

THE DATE AND HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE OF *IG XII v 714* OF ANDROS

(PLATE 76)

AN INSCRIPTION FROM ANDROS, *IG XII v 714* as emended, restored, and dated by Theophil Sauciuc (cf. *IG XII*, Suppl., p. 119), has provided an important piece of evidence for Athenian treatment of its allies under the Second Athenian Confederacy.¹ The inscription (see pp. 318–319 below) preserves a decree of the Andrians in honor of Ἀντίδοτος [---ο]υς, who is praised and granted a crown “on account of his excellence and benevolence toward the demos of the Andrians,” ἀρετῆς ἔνεκεν καὶ εὐν[ολίας τ]ῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀνδρῶν (lines 8–9). While much of the text describing the precise character of his benefactions is lost, enough remains to support the inference that he arranged for the sale of grain, [τ]οῦ σίτου τοῦ ξενικοῦ (line 3), at a reduced price (cf. lines 1, 4), probably of five drachmai (dr) per medimnos (med; line 2).² Along with Antidotos are praised “the soldiers who proved useful to the demos and worked with him to make the grain cheaper in the city,” τοῦ[ς] στρατιώτας, ὅσοι τὰς χρείας παρέσχοντο τῶι δῆ[μωι] καὶ συνήργησαν εἰς τὸ σῖτον εὐμαρεστέρο[ν εἶναι] ἐν τεῖ πόλει (lines 13–16).

The inscription was first published in 1876 in a very unreliable text, without remarks on the date or historical context.³ Pernice later suggested a date of the 4th century; of the content he wrote only that it was impossible to tell what events of war were being referred to.⁴ Friedrich Hiller von Gaertringen was the first to offer a specific date and historical context. He associated the events in the text with the expulsion from Andros in 308 B.C. of a garrison, presumably Antigonid, by Ptolemaios I during his operations in the Aegean and Greece (Diodorus Siculus 20.37.1).⁵ In 1911, after a reexamination of the stone and supported by powerful arguments, Sauciuc proposed instead to associate the decree with the activities of an Athenian garrison imposed on the island perhaps in the 360’s but certainly in place by the Social War and commanded by an Athenian strategos; the arrangement would have been similar to the garrison known from Arkesine on Amorgos, commanded in the 350’s by Androtion (*IG II*² 123 = Tod 1948, no. 156; *IG XII vii 5* = Tod 1948, no. 152). Antidotos

¹ For permission to study inscriptions of the Cyclades I am grateful to the Ephor of the Cyclades, Photini Zaphiropoulou. William D. E. Coulson, Director of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, offered me every assistance during my research trips in 1988, 1990, and 1991. For assistance on Andros in 1988, I thank Maria Korre, Director of the Archaeological Museum; for assistance on Tenos in 1991, I am indebted to Vaglista Desipri and my research assistant, Jennifer Chi. The comments of the two anonymous readers for *Hesperia* caught several errors and helped me to tighten my arguments; my gratitude in no way implicates them in the final results. My work was supported by grants from the National Endowment for the Humanities and Trinity College.

² Thus, Sauciuc 1911, pp. 9–10.

³ Weil 1876, pp. 239–241. Cf. Dragatsis 1881, pp. 794–795.

⁴ Pernice 1893, p. 15.

⁵ *IG XII v 714*, p. 203.

would then have been an Athenian general and the soldiers of the inscription the garrison troops referred to in *IG II*² 123. As far as I can tell, Sauciuc's dating and interpretation have been universally accepted.⁶

Sauciuc marshaled three main arguments to support his dating. He suggested that the abundant evidence for grain shortages in Athens in the latter half of the 4th century provided a suitable context for Antidotos' benefaction toward the Andrians. He found parallels in the nomenclature of officials in Athens and on Andros which he argued could only have resulted from close ties between the two states; changes in this nomenclature in Athens, he further asserted, justified a narrowing of the date to *ca.* 360 to 318/7. Finally, he pointed to the Athenian garrison already known for Andros during the period of the Social War, perhaps indeed precisely to 357/6 B.C. (see further, pp. 314–315 below), and argued that the events the inscription describes could best be explained by attributing them to the commander and troops of that garrison.⁷ These arguments are of very uneven force. There are, however, two further dating criteria which have received only scanty attention even though they offer the potential of providing an independent date: the forms of the letters and the orthography of the inscription.

LETTER FORMS AND ORTHOGRAPHY

On the letter forms of *IG XII v* 714, Sauciuc quotes Dragatsis, who described the lettering as "of good period", and Pernice, who put the inscription "probably in the fourth century" (both without discussion). Hiller von Gaertringen, who noted the bowed-bar alphas, attributed it either to the 4th century, following Pernice, or to the first half of the 3rd. Of the alphas Sauciuc himself remarked, "The middle stroke of the alpha is practically always straight, only curved a few times, so that the letters can easily belong to the second half of the fourth century."⁸

This is not entirely accurate. In fact, the bowed alphas outnumber those with straight bars by more than two to one. The rest of the letters are important, too. Thetas have both central dots and strokes. Omicrons are invariably small and never fully rounded. Pis with short right strokes and with full right strokes are both present; those with short strokes also display an overhang on the right of the top stroke, which is decorated at the end with a forked apex. Both mus and sigmas are splayed. "Big" letters like eta, mu, nu, and sigma often have curved strokes. Many of the letters are decorated with either simple dots at the ends of strokes or with small forked apices (Pl. 76:b).

⁶ Busolt and Swoboda 1920–1926, II, p. 1376, note 3 ("Ios" is a misprint for "Andros"), cf. I, pp. 478–479, note 5, giving "before 318/7" (cf. Sauciuc 1911, p. 16) without explicit reference to Sauciuc; *RE* Suppl. VI, 1935, col. 887, *s.v.* Sitos (F. Heichelheim); *IG XII*, Suppl., p. 119 (F. Hiller von Gaertringen) ("a. 318" must be a misprint for "a. 308"); Accame 1941, pp. 184–185; *KIPauly* I, 1979, col. 1539, *s.v.* Andros (E. Meyer); Cargill 1981, p. 158, note 28; Nigdelis 1990, p. 240, note 194; Brun 1993, p. 186. Develin (1989, p. 279) lists "? Antidotos" under the strategoi for 356/5 B.C. on the basis of *IG XII v* 714 but writes, "He is supposed as general on Andros in the Social War period, which must remain in doubt." McDonald (1943, p. 157, with note 138), not knowing Sauciuc, dates the text to the "late fourth or early third century B.C."

⁷ Sauciuc 1911, pp. 10–19.

⁸ Dragatsis 1881, p. 794; Pernice 1893, p. 15; Hiller in *IG XII v*, p. 203; Sauciuc 1911, pp. 14–15. There is nothing on letter forms in Weil 1876, pp. 239–240.

This lettering has a distinctly 3rd-century flavor. The bowed alpha occurs by *ca.* 250 B.C. on Delos, in the second half of the 3rd century on Paros, and on Ios probably at about the same time or a bit later (last third of the century?). On Andros' neighbor Tenos, the appearance of bowed alphas is harder to date precisely, but there can be no doubt that they did not begin before the 3rd century.⁹ Pis with short right strokes appear in Athens and on Delos during the second quarter of the 3rd century; a projecting horizontal stroke likewise points toward the mid- or later 3rd century. Splayed sigmas and mus can be found throughout the 3rd century, although in general they tend to be earlier rather than later.¹⁰ On the whole, the lettering points to a date in the mid-3rd century rather than in the mid-4th.¹¹

Another characteristic of the text which could bear on the date¹² is the use of the diphthong εῖ for ῆι (τεῖ, line 16; δοκεῖ, line 13). The form 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.¹³ The presence of εῖ in *IG XII v 714* would seem to speak strongly against a date as early as 357/6 or indeed before the end of the 4th century. If this text were to be assigned to a date only on the basis of the lettering and orthography, it would probably belong to the second or third quarter of the 3rd century.

The conclusions reached on the basis of the lettering and orthography cannot stand if other, better criteria demand a different date. It must be admitted, however, that dating *IG XII v 714* to the mid-4th century would radically upset long-held views about the development of lettering styles in the Hellenistic period. The implications are considerably more profound than the long-standing dispute, recently reinvigorated,¹⁴ over the date in the 5th century at which the Athenians stopped using three-barred sigmas. In that case the difference in date is only twenty or thirty years, whereas for *IG XII v 714* it is about a century; in the Athenian case there are numerous inscriptions whose letter-form dates

⁹ *IG XI ii 206, 287; IG XI iv 1052, Tabula III; cf. ID 313, 320, 353, and 372 (235–200 B.C.) apud IG XI 3, Tabulae I–III; ID 401 (189 B.C.). IG XI vi 1105 has bowed alphas only; cf. the photograph at Queyrel 1989, p. 294, pl. 32. J. Tréheux (apud Queyrel 1989, pp. 287–288) associates the lettering of this stone with *IG XI ii 287* (250 B.C.), but there are differences. Paros: *IG XII v 111, 445* (mixed with broken bars), Lambrinudakis and Wörrle 1983, pp. 283–368, *SEG XV 517*. Ios: *IG XII v 2, 1002, 1011*, which share the same rogorator. Tenos: *IG XII v 798, 814, 825* (autopsy), *IG XII, Suppl. 313* (cf. sketch at Graindor 1910, p. 45; Hiller's date at *IG XII, Suppl.*, p. 138), Etienne 1990, no. 4, pp. 102–106, pl. XI, no. 25, pp. 267–268, pl. XIV:2.*

¹⁰ Pis: Larfeld 1902, pp. 470–474; on Delos, *IG XI iv 562, 280–270 B.C.*, Tab. I (equal), 543 (early 3rd century), Tab. II, 1050 (250 B.C.), Tab. III, 681–682 (240–220 B.C.), Tab. I (shorter right); 1072 (early 3rd century), Tab. VI, 1049, Tab. III; cf. also *SEG XV 517* (Paros); on Tenos, *IG XII v 873* (photo at Etienne 1990, pl. XII:1), *IG XII, Suppl. 313* (shorter right, no overhang), *IG XII v 814*, Etienne 1990, no. 4, pp. 102–106, (shorter right, overhang), *IG XII v 798*, Etienne 1990, no. 25, pp. 267–268 (both). Sigmas and mus: on Delos, *ID 338* (224 B.C.); on Paros, *IG XII v 111, SEG XV 517*; on Tenos, *IG XII v 798, 816, 825, 873, IG XII, Suppl. 313*, Etienne 1990, no. 4, pp. 102–106. Further on the lettering of Hellenistic Cycladic inscriptions, see Reger 1994, pp. 35–39 (N.B., at p. 58, “facing south” should read “facing west”).

¹¹ On the very similar letter forms of *IG XII v 715*, which belongs securely to the 3rd century and probably to roughly the third quarter, see Sherwin-White 1982, p. 68, note 65, pl. 11:b.

¹² Noted by Pernice (1893, p. 15) but not further discussed.

¹³ Knitl 1938, p. 21; for Athens, Threatte 1980, pp. 374–378. See also Henry 1964, pp. 240–241; Schwyzler 1938, pp. 201–202.

¹⁴ Chambers *et al.* 1990, pp. 38–63; see also Mattingly 1992, pp. 129–138. *Contra*, Henry 1992, pp. 137–146.

various scholars had questioned for various reasons, whereas here we have only a single inscription. Sauciuc's arguments must therefore be especially compelling for us to set aside the clear evidence of the lettering, corroborated by the orthography. Now that we have seen that there is reason to doubt Sauciuc's date, we can consider the substance of his case.

ARGUMENTS FOR A DATE IN THE MID-4TH CENTURY

Grain crisis and prices

Sauciuc adduces the new importance of imported grain in the second half of the 4th century as evidence for the importance of Antidotos' beneficence to the Andrians. Owing, he says, to the activities of the Macedonians "grain prices rose considerably and the provisioning of the city [*sc.* Athens] became very uncertain." The evidence he cites for rising prices, however, dates exclusively to the period of serious and prolonged grain shortages at Athens in the 330's and 320's. Prices of 16 dr for these years have no bearing on putative prices in the 350's.¹⁵ Further, the handful of prices known for Athens before the growing crises of the last third of the 4th century¹⁶ are virtually impossible to interpret without a much better sense of the short- and long-term price trends. Some evidence does point toward a sense among the Athenians that 5–6 dr was a reasonable price for wheat soon after harvest; this may be what the expression ἡ καθεστηκυῖα τιμὴ refers to.¹⁷ If this price level was typical, then at 5 drachmai per medimnos the Andrians would not have been getting much of a bargain in the mid-4th century.

In the 3rd century, prices of 6–4 dr/med for wheat are very common again, not, however, as market prices but as administered or set prices.¹⁸ Perhaps most interesting for our purposes is a price of 4 dr from Pergamon, which was fixed for mercenary soldiers as a part of the benefits they exacted from their employer.¹⁹ Non-administered prices were typically much higher in the 3rd century. By a stroke of good luck, there is solid evidence from Andros' nearby Cycladic neighbor, Delos. In 282 B.C. wheat there cost 4.5–10 dr/med and barley (*alphita*), 4–5 dr/med. These prices have often been thought to reflect a shortage, but prices of 5.1 dr for *alphita* in 258 B.C., 3.1–5.1 dr for *alphita* in 250 B.C., 3.8 dr in 247, 6.2 in 246, and 3.1 in 224 argue rather that the figures for wheat prices in 282 were low for the mid-3rd century. In the one case where we have directly comparable prices for wheat and *alphita* on Delos, the price ratio is 2.75:1 (174 B.C.). No such directly comparable prices survive for the 3rd century, but prices of 282 B.C. for first wheat and then *alphita* in consecutive months imply, roughly, a ratio of about 2.5:1. At these ratios, the many barley (*alphita*) prices just cited would imply wheat prices of roughly 8–17 dr, and indeed for the 3rd century Delos

¹⁵ Sauciuc 1911, pp. 11 (quotation), 11–13 (evidence). Garnsey 1988, pp. 154–162. Demosthenes 34.39.

¹⁶ Wheat: 6 dr, early 4th century, *IG* II² 1356, line 17; barley as *alphita*: 4 dr, mid-4th century, *IG* II² 1358, lines 45, 50. See *RE* Suppl. VI, 1935, *s.v.* Sitos (F. Heichelheim); Jardé 1925, pp. 179–181.

¹⁷ Wheat at 6 or 5 dr: *IG* II² 1672, line 287; Demosthenes 34.39; *IG* II² 360, line 30. Figueira 1986, p. 165; see also Seager 1966, pp. 172–184, Ampolo 1986, p. 147, Reger 1993, pp. 312–313.

¹⁸ *IG* II² 1672, line 287, cf. 297, 298, 6 dr, 329/8 B.C., a year of shortage; cf. Garnsey 1988, pp. 154–162. *Syll.*³ 976, lines 25–26, minimum price of 5 dr 2 obols, Samos, late 3rd/early 2nd century or *ca.* 260 B.C., Gargola 1992, pp. 12–28; Tracy 1990b, p. 92 and 1990a, pp. 97–100. *Syll.*³ 495, lines 24–25, 5 dr, Olbia, *ca.* 230 B.C. *IG* V ii 437, line 6, 5 dr 3 obols, Messenia, *ca.* 100 B.C.

¹⁹ *OGIS* 266, lines 3–4 (*ca.* 260–250 B.C.). See Launey 1949–1950, II, pp. 739–741; Virgilio 1982, pp. 131–132.

preserves several wheat prices of 10–11 dr/med. We may cautiously conclude that, typically, wheat probably cost 8–12 dr/med in the Cyclades in the 3rd century.²⁰ Under such a price regime a price of 5 dr for wheat would have been a real benefaction.

Administrative officials

Sauciuc derived a *terminus ante quem* for the inscription from the titles of two secretaries mentioned in it, according to his restorations. The first was the secretary of the boule, who was enjoined to announce the award of Antidotos' crown at the Dionysiac festival: τὸν δὲ γρα[μμα]τέα τῆς βουλῆς ἀναγγεῖλαι τόνδε τὸν στέφαν[ον Διο]γυσίοις τραγωιδῶν τῶι ἄγῶνι (lines 9–11). The second was the secretary of the prytaneis, whose duty was “to inscribe this decree on a stone stele and set it up in the agora in front of the bouleuterion” (lines 16–19). Sauciuc pointed out that officials with the same titles appear also at Athens. There the secretary of the boule, who occurs in Attic decrees of the 5th and 4th centuries, was complemented between 358 and 354 B.C. by a new secretary, the γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν. They recur together for the next several decades; then after 318/7 B.C. the secretary of the boule disappears. Since, as Sauciuc argued, Andros was closely bound to Athens in the later 4th century, the Andrians must have taken their magistrates' titles from Athens. Thus *IG XII v 714* cannot date after 318/7 (the last attestation of the secretary of the boule) nor (by implication) before 358, the date of Sauciuc's first attestation of the Athenian γραμματεὺς ὁ κατὰ πρυτανείαν, which Sauciuc takes to be equivalent to the Andrian γραμματεὺς τῶν πρυτάνεων.²¹

There is no reason to suppose, however, that the Andrians must have borrowed Athenian titles and duties for their officials just because they were under Athenian hegemony, and in any case, discoveries since Sauciuc wrote have demolished his dichotomy at Athens between the secretary of the boule and the secretary κατὰ πρυτανείαν; we now know that both expressions refer to the same official.²² Moreover, there is a problem with the duties assigned to the Andrian secretaries. In a certainly 4th-century *stoichedon* inscription of Andros, *IG XII, Suppl. 245*, the task of inscribing the decree is assigned to the secretary of the boule (lines 10–11). This official disappears from 3rd-century documents, however,

²⁰ Sources: *IG XI* ii 158A, lines 37–50 (282 B.C.), 224A, line 29 (258 B.C.), 287A, lines 45, 59–60, 64, 66, 67–68, 71 (250 B.C.), *ID* 291b+, lines 55, 82 (247 B.C., see Vallois 1944, pp. 37–38, note 2), 290, lines 82, 97–98 (246 B.C.), 338Aa, line 35 (224 B.C.); *ID* 442A, line 220 (179 B.C.), 445, lines 4–5, 13 (178 B.C.) 452, line 9 (177 B.C.), 440A, lines 62–63, 69, giving both wheat and barley (174 B.C.), 461Bb, line 53 (169 B.C.); see Larsen 1938, pp. 347–348. Except for *IG XI* ii 158, prices are recorded for *krithai*, raw barley; I have converted to price equivalents for *alphita* by multiplying by 1.54, reckoning a milling loss of 35 percent (Foxhall and Forbes 1982, p. 46). The figures at *IG XI* ii 224A, line 29 and *ID* 338Aa, line 35 were read by me from the stones in the summer of 1990. *ID* 291b+ indicates the complex *ID* 291b + 292 + 306 + 291c + 291e + 294 (line 55 = 291b, line 25; line 82 = 291c, line 10 + 291e, line 10). These joins were first noted by Davis (1936, p. 109) but have never been fully published. I hope to offer a complete text in another context.

For the shortage, Glotz 1913, pp. 19–20; Jardé 1925, pp. 169–173; Heichelheim 1930, p. 51; *RE* Suppl. VI, 1935, cols. 857–858, *s.v.* Sitos (F. Heichelheim); Larsen 1938, pp. 383–384; Rostovtzeff 1941, pp. 168–169; Roebuck 1945, pp. 159–161; Clinton 1971, pp. 110–111; Shear 1978, p. 31; Foxhall and Forbes 1982, pp. 53–55; Garnsey 1988, p. 25; Couilloud-Le Dinahet 1990, pp. 134–137; Reger 1993, pp. 304–314. See Drexhage 1991, pp. 18–19 on fluctuations around harvest time.

²¹ Sauciuc 1911, pp. 15–16.

²² *IG II*² 120, lines 13–19, *SEG XIX* 129, lines 13–14, *IG II*² 138, 139; see Rhodes 1972, pp. 136–137.

and the duty of overseeing the inscription of decrees devolved first on the secretary of the prytaneis, exactly as in *IG XII v 714*,²³ and then on the secretary of the generals.²⁴ Finally, the presence of *two* secretaries in the inscription raises additional suspicions. The secretary of the prytaneis is charged, as secretaries generally were, with overseeing the inscribing of the document (lines 16–17). It seems odd that another secretary should intrude here in a very different and wholly unexampled role.

Examination of the stone confirms these suspicions. There is in fact no room to restore τὸν δὲ γρα[μ|μα|τέα τῆς β]ουλῆς. The right edge of the stone at line 9 cannot accommodate three broad letters. Nor could the space at the beginning of line 10 take any more than four letters; there is no room to move part of the word down a line (as in γρα[μ|μα|τέα]). Moreover, the traces at the end of line 9 do not correspond to ΓΠΑ. The first letter consists of a vertical with a clear node at its midpoint, from which a line sloping up to the right emerges: an unambiguous kappa. The next letter is an eta; the crossbar and parts of the verticals are clearly visible. The following letter is very hard to read, but the traces correspond to a rho. We have, then, not ΓΠΑ but KHP and must restore τὸν δὲ κῆρ[υκ|α τῆς β]ουλῆς, the herald of the boule. The herald was a common public office in the Cyclades. The Delians had a herald of the ekklesia, an office often occupied by a prominent politician.²⁵ Sacred heralds on Syros and on Amorgos at Minoa and Aigiale announced crowns publicly (*IG XII v 653*, lines 47–50; *IG XII vii 228*, lines 8–10, 231, lines 37–38, 235, lines 7–8, 237, lines 33–35, 258 [Minoa], 386, lines 36–40, 389, lines 33–36 [Aigiale]). Aigiale on Amorgos offers the best parallel, in an inscription in which the secretary (unfortunately not further identified) writes up the names of people elected to administer a foundation, while the herald announces publicly at the games the crown awarded to the man who has contributed the capital (*IG XII vii 515*, lines 99–101). Thus Sauciuc's strongest argument for a date in the mid-4th century collapses.

Presence of an Athenian garrison on Andros

The Athenians imposed a garrison on Andros in the mid-4th century, as a number of texts demonstrate. In *IG II² 123* (= Tod 1948, no. 156), of 357/6 B.C., the Athenians appoint one of their ten generals to be in charge of Andros and require one Archedemos to exact from the island members of the Second Athenian League contributions which were to be used to pay the salaries of the soldiers on Andros “so that Andros would be safe for the demos of the Athenians and for the demos of the Andrians, and that the garrison troops (φρουροί) on Andros should have their pay from the contributions in accord with the decree of the allies, and that the garrison (φυλακῆ) should not fall apart” (lines 7–13). According to Aischines (1.107), Timarchos bought the archonship over Andros for thirty mnai, or half a talent. If the longer passage of Aischines in which this accusation is embedded

²³ *IG XII v 715*, line 7; for discussion of the content, see Sherwin-White 1982, pp. 67–70.

²⁴ *IG XII v 716*, lines 9–10, 717, line 9 with *IG XII*, Suppl., p. 120, *IG XII*, Suppl. 246, line 7, restored in *IG XII*, Suppl. 248D, lines 42–43. Of these texts, one is clearly 2nd century (Suppl. 48), one probably 2nd century (717, cf. the lemma at *IG XII*, Suppl., p. 120), and one late 3rd (Suppl. 46). Only *IG XII v 716* looks as though it could be earlier than 715. The secretary of the boule and demos reappears in the later text *IG XII v 721* at lines 21–22. See Nigdelis 1990, pp. 240–241.

²⁵ Vial 1984, pp. 261–262.

(1.106–112) recounts Timarchos' offices in chronological order, then the garrison will have been planted by, probably, 363/2.²⁶ Relations between Athens and Andros in the later 4th century are attested also by the gift of a crown to Athens by the Andrians in 348/7 (*IG II²* 1441, lines 12–13) and the award of an honorary decree by the Athenians to an Andrian in 338/7 (*IG II²* 238). Since Sauciuc assigned a *terminus ante quem* of 318/7 to *IG XII v 714*, he naturally associated its honorand with the Athenian garrison.²⁷

The preserved text of *IG XII v 714*, however, includes nothing that specifically indicates that the persons there honored were associated with this garrison. Antidotos is never called an Athenian (except in Sauciuc's fully restored first line). The men honored with him are called soldiers, στρατιώται, not garrison troops, φρουροί, as in the Athenian text (*IG II²* 123, line 10).²⁸ There is no mention of a garrison, φρουρή, at all. It is instructive to compare this text with the decree of Arkesine on Amorgos honoring Androtion, commander of the garrison there (*IG XII vii 5* = Tod 1948, no. 152).²⁹ Androtion "ruled the city", ἄρξαζ τῆς πόλεως (line 4), language that echoes Aischines' phrase about Timarchos, who "ruled in Andros", ἤρξε ἐν Ἄνδρω (1.107). Androtion "paid the cost of the salary for the garrison troops out of his own pocket for the city, which was at a loss," τὸν μισθὸν τοῖς φρουροῖς ἀπορού<σ>ηι τῆι πόλει παρ' ἑαυτοῦ προαναλώσας (lines 9–10), language again similar to that of *IG II²* 123, lines 9–11: ὅπως – ἔχ[ωσ]ιν ο[ί] φρουροὶ οἱ ἐν Ἄ[νδρω]ι μισ[θὸ]ν ἐκ τῶν συντάξεων. There are no such echoes in the Andrian decree.

The years of the 350's were not the only time Andros saw foreign troops or garrisons. In 333, at the beginning of Alexander's war against Persia, the Persian admiral Pharnabazos imposed garrisons on Andros and Siphnos; both were certainly soon removed (Q. Curtius 4.1.37, 5.14). In 308 Ptolemaios I expelled from Andros a garrison undoubtedly stationed there by Antigonos Monophthalmos and Demetrios some years before (Diodorus Siculus 20.37.1). In 287 Andros served as the staging ground for troops led by Kallias of Sphettos against the Macedonian garrison in Athens. Among his other acts, Kallias arranged for a sizable donation of grain to the Athenians from his Ptolemaic superiors.³⁰ Although no garrison or troops are explicitly attested for the Chremonidean War, it would not be surprising if Andros joined Keos and the little island off Sounion, called Patroklos' island, as staging grounds for attacks on Attika.³¹ By 250 at the latest, Antigonos Gonatas had installed a garrison on Andros that inconvenienced Aratos of Sikyon during his secret trip to Egypt to plead for Ptolemaic support (Plutarch, *Aratos* 12.2–3). This garrison may have been maintained through the second half of the 3rd century,³² for Philip V controlled the island at the start of the Second Macedonian War. His garrison was in turn expelled by joint Pergamene-Rhodian action and the island awarded to Attalos as a war prize (Livy 31.15.8,

²⁶ Cawkwell 1981, pp. 51–52 and note 47, followed by Develin 1989, p. 264, giving 363/2 B.C.; doubts are expressed by Welsh (1991, p. 147, note 32).

²⁷ Sauciuc 1911, pp. 16–18.

²⁸ The use of στρατιώται later (line 18) must be understood in light of this more specific designation.

²⁹ See also Migeotte 1984, pp. 166–168.

³⁰ Shear 1978, p. 2, lines 20 (troops on Andros), 50–55 (grain).

³¹ Robert 1960, pp. 132–176; Cherry and Davis 1991, pp. 9–28; Pausanias 1.1.1. McCredie 1966; Heinen 1972, pp. 152–167. For a possible Ptolemaic garrison on Hydra, see Habicht 1992, pp. 88–90.

³² Holleaux 1942, p. 65, note 1.

45.2–7). The Attalids stationed their own troops there, probably until Andros fell under Roman control after the death of Attalos III and the revolt of Aristonikos.³³

The benefactions of Antidotos and his troops therefore need not belong in the 4th century; there are plenty of occasions for them which better fit the letter forms of the decree. On the basis of the lettering alone, a date of about the second or, even better, the third quarter of the 3rd century would be ideal. Antidotos would then fall either under the years of Ptolemaic supremacy in the Cyclades (288–261) or during the period of the Antigonid garrison under Gonatas or one of his successors.

The identity of Antidotos

It would be possible to offer another independent criterion for dating *IG XII v 714* if we could identify the honorand Antidotos, but unfortunately this remains an unsolved problem. Those who accept Sauciuc's date have not offered an Athenian candidate.³⁴ If the inscription actually belongs to a non-Athenian garrison of the Hellenistic period, the field of candidates becomes commensurately wider.

HISTORICAL INTERPRETATION

It should now be clear that Sauciuc's date for *IG XII v 714* can no longer be accepted. In the absence of any reasons for putting the inscription in the mid-4th century, the letter forms and orthography must be decisive, and these point unambiguously toward the middle of the 3rd century, indeed perhaps precisely toward the third quarter. Sauciuc's historical interpretation of the text likewise collapses. Before I can offer a replacement (which must remain tentative and somewhat speculative in the face of our exiguous evidence for the history of Andros in the mid- and later 3rd century), two further problems must be addressed: the meaning of the phrase τοῦ σίτου τοῦ ξενικοῦ (line 3) and the restoration of lines 3–4.

Sauciuc clearly understands τοῦ σίτου τοῦ ξενικοῦ to refer to imported grain, that is, grain not homegrown and so “foreign”, as in “foreign wine”, οἶνος ξενικός.³⁵ This is possible, but the presence on Andros of troops raises the possibility that ξενικός here means “having to do with mercenaries” and the phrase refers rather to the grain bought for the sustenance of the troops (e.g., *IG II² 1281*, line 8).

Sauciuc understands the phrase εἴκοσιν [---]ον (lines 3–4) to express the amount of grain that Antidotos supplied. It must be admitted that at less than thirty medimnoi, the amount would have been extraordinarily small. Thirty medimnoi might feed about fifty people for a month; “generosity” at such a piddling level would hardly seem to justify the award of a gold crown worth, by my restoration, 1000 drachmai (see below, at commentary on line 8). In other cases where persons are honored for supplying grain, the amounts are never less than 500 medimnoi and generally fall well over 1000 medimnoi.³⁶ Further, the

³³ Sauciuc 1914, pp. 83–88.

³⁴ Develin 1989, p. 279.

³⁵ Cf. Alexis, frag. 290 (T. Kock, *Comicorum atticorum fragmenta*, Leipzig 1880–1888, II, p. 515); Diphlios, frag. 32.27 (Kock, *op. cit.*, p. 550).

³⁶ *IG XI iv 627*, line 9, 500 med; *IG II² 360*, lines 9, 11, two lots of 3000 med each; *IG II² 408*, 4000 med; *IG II² 654*, lines 26–27, 7500 med; *IG II² 657*, line 13, 10,000 med; Demosthenes 34.39, more than 10,000 med; *IG II² 653*, lines 23–34, 15,000 med.

exact language that Sauciuc's understanding of these lines requires would be rather strange. We must read something like εἴκοσιν [μεδίμνους καὶ πέμπτ]ον τοῦ μεδίμνου.³⁷ 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. note 36).

A possible solution to these many problems arises out of the observation that the first legible letter of line 4 is not omicron but omega; the right foot is clearly visible on the stone. This reading suggests a restoration of [δρα|χμ]ῶν τοῦ μεδίμνου, that is to say, a price rather than an amount. This price should be the current market price, which I would associate with the figure "twenty" of line 3. After εἴκοσιν I was able to read three more letters: delta, omicron, and a third letter with a diagonal stroke that at first resembled a nu but which I would interpret rather as part of an alpha. The traces suggest εἴκοσιν δ[ύ]ο [δρ]α; the two lines might, for example, have read something like [πωλουμένου ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ τ]οῦ σίτου τοῦ ξενικοῦ εἴκοσιν δ[ύ]ο [δρ]α[χμ]ῶν τοῦ μεδίμνου, "when grain for the troops was selling in the agora for twenty-two drachmai per medimnos"; compare, for example, *Inscripfen griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien*, 15, *Die Inscripten von Ephesos*, Teil 5, Bonn 1980, no. 1455, lines 2–3 (*Syll.*³ 354): σῖτον εἰσαγαγῶν εἰς τὴν πόλιν πυρῶν ἐκτεῖς μυρίους τετρακισχιλίους καὶ καταλαβῶν τὸν σῖτον τὸν ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πωλούμενομ πλέονος δραχμῶν ἕξς. Prices as high as twenty or more drachmai during crises were hardly unheard of. At various times in the last third of the 4th century prices are reported at Athens of 16 dr for wheat, 18 dr for barley (which implies a far higher price for wheat), and 32 dr again for wheat. Plutarch gives an extraordinary price of 300 dr during the siege of Demetrios Poliorketes in 295/4, which, though clearly unparalleled, gives a sense of how high prices might rise during a blockade.³⁸ Since there seems to have been a general sense that wheat prices of about 6 dr/med were normal at Athens immediately after the harvest in the late 4th century, these high prices show unmistakably that a doubling of price or worse was far from unusual during a crisis. The typical wheat price on Delos during the 3rd and 2nd centuries was 10–11 dr/med. A price for wheat of about 22 dr on Andros in the 3rd century during a crisis, while certainly a very clear indication of extraordinary problems, is well within the range of possibility. Further, supplying grain for 5 dr during such a crisis would certainly have entitled Antidotus to the generous gift of a gold crown worth 1000 dr with which he was honored.

If this general understanding of lines 3–4 is correct, then the preceding lines must have contained the amount of grain Antidotus gave and its price, 5 dr. Sauciuc's restorations at lines 1–3 probably capture in part the general sense, although they must be taken as *exempli gratia*, not as the actual text of the inscription; in particular, they leave no place for the amount of grain sold at the reduced price.³⁹

With this understanding of the text, it is possible to offer a suggestion as to the circumstances that gave rise to Antidotus' honors. I want to stress that this interpretation must remain speculative in view of the uncertainties surrounding the restoration of the first few lines of the inscription, the loss of the beginning of the text, and our ignorance of the

³⁷ This seems to be the only restoration that could possibly meet the space restrictions, for there is room at the beginning of line 4 for no more than 2 or 3 letters. But at 15 letters the restoration is in fact too long for line 3, which can only accommodate 8 to 11 letters after εἴκοσιν.

³⁸ Demosthenes 34.39, 42.20 and 31; [Aristotle] *Oik.* 1352b, line 19; Plutarch, *Dem.* 33.6.

³⁹ Sauciuc's lines a–b, on the other hand, are fantasy and should be wholly rejected.

honorand's identity. Nevertheless, events analogous to those I outline below recurred again and again in the Hellenistic world; their repetition on Andros would be commonplace.

Andros was the site of a foreign garrison, perhaps of Ptolemaic origin after the liberation of Athens or of Macedonian origin after the Chremonidean War, under the command of one Antidotos son of ---es. 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 σῆτος ξενικός) at the price the troops paid, in effect, to receive a subsidy from Antidotos' employer. Antidotos and his troops consented (hence the emphasis on the troops' cooperation, lines 14–16). This very substantial benefit led the Andrians to honor their benefactor with a gold crown worth 1000 dr.

TEXT AND COMMENTARY

The stele, which tapers, is preserved on both sides and the bottom; the top is broken. H. 0.385; W. 0.32 (top), 0.34 (bottom); Th. 0.08–0.085 m. Letters: 0.005 (omicron) to 0.01 m.

Ed. Weil 1876, pp. 239–240, no. 3; Dragatsis 1881, pp. 794–795 (as if new); Pernice 1893, pp. 14–15, no. 15; *IG XII v* 714; Sauciuc 1911; *IG XII, Suppl.*, p. 119. In my text, I underline letters read by Sauciuc but which have since disappeared; for my readings which differ from his, see the commentary.

- ³⁻⁴ τ]ον μέδ[ιμνον -----
²⁻³] δραχμῶν πέντε -----
 [. . τ]οῦ σῆτου τοῦ ξενικοῦ εἴκοσιν δ[ύ]ο [δρ]α-
 5 [χμ]ῶν τοῦ μεδιμνου· ὅπως ἂν οὖν εἰδῶσιν πάν[τες]
 [ὅτι ἐ]πίσταται ὁ δῆμος χάριτας ἀξίας ἀποδιδ[ό]-
 [ναι τοῖς] εὐεργέταις, ἐπαινέσαι μὲν Ἀντιδοτ[ον]
 [-⁴⁻⁵ ο]υς καὶ στεφανῶσαι χρυσῶι στεφάνωι *vacat*
 [ἀπὸ χι]λίων δραχμῶν ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ εὖν[οί]-
 [ας τ]ῆς εἰς τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀνδρίων· τὸν δὲ κήρ[υ]-
 10 [κα τῆς β]ουλῆς ἀναγγεῖλαι τόνδε τὸν στέφανο[ν]
 [Διο]γυσιος τραγωιδῶν τῶι ἀγῶνι· εἶναι δὲ Ἀντιδό- *vacat*
 [τ]ωι καὶ ἄλλο ἀγαθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τοῦ δήμου ὁ-
 [τ]ρου ἂν δοκεῖ ἀξιος εἶναι· ἐπαινέσαι δὲ καὶ τοῦ[ς]
 [στ]ρατιώτας, ὅσοι τὰς χρείας παρέσχοντο τῶι δῆ-
 15 [μωι] καὶ συνήργησαν εἰς τὸ σῆτον εὐμαρεστέρο[ν]
 [εἶναι] ἔν τεῖ πόλει· τὸν δὲ γραμματέα τῶν πρυτάν[ε]-
 [ων ἀν]αγράψαι τότε τὸ ψήφισμα ἐν στήλην λιθίν-
 [ην] καὶ στήσαι ἐν τῇ ἀγορᾷ πρόσθε τοῦ βουλευ[υ]-
 [τηρί]ου· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα τὸ γενόμενον εἰς τὴν *vacat*

20 [ἀνα]γραφὴν δοῦναι τοὺς ταμίαις ἀπὸ τῶν πρόσο- vacat
[δων] τῶν τῆς πόλεως. vacat

Line 1: ONMEΔ Sauciuc, restoring [τ]ὸν μέδ[ιμνον ἐπέδωκε τῶι δήμωι τῶι Ἐνδρ[ιων].

Line 3: δ. ρ. . ρ The last letter has a diagonal. For the restoration, see p. 317 above.

Line 4: ον Sauciuc; ων. The bottom horizontal stroke of the omega is clear.

Line 7: For the patronymic, Hiller suggests [Ἐντιφάνου]ς (*IG XII*, Suppl., p. 119), which fits the space, but there are no traces before the upsilon. There is no room at the end of the line for [ἀπό] (Sauciuc).

Line 8: [ἀπὸ . . .] δραχμ[ῶν] Pernice; [. Ἐπι]κῶν δραχμῶν Sauciuc; [ἀπὸ χι]λίων δραχμῶν. *IG XII* v 1000, lines 12–14 (Ios), ἀπὸ χιλίων δραχμῶν; cf. also *IG II*² 343, lines 8–9. For another gold crown awarded by the Andrians, see *IG XII* v 719, lines 18–19; for other gold crowns of 1000 dr, *IG XII* v 799, lines 13–15 (Tenos), *IG XII* vii 506, lines 44–45 (= *Syll.*³ 390; Nesiotic League); of 2000 dr, *IG XII* v 481, lines 16–17 (Siphnos); of 3000 dr, *IG XI* iv 1038, lines 15–16 (Nesiotic League).

Line 9: At the beginning of the line the right vertical stroke of the eta is preserved. At the end: ΓΡ Pernice; ΓΡΑ Sauciuc; KHP (see p. 314 above).

Line 10: The omicron of στέφανο[ν] is clearly visible.

Line 11: The right vertical of the nu of Διονυσίος is readable.

Line 12: The omega and iota of Ἐντιδότηι are clear.

Line 14: The quarter-circle of the rho is visible.

Line 17: The left vertical and part of the angled stroke of the nu of λιθίνην are visible.

Line 19: ΟΥ clearly visible. The stone is vacant after τήν.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Accame, S. 1941. *La lega ateniese del secolo IV a.C.*, Rome

Ampolo, C. 1986. "Il pane quotidiano delle città antiche fra economia e antropologia," *Opus* 5, pp. 143–151

Brun, P. 1993. "Le stèle des céréales de Cyrène et le commerce du grain en Égée au IV^e s. av. J.C.," *ΖΡΕ* 99, pp. 185–196

Busolt, G., and E. Swoboda. 1920–1926. *Griechische Staatskunde (Handbuch der klassischen Altertums-Wissenschaft IV*, i), Munich

Cargill, J. 1981. *The Second Athenian League: Empire or Free Alliance?* Berkeley

Cawkwell, G. 1981. "Notes on the Failure of the Second Athenian Confederacy," *JHS* 101, pp. 40–55

Chambers, M., R. Gallucci, and P. Spanos. 1990. "Athens' Alliance with Egesta," *ΖΡΕ* 83, pp. 38–63

Cherry, J., and J. Davis. 1991. "The Ptolemaic Base at Koressos on Keos," *BSA* 86, pp. 9–28

Clinton, K. 1971. "Inscriptions from Eleusis," *Ἀρχ* Ἐφ 1971, pp. 81–136

Couilloud-Le Dinahet, M.-Th. 1990. "L'exploitation des domaines d'Apollon et le ravitaillement de Délos," in *Mélanges Pierre Lévêque*, 4, *Religion*, M.-M. Mactaux and E. Geny, eds. (Centre de recherches d'histoire ancienne 96), Paris, pp. 115–140

Davis, P. 1936. "The Accounts of the Theatre on Delos" (lecture, Chicago 1936), abstract in *AJA* 41, p. 109

Develin, R. 1989. *Athenian Officials 684–321 B.C.*, Cambridge

Dragatsis, I. 1881. «Ἐνδρου ἀρχαιολογήματα», *Παρνασσός* 5, pp. 783–801

Drexhage, H.-J. 1991. *Preise, Mieten/Pachten, Kosten und Löhne im römischen Ägypten bis zum Regierungsantritt Diokletians. Vorarbeiten zu einer Wirtschaftsgeschichte des römischen Ägypten I*, St. Katharinen

Etienne, R. 1990. *Ténos, II, Ténos et les Cyclades du milieu du IV^e siècle avant J.-C. au milieu du III^e siècle après J.-C.* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 263 bis), Paris

Figueira, T. 1986. "Sitopolai and Sitophylakes in Lysias' 'Against the Graindealers': Governmental Intervention in the Athenian Economy," *Phoenix* 40, pp. 149–171

Foxhall, L., and H. Forbes. 1982. "Σιτομετρεῖα: The Role of Grain as a Staple Food in Classical Antiquity," *Chiron* 12, pp. 41–90

Gargola, D. 1992. "Grain Distributions and the Revenue of the Temple of Hera on Samos," *Phoenix* 46, pp. 12–28

- Garnsey, P. 1988. *Famine and Food Supply in the Graeco-Roman World: Responses to Risk and Crisis*, Cambridge
- Glotz, G. 1913. "Notes sur les comptes de Délos," *Journal des savants* 11, pp. 26–39
- Graindor, P. 1910. "Fouilles et recherches à Ténos (1909)," *Musée Belge* 14, pp. 5–53, 233–251
- Habicht, C. 1992. "Athens and the Ptolemies," *ClAnt* 11, pp. 68–90
- Heichelheim, F., *RE* Suppl. VI, 1935, cols. 819–892 (Sitos)
- . 1930. *Wirtschaftliche Schwankungen der Zeit von Alexander bis Augustus (Beiträge zur Erforschung der wirtschaftlichen Wechsellagen Aufschwung, Krise, Stockung 3)*, Jena
- Heinen, H. 1972. *Untersuchungen zur hellenistischen Geschichte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr. (Historia Einzelschrift 20)*, Wiesbaden
- Henry, A. 1964. "Epigraphica," *CQ* n.s. 14, pp. 240–248
- . 1992. "Through a Laser Beam Darkly: Space-age Technology and the Egesta Decree (*IG I³ 11*)," *ZPE* 91, pp. 137–146
- Holleaux, M. 1942. *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* III, repr. Paris 1968
- Jardé, A. 1925. *Les céréales dans l'antiquité grecque. La production*, repr. Paris 1979
- Knittel, E. 1938. *Die Sprache der ionischen Kykladen nach den inschriftlichen Quellen*, Munich
- Lambrinudakis, W., and M. Wörle. 1983. "Ein hellenistisches Reformgesetz über das öffentliche Urkundenwesen von Paros," *Chiron* 13, pp. 283–368
- Larfeld, W. 1902. *Handbuch der griechischen Epigraphik* II, ii, Leipzig
- Larsen, J. 1938. "Roman Greece," in *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* IV, T. Frank, ed., Baltimore, pp. 261–498
- Launey, M. 1949–1950. *Recherches sur les armées hellénistiques* (Bibliothèque des Écoles françaises d'Athènes et de Rome 169), repr. with additions and corrections, Paris 1987
- Mattingly, H. 1992. "Epigraphy and the Athenian Empire," *Historia* 41, pp. 129–138
- McCredie, J. 1966. *Fortified Military Camps in Attica (Hesperia Supplement 11)*, Princeton
- McDonald, W. 1943. *The Political Meeting Places of the Greeks (Johns Hopkins University Studies in Archaeology 34)*, Baltimore
- Meyer, E., *Der kleine Pauly* I, 1979, cols. 1538–1539 (Andros)
- Migeotte, L. 1984. *L'emprunt public dans les cités grecques*, Québec/Paris
- Nigdelis, P. M. 1990. Πολίτευμα και κοινωνία των πόλεων των Κυκλάδων κατά την ελληνιστική και αυτοκρατορική εποχή, Thessaloniki
- Pernice, E. 1893. "Inschriften aus Andros und Paros," *AM* 18, pp. 7–20
- Queyrel, F. 1989. "Art pergaménien, histoire, collections: le Perse du musée d'Aix et le petit ex-voto attalide," *RA* 1989, pp. 253–296
- Reger, G. 1993. "The Public Purchase of Grain on Independent Delos," *ClAnt* 12, pp. 300–334
- . 1994. "The Political History of the Kyklades 260–200 B.C.," *Historia* 43, pp. 32–69
- Rhodes, P. 1972. *The Athenian Boule*, Oxford
- Robert, L. 1960. "Sur un décret des Korésiens au Musée de Smyrne," *Hellenica* 12–13, pp. 132–176
- Roebuck, C. 1945. "A Note on Messenian Economy and Population," *CP* 40, pp. 149–165
- Rostovtzeff, M. 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Oxford
- Sauciuc, T. 1911. "Zum Ehrendekret von Andros *IG XII 5, 714*," *AM* 36, pp. 1–20
- . 1914. *Andros. Untersuchungen zur Geschichte und Topographie der Insel* (Sonderschriften des Österreichischen archäologischen Instituts in Wien 8), Vienna
- Schwyzler, E. *Griechische Grammatik* I, Munich
- Seager, R. 1966. "Lysias against the Corndalers," *Historia* 15, pp. 172–184
- Shear, T., Jr. 1978. *Kallias of Sphettos and the Revolt of Athens in 286 B.C. (Hesperia Supplement 17)*, Princeton
- Sherwin-White, S. 1982. "A Greek Ostrakon from Babylon of the Early Third Century B.C.," *ZPE* 47, pp. 51–70
- Threatte, L. 1980. *The Grammar of Attic Inscriptions, I, Phonology*, Berlin/New York
- Tracy, S. 1990a. "The Date of the Grain Decree from Samos," *Chiron* 20, pp. 97–100
- . 1990b. "Hands in Samian Inscriptions of the Hellenistic Period," *Chiron* 20, pp. 59–96
- Tod, M. 1948. *Greek Historical Inscriptions* II, Oxford

- Vallois, R. 1944. *L'architecture hellénique et hellénistique à Délos jusqu'à l'éviction des Déliens (166 av. J.-C.)*, I, *Les monuments*, Paris
- Vial, C. 1984. *Délos indépendante (314–167 avant J.-C). Étude d'une communauté civique et de ses institutions* (*BCH* Supplement 10), Paris
- Virgilio, B. 1982. "Eumene I° e i mercenari di Filetereia e di Attaleia," *Studi classici e orientali* 32, pp. 97–140
- Weil, R. 1876. "Von den griechischen Inseln. Reisebericht," *AM* 1, pp. 235–252
- Welsh, D. 1991. "Isaeus 9 and Astyphilus' Last Expedition," *GRBS* 32, pp. 133–150

GARY REGER

TRINITY COLLEGE
Department of History
Hartford, CT 06106

