii.155–6 (mid IV); emporion: SB I 5021.4–5 (ca. II). Colophon: APN (1935) 359–72 no. 1.25: χρυσάτα ξενικά.

14. 13–16: έπανεκλαμάνει δὲ καὶ τούτα τὰ θρήνους ἐν τῷ τοῖς χρείας παρασκευή πολλῶν δόμων καὶ συνήγησαν εἰς τὸ στόμα εὔμακροστρέφοντες ἐν εἰς, ἐν κείμενοι (to praise also the soldiers who rendered services to the people and worked together so that grain might be in more ready supply in the city).

15. At Andros the scribe of the boulé, on SAUCIUC’s reading, was to announce Antidotos’ crown at the tragic competition at the Dionysia (9–11): τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τῆς βυσσιάς ἄναγγελλάτω τόνα ἐν τῶν σταύρων διάμετρος τραγωδοῦν τῶν αὐτῶν. SAUCIUC’s text mentioned two grammates, one of the boule and another of the prytnaines (9–10) τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τῆς βυσσιάς (16–17) γραμματέα τῶν πρυτάνων. SAUCIUC thought that under Athenian occupation Andros called its officials by Athenian titles. Since he did not find a grammates of the boule at Athens from after 318/17 or a grammates of the prytnaines from before 358, he placed the text between the two dates (AM 36 [1911] 15–16), unaware that the former would turn up in inscriptions dated after 318/17 (e.g. IG II 652.33–5 [ca. 290/89], 952.12–13 [ca. 161/0], 972.5–7 [ca. 140]) or that the two titles would be shown to have referred to one post: P. J. RHODES, The
Andros honored the soldiers can only have consisted of obedience to their commander's decision to sell a portion of their rations. We can imagine altruistic troops. But the Greek gives no reason to think that the soldiers consented to forego cheap food or that they provided anything but safe passage and perhaps strong backs. The usefulness of soldiers in such operations needs little explanation. Once the grain came to port it had to be trucked to the city, whether by cart, pack-mule or other means. Effective performance took manpower, infrastructure and logistical know-how, all of which soldiers possessed. Moreover, if the grain was not military it is worth asking whether Antidotos was a garrison commander at all, Athenian or otherwise. Cooperation from local soldiers does not necessarily mean that he was; benefactors and soldiers made an obvious and common pair.

Men honored for provision of grain tend to be described as, or assumed to be, Athenian Boule (Oxford 1972) 136–7. Reger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 313–14, adduced these discoveries in support of an argument against a fourth-century date, but they prove only that a later date is possible. He also proposes (314) to read κηρύχων τῆς βενετίας of 9–10, instead of γραμματίες τῆς βενετίας, on the idea that it would be strange to find two scribes in one text (alleging also that the grammateus of the boule went out of use on Andros in the third century, but see IG XII.7 212.20 [I ac]). Neither of the two photos (Reger, Hesperia 63 [1994] pl. 76) permits control on the new reading. Whether two scribes, each with one scribe, are stranger than one scribe with two is anyone's guess, but the new reading may be correct. A herald, not a scribe, should announce the crown, if not an agonothete: IG.Bulg. I 308(2).4–13; Paton and Hicks, Inscriptions of Cos 5.19–21; Seeger, LDicCos ED 39.10–12 (III); Clara Rodos 10.27.1–2 (306–301); IG XII.7 237.33–5, 37–8 (II?); also IG XII.8 53.15–18 (Imbros II). None of these observations precludes the traditional date or compels a new one.

16 Se Gauthier, Bull.epigr. (1995) 450; elsewhere see e.g. [Dem.] 50.20.

17 The new grain-tax law from Athens stipulates that purchasers of the tax ship grain to the Piraeus at their own risk and haul it up from the Piraeus to the city at their own expense; R. S. Stroud, The Athenian Grain-Tax Law of 374/3 B.C. (Princeton 1998) 4, II. 10–14: ξομυλὴ τῶν σιτῶν κηρύχων τῶν έστων οί ξυλὶκες μὲν εἰς τὸν Πειραύαν καὶ ἀνάκοιμον ές ές τὸν δίνειν τῶν σιτῶν τέλεσιν τῶν ές [ου]. See also n. 66 below.


19 Reger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 314–16, observes the following about Antidotos and the garrison in support of an argument against the traditional fourth-century date: (A) IG XII suppl. p. 119 does not refer to men mentioned in two fourth-century Athenian inscriptions concerning Andros (IG II 1441.12–13, II 238); (B) the men honored with Antidotos 'are called soldiers, στρατιώται, not garrison troops, γραμματίες as garrison troops are called at IG II 123.10; and though these same γραμματίες are called στρατιώται eight lines later (IG II 123.18) this use (315 n. 28) 'must be understood in the light of this more specific designation'; (C) Antidotos was garrisoned in the third and second centuries; (D) Antidotos is not otherwise known. These are facts, but they do not add up to a new date.


emperor. Many military officers, on the other hand, are known to have performed grain-related benefactions as well. Whether Antidotos' business was commanding, commerce or otherwise IG XII suppl. p. 119 does not say, and we do not know.

As xenikos sitos must have indicated foreign grain, there could have been no good reason for someone to have observed that xenikos sitos was selling at 22 drachmas per medimnos, or at any price. If "foreign" indicated the origin of the grain on sale in the Andrian market, then the price of "foreign grain", would have been irrelevant: all grain in the Andrian market, regardless of origin, would have gone down in price upon importation of new stock. If "foreign" indicated grain sold in foreign markets, then specifying "foreign" would have been ridiculous: local prices were at issue. If xenikos cannot mean "military" then the logic of the new interpretation unravels. And the restoration εϊξκοσα δτφ[μθο [σπ][α]κλ sign gives not only weak Greek but weak sense.

### Analogues

Benefactions such as Antidotos' are widely attested in Hellenistic inscriptions. The texts inevitably follow a coherent logic: when grain prices rose, the benefactor imported new stock and/or sold supplies on hand at a reduced rate. In the narrative, prices are always described on this trajectory, from high to low. Around 300 BC the city of Ephesos awarded citizenship to a Rhodian named Agathocles (I.Eph. V 1455). Agathocles had imported 14,000 hektai of wheat. When he saw that grain was selling in the market at prices higher than six drachmas he was persuaded to sell all of his stock for less. High to low.

Shortly after 270 BC Polykritos, a wealthy citizen from Erythrai, was honored for his assistance when grain was dear. When he saw that grain supplies were low he released stock that he himself had imported (21–22), presumably for resale, just as Agathocles had done. Then, in order to accelerate importation he advanced money to be lent toward the purchase of more grain (22–24). Finally, he promised to furnish another sum of money and to bring to market grain reserved for his own use (25–29). Later, when grain prices soared to a staggering 60 drachmas and the city was insolvent, Polykritos lent a talent of silver to purchase grain for Andros.

22 Kallias (SEG XXVIII 60) and Epichares (SEG XXIV 154. Rhannous, after 265/4) are merely two of the better known benefactors.

23 Unless the foreign grain was of significantly superior quality, in which case the irrelevant detail becomes ludicrous, for the logic would be that Antidotos assisted Andros when expensive grain became even more expensive.

24 I.Erythrai I 28.20–9; see also L. Micottas, L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques: recueil des documents et analyse critique (Quebec 1984) 95.

25 The price is virtually unprecedented in epigraphic sources. It would be tempting to read (36–7) καὶ τῶν μέδιμνων τῶν πυρῶν ἵππων διὰ τὴν στοιχεῖαν πηλομένην δραχμὴν ἐξ ἵππων,
more grain (34–41)\textsuperscript{25}. Supply was low. Polykritos increased supply directly and contributed capital so that others might do the same. Prices were high; Polykritos drove them down.

The pattern recurs in a contemporary honorary inscription from Olbia\textsuperscript{26}. Prices rose to one gold stater per five medimnoi\textsuperscript{27}, and so Protogenes, the honorand, sold 2000 medimnoi of grain at half the price, one gold stater per 10 medimnoi. If we assume a gold : silver ratio of 1 : 10\textsuperscript{28}, then the inflationary price was four drachmas per medimnos and the reduced rate two\textsuperscript{29}. A subsequent spike in prices prompted Protogenes’ intercession again (A.58–75). Prices had risen to one gold stater per 1 1/2 medimnoi (59–61), or 12 drachmas per medimnos, and then quickly to 1 1/2 gold staters per medimnos (62–63), or 33 1/3 drachmas per medimnos\textsuperscript{30}. To combat the inflation Protogenes lent money for the purchase of grain (63–71) and sold 2500 medimnoi in two lots, 500 at one gold stater per 4 1/6 medimnoi (73–74), or 4 4/5 drachmas per medimnos, and 2000 medimnoi at one gold stater per 2 7/12 medimnoi (74–75), or just under 7 3/4 drachmas per medimnos\textsuperscript{31}. In both cases the narrative follows the same order: high to low.

This list could go on\textsuperscript{32}, but the pattern is clear. When prices rose wealthy benefactors sold grain that they had on hand or subsequently imported, or they lent/gave money to the city so that others might import foreign stock. Inscriptions that honor such benefactors describe the sequence of events in chronological order: first inflation, then anti-inflationary measures. If the new interpretation be

(seeing that on account of the dearth of grain a medimnos was commonly selling for six drachmas), with ἱερὸν governing a complementary participle (ῥυθμοῦμενον); for the syntax see LSJ s.v. II.5: ἱερὸν καὶ καίν τὸ τῆς ἱερᾶς γνώμης which commonly happens even now, Plb.24.9.11 codd.\textsuperscript{.} But I find no parallel for this use of ἱερὸν in inscriptions.

\textsuperscript{25} Latyschev, IosPE P 32.A.23–32 = Syll.3 495; also Migeotte, L’emprunt public 44.

\textsuperscript{26} εἰς τῆς τῆς τέχνης τινες (IosPE I 32.A.24–5) must indicate one gold stater per five medimnoi, not five drachmas per medimnoi, as was pointed out nearly two centuries ago (see Migeotte, L’emprunt public p. 137 n. 419); otherwise Protogenes would not have been doing anyone a favor by selling the grain εἰς τῆς τῆς τέχνης (29). Regez, Hesperia 63 (1994) 312 n. 18 and idem, The Public Purchase of Grain on Independent Delos, CIAnt 12 (1993) 300–34, at 312, cites the first price as four drachmas per medimnoi, not citing the second.

\textsuperscript{27} So Migeotte, L’emprunt public p. 140.

\textsuperscript{28} If AU : AR :: 1 : 10, then 1 gold stater / 5 medimnoi = 20 drachmas of silver / 5 med. = 4 dr. / med.; 1 gold st. / 10 med. = 20 dr. AR / 10 med. = 2 dr. / med.

\textsuperscript{29} 1 gold st. / 1 1/2 med. = 12 dr. / med.; 1 1/2 gold st. / 1 med. = 33 1/3 AR / 1 med.

\textsuperscript{30} 1 gold st. / 4 1/6 med. = 20 dr. AR / 4 1/6 med. = 4.8 dr. / med.; 1 gold st. / 2 7/12 med. = 20 dr. AR / 2 7/12 med. = 7.74 dr. / med.

\textsuperscript{31} E.g. IG II\textsuperscript{2} 360.8–12 (order clearer in the second of the two benefactions); SEG XXXVII 82.11–14 (= IG II\textsuperscript{2} 398.a + II\textsuperscript{2} 438) (ca. 322/1–320/19); SEG XXX 569.1–6, with XXXVII 553; IG V.2 437.10–13; IG XII 6.11.37–9; IG XL 1049.6–7; SEG XI 397.28–33 (= IG IV. 1\textsuperscript{2} 66) (74 BC).

\textsuperscript{33} Regez, Hesperia 63 (1994) 312–13 with n. 20, referring to Regez, CIAnt 12 (1993) 305 Table 1. 332–3 Appendix 2.1, 2.2; idem, Regionalism and Change 306–7 Appendix III, Tables III.4, III.5.

\textsuperscript{34} Regez, CIAnt 12 (1993) 308–9.


Grain for Andros

Five drachmas per medimnos need not have been too low a price to arouse the concern of the Andrians. As we have seen, six drachmas per medimnos was enough to spur Agathocles and the Ephesians to action, and a price of four set Protogenes in motion.

But according to Regez grain (wheat specifically) sold on Hellenistic Delos consistently around 10 drachmas per medimnos. He builds here on an earlier article and his monumental book on the Delian economy, in which he gathered 30 price-observations from Delos, across 113 years (282–169)\textsuperscript{33}. Of the 30 observations, seven are for milled wheat, and come from a single inscription, from a single year, a record of state payments in 282 BC to purchase grain for Dionysiac artists (IG XI.2 158.A.37–50).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Julian</th>
<th>Amount of grain purchased</th>
<th>Rate per medimnos</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lēnaion</td>
<td>12/01</td>
<td>2 medimnoi 9 hemikteis 3 choineikes</td>
<td>6 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hieros</td>
<td>01/02</td>
<td>2 med. 9 hem. 3 ch.</td>
<td>6 dr. 3 ob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Galaxiōn</td>
<td>02/03</td>
<td>1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.</td>
<td>6 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artemiōn</td>
<td>03/04</td>
<td>1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.</td>
<td>4 dr. 3 ob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thargēlōn</td>
<td>04/05</td>
<td>1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.</td>
<td>6 dr. 5 ob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metageitaijōn</td>
<td>07/08</td>
<td>1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.</td>
<td>7 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bousphōniiōn</td>
<td>08/09</td>
<td>1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.</td>
<td>10 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Apatouriaiōn</td>
<td>09/10</td>
<td>3 med. 9 hem. (alphiá)</td>
<td>4 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arésiōn</td>
<td>10/11</td>
<td>3 med. 9 hem. (alphiá)</td>
<td>5 dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poseideōn</td>
<td>11/12</td>
<td>3 med. 9 hem. (alphiá)</td>
<td>5 dr.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fluctuation does not inspire confidence that this tiny sample, only seven observations, is representative. It is noteworthy that prices appear to have fallen in the winter and spring months, when we should expect them to have risen\textsuperscript{34}. But a drop could be explained by strategic stockpiling, which Hellenistic cities are
known to have conducted 35. The real oddity in this list, however, is that prices spiked in Bouphonion, not long after the harvest, when they should have been low, and then continued at an inflated rate through Posideon. If 282 was an ordinary year for grain prices then the effect of supply and demand was the opposite of what we would predict, or Delians stockpiled so effectively that prices in winter and spring were half the harvest-time rate. Neither seems likely. There is no reason to think that the prices recorded in this account are representative of grain prices on Hellenistic Delos.

The remaining 23 observations are for barley, 4 for milled (αλφιττα), 19 for unmilled (κρυβατ). Now, since barley loses 35% of its weight in milling, Reger multiplies each of the 19 prices by 1.54 in order to convert all prices to a notional equivalent for alphita 36. But the observed prices are measured in medimnoi, that is to say by volume. Thus, the operation assumes an identical 35%-decrease in weight, volume and price for unmilled and milled barley. Weight and volume change by identical proportion only in substances of equivalent density. Even if we admit unprocessed barley to this category, the conversion still fails to take account of added value in the processed flour. It is worth entertaining the notion that this additional cost was passed on to the consumer 37. Thus, of the 30 observations seven may be unrepresentative and 19 derive from a faulty calculus.

Now for the four remaining prices. To draw meaningful conclusions from the data all grain-prices must be converted to a single notional standard. The four prices for alphita are essential to this conversion, for the accounts in which they appear also provide prices paid by the state for milled wheat in the same year. From these four pairs of observations a milled wheat: alphita price-ratio of 2.75:2.5 is deduced by Reger 38; then the 19 derived prices for milled barley are converted to prices for milled wheat, giving 30 notional wheat prices. Everything stands on the four pairs of state-payments for barley and wheat 39:

1. I.Delos 401.18 (190): αλφιττα Δ (for the Posideia) 40

42 Reger, CIAnt 12 (1993) 305, Table 1, gives the price as 3.75 dr. (15 dr. per 3 medimnoi), or 5 drachmas; and new, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4, gives the price as 3.75 dr. At I.Delos II 452.9 DURRBACH restored Δ[Π], which is meaningless and must have been for Δ[Γ] 43 Reger, CIAnt 12 (1993) 332, Appendix 2.1 and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 306, Appendix III, Table III.3, notes, 44. Durbach restores Δ[Π], but this is unexampled. I prefer Δ[Γ]. But 15 were paid for alphita at 445.4–5.

43 Reger, Regionalism and Change 306, Appendix III, Table III.4, omits the barley price, but includes (307, III.5) the wheat. Reger, CIAnt 12 (1993) 305, Table 1, and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4, gives both.


45 The lacuna is at the start of line 63.

46 Larsen, ESAR IV 385; Reger, CIAnt 12 (1993) 305, Table I note a and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4, cites Larsen, ESAR IV 347–8; Larsen explains the argument at 385–6.

47 Reger, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4, assumes that different amounts of barley were purchased from year to year, four medimnoi in 190 (I.Delos II 401.18), 3.75 in 178 (445.4–5) and four again in 174 (440-A.62–3) and 3.875 in 169 (461 B.b.51); but cf. 306, Appendix III, Table III.4 and IDEM, CIAnt 12 (1993) 332, Appendix 2.1 for inconsistencies and omissions.

48 Standing grain-disbursements to τεχνητα in 282 were made in very uneven amounts: IG XI.2 158. A.37–50. It may be worth noticing that the 11-drachma medimnos could be a ghost. The use of the symbol Δ to indicate both one drachma (e.g. I.Delos II 440-A.63, 69) and N
opposed to, say, eight hekteis, or two medimnoi, or some other amount⁴⁸?

Thus, one pair of half-restored prices⁵⁹ is used to generalize about three others⁶⁰, in order to convert 19 erroneously derived numbers so that the 23 figures might be compared with seven prices⁵¹ that may not be representative. The results of these operations guide the proposed restoration of IG XII suppl. p. 119, a text of precarious date from another island⁵².

The procedure is impressive, but the conclusions as to price-trends in the Hellenistic Aegean, over centuries, stand ultimately on Larsen's unsupported assumptions concerning four pairs of prices that span just two decades. The fact is that we do not know what amounts those 10, or 11, drachmas purchased. Is it unimaginable that wheat sold normally for five drachmas per medimnos and the volume regularly purchased was two medimnoi⁵³? Or that wheat sold for six or seven drachmas per medimnoi of grain from the Numidian king Masinissa⁵⁴. The grain was sold in two batches, one for three drachmas per medimnoi and the other for four drachmas one obol⁵⁵. Gift or not, the uneven price «four drachmas one obol per medimnos» must have been set by some rational mechanism. At Epidauros, in 74 bc, grain-prices rose to 10 drachmas, which prompted one Euanthes to sell two lots of grain, one at five drachmas and the other at four⁵⁶. At Gazoros, some time under Philip V or Perseus, another benefactor sold wheat at the low price of two drachmas four obols per medimnos and barley at one drachma four obols per medimnos⁵⁶.

However extraordinary the circumstances surrounding these three consignments may have been, the low prices at which the grain was sold are sufficient reminder that such a tiny data set demands close reading, not number-crunching⁵⁷.

Inflationary Triggers

Prices charged for the Numidian grain may have been closer to a «normal» price for grain than the putative figure of 10 drachmas is. If we disregard questionable conversions from barley to wheat and hold aside the highest and lowest prices in the range⁵⁸, the seven remaining wheat prices fall between four and seven drachmas⁵⁹. We have already seen that Ephesos awarded Agathocles citizenship for his assistance when grain prices had risen above six drachmas (I.Eph. V 1455), and Olbia honored Protogenes for his intercession when prices had hit only four (Latschew, IosPE F 32.A.23–32). These episodes show what point two communities began to consider anti-inflationary measures. Agathocles initiated such a measure at Ephesos, a city with a seasoned trading population, when prices broke the six-drachma mark, a little over half of what Reger reckoned as normal rates on contemporary Delos, but at the upper end of the four-to-seven-drachma range. Olbia was closer to the source of Pontic grain and so its citizens

---

⁴⁸ Note Rostovtzeff's caution (SEHHW III 1488 n. 110) concerning the Delian prices «Our knowledge is unfortunately very limited and we must not base sweeping generalizations on insufficient material not always easy to interpret». See E. Cohen, Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective (Princeton 1992) 26-40 and idem, Commercial Lending by Athenian Banks: Climatic Failures and Forensic Methodology, CP 85 (1990) 177-90. Reger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 312-13, argues that grain prices in the Athenian text support a date in the third century. He rightly notes that the high prices adduced by Saucuc date from the 330s and 320s and so can have little bearing on a text that might have dated from the 350s. Next he argues that since wheat must have cost 8–12 drachmas per medimnos in the Hellenistic Cyclades, Antidotos' sale of wheat at five drachmas would have been welcome, and so the inscription could well belong in the third century not the fourth. But we know from Demosthenes (34.29) and IG II 360 that five drachmas per medimnos was also welcome at Athens in the 320s, as it would have been whenever and wherever prices rose above five drachmas. Scattered grain prices are weak evidence for the date of the inscription.

⁵⁷ Highest: the one certain price of 10 drachmas per medimnos (IG XI.2 158.46-7); two lowest: the batch of locally grown grain sold at Gazoros for two drachmas four obols (SEG XXXIV 683.4-5) and the Numidian grain that was sold at three (I.Delos II 442.A.100–2). Withholding the 10-drachma medimnos, presumably as an aberration; P. Garssey, T. Gallant and D. Rathbone, Thessaly and the Grain Supply of Rome during the Second Century B.C., JRS 74 (1984) 30–44, 43 n. 55.

⁵⁸ Prices charged for the Numidian grain may have been closer to a «normal» price for grain than the putative figure of 10 drachmas is. If we disregard questionable conversions from barley to wheat and hold aside the highest and lowest prices in the range⁵⁸, the seven remaining wheat prices fall between four and seven drachmas⁵⁹. We have already seen that Ephesos awarded Agathocles citizenship for his assistance when grain prices had risen above six drachmas (I.Eph. V 1455), and Olbia honored Protogenes for his intercession when prices had hit only four (Latschew, IosPE F 32.A.23–32). These episodes show what point two communities began to consider anti-inflationary measures. Agathocles initiated such a measure at Ephesos, a city with a seasoned trading population, when prices broke the six-drachma mark, a little over half of what Regier reckoned as normal rates on contemporary Delos, but at the upper end of the four-to-seven-drachma range. Olbia was closer to the source of Pontic grain and so its citizens

---

⁴⁸ Note Rostovtzeff's caution (SEHHW III 1488 n. 110) concerning the Delian prices «Our knowledge is unfortunately very limited and we must not base sweeping generalizations on insufficient material not always easy to interpret». See E. Cohen, Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective (Princeton 1992) 26-40 and idem, Commercial Lending by Athenian Banks: Climatic Failures and Forensic Methodology, CP 85 (1990) 177-90. Reger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 312-13, argues that grain prices in the Athenian text support a date in the third century. He rightly notes that the high prices adduced by Saucuc date from the 330s and 320s and so can have little bearing on a text that might have dated from the 350s. Next he argues that since wheat must have cost 8–12 drachmas per medimnos in the Hellenistic Cyclades, Antidotos' sale of wheat at five drachmas would have been welcome, and so the inscription could well belong in the third century not the fourth. But we know from Demosthenes (34.29) and IG II 360 that five drachmas per medimnos was also welcome at Athens in the 320s, as it would have been whenever and wherever prices rose above five drachmas. Scattered grain prices are weak evidence for the date of the inscription.

⁵⁷ Highest: the one certain price of 10 drachmas per medimnos (IG XI.2 158.46-7); two lowest: the batch of locally grown grain sold at Gazoros for two drachmas four obols (SEG XXXIV 683.4-5) and the Numidian grain that was sold at three (I.Delos II 442.A.100–2). Withholding the 10-drachma medimnos, presumably as an aberration; P. Garssey, T. Gallant and D. Rathbone, Thessaly and the Grain Supply of Rome during the Second Century B.C., JRS 74 (1984) 30–44, 43 n. 55.

⁵⁸ Prices charged for the Numidian grain may have been closer to a «normal» price for grain than the putative figure of 10 drachmas is. If we disregard questionable conversions from barley to wheat and hold aside the highest and lowest prices in the range⁵⁸, the seven remaining wheat prices fall between four and seven drachmas⁵⁹. We have already seen that Ephesos awarded Agathocles citizenship for his assistance when grain prices had risen above six drachmas (I.Eph. V 1455), and Olbia honored Protogenes for his intercession when prices had hit only four (Latschew, IosPE F 32.A.23–32). These episodes show what point two communities began to consider anti-inflationary measures. Agathocles initiated such a measure at Ephesos, a city with a seasoned trading population, when prices broke the six-drachma mark, a little over half of what Regier reckoned as normal rates on contemporary Delos, but at the upper end of the four-to-seven-drachma range. Olbia was closer to the source of Pontic grain and so its citizens
became anxious earlier.

The inscriptions from Ephesos and Olbia show price-thresholds beyond which countermeasures were deemed to be necessary. They reveal socially defined limits to tolerable inflation. These limits were roughly half of what has been reckoned as the normal price in the Aegean in the Hellenistic period. I suggest that these thresholds were at (on an inflationary curve that was perceived to be going up) or just above a «normal» price of 5–7 drachmas. This seems to suggest concerted effort to curb inflation before it spiraled out of control. The Ephesian, Olbian and Delian evidence suggests that wheat in the Hellenistic Aegean may have sold normally for roughly 5–7 drachmas per medimnos, not 10.

The Text

I suggest that IG XII suppl. p. 119 is part of this picture; that the Andrian decree followed the standard order of high-to-low and that the inflationary trigger was five drachmas: prices hit five drachmas per medimnos, and Antidotos, like Agathocles, Polykritos, Protagenes and others, was moved to action. The following restorations may serve as examples of the sense that should be restored to IG XII suppl. p. 119.1–4:


Seeing that a medimnos of grain was being sold in the market for more than five drachmas he brought in 20 wagons of foreign grain and sold it at five drachmas per medimnos. If this interpretation is correct, the price that triggered a response from Antidotos is identical to the κάθεσσα τημία attested at Dem. 34.39, and the price at which grain was sold at IG II 360.8–10, 29–30, 55–6, 67–8, where «the figure of $5 dr cannot be simple coincidence but must represent something of a «normal» price (i.e. pre-inflationary) price»: V. J. Rosvach, Some Economic Aspects of the Fourth-Century Athenian Market in Grain, Chiron 30 (2000) 31–64, at 53–4 with nn. 68–70; for another view see Meeott, Prix et formation des prix 38–9; A. Brissoux, La cité marchande (Bordeaux and Paris 2000) 183–210. Regier, Chant 12 (1993) 312–13, suggests on the strength of IG II 1672.287, Dem. 34.39, IG II 360.30, SEG XXIV 154.17–19, IG II 400.8, 499.16–17 (restored by Regier 313 n. 45), and Dem. 56.8 that this was the price set by the state in times of crisis and pegged to prices just after harvest; only IG II 1672 indicates season. Rosvach’s «normal» may capture the sense; J. and L. Roberts, Bull. Epigr. (1968) 247 p. 458, favored this translation. Seasonal fluctuation is not incompatible with a notion of a normal price (cf. Regier, Chant 12 [1993] 314). One recent US presidential candidate fared poorly in the New Hampshire primaries when in a debate he could not name the price of a gallon of milk. The audience was not asking for a prevailing (in which town?), fixed, administered or seasonally variable price, but for that semi-rational range which the community felt was acceptable. Communally formed ranges were as important to that candidate and the voters (who may have cast their votes with another) as they were to Agathocles and the Ephesians, Protagenes and the Olbians or Antidotos and the Andrians.

On the phrasing compare IG V.2 437.11–12: τῶν πυρῶν ἐν ἀγορᾷ τοῦ μεδίμνου πολυμένου — — στατήριον, εἴπαθησε μεδίμνους [μίτιοις ὀχτωκαίσιοι]; I. Eph. 1455.3–6: καταλαβὼν τὸν σιτον τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πολυμέννου πλέονος δραχμῶν ἐξες, ... ἐπώλησε τὸν σιτον πάντα εὐωνωτῶν τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πολυμένου; I. Erythrai 28.36–37: καὶ τοῦ μέδιμνου τῶν πυρῶν ὁ ἄρμ φαίνει τὴν στοιχεῖον πολυμένου δραχμῶν ἐξήκοντα. We would prefer to find ἐν ἀγορᾷ between πολυμένουν and δραχμῶν. Πέντε [και δέκα] is conceivable as a number at 2 (cf. IG I 3 254 b.16; II 839.46; II 1668.11, 30; IX 1 12.1.11, 31, 32; XIV 645.I.141; CID II 109.f.A.3). Regier dismissed, no doubt rightly, the likelihood that Antidotos would have been so lavishly honored for the delivery of a mere 20+ medimnos and so suggested that εἰκόσιον (3) refers to price, not volume. But εἰκόσιον δύο, where we should expect εἰκόσιον δύο, is dubious. I find no example of the numbers 22–25 with erroneous terminal μεδίμνου.

60 Though the lavishness of the honor rests on Regier’s restoration χαλίων δραχμών (8), as the weight of Antidotos’ honorary crown, where every previous editor had read ἀττικόν, neither of the two photos (Regier, Hesperia 63 [1994] pl. 76) permits control. I am unable confirm or refute the new reading in the IG squeeze. Regier notes that there is insufficient room at the end of line 7 for ἀττικόν, yet he prints «vocæ» at the end of the line. Could the number of Attic drachmas have been printed in? Regier, Hesperia 63 (1994) 317: «We must read something like εἰκόσιον [μεδίμνου καὶ μετέχειαν τοῦ μεδίμνου. I do not know a single parallel for expressing the amount of a grain gift in this fashion. Rather the texts invariably give round figures in medimnoi (cf. n. 36). But the redundancy, not the lack of roundness, seems awkward to me. For the latter we know a good parallel: in 180 the Delians received from the Numidian king Masinissa 2,796½ medimnoi of grain (MDelos II 442.A.100–2); this is usually assumed to have been a gift: C. VIAL, Délôs indépendante (314–167 avant J.-C.): Étude d’une communauté civique et de ses institutions [= BCH suppl. 10] (Athens 1984) 238; GAUTHIER, Comptes et Inventaires 61–9.

61 Regier, Hesperia 63 (1994) 311, is sensitive to other orthographic matters, arguing that orthography indicates a third-century date for IG XII suppl. p. 119: «The use of the diphthong εἰ for έι (εἰ, line 16; δοκεί, line 13) … does not appear in Cycladic inscriptions before the end of the 4th century. At Athens it is very rare before ca. 350 B.C. and even in the following twenty years; it is not until after 300 B.C. that it becomes predominant». Examples of εἰ in the fifth and fourth centuries are not uncommon: IG I 21.77 (450/49), 45.1 (446/5), 41 A fragm. d'e, line 53 (ca. 446/5), 61,48–9 (42/3), 71.42 (425/4), 78.a.11, 15, 24, 31 (ca. 422/3), 82.33 (421/0), 96.18 (412/11), 101 fragm. e-g line 56 (410/09), 102.44 (410/09), 105.43 (409), 142.3 (440/09), 223 A.front 5, 9 (343/2). Moreover, δοκεί, in some variation of the formula found in the Andrian text, εἰναι ἀντιδότου καὶ ἀλοκοποιό φυσικῶν παρά τοῦ δημοῦ, δὴ δὲν δοκεί δέος εἶναι (11–13), is not only well attested, but appears to occur only in Attica, Andros (this text) and Imbros, another well known Athenian subject-island: fourth century: IG II 412.5 (after 336/5); SEG XXXII 81.4–5 (ca. 336/5–322/1); IG II 360.75 (325/4). Third century: IG II 1272.18–20 (283/2); SEG XXV 89.28–30 (282/1); IG II 780.20–2 (ca. 246/1); IG XII 8.50.3 (Imbros ca. 220/II B.C). Second century: IG II 926.11–13 (early 2nd c.?) 1223.12–15 (after 167). Orthography is a weak guide to the date. The formula, on the other hand, might suggest an Athenian connection, which could support the traditional date in the fourth century. On these lines it is noteworthy, though not decisive, that ὅπως δὲν ὄν (4) is vastly more common in Attica than outside, where ὅπως ὄν dominates.
We must find a word that begins with nu, read a number whose second element begins with a vowel, e.g. 26–29, or another word beginning with a vowel, or else punctuate after eikoon. Wagons could work.64 Wagonloads of grain and other goods are widely attested.65 Wagons were a common means of military transport; perhaps the soldiers who assisted Antidotos drove the wagons up to the city.66 Maybe the wagons belonged to commercial agents.67 The definite article (tou of tou zevnikou) may suggest that the portion of the inscription now missing at the top mentioned the grain. When grain-prices at Ephesos rose above six drachmas Agathocles sold for less;68 I suggest here that Antidotos operated in similar fashion; when prices rose above five, he sold for five. These suggested restorations are just that; they are meant to indicate sense not precise wording.

64 Ships might fit the space (restore χρι[τς] [?]). A Delian decree from the late third century bans sale of certain on-board purchases (LDelos II 509): οὗτοι μηδε ρυμοί μηδε σταθμοί τος ξυλοποιής μη πωλεῖν; μη μηδε ἐν τούς πλοίοι; see R. Descat, La loi délienne sur les bois et charbons et le rôle de Délos comme marché, REA 103 (2000) 125–30. But twenty shiploads is a massive amount of grain, perhaps too massive; Gautier, BCH 111 (1987) 415, has pointed out that plóia or ὀλίκοες should carry grain, not νίκες; and the best parallel for sale of grain by the shipload has been read out of existence (see n. 56 above).

65 LSJ, s.v. ὀμάξας I.2, knew several: <c. gen., wagon-load, πτέρων, σιτοῦ, XAn. 4.7.10, Cyr. 2.4.18; ἐλλεβόρου Pl. Euthd. 299b; τρισθον ὀμάξαν βάρος E.Cyc. 385, cf. 473.> Wagonloads of grain: Xen., >Anabasis< 1.10.18; Diodorus 17.81.1; Plutarch, >Lucullus< 17.3; Aeneas Tacticus 28.3.

