Rhodes, Lindus. Sacrificial Regulations.
Ca. 250 B.C.

(Figures 25–26)

A fragment of a mottled gray plaque of Lartian stone, found in March 1982 lying in the yard of a private house. It is not clear how the stone reached its finding place; original provenance remains unknown. The stone is broken above, below, and on the right. The back is rough-picked. The inscribed face is fairly well preserved. There was probably nothing inscribed in the vacant space under the text, and Kostomitsopoulos seems correct in observing that not much is missing on the top.

H. 0.20, W. 0.21 (top)—0.09 (bottom), Th. 0.075. L.H. 0.014–0.017, round letters somewhat smaller, 0.012–0.013. Interlinear space 0.01. Left margin 0.01.
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Ed. Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 121–123; (= SEG XXXVIII 786).

Photograph: Kostomitsopoulos 1988, 121 (good).

ca. 250 a.

\[\text{᾿Απόλλωνι ΕΝΟ . [\]}
\[2 \text{χίμαρος: θυέτ[ω]}
\[\text{τὸν φυλετά[v]}
\[4 \text{ὁ γεμαίτα[ος]}
\[\text{τὰ θυηέντ[α αύτει]}
\[6 \text{καταχοή[θαυα.]
\[\text{}\text{vacat}

Epigraphical Commentary. I have seen the stone. Nice, large letters; small serifs; the strokes tend to widen toward the edges of the letters.

Last two traces: a lower part of a smaller round letter (Ο or Θ), followed by a lower part of a diagonal stroke. There are no signs of a serif at the bottom and the stroke itself does not widen toward the edge. If it is intentional, Α and Λ might be possible; X is somewhat less likely because the stroke begins too close to the preceding traces to allow sufficient room for the upper part of the other stroke. Α Δ seems to me unlikely since there are no traces of the bottom bar.

Translation

To Apollo [- - -] a young he-goat; the eldest of the tribesmen shall sacrifice (it); the sacrificed meat shall be consumed [on the spot].

Commentary

This fragment is very close to a number of Rhodian sacred laws which may generally be described as calendar extracts, commonly listing the recipient divinity and the animal to be sacrificed; the officiant and the motive or occasion for the sacrifice are typically not mentioned. In addition to similarity in contents these documents tend to share some physical features: they comprise a small number of comparatively short lines and are commonly inscribed on small stones. The major difference between the calendar extracts and the present fragment is its lack of a date (cf. LSS 88a). One might assume that the date was inscribed in the part now lost above, but the stone gives the impression that not much is missing on the top. The fragment may be regarded as an independent document, and the fact that nothing was inscribed below the preserved text seems to corroborate this. Kostomitsopoulos’ assumption that the stone could originally have been built into a wall or an altar is plausible.

Date. Kostomitsopoulos’ plausible dating of the inscription to the mid-third century B.C. is based upon letter forms and orthography.

Lines 1–2

The fragmentary word in line 1 probably referred to Apollo or to the victim (ed. pr. 122). Ἐνόλμος (‘sitting at the tripod’), which might be

---

1 See Part I pp. 69–70.