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P

erhaps the most widely known scholium to a Greek mathematical work is found in the *Matritensis Bibl. Nat*. 4678, f. 74r *marg. inf*. It comments on a problem in Dio­phantus’ *Arithmetica*, of which the Madrid manuscript is one of the main witnesses:

ἡ ψυχή σου Διόφαντε εἴη μετὰ τοῦ Σατανᾶ ἕνεκα τῆς δυσκολί(ας) τῶν τε ἄλλων σου θεωρημάτων καὶ δὴ καὶ τοῦ παρόν(τος) θεωρή(μα)τος

Diophantus, may your soul be with Satan because of the difficulty of the other theorems of yours, and in particular of the present theorem

The gloss was written by an exasperated John Chortasmenos (†1431), a Byzantine erudite particularly skilled in astron­omy and mathematics—even if he apparently found one of Dio­phantus’ problems too difficult. His hand was identified about twenty years ago by N. Wilson.[[1]](#footnote-2) The identification has recently been confirmed by I. Pérez Martín;[[2]](#footnote-3) her analysis of the several hands that annotated the *Matritensis* shows that Chor­tas­menos was a very attentive, and active, reader of the *Arithmetica*.

On the identity of the author of the annotation I have nothing to say. The point I want to make in this note is that the traditional identification of *Arithmetica* 2.8 as the Diophantine problem to which the scholium is related is surely wrong. This identification was first put forward by P. Tannery, when he edited a handful of scholia in the second volume of his Teubner edition of Diophantus’ extant works.[[3]](#footnote-4) It has subsequently been endorsed by A. Allard in his edition of the *scholia vetera* to the *Arithmetica*,[[4]](#footnote-5) by N. Wilson,[[5]](#footnote-6) B. Mondrain,[[6]](#footnote-7) and J. Herrin.[[7]](#footnote-8) T. L. Heath, with his unparalleled sobriety, did not pay attention to the scholium.

The traditional identification relates the scholium to a prob­lem, namely *Arithmetica* 2.8, which two centuries later triggered another, and most celebrated, marginal annotation, this time by Pierre Fermat (160?–1665): this annotation contains the statement universally known as ‘Fermat’s last theorem’, which resisted for about 350 years every attempt at proof until it finally capitulated in 1995 thanks to A. Wiles. In this way, a nice story can be told about the persistence of difficult mathematical problems, about the importance of marginal annotations in the process of transmission of knowl­edge, and, most notably, about the fact that Byzantine scholars were after all not so badly equipped to appreciate a supremely difficult author such as Diophantus is—at least, they were able to ap­preciate when a Diophantine problem was truly a difficult one. Both Wilson and Mondrain cite the connection between *Arith­metica* 2.8 and Fermat’s theorem, and draw one or the other of these morals from the story.

I shall first show, on mere palaeographical grounds, that the problem related to Chortasmenos’ scholium is, in keeping with Tannery’s first insight, *Arithmetica* 2.7. I shall then argue that there is a very good mathematical reason for this being so: both the enunciation and the solution of problem 2.8 are almost trivial, whereas both the enunciation and the solution of prob­lem 2.7 we can rightly term difficult, as Chortasmenos does. In this way, the connection of the scholium (which Fermat surely did not read) with Fermat’s last theorem (prompted by 2.8) evaporates.

My first point is straightforwardly made.[[8]](#footnote-9) The scholium is located in the lower margin of f. 74r, with a centered dis­position of the three lines. The first two of these lines are longer than the third, and each of them takes about ⅔ of the length of a line of the main text; the third line of the scholium is about ⅓ as long as any of the other two. The module of the script is larger than in any other Diophantine scholium by the same author, and hence its ir­regular character is accentuated: Chor­tasmenos does not hide his anger. The scholium immediately follows the main text, and it is preceded by a reference sign in the form of a cross. The same sign is found in the main text; it is located to the right of the last word of *Arithmetica* 2.7. The vertical stroke of the cross passes through the dot by which the copyist of this portion of the *Matritensis* closes the text of this problem; the horizontal, wave-like stroke of the cross is at about the middle of the interlinear space. A blank space of about ¼ of a line follows the end of problem 2.7. Problem 2.8 starts, with a rubricated letter as usual in this manuscript, at the beginning of the subsequent line and fills the last 3 lines of f. 74r (problem 2.7 takes 14 lines in the same page, preceded by 12 lines pertaining to 2.6). In this way, the scholium is just below the initial part of problem 2.8, and the in-text cross is located above the enunciation of 2.8, more precisely above the word τετραγώνους that closes the enuncia­tion. Nevertheless, the cross is located at a more significant position if it is related to problem 2.7: it is at the very end of it, and the invective bears in fact on the difficulty of a problem taken as a whole.

A confirmation of this comes from surveying, first, the distri­bution of Chortasmenos’ scholia both within the manuscript and with respect to the main text, second, the ways in which he identifies the text to which a scholium is related. As for the first issue, Pérez Martín’s analysis shows that six hands preceded Chortasmenos in annotating the *Arithmetica*, his and his prede­cessors’ scholarly work being concentrated in the first two books. As a consequence, Chortasmenos had to adapt the posi­tion and the form of his scholia to margins and interlinear spaces more or less filled with earlier annotations. It happens, for instance, that the scholium of his that surrounds the text of problem 2.8 on f. 74v [[9]](#footnote-10) relates to 2.11,[[10]](#footnote-11) a problem that one starts reading only on f. 75r—in its turn a page whose margins were already, and almost completely, filled by earlier scholia. One may reasonably surmise that the scholium to 2.11 was redacted after Chortasmenos had read that proposition, and *a fortiori* after he had read 2.8:[[11]](#footnote-12) it follows that the margins of f. 74v still lay blank when Chortasmenos read, and filled with short interlinear annotations, problem 2.8. He then had time and space to write down his short invective just above or beside problem 2.8. He did not do that simply because the invective relates to 2.7, which is entirely contained in f. 74r. However, he could not find a better place for the invective than the lower margin of f. 74r because the upper and outer margins of *this* page were already filled by earlier scholia, which extend exactly as far as the last line of the main text. But there is more. Chor­tasmenos clarifies the last two words of problem 2.8 on f. 74r (hence, the last two words of the main text in this page) by a short interlinear remark ἥ (*sic*) μονάδων δώδεκα placed *above* them. Apparently dissatisfied with this, he cancelled it by a stroke and replaced it by τουτέστι τετράδος μιᾶς ἥ μ(ονάδ)ων ιβ´ ε´ων, this time *below* the two words at issue. Now, this second annotation clearly gets sandwiched between the last line of the main text and the invective: it is traced in a smaller script and in such a way as to avoid the latter; therefore, it was written after it, and, conversely, the invective itself was written before Chortasmenos had started reading problem 2.8.

As for the ways in which Chortasmenos identifies the text to which a scholium is related, five different conventions can be recorded. First, no reference sign precedes the very short in­terlinear annotations, hundreds in number, that are placed im­mediately above or below Diophantine clauses or words to be clarified. These annotations fill up the interlinear spaces of the text of the first two books of the *Arithmetica*, and mainly consist in identifications of the numerical values actually per­taining either to the expressions containing the ‘unknown’ or to the designations of the sought numbers.[[12]](#footnote-13) This confirms Chor­tas­menos’ skills and his eagerness in studying Diophantus, for the numerical identifications are generally right and in this way he had to work out the problem twice. Second, a canonical *gamma-rho* compendium precedes annotations that apparently are short scholia, textual variants, or integrations that Chortas­menos suggests should be taken into account and that he could have found in some other source.[[13]](#footnote-14) Third, a conventional sign (like those for the sun or the moon, bizarre geometrical shapes, etc.), followed by the participle κείμενον, precedes a passage that, according to Chortasmenos or to some of his other sources, should belong in the main text. Fourth, a series of conventional signs precede long annotations related to a short stretch of text: clarifications of deductive steps, alternative procedures of solutions, terminological points. Fifth, a cross precedes scholia that usually offer comments on a problem taken as a whole. I have counted 11 of these,[[14]](#footnote-15) and only in the case of our invective does the cross have a counterpart some­where in the main text.[[15]](#footnote-16) I surmise, then, that the responding cross at the end of problem 2.7 was added to make it clear that, despite its position, the scholium containing the invective has to be related to this proposition, not to the subsequent one.

These considerations seem to me enough to make a strong case, independently of the mathematical content of the two problems involved, in favour of the fact that the scholium com­ments on problem 2.7, not on 2.8. But there are also math­ematical reasons that support this conclusion. In order to better assess this point, let us read first the enunciation of *Arithmetica* 2.8 (it is to be understood that the “squares” at issue are square rational numbers—note that they are designated by masculine adjectives):[[16]](#footnote-17)

τὸν ἐπιταχθέντα τετράγωνον διελεῖν εἰς δύο τετραγώνους

To divide an assigned square into two squares

Each problem of the *Arithmetica* is solved by concretely setting out the assigned numbers (in the case of 2.8, the assigned square is taken to be 16), by positing one unknown and by solving the resulting equality (‘equation’ in our language) by taking into account the constraints involved in the enunciation. Apart from this very general approach, there is no standard method to solve any specific set of Diophantine problems: the *Arithmetica* presents a host of clever tricks and specific manipu­lations, which a student gets acquainted with by simply doing Diophantine problems. Mathematics is mathematics is math­ematics is mathematics …

Now, the procedure of solution of 2.8 is well expounded, easy to follow, quite compelling, involving an equation that was re­peatedly solved in Book 1, and applying a trick (as in almost any other Diophantine problem) that is introduced there for the first time in the *Arithmetica* but whose rationale is clearly if briefly explained (as happens with almost no other Diophantine trick).[[17]](#footnote-18) What is more, problem 2.8 is actually given two differ­ent solutions, the second being marked by ἄλλως as usual and more or less amounting to a repetition of the first. In short, Diophantus quite uncommonly provides his readers with all the tools necessary to follow and understand step by step the whole procedure of solution of problem 2.8.

On the other hand, the very enunciation of problem 2.7 in­volves a subtle notion (here underlined):[[18]](#footnote-19)

εὑρεῖν δύο ἀριθμοὺς ὅπως ἡ ὑπεροχὴ τῶν ἀπ᾽ αὐτῶν τετρα­γώνων τῆς ὑπεροχῆς αὐτῶν δοθέντι μείζων ᾖ ἢ ἐν λόγῳ

To find two numbers such that the difference of the squares on them is by a given (number) greater than in ratio to their difference

The relation “being by a given number greater than in ratio” is never met elsewhere in the *Arithmetica*, and quite infrequently in Greek mathematical works.[[19]](#footnote-20) It is defined and studied, applied to magnitudes and not to numbers, only in definition 11 and propositions 10–11 and 13–21 of Euclid’s *Data*, a work spe­cifically devised to provide language and tools necessary for the so-called ‘method of analysis and synthesis’. It is quite an outlandish notion, as the contrived translation offered above already testifies:[[20]](#footnote-21) in general (*Data* def. 11), a magnitude *A* is by a given magnitude *C* greater than in ratio to *B* when (*A* − *C* ) : *B* is a given ratio. In the instance of problem 2.7, *A* and *B* are suitable combinations of the sought numbers, *C* = 10, and the given ratio is 3 : 1. A reader who is not well acquainted with Euclid’s *Data* is likely to get lost when confronted with this enunciation. That Chortasmenos was in fact at a loss is shown by two facts. First, by the mean­ingless scholium he transcribed above the first line of 2.7 in f. 74r γρ(άφεται) δοθέντι λόγῳ μεῖζον ᾖ καὶ ἔτι δοθέντι ἀριθμῷ, where the reference sign γρ(άφεται) is repeated, one line be­low, above the participle δοθέντι in the enunciation. Second, by the fact that his interlinear glosses to 2.7 are less frequent than usual[[21]](#footnote-22) and get abruptly interrupted four lines before the end of the problem: Chortasmenos had lost contact with the argumentative pro­gression of problem 2.7.

On these grounds, understanding or even following the simple but reader-unfriendly procedure of solution of 2.7 amounts more to an act of faith than to a true process of learning. What is more, this procedure is introduced by a “determination” that is not at all easy to derive from the enuncia­tion.[[22]](#footnote-23) In short, problem 2.7 can well be characterized as carry­ing a remarkable degree of δυσκολία. Nor could Chor­tasmenos be helped, in his effort to understand 2.7, by the scholia he found in the *Matritensis* itself [[23]](#footnote-24) or by Planudes’ com­mentary, supposing he had access to it.[[24]](#footnote-25)

Tannery’s misidentification, subsequently endorsed by all scholars, can be explained by the admittedly ambiguous posi­tion of the scholium and of the cross attached to it. But a deeper reason probably lies in the belief that the undeniable difficulty of proving the statement called ‘Fermat’s last the­orem’ somehow projects back on the Diophantine problem that gave rise to the statement itself, thereby making it a most appro­pri­ate target of Chortasmenos’ invective. I hope to have shown that this belief is unfounded, that 2.8 is an important but by no means difficult problem of the *Arithmetica*, and that some features of 2.7 single it out as a more appropriate target of the invective than 2.8.[[25]](#footnote-26)
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