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On the location of Leuke Kome
Dario Nappo

Roman harbours on the Red Sea are described in a number of literary sources, the most important of which are Strabo's Geographia, Pliny's Naturalis Historia, Ptolemy's Geographia and the anonymous Periplus Maris Erythraei (hereafter Periplus). Leuke Kome, Myos Hormos and Berenike were the key commercial hubs on the Red Sea in the 1st and 2nd c. A.D. for trade with India.1 Myos Hormos and Berenike have been identified and investigated: Berenike was sited just south of the large peninsula of Ras Benas, while Quseir al-Qadim is generally regarded as the site of Myos Hormos (fig. 1).2 The exact location of Leuke Kome, however, remains uncertain. Most scholars believe that it should be located in the area of modern Aynuna, c.5 km from the coast at the mouth of the Gulf of Aqaba;3 surveys of the area have revealed extensive architecture, including a tower and a necropolis.4 Although the evidence is meager, this identification is generally accepted. Nevertheless, a few scholars have suggested that Leuke Kome is located farther south. F.-L. Gatier and J.-F. Salles analysed some of the features of Leuke Kome described by the Periplus and cautiously suggested locating it at al-Wajh or possibly Qarna.5 H. Cuvigny has also suggested al-Wajh on the basis of the description provided by the Periplus and the site's geographical setting.6 Most recently, J. Hill has posited the identification of al-Wajh with Leuke Kome on the basis of Chinese texts.7

The first goal of this article is to explore in greater detail the hypothesis put forward by Gatier and Salles, Cuvigny, and Hill, and to demonstrate that the equation of Leuke Kome with al-Wajh is the best possible one. The second is to show how the location of Leuke Kome can be used to advance our understanding of the development of the Roman port system over time.

The location of Leuke Kome

The two main sources on Leuke Kome are Strabo and the Periplus.8 In Book 16, Strabo tells the story of Aelius Gallus' failed military expedition which aimed to conquer S Arabia.9

---

1 See Sidebotham 1986a; De Romanis 1996; Young 2001; Tomber 2008.
3 Kirwan 1979; Boversock 1983, 48; Desanges 1984; Sidebotham 1986a, 124-26; Casson 1989, 144; Young 2001, 85-87; Tomber 2008, 68.
6 Cuvigny 2003.
8 For the text of the Periplus, see Casson 1989; for that of Strabo 16, see Bihl 2002.
9 Strab. 16.4.22-24. Although Gallus' expedition was a failure, it was viewed as a diplomatic success by Augustus, who mentioned it in his Res Gestae (26): Meo iussu et auspicio duci sunt duos exercitus eodem fere tempore in Aethiopiam et in Arabiam, quae appellatur Ethiopum, maximaque hostilum gentis uritusque couiae caesae sunt in acie et complura oppida captas. In Aethiopiam usque ad oppidum Nabatae peruenit est, cui proxima est Mare. In Arabiam usque in fines Sabaeorum processit exercitus ad oppidum Martha. On this passage see Buschmann 1991; Jameson 1968; Luther 1999; Marek 1993; Potts 1994; Sidebotham 1986b; von Wissmann 1978.
This mistake would prove to be crucial for the final outcome of the expedition. Due to the shallow coastal waters of the Red Sea, large cargo ships were not suitable for navigation. See De Romanis 1996, 19-21.
Of the four comparanda, just one is applicable to Aynuna, one is uncertain, and two are not compatible. Thus the identification of Aynuna with Leuke Kome is unconvincing. It is useful to further analyse the first and the second points of Table 1.

The Periplus states that Leuke Kome lies eastwards from Myos Hormos. The words εἰς τὴν ἀνατολήν (eastwards) would suit both a location eastwards and north-eastwards from Myos Hormos. However, if we look at the relative location of Myos Hormos and Aynuna, we find that the latter is 18° NNE from Myos Hormos, so we would expect that the anonymous author would have said εἰς τὸν βορέαν “northwards”, rather than εἰς τὴν ἀνατολήν, “eastwards”.

Point 2 is more significant. First, the actual distance between Quseir al-Qadim and Aynuna is about 130 nautical miles (240 km) as the crow flies, a distance which seems to fit the Periplus’ description. But the crucial point is that sailing ships do not follow a straight line, and this is especially true in the Red Sea during the 1st c. A.D., when sailing from south to north was accomplished by sailing a zigzag path upwind. If we assume an average offset of 45° from the intended line of direction, then the actual distance covered by a ship going from Myos Hormos to Aynuna would be increased by roughly 40% beyond the straight-line distance, which works out at an overall actual distance of c. 250 nautical miles (330 km). This is not compatible with the 100-150 nautical miles (185-278 km) attested by the Periplus. Furthermore, this is sailing against the wind, which is much slower than running downwind. In such conditions, the possibility of accomplishing the journey in two or three days becomes even more unrealistic.

To the evidence in Table 1 we may add that the particular regimen of winds in the N part of the Red Sea would make Aynuna a very difficult port to reach for ships coming from the south. In the area around Aynuna the winds blow year round from north to south, making a voyage to the port from the south extremely difficult (see further below).

Despite these difficulties, the equation of Aynuna with Leuke Kome has been favoured by most scholars due to a lack of alternate excavated sites on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea, and because the correct identification of the site of Myos Hormos with Quseir al-Qadim is still relatively recent. Since the first half of the 19th c. Abu Shaar (mod. Deir Umm Debeis) was considered the most likely candidate for this port, whereas Quseir al-Qadim was believed to be Leukos Limen. Such a reconstruction was based largely on the information provided by Potelény, who placed Leukos Limen south of Myos Hormos, in the area of modern Quseir al-Qadim.20

16 For a similar argument, see Cuvigny 2003, 28.
17 Such a degree can be considered as average for this kind of upwind navigation: see the calculations provided by Seldman 1994, 196-99. Even an offset of 10° would be possible in particular conditions, depending on the strength of the winds (see Medas 2004, 191). For an empirical case study, see the experiments conducted by the Kyrenia II, a reconstruction of a merchant ship of the late 4th c. B.C. excavated off N Cyprus (Katzev 1989, 8-10; id. 1990, 254); in sea trials the ship managed to sail 30-40° off the wind.
18 It makes little sense to demonstrate that the reverse journey (from Aynuna to Myos Hormos) could have been completed in two or three days using the northern winds, for in fact the Periplus gives figures for the journey from Myos Hormos to Leuke Kome, not the reverse.

20 A gate inscription reads ad usum mercatorum (see Bagnall and Sheridan 1994a, 162-63; Sidebotham 1994, 141 and 138); one ostrakon reads τῷ γεω Αντόνιου / Η λευκή Λίμη / της Κέρκυρας. 159-60; [ / Πατώνι.] τῷ σελεβικοῦ] θύρα [ (see Bagnall and Sheridan 1994b, 112). 21 Sidebotham 1994, 133; Bagnall and Sheridan 1994a, 159-60; Sidebotham 1996. 22 Bagnall and Sheridan 1994a, 161. 23 Peacock 1993. 24 Bilow-Jacobsen, Cuvigny and Fournet 1994, 27-42; iid. 1998, 65-66; Cuvigny 2003 and 2005; Cohen 2006, 333. So far, 33 documents have been found, but only some are published. 25 van Rengen 2000, 51. 26 Kirwan 1979, 57. 27 Ibid. 59: "... Duba would satisfy none of the requirements for Leuke Kome: ample and protected anchorage; a sufficient breadth of fertile coastal plain to provide food supplies; water for men and camels; and proximity to the Wadi Ufal.” 28 Kirwan 1979, 59.
can be used again. Taking a line due east from Quseir al-Qadim, one arrives on the Arabian coast much farther south than Aynuna. In this area, opposite Myos Hormos, lies al-Wajh. This site was previously identified as Egra, the port from which Gallus departed, according to Strabo, on his way back to Alexandria. A. Musil was the first to do so. However, the Egra to which Strabo referred is probably an inland town whose actual ancient name was Hegra. It lies in the area of modern Mada’in Salih and has been only partially explored by archaeologists. Hegra was established as a major Nabataean military post in the late 1st c. B.C. It seems probable that an outpost of such a size, so far from the centre of the kingdom, must have been designed to protect valuable commodities entering the Nabataean kingdom by land from S Arabia. It probably also functioned as a southern frontier and customs post. Musil suggested that the settlement at al-Wajh was the port of al-Hegr, its maritime counterpart, and was in some way linked to the inland town:

It is true that al-Hegr lies not by the sea, but inland; but near this town Aelius Gallus left the trade route and branched off to the coast, upon which the port of al-Wajh was situated. It is possible and indeed probable that this harbour was also called al-Hegr, just as the port of Madjan was likewise known as Madjan, and it is perhaps identical with the modern harbour of al-Wegh (i.e., al-Wajh)?

However, the notion that there was a port called Egra (or Hegra) at al-Wajh is contradicted by our sources. Strabo says that Gallus stopped at Egra on his way back to the Empire, and that from there he reached Myos Hormos after 11 days. Since the Periplus states that the distance between Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome was 2 or 3 days, one could infer that Egra was much farther south from Myos Hormos than Leuke Kome, because Gallus was coming northwards from S Arabia. Strabo describes Egra as situated within the Nabataean kingdom, but this is contradicted by the Periplus, which claims that Leuke Kome lies on the frontier of the Nabataean kingdom. The possibility that any Nabataean ports existed farther south than Leuke Kome is then ruled out. Moreover, al-Wajh is directly opposite Myos Hormos and is the closest port on the Arabian coast. If al-Wajh was Egra, Leuke Kome (no matter where it was located) would be farther from Myos Hormos than Egra. But this is not possible because the journey between Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome requires 2 or 3 days, whereas Strabo stipulates 11 days from Egra to Myos Hormos. The only way to make sense of such a scenario is to assume that Strabo has mistakenly reported what Aelius Gallus told him about the expedition.

I believe the evidence can be re-interpreted as follows. Strabo’s Egra should be located at Mada’in Salih, where Gallus stopped during his withdrawal from southern Arabia. Strabo’s mistake was to confuse the city at which Gallus stopped with the port from which he later embarked. That port was clearly Leuke Kome, which is exactly where Gallus had previously left his fleet to await his return. Musil was right in believing that Gallus reached

---

30 There is no correspondence between the name Egra provided by Strabo and the name Hegra as found in the inscriptions in Mada’in Salih. The equation Egra = Hegra seems reasonable enough (see below). The Loeb edition of Strabo reports the variants Hygras and Negras.
32 Musil 1926, 299.
33 On Strabo’s use of Gallus as his source, see Biffi 2002, 14-22.
34 There was no compelling reason for Aelius Gallus and his army to stick to the pirate-ridden coast on his return from Negrana. The safer and more convenient way was to follow the inland caravan route northwards through Mekka, Jathrib, Khaybar and Dedan.
did not travel in a straight line, but this distance is perfectly compatible with the *Periplus* within the parameters of Red Sea navigation.

### TABLE 3

**Comparison between the *Periplus’* Description and Features of Aynuna and Al-Wajh**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Periplus’ account</th>
<th>Aynuna</th>
<th>Al-Wajh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Leuke Kome lies to the left of Berenike (i.e., northwards), and eastwards from Myos Hormos.</td>
<td>Aynuna is not located eastwards from Myos Hormos, but northward.</td>
<td>Al-Wajh is located precisely eastwards of Quseir al-Qadim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. 2 or 3 days are required to travel from Myos Hormos to Leuke Kome (i.e., between 185 and 278 km).</td>
<td>The distance between Myos Hormos and Aynuna is more than 2 or 3 days of sailing.</td>
<td>Al-Wajh is no more than 2 or 3 days of sailing from Quseir al-Qadim.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Leuke Kome lies next to a gulf.</td>
<td>Aynuna lies next to the Gulf of Aqaba.</td>
<td>Al-Wajh lies close to a gulf.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Leuke Kome is on or near a boundary between the Nabataean kingdom and what the anonymous author calls Arabia.</td>
<td>It is uncertain whether Aynuna was on the S border of the Nabataean kingdom, since the precise extension of its southern border remains unclear.</td>
<td>Al-Wajh may lie in a possible “border” area, as it lies on the same latitude as Madain Salih (26°48′0″N; al-Wajh: 26°13′60″N), which was the southernmost Nabataean outpost in the Arabian Desert.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On point 4, we may draw some inferences regarding Leuke Kome’s rôle in the economy of the area. The *Periplus* says that the port was a customs point. Its link to Hegra suggests the existence of a customs area in the south of the Nabataean kingdom (and later in the *provincia Arabia*), one that operated through two main gates: an inland gate, which controlled caravans coming from the desert; and a coastal gate, controlling cargoes coming from the Red Sea. This suggests a well-organised system, perhaps established by the Nabataeans and inherited and improved by the Romans (a *centurio* is attested at Leuke Kome).39

### Leuke Kome and the Red Sea’s Port System

Resolving the location of Leuke Kome permits us to understand more fully the economic dynamics operating in the Red Sea between the 1st c. B.C. and the 2nd c. A.D., and to estimate more accurately the relative importance of settlements in the region. During the 1st c. A.D. two of the Red Sea’s main ports, Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome, lay at approximately the same latitude on opposite coasts; a third, Berenike, lay farther south. All of them are said to have been in contact with India. According to the Elder Pliny, Berenike was the main hub from which ships going to S India would depart:40

**On the location of Leuke Kome**

[sc. From Berenike] Passengers generally set sail at midsummer, before the rising of the Dog-star, or else immediately after, and in about 30 days arrive at Ocelis in Arabia, or else at Cane, in the region which bears frankincense. There is also a third port of Arabia, Musa by name; it is not; however, used by persons on their passage to India, as only those touch at it who deal in incense and the perfumes of Arabia. More in the interior there is a city; the residence of the king there is called Saphpar, and there is another city known by the name of Save. To those who are bound for India, Ocelis is the best place for embarkation. If the wind, called Hippalus, happens to be blowing, it is possible to arrive in 40 days at the nearest mart of India, Muziris by name.

The region in India reached by such ships was called Limyrike. Only big ships could manage such a voyage, as attested by the *Periplus*, because it involved a long passage across open ocean using the monsoon winds:41

πλοῖα δὲ εἰς τὰ μικρά 3άλαι μέχριστα 42 πλοῖα διὰ τὸν άγκον καὶ τὸ πλήθος τῶν πτερόνων καὶ τοῦ μάλακτος.

The biggest ships in these ports of trade carry full loads because of the volume and quantity of pepper and malabathron.

The success of Berenike is easily understandable in light of the geographical and meteorological characteristics of the Red Sea. The regime of the winds in this sea is very peculiar: at latitudes south of 20°N, southerly winds blow from May to September, while the rest of the year they are northerly; at latitudes north of 20°N, winds blow from north all year long. Therefore, sailing northwards in the northern gulf of the Red Sea was difficult for square-sailed vessels, a condition compounded by the generally shallower coastal waters in this area.42 Berenike was favoured by its geographical position at the southernmost point on the Egyptian coast, not far from the latitude that marked a change in the wind regimen. This also explains why, during the Ptolemaic age, the heavy λαβαντίγιον, ships transporting elephants from Africa to Egypt, moored at Berenike;43 it would have been difficult for ships of that tonnage to travel farther north to Myos Hormos.44

If Berenike were the chief hub for direct trade with S India, what rôle did ports like Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome serve? According to the *Periplus*, Leuke Kome was the northern terminus of a maritime route running from north to south in the Red Sea. Numerous ships reached Leuke Kome each year, but none of them was large (τῆλοιοι ὀυ μεγάλοιοι).

This, however, does not necessarily mean that Leuke Kome played a minor rôle in the economy of the region. The *Periplus*, after all, calls Leuke Kome an *emporion*, a term never used by that author for Berenike or Myos Hormos. This is a crucial point: despite the smaller size of ships that made for Leuke Kome, it was considered an important port and the volume of trade passing through it was large.

The apparent contradiction between the size of the ships and the volume of trade can be resolved by reviewing the geographical characteristics of the Red Sea. Leuke Kome lay within the parameters of the Red Sea navigation.41

---

39 *Periplus* 19: ἑκατοντάρχης μετὰ στρατηγῶν.
firmly above 20° N in an area of shallow water. As northerly winds dominate year round, ships were forced to sail close to wind in order to reach this port from the south. The only way to make this voyage easier and safer was to use numerous ships of relatively smaller size. We can then postulate a parallel situation at Myos Hormos, located at approximately the same latitude. From our sources we understand that Myos Hormos was used as a terminal for trade both within the Red Sea and with N India by way of cabotage. It follows, then, that during the 1st c. A.D. large ships from Berenike capable of navigating the open ocean undertook direct voyages to S India. Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome filled a different role: ships working from there traded within the Red Sea or (in the case of Myos Hormos) with N India. It is also possible that goods brought from S India were transshipped through Berenike before arriving at Myos Hormos in smaller hulls, whence they were conveyed to Koptos and on to Alexandria.67

I am not suggesting that such an organisation was in effect from the moment the Romans conquered Egypt, but this pattern does appear to have been operative during the 1st and 2nd c. A.D. A fluid situation is reflected in excavations conducted along the Myos Hormos/Nile and Berenike/Nile routes, as well as at the two ports themselves. There is no obvious difference in the material from the two sites that would suggest alternate sources (e.g., N India and S India) for the items traded there.68 On the other hand, it is reasonably clear that after an initial commercial ‘boom’, which lasted until the middle of the 1st c. A.D., the volume of trade passing through Myos Hormos began to diminish, to Berenike’s advantage.69

One possible reason might be that ports like Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome represented a ‘hybrid solution’: while Berenike was the only suitable port for big ships coming from the south, Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome were not the best ports even for smaller ships coming from that direction. Instead, the crews of smaller ships coming to the Red Sea would have preferred to moor at the northermmost point (either Klysma or Aila) in order to avoid a long transit of goods through the desert. But winds complicated the matter, and there was a lack of infrastructure that could have connected the northern ports on the Red Sea with the hinterland and facilitated the conveyance of a large quantity of merchandise coming from the East. Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome were closer to the main emporia of their respective regions by comparison with Berenike, and this resulted in shorter journeys through the desert: the length of the land route between Myos Hormos and Coptos is 174 km,50 while that between Coptos and Berenike is 392 km.51

This reconstruction of the Red Sea port system may also provide the key to understanding developments during late antiquity. At least from the 3rd c. A.D. the decline of Myos Hormos was so dire that the Romans gradually abandoned the site.52 Explanations for its nadir range from the 3rd-c. crisis, to attacks of the Blemmyes, to problems connected with the silting of the port.53 But the crisis and the attacks affected Berenike as well; one might expect that Berenike’s more peripheral location and consequent difficulty with regional control and protection would have caused its abandonment. Nevertheless, although a period of decline occurred during the 3rd c. A.D., Berenike recovered its rôle as an international entrepôt between the 4th and 6th c.54 This suggests that the crisis that occurred in the region was not irreversible,55 and that the reason for the decline of Myos Hormos lies elsewhere.

I suggest that the reason lies in the nature of the system itself during the first two centuries A.D. Something occurred that made the ‘hybrid’ positions of Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome weaker than before, effectively pushing these two ports out of the system. The 3rd-c. crisis accelerated the change, but did not cause it. It is more likely that the change started in the 2nd c. A.D. when two public works projects transformed the situation in the area of the northern Red Sea. Under Trajan a road, the via Nova Traiana, was built, which served as a link between the port of Aila (mod. Aqaba) and Syria.56 He also opened (or re-opened) the canal linking the Nile to Klysma (close to mod. Suef).57 These projects broke the isolation of the northern ports of the Red Sea, making them more suitable for trade.58 After the 3rd-c. crisis, the emporia at Aila and Klysma took over the rôle of Myos Hormos and Leuke Kome for merchant ships coming from the southern Red Sea.59 The infrastructure developed under Trajan made the ‘hybrid solution’ an inconvenient one.

Another factor that probably fostered this process was a partial change in commercial routes in the Red Sea and across the Indian Ocean in the 3rd and 4th c. As several scholars have pointed out, during and immediately after the crisis of the 3rd c. the rôle of Aksumite and Arab middlemen in managing the commerce with India seems to have greatly increased.60 This would have led to a contraction in the volume of direct trade between the Roman empire and India. Roman traders would now find it more convenient to sail to emporia such as Adulis in the Aksumite Kingdom and there buy Indian goods imported from local traders. Although the influence that these middlemen had may have been overstated, sources attest to a well-established route linking the emporia with such large emporia as Adulis.61 With a reliance on shipping confined to the Red Sea, the convenience of using northern ports such as Klysma and Aila became even greater.

54 Sidebotham 2002b.
55 See the general discussion on the impact of these ‘invasions’ of the area in Fournet 2002 and Rathbone 2002.
57 Trajan was not the first ruler to engage in building a canal in this area. It was attempted by the pharaoh Necho, by Darius I and by Ptolemy II, as attested in Herodotus (2.158) and Diodorus (1.33.8-12). On the canal, see Faville 1902-3; Whitehouse 1996; Nappo, ibid.
58 The rôle of the canal in fostering trade in the area has been questioned by scholars. Although some believe that the canal could have been used by ships from Alexandria to reach Klysma and the Red Sea (see, e.g., Young 2001, 75-79, with bibliography), problems with this hypothesis have been raised by Mayerson (1996, 121), Aubert (2004), Adams (2007, 35) and Cooper (2009). As far as this paper is concerned, it makes little difference whether the canal was used by ships or small boats. Whichever the case, Trajan’s canal linked Klysma with the Nile and opened up a route that was quite difficult to traverse before its construction. Such a route made it possible to connect the port on the Red Sea to Alexandria.
60 Munro-Hay 1996; Whitehouse 1996; Nappo, ibid.
61 Cosmas Indicopleustes 2.54-6.
This suggests that the transport system operating in the Red Sea region was not monolithic but experienced several readjustments, depending on changes in routes of trade, but also on the influence of the imperial infrastructure. Identifying the correct location of Leuke Kome is crucial for developing a more complete picture of Red Sea trade from the 1st c. A.D. to late antiquity.
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The building inscription from the fort at Udruh and Aelius Flavianus, tetarchic praeses of Palaestina

Caillan Davenport

In JRA 21 (2008), D. Kennedy and H. Falahat published an important new inscription from Udruh in Jordan. It provides the first official confirmation that legio VI Ferrata was stationed at Udruh during the ‘first tetarchy’ (A.D. 293-305) after its transfer from Caparacta. The text also records the names of three imperial officials: a duux, Aurelius Hercalidhs, vir perfectissimus; the provincial praeses, Aelius Flavianus, vir clarissimus; and the legiunary prefect, Aurelius Mucianus:


The text of the inscription reads: “From the governor of Palaestina to the legio VI Ferratae stationed at Udruh during the ‘first tetarchy’ (A.D. 293-305)” and it records the names of three imperial officials: a duux, Aurelius Hercalidhs, vir perfectissimus; the provincial praeses, Aelius Flavianus, vir clarissimus; and the legiunary prefect, Aurelius Mucianus.

Kennedy and Falahat provided a thorough commentary on the inscription and its implications for the military history of the region. The object of this note is to re-evaluate the position of the senatorial governor Aelius Flavianus in light of this new evidence by placing his career in the socio-political context of the tetarchic period.

The career of Aelius Flavianus

Kennedy and Falahat identified the Aelius Flavianus in the new inscription with the Flavianus recorded by Eusebius as governor of Palaestina in 303. Flavianus had left office by 304, when he was replaced by Urbanus. This suggests that the new inscription should be dated c.303, before the change of governor. However, Kennedy and Falahat did not notice an inscription from Petra, also dating to the reign of Diocletian, which attests a vir clarissimus by the name of Aelius Flavianus as praeses. My first suggestion is that the Flavianus of the Udruh inscription and the Flavianus of the Petra inscription are one and the same man. The Petra inscription reads:

Excelsa giietae / maxima virtute p(atris) / [p(atriae)] 60 / felicitatis Aug(usto) / Ael(ius) Flavianus (sic) / clarissimus / praeses. 5

Kennedy correctly noted, pater patriae usually follows the emperor’s name and is generally placed last among his titles.

2. The text of the inscription reads urbis, but orbis was surely intended. A number of other oddities in the Udruih text are not resolvable based on the published photograph.
3. Kennedy and Falahat 2008, 163-64. For Flavianus, see FLRE I Flavianus 1; Euseb., Mart. Pal. (S) pref. (L) 1.1, 1.5; Barnes 1982, 152. The province continued to be officially known as Syria Palaestina in c.310/11 (AIE 1964, 198 = 1950, 1618).
4. P. Urbanus 2; Barnes 1982, 152.
5. Tracy 1999, 305-7 = AE 1999, 1702. The text was originally published separately as IGLS XXI vol. IV, 40, 41, 53.
6. It is difficult to expand the abbreviation p. p. with any certainty. Tracy (1999, 307) read p(atris) p(atriso), though he also considered p(atrini) p(atrocius). The former reading would be unprecedented on an imperial dedication: p(atris) p(atriso) would be more appropriate. However, as Tracy correctly noted, pater patriae usually follows the emperor’s name and is generally placed last among his titles.