

Cert. Hom. Hes. 138-148 and AP XIV 147

πρὸς πάντα δὲ τοῦ Ὀμήρου καλῶς ἀπαντήσαντος πάλιν φησὶν ὁ Ἡσίοδος:

τοῦτό τι δὴ μοι μῦθον ἐειρομένῳ κατάλεξον, 140
 πόσσοι ἄμ' Ἀτρεΐδῃσιν ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί;
 ὁ δὲ διὰ λογιστικοῦ προβλήματος ἀποκρίνεται οὕτως·
 πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν πυρὸς ἐσχάραι, ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη
 πεντήκοντ' ὀβελοί, περὶ δὲ κρέα πεντήκοντα·
 τρις δὲ τριηκόσιοι περὶ ἓν κρέας ἦσαν Ἀχαιοί. 145

τοῦτο δὲ εὐρίσκεται πλῆθος ἄπιστον· τῶν γὰρ ἐσχαρῶν οὐσῶν πεντήκοντα ὀβελίσκοι γίνονται πεντακόσιοι καὶ χιλιάδες β', κρεῶν δὲ δεκαδύο μυριάδες ,ε†ϋ†

«As Homer replied well to all [the challenges], Hesiod said, again: Tell me only this, as I ask you: how many Achaeans went to Ilion with the Atreidae? And he answered with a numerical problem, as follows: Fifty were the fire-hearths, and in each one fifty spits, around each of which were fifty pieces of meat; and three times three hundred Achaeans were around one piece of meat. But this results in an incredible number: for if there are 50 hearths, then there are 2,500 spits, and 125,000 pieces of meat †...».

This is the text and (slightly altered) translation of *Cert. Hom. Hes. 138-148* as printed in the most recent edition by Bassino (2019, 98f.)¹. She notes in the apparatus that Martin West recognized ll. 146-148 as interpolated; he made this suggestion in passing, with characteristic confidence, in his 1967 discussion on the *Certamen*², and stood by it in 2003 as he marked the interpolation in his Loeb text of the *Certamen*³. Nevertheless, Bassino decided to include the suspicious passage in her text; this is how she explains her decision in the commentary:

¹ This passage is only preserved in *Laur.* pl. 56,1.

² See West 1967, 442 n. 2: «the irrelevant note that follows [Homer's arithmetical riddle] in the manuscript [...] is clearly interpolated. It is incomplete at the end, possibly because of damage to a lower margin in which it was written».

³ West (2003, 335 n. 13) repeats his 1967 comment.

«the suggestion [*scil.* that 146-148 originated as a marginal gloss, which a scribe erroneously included in the text] is fascinating, because it suggests that the topic of the exchange – the number of Achaeans who went to Troy – generated debate from antiquity (see 140-1n. on Thucydides) through to the Byzantine age. However, only the discovery of new manuscript witnesses could prove it with certainty» (p. 158).

As it happens, we do have a rather famous textual witness whose testimony sheds important light on this passage, yet this evidence has been overlooked by the editors of the *Certamen*. This neglected manuscript is *Par. suppl. gr. 384*, better known as (the second part of) the *Palatine Anthology (AP)*. Among the riddles, mathematical puzzles and oracles of *AP XIV*, one finds a simple arithmetical riddle, which is almost, but not exactly identical with *Cert. Hom. Hes. 143-145*; the three hexameters are preceded by a lemma. This is *AP XIV 147*, the last of the arithmetical problems collected in this book⁴; besides *AP* and the *Certamen*, it is now known, thanks to two recent studies, from the collective testimony of five mss. that preserve a Byzantine collection of epigrams on Homer⁵. The ultimate source of this collection must have been a copy of the Cephalaean anthology similar to those on which the *Palatine* and *Planudean Anthologies* are founded, and therefore this *sylloge* is a distinct source of information on the tradition from which *AP* emerged⁶, although in the case of *AP XIV 147*, the text of *AP* is clearly superior to the joint testimony of the newly-introduced witnesses. Here is my text of the riddle, with a somewhat abridged apparatus; in reporting the readings of the Homeric *sylloge*, I rely on the studies by Francesca Maltomini and Francesco Valerio (the sigla are Maltomini's)⁷:

ἔπτ' ἦσαν μαλεροῦ πυρὸς ἐσχάραι, ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη
 πεντήκοντ' ὀβελοί, περὶ δὲ κρέα πεντήκοντα·
 τρὶς δὲ τριηκόσιοι περὶ ἐν κρέας ἦσαν Ἀχαιοί.

|| lemma: Ὅμηρος (**Pal.** Δ^{Va}: Ὅμηρου Δ^{A,H}) Ἡσιόδῳ ἐρωτήσαντι πόσων (πόσον Δ) τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος τὸ κατὰ τῆς Ἰλίου στρατεῦσαν (ὃ κατὰ τῆς Τροίας ἐστράτευσαν Δ)
 || 1 ἔπτ' ἦσαν vel ἐπτὰ ἔσαν Meineke 1856, 284 : ἔπτ' ἔσαν **Pal.** Δ^A : ἔπτ' ἔσαν Δ^{H,L,V,Va} : πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν *Cert.* | μαλεροῦ om. *Cert.*

«Answer of Homer to Hesiod when he asked the number of the Greeks who took part in the war against Troy: “There were seven hearths of fierce fire, and

⁴ On the autonomous status of *AP XIV 147* in this collection, see Grillo 2019, 249 n. 2.

⁵ See Maltomini 2015 and Valerio 2016; both provide a critical text and extensive discussion of the same epigrammatic *sylloge*, but their studies were prepared independently.

⁶ See Maltomini 2015, 161-168 and Valerio 2016, 273-279; they both conclude that future editors of *AP* will have to take this testimony into account.

⁷ Δ = the Homeric *sylloge*; Δ^A = *Ambr.* I 4 sup. (gr. 450); Δ^L = *Laur.* conv. soppr. 139; Δ^V = *Vat.* gr. 29; Δ^H = *Lond.* Harl. 5600; Δ^{Va} = *Vat.* gr. 915.

in each were fifty spits and fifty joints on them. About each joint were nine hundred Achaeans”»⁸.

AP is likely to preserve the lemma in its original (i.e. presumably Cephalan⁹) form; as Valerio (2016, 275) notes, the participle at its end is less obvious than the syntactically simpler relative clause of the Homeric *sylloge*, and the same can be said about πόσων, a genitive of measure, which the *sylloge* (and recent editions) substitute with πόσον. In addition, note the use of Ἴλιον in AP, which the other mss. substitute with Τροία. I will return to these variants further on.

The riddle is accompanied in AP by a marginal scholion, which reads, μυριάδες ,αφοε΄, ἤγουν χιλιάδες μύρια πεντακισχίλιοι ἑπτακόσιοι πεντήκοντα. Variants are yielded by two mss. preserving the Homeric *sylloge*: Δ^{Va} only has εἰσὶ μυριάδες ,αφοε΄ and Δ^A has εἰσὶ μυριάδες ,αφοε΄, ἤγουν χιλιάδες μύρια καὶ ,εψν΄. What follows ἤγουν is absurd¹⁰, but Marian Auerbach demonstrated that the error is, in fact, scribal rather than arithmetical; the text should read, μυριάδες χίλιοι πεντακόσιοι ἑβδομήκοντα πέντε, i.e. 15,750,000¹¹. This does not mean that the paradosis of Δ^{Va}, where ἤγουν κτλ. is missing, goes back to the original version; the scribe was likely to have simply realized the absurdity of the explanation. At any rate, the shared error of χιλιάδες μύρια points to a shared ancestry. In addition, the πεντακισχίλιοι ἑπτακόσιοι πεντήκοντα written in words must have preceded in transmission the ,εψν΄ written in numerals, since the latter is doubly absurd as an interpretation of what precedes ἤγουν. All in all, the text of AP is, again, superior.

Another problem we ought to consider is that this solution – 15,750,000 – is, in fact, wrong. Or better, it is *prima facie* correct, yet only if one misunderstands l. 2 – which I suspect may be deliberately misleading – to say that there were fifty pieces of meat on each of fifty spits (i.e. $7 \times 50 \times 50 \times 900$), whereas what it actually says is that there were fifty spits and accordingly fifty carcasses at each of the seven hearths, i.e. one carcass on one spit ($7 \times 50 \times 900$)¹². The actual solution is, then, 315,000. The choice between 15,750,000 and 315,000 is dictated by common sense; after all, the first number exceeds the population of Greece even today. As it happens, an attentive reader of the *Iliad* can estimate the number of the Greeks at Troy on the basis of the information supplied in the “Catalogue of Ships” (II 494-759), and such calculation was famously done by Thucydides (I 10,3-5), by

⁸ Transl. Paton 1918, 105.

⁹ See n. 32 below.

¹⁰ Cf. Tannery 1895, 72 n. 1.

¹¹ «Scriba erravit et pro μυριάδες χίλιοι scripsit χιλιάδες μύρια. Altero igitur loco pro 1,000 scripsit 10,000, et constanter usque ad finem scripsit 5,000 pro 500, 700 pro 70, 50 pro 5» (1929).

¹² Cf. Beckby 1967, 539 and Buffière 1970, 99 n. 4 and 203 n. 5; the first to comment on the ambiguity was Boissonade in Dübner 1872, 501, but the correct solution is already given by Bachetus 1621, 368.

whose estimate the number was 102,000. 315,000 is still a significantly larger number¹³, yet Thucydides' reckoning helps us see what sort of logic the ancients applied to solve this problem and which solution to our riddle is preferable¹⁴.

It is probably clear by now that what I would like to suggest is that *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 143-145 and *AP XIV* 147 are not two slightly different riddles; this is the same riddle, whose first line is corrupt in the ms. of the *Certamen*, but fortunately preserved intact in *AP*. In fact, the suggestion is not mine; this was seen four hundred years ago, soon after more scholars had come to be aware of the existence of *AP* owing to Salmasius, by Claude Gaspard Bachet de Méziriac, the *editor princeps* of the arithmetical riddles of *AP XIV* (whose text, accompanied by his metrical translation into Latin, he included in his edition of Diophantus). Here is his comment on *AP XIV* 147¹⁵:

extat hoc epigramma in agone Homeri et Hesiodi Graece edito, sed corruptum, nam initium primi versus sic legitur: πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν πυρὸς ἐσχάρα. Unde non immerito Agonis illius author incredibilem quae inde colligitur militum multitudinem miratur, sic enim fieret eorum numerus 2,250,000 [*scil.* 50 × 50 × 900].

This observation is correct, except that the comment on the suspicious solution we find in the *Certamen* is not by its author, but rather, as West (*l.c.*) saw, a Byzantine scribal gloss, one quite similar to the Cephalan scholion of *AP* and the Homeric *sylloge*: this is guaranteed by the fact that it comments on the already-corrupt text.

How ἔπτ' ἦσαν μαλεροῦ πυρὸς ἐσχάρα became πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν πυρὸς ἐσχάρα is not easy to explain, but the fact that πεντήκοντα occurs twice in the next line, including its beginning, no doubt influenced the appearance of yet another πεντήκοντα at the beginning of the corrupt verse. The corruption must have been multi-stage; perhaps μαλεροῦ was left out first, *e.g.* because it was subject to corruption as a relatively rare word, and subsequently a scribe attempted an emendation to repair the evidently unmetrical verse. Be that as it may, it is noteworthy that the

¹³ Cf. Leventhal's (2015, 214) comment on *AP XIV* 147: «this epigram collapses the Iliadic passage, 285 hexameters (Il 2.494-779), into three lines. Furthermore, whereas Homer reckons between 100,000 and 150,000 men, this epigram bests him by suggesting there were 315,000. Homer is stripped of poetic weight, and accuracy».

¹⁴ Jerzy Danielewicz points out to me, *per litteras electronicas*, that the number of the Greeks in the last line, *i.e.* 900 Greeks at one spit, is suspiciously large and therefore perhaps resulting from corruption. Yet even though I expect the solution of our riddle to conform to literary realism of a sort, perhaps we do not have to assume the imagery of such arithmetical riddles to be entirely realistic; *e.g.*, in *AP XIV* 3 Eros is carrying 3,360 apples. That said, one cannot rule out a corruption at an early (pre-Byzantine?) stage of transmission and the last line is, admittedly, particularly suspicious; in fact, it might strengthen my argument if the solution could be cut down to approach the number provided by Thucydides.

¹⁵ Bachetus 1621, 368. He must have used Stephanus' 1573 *editio princeps* of the *Certamen*, which was the only one available at the time.

Certamen preserves the variant ἦσαν in place of ἔσαν, which is the reading of *AP* and one of the mss. containing the Homeric *sylloge*, or the odd ἔσσαν, which is found in the remaining mss. and before their evidence came to light was conjectured to solve the problem of the unmetrical ἔπτ' ἔσαν, probably first by Salmasius. As Maltomini rightly observes, the new evidence is ambiguous and does not necessarily support the old conjecture, since it is possible that ἔσσαν entered the tradition as a scribal emendation¹⁶. Its only other appearance I am aware of is, in a part of the bucolic mss., as a variant in Theocr. 12,15¹⁷. It is therefore perhaps a sort of ghost hyperepicism, unnecessarily conceived to solve a metrical problem, which can be easily remedied by conjecturing ἦσαν, as was seen by Meineke (1856, 284)¹⁸. As a matter of fact, this is supported not only by the evidence of the *Certamen*, but also by l. 3 of Homer's riddle, which has the regular ἦσαν. I suspect what happened here was too much Byzantine philology: ἦσαν first became ἔσαν, a misplaced epicism (perhaps influenced by *Il.* IX 85), which was subsequently corrected, in one branch of the tradition, into the non-existing ἔσσαν. Meineke's alternative was ἔπτὰ ἔσαν, but there is no need to consider the possibility of the hiatus¹⁹.

Moreover, there is one more reason to print the elided form, ἔπτ', i.e. the paradosis. We should take into account a forgotten discovery made by Hermann Beckby, who noticed that the first letters of the three lines of Homer's riddle spell out the acrostic ΕΠΤ²⁰. Now, I am the first to admit that a third-letter acrostic is more likely than not to be accidental²¹, but what suggests that this is not the case with our riddle is the fact that if the elided ἔπτ' is accepted – and there is every reason to do so – what we get is a perfect example of the so-called *gamma*-acrostic, i.e. an acrostic whose first line begins with the word spelled out vertically (the λεπτὴ at Arat. 783-787 supplying a famous example):

ἔπτ' ἦσαν μαλεροῦ πυρὸς ἐσχάροι, ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη
 πεντήκοντ' ὀβελοί, περὶ δὲ κρέα πεντήκοντα·
 τρὶς δὲ τριηκόσιοι περὶ ἐν κρέας ἦσαν Ἀχαιοί.

There is more. I suggest elsewhere that the riddle under discussion had an interesting afterlife in Late Antiquity²², as the pattern emerging from *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 138-145, where a challenging query is answered with a riddle, is mirrored in

¹⁶ See Maltomini 2015, 163 n. 1; this solution is overlooked by Valerio 2016, 276.

¹⁷ See the apparatus in Gallavotti 1993, 124 and Meineke 1856, 284, who adduces *AP* XIV 147,1 while commenting on the passage of Theocritus.

¹⁸ Cf., again, Maltomini 2015, 163 n. 1.

¹⁹ Cf. Valerio (2016, 276 n. 75), who, however, is inclined to accept ἔσσαν.

²⁰ See Beckby 1967, 539.

²¹ Cf. Kwapisz 2019 on the brevity of Aratus' λεπτὴ acrostich.

²² See Kwapisz (forthcoming), which contains an extensive discussion on *AP* XIV 1 and the significance of its numerical solution.

the arithmetical riddle with which *AP XIV* opens, a dialogue between Pythagoras and the Samian tyrant Polycrates:

“ὄλβιε Πυθαγόρη, Μουσέων Ἑλικώνιον ἔρνος,
εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ, ὅπόσοι σοφίης κατ’ ἀγῶνα
σοῖσι δόμοισιν ἔασιν ἀεθλεύοντες ἄριστα”.
“τοιγὰρ ἐγὼν εἴποιμι, Πολύκρατες· ἡμίσεες μὲν
ἀμφὶ καλὰ σπεύδουσι μαθήματα· τέτρατοι αὐτὲ 5
ἀθανάτου φύσεως πεπονήαται· ἑβδομάτοις δὲ
σιγῇ πᾶσα μέμηλε καὶ ἄφθιτοι ἐνδοθι μῦθοι·
τρεῖς δὲ γυναιῖκες ἔασι, Θεανὼ δ’ ἕξοχος ἄλλων.
τόσσους Πιερίδων ὑποφήτορας αὐτὸς ἀγινῶ”.

«“Blessed Pythagoras, Heliconian scion of the Muses, answer my question: How many in your house are engaged in the contest for wisdom performing excellently?”
“I will tell you then, Polycrates. Half of them are occupied with belles lettres; a quarter apply themselves to studying immortal nature; a seventh are all intent on silence and the eternal discourse of their hearts. There are also three women, and above the rest is Theano. That is the number of interpreters of the Muses I gather round me”»²³.

Besides the general resemblance in structure, note that *AP XIV* 1,2 εἰπέ μοι εἰρομένῳ is closely echoed by *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 140 τοῦτό τι δὴ μοι μῶνον εἰρομένῳ κατάλεξον. Altogether, we have reasons to think that *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 140f. and 143-145, i.e. Hesiod’s query and Homer’s riddle, were perceived as one whole. That these five lines were indeed composed as such is, in addition, suggested by a curious detail. Note that when the two parts are stitched up together, there emerges another ramification of the ΕΠΤ acrostic, one that starts with the middle line and runs upwards:

“τοῦτό τι δὴ μοι μῶνον εἰρομένῳ κατάλεξον,
πόσσοι ἄμ’ Ἀτρείδησιν ἐς Ἴλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί;”
“ἔπτ’ ἦσαν μαλεροῦ πυρὸς ἐσχάροι, ἐν δὲ ἐκάστη
πεντήκοντ’ ὀβελοί, περὶ δὲ κρέα πενήκοντα·
τρὶς δὲ τριηκόσιοι περὶ ἐν κρέας ἦσαν Ἀχαιοί”.

We can dub this a *heta*-acrostic, after its resemblance to the letter *heta*²⁴. I leave it to others to decide whether this is deliberate, as I am inclined to think, or not, and what exactly the insistence on the number seven could mean²⁵.

²³ Transl. Paton 1918, 27, slightly altered; the solution is “28”.

²⁴ Danielewicz (2019) suggests a similarly shaped syllabic acrostic at Verg. *Ecl.* 4,50-52.

²⁵ To be sure, the number seven recurs in the closely related tradition on Homer; the seven

May this five-liner have been composed independently, at some point, as a self-contained epigram, which the redactor of the Hadrianic version of the *Certamen* subsequently included in its text? What speaks against such a possibility is the fact that unlike what we see in AP XIV 1, the names of the interlocutors are not embedded in the text of the epigram; it is easy to envisage, however, that a simple lemma might have ensured their identification. Another possibility is that the epigram was from the start composed as a part of the *Certamen* (or a *Certamen*, i.e. some earlier version), but the prose separator of *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 142, ὁ δὲ διὰ λογιστικοῦ προβλήματος ἀποκρίνεται οὕτως, was a later insertion intended to clarify who is speaking (the introduction of Hesiod's query at ll. 138f. may also have had a different form), whereas the change in speakers was originally indicated by *paragraphoi*²⁶. Be that as it may, the curious acrostic is not out of place in the Hadrianic epoch, whose liking for such devices is well-known; compare the acrostics in Dionysius Periegetes and in the pattern poem *Altar* presumably composed by Julius Vestinus²⁷.

I offer two conclusions. First, in the future editions of *Cert. Hom. Hes.*, ll. 146-148 should be athetized, following West, and l. 143 should, accordingly, be printed as in AP XIV 147,1, i.e. ἔπτ' ἦσαν μαλεροῦ πυρὸς ἐσχάρα in place of πεντήκοντ' ἦσαν πυρὸς ἐσχάρα, as was already conjectured by Bachet de Méziriac. Even one reluctant to accept the reality of the above-discussed acrostic has to admit that the latter variant is clearly inferior to the former, not only since otherwise the solution of the riddle no longer makes sense, but also because μαλεροῦ πυρὸς ἐσχάρα quite ingeniously weds *Il.* IX 242 μαλεροῦ πυρὸς (the genitive only here in Homer) and X 418 πυρὸς ἐσχάρα (another Homeric *hapax*, in the same metrical *sedes*). The textual variant yielded by the single late Byzantine ms. of the *Certamen*²⁸ and devoid of any poetic merits can hardly be considered as a real alternative; it is not the work of a poet, but of entropy.

Second, the Cephalian tradition attested by AP XIV and the Homeric *sylloge* deserves to be recognized among the witnesses of the textual tradition of the *Certamen*, alongside *Laur.* pl. 56,1, Musurus' notes in the *Vind. phil.* gr. 187, whose

cities contending for Homer are listed in two epigrams attested by the *Planudean Anthology* and also included in the same Homeric *sylloge* in which we find AP XIV 147 (*API* 297 and 298), which both begin with ἐπτά, and the *Certamen* includes a passage on Homer's seven alleged mothers and fathers (18-27). I note that the triple appearance of ἔπτ' in the acrostic brings to mind recent observations on the multiplying λεπτή in Arat. 783-787; see Hanses 2014, Danielewicz 2015 and Trzaskoma 2016. Moreover, ΕΠΤ are the three middle letters of ΛΕΠΤΗ – may this be a striking case of acrostichic intertextuality? For the concept, see Robinson 2019. Kronenberg (2018) attempts to identify a gamut of allusions to Aratus' acrostic in Greek and Latin poetry.

²⁶ On their use in papyri, see now conveniently Jażdżewska 2018.

²⁷ See, respectively, Lightfoot 2014, 558 (*General Index s.v. acrostic*) and Kwapisz 2013, 177-190.

²⁸ *Laur.* pl. 56,1 has been dated to the twelfth-fourteenth centuries; see Bassino 2019, 49.

importance has now been demonstrated by Bassino (2019, 52-60), and the papyri. Besides *AP* XIV 147, two further textual elements shared between the *Certamen* and *AP* XIV are *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 37-40 = *AP* XIV 102 and *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 59f. = *AP* XIV 65. Although the source for the latter may be different, as, e.g., Paus. X 24,2 attaches *AP* XIV 65 (which is also preserved in other authors²⁹) to the first two lines of *AP* XIV 66, *AP* XIV 102 is otherwise only known from *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 37-40 (including Musurus' notes)³⁰. In fact, like *AP* XIV 147, the text of *AP* XIV 102 deserves better recognition by the editors of the *Certamen*. At *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 39, Bassino prints Ἐπικάστη, although this is contradicted both by *AP* XIV 102,3 (which she acknowledges as a simile in her apparatus) and *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 27; West (2003, 322) rightly adopts Πολυκάστη, but attributes this as a conjecture to Nietzsche, whereas this is the reading of *AP* XIV 102³¹. Friedrich Jacobs's suggestion to emend *AP* XIV 102,4 ἄλλον to ἄλλων should at least be mentioned in the apparatus. Particularly telling, however, is the comparison between (a) the already-discussed lemma to *AP* XIV 147 and (b) *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 141, i.e. Hesiod's query to Homer:

(a) Ὅμηρος Ἡσιόδῳ ἐρωτήσαντι πόσων τὸ τῶν Ἑλλήνων πλῆθος τὸ κατὰ τῆς Ἰλίου στρατεῦσαν.

(b) πόσσοι ἄμ' Ἀτρείδησιν ἐς Ἰλιον ἦλθον Ἀχαιοί;

This sheds light on the wording of the *AP* lemma (and, incidentally, demonstrates the precedence of the text of *AP* over that of the Homeric *sylloge*); the similarities must be due to the fact that the compiler of *AP* XIV (Cephalas?³²) found *AP* XIV 147 (and also 102) in his copy of the *Certamen*, one arguably superior to that available to us today. In a way, this is a cautionary tale – what else is our text of the *Certamen* not getting right?³³

Institute of Classical Studies

ul. Krakowskie Przedmieście 1, PL – 00-047 Warsaw

JAN KWAPISZ

jan.kwapisz@uw.edu.pl

²⁹ See the apparatus in Maltomini 2015, 170; Valerio 2016, 270; Bassino 2019, 90.

³⁰ Cf. Bassino 2019, 131.

³¹ Cf. Bassino 2019, 89.

³² For the debate on whether *AP* XIV is Cephalan, see Cameron 1993, 135-137, 207-215 and 223f. and Maltomini 2008, 189-195 (with Floridi 2009).

³³ I am grateful to Jerzy Danielewicz, Max Leventhal and Francesco Valerio for sharing with me both their work on related topics and their thoughts on my work; for precious suggestions and corrections I also thank the readers and editors of «Eikasmós».

Bibliographical abbreviations

- Auerbach 1929 = M. A., *De scholio in Anthol. Pal. XIV 147*, «Eos» XXXII (1929) 220.
- Bachetus 1621 = C.G.B. Meziriacus, *Diophanti Alexandrini Arithmeti corum libri sex*, Parisiis 1621.
- Bassino 2019 = P. B., *The Certamen Homeri et Hesiodi. A Commentary*, Berlin 2019.
- Beckby 1967 = H. B., *Anthologia Graeca*, IV. Buch XIV-XVI, München 1967².
- Buffière 1970 = F. B., *Anthologie grecque*, XII. *Anthologie Palatine. Livres XIII-XV*, Paris 1970.
- Cameron 1993 = A. C., *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*, Oxford 1993.
- Danielewicz 2015 = J. D., *One sign after another: the fifth ΛΕΠΤΗ in Aratus' Phaen. 783-4?*, «CQ» n.s. LXV (2015) 387-390.
- Danielewicz 2019 = J. D., *ASTER, ASTER, ASTER: A triple transliterated Greek Acrostic in Vergil's Eclogue 4*, «Philologus» CLXIII (2019) 361-366.
- Dübner 1872 = F. D., *Epigrammatum anthologia Palatina*, II, Parisiis 1872.
- Floridi 2009 = L. F., rev. of Maltomini 2008 [q.v.], «BMCR» (2009.05.41).
- Gallavotti 1993 = C. G., *Theocritus quique feruntur Bucolici Graeci*, Romae 1993³.
- Grillo 2019 = F. G., *Too many Metrodoruses? The compiler of the ἀριθμητικά from AP XIV*, «Eikasmos» XXX (2019) 249-264.
- Hanses 2014 = M. H., *The pun and the Moon in the sky: Aratus' ΛΕΠΤΗ acrostic*, «CQ» n.s. LXIV (2014) 609-614.
- Jażdżewska 2018 = K. J., *Indications of speakers in ancient dialogue: a reappraisal*, «CQ» n.s. CXXXVIII (2018) 249-260.
- Kronenberg 2018 = L. K., *Seeing the light, Part II: the reception of Aratus's LEPTĒ acrostic in Greek and Latin literature*, «Dictynna» XV (2018) <<https://journals.openedition.org/dictynna/1575>>.
- Kwapisz 2013 = J. K., *The Greek Figure Poems*, Leuven 2013.
- Kwapisz 2019 = J. K., *The technē of Aratus' leptē acrostich*, «Enthymema» XXIII (2019) 374-389.
- Kwapisz (forthcoming) = J. K., *Socrates' answer to the ultimate question of life, the universe, and everything: explaining the arithmetical riddles of AP 14*, «AJPh» CXLI (forthcoming).
- Leventhal 2015 = M. L., *Counting on epic: mathematical poetry and Homeric epic in Archimedes' Cattle Problem*, «Ramus» XLIV (2015) 200-221.
- Lightfoot 2014 = J.L. L., *Dionysius Periegetes. Description of the Known World*, Oxford 2014.
- Maltomini 2008 = F. M., *Tradizione antologica dell'epigramma greco. Le sillogi minori di età bizantina e umanistica*, Rome 2008.
- Maltomini 2015 = F. M., *Una silloge di epigrammi su Omero (e alcuni inediti bizantini)*, «MD» LXXV (2015) 151-175.
- Meineke 1856 = A. M., *Theocritus, Bion, Moschus*, Berlin 1856³.
- Paton 1918 = W.R. P., *The Greek Anthology*, V, London 1918.
- Robinson 2019 = M. R., *Looking edgeways. Pursuing acrostics in Ovid and Virgil*, «CQ» n.s. LXIX (2019) 290-308.
- Tannery 1895 = P. T., *Diophanti Alexandrini opera omnia*, II, Lipsiae 1895.
- Trzaskoma 2016 = S.M. T., *Further possibilities regarding the acrostic at Aratus 783-7*,

«CQ» n.s. LXVI (2016) 785-790.

Valerio 2016 = F. V., *Analecta Byzantina*, «MEG» XVI (2016) 255-302.

West 1967 = M.L. W., *The Contest of Homer and Hesiod*, «CQ» n.s. XVII (1967) 433-450 (repr. in *Hellenica*, III, Oxford 2013, 369-395).

West 2003 = M.L. W., *Homeric Hymns. Homeric Apocrypha. Lives of Homer*, Cambridge, Mass. 2003.

Abstract

AP XIV 147, a three-hexameter arithmetical riddle which the lemma introduces as Homer's response to Hesiod's query regarding the number of the Greeks at Troy, is identical with *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 143-145, with the exception of the first line. This discussion argues that the text of *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 143 is corrupt; the correct text is preserved, as was seen by Bachet de Méziriac, in the variant offered by *AP* XIV 147, 1. Accordingly, *AP* XIV is to be recognized as a textual witness for *Cert. Hom. Hes.* In addition, the presence of a curious acrostic confirms that the reading in *AP* XIV 147 is correct, and suggests that *Cert. Hom. Hes.* 140-141, i.e. Hesiod's question put in hexameters, and 143-145 had originally been one whole, either as an independent riddle or within *Cert. Hom. Hes.*, yet its unity was obscured by the insertion of line 142, a part of the prose frame.