

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 Antidotot¹. We have long understood from the fragmentary text that Antidotot sold the Andrians grain during a shortage. REGER seeks to improve our picture of two features of the transaction: (1) the grain that Antidotot sold the islanders had been reserved by him as rations for mercenaries who manned the local garrison, of which Antidotot was in charge; (2) when prices had risen to 22 drachmas per *medimnos* Antidotot 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. SAUCUC read them as follows, adding two lines at the start, presumably to illustrate his understanding of the context²:

- [..... ἐπειδὴ Ἀντίδοτος..... οὐς Ἀθηναίος]
 [γοργυρῆος κατακελεύσας ἐπὶ τὴν παραλαβὴν τοῦ]
 1 [στοῦ τῶν μέδιμνων ἐπέδοκε τὰς δῆμιας τὰς Ἄνδρ]-
 [ῶν] δραχμῶν πέντε [καὶ ἦγορε τὰς δῆμιας τὰς Ἄνδρῶν]
 [τῶν στοῦ τοῦ ξενικοῦ εἰκοσὶν [Zahl der Medimnen und]
 4 [ἐπι Τρι(ε?)ῶν τοῦ μέδιμνου, ὅπως ἂν οὖν εἰδοσὶν πάλιν] τεός ...

REGER reads as follows:

- [...³⁻⁴... τῶν μέδιμνων -----]
 [...²⁻³...] δραχμῶν πέντε [-----]
 [... τῶν στοῦ τοῦ ξενικοῦ εἰκοσὶν δὶ τὸ [δραχ]-
 4 [μῶν τοῦ μέδιμνου ὅπως ἂν οὖν εἰδοσὶν πάλιν] τεός]

On this reading Antidotot sold grain (τῶν μέδιμνων ?) at five drachmas per *medimnos* when *xenikos* grain was selling at 22. No previous editor read anything

¹ R. WEIL, Von den griechischen Inseln. Reisebericht, AM 1 (1876) 235-52, 239-41; E. PERINCE, Inschriften aus Andros und Paros, AM 18 (1893) 7-20, no. 15, 14-15; HILGER VON GAERTINGEN, IG XII.5 714; T. SAUCUC, Zum Ehrendekret von Andros IG. XII 5, 714, AM 36 (1911) 1-20, 2-3 (copy on p. 3) [IG XII suppl. p. 119]; G. REGER, The Date and Historical Significance of IG XII v 714 of Andros, Hesperia 63 (1994) 309-21 (pl. 76). The stone is housed in the archaeological museum on Andros; brief mention at X. A. ΤΡΑΒΑΥΤΟΥ, ΑΝΑΡΟΣ. Τὰ Μνημεῖα καὶ τὸ Αρχαιολογικὸ Μουσεῖο (Athens 1996) p. 94.

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 [il] rather as part of an alpha«. Neither of the two photos provided (REGER, Hesperia 63 [1994] pl. 76) permits control. I am unable to confirm or refute the new reading in the squeeze held in the IG collection of the BBAW.

after εἰκοοῖν, whose final letter is no longer visible. REGAE now reads [ε]. [ο]. [ε]. [ο].³ The intrusive *na* renders εἰκοοῖν δὲο 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 [παλοκουμένου ἐν τῇ δρύορᾳ τῆο ὄστου τοῦ ξενικὸυ εἰκοοῖν δέο]ο [δρ]ο[χ]υλῶν τοῦ μεδίουνο«.⁵ Thus, 22 drachmas per *medimnos* 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 their employment, may have enjoyed the privilege of buying grain for a very low price, perhaps 5 dr/med, from their employer, who himself of course probably bought it on the market at current prices. In these difficult circumstances, the Andrians asked, or Antidotos offered, permission to buy grain intended for the troops (ὁ ὄστου ξενικὸς) at the price the troops paid, in effect, to receive a subsidy from Antidotos' employer.

This seems to mean the following: grain prices on Andros rose, which put pressure on Andrians, but not the resident mercenaries, who purchased grain from Antidotos, their garrison commander, at the fixed rate of five drachmas per *medimnos*, regardless of market conditions. Antidotos purchased grain at the prevailing price (at this point, I assume, the grain became *xenikos*); he then sold the grain to the troops at the fixed rate⁷. The hard-pressed Andrians petitioned to purchase some of the troops' rations at the fixed price. This is confusing. Did the troops pay the market price, allegedly 22 drachmas, or did not they not?

The confusion is unnecessary, as *xenikos sitos* cannot have been »military grain«. IG II² 1281.8 is adduced in support of the idea that the *xenikos sitos* was

⁴ REGAE, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 316, 318.

⁵ REGAE, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 317, citing LEIGH, V 1455.2–3: ὄστου εἰκοοῖν εἰς τὴν πόλιν πρῶν ἐκτελεῖ μνηστὸς ἑταροχρησίου καὶ καταλαβὸν τὸν ὄστον τὸν ἐν τῇ δρύορᾳ παλοκουμένου παλοῦς δραχμῶν ἕξ.

⁶ REGAE, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 317, 318.

⁷ Losing money, but presumably winning the hearts of his men; the first demand of Eumenes' (1) mutinying troops at Philaeterea and Atalea was grain and wine at guaranteed low prices: (OGIS 266.3–4): [ἐξ]ήλοματτα ἄ ἐνεχέ[ω]ρησεν Εὐμένε[ω]ς Φυλακτοπόλ[ι] τοῖς, ἰ ἐ[μ]ε Φυλακτοπειται σπορῶντας καὶ τοῖς ἐν Ἀττάλειαι: ἰ [ὄ]στου πηλῆ ἀποτίθειν τοῦ μεδίουμου δραχμῶς ἑσ[ο]σ[α]β[ο]ς, ὄστω τοῦ μεστῶν δραχμῶς ἑσ[ο]σ[α]β[ο]ς.

⁸ SAUCUC, *AM* 36 (1911) 10: »aus dem Auslande«; P. ГАУТНЕР, *Bull. épigr.* (1995) 450: »grain étranger«.

»intended for the troops«, rather than foreign⁸. But IG II² 1281.8 simply speaks of provisioning a garrison with missiles, grain, and other things useful for safety. Troops etc. Whether anyone called their food *xenikos* IG II² 1281 does not say. The only parallel for such »military grain« is restored by REGAE at IG XI.2 159.A.53–54 (ὁ ξενικὸς ὄστος), a fragmentary account, whose context illuminates neither the restoration nor the proposed meaning⁹. At IG XII suppl. 347.H.8–9 (ca. 425–412) we find an injunction against Thasian vessels importing ξενικὸν ὄστω to the mainland between Athos and Pacheia¹⁰. Here the phrase can hardly mean anything but »foreign wine«¹¹. And wine was not the only other commodity to have been so classified. Stroud's brilliant restoration, [ξ]ε[ν]ικὸν ἀργύρον[?], 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«.

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

⁹ G. REGAE, 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 συνγοροστρ]ικὸς or [ὁ τροποστρ]ικὸς could also be correct at IG XI.2 159.A.53–4.

¹⁰ μηδὲ πάλιν Ὀσίτρον ξενικὸν ὄστω ἐστέτω ἐσὼ Ἀθ-ω» καὶ Πιργεῖς.

¹¹ The ὄστων ξενικὸν at IG XIII 330.140 (ca. 210–195) seems to be wine that is suitable for guests, *xenoi*, but perhaps it was imported / foreign.

¹² SEG XXVI 72.8; T. FIGUERA, The Power of Money: Coinage and Politics in the Athenian Empire (Philadelphia 1998) 336–47 collects much of the copious bibliography on this inscription.

¹³ E.g. IG I³ 1453.G.11; [B/G.11.1]. G.17 [B/G.12.2] (ca. 449?). IG II² 1421.iii.75 (374/3).

¹⁴ 1424a.ii.183 (369/8), 1428.i.75 (367/6), 1436.ii.56 (350/49). Also IG II² 1672.ii/iii.fr.b.301 (329/8), with noun suppressed: στήσαν κεφάλανον σὸν τῆ τιμῆ τοῦ χροῦσιου καὶ τοῦ ξενικῶ. »Foreign« purple gowns: IG II² 1514.ii.49, 1516.ii.26, 1517.B.fr.a.ii.155–6 (mid IV); *emporion*: SB I 5021.4–5 (ca. II). Colophon: *AMP* (1993) 359–72 no.1.25: χρηματα ξενικῶ.

¹⁴ 13–16: ἐπαυέσσαι δὲ καὶ τοῖς [ε] [στ]ρατοῦσας, ὅσοι τὰς χρεῖσας παρῆχογγο τοῖς δὴμ[ω]ν] καὶ συνήγησαν εἰς τὸ ὄστω εὐμωρόστρο[ν] ἰ εἶναι] ἐν αἰ πόλει (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 *boule*, on SAUCUC's reading, was to announce Antidotos' crown at the tragic competition at the Dionysia (9–11): τὸν δὲ γυμναστῶντα τῆς βλοῦνῆς ἀνοργεῖται τὸδε τὸν στέφανον [Διολύνοτος] τρυφῶδων τῶν ὄστων. SAUCUC's text mentioned two *grammatists*, one of the *boule* and another of the *prytaneis* (9–10 τὸν δὲ γυμναστῶντα τῆς βλοῦνῆς; 10–11 γυμναστῶν τῶν κρηναγέλων). SAUCUC thought that under Athenian occupation Andros called its officials by Athenian titles. Since he did not find a *grammatist* of the *boule* at Athens from after 318/17 or a *grammatist* of the *prytaneis* 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 II² 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 honored¹⁵ 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 passage¹⁶ 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 means¹⁷. 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 otherwise¹⁸. Cooperation from local soldiers does not necessarily mean that he was¹⁹, benefactors and soldiers made an obvious and common pair²⁰. 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 κήρυκτα τῆς βλοχῆς at 9–10, instead of ὑπομιατῆρα τῆς βλοχῆς, on the idea that it would be strange to find two scribes in one text (alleging also that the *grammateus* of the *boulé* went out of use on Andros in the third century, but see IG XII.5 721.20 [I sc]). Neither of the two photos (REGER, *Hesperia* 63 [1994] pl. 76) permits control on the new reading. Whether two scribes, each with one title, 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 crown²¹; if not an agonothete: IG Bulg. I² 308(2).4–13; PATON and HICKS, *Inscriptions of Cos* 5.19–21; SEGRE, *IdiCos* ED 39.10–12 (ID); CIARA RODOS 10.27.1.2–3 (306–301); IG XII.7 237.b.33–5, 37–8 (II²); also IG XII.8 53.15–18 (Imbros ID). None of these observations precludes the traditional date or compels a new one.

¹⁶ So GAUTHERA, *Bull. épigr.* (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) p. 4, ll. 10–14; [κό]μμετ τὸν ὄριον κινδύων τῶν ἐαυτοῦ ἢ [ἐ]πιβληθέντος εἰς τὸν Πειραιᾶ καὶ ἀνακομ[ε]ῖν εἰς τὸ ὄριον τὸν ὄριον τῆς ἀστυν τοῖς ἀ[ν]τι[σ]τοῖς. See also n. 66 below.

¹⁸ Cf. REGER, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 316–18.

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 II² 1441.12–13, II² 238); (B) the men honored with Antidotos were called soldiers, στρατιῶται, not garrison troops, ἄστυνοί as garrison troops are called at IG II² 123.10; and though these same ἄστυνοί are called στρατιῶται eight lines later (IG II² 123.18) this use (315 n. 28) must be understood in the light of this more specific designation known; (C) Andros 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.

²⁰ E.g. I.v.Piraeus 108.130–2: Μοσχίου μετὰ τῶν συν[υ]νοστάντων [ἐ]πιβληθέντων | τοῖς ὀπισθητικῶν εἰς μίσηρον ὄριον, τὴν εἰς ἀστυν μισθοδοσῶν | [ἐ]κ [τῶν] ἰδίων χορηγῶν.

²¹ E.g. L. MASONNE, *Le contrôle des prix dans les cités grecques*, in J. ANDREAUX, P. BRIAULT and R. DESCART, eds., *Économie Antique* vol. 2: *Prix et formation des prix dans les économies antiques* (Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges 1997) 33–52, 43–4.

*emporoi*²¹. Many military officers, on the other hand, are known to have performed grain-related benefactions as well²². Whether Antidotos' business was commanding, commerce or otherwise IG XII suppl. p. 119 does not say, and we do not know.

As *xenikos stios* must have indicated foreign grain, there could have been no good reason for someone to have observed that *xenikos stios* 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 dropped in price upon importation of new stock²³. If »foreign« indicated grain for sale 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 εἰκοσὶ δ[ι]ο [δ]ραχμῶν 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 (IEph. V 1455). Agathocles had imported 14,000 *hekteris* 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 dear²⁴. 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

²² Kallias (SEG XXVIII 60) and Epichares (SEG XXIV 154, Rhamnous, 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 IErythrai I 28.20–9; see also L. MIGNOTTE, *L'empunt public dans les cités grecques: recueil des documents et analyse critique* (Quebec 1984) 95.

²⁵ The price is virtually unprecendented in epigraphic sources. It would be tempting to read (36–7) καὶ τὸν μεδίωνων τῶν τρυφῶν | ὀριῶν δὲ τὴν στροβέταν πλοδομένον ἄστυκῶν ἐξ ἴκοντα.

more grain (34–41)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 Olbia²⁶. Prices rose to one gold stater per five *medimnoi*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 : 10²⁸, then the inflationary price was four drachmas per *medimnos* and the reduced rate two²⁹. A subsequent spike in prices prompted Protogenes' intercession again (A.58–75). Prices had risen to one gold stater per 1 2/3 *medimnoi* (59–61), or 12 drachmas per *medimnos*, and then quickly to 1 2/3 gold staters per *medimnos* (62–63), or 33 1/3 drachmas per *medimnos*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*³¹. In both cases the narrative follows the same order: high to low.

This list could go on³², 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 death of grain a *medimnos* was commonly selling for six drachmas) with ἡκόνη governing a complementary participle (προδοῦμενον), for the syntax see LSJ s.v. II.5: οὐδὲ καὶ τὸν ἥκει γινώμενον which commonly happens even now, P1b.24.9.11 codd κ. But I find no parallel for this use of ἥκει in inscriptions.

²⁶ LАТΥСКЕВ, IosPE I² 32.A.23–32 = Syll.³ 495; also Migeotte, L'empire public 44.

²⁷ εἰς μέγεθος (IosPE I² 32.A.24–5) must indicate one gold stater per five *medimnoi*, not five drachmas per *medimnos*, as was pointed out nearly two centuries ago (see Migeotte, L'empire public p. 137 n. 419); otherwise Protogenes would not have been doing anyone a favor by selling the grain εἰς μέγεθος (29). Reeger, 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 five drachmas per *medimnos*, not citing the second.

²⁸ So Migeotte, L'empire public p. 140.

²⁹ 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.

³⁰ 1 gold st. / 1 2/3 med. = 20 dr. AR / 1 2/3 med. = 12 dr. / med.; 1 2/3 gold st. / 1 med. = 33 1/3 AR / 1 med.

³¹ 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.

³² E.g. IG II² 360.8–12 (order clearer in the second of the two benefactions); SEG XXXVII 82.11–14 (= IG II² 398.a + II² 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 XI.4.1049.6–7; SEG XI 397.28–33 (= IG IV.1.2.66) (74 BC).

accepted then IG XII suppl. p. 119 is rare if not unique in not following this logic. Thus, the sense of the four lines should be as follows: when grain was selling at/above five drachmas per *medimnos* Antidotos imported 20 units of foreign grain (*xenikos stros*) and sold it for less.

The Price of Grain

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 Reeger 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)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):

Month	=	Julian	Amount of grain purchased	Rate per <i>medimnos</i>
Lênaiôn		12/01	2 <i>medimnoi</i> 9 <i>hemiktis</i> 3 <i>choinikes</i>	6 dr.
Hieros		01/02	2 med. 9 hem. 3 ch.	6 dr. 3 ob.
Galaxiôn		02/03	1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.	6 dr.
Artemision		03/04	1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.	4 dr. 3 ob.
Thargêlion		04/05	1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.	6 dr. 5 ob.
Metagektion		07/08	1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.	7 dr.
Bouphotion		08/09	1 med. 10 hem. 2 ch.	10 dr.
Apatourion		09/10	3 med. 9 hem. (<i>alphita</i>)	4 dr.
Artesion		10/11	3 med. 9 hem. (<i>alphita</i>)	5 dr.
Posideon		11/12	3 med. 9 hem. (<i>alphita</i>)	5 dr.

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 risen³⁴. But a drop could be explained by strategic stockpiling, which Hellenistic cities are

³³ Reeger, Hesperia 63 (1994) 312–13 with n. 20, referring to Reeger, 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.

³⁴ Reeger, CIAnt 12 (1993) 308–9.

³⁵ L. Migeotte, Les ventes de grain public dans les cités grecques aux périodes classique et hellénistique, in *La Mémoire perdue: Recherches sur l'administration romaine* (Rome 1998) 229–46, at 235–7; Philo Byz., *Mechanikê syntaxis*, 5.B.30 (p. 303 GARLAN).

known to have conducted³⁵. The real oddity in this list, however, is that prices spiked in Bouphoniōn, not long after the harvest, when they should have been low, and then continued at an inflated rate through Posideōn. 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 (ἀλαττα), 19 for unmilled (κροβάτ). 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 *alpha*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 uniform 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 consumer³⁷. 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 *alpha* 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: *alpha* price-ratio of 2.7–2.5:1 is deduced by REGER³⁸, 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 wheat³⁹.

1 I.Delos 401.18 (190): ἀλαττα Δ, † (for the Posideia)⁴⁰

³⁶ REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 304, citing L. FOXHALL and H. A. FORKES, Στοιχειώδεις: The Role of Grain as a Staple Food in Classical Antiquity, *Chiron* 12 (1982) 41–90, at 46.

³⁷ Readers of Apuleius, *Met.*, VII 15, and visitors to Pompeii can easily imagine the labor that was involved milling grain.

³⁸ REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 315–17; cf. IG II² 1672.283–7, where the rate seems to have been 2 : 1, and SEG XXXIV 638.3–6 (n. 56 below), where the rate was 1.6 : 1.

³⁹ REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 333, Appendix 2.2, and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4.7, 307, Appendix III, Table III.5.

⁴⁰ REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 332, Appendix 2.1, and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 306, Appendix III, Table III.4, omits the barley price, but includes (333, Appendix 2.1 and 307, Appendix III, Table III.5) the wheat price. REGER, Regionalism and Change 125 Table 4.7, includes both.

⁴¹ REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 333, Appendix 2.2, and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 306, Appendix III, Table III.4, attributes all the expenditures on wheat for the Eleithyiaia to payments for the Posideia, presumably he means the former.

- 401.22 (190): πρῶσι Δ (for the Eleithyiaia)⁴¹
 2 445.4–5 (178): ἀλαττα †Δ† (for the Posideia)⁴²
 445.13 (178): πρῶσι †Δ (for the Eleithyiaia)
 3 440.A.62–63 (174): ἀλαττων [μ:] III, τμηθ Δ†† (for the Posideia)
 440.A.69 (174): πρῶσι Δ† (for the Eleithyiaia)
 4 461.B.b.51 (169): ἀλαττα Δ†III (for the Posideia)⁴³
 461.B.b.53 (169): πρῶσι Δ (for the Eleithyiaia)

Only one payment for barley appears to have a matching volumetric value and there the unit of measure is not only restored (I.Delos 440.A.62–63), but highly suspect. On Delos με. appears always to be με/(τηρητις) not μέ(δύμωγ)⁴⁴. In the context [μ:] is all but impossible. Why not ἀλαττων [I]III, or ἀλαττων [†]III⁴⁵? Not one expenditure for wheat is keyed to a volumetric equivalent. Πρῶσι Δ tells us only that 10 drachmas were spent on some amount of wheat. That this amount was one *medimos* is simply an old assumption made by LARSEN, who had asserted that⁴⁶:

[The one occurrence of 11 drachmas [I.Delos 440.A.69] is enough to show that 10 drachmas were not set aside for the purpose but that rather a definite quantity was bought; this must have been a *medimos*.

But on what logic must the »definite quantity«⁴⁷ have been one *medimos*, as

⁴² REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 305, Table I, gives the price as 3.75 dr. (15 dr. for four *medimnoi*), but at 332, Appendix 2.1, gives 15 dr. per 3 *medimnoi*, or 5 drachmas; IDEM, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4.7, 306, Appendix III, Table III.4, gives the price as 3.75 dr. At I.Delos II 452.9 ΔΥΡΑΒΑΧΗ restored Δ†II], which is meaningless and must have been for Δ†I]; REGER, CIANT 12 (1993) 332, Appendix 2.1 and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 306, Appendix III, Table III.4, notes, »Durrbach restores Δ†III], but this is unexampled. I prefer Δ††††«. But 15 were paid for *alpha* 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 I, and IDEM, Regionalism and Change 125 Table 4.7, gives both.

⁴⁴ ἐλατων με.: I.Delos II 440.A.2.7.9.12.18.22.24; 442.A.192.193–4; 456.B.8. πῖτος με.: 440.A.9; 442.A.188.202; 456.B.23; 461.A.b.9. γλυκετος με.: 440.A.62; 445.3–4. I find no example on Delos of grain measured in *metretai*.

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 4.7, cites LARSEN, ESAR IV 347–8; LARSEN explains the argument at 385–6.

⁴⁷ REGER, Regionalism and Change 125, Table 4.7, 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 *teichitai* in 282 were made in very uneven amounts: IG XI.2 158.A.37–50. It may be worth noting that the 11-drachma *medimos* could be a ghost. The use of the symbol † 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 prices⁴⁹ is used to generalize about three others⁵⁰, 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 *medimos* and the volume regularly purchased was two *medimnoi*? or that wheat sold for six and the fixed sum was one and two thirds? In 180 bc an evidently powerful ambassador named Rodón helped secure for the Delians what appears to be a gift of 2,796 1/2 *medimnoi* of grain from the Numidian king Masinissa⁵³. The grain was sold in two batches, one for three drachmas per *medimos* and the other for four drachmas one obol⁵⁴. Gift or not, the uneven price »four drachmas one obol per *medimos*« must have been set by some rational mechanism. At Epidaurus, 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 four⁵⁵. At Gazoros, some time under Philip V or Perseus, another benefactor sold wheat at the low price of two drachmas four

obols per *medimos* and barley at one drachma four obols per *medimos*⁵⁶. 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 Protophones for his intercession when prices had hit only four (Latyshev, IosPE I² 32.A.23–32). These episodes show at 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 Reges 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

drachmas« (e.g. 445.5, 13) in the same system could have caused confusion. Could *trpoi* Δτ at 440.A.69 be an error for *trpoi* ΠΔ, as at 445.13? Or *vice versa*? Could ἀφαιρα Δτ at 401.18 be an error for ἀφαιρα ΠΔ, as at 445.4–5? LARSEN was not alone or first in positing high prices for wheat: F. HECHENHEIM, Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen der Zeit von Alexander bis Augustus (Jena 1930) 51–2, 128–34, though he did express doubt (132, 134) as to the likelihood of the 10-drachma *medimnoi*; also DEM, RE suppl. VI 887–9.

⁴⁸ IDélos II 440.A.62–3.

⁴⁹ IDélos II 401.18, 22 (190), 445.4–5, 13 (178), 461.B.b.51, 53 (169).

⁵⁰ IG XI.2 158.A.37–50.

⁵¹ REGG, Hesperia 63 (1994) 317.

⁵² REGG, Hesperia 63 (1994) 317.

⁵³ IDélos II 442.A.101; P. GAUTNIER Sur le don de grain numide à Délos: un pseudo-Rhodian dans les comptes des hiéropes, in D. ΚΝΟΡΕΛΛΑ, ed., *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque* (Neuchâtel and Geneva 1988) 61–9.

⁵⁴ IDélos II 442.A.100–2, 102–6; not included in REGG's lists.

⁵⁵ SEG XI 397.28–33 (= IG IV.1² 66).

⁵⁶ SEG XXXIV 638.3–6 (GAUTNIER, BCH 111 [1987] 413–18): ἐπιτυχεῖσθαι τοῖς πολιταῖς κομῆτευσιν | ἕξος (sc. κορτῶν) ἑσῶν ἄττον, τῶν μὲν κτηρῶν τὸν μέθιμον φρουδῶν δὲ ὀβολῶν τε<σ>οδῶν, τῶν δὲ κριθῶν μίξος ὀβολῶν τεσοδῶν (He promised the citizens that he would sell grain until the new harvest, a *medimos* of wheat at two drachmas four obols, and barley at one drachma four obols). GAUTNIER understands barvest, from the fields of a local landowner, in the place of VEIGANDNI's 10 ships: cf. C. VEIGANDNI, Ein hellenistisches Ehrendekret aus Gazoros, ZPE 51 (1983) 105–14, lines 3–4 (cf. J. and L. ROBERT, Bull.Épigr. [1984] 259): ἐπιτυχεῖσθαι τοῖς πολιταῖς κομῆτευσιν | ἕξος ἰ ἑσῶν ἄττον.

⁵⁷ Note ROSTOVETZKI's caution (SEHNW 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. CONER, Athenian Economy and Society: A Banking Perspective (Princeton 1992) 26–40 and DEM, Commercial Lending by Athenian Banks: Chionetic Fallacies and Forensic Methodology, CP 85 (1990) 177–90. REGG, Hesperia 63 (1994) 312–13, argues that grain prices in the Andrian text support a date in the third century. He rightly notes that the high prices adduced by SAUCIRE 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 *medimos* 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 II² 360 that five drachmas per *medimos* 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.

⁵⁸ Highest: the one certain price of 10 drachmas per *medimos* (IG XI.2 158.A.46–7), two lowest: the batch of locally grown grain sold at Gazoros for two drachmas four obols (SEG XXXIV 638.4–5) and the Numidian grain that was sold at three (IDélos II 442.A.100–2). Withholding the 10-drachma *medimos*, presumably as an aberration: P. GABRSEV, T. GALLANT and D. RAKHIBOV, Thessaly and the Grain Supply of Rome during the Second Century B.C., JRS 74 (1984) 30–44, 43 n. 55.

⁵⁹ IG XI.2 158.A.37–8 (6 dr. / med.), 39–40 (6 dr. 3 ob. / med.), 41 (6 dr. / med.), 42–3 (4 dr. 3 ob. / med.), 45 (7 dr. / med.); IDélos II 442.A.102–6 (4 dr. 1 ob. / med.).

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, Protogenes and others, was moved to action⁶⁰. The following restorations may serve as *examples of the sense* that should be restored to IG XII suppl. p. 119.1–4:

1. 3–4. . . . τῶν μεδίμνων τοῦ σίτου ὀρῶν κολοῦμενον πέντε[
[νομ] δαχμῶν πέντε [ἐν τῇ τροφῇ, εἰσόδων (?) ἐπιβολῇ]-
[οὐ τοῦ σίτου τοῦ ἑνέκαστοῦ εἰκοσὺν ἑξαδάκτυλ[?] [πέντε δραχμ]
4 [χρη]σὶν τοῦ μεδίμνου.

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*.

⁶⁰ If this interpretation is correct, the price that triggered a response from Antidotos is identical to the κοβερνικυία τιμὴ attested at Dem. 34.39, and the price at which grain was sold at IG II² 360.8–10, 29–30, 55–6, 67–8, where »[t]he figure of 5 dr cannot be simple coincidence but must represent something of a »normal (i.e. pre-inflationary) price«: V. J. ROSIVACH, *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 ΜΑΘΕΩΤΗ, *Prix et formation des prix* 38–9; A. BRASSON, *La cité marchande* (Bordeaux and Paris 2000) 183–210. Rescaz, *CIant* 12 (1993) 312–13, suggests on the strength of IG II² 1672.287, Dem. 34.39, IG II² 360.30, SEG XXIV 154.17–19, IG II² 400.8, 499.16–17 (restored by Rescaz 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 II² 1672 indicates season. ROSIVACH's »normal« may capture the sense; J. and L. ROBERT, *Bull. épigr.* (1968) 247 p. 458, favored this translation. Seasonal fluctuation is not incompatible with a notion of a normal price (cf. Rescaz, *CIant* 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, Protogenes and the Olbians or Antidotos and the Andrians.

On the phrasing compare IG V.2 437.11–12: τῶν πυρῶν ἐν ἀγορῇ τοῦ μεδίμνου παλοῦμένου – – στατήρων, ἐπιπλάσσει μεδίμνου; [χρη]σίου; ἰερίακορίου; I.Eph. V 1455.3–6: καταλαβὼν τὸν σίτον τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ παλοῦμενον πέντε δραχμῶν ἕξ; ... ἰερίακορε τὸν σίτον πάντα εὐκωλύον τοῦ ἐν τῇ ἀγορῇ παλοῦμένου; I.Erythrae I 28.36–37: καὶ τῷ μεδίμνω τῶν πυρῶν ἢ ὀρῶν διὰ τὴν στροδείαν παλοῦμενον δραχμῶν ἐξήκοντα. We would prefer to find ἐν ἀγορῇ between παλοῦμενον and δραχμῶν. Πέντε [καὶ δέκα] is conceivable as a number at 2 (cf. IG I³ 254.b.16; II² 839.46; II² 1668.11.30; IX.1² 1.2.11, 31, 32; XIV 645.1.141; CID II 109.fr.A.3). REGER dismissed, no doubt rightly, the likelihood that Antidotos would have been so lavishly honored⁶¹ for the delivery of a mere 20+ *medimnoi*⁶² and so suggested that εἰκοσὺν (3) refers to price, not volume. But εἰκοσὺν δ[ύ]ο, where we should expect εἰκοσι δύο, is dubious. I find no example of the numbers 22–25 with erroneous terminal *na*⁶³.

⁶¹ Though the lavishness of the honor rests on REGER's restoration χρη]σίου δραχμῶν (8), as the weight of Antidotos' honorary crown, where every previous editor had read: Ἀντιλκῶν; neither of the two photos (Rescaz, *Hesperia* 63 [1994] pl. 76) permits control. I am unable to confirm or refute the new reading in the IG squeeze. Rescaz notes that there is insufficient room at the end of line 7 for αὐτο, yet he prints »vocat« at the end of the line. Could the number of Attic drachmas have been painted in?

⁶² REGER, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 317: »We must read something like εἰκοσὺν [μεδίμνων] καὶ πέντε τῶν 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 Nuntidian king Masinissa 2,796 1/2 *medimnoi* of grain (1.Déllos II 442.A.100–2); this is usually assumed to have been a gift: C. VAL, *Déllos 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.

⁶³ REGER, *Hesperia* 63 (1994) 311, is sensitive to other orthographic matters, arguing that orthography indicates a third-century date for IG XII suppl. p. 119: »[T]he use of the diphthong εἰ for η (εἰ, line 16; δοκεῖ, line 13) ... does not appear in Cypeladic 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 too numerous to repay counting. Examples of δα δοκεῖ in the fifth and fourth centuries are not uncommon: IG I³ 21.77 (450/49), 40.51 (446/5), 41.A fragm. d/e, line 53 (ca. 446/5), 61.48–9 (424/3), 71.42 (425/4), 78.a.11, 15.24, 31 (ca. 422/7), 82.33 (421/0), 96.18 (412/11), 101 fragm. e-g, line 56 (410/09), 102.44 (410/09), 105.43 (ca. 409), 142.3 (440–410), 223.A.front.5, 9 (343/2). Moreover, ἀν δοκεῖ, in some variation of the formula found in the Andrian text, εἶνα θε ἀντιδότη[?] καὶ ἀλλο ἀγορῶν ἐπιπέθετα παρὰ τοῦ δήμου, ὄλ[?] τῶν ἀν δοκεῖ δέκος εἰκοσὺν ἢ (1–13), 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 II² 412.5 (after 336/5); SEG XXXII 81.4–5 (ca. 336/5–322/1); IG II² 360.75 (325/4). Third century: IG II² 1272.18–20 (283/2); SEG XXV 89.28–30 (282/1); IG II² 780.20–2 (ca. 246/1); IG XII.8.50.3 (Imbros ca. 220/II bc). Second century: IG II² 926.11–13 (ca. 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 ὄραος ἀν οὖν (4) is vastly more common in Attica than outside, where ὄραος οὖν 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 εἰκοσῶν. Wagons could work⁶⁴. Wagonloads of grain and other goods are widely attested⁶⁵. Wagons were a common means of military transport; perhaps the soldiers who assisted Antidotos drove the wagons up to the city⁶⁶. Maybe the wagons belonged to commercial agents⁶⁷. The definite article (τῶν οἴων τοῦ ξενικοῦ) 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; Reeger suggests that »[t]he reduced price was probably the 6 dr itself«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 γαλῶν[?]). A Delian decree from the late third century bans sale of certain on-board purchases (I.Délíos II 509): ἀνθρακός μῆδὲ πυροὺς μῆδὲ ξύλα ὄς ἀν μὴ χροῖται τοῖς σποδοῖς τοῖς ξυληγοῖς, μὴ κοκκίω· μῆτ' ἰσχυροῦνον ἐν Ἀρχῶν κοκκίω, μῆδὲ ὄβρα ἐν κοῖλῃ· ῥαλοῖται; see R. Descart, La loi délienne sur les bois et charbons et le rôle de Délíos comme marché, REA 103 (2000) 125–30. But twenty shiploads is a massive amount of grain, perhaps too massive; GAUTHER, BCH 111 (1987) 415, has pointed out that ῥαλοῖτα or ὀκκίδες should carry grain, not ῥῆς; 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. ἀμάξα 1.2, knew several: »c. gen., wagon-load, νετροῶν, οἴων, X.An.4.7.10, Cyr.2.4.18; ἐμάλεβρον Pl. *Enthalp* 299b; προσοῶν ἀμαξῶν βάρος E.Cyc.385, cf. 473«. Wagonloads of grain: Xen., *Anabasis* 1.10.18; Diodorus 17.81.1; Plutarch, Ἰουλιανὸς 17.3; Aeneas Tacticus 28.3.

⁶⁶ For the importance of wagons as land-transport see the well known early imperial decree by the governor of Galatia concerning requisitioned land-transport: SEG XXVI 1392 (S. Mitchell, JRS 66 [1976] 106–31 + ZPE 45 [1982] 99–100); on wagons see G. RAKERSAFT, *Chartes en terre cuite de l'époque archaïque de Corinthe*, AC 57 (1988) 56–88 esp. 80–8; IDEM, *Transport de bambous de colonies du Pentélique à Eleusis au IV^e siècle avant notre ère*, AC 53 (1984) 101–36. S. ISAGER and J. E. SKRUDSALAK, *Ancient Greek Agriculture: An Introduction* (London and New York 1995) pl. 3.3, p. 51, black-figure kylix featuring a donkey hauling large amphoras on a two-wheeled cart. Military transport: N. G. L. HAMMOND, *Army Transport in the Fifth and Fourth Centuries*, GRBS 24 (1983) 27–31, with numerous citations; Thucydides 5.72.3. Wagon roads: W. K. Pritchett, *Studies in Ancient Greek Topography: Part III (Roads)* (Berkeley 1980) 181–96, esp. 191 with numerous citations.

⁶⁷ Wagons seem now to have been read out of existence in the newly discovered text from Pistiros (after 359 BC): SEG XLIII 486.25–26: τοὺς ἐμπορίους τὰς ἀμάξας καὶ ὄνοβριον καὶ κλάειον, which V. CHANKOWSKI and L. DOMARADZKA, *Rédaction de l'inscription de Pistiros et problèmes d'interprétation*, BCH 122 (1999) 247–258 at 249, 251, now read as τοὺς ἐμπορίους τὰς ΑΠΑΣΕΙ[-?], καὶ ὄνοβριον καὶ κλάειον. Also L. Loukouidou, *Sur le statut et l'importance de l'emporion de Pistiros*, BCH 122 (1999) 359–371, at 363: ἀνάστατον· Cf. F. SALVIAT, *Le roi Kersobleptès, Maronée, Apollonia*, Thassos, Pistiros et l'histoire d'Hérodote, BCH 122 (1999) 259–273, at 277, and 266–267 on wagon transport.

⁶⁸ Reeger, *CIAnt* 12 (1993) 313–14.

Conclusion

If the precise wording of IG XII suppl. p. 119 cannot be pinned down certain details can. We may be confident that the decree followed the same pattern widely attested on stone, and that Antidotos' behavior did too. The inscription does not appear to tell a story of crisis, massive inflation, a heroic general and his selfless mercenaries. It appears instead to illuminate a much less dramatic set of events, the likes of which are well known and must have been common. Grain-prices started to climb. Before inflation spun out of control the Andrians and Antidotos negotiated a deal on which the latter purchased foreign grain, which he sold at reduced rates. The story is one of seasonal inflation and rational management of the grain market.⁶⁹

Duke University

JOSHUA D. SOSIN

⁶⁹ I am grateful to KENT RIGSBY and ALAIN BRASSON for helpful criticism, and to KLAUS HALLOF who generously granted me access to the squeeze of IG XII suppl. p. 119 held in the IG collection of the BBAW.