

CRANTOR OF SOLI –
HIS BEQUEST AND FUNERAL
IN PHILODEMUS' *INDEX ACADEMICORUM*
(PHERC. 1021, COL. 16.37 – COL. S.10)*

Abstract: This article provides a new edition of a passage from Philodemus' *Index Academicorum* which deals with the bequest and funeral of the Academic Crantor of Soli and depends on Antigonus of Carystus (PHERC. 1021, col. 16.37 – col. S.10). From the new readings it emerges that, like Diogenes Laertius, Philodemus too mentioned the bequest of twelve talents. Furthermore, the new readings help us to better understand the meaning of a verse related to Crantor's funeral.

Keywords: Crantor of Soli, Antigonus of Carystus, Diogenes Laertius, *Index Academicorum*, Philodemus

Crantor of Soli was an outstanding figure in the early history of the Academy at a time when it had not turned to Scepticism yet under the influence of his darling Arcesilaus.¹ His death (276/75) was premature to some extent and he would have most probably become scholarch of the Academy, had he outlived Polemo.² Cran-

*) This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No.703798 – AcadHist. This article reflects only the author's view. I am currently working on a new comprehensive edition of Philodemus' *Index Academicorum* (PHERC. 1691/1021/164). I would like to thank Graziano Ranocchia and Nigel Wilson for their advice.

1) On Crantor see H. Krämer, *Die Ältere Akademie*, in: H. Flashar (ed.), *GGPh 3 (Ältere Akademie, Aristoteles, Peripatos)* (Basel 2004) 113, 115, 122–125. A collection of testimonies has been provided by H. Mette, *Zwei Akademiker heute: Krantor von Soloi and Arkesilaos von Pitane*, *Lustrum* 26 (1984) 1–94, here: 1–40.

2) On Crantor's death under the archon Philocrates, see C. W. Müller, *Das Archontat des Philokrates und die Chronologie der Hellenistischen Akademie*, *RhM* 146 (2003) 1–9 with the note of C. Habicht, *Wie sicher ist die Datierung des Archontats des Phikokrates ins Jahr 276/5?*, *RhM* 147 (2004) 2–4. Müller (2003) 6–7 points out that the phrasing of Theaitetus' epigram in D. L. 4,25 does not imply that Crantor was a (very) young man at his death. Nevertheless he seems to have died before his time (probably in his fifties).

tor was famous for his ethics and in particular his treatise *περὶ πένθους* enjoyed great popularity with ancient readers.

Diogenes Laertius devotes a few passages (D.L. 4.24–27) to Crantor's life which often bear a striking resemblance to his description in Philodemus' *Index Academicorum* (PHerc. 1021). Gomperz (1870) and later Wilamowitz (1881) have demonstrated that both authors (indirectly) depend on Antigonos of Carystus.³ Gaiser (1988) goes even further and argues that Antigonos was the direct source for Philodemus.⁴

In this contribution several new readings made in the *Index Academicorum* (PHerc. 1021, col. 16 and col. S) shall be presented. Here, in addition to an autopsy, multispectral images (MSI) of the papyrus have been exploited for the first time.⁵ The new readings provide a better understanding of the meaning of a verse referring to Crantor's funeral which is quoted by both Philodemus and Diogenes; they reveal that Crantor's bequest to Arcesilaus was mentioned not only by Diogenes, but also by Philodemus. So far, the relevant passage in Philodemus' *Index Academicorum* (Dorandi 1991) and in Diogenes Laertius (Dorandi 2013) read as follow:⁶

3) T. Gomperz, in: *Anzeiger der kaiserl. Ak. d. Wissenschaften in Wien* (1870) 40–42, here: 41. U. v. Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Antigonos von Karystos* (Berlin 1881) 45–77, in particular: 57, 68–70.

4) K. Gaiser, *Philodems Academica* (Stuttgart / Bad Cannstatt 1988) 130, 131.

5) The MSI could only be exploited for col. 16, since col. S was copied on the back of the papyrus and is nowadays not visible anymore (the papyrus is clued on a cornice). Our only witness for the column is the so called Oxford disegno, which was drawn before the papyrus was clued on the cornice.

6) T. Dorandi, *Filodemo. Storia dei filosofi. Platone e l'Academia* (PHerc. 1021 e 164). Edizione, traduzione e commento (Naples 1991). Prior editions were provided by Bücheler (1869), based on the *Collectio Altera*, and Mekler (1902). Gaiser's (note 4) edition includes just the first part of the *Index Academicorum* (col. 1*–17). The *Index Academicorum* (also called *Historia Academicorum* or by other similar titles) is commonly believed to represent a part (book) of Philodemus' *Σύνταξις τῶν φιλοσόφων* which consisted of at least ten books (D.L. 10,3). PHerc. 1691/1021 represents an opistograph and preliminary draft, probably Philodemus' actual working manuscript, whereas PHerc. 164 preserves some poor remains of the final version (T. Dorandi, *Nell'officina dei classici. Come lavorano gli autori antichi* [Rome 2007] 40–42). For the edition of Diogenes Laertius: T. Dorandi, *Diogenes Laertius: Lives of eminent philosophers* (Cambridge 2013).

Phld. Ind. Acad. col. 16.37–S.10
(PHerc. 1021)

D. L. 4.25.14–19:

Col. 16

37 βίον [.....]αισ[.....]
την [---]
οὐκ ἐλαττόνων [ο]ῦσα[ν] ἄ-
40 ξίαν ἤλω δια τα[.....]
φιλο[.....] τούτου δέ φησιν
ἐγλείπ[οντο]ς ἤδη πυνθά-
νεσθ[α]ι τὸν [Ἀρκεσί]λαν, πότε-
ρον αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς [κ]ο[ι]ναιῖς
45 θάψωσιν ἢ [ἐν] ἄλλαις θήκαις. ||

λέγεται δὲ καὶ τὴν οὐσίαν καταλιπεῖν Ἀρκεσίλαφ, ταλάντων οὐσαν δυοκαίδεκα. καὶ ἐρωτηθέντα πρὸς αὐτοῦ ποῦ βούλεται ταφῆναι, εἰπεῖν· ἐν γῆς φύλης ὄχθοισι κρυφθῆναι καλόν (TrGF Adesp. 281). λέγεται δὲ καὶ ποιήματα γράψαι καὶ ἐν τῇ πατρίδι ἐπὶ τῷ τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερῷ σφραγισάμενος αὐτὰ θεῖναι. ...

Col. S

[οὔτος δ' "ἐν γῆς φύλης ὄχ-]
θοισι καλόν" ἔφη] " κρυφθῆ-
ναι". δι[ταβεβαιου]μένον
δε τοῦ Πο[λ]έμου[ο]ς καὶ νο-
5 μίζοντος αὐτὸν δεῖν ἐ-
ν αἰς αὐτοὶ μέλλουσιν τε-
θῆναι θήκαις, εἶπεγ ὡς „οὔ-
τε πρότερον ἀντ[έ]τ[ει]ν' ἀ[ύ]-
— τωι πόποτε οὔτ[ε] γῆ[ν]". καὶ
10 οὐκ ἀφηγησάμε[νος].....
κτλ.

The tragic verse also occurs in Stob. 3.40.8 (p.743.3 Hense), as a quotation from Teles' περὶ φυγῆς (Telet. rell. ed. Hense² p.30, 10):

καὶ γῆς φύλης ὄχθοισι κρυφθῆναι καλόν

col. 16: 39 [ο]ῦσα[ν] Mekler 40–42 δια τα[.....]φιλο[.....] τούτου δέ φησιν | ἐγλείπ[οντο]ς ἤδη Dorandi : διατα[ξ]όμενος. οἱ | φίλοι γὰρ περιέστασαν | ἐγλείπ[ον]τ' ἤδη Mekler : διὰ τα[ύτης τῆς] | φιλο[σοφίας]. τούτου δέ φησιν | ἐγλείπ[οντο]ς ἤδη Gaiser 43 Mekler 44 Gaiser 45 [ἐν] ἄλλαις θήκαις] Gaiser : [θήκαις διαπυθές-] Mekler col. S: 1–2 οὔτος δ' "ἐν κτλ. Gaiser : -θαι· ὁ δ' ἐν κτλ. Mekler 3 δι[ταβεβαιου]μένου Mekler 5 αὐτόν Bücheler : αὐτόν Gomperz 8 ἀντ[έ]τ[ει]ν' Gomperz : ἀντ[ι]τ[εί]να[ι] αὐ[τῶ]ι Arnim : ἀντ[έ]στη Bücheler 9 γῆ[ν].” καὶ Gaiser : γῆ[ν] δῆ.” Gomperz 10 ἀφηγησάμε[νος] Gaiser : ἀφηγησα- μένωι Mekler

Let us first focus our attention on the mysterious ἤλω (= ἑάλω – ἀλίσκομαι) in line 40, a combination of letters which is very rare indeed and hardly allows for an alternative word division in this context. The reading was first suggested by Mekler and followed by Dorandi in his edition; Gaiser offers a very daring reconstruction of the entire passage which he thinks should be interpreted to the effect that Arcesilaus was won over by Crantor's philosophy.⁷

7) Gaiser (note 4) col. 16, 37–41: „βίον[.....]καὶ συνιείς τὴν [Κράντωρος διατριβὴν] | οὐκ ἐλαττόνων [ο]ῦσα[ν] ἀ⁴⁰ξίαν, ἤλω δια τα[ύτης τῆς] | φιλοσοφίας.

Yet, a closer look at the papyrus shows that it is possible, maybe even necessary, to read the letter δ instead of λ . Traces at the feet of both oblique strokes of δ hint at a lost “horizontal” base (a connection between the feet). The angle and the shape of the oblique strokes are compatible with δ . After the ω the left part of a δ can be identified; the following letter is compatible with ϵ and again the next might represent the lower stroke of κ . After this, the left foot and the top of an α are visible, then traces suggesting τ can be identified. Next we have the right part of an α , one letter missing, then the middle triangle of an α . After a gap of three letters the final letter of the line is ν .⁸

The reading / supplement $\eta \delta\omega\delta\epsilon\kappa\alpha \tau\alpha[\lambda]\acute{\alpha}[\nu\tau\omega]\nu$ seems inevitable, especially if we compare it with the corresponding passage in Diogenes: $\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\ \delta\acute{\epsilon}\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\nu\ \upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\nu\ \text{Άρκεσιλάω, ταλάντων οὔσαν δυοκαίδεκα}$. I suppose that a word meaning “property” was written right after the $\tau\eta\nu$ in line 38 and the faded and scanty traces allow for $[\omicron]\upsilon\sigma\iota\acute{\alpha}\nu$, a noun which is also used by Diogenes. The subsequent traces are difficult to make out, but at the end of the line $\epsilon\nu$ is rather certain. Therefore, one should consider reading the verb $\kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\iota\pi\epsilon\upsilon$, which would parallel the word order in Diogenes.⁹ In any case, a verb with the meaning “leave / bequeath”¹⁰ and a dative referring to Arcesilaus must have occurred in lines 37–38, as the remaining letters and the supposed syntax do not favour the assumption that $\epsilon\gamma\lambda\epsilon\iota$ in line 42 represents this very verb. The noun $\beta\acute{\iota}\omicron\nu$ in line 37, along with information to be found in Diogenes,¹¹ may suggest the following reconstruction

τούτου δέ φησιν] | ἐγλείπ[οντο]ς ἤδη πυνθάινεσθ[αι κτλ. He translates: “. . . Leben. Doch als er (= Arkesilaos, der vorher bei Theophrast studierte) erkannte, daß die philosophische Unterweisung Krantors nicht weniger wert war, da wurde er durch diese Philosophie gefangen (für die Akademie gewonnen).”

8) There is a sign in the space between columns 15 and 16 at the level of line 40 (first identified by Ranocchia). It is not clear whether it represents a kind of letter (a stichometric sign? κ ?) or an unknown scribal sign (maybe concerning the final layout). At least it seems to bear no obvious relation to the content of the lines of both columns.

9) Lower part of the vertical of κ preserved, faded traces of lower stroke. Indistinct traces of α . Foot of τ . Tip of middle-stroke of ϵ . Lower left part of λ . Part of (right?) foot of π .

10) Considering Diogenes’ parallel text, the verb $\kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\pi\omega$ is more likely than any other word.

11) D.L. 4.22,29.

of the sense of the clause: “Crantor spent his life together with Arcesilaus (in a shared accommodation) and (later) bequeathed his property to him, worth no less than twelve talents.”

At the beginning of line 41 I transcribe φασί, what seems to be the beginning of a new sentence (cf. λέγεται in Diogenes). The traces after φ do not allow for ιλ and what remains looks very much like a broad α. Then follow a σ and ink at bottom which belongs to a tiny letter. The subsequent traces at bottom would fit a horizontal (δ is possible). The traces coming next would fit αὐτοῦ. The following letters, which might be estimated to be eight, are hard to discern and only faded and scattered traces survive. The vertical at the end of the line is hardly a ι, since this would imply a hiatus which is not very likely. It is possible that the traces represent the right part of a ν, which would allow for τὸν βίον. However, this reading would require the plausible supplementing of a short word (2–3 letters) after αὐτοῦ which is difficult to find. The supplement κῶτ’ ὀλ[ί]γον would be in accordance with space and context. In line 42 ἐγλείπ[οντο]ς ἤδη obviously means “when he (Crantor) was already dying”.¹²

In lines 44–45 Dorandi approves of Gaiser’s conjecture ἐν ταῖς [κ]ο[ιναῖς] θάψωσιν ἢ [ἐν ἄλλαις θήκαις. Gaiser believes that Arcesilaus asked Crantor whether he would like to be buried in a tomb together with his fellow Academics or in other tombs, whatever this might mean. Yet, given Crantor’s answering verse, such a question seems slightly awkward and the rest of the episode does not go well with this supplement.¹³ Praechter (1902) has correctly outlined the meaning of the verse: “Auf Drängen Polemons aber willigt er ein. Dann muß das Verszitat eine Weigerung enthalten, das kann es aber nur, wenn φίλης auf ein Begräbnis an anderem Orte, nämlich in der Heimat des Philosophen hindeutet.”¹⁴ Al-

12) Crantor died from dropsy, cf. D.L. 4.27.

13) The phrase gives the impression that Polemo is introducing shared tombs for the first time.

14) K. Praechter, Rezension zu: S. Mekler, Academicorum philosophorum index Herculaneensis (1902), in: Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen 164 (1902) 953–972, here 965 note 2. For „Polemons Drängen“ see col. S, 3–7. T. Gomperz, Die herkulanische Biographie des Polemon, in: Philosophische Aufsätze. Eduard Zeller zu seinem fünfzigjährigen Doctor-Jubiläum gewidmet (Leipzig 1887) 139–149, here 148, thinks that the verse refers to Attica, not to his homeland. Wilamowitz (note 3) 68 states that the verse alludes to the speaker’s desire to be buried in his own country. The ποῦ in Diogenes also suggests a geographical place.

though Gaiser shares this view, his reconstruction does not express the alternatives of being buried either in Athens or in Soli in a way which would naturally lead to the quotation of this particular verse.

In line 44 the traces after ταῖς represent an α whose left part and right foot are well preserved. The following curved letter hint at a ϑ and the supplement Ἀθῆ[ναις] fits the space well. In line 45 the MSI enables us to read καύσαντες (“after burning him”), some letters of which cannot be detected by the naked eye in the original. The space at the end of the line suggests another two letters; ἐν is perfectly possible. The sentence was continued on the back of the papyrus (the Oxford disegno is our only source for col. S).¹⁵ The alternative ἐν ταῖς Ἀθῆ[ναις], as well as the answering verse, virtually require a contrasting location “in Soli / in his homeland”. The second possibility obviously implies cremation,¹⁶ because it would have been difficult (without some special effort) to bring Crantor’s corpse from Athens to Soli. Nonetheless, the first alternative (Athens) might have gone along with cremation as well and the position of the participle may only emphasize the fact that burning was absolutely inevitable if Crantor had chosen to be buried in his hometown. It does not seem probable to me that the alternatives and the answering verse somehow allude to the choice between cremation and inhumation. Both practices coexisted in Ancient Athens, while inhumation seems to have been predominant during the Hellenistic period, and it seems unlikely that Crantor or Arce-silaus were concerned about this aspect of the funeral.¹⁷ Accordingly, the most natural supplement for the beginning col. S line 1 would be Σόλοις or τοῖς Σόλοις, but also τῆι πατρίδι or any other expression indicating Crantor’s homeland is possible.

The infinitive κρυφθῆναι strongly suggests that the tragic verse of unknown provenance quoted by Diogenes has also been

15) Cf. note 5.

16) The first possibility (Athens) might also have gone along with cremation; on burial see W. Tomaschek, *Bestattung*, RE III (1899) 331–360, here 337 and 339, and R. Garland, *The Greek Way of Death* (London 2001) 34–36. The latter says that the evidence from the Classical period reveals no preference either way, whereas in tragedy the usual form of burial is cremation.

17) Even the remains of cremated bodies were usually buried, cf. Tomaschek (note 16) 337.

copied by Philodemus.¹⁸ However, I find it hard to believe that Philodemus changed the word order of the verse by ignoring the rules of iambic metre, and inserted ἔφη immediately before the last word of the verse. The η of the Oxford disegno could be a miswriting for σι and the δ following the verb might in fact have been a κ.¹⁹ If one accepts these not too far-fetched corrections of the disegno, it is quite possible that the verse has been quoted in full, in correct metric word order and without any insertion. This would leave space for supplementing four or five letters before the expected participle ending λυμένον in line 3. In addition to a possible present (perfect) participle indicating refusal, the aorist participles πύθο]-μένον and αἰσθο]-μένον might be considered.²⁰ Since the funeral-epitaph represents a rather coherent narrative marked with a paragramphus at the end (col. S.10), it is quite likely that the verb in line 7 still depends on φασί. Therefore, I prefer to change the εἰπερ[]ωσ of the Oxford disegno to εἰπέτω and not to the finite verb εἶπεν, as previous editors have done.²¹ This would also imply an infinitive in line 1 for which the verb εἰπέτω would have a parallel in Diogenes Laertius. If the verse was quoted in full and without interruption, as I assume, it started most probably with ἐν at the end of

18) The version to be found in Diogenes begins with ἐν, the one given by Stobaeus with καὶ. Dorandi (2013) prints ὄχθοισι and not μύχθοισι which, as emerges from the apparatus, has to be considered a false correction by a scribe. I do not wish to dwell on the question who the author of this verse might be. There are good reasons to adopt a cautious approach and list the fragment under the Adespota (TrGF Adesp. 281).

19) The left oblique of δ might have been mistakenly regarded as the slightly curved vertical of κ. The ‘horizontal’ of δ might have been the lower stroke of the κ and the upper stroke of κ might have been mistaken for the right part of δ. This is possible, in particular, if the letter was partly destroyed, which is not improbable given the lacuna to right of the δ. Also the shape of δ in the disegno might hint at a miswriting.

20) Both participles would imply that Polemo was not present when Arcesilaus asked Crantor about his funeral. This is possible and Polemo might have been indirectly informed about Crantor’s response. However, the 3. p. pl. in col. 16.45 may suggest that he was also present when Arcesilaus asked Crantor. The citation of the complete verse in a correct and uninterrupted way would have the convenient consequence that the supplement δ[ταβεβαίου]μένον would no longer be possible. Hitherto, it had been linked to the first alternative of Arcesilaus’ question in a very unnatural way by Gaiser (note 4): “Als aber Polemon die (andere) Auffassung verstärkte”; Dorandi (note 6): “Poiché però Polemone aveva rafforzato il proposito ...”

line 1.²¹ This would for instance allow for the following reconstruction of col. S.1: (τοῖς) Σόλοις, αὐτὸν δ' εἰπεῖν· “ἐν. In any case, it is probable that line 1 contained the name of Crantor’s hometown (whatever the wording) and a verbum dicendi referring to Crantor.²²

In line 8 the assumption of direct speech (indicated by quotation marks in the text above) does not seem absolutely necessary to me.²³ The traces in the disegno fit better the supplement ἀντεῖ[πε]ν than ἀντ[έ]τ[ε]ν.²⁴ Before some conclusive remarks are made, let me provide a new transcript and translation of the passage.

Phld. Ind. Acad. col. 16.37–S.10 (PHerc. 1021) – Fleischer

Col. 16

37 βίον . . . [.]α . . . [τ.] [.] [.] [.] (.)
 τὴν [ο]ὑσίαν κατέλ[ι]πεν
 οὐκ ἔλαττόνων [ο]ῦσα[ν] ἄ-
 40 ξίαν ἢ δώδεκα τα[λ]ά[ν]των.
 φασὶ δ' αὐτοῦ κατ' ὀλ[ί]γον
 ἐγλείπ[ον]το[ι]ς ἤδη πυρθα-
 νεσθ[α]ί τὸν Ἀρκ[ε]σι[λ]αν, πότε-
 ρον αὐτὸν ἐν ταῖς Ἀθή[ν]αις
 45 θάψωσ[τ]ιν ἢ καύσαντες [ἐν

... life ... (and to him, sc. Arcesilaus) he bequeathed his property, worth no less than twelve talents. Arcesilaus is said to have inquired from him, when he was already getting closer to death, whether they should bury him in Athens or in Soli after his cremation. (He replied) “Please it would be covered in the hills of this beloved soil.” When Polemo (... and) continued to express the view that he (sc. Crantor) should be buried in the same tomb(s) in which they will one day be buried, he (sc. Crantor) said that he had never contradicted him and would not do so now. He has not led the school ...

Col. S

1 [Σόλοις, αὐτὸν δ' εἰπεῖν· “ἐν]
 γῆς φίλης ὄχθοι[σ]ι κρυφθῆ-
 ναι κ[α]λόν.” ... (.) μένου
 δὲ τοῦ Πο[λ]έμων[ο]ς καὶ νο-
 5 μίζοντος αὐτὸν δεῖν ἐ-
 ν αἰς αὐτοῖ μέλλουσιν τε-
 θῆναι θήκαις, εἰπεῖν ὡς οὐ-
 τε πρότερον ἀντεῖ[πε]ν ἀ[ν]-
 τῶι πάποτε οὐτ[ε] γῆ[ν]. ...
 10 οὐκ ἀφηγησάμενος.....
 κτλ.

21) The space in line 2 seems to be sufficiently broad for this reconstruction, although it cannot be entirely excluded that γῆς is already written at the end of line 1.

22) A subject (accusative) is likely, but, as the isolated εἰπεῖν in line 7 shows, not absolutely necessary. If line 7 read εἶπε, a definite verb in line 1 would be possible as well.

23) Furthermore, Philodemus (and other authors) would normally use ὅτι or διότι (for Philodemus see col. 2.40; 2.43; 6.38; 9.5; col. Q. 6) to indicate the beginning of direct speech.

24) The space between ἀντ and the vertical (supposedly a vertical τ) seems to be too small for ε and the left part of τ (usually rather extended horizontal).

col. 16: 37 in hac linea Arcesilai mentionem factam esse conicias
 38 legi et suppleni (de [κ]τῆσι cogitaveris) 39 [ο]ῦσα[v] Mekler 40 ἢ
 δώδεκα τα[λ]ά[ντων] legi et suppleni : ἥλω διαταξάμενος Mekler
 41 legi et suppleni 42 ἐλείπει[οντο]ς Gaiser 44–45 ἐν ταῖς Ἀθηναίς
 ... ἢ καύσαντες [ἐν legi et suppleni : ἐν ταῖς [κ]ο[ρ]ινθαῖς] ... ἢ [ἐν ἄλ-
 λαις θήκαις Gaiser col. S: 1–3 Σόλοις. αὐτὸν δ' εἰπεῖν suppleni (pos-
 sis etiam τοῖς Σόλοις. τὸν δ' εἰπεῖν) : Σόλοις. ἀποκρίνασθαι δ' Schröder
 per litteras „ἐν γῆς φίλης ὀχλοῖσι κρυφθῆναι καλόν.” suppleni e
 D.L. 4,25 et Stob. 3,40,8, qui καὶ pro ἐν habet (versu dissoluto „ἐν
 γῆς φίλης ὀχλοῖσι καλόν” ἐφη) „κρυφθῆναι.” scripserat Mekler)
 2–3 [η]κρυφθῆναιδ[ι] Ο 3 πυθο]μένου vel αἰσθο]μένου conieci : λυ-
 που]μένου Schröder per litteras: δι]αβεβαιου]μένου Mekler 7 εἰπεῖν
 ὡς legi et correxī : εἰπερ]]ωσ Ο : εἰπευ ὡς Mekler 8 ἀντεῖ[πει]ν sup-
 pleni : ἀν[έ]τ[ει]ν' Gomperz : ἀν[τ]ι[τ]εῖ[ν]α[ι] αὐ]τῶι Arnim : ἀν[τ]έστη
 Bücheler 9 γῦ[v.] καὶ Gaiser : γῦ[v] δῆ.” Gomperz 10 ἀφηγησάμενος
 Gaiser : ἀφηγησάμε[v]οι Mekler

My new reading making Philodemus mention the bequest of twelve talents in col. 16 shows once again how similarly many passages in Diogenes and Philodemus were phrased (τὴν [ο]ῦσίαν κατέλ[ι]πειν οὐκ ἐλαττόνων [ο]ῦσα[v] ἀξίαν ἢ δώδεκα τα[λ]ά[ντων] vs. τὴν οὐσίαν καταλιπεῖν Ἄρκεσιλάω ταλάντων οὔσαν δυοκαίδεκα). It is noteworthy that even the word order is almost the same. Philodemus' phrasing underlines that the bequeathed amount was a rather substantial one. Diogenes' οὔσαν and the position of ταλάντων οὔσαν δυοκαίδεκα hint at an original and more elaborate wording which Diogenes shortened or already found in condensed form, whereas Philodemus transmits a version which seems to be closer to Antigonus' original, maybe even more or less adopting the biographer's own words.

Crantor's deeply felt desire to be buried in his faraway Cilian hometown of Soli, which the tragic verse expresses so emotionally, gives us a touching picture of Crantor and his mild character. He had been held in high esteem in his hometown before migrating to Athens and may still have had ties to Soli.²⁵ It was obviously Athens which had first allowed Crantor to fully develop his talent and to suitably pursue his philosophical interests, and he had very good friends there (Polemo, Crates, and of course his

25) D.L. 4.24 Κράνωρ Σολεὺς θανατούμενος ἐν τῇ ἑαυτοῦ πατρίδι ἀπῆρεν εἰς Ἀθήνας καὶ Ξενοκράτους διήκουσε Πολέμωνι συσκολάζων and Phld. Ind. Acad. col. 16.1–3. Philodemus touches upon the topic of dying far away from one's homeland in De morte, col. 25.37 – col. 26 mid (Henry).

darling Arcesilaus). But for all his ‘Academic’ satisfaction in Athens, Crantor may well have occasionally remembered his beloved homeland and felt a touch of nostalgia. With regard to Crantor’s treatise *περὶ πένθους* which is so different from the rigid Stoic view on the subject and accepts human emotions to a certain extent, it should not surprise us to find that the philosopher was open to deeply human feelings such as nostalgia. It seems that Arcesilaus, who shared a house with Crantor, was basically willing to fulfil his last will and it was maybe more by chance that Polemo was informed about his desire to be buried in Soli. The scholarch seems to have almost insisted (present participle – νομίζοντος) that Crantor should lie in the same tomb “they”²⁶ will one day be buried in. For sure, if Polemo had suggested to Crantor that he be buried in any other tomb in Athens, he would have possibly rejected this suggestion in favour of his beloved Soli, but the prospect of sharing a tomb²⁷ with his teacher Polemo and his friend Crates (as well as Arcesilaus), with whom he had enjoyed many communal meals,²⁸ may have changed his original intentions. Crantor’s reply may be interpreted to mean that he struggled somewhat with the decision, but finally agreed with Polemo’s generous and possibly unexpected offer. His answer shows his affection for Polemo: he has never contradicted Polemo (concerning his philosophical views) and does not do so now (concerning a question, which is in fact non-philosophical, but here too, Crantor is convinced, Polemo surely knows what the best thing to do is). May it be that Crantor simply did not wish to disappoint Polemo by rejecting his offer, or that he liked the idea of remaining united with his closest Academic companions even post mortem Crantor chose friendship

26) This must refer in particular to Polemo and Crates, but also Arcesilaus could be included. Arcesilaus was still comparatively young at the time when Crantor died and if he was already thought to be buried once in the tomb, one wonders why Polemo and not Arcesilaus himself suggested this possibility to Crantor. On the other hand, the context suggests that Arcesilaus was also meant and D.L. 4.22 (ὁμονόως συμβιούντων τούτων τε καὶ Ἀρκεσιλάου) confirms that all four philosophers were very close to each other.

27) One may think of a kind of crypt where the (cremated) bodies were deposited in sarcophagi or in urns. It might even be possible that the tomb in question was located in the area of the Academy.

28) D.L. 4.22: συσσίτιον δέ φησιν αὐτῷ ὁ Ἀντίγονος εἶναι παρὰ Κράντορι, ὁμονόως συμβιούντων τούτων τε καὶ Ἀρκεσιλάου.

over homeland in his last decision. It is remarkable that Diogenes shortens the episode so drastically that the wrong conclusion, that Crantor was buried in his native town and not in Athens, could easily be drawn from his account. Fortunately, the ashes of Mount Vesuvius have preserved the whole story, which the new readings allow us to understand and appreciate now better than ever.

Oxford

Kilian Fleischer