

Delphi. The credit of the City to the naopoioi for the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo

Description: slab of Saint-Elie limestone with white veins. The back side is rough-hewn, and the edges are roughly flattened. Dimensions: h: 1.534 m w: 0.884 m d: 0.21 m

Layout: stoichedon, but the initial letters of each paragraph are not always exactly below those of the previous paragraph; even in the same paragraph the intervals are sometimes very irregular. The last two or three words of each line are more narrow, depending on the available space to be filled. Empty lines have been left between paragraphs and one or two white spaces highlight the beginning of a sentence or the names. Only the face is inscribed

Letters: Phokian alphabet. The letters have fourth-century forms: specifically, the Θ, Ο and Ω are slightly smaller than the other characters. The engraving is generally neat. Height h: 0.006 m - h: 0.007 m ; line spacing h: 0.005 m

Origin: Delphi

Dating: The lines 1-70 of CID II 31 record the transactions from the autumn-pylaia of Argilios (358/7 BC) until the spring-pylaia of Theucharis (352/1 BC). The accounts of CID II 31 and CID II 32 were clearly planned and cut as a single job in or just after Maimalos' year, 311/10 BC, or later (CID II 32, l. 100)

Findspot: found on 13 June 1893 in the Sanctuary of Apollo at Delphi, at the foot of the tufa building in the northeast the Athenian Treasure, near the Sacred Way and on the lowest level of the terrace that leads to the hieron of Gea

Current location: Delphi, Archaeological Museum, inv. 550

Reference edition: J. Bousquet, *CID II 31*

Other editions: É. Bourguet 1896 (editio princeps; see Reinach 1897, 89); J. Baunack, *SGDI* II 2502 A; C. Michel, *Recueil* 591; E. L. Hicks, G.F. Hill, *GHI* 129 (only lines 1-33); W. Dittenberger, *Syll*² 140; W. Dittenberger, *Syll*³ 241; E. Schwyzer, *DGE* 326 (only lines 1-18); É. Bourguet, *FD III* 5 19; A. Jacquemin, D. Mulliez, G. Rougemont, *Choix Delphes* 38 (Bousquet's text)

Photographs: Bourguet 1896, pl. IV; Bourguet 1932, pl. III; Bousquet 1989, pl. IV-V

Translations: Bousquet 1989 (French); Jacquemin, Mulliez, Rougemont 2012 (French)

Bibliography: Bourguet 1905; Pouilloux 1962; Roux 1966; id. 1979; Tréheux 1980; Bousquet 1988; Davies 1988; Roux 1990; Bousquet 1992; Sánchez 2001; Amandry, Hansen 2010; Deltenre 2010

ἐπὶ Ἀργιλίου ἄρχοντος, ὁπωρινᾶς πυλαίας, πὰρ τὰν πόλιν τῶν Δελφῶν λοιπὰ χρήματα τοῖς ναο-
 ποιῶσι· τάλαντα ἑκατὶ, μναῖ δέκα τέτορες, στατῆρες δέκα· μετὰ τοῦτο ἀπεδώκαμες. ἐπιστει-
 λάντων τῶν ναοποιῶν πάντων, ταῖ ἡρινᾶι πυλαίαι, ἐπὶ Ἡρακλείου ἄρχοντος, ἀργύριον διδόμ[εν],
 5 ἔδωκε ἡ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν, ἐπὶ Ἀριστοξένου ἄρχοντος, μηνὸς Ἀπελλαίου, βουλευόντων
 Καλλίππου, Σακεδάλλου, Αἰγύλου τοῦ Ἰέρωνος, Ἀρισταγόρα μὲν ἀφισταμένου τᾶς ναοποιίας,
 Νικομάχου δὲ τοῦ Μενεκράτεος ναοποιέοντος, ἐπιμνηνιεύοντος δὲ Φιλολάου Λακεδαιμονίου,
 Ἀμφάρεος Φωκέος· Πασίωνι ἰσχεγᾶου μναῖς δέκα, στατῆρας ἑπτὰ, ὀβολοὺς ἑννέα· Ἀρμοδίῳ χαλκεῖ
 δεσμῶν μναῖς ἕξ, στατῆρας δέκα πέντε. ἄλλο ἔδωκε ἡ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν, ἐπὶ Ἀριστοξένου
 10 ἄρχοντος, μηνὸς Ἡραίου, ὁπωρινᾶι πυλαίαι, ναοποιέοντος Νικομάχου Δελφοῦ, βουλευόντων
 Καλλίππου, Σακεδάλλου, Αἰγύλου, τοῖς ἐργῶναις, κελευόντων πάντων τῶν ναοποιῶν,

- παρεόντων δὲ ναοποιῶν τῶνδε· Νικομάχου Δελφοῦ, Νικοτέλεως Ἀργείου, Κλεοδώρου Ἀργείου, Ζενοτίμου Σικωνίου, Δαμοφάνεως Κορινθίου· Νικοδάμωι ξύλων ποτὶ τὰ μαχανώματα μνᾶς ἕξ· Πασίωι ἄλλο τοῦ ἰσχεγᾶου τοῦ αὐτοῦ ἔργου, μνᾶς δέκα, στατῆρας τρεῖς, ὀβολοὺς τρεῖς· Νικοδάμωι Πασίωι λατομίας μνᾶς τριάκοντα τέτορας, στατῆρας ἵκατι ἕξ· Πραξίωι
- 15 Ἀριστάνδρωι λιθαγωγοῖς μνᾶς δέκα τέτορας, στατῆρας δέκα· Κλεινίαι σκαπέτων στατῆρας ἵκατι τέτορας, ὀβολοὺς ὀκτώ· Ἀριστίωι λίθων ἀπαγωγᾶς στατῆρας δέκα· τῶι μαγίρωι τρία ἡμιωβέλια. ταῦτα ἀπελογιξάμεθα ποτὶ πάντας τοὺς ναοποιοὺς καὶ ἐγένετο κεφάλωμα τάλαντον, μναῖ ἵκατι δύο, στατῆρες ἵκατι ἕξ, ὀβολοὶ ἐννέα, ἡμιωβέλιον.
- 20 μετὰ τὸν λογισμὸν, παρεόντων τῶν βουλευτᾶν, ἐπέταξαν τοὶ ναοποιοὶ πάντες τᾷ πόλι τῶν Δελ[φ]ῶν ἀργύριον δόμεν ποτὶ τὰ ἔργα τὰ ἐγ Κορίνθωι, καὶ ἐδώκαμεν· τοῖς μὲν ναοποιοῖς εὐθύς μναῖ[ς] τέτορας, τοῦτο δὲ ἐδόθη Λαβῶται Δαμοφάνει Κορινθίοις, Ζενοτίμωι Σικωνίωι. ἄλλο ἐδώκαμεν Λαβῶται Δαμοφάνει Κορινθίοις, Ζενοτίμωι Σικωνίωι, μνᾶς δέκα. ἄλλο Νικόμαχον ἀπεπέμψαμεν φέροντα εἰς Κόρινθον τοῖς ναοποιοῖς μνᾶς τέτορας. κεφάλωμα τοῦ ἔλαβον μετὰ τὸν λογισμὸν οἱ Κορίνθιοι ναοποιοὶ καὶ ὁ Σικωνίος μνᾶς
- 25 δέκα ὀκτώ.
- [ἀπὸ] τούτου ἀνάλωμα· μαχανώματος Χαιρόλαι μνᾶς τέτορας· βολίμου εἰσφορᾶς δραχμαὶ τρεῖς, [ἡ]μιωβέλιον· πὸτ τὸ μαχάνωμα λίθων τομᾶς Θεογένει δραχμαὶ πέντε· ἀγωγᾶς τούτων Ἀγάθωνι δραχμαὶ
- 30 ἐπτὰ· βολίμου στάσιος Σατύρωι δραχμά· τριγλύφων δυώδεκα ἀγωγᾶς Χαιρόλαι μναῖ τρεῖς, στατῆρας ἐννέα· τοπείου Ζένωι μναῖ τρεῖς, στατῆρες ἵκατι δύο· ἐπιστυλίων ἕξ Χαιρόλαι μναῖ ἕξ, στατῆρες τριάκοντα· βολίμου συνθέσιος ὀβολοὶ δέκα· πινακίον ὀβολοὶ τέτορες.
- ἐπὶ Ἀριστοξένου ἄρχοντος, πυλαῖαι ἡρινᾶι, ναοποιοὶ οὐ συνῆλθον· οὐδὲ ἐπὶ Ἱερίνου ἄρχοντος, πυλαῖαι ὀπωρινᾶι καὶ ἡρινᾶι, οὐ συνῆλθον· οὐδὲ ἐπὶ Νίκωνος ἄρχοντος, πυλαῖαι ὀπωρινᾶι, ναοποιοὶ οὐ συνῆλθον. ἐπὶ Νίκωνος ἄρχοντος, ἡρινᾶς πυλαίας, ναοποιοὶ συνῆλθον τοῖδε· Ἀγήσαρχος Δελφός, Τηλοκλέας Ἀθηναῖος, Εὐόρμος Λοκρός, Νικέας Λοκρός, Θέων Μεγαρεὺς,
- 35 Ἀστίας Ἐπιδαύριος, Φιλόλαος Λακεδαιμόνιος, Καλλιμήδης Κορίνθιος, Θρασύδαμος Κορίνθιος, Ἐπιχάρης Φωκεύς.
- ἐπὶ Νίκωνος ἄρχοντος, ἡρινᾶς πυλαίας, ἡ πόλις ἔδωκε τοῖς ναοποιοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῶι πολέμωι, πράταν δόσιν, ναοποιέοντος Ἀγησάρχου Δελφοῦ, βουλευόντων Λύσωνος, Μαχίδα, Ἀρχε[μ]αχίδα, προστατευόντων Τηλοκλέος Ἀθηναίου, Ἀστία Ἐπιδαυρίου, στατῆρας πεντήκοντα ὀκτώ,
- 40 ὀβολοὺς τρεῖς. τοῦτο ἐδόθη τῶι ἀρχιτέκτονι Ζενοδώρῳ πὸτ τὸν μισθόν.
- ἄλλο ἔδωκε ἡ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν, δευτέραν δόσιν, ναοποιέοντος Ἀγησάρχου Δελφοῦ, βουλευόντων Διοκλέος, Ἡρακλείτου, Δεινομάχου, ἐπὶ Αὐτία ἄρχοντος, τᾶς ὀπωρινᾶς πυλαίας, τοῖς ναοποιοῖς, προστατευόντων Θέωνος Μεγαρεὺς, Κυδίου Ἀθηναίου, Θράσωνος Ἀθηναίου, Ζενοτίμου Σικωνίου, Εὐόρμου Λοκροῦ, μνᾶς ἵκατι ἐπτὰ, στατῆρας ἵκατι πέντε.
- 45 τούτου ἐδόθη· Νικοδάμωι ποτὶ τὸ ἐγ Κίρραι μαχάνωμα καὶ τοῦ χώματος μναῖ τρεῖς, στατῆρες τριάκοντα δύο, <ὁ>βο<λο>ι ἐπτὰ, ἡμιωβέλιον· Νικοδάμωι σφενδόνας τιμὰν ποτὶ τὸ ἐγ Κίρραι μαχάνω-
- μα στατῆρες πεντήκοντα εἰς, ὀβολοὶ τέτορες· Ὀνασίμωι λιθαγωγῶι κατὰ θάλασσαν μναῖ ἵκατι μία, στατῆρες ἵκατι πέντε· Χήρι ἐφόδιον καλυμένωι τοὺς Ἡρέα ἐγγύους στατῆρες δέκα τέτορες· γραμματιστᾷ στατῆρες πέντε· κάρυκι δραχμαὶ τρεῖς· ζυγᾶστρου ὀβολοὶ πέντε,
- 50 ἡμιωβέλιον· πινακίων ὀβολός.
- ἄλλο ἔδωκε ἡ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν, τρίταν δόσιν, ναοποιέοντος Ἀγησάρχου Δελφοῦ, βουλευόντων Κλέωνος τοῦ Τιμοκράτεος, Φειδίλα, Θεοχάριος, Ὀρνιχίδα, ἐπὶ Αὐτία ἄρχοντος, τᾶς ἡρινᾶς,

- τοῖς ναοποιοῖς, προστατευόντων Νικιάδου Ἀθηναίου, Δέξιος Κορινθίου, Θράσωνος Φωκέος, μνᾶς δέκα δύο, στατῆρας ἑξ, ὀβολοὺς τρεῖς· τούτου ἐδόθη· Ὀνασίμωι κατὰ θάλασσαν λιθαγωγῶι
- 55 ποτεθήκαμες πὸτ τὰν δόσιν μνᾶς δέκα μίαν, στατῆρας δέκα πέντε· Νικοδάμωι πίσσας τιμὰ καὶ τὸ μαχάνωμα πισσῶσαι τὸ ἐγ Κίρραι στατῆρες δέκα, ὀβολοὶ τρεῖς· Χήρι ἐφόδιον καλυμμένωι τοὺς Ἡρέα ἐγγύους στατῆρες δέκα ἑξ.
- ἄλλο ἔδωκε ἅ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν, τετάρταν δόσιν, ναοποιέοντος [Ἀ]γ[η]σάρ[χ]ου Δελφοῦ, βουλευόντων Κλέωνος, Κλεινία, Δίωνος, ἐπὶ Θευχάριος ἄρχοντας, τᾶς ὀπωρινᾶς, τοῖς
- 60 ναοποιοῖς, προστατευόντων Δέξιος Κορινθίου, Ἀστία Ἐπιδαυρίου, Πολυπείθεος Λακεδαιμονίου μνᾶς δύο, στατῆρας ὀκτώ, δραχμάν· τούτου ἐδόθη· Ξενοδώρωι ἀρχιτέκτονι μναῖ δύο, στατῆρες πέντε· Καλλιτέλει τοῦ μαχανώματος ἀκέσιος στατῆρες τρεῖς, δραχμά.
- ἄλλο ἔδωκε ἅ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν, πέμπταν δόσιν, ναοποιέοντος Ἀγησάρχου Δελφοῦ, βουλευόντων Καλλαγόρα, Ἀθάνιος Μένωνος, ἐπὶ Θευχάριος ἄρχοντας, τᾶς ἡρινᾶς, τοῖς ναοποιοῖς,
- 65 προστατευόντων Ἀγία Λακεδαιμονίου, Μνασικλέος Φλειασίου, μνᾶς τρεῖς· τοῦτο ἐδόθη τῶι ἀρχιτέκτονι Ξενοδώρωι. ταῦτα ἀπελογιζάμεθα τοῖς ναοποιοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῶι πολέμωι καὶ ἐγένετο κεφάλωμα ἐν ταῖς πέντε πυλαῖαις μναῖ τετρώκοντα ἑξ, στατῆρες ἵκατι ὀκτώ.
- σύμπαντος κεφάλωμα οὗ ἀπέδωκε ἅ πόλις τῶν Δελφῶν τοῖς ναοποιοῖς ἀπὸ Ἀργιλίου ἄρχοντας, τᾶς ἡρινᾶς πυλαίας, εἷς τε εἰς Θεύχαριν ἄρχοντα, εἰς τὰν ἡρινὰν πυλαίαν, ἀργυρίου τάλαντα
- 70 δύο, μνᾶς ἵκατι ἐπτὰ, στατῆρας δέκα ἐννέα, ὀβολοὺς ἐννέα, ἡμιωβέλιον.

Apparatus criticus: I. 2: δέκα τέτορες Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Schwyzer, Bousquet : δεκατέτορες Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll², Dittenberger apud Syll³. I. 3: Ἡρακλείου Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll², Bousquet : Ἡρακλείτου Dittenberger apud Syll³, Schwyzer. II. 5, 10: Αἰγύλου rest. Dittenberger apud Syll³ : Αργύλου Bourguet apud BCH, Baunack, Michel, Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll². I. 7: Ἀμφάρεος rest. Bousquet : Λαφάρεος Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³, Schwyzer. I. 8: δέκα πέντε Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Schwyzer, Bousquet : δεκαπέντε Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 12: ἑξ Bousquet : [ἑξ] Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³, Schwyzer. I. 15: δέκα τέτορας Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Schwyzer, Bousquet : δεκατέτορας Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 25: δέκα ὀκτώ Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Bousquet : δεκαὸκτώ Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 29: ΣΤΑΤΗΡΑΣ lapis : στατῆρας Bousquet : στατῆρες Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Hicks-Hill, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 43: ΜΕΓΑΡΕΥΣ lapis : Μεγαρεῦς Bousquet : Μεγαρέος Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 46: ΔΥΟΒΟΙ lapis : δύο <ὀ>βολ<οῖ> rest. Bourguet. I. 48: Χήρι Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³, Bourguet apud FD III 5 19, Bousquet : Χῆρι Bourguet apud BCH, Baunack, Michel. I. 54: δέκα δύο Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Bousquet : δεκαδύο Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 55: δέκα πέντε Bourguet, Baunack Michel, Bousquet : δεκαπέντε Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 56: Χήρι Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³, Bourguet apud FD III 5 19, Bousquet : Χῆρι Bourguet apud BCH, Baunack, Michel. I. 57: στατῆρες Bourguet, Baunack Michel, Bousquet : στατῆρας Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³. I. 69: εἷς τε Bourguet, Baunack, Michel, Bousquet : εἶστε Dittenberger apud Syll² et Syll³.

Translation:

During the archonship of Argilios, in the autumn pylaia, the naopoioi's residual funds from the city of Delphi: 20 talents, 14 minas, 10 staters. After this we paid; having the all naopoioi ordered in writing to pay in silver, during the archonship of Heracleios, in the spring pylaia, the city of Delphi paid, during the archonship of Aristoxenos, in the month of Apellaios, as bouletai were Kallippos, Sakedallos, Aigylos son of Hieron, Aristagoras who resigned from his office as naopoios, Nikomachos son of Menekrates who became naopoios in his place, and epimenioi were Philolaos of Sparta, Amphares of Phocis: to Pasion for the ischègaon 10 minas, 7 staters, 9 obols; to the bronze worker Armodios for the clamps 6 minas, 15 staters. The city of Delphi gave another (amount), during the archonship of Aristoxenos, in the month of Heraios, in the autumn pylaia, when the naopoios was Nikomachos of Delphi and the bouletai were Kallippos, Sakedallos, Aigylos, to the contractors, because all the naopoioi have ordered it, being present these naopoioi: Nikomachos of Delphi, Nikoteles of Argos, Kleodoros of Argos, Xenotimos of Sikyon, Damophanes of Corinth: to Nikodamos for the wood for the winch 6 minas; to Pasion another (payment) for the same ischègaon 10 minas, 3 staters, 3 obols; to Nikodamos

and Pasion for the quarrying work 34 minas, 26 staters; to Praxion and Aristandros, stone-transporters, 14 minas, 10 staters; to Kleinias for the pits 24 staters, 8 obols; to Aristion for the transport of stones 10 staters; to the cook 3 ½ obol. We presented our accounts to all the naopoioi and the total was 1 talent, 22 minas, 26 staters, 9 ½ obols.

After the calculation, in the presence of the bouletai, all the naopoioi ordered the city of Delphi to pay in silver for the works at Corinth and we immediately gave (an amount) to the naopoioi of 4 minas, this was given to Labotas and Damophanes of Corinth and to Xenotimos of Sikyon. In addition, we gave 10 minas to Labotas and Damophanes of Corinth and Xenotimos of Sikyon. Moreover, we sent Nikomachos to Corinth to give 4 minas to the naopoioi. Total of what the naopoioi of Corinth and one of Sikyon have received after the calculation: 18 minas. Expenditure of this (silver): to Chairolas for the winch 4 minas; for the transport of lead 4 drachmas, ½ obol; to Theogenes for the cutting stones for the winch 5 drachmas; to Agathon for the transport of these (stones) 7 drachmas; to Satyros for the weighing of lead 1 drachma; to Chairolas for the transport of twelve triglyphs 3 minas, 9 staters; to Xenon for the rope 3 minas, 22 staters; to Chairolas for the six epistyles 6 minas, 30 staters; for the storage of lead 10 obols; for two pinakes 4 obols.

During the archonship of Aristoxenos, in the spring pylaia, the naopoioi did not assemble; also during the archonship of Hierinos, in the autumn and spring pylaia, they did not meet; also during the archonship of Nikon, in the autumn pylaia the naopoioi did not even meet. During the archonship of Nikon, in the spring pylaia, the following naopoioi assembled: Hagesarchos of Delphi, Telokleas of Athens, Euormos and Nikeas of Locris, Theon of Megara, Astias of Epidaurus, Philolaos of Sparta, Kallimedes and Thrasydamas of Corinth, Epichares of the Phocis.

During the archonship of Nikon, in the spring pylaia, the city gave a first payment to the naopoioi in war, as the naopoios of Delphi was Hagesarchos and the bouletai were Lyson, Machidas, Archemachidas, and the prostatauontes Telokleas of Athens and Astias of Epidaurus: 58 staters, 3 obols. This (sum) was given to the architect Xenodoros as his stipend.

The city of Delphi gave another (amount) as second payment, when the naopoios of Delphi was Hagesarchos and the bouletai were Diocles, Heracleitos, Deinomachos, during the archonship of Autias, in the autumn pylaia, to the naopoioi, when the prostatauontes were Theon of Megara, Kydimos and Thrason of Athens, Xenotimos of Sikyon, Euormos of Locris: 27 minas, 25 staters.

From this (amount) was given to: Nikodamos for the winch in Kirrha and for the earth thrown up 3 minas, 32 staters, 7 ½ obols; Nikodamos the cost of the slingshot for the winch in Kirrha 51 staters, 4 obols; Onasimos for the transport of the stones by sea 21 minas, 25 staters; Chérís the travel expenses for the convocation of the guarantors from Heraea 14 staters; the grammateus 5 staters; the herald 3 drachmas; for the chest 5 ½ obols; for the pinakes 1 obol.

The city of Delphi gave another (amount) as third payment, when the naopoios of Delphi was Hagesarchos and the bouletai were Kleon son of Timocrates, Pheidilas, Theocharis and Ornichidas, during the archonship of Autias, in the spring (pylaia), to the naopoioi, as the prostatauontes were Nikiades of Athens, Dexis of Corinth and Thrason of Phocis, 12 minas, 6 staters, 3 obols; this (amount) was given to: Onasimos for the transport of the stones by sea as addition 11 minas, 15 staters; Nicodamos the cost of the pitch and for the pitching of the winch in Kirrha 10 staters, 3 obols; Chérís the travel expenses for the convocation of the guarantors from Heraea 16 staters.

The city of Delphi gave another (amount) as fourth payment, when the naopoios of Delphi was Hagesarchos and the bouletai were Kleon, Kleinias and Dion, during the archonship of Theucharis, in the autumn pylaia, to the naopoioi, as the prostatauontes were Dexios of Corinth, Astias of Epidaurus, Polypeithes of Sparta: 2 minas, 8 staters, 1 drachma; this (amount) was given to: architect Xenodoros 2 minas, 5 staters; Kalliteles for the repair of the winch 3 staters, 1 drachma.

The city of Delphi gave another (amount) as fifth payment, when the naopoios of Delphi was Hagesarchos and the bouletai were Kallagoras, Athanis and Menon, during the archonship of Theucharis, in the spring pylaia, to the naopoioi, as the prostatauontes were Agias of Sparta, Mnasikleos of Phlius, 3 minas; this was given to the architect Xenodoros. We presented our accounts to the naopoioi in war and the total in the five pylaiai was 46 minas, 28 staters.

Total of everything that the city of Delphi has given in silver to the naopoioi starting from the archonship of Argilios, in the spring pylaia, until the archonship of Theucharis, in the spring pylaia: 2 talents, 27 minas, 19 staters, 9 ½ obols.

Commentary:

This inscription represents the first 70 lines of *CID* II 31, which, together with *CID* II 32, report the accounts of the payments made from the credit (opheilèma) that sometime after 373/2 BC the city of Delphi granted to the naopoioi to help meet the costs of rebuilding the temple of Apollo. The accounts of this special fund were

originally inscribed about 60 years later on three huge stelai which were set up in a prominent place by the Treasury XXVI (the so-called Bouleuterion) to serve as a public record of the city's philotimia and piety. Since this inscription begins in mediis rebus with the transactions of Argilios-autumn (358/7 BC) and since all entries concern the rebuilding, a first, lost stele is presumed to have detailed the entries from some year after 373/2 BC until 359/8 BC (Roux hypothesizes the existence of a fourth stele, see Roux 1979, 187).

For a long time, it was believed that the 6th century BC temple had been destroyed by the earthquake of 373 BC that destroyed the city of Helice. It is more likely that the main cause was a landslide due to heavy rains or the action of groundwater and to the kind of the soil on which the temple was built (Amandry, Hansen 2010, 121; Roux 1990, 329). According to the literary sources, the collapse of the temple occurred between 418 BC (Eur. *Ion.* 205-218) and 371 BC (Xen. *Hell.* 6.4.2) and it may have occurred between 375 and 371 BC (Sánchez 2001, 125 n. 4). The rebuilding of the temple lasted, with some interruption due to the Sacred War, from 366 to 330 BC when the temple, though not finished, was consecrated. We can trace each stage of the reconstruction through the corpus of 139 accounts found in the sanctuary.

The Amphictyony chose a mixed-finance plan (Roux 1979, 137-142) to front the cost of rebuilding which Migeotte estimates to be between 320 and 400 talents (Migeotte 2014, 373-374). It is, therefore, possible to distinguish three types of loan corresponding to three different kinds of contributors: 1. *ὀφείλημα* (CID II 31-32): this is the long-term credit that the city of Delphi has made available to the naopoioi. It is a commitment by the inhabitants of Delphi to pay the invoices that the naopoioi submit to them up to a maximum amount that Bousquet has estimated as being around 40 talents (Bousquet 1989, 53);

2. *ἐπαρχαί* (CID II 1-30): these are the voluntary donations made by individuals and by cities and states (inside and outside the Amphictyony) asked by a panhellenic subscription to contribute to the rebuilding of the temple of Apollo;

3. *ἐπικέφαλος ὀβολός* (CID II 1-10): it is a levy of one obol per person on the states belonging to the Amphictyony. The 'first obol' was collected from spring 366 to spring 361 BC (the first to the eleventh *pylaia* in the numbered series) and a 'second obol' from spring 361 to autumn 356 BC (the eleventh to the twenty-second *pylaia*).

According to Roux (1979, 114, 142-143), the credit opened by the City of Delphi to the naopoioi (*opheilèma*) was managed by the Council; only the naopoioi could use these funds and exclusively for the rebuilding of the temple. On the other hand, the ordinary revenues (usable both for the ordinary expenses and for the rebuilding of the temple), the *eparchai* and the *epikephalos obolos* flowed into the Amphictyonic treasury which was jointly managed by the Amphictyonic Council and the *prytanies* of Delphi. Bousquet (1988, 112; id. 1989, 9; id. 1992, 24), followed by Sánchez (2001, 130), argues, instead, that the naopoioi managed a special fund (into which flowed the *opheilèma*, the *eparchai* and *epikephalos obolos*), separate from the fund of the Amphictyony, since the unit of account used in all contributions lists is the drachma which the naopoioi are the only ones to use in Delphi.

The very substantial credit made available by the city is managed on its behalf and under the control of the Council, but it is difficult to identify the administrators who compiled or published the three stelai. Their anonymity has provoked debate. The compilers cannot be the Council tout court (contra Roux 1979, 243-245), since the "we" is accompanied by two, or more normally three, members of Council. The compilers would not be the *prytanies* (contra Marchetti 1977, 160-164), since these appear only in Pleiston's year (CID II 32, ll. 54ff; 318/7 BC at earliest) onwards, since they receive money from the Council, and since their competence lies with the sacred monies of Apollo, not the public monies of the city. According to Bousquet (1986, 273-283), the compilers should be the two city *tamiai*, since they are the only city officials who use the system talents-minas-staters-drachmas-obols (TMSDO mode; for the monetary standards in the accounts see SEG XXXVI 491, Bousquet 1986), although they are not attested as financial officials of the city until the end of the third century BC (Syll³ 579, l. 14). The "we" who compiled was clearly in some sense the city (Davies 1988, 6 n. 34).

This inscription attests that the Delphi Council supported, from the administrative point of view, the naopoioi and executed the disbursements in agreement with them. The naopoioi were literally the temple builders who collected and spent the funds for the rebuilding of the temple. They are not attested before the 360s and it is impossible to prove that their college did not already exist before the collapse of the temple, but the name of its members *οἱ ναοποιοί* ("those who are responsible for building the temple") suggests that it may have been an ad hoc creation after 373 BC rather than a standing body (Roux 1979, 95-98). The college was chaired by an office made up of two to five *prostatai*, whose composition changed at each *pylaia* (CID II 31, ll. 39, 43-44, 53, 60-61, 65, 81-82, 85, 95-96) and it included two or three *argyrologoi*, responsible for collecting funds. The accounts also mention a monthly committee (*epimenioi*) which ensured the continuation of the financial

transactions between the *pylaia* (*CID* II 31, ll. 6-7, 90-94, 105). The *naopoioi* were appointed from among the constituent communities of the Amphictyony and held indefinitely repeatable office. Some *naopoioi* were well-known personalities, who exercised important duties in their city, therefore the members of this college were not drawn but elected, and they were chosen because of their fortune, which served as a guarantee for financial transactions (Roux 1979, 105-109; Bousquet 1992, 24). According to most of the scholars, the *naopoioi* were not only financial experts, but also technicians and engineers (Pouilloux 1962, 309; La Coste-Messelière 1974, 199-201; Bousquet 1992, 24; Lefèvre 1991, 590). On the other hand, Roux states that the *naopoioi* had no technical expertise and they would have been chosen on the basis of their social status and wealth, and their only task would have been to manage the funds for the rebuilding of the temple (Roux 1979, 111-120; id. 1989, 23; id. 1990, 328). However, it is important to highlight that they did not have the function of representing the twelve communities of the Amphictyony and that they did not exercise any political influence. The number and origins of the *naopoioi* varies over time, but these changes are generally due to reasons independent of political history. Firstly, the accounts mention only the *naopoioi* present at Delphi at the time of the financial transaction and they don't take into consideration those who were on a mission outside the city (*CID* II 31, l. 11; Roux 1979, 110-111). Secondly, the origins of the *naopoioi* seem to have been determined by the kind of works carried out at Delphi. It was a way to avoid unnecessary travel and to use the personal contacts between the *naopoioi* and the entrepreneurs of their city, in order to obtain the best quality at the best price (*CID* II 31, ll. 19-25; Roux 1979, 109-110). The risks of fraud and collusion were reduced as all members of the college were responsible for the payment orders (*CID* II 31, ll. 2-3, 10-12, 17; Roux 1979, 105-110). The most important political events could have an impact on the composition of the college. For example, during the Third Sacred War only the *naopoioi* from pro-Phocians cities were encountered. The other cities were not excluded from the college, but they refrained from sending their *naopoioi* to Delphi as a security measure and as a protest against the Phocians (Sánchez 2001, 128-132).

The first 70 lines of *CID* II 31 allow us to follow the events of the Third Sacred War and each stage of the reconstruction of the temple of Apollo.

Before the sacred war (ll. 1-30).

The text records such specific information as the year and the *pylaia* in which the Delphians made disbursements, the exact sums paid, the names of those who received the funds and of those who witnessed the transactions, and the purpose of the disbursement (Buckler 1989, 151). The extant text begins *ex abrupto* with the indication of the remaining sum available to the *naopoioi* in the autumn *pylaia* during the archonship of Argilios (the Delphians recorded the balance of funds from the spring-*pylaia* of Argilios to the spring-*pylaia* of Theucharis): 20 talents, 14 minas, 10 staters (l. 2). Bousquet assumes that the original credit of the city to the *naopoioi* was 40 talents, of which little more than 20 remain in 358, and he estimates the income from the *epikephalos obolos* as being of the order of 40 talents: based on these sums, he argues that the works of the rebuilding needed 60 talents in the first nine years (under this analysis, the accounts of such expenses were inscribed on the lost slab; see Bousquet 1989, 53). The disbursements started again in Herakleios-spring when an official letter of the *naopoioi* asked the city to reopen the credit line. The transactions in silver are recorded in the aeginetic system (with the only exception that the mina is worth 70 drachmas and not 72; see Doyen 2014). The *naopoioi* ordered the city in writing (*ἐπιστειλάντων*, l. 2; *κελεύοντων*, l. 10) to pay in silver the total expense which the city then gave to its contractors (*τοῖς ἐργώνας*, l. 10). Some *bouletai* and some of the *naopoioi* (including the *naopoi* of Delphi) witnessed these transactions (for the problem of the abdication of Aristagoras (l. 5), see Roux 1979, 109, Tréheux 1980, 523; the participle *ἐπιμηνιεύοντος* is followed by two names (ll. 6-7), see SEG 30 490, Tréheux 1980, 519-524).

The text (ll. 2-8) records one payment under both the spring-*pylaia* of the archonship of Herakleios and the month Apellaios of the archonship of Aristoxenos. Roux (1979, 177-178) has explained this double dating (cf. ll. 90 and 104) as the result of the discrepancy between the Delphian and Amphictyonic calendars. Since the eponymous archon of Delphi took office in the last month of the spring- *pylaia*, which was itself dated by the name of the preceding archon, the Delphians inscribed both the *pylaia* and the name of the Delphian archon under whom the payment was actually made. Thus, this payment was made in the last month of the spring-*pylaia* and in the first month of the Delphian civil year. During this period, the transactions are dated by the name of the eponymous archon of the *pylaia* and of the new eponymous archon of Delphi.

Despite the difficulties related to the war, the Delphian contractor Pasion had built the *ischègaon*, the terraced wall in poros north of the temple, and worked in the quarries of Corinth, where he extracted the poros blocks for the trabeation of the temple together with Nikodamos of Argos. Pasion received double pay for building the *ischègaon*: the first (10 minas 7 staters 9 obols) during the first month of the year (l. 7) and the second (10 minas 3 staters 3 obols) during the fourth month (l. 13). These two sums are 9/10 of a total of 22 minas and 20 staters, therefore Pasion's pay was subject to the 'one-tenth of guarantee' even if the text lacks the traditional

formula (τὸ ἐπιδέκατον ἀφελόντες) (see Bousquet 1984; Amandry, Hansen 2010, 474-494). At the beginning, the contractor receives 9/10 of the pay and the last part is retained as a guarantee, as an incentive to finish the work. This was paid only after checking the finished work (ἔδωκαμεν, τὸ ἐπιδέκατον ἀφελόντες) by the funds of the epidekaton (10% of the contractor's pay). By these funds, the naopoioi withdrew the money to pay any fines against the contractor in case of fraud or delay or damages. If the contractor had refused to pay, his guarantors would have to intervene (cfr. Il. 48-49; Il. 56-57; Amandry, Hansen 2010, 474-494 and for guarantors in public works contracts, see Erdas 2010; id. 2018).

Two other major contractors were Praxion and Aristandros of Tegea. They are two λιθαγωγοί, namely those who rent their means of transport (wagons or boats) for the transport of heavy goods, in this case, the poros from the Corinthian quarries to the port of Lechaion. They did not list the details of the invoices and they got a flat fee. The naopoioi asked the city to give Praxion and Aristandros 14 minas and 10 staters (l. 15), which are a part of the 3 talents for the transport of forty beams for the peristasis of the temple. The 3 talents are 9/10 of a sum of 200 minas whose tenth (20 minas) will be paid after the peace during the archonship of Damoxenos (FD III 5 23, l. 38). The 3 talents for the transport of the beams are not the same 3 talents that the naopoioi have paid in advance to Praxion and Aristandros (l. 87) for the repair of the road (λιθαγωγία) during the archonship of Archon. In this case, since it was an advance and not a contract, the naopoioi did not retain 'one-tenth of the guarantee'.

At the end of the fourth month, the city and the naopoioi stopped the disbursements, but immediately after, the naopoioi ordered the city of Delphi to pay in silver for the works at Corinth. As for all works outside Delphi, the city gave the amounts not directly to the contractors but τοῖς ναοποιοῖς (l. 21) to deliver the money to the recipients (Il. 19-30). Given the particular political situation, Delphi used extreme caution in making disbursements: Delphi presented the accounts to all the naopoioi and only after checking the accounts, the city, in the presence of the bouleutai, gave the sums required to the naopoioi (named by name) to pay the works at Corinth (Il. 19-30). At the end of 356 BC, Chairolas of Corinth and Nicodamos of Argos built the two winches (τὰ μηχανώματα) to load and unload ships: one at the port of Lechaion and the other at Kirrha. Chairolas dealt also with the transport of some architectural elements from the Corinthian quarries to the port of Lechaion. He earned 228 drachmas for twelve triglyph blocks and 480 drachmas for six epistyles (19 drachmas for a triglyph block and 80 drachmas for an epistyle). These amounts have been considered as total prices, but the order of magnitude leads Bommelaer to think that they are partial prices. According to the scholar, the reason for the difference between two prices may be explained either because the term ἐπιστύλιον would indicate two blocks (epistyle and interior epistyle) or because the percentage of the total price would not have been the same in the two cases (Bommelaer 2008, 245).

During the Sacred War (Il. 31-70).

During the archonship of Aristoxenos war was raging. In the spring-pylaia the naopoioi did not meet (l. 31), nor did they again until the spring-pylaia of Nikon's archonship. The account specifically states that the funds were paid to 'the naopoioi in the time of war' (l. 37). The city of Delphi let the naopoioi use the credit, but it took precautions: the city recorded under a special heading the disbursements made to the 'naopoioi in the time of war' (τοῖς ναοποιοῖς τοῖς ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ). The city gave the amounts in silver (all the transactions are numbered) not to the contractors, but to the naopoioi themselves in the presence of witnesses (the naopoios of Delphi, a delegation of bouleutai, the naopoioi prostatauontes) and only during the sessions of the Amphictyones. The architect Xenodoros received part of his pay and his name appeared for the first time in this text (l. 40). The maritime transport between Lechaion and Kyrrha could resume under the direction of Onasimos, which received two disbursements (Il. 47 and 54) for the substantial sum of 2320 drachmas, probably for transporting the twelve triglyphs block and six epistyles from the port of Lechaion to Kirrha. Kheris was a herald who had to go twice on a mission to Hera to the guarantors of a defaulting worker.

The system of enumerating the disbursements (useful for future checks) is used until the archonship of Theucharis, in the spring-pylaia. At that time, the disbursements and the rebuilding of the temple stopped due to the war. The Delphians recorded the balance of funds from the spring-pylaia of Argilios (the last λογισμός) to the spring-pylaia of Theucharis, the latter being the last meeting of 'the naopoioi in the time of war' (Il. 68-70). The balance is 2 talents 27 minas 19 staters 9.5 obols. The expenses made amount to 10,329 drachmas and 3.5 obols and, therefore, the remaining credit available to the naopoioi is 74,670 drachmas and 2.5 obols. The naopoioi will find these funds untouched after the war in the autumn-pylaia of Damoxenos' archonship (CID II 34).

This text was used as an argument for the theory whereby the Phocians plundered the temple of Apollo in 357/6 BC (for the question of the chronology of the Third Sacred War see Deltenre 2010). Pausanias (10.2.3) writes that this happened when Heraklides was prytane in Delphi and Agathokles was the Athenian archon, in

the fourth year of the one hundred and fifth Olympiad (357 BC). According to Mommsen, the Heraklides mentioned by the periegete would be the archon Heracleios (l. 3; Bousquet 1989, 54). The name Herakleios is not the same as Herakleides, attested in Delphi, moreover, Pausanias mentions a prytane and not an archon. Because of these elements and others, Deltenre denies the reliability of Pausanias' text. The scholar points out that the only objective element in the accounts relating to the beginning of the Third Sacred War is that the naopoioi did not meet during the spring-pylaia of Aristoxenos and, when they next met, they were called 'the naopoioi in the time of war'. The most reasonable explanation is that the Phochians plundered the temple of Apollo after the autumn-pylaia of Aristoxenos.

- Bommelaer, J.F. (1983), 'La construction du temple classique de Delphes', BCH 107, 191-215
- Bommelaer, J.F. (2008), 'Delphica 1. À nouveau les comptes de Delphes et la reconstitution du temple d'Apollon au IV^e siècle av. J.-C.', BCH 132, 221-255
- Bousquet, J. (1984), 'Les comptes de Delphes et le dixième de garantie', in H. Walter (ed.), *Hommages à Lucien Lerat*, Paris, 135-143
- Bousquet, J. (1986), 'Les Unités Monétaires dans les Comptes de Delphes', BCH 110, 273-283
- Bousquet, J. (1988), 'La reconstruction du temple d'Apollon à Delphes au IV^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ', in D. Knoepfler (ed.), *Comptes et inventaires dans la cité grecque. Actes du colloque international d'épigraphie tenu à Neuchâtel du 23 au 26 septembre 1986 en l'honneur de Jacques Tréheux*, Genève, 13-25
- Bowden, H. (2003), 'The functions of the Delphic Amphictyony before 346 B.C.E.', *Scripta classica Israelica. Yearbook of the Israel Society for the Promotion of Classical Studies* 22, 67-83
- Buckler, J. (1989), *Philip II and the sacred war*, Leiden.
- Casson, S. (1916), 'Les naopes de Delphes et la politique hellénique de 356 à 327 av. J.-C.', BCH 40, 78-142
- Cloch  , P. (1920), 'Les naopes de Delphes et la cr  ation du coll  ge des tamiai', BCH 44, 312-327
- Doyen, C. (2014), 'Pratiques comptables en Gr  ce hell  nistique', *Comptabilit  s* 6, 1-32
- Erdas, D. (2010), 'Il ricorso ai garanti solvibili nei documenti ateniesi di et   classica', in A. Magnetto, D. Erdas, C. Carusi (ed.), *Nuove ricerche sulla legge granaria ateniese del 374/3 a. C.*, Pisa, 187-282
- Erdas, D. (2018), 'What laws applied to guarantors? Epigraphic evidence for legal procedure affecting personal security in Athens and beyond', *AnnPisa* 10/2, 333-357
- Feyel, C. (1998), 'La structure d'un groupe socio-  conomique: les artisans dans les grands sanctuaires grecs du IV^e si  cle', *Topoi* 8/2, 561-579
- Feyel, C. (2003), 'Des   lites dans le monde du travail. Le cas des entrepreneurs    travers les comptes de construction des grands sanctuaires grecs', in M. C  beillac-Gervasoni, L. Lamoine (ed.), *Les   lites et leurs facettes. Les   lites locales dans le monde hell  nistique et romain*, Rome, 293-305
- Feyel, C. (2006), *Les artisans dans les sanctuaires grecs aux   poques classique et hell  nistique:    travers la documentation financi  re en Gr  ce*, BEFAR 318, Ath  nes-Paris
- Keil, B. (1897), 'Zur Verwerthung der Delphischen Rechnungsurkunden', *Hermes* 32, 399-420
- La Coste-Messeli  re, P. (1974), 'Les naopes    Delphes au IV^e si  cle', in G. Daux (ed.), *M  langes hell  niques offerts    Georges Daux*, Paris, 199-211
- Laroche, D., Jacquemin A. (2010), 'Constructions et reconstructions    Delphes au IV^e s. av. J.-C.', *Dossiers d'Arch  ologie* 342, 24-31
- Lef  vre, F. (1991), 'Remarques sur le calendrier des r  unions de l'Amphiclyonie pyl  odelphique', BCH 115, 579-594
- Lef  vre, F. (2011), 'Quoi de neuf sur l'Amphiclyonie?', *Pallas* 87, 117-131
- Marchetti, P. (1977), '   propos de l'archonte delphien de 344/3', BCH Supp. 4, 67-89
- Marchetti, P. (1979), 'La construction du temple de Delphes et la date d'Arist  nymos', BCH 103, 151-163
- Marchetti, P. (1998), 'Note sur la date des archontes de Delphes de 346    336', *Topoi* 8/1, 167-172
- Marchetti, P. (2002), 'En relisant les comptes de Delphes autour de l'archonte Palaois', BCH 126, 59-72
- Marchetti, P. (2011), 'Quelques aspects trop souvent n  glig  s des comptes de Delphes: de l'amphiclyonionique nouveau aux couronnes d'Olympias', *Pallas* 87, 133-150
- Migeotte, L. (2014), *Les finances des cit  s grecques: aux p  riodes classique et hell  nistique*, Paris
- Pomtow, H. (1897), 'Die neuen delphischen Tempelbau-Rechnungen', *Berl. Phil. W.* 3, 92-96
- Reinach, T. (1896), 'Observation sur le syst  me mon  taire delphique du IV^e si  cle', BCH 20, 251-256
- Reinach, T. (1897), 'Bulletin   pigraphique', REG 10, 82-99
- Roux, G. (1970), 'Les prytanes de Delphes', BCH 94, 117-132
- Roux, G. (1989), 'Probl  mes delphiques d'architecture et d'  pigraphie', RA, 23-64
- Sordi, M. (1957), 'La fondation du coll  ge des naopes et le renouveau politique de l'Amphiclyonie au IV^e si  cle', BCH 81, 38-75
- Sordi, M. (2002), *Scritti di storia greca*, Milano

Author: Giulia Vannucci

Last update: May 2020

DOI: 10.25429/sns.it/lettere/GEI043
