A lower part of a tapered stele of Thasian marble found in Thasos in 1969 near the coast, south of Potos, among the excavated remains of a post-Byzantine chapel which had utilized building materials of the early Christian period in its construction. A relief of Roman times was also discovered among these remains. The stone is broken above and about one quarter is missing on the upper right down to about the level of line eight. The back is rough-picked and was somewhat crudely hollowed to create a wider base. In the middle of the bottom there is a shallow cutting of roughly 0.06 in length into which a stabilizing metal tenon might have been inserted. The inscribed face is worn and considerable parts have peeled off. The last two words are somewhat bigger than the rest of the inscription and 0.05 was left uninscribed below the text. The inscription is written in the Parian alphabet.\(^2\)

\[H \ 0.325, \ W. \ 0.431 \text{ (bottom)}—0.428 \text{ (at the level of line 8)}, \ Th. \ 0.145 \text{ (at the base)}—ca. \ 0.95, \ L.H. \ ca. \ 0.015–0.017; \ O, \ Θ \ ca. \ 0.007–0.01. \text{ Last two words ca.} \ 0.02; \ Θ \ ca. \ 0.017. \text{ Interlinear space ca.} \ 0.003–0.005. \text{ Bottom margin} \ 0.05.\]

Thasos (Limenas), Archaeological Museum. Inv. Λ 2726.


Photograph: Veligianni 1988, pl. XIXa; (= Duchêne 1992, pl. XX); (good).

\footnote{1}{Ch. Koukouli-Chrysanthaki \textit{AD} 25, 1970, B 2, 40 (cf. 22, 1967, B 2 423); (Veligianni 1988, 191).}

\footnote{2}{See below epigraphical commentary.}
ca. 430–420 a. NON-ΣΤΟΙΧ.


Epigraphical Commentary. I have seen the stone. My readings differ from ed. pr. in several places; an account of the differences is given where needed. The letters are rather crowded and somewhat crudely inscribed. Vertical strokes have sometimes been lined up, occasionally creating a semi-stoichedon impression. The inscription employs the Parian alphabet which uses Γ for Λ, Λ for Γ, Ω for τ/omΛkron, and τ/omΛkron for Ω. These forms have been retained in the text for capital letters.

1 Whatever remains of line (not counted by V.) is affected by attrition.
2 τ/omΛkron (= ω, Ω (= ω)): O might be considered. Last traces: probably Ω missing its upper part. For this line V. prints - - - - - - - - - - - - and restores [ἐν]χος. One is tempted to take what appears to be A for Λ (= γ) and read [δ] ώ χος, but alpha appears a more obvious reading and, moreover, upsilons in this inscription (lines 5, 8, 10) do not have pronounced stems, if they have stems at all.
3 The lacuna after the first ταυ might allow one letter plus a iota.
4 Second letter: Α, Ω, or Λ (= γ) are possible. After the upsilon V. detected traces of a Φ or a B. End: I could not see any traces after the doubtful ρho.
5 The first lacuna allows about three letters, perhaps with an extra iota. Β.'s καὶ gives good sense but may be too long.
6 First word: ω: ed. pr. (followed by subsequent editions) mistakenly transcribed the stone’s O as an omicron.
7 First Σ: traces of bottom strokes seem clear (not read by V.). H: traces of verticals: V. reads an epsilon lacking a middle horizontal.
8 V. prints the restoration [θ] εὐστα, but the chi seems too close to the left edge to be preceded by any letter.
9 The epsilon in ἐπί: insecure traces (V. tentatively detected a vertical stroke).

vacat 0.05

3 For snouts cf. commentary on 20.16 above.