

surprising: there would be precious few customers for a trireme, a type of vessel that had no use other than as an engine of war. But if a customer did turn up, we may safely assume that the Board would leap at the chance to pocket some unexpected cash. If we further assume that Macartatus got his trireme in this way, we have a reasonable explanation of why his private act took on an official cast. Although he was an individual operating for his own account a warship that was his own property, appearances would by no means reveal this; indeed they would give the opposite impression. When he went into battle, how were his antagonists to know that the ship bearing down on them, a trireme like any other in the Athenian navy, was commanded by an adventurer out to make a profit and not by a trierarch operating under orders from the Athenian state?¹⁶

New York University

LIONEL CASSON

¹⁶ During the Peloponnesian War the Athenian warships, lightly built in order to carry out tactics that demanded speed and manoeuvrability, were easily distinguished from the heavier units of their opponents; see J. Morrison and R. Williams, *Greek Oared Ships* (Cambridge, 1968), pp. 281–2, 313, 317–20. This doubtless was true of the fourth century as well.

A NOTE ON POLYBIUS 24.14.8–9

In 180 B.C., in response to a treaty-breaking incursion into Galatia and a threat to Cappadocia, Eumenes of Pergamum marched against Pharnaces of Pontus. The route he took is described thus by Polybius (24.14.8–9):

παραγενόμενοι δ' ἐκ Καλπίτου πεμπατοῖσι πρὸς τὸν Ἄλυν ποταμὸν ἑκταῖοι πάλιν ἀνέζευξαν εἰς Παριασσόν. ἔνθα καὶ Ἀριαράθης ὁ τῶν Καππαδοκῶν βασιλεὺς συνέμιξεν αὐτοῖς μετὰ τῆς οἰκείας δυνάμεως, καὶ (παρεισ)ῆλθον εἰς τὴν Μωκισσέων χώραν.¹

It is the purpose of this note to suggest a replacement for the conjecture *Μωκισσέων*, which has inhabited nearly all texts of Polybius for more than two hundred years. The suggestion I have to make arises out of my study of the episcopal geography of western Cappadocia in the time of St. Basil, but in the course of researching the history of the Polybian text I have discovered that my conclusion was anticipated in the mid-eighteenth century, although apparently ignored by Polybian scholars since then.

Μωκισσέων first entered the text as the suggestion of John Jacob Reiske in 1763.² He was disagreeing with the decision of the editor of the *editio princeps*,³ Fulvius Ursinus, who, 'pro *Καμισέων*, quod fuit in eius codice, reposuit *Ἀμισέων*'. This was absurd, Reiske argued, since Ursinus had already removed Parnassus from the text and replaced it with Amasea. Thus, Ursinus had Eumenes marching from Amasea to the territory of Amasea. Reiske's justification for *Μωκισσέων* was its occurrence as a metropolis of Cappadocia in all the episcopal notitiae. Ursinus' 1581 edition was based on copies made in the Escorial in 1574 by Andreas Darmarius of what was at that time the sole surviving manuscript of Constantine Porphyrogenitus' *De Legationibus*. This original manuscript and the first copy were both destroyed in a fire at the Escorial in 1671 but other versions in Darmarius' hand survive. Büttner-Wobst

¹ The text is quoted from the Teubner edition of Th. Büttner-Wobst, (Leipzig, 1904), Vol. IV, p. 171.

² *Animadversionum ad Graecos Auctores* (Leipzig, 1763), Vol. IV, p. 681.

³ *Ex libris Polybii Megalopolitani selecta de legationibus, ex bibliotheca Fulvii Ursini* (Antwerp, 1582).

highlights four manuscripts of the *Excerpta de Legationibus Romanorum ad Gentes* in his apparatus. His V (Escorial R III 14) and N (Monacensis 267) read *κάμησιν*, while W (Bruxellensis 11301/16) and U (Vaticanus 1418) have *κάμησιν*. This last however appears to be a misprint for *κάμησον*, which earlier editors, as described below, read in U. As U was the manuscript used by Ursinus, Reiske must be mistaken when he writes that Ursinus had *καμισέων* 'in codice'.⁴

J. Schweighaeuser adopted Reiske's conjecture in his monumental edition, although cautiously, bracketing it in his text. He comments in his apparatus that it is 'non satis certum', and records the manuscript reading of *Κάμησον*.⁵ F. Hultsch, in his 1872 edition, felt bold enough to discard the brackets, noting the readings *κάμησιν* and *κάμησον* in his apparatus.⁶ In 1902 C. de Boor restored *κάμησιν* to the text in his edition of the *Excerpta de Legationibus* of Constantine Porphyrogenitus.⁷ In his apparatus he notes the readings *κάμησιν*, *κάμησιν*, *κάσιν*, as well as the conjectures of Ursinus and Reiske. For his own part he offers *καμισινην* or *καμισινηνών*, citing Strabo's mention of the region of Camisene in Pontic Cappadocia (C.546 = 12.3.12 & C.560 = 12.3.37). The geographical aspect will be considered further below. In his Teubner text of 1904, Büttner-Wobst returns to *Μωκισσέων*, although in his apparatus he suggests *Μουκισσέων*, following Stephanus Byzantinus, as well as recording the conjectures of Ursinus and de Boor.

The next step is to combine a consideration of the history of the text with that of the historical geography of Cappadocia. The text as it stands contains three place-names. Where Kalpitos (or Kalpiton) was is unknown; presumably somewhere in Galatia.⁸ The river Halys was reached in five days' march, then Parnassus a day later. Parnassus was situated in north-west Cappadocia between the Halys and Lake Tatta.⁹ What of Mokissos? Hierocles terms it a *regio* and places it in Cappadocia Secunda.¹⁰ A late source records that a place called *Μωκησός* was the source of *στήλαι* for the hippodrome at Constantinople, but as it is included among a list of such major centres as Athens, Cyzicus, Sardis and Antioch there must be doubt whether it means to identify this Cappadocian backwater.¹¹ The place rose to prominence under Justinian. Procopius (*De Aed.* V.4.15–18) describes how it was he who pulled down the old, decayed fortress of 'Mocosos' and built the city which he named Justinianopolis. This subsequently acquired metropolitan status. Recognising the lateness of these references to Mokissos, and also because he felt that Eumenes must have been further east when the Romans caught up with him, Niese thought Reiske's emendation of

⁴ On the history of the manuscripts see J. M. Moore, *The Manuscript Tradition of Polybius* (Cambridge, 1965), pp. 137–161, esp. 152–3. The suggestion that Büttner-Wobst's '*κάμησιν*' as the reading of U is a misprint, is made to me by Professor Walbank, who notes that the accent ought to be on the first η, not the α.

⁵ J. Schweighaeuser, *Polybii Megalopolitani Historiarum quidquid superest*, Vol. IV, (Leipzig, 1790), p. 321.

⁶ F. Hultsch, *Polybii Historiae* (Berlin, 1872), Vol. 4, p. 1135.

⁷ C. de Boor, *Excerpta de Legationibus, Pars 1, Excerpta de Legationibus Romanorum ad Gentes* (Berlin, 1903), p. 47.

⁸ F. Walbank, *Historical Commentary on Polybius* (Oxford, 1979), Vol. III, pp. 268–9 suggests it is possibly Kalpinon, known from a late Christian source, near the confluence of the Aladağ Su and the Sakarya (Sangarius).

⁹ J. Anderson, *JHS* 19 (1899), pp. 107–9 identified Parnassus as the modern Parlassan, about six miles from the Halys.

¹⁰ Hierocles, 701.1. The Cappadocian information contained in the sixth century handbook of Hierocles is most accessible in Table XXV of A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*² (Oxford, 1971), p. 539.

¹¹ *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, Theodore Preger (ed.), (Teubner, 1901–1907), p. 189.

Polybius 'sehr zweifelhaft'.¹² But where was Mokissos? Many twentieth-century scholars have been content with Ramsay's claim in his *Historical Geography of Asia Minor* that it lies beneath the modern town of Kirşehir. That is, on the north side of the river Halys.¹³ However the episcopal notitiae which proclaim the metropolitan status of Justinianopolis suggest we should look for it to the south of the river, given the locations of the sees subordinate to it; Doara, Colonia, Parnassus, Nazianzus, and later, Matiane.¹⁴ It has recently been suggested that the site of Justinianopolis/Mokissos is to be found at the modern village of Viranşehir, 27 kilometres south-east of Aksaray.¹⁵ One might add that Stephanus Byzantinus, whence Büttner-Wobst derived *Μουκισσέων*, says he collected the name from the sixth book of the eight-volume *Ἰσαυρικὰ* of Capito of Lycia.¹⁶ A site in south-west, rather than north, Cappadocia would be in a more likely geographical position for inclusion in such a work. Walbank¹⁷ correctly observes that Polybius implies, rather than explicitly states, that Eumenes and Ariarathes crossed the Halys in their march against Pharnaces but this must be certain, given that Pharnaces was coming from Pontus. The conjecture *Μωκισσέων* therefore makes no geographical sense, just as Niese was correct to realize that it does not make chronological sense.

One must therefore restore the original manuscript reading *κάμησον* as the starting point in our search for the solution. Walbank is attracted by de Boor's *καμισσηνήν* as palaeographically the easiest emendation. But geographically it is not easy to leap from north-west Cappadocia to the far north-east where Camisene lay, near the headwaters of the Halys, as Strabo tells us. While it may be true that Polybius' text shows signs of compression by Byzantine excerptors around this point, I do not feel compelled to accept Walbank's view that 'it need not be supposed that that Eumenes

¹² B. Niese, *Geschichte der Griechischen und Makedonischen Staaten seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea* (Gotha, 1903), Vol. 3, p. 76, n. 5, quoted by E. V. Hansen, *The Attalids of Pergamum*² (Cornell University, 1971), p. 103, n. 105. As Professor Walbank has suggested to me, Niese presumably felt that Eumenes was further east on account of the Romans requesting him to withdraw, *ἐκ τῆς χώρας* (24.15.5). This might be taken most naturally to imply that Eumenes was well within Pontic territory. In that case the search for *κάμησον* would need to be in the region of the headwaters of the Halys, which would strengthen the case of de Boor and Walbank for Camisene, although Niese himself rejects this. However I do not think 24.15.5 is sufficiently explicit to be fatal to my case.

¹³ *The Historical Geography of Asia Minor* (London, 1890), esp. p. 299. He is followed on the site of Mokissos by Jones in *CERP*, p. 433, n. 23, and, implicitly, by Hansen (n. 12) who says Mokissos is in north Cappadocia. There appears to be a misprint in Walbank (n. 8). He quotes Ramsay as the authority for the position of Mokissos and then says that it lay to the south-west of Caesarea. Ramsay's identification of it with the modern Kirşehir, places it *north-west*. S. Eyice, *Analecta Bollandiana* 91 (1973), p. 363 and *Cahiers archéologiques* 18 (1968), pp. 137–8 believed the identification of Mokissos-Justinianopolis-Kirşehir unfounded; cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin Épigraphique* 1974, 592 in *REG* 87 (1974), p. 304. Hild and Restle (below, n. 15), pp. 143–4 identify Kirşehir with the ancient Aquae Saravenae.

¹⁴ J. D. Mansi, *Sacrorum conciliorum nova et amplissima collectio* (Florence, 1757–98), Vol. IX, p. 258. For a convenient table, Jones, *CERP*, p. 539.

¹⁵ F. Hild and M. Restle, *Tabula Imperii Byzantini 2: Kappadokien* (Vienna, 1981), pp. 238–9. This is by far the most reliable account of the geography of Cappadocia and its excellent maps should be consulted for all the place-names mentioned here. For the extensive remains at Viranşehir see the photographs in M. Restle, *Studien zur frühbyzantinischen Architektur Kappadokiens* (Vienna, 1979) and also in F. Hild, *Das Byzantinische Strassensystem in Kappadokien* (Vienna, 1977), 50, 51.

¹⁶ Stephanus Byzantinus, *Ethnicorum Quae Supersunt*, (ed. A. Meineke, Berlin, 1899), p. 457. On Capito see *RE* III, col. 1527. He wrote c. 500.

¹⁷ Walbank, (n. 8).

reached “*κάμησην*” from Parnassus in a day’, given that Polybius or his excerptor has just chosen to describe a mere one day march along the Halys to Parnassus.¹⁸

It is elsewhere in Strabo that we should look to discover the identity of ‘*κάμησον*’. I believe that this is a corruption of the name of the Cappadocian strategia of *χαμανηνή* or *χαμμανηνή*, which, according to Strabo (C.534 = 12.1.4, C.540 = 12.2.10), comprises north-west Cappadocia, bordering Galatia. In other words, exactly the region one would enter if one crossed the Halys in the vicinity of Parnassus. The reading makes excellent geographical sense of the text and it would not seem palaeographically impossible. In fact many mss. of Strabo spell the name of the strategia with an initial kappa rather than chi.¹⁹ Some version of this name looks even more likely given that Ptolemy, *Geographia* V.6.12 calls the strategia *χαμανή*. He also gives *χαμανηνή* and *χαμαννησία*. This last, in the accusative, *χαμαννησίαν*, would seem to be easiest to square with the manuscripts of Polybius.²⁰ A closer reading still could be obtained by replacing the chi with the kappa found in the Strabonian versions mentioned above.

My belief that Mokissos must be wrong and Chamanene correct arose out of research far removed from questions of Polybian textual criticism but as I consulted the editions of Polybius I became increasingly surprised that no-one seemed to have made this suggestion before. Reiske’s *Μωκισσέων* has held sway since 1763. However, if one reads Reiske’s comments in full, there is a reference to Wesseling’s edition of the Roman Itineraries, in which, Reiske says, ‘*in hoc loco restituendo alias iniit vias*’.²¹ There, in his commentary on *mansio Parnasso* in the Jerusalem Itinerary, Wesseling anticipates the criticisms Reiske makes of Ursinus for removing Parnassus from the text but his ‘*alia via*’ is to adduce Ptolemy’s *χαμανή* as the true reading behind ‘*τὴν κάμησον χώραν*’. Presumably, had Reiske’s reference been less cryptic, *Μωκισσέων* would have disappeared from the texts of Polybius long before now.²²

University of Manchester

PHILIP BEAGON

¹⁸ Professor Walbank suggests to me that the implication of his remark about a compressed text is that a number has dropped out between Parnassus and ‘*κάμησον*’; he thinks it odd that we should not be given a duration for the third leg of the journey when we have them for the other two. Obviously it is impossible to be sure but one might argue that, as Chamanene is virtually on Parnassus’ doorstep, it wasn’t even a day’s march.

A line of argument which might support Walbank’s case for Camisene, although it is not one he uses himself, revolves around the meaning of ‘*πεμπταῖοι*’ and ‘*έκταῖοι*’. When Ursinus proposed to replace Parnassus with Amasea, he clearly took *έκταῖοι* to mean a six-day march from the Halys. (Quoted by Wesseling, n. 21, below). To translate in this way however, merely changes, rather than solves, the problem, as then one has to reject the mss. reading *Παρνασσόν*, which is supported on the grounds of *lectio difficilior*.

¹⁹ C. Müller and F. Dübner, *Strabonis Geographica* (Paris, 1853), *Ind. Var. Lect.*, p. 1020.

²⁰ As suggested to me by Peter Derow.

²¹ P. Wesseling (ed.), *Vetera Romanorum Itineraria, sive Antonini Augusti Itinerarium, Itinerarium Hierosolymitanum et Hieroclis Grammatici Synecdemus* (Amsterdam, 1735), p. 576. Incidentally, Wesseling adds further support to the view that the proper reading of U is *κάμησον* (see above, n. 4).

²² I would like to thank Professor Frank Walbank, Dr Peter Derow and Dr John Briscoe for their improvements to this note. Moore (n. 4), p. 153 notes that Trinity College, Cambridge, holds a sixteenth-century manuscript of the *De Legationibus*, which has not been consulted by subsequent editors. Angela Heap has kindly consulted this ms. on my behalf and informs me that it reads *καμνήσσην*.