

SEG XXXII 1243, 13–15¹⁾

καὶ ὄσσαι[ς]
ἔποιήσατο δαπάναις εἰς τὸν πενταετήριον τῶν μυστηρίων κόσμον,
ὃ {το}
τε τῶν ἀναλωμάτων καίρος τὰν πονπευομένην αὐτῷ φιλοδοξίαν καὶ εὐ-
σέβησαν ἐπέδειξεν·
ὃ {το}τε litteras seclusi: OTOTE lapis: ὄτ' ὃ τε Hodot: ὃ τότε Merkelbach

René Hodot, in his *editio princeps* of this text, segments the stone's OTOTE as ὄτ' ὃ τε, arguing soundly that “καίρος, le sujet d' ἐπέδειξεν, doit être accompagné de l'article, qui lui-même doit être précédé d'un subordonatif”, but is perturbed by the elision of ὄτε and the anacoluthon²⁾. In fact, Hodot preserves the text at too high a price, as does Merkelbach, whose reading ὃ τότε³⁾, adopted by the SEG, leaves the clause without any syntactical connection to the rest of the sentence and strains the construction of τότε. ὃ τε gives passable grammar, with τε as a

1) Other editions: René Hodot, Décret de Kymè en l'honneur du Prytane Kléanax, *The J. Paul Getty Museum Journal* 10 (1982) 165–180 *editio princeps*, reviewed by J. and L. Robert, *BE* 323 (1983) 132–138; Reinhold Merkelbach, *Ehrenbeschluss der Kymäer für den Prytanis Kleanax*, *Epigraphica Anatolica* 1 (1983) 33–38.

2) Hodot 172–73.

3) Merkelbach 36.

loose connective, but the emendation assumes a slip on the part of an otherwise exemplary engraver. The extra letters may have crept in as he broke $\omicron \tau\epsilon$ over two lines. However farfetched this proposition may be, OTOTE cannot stand⁴).

Ann Arbor, Michigan

Robert John Sklenář

4) I first suggested the emendation $\omicron \{ \tau\omicron \} \tau\epsilon$ in a seminar paper written for Professor Glen W. Bowersock, to whom I am greatly indebted for criticism and encouragement.