Sebastian Prignitz, **Bauurkunden und Bauprogramm von Epidauros (400–350). Asklepiostempel, Tholos, Kultbild, Brunnenhaus**. Vestigia. Beiträge zur Alten Geschichte, volume 67. Publisher C. H. Beck, Munich 2014. X and 395 pages with several illustrations in the text and 67 plates.

The sanctuary of Asklepios at Epidauros has long been renowned for the almost unique survival of a large body of building inscriptions, which include the financial accounts of many of the excavated structures of the site, providing a rare opportunity to understand the whole process of public construction from design to execution. While we have epigraphic records of building activities from many other Greek sanctuaries (e. g., Athens, Delphi, Lebadeia, Delos, Didyma), the Epidaurean inscriptions provide much more complete sets of accounts of the sanctuary buildings as they were being built. As such, there has been no shortage of scholarship on them, the most-cited synthesis of the various projects that of Alison Burford in her 1969 economic study ›The Greek Temple Builders at Epidauros‹. The time is right, however, for a fresh investigation of the material, and Sebastian Prignitz has provided not only a solid and reliable evidence base for future studies in this field, but has also developed an innovative methodology for understanding these documents within their economic, historical, and archaeological contexts, which should be taken as a model for work on the history of the administration and financing of public construction projects.

This first volume examines the accounts for the major building projects at Epidauros in the first half of the fourth century B.C., namely the Temple of Asklepios and the cult statue of the god within it, the enigmatic round Tholos, and the Fountain House. A forthcoming second volume will deal with the later accounts. Following an introduction to the Asklepieion, a history of its buildings, excavations and epigraphic research from 1881 to 2006, the inscriptions are presented by project, with full lemmata, Greek text and translation, commentary, and notes.

The accounts for the temple of Asklepios are perhaps the most discussed of the Epidauros building inscriptions, but they have raised many difficulties in their interpretation and even in a comprehension of their basic layout. Prignitz presents the text and a translation in a useful system of boxes so that the relationship between the larger and thinner columns of text on both the front and back sides becomes clear, the translation being similarly executed. The order of entries broadly follows the logical sequence of construction: the entries begin with foundations, then move to the cella and core of the building, next the roof, and finally the sculpture and interior decoration. The contents suggest that both columns were written in parallel with each other, although their entries are quite different in the forms of recording used. A close study of the language of recording reveals that the entries in the thinner columns are written in the dative, the amounts in the larger columns are much higher, and that payments for messengers, heralds, and small expenditures appear only in the thinner columns. As such, the accounts in fact record in the larger columns contracts given out to entrepreneurs, while the thinner columns record the day to day expenses of the project, the two sometimes – but not always – converging. A set of formulae begin to emerge whereby entrepreneur plus εἵλητω (from αἱρέω) plus guarantor means that the job is still in progress, money having been partly paid out, and the guarantor is named in case there are problems with the work and funds need to be recovered. Entrepreneur plus εἵλητω without guarantor means that the man undertook to provide a commodity (wood, stone etc.) and will only be paid as soon as he delivers it to the sanctuary; a guarantor is not needed because no cash has left the sanctuary coffers. The entrepreneur in the dative plus guarantor means that he has undertaken the work and was then paid on its completion. It is an unusual and complicated form of accounting, and Prignitz concludes that we should see the Temple inscription not as a series of accounts posted after the fact from the sanctuary's cash registers, but as a form of public notice recorded annually during the construction process, with both already completed contracts and also contracts still underway. As such, no annual total expenditure is calculated, penalties and income are also not recorded; what mattered to the building commission was the writing down of the contracts awarded and the payments made to the entrepreneurs. It is not impossible that income and penalties were recorded on a now lost stone, as there are surviving inscriptions from Epidauros concerning law suits brought against contractors and fines imposed (e. g., SEG 41, 308). The later Tholos, cult statue, and Spring House accounts, however, diverge from this recording system, and are instead balanced calculations of revenue and expenditure

ex post, similar to many other familiar records of accountability.

Five years of building activity are recorded for the Temple project: the first year was principally taken up with the foundations; the second with the construction of the peristasis, buying materials for the cella, wood for the roof, and the building of a workshop. The third year sees the workshop built, the ramp of the temple constructed, the roof and interior ceiling begun, paving courses laid, and doors created for the cella and pronaos. The fourth year deals with the interior of the building: doors, grills, plastering, painting and decoration of the ceiling, and the pedimental sculptures and akroteria are begun. The final year sees the sculptures installed and final embellishments added, such as to the cella doors. The project can only be relatively dated, but a series of new observations in the text has led to a more accurate estimation of the length of time the temple took to be built. Reconstructions have focused on the salary of the architect, Theodotos, set at one drachma per day throughout the project. He received a salary six times in the accounts: four full year payments, one half year, and an enigmatic seventy drachmas. Prignitz proposes that Theodotos had left for a period and was brought back to oversee the fitting of the last pedimental figures of the sculptor Hektoridas, which had been delayed for some reason. The building time then needs to include these extra days when Theodotos was absent and did not receive a salary, which can be calculated from the payment to the official Astias, who received in the final fifth year 276 drachmas, while Theodotos took 245, thus an additional thirty-one days is needed. The total building time of the Temple was then four years, nine months, and twelve or thirteen days (depending on whether the last two months both contained twenty-nine days).

Improved readings and restorations of the text have also greatly improved our evidence base for the huge number of payments, workers and commodities laboriously recorded. Even without a knowledge of Greek, a glance at the differences between the translations of Prignitz and Burford will show how many new readings have now been entered into the text.

We hear of course of stone quarrying and construction, but a whole host of other jobs and items are worth attention: encaustic painting, plastering, polishing, weaving, payments for timber, cypress wood, glue, ivory, nails, hinges, door keys, pitch, brushes. The huge range of services which needed to be procured led the commission to send out many messengers and heralds to cities on fact-finding missions or to announce contracts for sale; the specific jobs they were tasked with are not listed, but their travel expenses listed in the accounts places them on journeys to Athens, Argos, Corinth, Hermione, Aegina, Tegea, Troizen, and elsewhere.

The amounts paid to workers in the Temple accounts are recorded in local Epidaurean currency, although the men are mostly of foreign origin. Prignitz sees behind a number of these figures, however, an initial calculation based on the Attic drachma, especially for the sculptures and interior decoration of the temple. This could mean either that the workmen were paid in Athenian coin and the accountants converted the amount when writing it up, or, more likely given the lack of probability that the building commission stockpiled large quantities of foreign coinage, that the parties had initially estimated the value of the labour of the sculpture in Athenian currency.

The Temple accounts are often discussed in art historical studies, and this volume devotes much space to the sculptures and artists mentioned in the inscriptions, as well as observations on the surviving sculptures and their relations with the inscribed entries. The archaeologically minded element of the methodology is clearly crucial for such studies, although rarely undertaken, and it has produced some interesting conclusions. The contractor Hektoridas was commissioned for the sculptures of the east pediment in Pentelic marble, the material price of which is not included in his contract but is probably hidden in a series of payments to five men, including Hektoridas, who are listed without guarantors and so likely are hired to deliver the stone. The east pedimental figures depict the fall of Troy. The name of the sculptor of the west pediment has not survived, but the sculptures depict an Amazonomachy. The akroteria groups were by Theom[nastos] (not previously read on the stone) on the east (Apollo and Koronis?, Nikai), and Timotheos on the west (Nike and female riders – Aurai?).

The four contracts for the sculpture were in all probability given out at the beginning of the fourth year of construction. Careful attention to payments and dates has allowed for calculation of the costs and construction times of the two pedimental groups. The east and west sculptural groups cost the same amount (3010 drachmas), but were completed in very different times: the west pediment figures took about a year, while the east lasted for twenty-one and a half months. The identical cost of the two groups has been variously explained. It could be that the figure represents daily wages for sculptors employed on the work, in which case it can be shown that, using a daily wage of an Aeginetan drachma, the west pediment had nine sculptors for 334 days; the east five sculptors for 602 days. Factoring in a daily wage of an Attic drachma, we arrive at a figure of twelve sculptures at 258 days for the west, and seven sculptors at 615 days for the east. The model, however, assumes that both sculptural groups were made in exactly the same number of daily units, 3010 Aeginetan or 4300 Attic. Prignitz opts instead for an explanation based on fixed payments per pedimental figure, as was previously used in the Erechtheion frieze accounts. Starting with the currency in which the lots were paid, the Epidaurean (Aeginetan) currency is at a ratio of seven to ten against the Attic drachma. This produces a round number for the

sculpture payments: the 3010 drachmas for the pediment groups would be equivalent to 4300 Attic drachmas; the akroteria at 2240 Aeginetan drachmas reveals a calculation into Athenian coin of 3200 drachmas. This strongly suggests that the sculptors themselves were Athenian, and reckoning their bids for the jobs in their own currency. The fact that the material employed was Pentelic marble may also back up this assertion. With this theory in mind, the study then turns to the surviving sculptures themselves. The sculptural reconstructions of Yalouris shows at least twenty whole figures as well as a small xoanon of Athena on the east pediment; the west had at least seventeen figures and four horses. Prignitz makes the calculation that both pediments could have been based on twenty-one and a half figures, taking, for example, the xoanon in the east and the overthrown Amazon queen in the west as half figures. A basic amount can then be posited of two hundred Attic drachmas per figure. The payment schedule of Hektoridas may support this hypothesis: his first payment of two thousand three hundred drachmas could equal eleven figures and the xoanon, while his second payment of two thousand drachmas was for ten further whole figures. This is the same principle underlying the payment for the frieze figures of the Erechtheion, where the basic price is sixty drachmas. At Epidauros, however, the sculptors are not each paid individually for their figures, but one contractor is given the job to oversee an entire pediment and the various sculptors working under him are therefore silent in the records.

The Temple inscription includes a number of much-discussed ›paradeigmata‹ and ›typoi‹, words which Prignitz attempts to clarify against previous attempts. ›Paradeigmata‹ appear in the accounts of the Erechtheion as models for ceiling coffers and their rosette ornaments and are made of wax. A single paradeigma for a series of identical column capitals is mentioned as a stone master copy in the accounts of Delos for a stoa. The Epidaurean accounts have such models also for nails and mouldings, always for the production of a series of identical works. Hektoridas produces a single section of the lion-head sima, which was the model for the rest of the length of the gutter. In this case the paradeigmata are different to the typoi, which are mentioned in relation to the pediment and akroteria groups and are individual creations not to be repeated over and over again. The translation of ›typos‹ as ›model‹ is therefore not correct, that word field being taken up in these texts by ›paradeigma‹. ›Typos‹ should be understood more as a moulded or struck form linguistically; the idea that it is a clay or plaster model in the sense of showing a piece on a smaller scale must also be rejected, that being usually described as ›plasma‹ or ›proplasma‹. The attempts of earlier commentators to see typoi as models springs perhaps from a desire to see Timotheos as the guiding spirit of the artistic programme, and for similar reasons the east akroteria have been repeatedly attributed to him, against the logic of the text, because the east was considered the more important and visible side of the building. Within the accounts, all the artistic works associated with the pediments and akroteria are found close together (p. 87 ff.), and so if the typoi were to be part of the artistic programme, they should have been made well before the awarding of the sculptural contracts, but the accounts reveal that Timotheos was still in the process of making the typoi at the end of the third year, when the sculptors were about to start work at the beginning of the fourth. There is perhaps then no general artistic master plan for the sculptures, but the pay for the design of the four groups is included in the monies paid to the four overseers, each one of the four artists designing his own pediment or akroteria groups, having clarified design issues well in advance.

A useful table (pp. 66–73) lists the sections of the Temple project and what we can tabulate from the accounts was spent on the materials, transport costs and labour. The surviving amounts total around 125.000 drachmas. The date of the project can only be relatively assigned, but Prignitz posits construction around 400–390 B.C., twenty years older than generally thought, based on the morphology of the inscription, style of the sculptures, and relationship with the Tholos and cult statue accounts. The next series of accounts is for the Tholos, which begins before 375 and is completed after 351. One breakthrough with this set of accounts was the recognition of a fragment of another stele of the same project, which must have contained the information missing from the main Tholos account, i. e., the expenses for building the roof, the interior ceiling, and the nineteen paving stones not accounted for previously. The existence of this fragment proves that accounts for particular building projects could be written on more than one stele, which should be kept in mind when discussing the type and role of the surviving stones. The cult statue of Asklepios was finished around 370 B.C., while the construction of the Fountain House begins around 365 and is completed about five or ten years later.

The presentation of the texts is followed by a series of chapters on various subjects illuminated by them. The building commission and their methods of selling contracts is discussed, along with the many heralds sent out to announce contracts and make arrangements in other cities. A chapter on Epidaurean demes greatly expands our knowledge of the civic structure of the city, and a full prosopography of all those involved in the works certainly adds much to the corpus. The index of specialised vocabulary should be consulted by anyone interested in architectural terminology, bringing up to date as it does over two hundred and fifty building-related words. Discussions of the sculptural groups are also complemented by images of the surviving sculptures and their closest parallels.

What marks this volume out is the principal of thorough autopsy of the stones themselves as the es-

sential basis for any investigations of the texts. Not only have the inscriptions been thoroughly mined for every possible letter trace, but an investigation of the archival squeezes (paper impressions) of the inscriptions (in the archives of the Inscriptiones Graecae project in Berlin) has contributed to a rewardingly large number of new readings, entirely unnoticed sections, and newly joining fragments. Such an insistence on autopsy, while essential for any good epigraphic work, is increasingly difficult for many students of epigraphy, tied to their desks through a lack of financial support to travel or by time constraints which mean the evidence base is always on other people's editions, often generations older. Here we see what remarkable results can be achieved by returning to long-neglected stones in the field.

Athens Robert K. Pitt