Collecting Fragments

Fragmente sammeln

Edited by
Glenn W. Most

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht in Göttingen

Jacoby's Fragments and Two Greek Historians of Pre-Islamic Arabia

G. W. BOWERSOCK (Princeton)

Any historian knows that serious historical research inevitably carries important methodological implications, either implicit or explicit. For the historian of antiquity fragments of all kinds litter the path he must traverse — broken monuments, broken inscriptions, scraps of papyri, as well as arbitrarily reduced or paraphrased excerpts from writings that no longer exist in their entity. For that capacious final category the laborious efforts of scholars to collect fragments by author have not only provided useful employment for the collector but an attractive shortcut for the historian who may need to assess and exploit those fragments.

No collection of historical fragments has been so ambitious nor so widely influential as Jacoby's. Every historian's experience of it is likely to be unique. Those who have mined the collection for study of pre-Islamic Arabia constitute a tiny and hardy band. As one of their number, I have confronted the obvious convenience and less obvious danger of using Jacoby on many occasions and over a long period of time. What follows here may be viewed as a kind of trial trench by an archaeologist of historical texts. These observations arise from highly specialized work on Arabia, and their aim has been to resurrect two largely forgotten and underappreciated historians of the ancient near east. My response to Jacoby may or may not provide a fair measure of the work overall. For that we will need many trial trenches from various areas of the enormous terrain that Jacoby has prepared for us. But I dare to hope that the substantive result offered here and the methodological criticism suggested by them will, in some helpful way, complement and reinforce each other.

* * *

Literary testimony on the Roman and early Byzantine Near East outside of Judaea is exceptionally scarce, and so we must be grateful for the scraps we have and try to make the most of them. For Arabia Jacoby presented, in III C 674 and 675, what he called fragments of the historical works of two clearly important writ-

ers, Glaucus and Uranius.[1] The epochs to which these writers should be assigned remain problematic. Much depends upon the nature and interpretation of the alleged fragments. Consequently the principles and utility of Jacoby's work can be assessed in a convenient compass by a close examination of what survives of Glaucus and Uranius. It may be asked whether scholars would be better able to do their work without the intermediate and selective presentation of texts by Jacoby. The answer will incline more to the affirmative than might have been expected.

Jacoby's monumental enterprise was born in the spirit of optimism that engendered Pauly-Wissowa, the Cambridge Ancient History, the Beck Handbücher, and other comprehensive surveys of available information on classical civilisation. But, unlike these works, Jacoby's *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* took the form of the great nineteenth-century collections of fragments of tragedy and comedy. There, however, meter could provide some control over words excerpted from the extant texts that hosted the fragments. In his collection of historians Jacoby went far beyond his predecessor Müller, who had collected only substantial remains. Jacoby undertook to root out every reference to a work or historian that did not survive, and thereby to provide a repertorium of texts that would constitute all the actual surviving words of authors whose works as a whole have been lost to us.

But Jacoby thought it nesessary as well to include paraphrases and allusions to passages in the lost histories, and it was inevitably difficult for him to distinguish in many cases a paraphrase from a quotation. This confusion is ubiquitous throughout his work, although he used a variant typography to inform readers when he believed he was reproducing the substance of a lost text but not its precise words. He also employed quotation marks to set off material he determined to be excerpted *verbatim* from his source. Yet, with all this fastidious concern for the character of an excerpt, Jacoby chose to call anything that was not clearly testimony about the writer himself (rather than his work) a fragment. *Hinc illae lacrimae.*

Jacoby's was a noble objective, but from the start the scholarly industry and positivist erudition of the editor obscured the fundamental confusion in his project. This, it may be suspected, is one important reason why after Jacoby's death the impeccable scholar who was supposed to continue the work — Herbert Bloch — never found himself in a position to do so. The problem of what a fragment is hovers ominously over the entire work. Obviously fragments of lost works on papyri or stone are quite litterally fragments: the Hellenica Oxyrhynchia are a good example, or the Marmor Parium. But the majority of items identified as fragments in Jacoby were culled with learning and assiduity from literary texts. It is often impossible to tell whether an extant author is providing a quotation or a paraphrase of

---

1 For detailed study of the observations offered here, it would be advisable to have Jacoby's text to hand.

the work he adduces. An opinion, fact, or spelling could be ascribed to a lost work without any clear indication of how many of the actual words, if any at all, came from that work.

For the precious testimony of Glaucus and Uranius the problem is unusually exposed. All the alleged fragments in Jacoby, with the sole exception of a paraphrase of Uranius in Tzetzes' *Chiliads*, are drawn form the *Ethnika* of Stephanus of Byzantium, who invokes these writers for attestations of ethnics of near eastern cities and tribes. Although Stephanus himself is generally agreed to have been writing in the first half of the sixth century, his work is available to us only in an abridgement made sometime after Constantine Porphyrogennetos in the tenth century.[2] The epitomator, a grammarian called Hermolaos, was capable of introducing material of his own (such as a reference to the ninth-century George Choiroboskos), and he was also capable of introducing errors into the documentation of Stephanus' original work.[3] But the dangers in the abbreviated Stephanus are manifestly greater where no anterior source is cited for an observation. It seems as if Stephanus himself was not averse to making up ethnics where none was attested.[4] But when a source is explicitly cited, a reasonable interpretation not only becomes feasible: it can also provide some guidance in the analysis of other parts of the work where a source is not named.

Unfortunately both authors on pre-Islamic Arabia are otherwise totally unknown, and the time in which they wrote has largely to be deduced from the scraps they are thought to have written. Onomastics can help a little in the case of Uranius (a name redolent, as we shall see, of late antiquity), but Glaucus' name could be of almost any date. A scholar of pre-Islamic Arabia could undertake research on the evidence of these two writers either by an attentive reading of Stephanus or by consultation of the texts marshalled conveniently by Jacoby. The dangers that attend the latter course of action are such as to call into question the value of Jacoby's method.

The history by Glaucus bore the title Ἀραβικὴ ἀρχαιολογία, whereas Uranius' work was entitled simply Ἀραβικά. At least it is under these names that Stephanus consistently cites these writers. A work entitled Ἀρχαιολογία evokes

---

2 For the basic information and bibliography one may consult A. Kazhdan in the *Oxford Dictionary of Byzantium* (Oxford 1991) III 1953-54. The article of E. Honigmann in Pauly-Wissowa III A.2, cols. 2369-99 is still fundamental.

3 This seems to have happened in the case of the entry for Stratoniceia: L. Robert, *Villes D'Asie Mineure*, 2nd ed. (Paris 1962) pp. 43-4. Fobert repeatedly emphasized the need for a careful methodology in using Stephanus. Cf., for example, *Hellenica* II (1946) ch. VII ("Sur quelques ethniques"), with the bibliography on p. 66 n. 3.

4 Cf. J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin épigraphique* 42 (1950) p. 137. See now the valuable study by D. Whitehead, "Site-classification and reliability in Stephanus of Byzantium," in D. Whitehead (ed.), *From Political Architecture to Stephanus Byzantius: Sources for the Ancient Greek Polis* (Historia-Einzelschriften 87, 1994) pp. 99-124.

the same word in the titles of the Roman history of Dionysius of Halicarnassus and of the Jewish history of Josephus. Like Dionysius and Josephus, Glaucus appears to have investigated the early history of his chosen people: the great city of Aela or Aelana at the head of the Fulf of Aqaba appears only as a village (κώμη) in Glaucus, as Stephanus observes, and similarly the city of Aridela appears as a village. There is absolutly nothing in any of the references to Glaucus to indicate the lower terminus of his account. A tantalizing occurrence of Parthia in the description of Ertha, an otherwise unknown city on the Euphrates, could just as well allude to the earlier history of the kingdom as to its final phase. If we cannot say how late Glaucus went in his history, we are equally at a loss to say when he was at work on it. Jacoby, in a marginal annotation, placed him *zwischen ca. 140a. - 200p.*, which is neither helpful nor precise.

No less than thirteen fragments of Glaucus are printed in Jacoby's *Fragmente*. The first of these is Ἀταφηνοί· ἔθνος μέγα Ἀραβίας, περὶ οὗ Γλαῦκος ἐν β. It is obvious that this may not be a fragment in any reasonable sense of the word. The only certainty is that Glaucus said something about Ataphenoi in his second book of his history. We cannot even tell whether he described these people as a "great people of Arabia" or whether this is Stephanus' own identification of them (based perhaps on his reading of Glaucus). Other so-called fragments leave no doubt that Stephanus gave his own identifications apart from references to authorities. His citations of Glaucus for the designation of village in the cases of Aela and Aridela prove this: Each entry begins by calling the place a polis. In fact, it looks as if one can only be sure of an authentic excerpt from Glaucus when a term such as village or small city (πολίχνιον) is cited on his authority.[5]

Accordingly all thirteen fragments of Glaucus in Jacoby must be judged not to be fragments at all. Consider the second alleged fragment, which concerns Dumata (Dumat al-jandal): Δούμαθα· πόλις Ἀραβίας. ὁ πολίτης Δουμαθηνός, ὡς Γλαῦκος ἐν β Ἀραβικῆς ἀρχαιολογίας. Glaucus is invoked here solely for the ethnic of the city name. We have no way of telling whether the historian called Dumata a polis, as Stephanus does, or whether his text included the word πολίτης. This item can hardly be called a fragment by any definition. Only the word Δουμαθηνός might possibly qualify, but even this is doubtful since Glaucus might well have used the word in an oblique case. It is, however, of the greatest interest that Dumata appeared in his work. This is a city that is ill documented in Graeco-Roman tradition, but it was clearly an important place in the Babylonian period. Its location at the bottom end of the Wadi Sirhan ensured continued importance in the days of the Nabataeans and Romans, and a Latin inscription attesting a

5 Stephanus, as the philologist he was, tried to distinguish carefully among πόλις, χωρίον, πολίχνιον, vel sim.: cf. Robert, *Études épigraphiques et philologiques* (Paris 1938) pp. 261-62 n.

centurion has turned up there.[6] The geographer Ptolemy was, it seems, unsure of the spelling. He offers at V. 19, 7 Δούμεθα ἢ Δουμαίθα, whereas Glaucus delivers a more exact vocalization, reflecting the Assyria form Adummatu as well as the Hebrew and Arabic Duma(t).

Glaucus' spelling of Dumata, like his allusions to villages where there were cities in Stephanus' day, points to a narrative concerning Arabia in earlier times. The question now arises whether he was writing about the history of Arabia before the Nabataeans. It has been observed that none of the references to Glaucus in Stephanus mentions the rulers of Petra, who populated and shaped the kingdom that was annexed as the province of Arabia in A.D. 106. Since the so-called fragments in Jacoby prove not to be fragments in any meaningful sense, one ought not to infer from them that a whole people was necessarily omitted in the original work. But that is indeed an inference that can be made by comparing Stephanus' citations of other authors. In other words, this is not a problem of assessing the techniques of citation in a source that alludes to the lost work.

A review of the citations of a surviving work in Stephanus makes his method perfectly plain: when he cites Strabo's *Geography*, for example, he regularly deduces supporting information from the text to flesh out the word or words he actually quotes. This happens most commonly in supplying details of the relevant people or general geographical region for the place-name that interests him. A few of many possible illustrations should suffice: for Ἀρρηχοί Stephanus gives ἔθνος Μαιωτῶν followed by the name of Strabo as his source, but Strabo (p. 495) does not use this precise phrase. What he says is Τῶν Μαιωτῶν δ' εἰσὶν αὐτοί τε οἱ Σινδοὶ καὶ Δανδάροι καὶ Τορέται καὶ Ἄγροι καὶ Ἀρρηχοί. For Zelos (or Zelis) Stephanus gives πόλις τῶν ἑσπερίων Αἰτιόπων and names Strabo, who uses no such phrase but does indeed present the city in his discussion of the western Ethiopians. But Stephanus can quote his source's actual words when he wishes: for Χατραμωτῖτις he cites Strabo (p. 768) with two phrases that can only make sense as quotations, and that is exactly what they are — word for word: Γέρραιοι δ' εἰς τὴν Χατράμωτῖτιν and πρὸς ἕω μάλιστα χατραμωτῖται.

All this means that the absence of any allusion to the Nabataeans when Glaucus is named as an authority must be taken to imply that they were not mentioned in his original text. The best explanation, in the light of other indications, is that he was describing Arabia before the Nabataeans were fully established in Transjordan. An opinion that I once espoused on the assumption that Glaucus was a writer of the

---

6 For a valuable account of Dumat al-jándal and exploration in the area, see F. V. Winnett and W. L Reed, *Ancient Records from North Arabia* (Toronto 1970) pp. 71-73. The Latin inscription found at Jawf is discussed in G. Bowersock, *Roman Arabia* (Harvard Univ. Press, 2nd ed. 1994) p. 98, n. 26, with a photograph of the stone as plate 14.

tering the city to show its ethnic, calls it Πέτρα, a city of Third Palestine. That this is a singular form emerges incontrovertibly from the very entry for Gea. It continues, beyond the point where Jacoby's excerpt ends, with the words ἐν Πέτραις δ' ἐπιχωριάζειν κύριον ὄνομα τὸ Γέσιος. The plural form, clearly feminine, must also have been drawn directly or in paraphrase from the text of Glaucus, — a point that completely escaped Jacoby, as his omission of the words demonstrates.[9] The remainder of the entry speculates (ἴσως) that the great sophist Gesios of the third century A.D. owed his name to the proper name derived from Gea. This speculation is clearly Stephanus' own.

Slowly we have uncovered in Glaucus an early Greek witness to the history of the Arabs before and during the early Hellenistic age. Such a witness might be expected to preserve places and episodes otherwise erased from the historical record. The mysterious Parthian city of Ertha on the Euphrates would appear to be one such place. And Stephanus' account (Jacoby's fragment 10) of Characmoba, on the site of the modern Jordanian city of Kerak, implies one such episode, frustratingly vague as it is. For the ethnic in Glaucus we clearly have a quotation that appears to allude to unrest in Moab at another time: ἡσύχαζον δ' ἐν τούτοις Χαρακμωβηνοί. (Whether an excerpt such as this gains anything from being called a fragment instead of a quotation may be left for a different discussion.) And in another place, at the entry of Βασσινοί, we find a plain identification, ascribed to Glaucus, of Ἀραβικὸν ἔθνος. Just over a decade ago a Latin milestone inscription at the oasis of Azraq in the Jordanian desert confirmed the evidence of an inscription from a nearby ruin (Khirbet Manara) that a site in this region, at the head of the Wadi Sirhan, was called Basia.[10] A *protector* at Manara is described as *agens Basie* (for *Basiae*), and the word surfaces again in the Azraq document with reference to a *caput viae* in a puzzling line beginning *a Basie nisa* (which I am inclined to understand as "from the camp at Basia," with *nisa* taken as a transliteration of the Aramaic **nîšâ**, meaning *signum*).[11] If Glaucus knew the pre-Roman names of the Arbs, as he manifestly did, his Basinnoi may well be the eponymous people of the Azraq oasis area in antiquity.

---

9 Another good example of Stephanus' incorporation of a spelling in his source is πόλις Παρθυαίων in the entry for Artemita where he is adducing Strabo, although the actual two-word phrase itself does not occur in the source. Stephanus is only interested in the designation πόλις, but he absorbs Strabo's spelling of the word for Parthians.

10 *Archaiologikē Ephēmeris* 136 (1948) (Manara). For the Azraq inscription, which poses many problems, see the discussion in H. I. MacAdam's article in *The Eastern Frontier of the Roman Empire*, ed D. H. French and C. S. Lighfoot, Brit. Inst. of Arch. at Ankara monograph no 11, BAR Int. Ser. 553 (i), 1989, p. 300.

11 The line is read by Michael Speidel as *a Basiensis Amat(a) LXX* in his article "The Roman Road to Dumata," *Historia* 36 (1987) 213-221. His view is discussed in detail by MacAdam in the article cited in the foregoing note.

The unpromising Glaucus thus yields up more treasures when examined in Stephanus rather than in Jacoby. For Uranius the rewards are even greater. In his entry for Characmoba Stephanus cites Uranius and then makes remarkable parenthetical observation: ἀξιόπιστος δὲ ἀνὴρ περὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα· σπουδὴν γὰρ ἔθετο ἱστορῆσαι ἀκριβῶς τὰ τῆς Ἀραβίας. This reference to the character of the man — his trustworthiness and his enthusiasm for exactitude — makes one surmise that Stephanus may actually have known him personally or known those who did. This possibility, which is at best only that, seems not to have occurred to Jacoby, although his marginal annotation for Uranius proposes a date in the sixth century A.D. In support of this suggestion he adduces, among his testimonies on Uranius, texts from Agathias (*Hist.* 2. 29) and Damascius (*Vit. Isidor.* p. 342b 12) about a fraudulent philosopher called Uranius who is the target of one of the most vivacious and eloquent passages in Agathias.[12] The ignorance and pomposity of the man hardly fit with Stephanus' admiring characterization. Out of this chaos Jacoby must, however, derive some credit for judging Uranius an historian of late antiquity. Because of explicit references to the Nabataeans in material ascribed to him, Unranius has been assigned to the first century B.C. by several scholars, includig Jean Starcky (who should probably be ranked as the greatest *Nabatéologue* of this century).[13]

Three strong arguments counsel a late date for Uranius, in late antiquity if not necessarily in Stephanus' own time. The first is the inescapable implication of Uranius' allusion to a city called Nicephorion, which is said to be in the vicinity of Edessa. The item in Stephanus stands as fragment 29 in Jacoby: Νικηφόριον· οὕτως ἡ Κωνσταντίνα ἡ περὶ Ἔδεσαν πόλις, ὡς Οὐράνιος. It would be almost impossible to understand this comment as meaning anything other than that Uranius identified the Constantina of his own day as formerly Nicephorion. To readers of Procopius Constantina will be a well known city of Mesopotamia, Tela or Tella in Syriac. Some have argued that the name is properly Constantia rather than Constantina, but the point is unimportant for locating Uranius no earlier than the fourth century.

The second argument turns on Uranius' use of the term Τάινοι or Τάννοι for Saracens (fragment 10): the standard Syriac designation of the nomadic Arabs known to the Greeks and Romans as Saracens was ṭayyâyê, and in eastern Greek

---

12 Jacoby was probably only reproducing Honigmann's suggested identification of the historian with the man in Agathias: Pauly-Wissowa III A.2, in the article on Stephanus of Byzantium, col. 2387, published in 1929. The preface to Jacoby's volume with Uranius is dated to 1957. Honigmann's remarks on Uranius are uncharacteristically wide of the mark and will be dealt with below.

13 A. von Domaszewski, *Archiv für Religionsgeschichte* 11 (1908) 239; H. Papenhoff, Pauly-Wissowa, *RE* IX A.1 (1961) col. 647; J. Starcky, *Suppl. au Dict. de la Bible* (n.3 above), col. 906.

writers this was transliterated directly. In speaking of the assassin of the emperor Julian Libanius (Orat. 24. 6) refers to Τάιηνός τις. The word Saracen and its Syriac equivalent, both originally tribal names, did not become generalized terms for nomadic Arabs until late antiquity. The third and final argument is the simple fact that before the appearance of the noted eastern usurper of the third century A.D., Uranius Antonius, the name is missing from the prosopography of the Roman world. It obviously could have been borne by others before that, but the relative frequency with which it turns up afterwards points to a date in late antiquity for the historian.[14] This presumption, combined with the identification of Nicephorion and familiarity with Saracens and ṭayyâyê, comes as near to certainty as we are likely to get.

On the other hand, one of the alleged fragments of Uranius in Jacoby ought not to be pressed into service to support a late date. In fragment 11a reader dependent upon Jacoby's collection would be led astray, as was J. M. I. West in his study of Uranius two decades ago.[15] In his entry for Palmyra Stephanus gives: Πάλμυρα· φρούριον Συρίας, οὗ μέμνηται Οὐράνιος ἐν Ἀραβικῶν β. There is absolutely no way of telling whether or not Uranius simply mentioned Palmyra or whether he called it explicitly φρούριον Συρίας. With other reasons for assuming a late date for Uranius it becomes entirely plausible for him to have described the city of Zenobia in this way. The place was reduced to a military camp after Aurelian's triumph over the queen. But unfortunately in this case we cannot even be sure that we have a fragment here.

The citations of Uranius in Stephanus allow two important characteristics of his history to be inferred. One is a philological precision in explaining the Semitic meaning of words transliterated into Greek. There are two documented cases associated with Uranius' name. In Stephanus under Μωθώ, a village in Arabia where an Antiochus is said to have died according to Uranius, we are told, quite correctly, ὅ ἐστι τῇ Ἀράβων φωνῇ τόπος θανάτου. There is no certainty that this remark occurred in the *Arabica*, but Stephanus is unlikely to have known the meaning on his own. Again in the entry for Nisibis, Stephanus first cites Philo of Byblos as stating that the name of the city means τὰς στήλας. But Uranius, he tells us, rendered the word differently (and here we seem to have a real quotation): ὁ δὲ Οὐράνιος "νέσιβις" φησί "σημαίνει τῇ Φοινίκων φωνῇ λίθοι συγκείμενοι, συμφορητοί." Uranius clearly knows what he is talking about, since the word means a monument or pillar, which requires an accumulation of stones. Stelae are hardly the same thing.

---

14 Observe the *Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire* vol. I with six Uranii and vol. II with seven (not including the quack philosopher in Agathias).

15 *Harvard Studies on Classical Philology* 78 (1974) 283.

The second characteristic of Uranius, as he can be observed in Stephanus, is his precise knowledge of Nabataeans, whose kingdom had come to end at least several centuries before his own time (but whose language was still being used in the fourth century and probably later).[16] On this score alone Uranius would undoubtedly have merited Stephanus' praise of him as an accurate historian. Jacoby duly registers as fragments 6, 7, 8, 12, and 24 the five entries in Stephanus where Uranius' name is mentioned together with Nabataeans. But without recourse to Stephanus one would never know that the compiler refers on six other occasions to Nabataeans, and it would be reasonable to inquire whether the information found there also reflects the erudition of Uranius. One item, on Ammanitai, is assigned to Josephus, but the others are anonymous. Of these the entry for Ναβαταῖοι is particularly interesting: it identifies the eponym of this people as a certain Ναβάτης. We then read Ναβάτης δέ ἐστιν ἀραβιστὶ ὁ ἐκ μοιψείας γενόμενος. This is very remarkable knowledge, perhaps not etymologically correct as an explanation of the name of the Nabataean people but astonishingly correct in rendering an early Arabic meaning of the word as a bastard or despicable person (a sense documented in the supplement to Lane's *Arabic Lexicon* under the root ṅbṭ). It is hard to resist the idea that Uranius provided this meaning. Similarly in Stephanus entry Σαλάμιοι we read ἔθνος Ἀράβων. σάλαμα δὲ ἡ εἰρήνη. ὠνομάσθησαν δὲ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἔνσπονδοι γενέσθαι τοῖς Ναβαταίοις. The conjunction here of an explanation of a Semitic word with a piece of Nabataean history would again point to Uranius. These two items are undoubtedly as deserving of attention as many of the so-called fragments in Jacoby, and they enrich our discussion of a lost but obviously valuable writer.

The interest and knowledge that Uranius manifests in his comments on the Nabataean world should lead us back to his reported identification of Constantina (or Constantia) in Mesopotamia as Nicephorion. His attention to this place may well reflect its importance in the early sixth century in Byzantine conflicts with the Persians, as documented in the first two books of Procopius' account of the Persian war. But the name Nicephorion is utterly new for the site. (The Suda simply repeats what appears in Stephanus, apart from using the form Constantia.) Before it took its name from the house of Constantine this place was known as Antoninopolis and has been presumed to be a foundation of Caracalla on his eastern expedition. The situation as described in the second volume of Pauly-Wissowa (*RE* I. 2, col. 2571) has not changed in a hundred years: *eine wahrscheinlich von Caracalla angelegte Stadt in Mesopotamien, zwischen Edessa und Dara.*

But if Uranius is as reliable as Stephanus claimed and other references suggest, we learn from him that this city had borne a name that would imply most reasona-

16 The newly discovered papyri of the sixth century at Petra appear to contain subscriptions written in cursive Nabataean. But the readings are not yet assured.

bly a Seleucid foundation, possibly taking its name (like the well known Nicephorion on the Euphrates at modern Raqqa) from a king who bore the epithet Nicator. The obvious and only secure candidate is Seleucus I, to whom the foundation of the city at Raqqa is ascribed.[17] It is equally possible that a victory was celebrated by this name, as in the case of the Pergamene sanctuary called Nicephorion and its Nicephoria or, one supposes, the river Nicephorion in the vicinity of Tigranocerta.[18] Whatever the explanation, all the known instances of names of this form are Hellenistic in date and contrast strikingly with the form Nicopolis preferred in imperial urban nomenclature. The popularity of the name Nicephoros/-ios in the Hellenistic period may be reflected in its appearance as an epithet of a Bactrian king Antimachus in the second century B.C.[19] No one seems ever to have noticed that Uranius identified the city near Edessa as a Nicephorion: it is not registered in the Pauly entry for Constantia-Antoninopolis nor in the listings for Nicephorion.

Confirmation of Uranius' testimony can be had from a surprising source: the Syriac life of Rabbula of Edessa. There Tela is described as "the victorious city of great renown" (*madînta nṣiḥa dašmâhâteh*).[20] In view of the otherwise demonstrably reliable quality of Uranius' information, not to mention the Syriac evidence and the high regard that Stephanus had for him, it would be perverse to argue that Uranius is simply in error on this point and has confounded the site at Raqqa with Tela. Besides in late antiquity Raqqa was called Callinicum, not Constantina (or Constantia).

The one so-called fragment of Uranius in Jacoby that is not drawn from Stephanus is no. 21, excerpted from the *Chiliads* of John Tzetzes. Even with the most generous priciples of inclusion it is hard to believe that a scholar would wish to register as a fragment from a prose author eight lines of poetry composed in the twelfth century in the 15-syllable political verses of the Byzantine Empire. In fair-

---

17 An Antiochus is called Nicator on coins of Agathocles: Paul Bernard, *Fouilles d'Aï Khanoum IV — Les monnaies hors trésors — questions d'histoire gréco-bactrienne* (Paris 1985) pp. 151 and 166.

18 For the Pergamene Nicephoria, see C. P. Jones, "Diodoros Pasparos and the Nikephoria of Pergamon," *Chiron* 4 (1974) 183-205. The river (modern *Batman suyu*) is attested twice: Tac. *Ann.* 15. 4 (where it is called, in the narrative of Corbulo's campaign, *Nicephorius amnis*) and Plin. *NH* 6. 31. 129 of the Tigris *acceptis fluminibus claris Parthenia ac Nicephorione*. There is nothing to recommend a date for the adoption of this name in the Julio-Claudian age before Corbulo, and in any case Pliny's source, if not Agrippa's map, will have been certainly Hellenistic.

19 For the coins of Nicephorus Antimachus (the Bactrian kings regularly put the epithet before the name) see O. Bopearachchi, *Monnaies gréco-bactriennes et indo-greques: catalogue raisonné* (Paris 1991) pp. 196-98. For a discussion of the identity of this king, A. S. Hollis, *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik* 104 (1994) 270-71).

20 This text is most conveniently located in the Chrestomathy included in C. Brockelmann's *Syrische Grammatik*, 11th ed. (1968) p. 77*.

ness it must be said that Jacoby prints the lines in a different typeface to indicate that we are reading a paraphrase, but if there is anything to be said with complete assurance about these lines it is that they are not a fragment of Uranius in the sense that most people would speak of a fragment. Jacoby evidently was unable to resist the apparent authority of Tzetzes' line (7. 730), Οὐράνιος ἐν τρίτῳ δὲ Ἀραβικῶν που λέγει. What follows is, to be sure, of the greatest interest as it concerns special burial practices for kings and their families, and we know from the quotation in Stephanus under the name Oboda (modern 'Avdad in Israel) that Uranius took care to record details of at least one royal burial and cult. Tzetzes may well provide the substance of an account in Uranius, but we certainly do not have this text.

In fact the testimony of Uranius on Oboda provides a stunning confirmation of his trustworthiness. Stephanus (fragment 24) gives us: "Οβοδα· χωρίον Ναβαταίων· Οὐράνιος Ἀραβικῶν δ "ὅπου ὁ βασιλεύς, ὃν θεοποιοῦσι, τέθαπται." The cult of Obodas (which of the kings of this name is immaterial here) is nowhere attested in the literary tradition, but inscriptions have documented it in both Petra and Oboda itself. The excavator of Oboda found two inscriptions referring to it on a temple dedicated as late as A.D. 267-8, and the same scholar has published an extraordinary graffito from a site near Oboda with a bilingual text in Nabataean and proto-Arabic twice mentioning "Obodas the god."[21]

Since the present argument has led to an insistence upon the exceptional reliability of Uranius on Arabian history and geography, something must now be said about the curiously dyspeptic comments on this writer that Honigmannn introduced into his important Pauly article on Stephanus of Byzantium. Jacoby must have known this article, not least because he took over Honigmann's identification of the historian with the charlatan in Agathias. The reader in Pauly is referred to Uranius' *viele krasse Irrtümer*, but in each case cited by Honigmann it is Uranius who can be proved correct. A Nabataean king called Rabilos (fragment 25) should, we are told, really be Zabilos: not so, Rabilos is Greek for Rabbel, a well established royal name, whereas Zabilos is nothing of the kind: In the matter of Nicephorion, Honigmann is unaware that Tela bore the Name of Constantina (or Constantia) and so tries to convict Uranius of confusing the city with a far more distant one. He reproaches the historian for putting Karana on the Red Sea (fragment 27), but Strabo (16 p. 768) did that — not Uranius, who is cited only for the forms Karnania and Karnanitai. Perhaps most telling of all is Honigmann's mockery of Uranius for stating that Adana was in the inland of Eudaimon Arabia (ἐν μεσογείῳ τῆς Εὐδαίμονος Ἀραβίας, fragment 13). From the *Periplus of the Red Sea* (ch. 26) we learn that the port of Aden in the Roman Empire bore the name Eudaimon Ara-

21 All the evidence on the Obodas cult is assembled in the publication of the bilingual graffito by A. Negev, "Obodas the God," *Israel Exploration Journal* 36 (1986) 56-60.

bia,[22] and it is clearly to that name that the citation from Uranius alludes. As so often with ports on the Indian Ocean, the urban settlement was located in the interior behind the port. There can be little doubt that Uranius is telling us that about Adana. The truly remarkable thing is that he knew the name for the port at a time when most people knew that name as a designation for the Arabian peninsula. Uranius emerges trimphant.

The brief account of Glaucus and Uranius that I provided for a colloquium in France in 1988 was based upon work on the evidence as collected by Jacoby. My comments were included in a paper, mentioned earlier, on the three Arabias in Ptolemy's *Geography* (Πετραία, ἔρημος and εὐδαίμων).[23] As the years passed, I became increasingly doubtful of the wisdom of relying upon Jacoby's collection, and the present contribution, which goes much further than I could manage earlier and offers rectifications of what was said there, owes whatever value it may have to a decision to work directly from the ancient text that conserved most of our information about the two lost historians. One may hope that the result may advance, in some modest way, our understanding of the Greek sources for pre-Islamic Arabia.

The methodological problems of Jacoby's *Fragmente* illustrated here may arguably not warrant a wholesale condemnation of his enterprise. His collection can be viewed as a kind of ladder borrowed from Wittgenstein's philosophy: one uses it to climb up and then throws it away. Or again it may be seen to resemble navigational software for the Internet: We can perhaps locate useful material more quickly with it than without it. But one point is absolutely secure, and that is the necessity to leave Jacoby behind and to examine the original sources for historical fragments (however defined) before bringing any scholarly research on them to a conclusion.[24]

---

22 Cf. Lionel Casson, *The Periplus Maris Erythraei* (Princeton 1989) p. 158: "There is universal agreement that Eudaimon Arabia was on the site of Aden."

23 See the full reference in note 7.

24 I am much indebted to Christopher Jones for his comments on a draft of this paper, and to Michael Gawlikowski for discussion of several points. The latter scholar is inclined to emend Ἔρθα in Glaucus' frg. 3 to Εἴθα (therefore Hit), but I find the change from rho to iota difficult to accept here. In Stephanus the name appears in alphabetical order, and the entry cites as well an ethnic Ἐρθηνός. The transmitted name might represent Semitic *ḥirtha* (camp), but it is perhaps best to remain agnostic about this Parthian site.