CHAPTER 11

The Aksumites in South Arabia: An African Diaspora of Late Antiquity

George Hatke

1 Introduction

Much has been written over the years about foreign, specifically western, colonialism in sub-Saharan Africa, as well as about the foreign peoples, western and non-western alike, who have settled in sub-Saharan Africa during the modern period. However, although many large-scale states rose and fell in sub-Saharan Africa throughout pre-colonial times, the history of African imperial expansion into non-African lands is to a large degree the history of Egyptian invasions of Syria-Palestine during Pharaonic and Ptolemaic times, Carthaginian (effectively Phoenician) expansion into Sicily and Spain in the second half of the first millennium B.C.E., and the Almoravid and Almohad invasions of the Iberian Peninsula during the Middle Ages. However, none of this history involved sub-Saharan Africans to any appreciable degree. Yet during Late Antiquity, Aksum, a sub-Saharan African kingdom based in the northern Ethiopian highlands, invaded its neighbors across the Red Sea on several occasions. Aksum, named after its capital city, was during this time an active participant in the long-distance sea trade linking the Mediterranean with India via the Red Sea. It was a literate kingdom with a tradition of monumental art and architecture and already a long history of contact with South Arabia. The history of Aksumite expansion into, and settlement in, South Arabia can be divided into two main periods. The first lasts from the late 2nd to the late 3rd century

1 Although there is disagreement among scholars as to the chronological limits of “Late Antiquity”—itself a modern concept—the term is, for the purposes of the present study, used to refer to the period from ca. 200 A.D. until the fall of the Umayyad Dynasty in 750. It should be noted that the period within which the Ethiopian kingdom of Aksum held sway only partially overlaps with the timeframe for Late Antiquity adopted here, while the period within which Aksum was active in South Arabia began sometime before 200 and ended nearly two centuries before 750.
A.D.² and witnessed Aksum’s entry into direct contact, for better or worse, with the South Arabian kingdoms of Sabaʾ and Ḥimyar. The second began around the turn of the 6th century and is characterized by the appointment of local vassal kings, brought to power through military invasions, to rule Ḥimyar on Aksum’s behalf. Although the period of direct Aksumite rule of Ḥimyar ended sometime between 531 and 540, Ethiopians of Aksumite origin maintained an importance presence in South Arabia. Only with the conquest of South Arabia by the Sāsānid Persians ca. 570 was Ethiopian rule brought to an end.

In addition to their military and political activities in South Arabia, the Aksumites were also active in the region as merchants. Of such commercial activities South Arabian inscriptions have nothing to say, though it must be stressed that direct references to commerce are relatively rare in such inscriptions during all periods. As we shall see,³ ceramic evidence from Qāniʾ, located on the southern coast of Yemen, indicates an Aksumite presence there. Apart from Qāniʾ, however, archaeology has until now brought to light little data pertaining to the Aksumite presence in South Arabia at large. Even Ṣafār, the capital of Ḥimyar and a town at which the Aksumites are known to have established a significant presence, has yielded no more than a single potsherd of (possible) Aksumite origin.⁴

Before proceeding, a few words about the terms used for the Aksumites and their settlements in South Arabia are in order. Inscriptions in the Sabaic language, left by both Sabaeans and Ḥimyarites, refer to the African subjects of Aksum as either “Aksumites” ʾḳšmn (ʾAsūmān) or as “Ethiopians” ʾḥbsn (ʾAḥbāshān), Ḥbsn (ʾḤabashān), and Ḥbsnt (ʾḤabashatān). The nisba Ḥbsy (ʾḤabashī) “Ethiopian” is also attested.⁵ It is likely that the former ethnonym designates specifically the Geʾez-speaking inhabitants of the city of Aksum and its environs, while the latter refers to the various other groups dwelling in the northern highlands of Ethiopia who were subject to Aksum. In addition, armed divisions of Aksumites are designated in Sabaic by the term ʾḥzb (ʾaḥzāb), which is derived from Geʾez ḥazy “people, tribe, crowd, nation” but is attested in Sabaic only in the plural form (cf. Geʾez pl. ʾaḥzāb). The singular form is, however, used in a 6th century Syriac text, the Letter of Pseudo-Simeon of Bēth Arsham, which in one instance seems to refer to the Aksumite residents in South Arabia as ḥezbā.⁶ A number of Sabaic inscriptions allude to the

---

² Except where otherwise noted, all dates mentioned henceforth refer to years of the Common Era (A.D.).
³ See §4.
⁴ Yule, Late Antique Arabia, pp. 104–105.
⁵ Ja 576+Ja 577/28 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, pp. 77; 78–79 [line 12]).
⁶ Shahid, Martyrs, p. iii (Syriac text).
settlements established by the Aksumites in South Arabia, specifically in the Tihāma region, as "ṣd" ('aʾṣaadīn). Like 'ḥzb, this term is also attested exclusively in the plural form in Sabaic and is derived from Geʿez ('aṣad “village, farm, enclosed area, field”; pl. 'aʾṣād). To date, these Aksumite settlements are known only from Sabaic inscriptions and might well have been of an ephemeral nature—perhaps camps, or at most small villages, rather than towns. If and when it becomes possible once more to conduct research in Yemen, archaeological surveys of the Tihāma may well locate such settlements. In Syriac sources, Aksumites are generally referred to as Kūšāyē (sg. Kūšāyā), literally “Kushites”, a term derived from the Hebrew name for the Nubians (Kūšīm (< Egyptian K3š)), but at times as Hendwāyē (sg. Hendwāyā), literally “Indian”, the latter a very fluid term that occasionally designates South Arabians, in addition to people from India proper. Greek sources, though at times referring to the Aksumites as Ἀξωμιτῶν, more commonly calls them simply Aἰθιοπῶν “Ethiopians”. The latter ethnonym, like Syriac Kūšāyē, referred originally to the Nubians but was adopted by the Aksumites in the mid-4th century as the equivalent of Geʿez Ḥabašat (> Sabaic Ḥbs2t) and is used for the first time by the ecclesiastical historian Philostorgius (d. 433) as a generic term for the Aksumites. Finally, medieval Arabic authors designate the Aksumites by the generic term for Ethiopians, al-Ḥabaṣha, less commonly al-Sūdān “the blacks”. A few such authors knew of a town or region called Aksūm or Akhshūm—the latter form reflecting the Tigrinya pronunciation—and were even vaguely aware of its ancient past but, while Aksūm is attested as a personal name in Arabic sources, the Aksumites are never referred to as such in Arabic.

7 For an extended discussion of such settlements, see Shitomi, “Note”.
8 Only once in Syriac literature, in the Ecclesiastical History of John of Ephesus (d. 586/8), are the Aksumites referred to as Ἀξωμιτῶν, a calque on Greek Ἀξωμιτῶν (Hatke, Aksum and Nubia, p. 161 [n. 681]). Since the relevant passage deals with a group of Aksumite visitors to the Nubian kingdom of Alodia, it has no bearing on the present discussion.
9 Hatke, Aksum and Nubia, p. 52.
10 Murray, “Review: East of Suez”, p. 80.
11 Hayajneh, “Abessinisches”, p. 505.
12 The Egyptian historian Aḥmad bin ‘Ali al-Maqrīzī (d. 1442) and the 16th-century Yemeni scholar Shihāb al-Dīn bin ‘Abd al-Qādir ‘Arabaqī are both aware that Aksum was an ancient city (Hayajneh, “Abessinisches”, pp. 502–503; ‘Arabaqī, Tuhfat al-zamān, ed. Shaltūt, p. 322), while Muḥammad bin ‘Abd Allāh al-Azraqī (d. ca. 865) mentions “the land of Aksum” (bilād Aksūm) as the place where the Ethiopian king resided (al-Azraqī, Akhbār makka, ed. al-Ṣāliḥ Malḥas, p. 137).
13 E.g. al-Aksūm bin Aswad bin Yāsir in the genealogy of the South Arabian tribe of Dhū-Manākh preserved by al-Ḥasan bin Aḥmad al-Hamdānī (d. 950s) in his Kitāb al-Iklīl (Müller, “Aksum”, p. 220).
The African and Arabian sides of the Red Sea have been in contact since prehistory. One of the most significant long-term results of this contact was the diffusion of Semitic speech from South Arabia to the Horn of Africa. Attempting to determine a precise date for this development is all but impossible and, since the diffusion of Semitic speech was undoubtedly a long process, inappropriate. Whatever the case, a turning point in relations between the two sides of the Red Sea came in the first half of the first millennium B.C. when South Arabia, in particular the kingdom of Sabaʾ, began exerting a significant cultural impact on northern Ethiopia, one aspect of which was the use of the Sabaic language and the South Arabian musnad script in inscriptions. That a pre-Sabaean Semitic language or group of languages already existed in Ethiopia at this time is evident from the lexical and morphological idiosyncrasies which occur in Sabaic inscriptions from Ethiopia but are absent in the ancient inscriptions from South Arabia. Likewise, the Ethiopian branch of Semitic, which includes such languages as Geʿez, Amharic, Tigrinya, and Tigré, is characterized by numerous morphological features not attested in any of the written languages of ancient South Arabia, which strongly suggests that an older form of Semitic was introduced to the Horn of Africa well before the first millennium B.C.

The Sabaic inscriptions that have come to light in northern Ethiopia preserve the names of several kings who reigned during the first half of the 1st millennium B.C. What their polity was called is unknown, and while scholars have long assumed that this early Ethiopian kingdom was called Diʿmat, this name, while attested in some Sabaic inscriptions from Ethiopia, does not occur in all of the attested royal titles. The same corpus of inscriptions indicates that several South Arabian deities were worshipped in Ethiopia during this period, namely ʾĪlmuquh, ʿAḥtar, Hawbas, and Dhāt-Ḥimāyīm, together with such local deities as Yāfīʾum, Naraw, ʿAybas, Shayḥīn, and Ṣādiqīn. From these inscriptions, we also learn of the presence in Ethiopia of a community of South Arabian expatriates hailing from the Sabaean capital of Mārib and from the town of Ḥadaqīn, the capital of the small kingdom of Samʿī based in the Yemeni highlands. A number of these resident South Arabians bear the title of grby, which translates as “stonemason” but which also designates a cadre of specialist who at times, at least in South Arabia, occupied ministerial positions at the royal court. In Ethiopia, such individuals were effectively agents of

14 Robin in Robin/de Maigret, “Grand Temple”, pp. 784–787; Kropp, “Sabäisch”, p. 333.
15 Maraqtēn, “Inschrift aus Mārib”, p. 244.
South Arabian cultural influence. Although one might assume the presence of a parallel community of Ethiopians in South Arabia, no trace of such a community survives in the archaeological or epigraphic record in the first half of the first millennium B.C.

In the second half of the 1st millennium B.C., northern Ethiopia entered an obscure period during which the South Arabian cultural influence gradually diminished. Although it is impossible to discern any semblance of a coherent history during this period, it is likely that the region became divided between several small-scale polities. The picture becomes clearer when Aksum emerged as the dominant polity sometime around the turn of the Common Era, a development that led to a revival—indeed an expansion—of Ethiopian contact with the outside world. The *Periplus of the Erythraean Sea*, a Greek text dating from the mid-1st century which served as a guide for merchants conducting business in the Red Sea and the western Indian Ocean, describes the Aksumite town of Adulis, located near the Red Sea coast in what is now Eritrea, as a bustling center of trade at which ivory, tortoise shell, and rhinoceros horn were exchanged for cloth, garments, tools, weapons, and iron from places as far afield as the Roman Empire and northwestern India. According to the *Periplus*, the Aksumite king of the time was literate in Greek, and indeed Greek continued to be used in royal inscriptions, side by side with Ge’ez, down to the 4th century. Thus, far from being barbarian marauders who intervened militarily—and at times settled—in South Arabia hailed from an affluent, cosmopolitan kingdom that engaged in long-distance trade. Material evidence of this affluence survives in the form of large-scale elite residences and tombs at Aksum, as well as archaeological and numismatic evidence for trade with the Roman Empire and India.

3 The Aksumite Presence in South Arabia, ca. 170–270

Although Aksumite merchants were undoubtedly present in South Arabia from at least the 1st century, it is not until the second half of the 2nd century that the Aksumites make an appearance in South Arabian inscriptions. They entered the South Arabian political arena during a period of intense warfare between the kingdoms of Saba’, Ḥimyar, Qatabān, and Ḥaḍramawt. Of these,
Qatabān was the first to collapse, its territories in the southwest having been gradually annexed by Ḥimyar until the deathblow was finally dealt by Ḥaḍramawt ca. 150–160. In the 220s, however, the western part of Ḥaḍramawt was attacked by Sabaʾ. Although a Ḥaḍramī regime managed to survive, Sabaʾ and Ḥimyar were the only South Arabian polities with which the Aksumites are known to have had direct relations. Throughout the 3rd century, down to the eventual conquest of Sabaʾ by Ḥimyar ca. 275, the Aksumites allied themselves alternately with one or other of these two polities depending on the political climate of the time, all the while seeking to establish a sphere of influence in the Tihāma region, the “wild west” of South Arabia, referred to in Sabaic inscriptions by the name Sahratān. A poor and relatively peripheral region, much of the Tihāma, apart from Red Sea ports in the south like al-Mukhāʾ (controlled by Ḥimyar), lay beyond the direct rule of either Sabaʾ or Ḥimyar. As late as the first half of the 4th century, the Ḥimyarites, despite having by then overcome all remaining pockets of resistance in Ḥaḍramawt, were obliged to undertake military operations against the Tihāma. Here, too, the Aksumites established alliances with local tribes like ‘Akkūm and Dhū-Sahratān, often acting in concert with these groups against Sabaʾ or Ḥimyar.

Exactly why the Aksumites chose to involve themselves in the political affairs of South Arabia at the time they did is not a question that can be easily answered. There are, however, indications that the Romans established some sort of sphere of influence in South Arabia at the end of the 1st century B.C.E., and even posted troops there. From two Latin inscriptions in the Farasān Archipelago, one dating from ca. 120, the other from 143–144, it is known that a Roman legionary detachment was stationed there during the 2nd century, most likely to protect shipping lanes against pirates. What exactly happened after the mid-2nd century is not clear, owing to lack of evidence. Not long after the record of the Roman presence in the southern Red Sea falls silent, we find the earliest known reference to the Aksumites in South Arabia in Robin-Umm Laylā 1, a Sabaic inscription dating from ca. 160–190. By this time, so the inscription tells us, the Aksumites already penetrated the Yemeni highlands and had started threatening the local tribes, who in response formed an alliance for mutual protection. If it is true that the Romans withdrew their military forces
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20 Still useful as a summary of Aksumite activities in South Arabia during the 3rd century is Robin, “Intervention abyssine”.
21 Robin, “Ḥimyar au ive siècle”.
22 ‘Abadān 1/5.24–7 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, pp. 51; 52).
23 Speidel, “Almaqah”.
24 Speidel, “Außerhalb des Reiches”.
25 Robin-Umm Laylā 1/1–6 (Robin, “Sabaʾ et la Khawlān”, p. 18).
from South Arabia after the mid-2nd century, the Aksumites might have sought to take advantage of the situation by seeking to establish a sphere of influence of their own in the region. What Robin-Umm Laylā 1 does not explain is how the Aksumites had gotten this far this early. One would assume that they could only have reached the Yemeni highlands having already established some base on the Red Sea coast, though it is not clear whether any significant number of Aksumites had settled permanently in South Arabia at this time. The earliest epigraphic evidence to that effect appears in the mid-3rd century.

### 3.1 Sabean Relations with Aksum under Ḳīshārah Yaḥḍub and Yaʿzil Bayyin

A number of important Sabaic inscriptions documenting the Aksumite conflict with Sabaʾ date from the coregency of the Sabaean king Ḳīshārah Yaḥḍub and his brother Yaʿzil Bayyin (r. ca. 245–260). Of these, several allude to Aksumite settlements in the Tihāma region (ʾṣd). The relevant inscriptions all come from the Sabaean capital of Mārib.

#### 3.1.1 Ir 69

One of the inscriptions in question, Ir 69, was dedicated at the Barʾān Temple by three officers of the royal brothers, Wahābʾawwām Yiʾdhaf, and Khadhwat and Karibʾatḥat ʿAsʿad. According to the text:

\[\text{Their two lords, Ḳīshārah Yaḥḍub and his brother Yaʿzil Bayyin, the two kings of Sabaʾ and Ḳhū-Raydān, waged war against the villages of the Ethiopians and Ḳhū-Saharatim, and they came upon them in the middle of Sahratim in the foothills of the mountain of Waḥdat.}\]

A few lines later in the same inscription, we read that:

\[\text{Their lord, Ḳīshārah Yaḥḍub, king of Sabaʾ and Ḳhū-Raydān, campaigned and waged war a second time against the villages of the Ethiopians and}\]

---

26 Ir 69/20–24 (Bron, "Nouvelle inscription sabéenne", pp. 79; 80).
27 Ir 69/27–32 (Bron, ibid.).
Dhū-Sahratīm, and his main army division, the army division of Sabaʾ, and some of (those armed divisions) of the tribal leaders and tribes of Ḥimyarūm served under him, and they came upon their villages in Maqrafūm on the plain of the land of ‘Akkūm.

Two points are worthy of note here. One is that no distinction is made between the villages inhabited by the Ethiopians (Ḥbs2t) and those inhabited by the indigenous Tihāma tribe of Dhū-Sahratīm. Whether this means that both groups inhabited the same settlements is difficult to say for lack of further details, though the fact that the term used for village is of Geʿez derivation suggests that those settlements designated as ʿṣd were established by the Aksumites, even if they came in time to attract indigenous peoples. Significantly, when the origins of the inhabitants of the ʿṣd are given, Ethiopians are invariably among said inhabitants, and in fact Ja 574, another inscription, which we shall examine in greater detail shortly,²⁸ links one group of ʿṣd exclusively with the Ethiopians, with no reference to tribes from the Tihāma. Contrasted with villages of this type are settlements designated qr, ʿḏwr, and ʿḏyr in Sabaic. Although such settlements, as we shall see below, are at times associated with Aksumites together with local tribes, the terms used to designate them, while absent from Geʿez, are attested in Arabic, e.g. qarya “village” and dār “territory, domain”. Perhaps, then, those settlements designated qr, ʿḏwr, or ʿḏyr were villages established by the indigenous peoples of the Tihāma at which Aksumites later took up residence.

3.1.2  Ja 575
The attack on the Ethiopians at the mountain of Waḥdat is documented another inscription, Ja 575, dedicated at the ʿAwwām Temple by several members of the tribe of Sukḥaymūm, the names of whom are not preserved. In this inscription, we are told that:

wrdw S₁ḥrtn b-ʾly ʿṣd dllw l-hmw w-hḏrw hmt ʿṣdn bn kfl ʿrn Whḥt w-ẓnw l-bḥrn w-hdrk-hmw b-ʾṭr-hmw w-ḥrbw h[mt ... ... h]mt ʿḥbs₂ⁿ w-ʾkm w-dkwn kwn-hmw D-S₁ḥrtm mwṭbtm bʾd ḡld-hmw w-qnḥ-hmw w-yʾṭtmw w-tqdmn w-rṭḥn b-ʾm hmt ʿḥbs₂ⁿ w-[... ... w-ʾ]wld-hmw w-ʾnt-hmw f-hrgw w-s₁byw w-bn-hw f-tʾwlw w-ḥrbw b-ʾynm w-hʾn l-d-mḥrm b-ʾly-hmw  đ-š₁ʾr bn hmt ʿḥbs₂ⁿ w-ʾkm w-d-š₁ṭrw b[nt ... ... ]ʾwm b-hṣ₁m w-hrg w-hṣ₁ḥtn ʿnt hmt ʿḥbs₂ⁿ w-ʾkm w-kl  đ-kwn kwn-hmw bn  đ-š₂ⁿ b D-S₁ḥrtm.²⁹

²⁸ §3.1.3.
²⁹ Ja 575/4–7 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, p. 64).
They (i.e. members of Sukhaymum) descended upon Sahratim, against the villages about which they had been informed. And they threatened those villages from the flank of the mountain of Wahdat. And they shifted their position to the seacoast and followed them (i.e. the enemy) by their tracks. And they made war on those Ethiopians and ‘Akkum and those who supported them among Dhū-Sahratim, the sedentary folk, after their children and their possessions. And they regrouped and fought and did battle with those Ethiopians and [...] their children and their wives were killed or taken prisoner. And from there they returned. And they made war at ‘Aynum and those who remained of those Ethiopians and ‘Akkum and those who had sought help [...] mounted an attack against them on the following day [...] with a decisive defeat and a killing and a routing of a contingent of those Ethiopians and ‘Akkum and all those who supported them among Dhū-Sahratim.

Although Ja 575 provides a few details not given in Ir 69, it sheds no light on the question of Aksumite settlement patterns in South Arabia. Once again, the Aksumites are said to have operated in concert with the local tribes of ‘Akkum and Dhū-Sahratim. Perhaps significantly, each time the coalition is mentioned, the lists of its constituent elements are invariably headed by the Ethiopians (ʾḥbs2n), while Dhū-Sahratim—and even then, so it appears, only some of them—merely provided support of an undisclosed nature. This suggests that the resistance movement in the Tihāma was led by the Aksumites, perhaps attracted to the region because local tribes had sought out their aid in the struggle against the Sabaean state. In the 6th century, disenfranchised elements in South Arabian society would again seek military aid from Aksum,30 and while they were prompted to do so by primarily religious—rather than political—factors, it is not implausible that, already in the 3rd century, marginalized groups in the Tihāma saw in Aksum a powerful ally. One final point connected with the portion of text presented above that bears mentioning are the references to women and children among those groups whom the Sabaean attacked. Despite the lacunae in the inscription and the somewhat ambiguous wording of what text survives, it is likely that the women and children in question were affiliated with all three groups in the coalition, rather than with the Aksumites alone. Insofar as the Aksumites are concerned, two scenarios are possible. One is that the Aksumite soldiers brought their families with them, in which case it would seem that they planned to settle permanently in the Tihāma. Alternatively, such soldiers might have married local women—a not implausible scenario if, as suggested above, Aksumites and local tribal groups

30 On this, see §5.1.
occupied the same settlements. In fact, both the relocation of Ethiopian families and marriage with local women are likely to have occurred.

3.1.3 Ja 574

Another relevant inscription from the ’Awwām Temple, Ja 574, is dedicated by ʾĪlšahrah Yahḏub and his brother Yaʿzīl Bayyin themselves and claims that the Sabaean god ʾĪlmuquh intervened in Sabaean military operations against the Aksumites.

Images of inscriptions:

He (i.e. ʾĪlmuquh) bestowed upon and granted to his servant ʾĪlšahrah Yahḏub, King of Sabaʾ and Dhū-Raydān, the punishment of the Ethiopians and Dhū-Sahrā in a battle which they waged in their village(s) in the valley of Sihām. And after that, ʾĪlšahrah Yahḏub, King of Sabaʾ and Dhū-Raydān, and with him some of his main army and his tribal leaders, waged war against the armed bands of the Ethiopians and their villages, up to the cultivated area of the valley of Šurdud. And they made war on those Ethiopians and Dhū-Sahrā at the hill of Wadfatān and (at) Wadayfān and (at) the cultivated field of Liqaḥ. And in those hills they made war on twenty-five villages among the villages of the Aksumites and Gumda and Ḍḥw-Sahrā in.

As with those villages designated ʾʿṣd in Ir 69 and Ja 575, the villages referred to as ʾdwr are associated with Ethiopians, here designated specifically as Aksumites (ʾksʾlmn), as well as with local tribes. In this instance a new group, Gumda, joins the ranks with the by now familiar ʾAkk and Dhū-Sahrā. Nothing is said of the families of the Aksumites, however, though Gumda is said to have sent a delegation to Ṣanʿāʾ—at that time a secondary capital of Sabaʾ—where they gave their children as hostages (whbw ʾwld-hmw ʾwṯq).

---

31 Ja 574/3–8 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, p. 60).
32 Ja 574/10–11 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, pp. 60–61).
3.2 Ḥimyarite Conflict with Aksum

Our final text that refers to Aksumite settlement in the Tihāma, MAFRAY-al-Mi’sāl 5, is a Sabaic inscription from al-Mi’sāl in southwestern Yemen, dating from the reign of the Ḥimyarite king Yāsirʿum Yuhanʿim (ca. 265–287). Dedicated in honor of the sun-goddess ‘Āliyat by a military leader named Ḥaṣiyyān ’Awkan, the inscription documents a military conflict that affected Aksum at the highest level.

The Aksumites in South Arabia

That this was a major conflict is evident from the fact that two Aksumite kings, most likely coregents, got involved. As before, the Aksumites allied themselves with Dhū-Maʿāfirim. Once the Ḥimyarites overcame this combined force, they pursued what remained of the Aksumite force, together with several local tribes that stood in their way.

---

33 MAFRAY-al-Mi’sāl 5/9–11 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, pp. 29–30).
34 This can be identified with Wādī Khubān, located to the east of Ṣafār.
35 The vocalization of the names Datwanas and Zaqarnas is hypothetical. That the individuals bearing this name were indeed reigning monarchs rather than simply the sons of kings is evident from the fact that other Sabaic inscriptions specifically designate other individuals as sons of the Aksumite king (wld ngs²yn). For attestations of this phrase, see Ja 576+Ja 577/19.22 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, pp. 77; 78 [line 3]); Ja 631/21 (Jamme, ibid., pp. 132; 133).
t’bdw w-hbrrn b-ʿly b’b’t ḥbs²n w-ʿly s²b²n ʿryb²n w-s²b²n Ḥbr²n w-s²b²n Yhgmn w-wḍ’-hmw w-hs¹b’n w-ʿlw kl ḥqdm-hmw w-ʿwṭq-hmw w-ʿlw w-s³d’n-hmw w-mdd-hmw w-s²b²n Yhgmn f-ʿdyw b-ḥyl-hmw w-ʿdyw w-hb’ln w-dḥr kl mṣn’-hmw ḫms¹ mṣn’tm w-kl ḥwd-hmw w-bnt-hmw w-ʿqny-hmw w-ʿṣd-hmw.³⁶

They brought to submission and went forth against the roaming bands of Ethiopians and the tribe of ʿArīb⁵⁷ and the tribe of Ḥubr⁵⁷ and the tribe of Yuhgamin, and they humiliated them and forced their capitulation. And they brought back all of their leaders and hostages. And they brought back their comrades-in-arms and their military aids and (members of) the tribe of Yuhagmin. Then they advanced and plundered and burned all of their forts—five forts (in total)—and (seized) all of their sons and their daughters and their possessions and their villages.

As with the other inscriptions which we have examined thus far, it is not possible to determine what portion of those taken captive were Aksumites. Judging from the reference to ʿṣd, however, it is likely that the Aksumites were represented among the prisoners-of-war. That children were taken captive indicates that some of the Aksumites had started families in South Arabia, whether with Ethiopian spouses who might have accompanied them to their new home or with local women. MAFRAY-al-Miʿsāl 5, it should also be noted, contains the last known 3rd-century reference to the Aksumite presence in South Arabia. Although Ḥimyar maintained relations with Aksum during the 4th century, as we shall see shortly, it is not until the early 6th century that we again find allusions in Sabaic inscriptions to Aksumite settlement in South Arabia. This suggests that Yāsir⁵⁷ Yuhānʾim was the ruler who succeeded in expelling the Aksumites from South Arabia.

3.3 Aksumites in Peripheral Areas of South Arabia

Although the epigraphic material analyzed thus far indicates Aksumite settlement only in the Tihāma during the 3rd century, there are hints of an Aksumite presence in other, more peripheral, parts of South Arabia during the same period.

3.3.1 Ja 576+Ja 577

One indication of this is a passage in Ja 576+Ja 577, a Sabaic inscription on two blocks of stone from the ʿAwwā Temple at Mārib. Like most of the Sabaic inscriptions treated above, it, too, dates from the coregency of ʿĪlsharaḥ Yaḥḍub

³⁶ MAFRAY-al-Miʿsāl 5/12–13 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 30).
³⁷ See §4.
and Yaʿzil Bayyin and, in fact, was dedicated by the two kings themselves. At one point, we are told that the people of Najrān, an oasis located north of the Yemeni highlands, had rebelled against Sabaʾ and made common cause with the Aksumites. The latter had even appointed a governor over the town, supported by an armed contingent.

They (i.e. Sabaeans) had heard that those Najrānīs had sent a mission to the armed bands of the Ethiopians to aid the nagāśī's governor in the town of Najrān and the tribe of Najrān. And they were aware of the (Ethiopians') promise to the Najrānīs to guarantee protection against their lords, the kings of Sabaʾ, but they thwarted it through (their knowledge of) their (i.e. the Najrānīs') promise to help the contingent of the Ethiopians.

There is much in this passage that remains obscure. If, however, one accepts the interpretation presented here, it would seem that the Aksumites had taken on the Najrānīs as vassals, hence the appointment of a governor who administered the town on behalf of the Aksumite king himself, but that the Sabaeans managed to intervene and reassert control. That this is what happened is evident a few lines later, where we read:

And as for their Ethiopian governor, Sabqalum [... ...h]is [...]. And those who had acted wrongfully and had staged the rebellion sent a mission with him and they gave their sons and their daughters as hostages. And they admitted into the town of Ẓirbān a governor whom their lord, the king ʾĪlsharaḥ Yaḥḍub, commanded to govern in that town of Ẓirbān and their two valleys of Najrān.

Here the name of the Ethiopian governor is given, though the nature of his involvement in the events surrounding the reassertion of Sabaean control remain obscure, owing to the lacuna in the text. Regarding the place-names

---

38 Ja 576+Ja 577/26 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, p. 77 [line 10]).
39 Ja 576+Ja 577/28–29 (Jamme, Sabaean Inscriptions, p. 77 [lines 12–13]).
mentioned in the text, the town of Zīrbān is most likely to be identified with the site of al-Ukhdūd, located not far from the town of Najrān. The latter had given its name to the valley in which both towns were located. In view of the presence of an Ethiopian governor and an armed force of Ethiopians at Najrān, it is clear that the oasis had a community of Aksumite expatriates during the mid-3rd century. That Sabqalūm is referred to as “the nagāšī’s governor” (ʿqāb ngsyyn) nagāšī being the title for king in Ge’ez indicates that this community was essentially there to maintain Aksumite control, albeit in the guise of aiding the Najrānis against the Sabaeans. How long the Aksumite occupation of Najrān lasted is hard to say, though there is nothing in Ja 576+Ja 577 to suggest a timeframe of more than at most a few years. Those said to have “acted wrong-fully and had staged the rebellion” (hb’shw hs’tw qsldn) were probably the Najrānis. The Aksumites gave aid to the effort and even occupied Najrān, but since they were not Sabaeans subjects, they cannot be said to have rebelled against Saba’, only to have supported those who did. As a result, it is likely that the sons and daughters who were handed over as hostages were the children of local Najrānis, not Aksumites, though the possibility that at least some of these children were the offspring of local women by Aksumite troops cannot be dismissed.

3.3.2 Ge’ez Graffiti from the Grotto of Ḥōq (Soqoṭrā)
To date, the only trace that the Aksumites themselves have left of their presence in South Arabia comes not from the mainland but from the island of Soqoṭrā. The Periplus of the Erythraean Sea refers to the island as Dioskouridēs (Διοσκουριδής), a name probably derived from a putative D-Sṣkr (†Dhū-Sakūrid), and reports that it was a colony of the kingdom of Ḥaḍramawt and was populated by a mixture of Arabs (i.e. South Arabians), Indians, and Greeks who had gone there to trade. This statement is confirmed by the discovery of Roman, Ḥaḍrami and Indian pottery on Soqoṭrā. Although the Periplus says nothing about an Aksumite presence on the island, a Belgian team of speleologists exploring the grotto of Ḥōq at the northern end of Soqoṭrā between December 2000 and January 2001 came across a series of inscriptions and graffiti in not only Palmyrene, Ancient South Arabian, Sanskrit, and Middle Indic, but also Ge’ez. Given the timeframe for the corpus, it is clear that the Ge’ez graffiti are of Aksumite date. To be sure, only six Ge’ez graffiti can be confidently identified, together with two that are probably Ge’ez and three that could be either

40 Schiettecatte, “Najrān”, pp. 28–29.
41 Robin 2012: 445.
42 Casson, Periplus, §30.10.9–11.
43 Biedermann, Soqotra, p. 33.
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Ge’ez or Ancient South Arabian. Needless to say, this is not a significant number, particularly when compared to the 193 Indian graffiti and inscriptions, which make up the majority of the corpus. Nevertheless, it does indicate that Aksumites were present on Soqoṭrā. To focus just on the six definitively Ge’ez graffiti, three appear to be of Christian origin and shall be treated below, while the other three may well date from an earlier period, most probably the 3rd century, when Aksumite influence on mainland South Arabia was at its height. However, as we shall see in the following section, there is evidence of continued Aksumite commerce with South Arabia during the 4th century, in which case Aksumite visits to Soqoṭrā at that time are also conceivable. Of the three pre-Christian graffiti, two consist of what are probably names: ʾArtaḥ (ʾṛṭḥ) and Sǝmūr/Samr (Sm[r]). The other reads [ḥʃy[yns] t[s], of which no sense can be made. Although the Periplus alludes to foreign settlers on Soqoṭrā, there is no hard evidence that the individuals—whatever their origin—who left written records of their visits to Ḥōq were permanent residents, and it is likely that this applies to the Aksumites as well. It remains unknown what relationship the Aksumite visitors to the island had with other foreigners, as well as with the indigenous inhabitants.

4 Aksumite Relations with South Arabia in the 4th Century

Following the withdrawal of Aksumite military forces from South Arabia after ca. 270, the kings of Aksum, in particular Ousanas (r. ca. 310–330) and his brother and successor ʿĒzānā (r. ca. 330–370), continued to lay claim to South Arabia in their royal titles, which designate as vassals of Aksum both Ḥimyar and the by now defunct kingdom of Saba’, as well as their respective capitals of Ṣafār and Mārib. The latter are alluded to by the names of their respective royal palaces: Raydān at Ṣafār and Salḥīn at Mārib. These claims of dominion over South Arabia are political fictions through and through, but nevertheless indicate that the memory of past Aksumite occupation of South Arabia retained a certain degree of ideological importance for the kings of Aksum.

It must be emphasized, however, that the cessation of Aksumite occupation in South Arabia in no way implies a cutting of ties between Aksum and Ḥimyar,
by now the unquestioned superpower in South Arabia. For one thing, Ḥimyar maintained diplomatic ties with Aksum during the 4th century, as we learn from a Sabaic inscription from Mārib (Ir 28) documenting a diplomatic mission to Aksum dispatched by the Ḥimyarite king Karibʾīl Watar Yuhanʿim (r. ca. 312–316) under the leadership of one Sharaḥʿatḥ ʿAshwaʿ Dhū-Ḥubāb. The Aksumites responded with a mission of their own, led by two diplomats named ʾAḥēqamm (ʾḥ[y]qʾm) and Zalnas (Zlnsʾ) respectively. Archaeology also yields evidence of Aksumite contact with Ḥimyar during the 4th century. For this, we turn to Qāniʾ, a port founded by the kingdom of Ḥaḍramawt towards the 1st century B.C.E some 100 km southwest of al-Mukallā. After the fall of Ḥaḍramawt, Qāniʾ continued to serve as South Arabia’s chief important outlet to the Indian Ocean. Towards the end of the so-called Middle Period (BA-11), Aksumite ceramics appear for the first time at the site. Since the Middle Period at Qāniʾ has been dated to the 2nd to 5th century, the appearance of such ceramics can be dated to sometime not earlier than the 4th century. Sherds similar to, and possibly to be identified with, Red Aksumite Ware and Gray and Black Aksumite Ware have been also been found at Qāniʾ.

5 Aksamite Relations with South Arabia in the 6th Century

The 6th century witnessed a renewal of Aksumite military intervention in South Arabia. Yet the nature of this intervention differed considerably from that of Aksumite intervention during the 2nd and 3rd centuries. Whereas in earlier centuries the Aksumites had for the most part occupied relatively peripheral regions in South Arabia and had formed alliances with such regional powers as were deemed political useful, their intervention in the early 6th century was far more organized and systematic and was driven by a much clearer agenda. This second period of intervention in South Arabia is characterized by a policy of appointing sympathetic Christian members of the local elite to rule Ḥimyar on behalf of Aksum, supported by Aksumite troops and a cadre of Aksumite officials. Ostensibly, Aksum’s intervention in the early 6th century
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50 Ir 28 (al-Iryānī, Fi Taʾrīkh al-Yaman, p. 147). In his transcription of the inscription, al-Iryānī divides the text into two sections but does not indicate the divisions between the lines of text as they would have appeared in the original inscription. As with the names of Kings Datwanas and Zaqarnas in MAFRAY-al-Mī’sāl 5, the vocalization of the names of the Aksumite diplomats is hypothetical. For a discussion of their names, see Müller, “Abessinier”, pp. 163–164.

51 Sedov, “Stratigraphy and Development”, p. 375.

52 Sedov, “Synagogue”, p. 107 (Fig. 46/442, 444–445), 110.
was prompted by the persecution of Christians—specifically Christians of the Miaphysite sect to which the Aksumites belonged—by Jewish Ḥimyarites. While it might well have been the case that the Aksumites simply used this bout of persecution as a pretext for establishing a sphere of political influence in South Arabia, the evidence from the Ge’ez records left by the Aksumites—not to mention the Syriac and Greek sources that document South Arabian affairs in the 6th century—present this period of Aksumite intervention in unabashedly religious terms.

5.1 Historical Background

While some details remain obscure, the general course of events in 6th-century South Arabia is reasonably clear. During the reign of the Ḥimyarite king Marthadīlān Yanūf (r. ca. 500–518?), the Aksumites seem to have established a diplomatic presence at the Ḥimyarite capital of Zafār. Although some scholars have gone so far as to posit that Marthadīlān Yanūf was actually brought to power by the Aksumites, the extant documentation for his reign does not yield any concrete data bearing on the manner in which he came to the throne. If the presence of Aksumite diplomats at Zafār indicates amicable relations between Aksum and Ḥimyar—whatever the religion of king Marthadīlān Yanūf might have been—this state of affairs seems not to have lasted for long, for at some point during the second decade of the 6th century a systematic persecution of South Arabia’s Christian community was initiated. In response to this persecution, the Aksumite king Kālēb (r. ca. 510–540) dispatched a punitive campaign to South Arabian under the command of a Ḥimyarite named Ḥayyān ca. 518. In the process, the Aksumites brought to

53 Nestorians, the other major Christian sect represented in South Arabia, appear to have not only been left alone during the persecutions, but are even charged in Miaphysite sources with having acted as collaborators with Ḥimyarite Jews in the persecutions (Arzhanov, “Zeugnisse”).

54 For a detailed discussion, see Hatke, Africans in Arabia Felix. Although the corpus of 6th-century Ge’ez inscriptions found in Yemen (Hatke, ibid., pp. 355–384; Müller, “Äthiopische Inschriftenfragmente”, passim) implies the presence of Aksumites in Ḥimyar, they have been omitted from the present study on the grounds that, in terms of their actual content, they yield little or no information about Aksumite settlement in South Arabia.

55 See §4.

56 Robin, “Ḥimyar et Israël”, pp. 871; 873.

57 That Marthadīlān Yanūf did not come to power through royal succession is evident from the fact that he never bears a patronym, as all Ḥimyarite rulers born of a king were in the habit of doing.

58 Moberg, Book of the Himyarites, p. 3b (Syriac text). This individual’s name appears in the form Ḥynnā in the Syriac text. He is most likely to be identified with the Ḥynn who, according to Kālēb’s victory inscription from Aksum, RIÉth 191/35 (Drewes/Schneider,
power a Ḥimyarite Christian named Maʿdīkarib Yaʿfur. Although this king managed to establish a degree of stability in South Arabia and embarked on a campaign of military expansion into Central and North Arabia that took Ḥimyarite troops as far as central Mesopotamia, his reign was brought to an abrupt end ca. 522, when the Ḥimyarite Jewish rebel Yūsuf ‘Asʾar Yaḥṭar declared himself king and reinitiated the persecution of South Arabia’s Christians. The first target in Yūsuf’s campaign was the Aksumite community in Ṣafār, after which the Christians of the Tihāma were attacked. Then, after the Tihāma was fortified as a precaution against Aksumite incursions, Najrān was besieged and its Christian inhabitants were given the choice of converting to Judaism or the sword. When most of Najrān’s Christians refused to recant their faith, they were slaughtered en masse by Yūsuf’s forces. In response to these aggressions, Kālēb invaded South Arabia once more in 525, this time leading the invasion force in person. Following his defeat of Yūsuf, Kālēb set about restoring those churches that had been destroyed in the conflict and welcoming back within the fold those Christians who had converted to Judaism under duress, after which he placed another South Arabian Christian, Sumūyafaʿ ʾAṣḥawā’, on the Ḥimyarite throne.

However, as before, the reign of this Aksumite vassal was not to last long, for at some point between 531 and 540 a new potentate came to power—not a Ḥimyarite Jew this time but in fact a Christian Ethiopian general in the Aksumite army named ʾAbrḥā, who had come to South Arabia during the invasion in 525 and had stayed on, rising through the ranks until he seized power and declared himself an autonomous king of Ḥimyar. After two punitive campaigns sent by Kālēb failed to remove ʾAbrḥā from power, Aksum begrudgingly accepted his rule over Ḥimyar on condition that he paid tribute. While there is no indication as to how long he maintained his end of the bargain, ʾAbrḥā maintained diplomatic relations with Aksum, as well as with the Romans and the Sāsānids, as well as with the Ghassānids and the Lakhmids, who were clients of the Romans and Sāsānids respectively. Like Maʿdīkarib Yaʿfur, ʾAbrḥā undertook a program of military expansion in the Arabian Peninsula, and managed to extend Ḥimyar’s sphere of political influence as far as the oasis of al-Hufūf in East Arabia and the frontier of the Roman Empire in the
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Yet under the brief, ineffectual reigns of his sons Yaksūm (r. ca. 560–565) and Masrüq (r. ca. 565–570) this pan-Arabian empire quickly crumbled, and South Arabia was itself conquered by the Sāsānids in the 570s.

5.2 Gar antichità 9 d

Our first text pertaining to the Aksumite presence in 6th-century South Arabia is the Sabaic inscription Gar antichità 9 d. Originally erected at the Ḥimyarite capital of Ẓafār, it was moved at some point to Bayt al-Ashwal, where it was reused in the structure of a modern house. The text reads as follows:

1. [b-rd’ w-]b-ḥmd Rḥmn n b’il s’myn w-b-2.[nṣr] mr’-hmw mk’n Mrtd’ln Ynwfn 3.S’2g’ w-bny-hw Wḏfh w-ṣbḥh tn4.blt’n br’w w-hqs2bn w-ṭwbn 5.bytn-

hmw Ws2b’n bn mwtr-hw ’d6.y tfr’-hw w-qs2bw b-hw mb’tm b-m7.nhm’tm w-mwgl’m b-zkt Rḥmn wrl-h8.w D-M’n d-l-ts’t s2r w-s’t m’tm.65

1.[With the aid of, and] with praise to, Raḥmānān, Lord of Heaven, and

with 2.[the help] of their lord, King Marṭḥad’ilān Yanūf;66 3.Shegāʾ and his sons WADFā and ʾAṣbeḥā, the amān ambassadors, built, completed, and reno-
vated 5.their house of Waṣbaān from its foundations to 6.its roof, and

finished off therein the entrance with polished maṣrny and alabaster,
by the grace of Raḥmānān; the month 8.of Dhū-Maʿūn of 619 (of the Ḥimyarite Era=March 509).

Since the dedicants of this inscription are described as “ambassadors” (tnblt), it is clear that they had come from abroad.67 Müller identifies their names as Ethiopian,68 in which case we can assume that they came from Aksum.
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63 Robin/Ṭayrān, “Soixante-dix ans”.
64 See §6.
65 Müller, Sabāische Inschriften, p. 92.
66 Here, the use of “lord” (mr’) in reference to Marṭḥad’ilān Yanūf should be understood as a term of respect rather than an expression of political submission. This is paralleled elsewhere in the South Arabian epigraphic corpus by instances in which foreigners dedicating an inscription will invoke the local ruler as “lord”. Thus in RES 2999, a Minaic inscription from Barāqish (ancient Yathīl), the dedicant, Yishra’yīl bin ’Albāʾ, himself a Minaean, invokes the names of the Minaean king Waqāḥ’il Yithāʾ and his son and coregent ʿIlīya’ Yishlūr, as well as the name of the Qatabānian king Shahr Yagill Yuhargib, referring to all three as “lord” (Robin, “Royaume de Maʿīn”, pp. 180–181). Similarly, Ja 931, a Ḥaḍramitic inscription from al-Uqla (ancient ʾAnwād um) dedicated by a group of foreign envoys hail-
ing from Palmyra, Chaldaea, and India, invokes the Ḥaḍramī king ʿIlīʾazz Yaluṭ, referring to him as “their lord” (mr’-s’m) (Jamme, al-Uqlah Texts, pp. 44–45).
67 For the sake of comparison, it bears mentioning that the Sāsānīd diplomatic mission which ʿAbrḥād had received in the 540s is referred to as tnblt mlk Frst “the ambassadors of the king of Persia” in CIH 541/89–90 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 115).
68 Müller, “Abessinier”, pp. 163–164.
Although a number of Sabaic inscriptions dating from the 5th and 6th centuries were dedicated by family groups, nothing is said about the extended family (or families) of Shegāʿ and his sons. It can hardly be doubted, however, that the residence which they built at Zafār was intended to accommodate wives and children as well.

5.3 The Aksumite Invasion of 518
The period between Marthadʾīlān Yanūf’s reign and the Aksumites’ appointment of Maʾdikarib Yaʿfur as king of Ḥimyar remains obscure, though if the Syriac Book of the Ḥimyarites is to be believed, it witnessed the persecution of South Arabia’s Christian community by Ḥimyarite Jews. Documentation for the Aksumite invasion of South Arabia in 518, which brought Maʾdikarib Yaʿfur to power, is similarly scant. The chapters that dealt with this invasion in the Book of the Ḥimyarites are missing from the sole extant manuscript of the text and our knowledge that they existed at all is based solely on the surviving table of contents, while RIÉth 191, a Geʾez inscription from Aksum dating from the reign of Kālēb, preserves only a very laconic mention of the invasion and says nothing of the settlement of Aksumites in South Arabia, nor even of the Aksumites’ having brought Maʾdikarib Yaʿfur to power. Rather, it is in the far more abundant and detailed documentation of the Aksumite invasion of 525 that we find references to the presence of Aksumites in South Arabia at the time when Yūsuf seized power. It can be safely assumed that most members of this community settled in South Arabia following the invasion of 518. They included a military contingent, presumably acting as an armed guard for Maʾdikarib Yaʿfur, as well as religious leaders and no doubt administrators as well. From the number of Aksumite casualties of Yūsuf’s aggressions, as recorded in Syriac and Sabaic sources, it is even possible to gain a rough idea of the size of the Aksumite community of Zafār.

5.4 The Aksumite Community in South Arabia in the Early 520s
The Martyrium Arethae, a 6th-century Greek text documenting Yūsuf’s persecution of South Arabian Christians, is, while useful in many regards, not
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69 These include inscriptions dedicated by men with their wives and children (Gar nuove iscrizioni 4; Ibrahim al-Hudayd 1; RES 5094); by a man with his wife, sons, and daughters (ZM 5+8+10); by a man with his brothers, his wife, and his children (RES 4109); and by a man with his mother, wife, and children, together with all of the members of his household (cih 543). For the full text of these inscriptions, see the Corpus of Late Sabaic Inscriptions in the University of Pisa’s Digital Archive for the Study of Pre-Islamic Arabian Inscriptions (http://dasi.humnet.unipi.it/).

70 RIÉth 191/34–6 (Drewes/Schneider, “Inscriptions guèzes”, p. 273).
particularly helpful in terms of data on South Arabia’s Aksumite community, as it states only that Yūsuf’s forces killed all the men left by Kālēb in South Arabia, without furnishing any details. Instead, Syriac and Sabaic sources provide most of the information on the Aksumite presence in South Arabia following the invasion of 518. It is to these sources that we now turn.

5.4.1 Simeon of Bēth Aršam
To begin with the Syriac sources, the Miaphysite bishop Simeon of Bēth Aršam (d. 540s) preserves a letter sent to the Lakhmid ruler al-Mundhir III (r. 503/5–554) from Yūsuf himself in the autumn of 523. In it, the Ḥimyarite king states that the attack on the Aksumites residing in South Arabia constituted the first stage in his anti-Christian campaign.

W-qadmāyaṯ l-kūllhōn Kūšāyē ḏa-šḇīqīn (h)waw b-aṯrān d-nāṭrīn (h)waw ʿittā hāy d-sabbar(w) (h)waw l-hōn da-ḥnaw b-aṯrān ēstakḥeṭ d-ešaggeš w-elbūḵ ennōn w-qeṭleṯ l-kūllhōn d-hāwīn (h)waw māṭēn wa-tmānēn gabrē ḇnay qyāmā w-ʿālmāyē. Hāy dēn ʿidaṯhōn ʿḇaḏtāh bēṯ knūštā dilan.72

First I was able to throw into disorder and seize all those Ethiopians who remained in our country, who were guarding that church which they had published abroad that they had built in our country, and I killed them all, 280 men—monks and laymen. That church of theirs I converted into a synagogue for us.

Based on this passage, we can conclude that the Aksumite invasion of South Arabia in 518 was aimed at more than bringing the Christian Ḥimyarite Maʿdikarib Yaʿfur to power, for the construction of a church in Ḥimyar73 and presence there of Aksumite monks (gabrē ḃnay qyāmā) indicates an effort to promote Christianity in the country. As for the resident Aksumite laymen (ʿālmāyē), it is likely that this group included an armed contingent as well as administrators and advisers to Maʿdikarib Yaʿfur. Although the text states that the monks and laymen together numbered 280, it is quite possible that this number does not take into account the wives and children of the laymen, who
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71 Martyrium Arethae §3.11–12.
72 Simeon of Bēth Aršam, Lettera, ed. and trans. Guidi, p. 2 (Syriac text).
73 The church alluded to in this passage might be the structure which Kālēb claims in RIÉth 191/35 to have built in Ḥimyar (Drewes/Schneider, “Inscriptions guèzes”, p. 273), though this is by no means certain. As we shall see below (§5.4.3), there was at least one other church associated with, and possibly built by, the Aksumites at the port of al-Mukhā during this period.
are more likely to have been taken prisoner than killed. The *Book of the Himyarites* and the *Letter of Pseudo-Simeon of Bēth Aršam* provide additional data, giving Abābūt as the name of the leader of the local Ethiopian community. Müller identifies this name with Old Amharic Abbabūt or Abbabat, a name which survives in Modern Amharic in the form Ababačč. Although Yūsuf’s letter does not specify where this massacre took place, the *Letter of Pseudo-Simeon of Bēth Aršam* notes that Abābūt was the archbishop of the Ethiopians (rīšā ḏḥ-qaššīšē Kūšāyē) in Žafār (Ṭaypar) and states that three hundred men (tlāṯmā ḡarē; “three hundred warriors” tlāṯmā ʿabday qrāḇā, according to the *Book of the Himyarites*) accompanied him when he went forth to meet Yūsuf in person.

5.4.2 Ry 508
Further information on Yūsuf’s attack on the Aksumites took place in Žafār is provided by Ry 508, a Sabaic inscription from the site of ʿān-Halkān 1 in the Jabal Kawkab region of southwestern Saudi Arabia, dating from June 523 (Ｄḥū-Qiyāţâ in Year 633 of the Ḥimyarite Era). In this inscription we read:

Qyl n S₂rh’l Yqbl bn S₂rb’h’l Ykm bn Yz’n w-Gdn w-Ḥb w-Ns’n w-Ḡb’ ts’ṭrw b-ḏn ms’nd’n d-s₂mw b-s₁b’t’m ‘wd-h k-hm ‘m mr’-hw mk n Ys’f ṣ’r ’ly ḡbs²n b-Zfr w-dhr w qls’n w-wrd mk n ʾs²t’r w-ḏky-hw b-gys²m w-hrb Mḥw’n w-hṛg ⁴kl ḡwr-hw w-dhr qls’n.

The tribal leader Sharaḥ’l Yaqbul bin Shuraḥbi’il Yakmul of the Banū Yazan and the Gadaṇum and Ḥabbum and Naṣī’īn and Ghuba’ wrote in this inscription, which they set up during the campaign against the Ethiopians in Žafār with which they were charged, when they were with their lord, the King Yūsuf ʾAs’ar. And they burned the church and the king came down to the Ḡash’ar (tribe) and sent him (i.e. Sharaḥ’l Yaqbul) with a detachment and he made war on Mukḥāw’īn and he killed all of its inhabitants and he burned the church.

From this portion of the inscription we learn that the attack on the Aksumites in Žafār was followed by an attack on southwestern Yemen, targeting the port of al-Muḥāw (Sabaic Mḥw w-Mukḥāw’īn). Of the enemy forces, some 13,000 are

---

74 Moberg, *Book of the Himyarites*, p. 7a (Syriac text); Shahid, *Martyrs*, pp. iii–iv (Syriac text).
75 Müller, “Abessinier”, p. 164.
76 Shahid, *Martyrs*, pp. iii–iv (Syriac text).
77 Shahid, *Martyrs*, ibid.
78 Moberg, *Book of the Himyarites*, p. 7a–b (Syriac text).
79 Ry 508/1–4 (Müller, *Sabäische Inschriften*, p. 98).
The Aksumites in South Arabia

said to have been slain and 9500 taken prisoner, though the inscription says nothing about how many of these enemies were Aksumite.

5.4.3 Ry 507

For further information on Yūsuf’s military campaigns and the manner in which they affected the Aksumite community of South Arabia, we turn to Ry 507 from Bīr Ḫimā, also located in southwestern Saudi Arabia and dating from July 523 (Dhū-Madhraʿan in Year 633 of the Ḥimyarat Era), which presents certain details relating to the activities of Yūsuf’s forces not included in Ry 508:

4. dhrw qls[n] w-hrgw ʾḥbs[n] b-Zfr w-k-w[rd mlk n s2tn ...]dh Rʾwm ...]
   w-hrg-h[m]w tlt mʿt[m] [......]mw w-kl-деж b-ʾ[ly]ʾṣ2tn 5 w-mṣn S2mr w-
   Rkb[n] w-Rmʾ w-Mḥw[n ... ]bnḥ[ ... ]ny w-mtw b-ʾs2tn[r n] w-[dh]rw qls[n] w-
   hrgw w-ḡ[n]mw ʾḥbs[n] b-Mḥw[n b-[ḥw]r-hw Frs⁵nty[m].

4. they burned the church and killed the Ethiopians in Zafār, and when
   the king came down in force upon the ʾAṣḥʿarān ... ] Raʾwum[ ... ] and he
   killed 300 of them [ ... ]. And when he sent (an expedition) against ʾAṣḥʿarān
   5. and the fortresses of ʾṢawr and Rimaʾ83 and Mukhāwān ... ... ... ]
   and they died in ʾAṣḥʿar[ ... ]; and they b[r]ned the church and killed and
   plundered [the Ethiopians] in Mukhāwān, together with its (other) [inhab]
   itants, the Farasan.84

Of particular interest here is the allusion to 300 enemy casualties. Although the identity of this enemy is obscured by the lacunae in the text, the number given here is close enough to the 280 Ethiopian monks and laymen whom Yūsuf boasts of killing in the letter quoted by Simeon of Bēth Arsham to suggest that they were Aksumites. Ry 507 is also of importance for the history of the Aksumite diaspora in South Arabia as it indicates that, in addition to Ṣafār, the Aksumites had by the early 6th century established a presence at the port of al-Mukhāʿ, and that the town had a church, possibly built by the Aksumites. That al-Mukhāʿ attracted Aksumite settlers is undoubtedly due to the port’s location on the Red Sea, which made it an ideal center for trade with Africa, as

---

80 Ry 508/5 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 98).
81 Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, pp. 103–104.
82 Present-day ʾṢawr in the Yemeni Tihāma.
83 Rimaʾ is regarded by al-Hamdānī as part of the territory of the ʾAkk tribe (al-Hamdānī, ʿṢifat jazīrat al-ʿarab, ed. al-Hawālī, p. 107).
84 This tribe appears to have given its name to the Farasān Islands, located off the southern Red Sea coast of Saudi Arabia.
indeed it was since at least the 1st century. It is likely that many of the Aksumite residents of al-Mukhā’ were merchants, as most of those resident at Qānī’ are likely to have been. Since, however, Qānī’ seems never to have been targeted by Yūsuf’s campaigns, nor to have been directly affected by Kālēb’s campaigns in South Arabia, its Aksumite community never merits mention in written sources. If ceramic evidence is any indication, the Aksumite community at Qānī’ would seem to have passed its prime by the 6th century.

5.5 Other Aksumite Communities in 6th-Century South Arabia

Thus far, we have seen that there were Aksumite communities at both Ẓafār and al-Mukhā’ during the early 6th century. What about elsewhere in South Arabia? As in the 3rd century, there is evidence of an Aksumite presence at Najrān as well as on Soqoṭrā. The Book of the Ḥimyarites states that there was at least one Ethiopian deacon (mšamšānā) named Yōnan in residence at Najrān. He and several other foreign clergymen—two priests from the Lakhmid capital of al-Ḥīra in south-central Mesopotamia, a priest and a deacon of Roman origin, and a priest of Persian origin—are said to have been interrogated by Yūsuf during his occupation of Najrān. What happened in the immediate aftermath of this interrogation is not clear, for an entire leaf is missing from the manuscript. When the text resumes, we find Yūsuf announcing that these foreign clergymen were to be burned alive like the other Christians of Najrān. At this point there follows another large lacuna in the text, and it is not until the beginning of the following chapter that the text can be reconstructed, though by then the narrative has moved on to the unrelated issue of a woman martyr named Trwyb’ (=Ẓarwība?). Textual lacunae aside, it is likely that Yōnan was martyred together with his fellow clergymen. Whether other Aksumites resided in Najrān at this time, as they appear to have during the mid-3rd century, is not clear from what survives of the Book of the Ḥimyarites.

That the Aksumites maintained ties with Soqoṭrā during the 6th century is evident from the account of Cosmas Indicopleustes, a merchant who, during his visit to Ethiopia ca. 518 met Greek-speaking merchants from Soqoṭrā.

---

85 According to the Periplus of the Erythraean Sea (Casson, Periplus, §16.6.8-13), the merchants of Mouza, the name by which the anonymous author designates al-Mukhā’, conducted commerce with the port of Rhapta, located somewhere on the coast of what is now Tanzania.
86 Moberg, Book of the Ḥimyarites, p. 14b (Syriac text).
87 Moberg, Book of the Ĥimyarites, ibid.
88 Moberg, Book of the Ḥimyarites, p. 15a.
89 See §3.3.1.
90 Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topographie chrétienne, ed. and trans. Wolska-Conus, §3.65.12–13.
That Aksumites, in turn, traveled to Soqotra is evident from three Ge'ez graffiti from the grotto at Hoq, which, according to Robin, are probably of Christian origin and of 6th-century date.91 The first of these (2:25) reads šḥ[f] Bd “He has written: Blessed!”,92 the second (2:27) Bd[ ] šḥ[f] “Blessed! he has written”,93 the third (2:34) šhf Bs “He has written: Blessed!”.94 Robin draws attention to parallel phrases in Ge'ez literature in hagiographies of the Aksumite-period saint Libanos, according to which the saint had written the Beatitudes in the country of Degsā (hallawa ṣḥīf Bəḍʿān ḫaba mǝdra Dǝgsā).95 As with the Ge'ez graffiti from earlier periods that have become known at Hoq,96 however, these three graffiti constitute a rather dubious foundation on which to base the hypothesis of a permanent Aksumite colony on Soqotra. While Christianity is known to have established a presence on the island by the 6th century,97 the fact that Soqotri Christians adhered to the Nestorian Church, as opposed to the Miaphysite Church to which the Aksumites belonged,98 suggests that the Aksumites had little influence on the island. Indeed, it is not even clear whether, following the invasions of Himyar in 518 and 525, the Aksumite sphere of influence even encompassed Soqotra.

91 Robin, “Sudarabiques et Aksúmite”, p. 440.
92 Robin in Strauch, “Catalogue”, pp. 54–55.
93 Robin in Strauch, “Catalogue”, p. 57.
94 Robin in Strauch, “Catalogue”, p. 64.
95 Robin in Strauch, “Catalogue”, p. 55.
96 See §3.3.2.
97 In his description of Soqotra, Cosmas Indicopleustes, Topographie chrétienne, ed. and trans. Wolska-Conus, § 3.65.6–13, alludes to the presence on the island of clerics ordained in Persia, i.e. the Sasanid Empire, and a multitude of Christians. Such a community can only have formed over a period of several decades, if not generations, in which case the origins of Soqotri Christianity would date back to at least the 5th century.
98 On the history of Soqotri Christianity, see Beckingham, “Some Notes”, passim; Biedermann, Soqotra, pp. 39–63. Although the chronicler Joao de Barros (d. 1570) claims that the Christians of Soqotra belonged to the same sect of Christianity as the Ethiopians, i.e. Miaphysite Christianity (Beckingham, “Some Notes”, p. 174), this idea is likely to have arisen from a lack of awareness on the part of his informants of the doctrinal nuances of eastern Christianity. Of de Barros’ statement that Soqotri Christians chanted in “Chaldaean” (cal-deu), Beckingham (ibid., p. 180 [n. 5]) states that “[t]his would normally mean Syriac, but the word is sometimes used by the Portuguese for Ge’ez”. Since, however, the Ethiopian Church is not known to have exerted its influence on Soqotra during any period, it is highly unlikely that the indigenous Christians of the island knew Ge’ez. The “Chaldaean” in which they chanted is therefore likely to have been either Syriac—regardless of whether or not the locals still understood it—or even, perhaps, the Soqotri language, which the Portuguese categorized as “Chaldaean” for the sake of convenience. That a significant language barrier separated the Portuguese from the indigenous Soqotris should not be forgotten.
5.6 The Ethiopian Community under ʾAbrāhā

With the reign of ʾAbrāhā (ca. 531/5–560) we come to the final period of the history of the Aksumite diaspora in South Arabia. Where this period differs from those that preceded it is that now the Aksumites residing in South Arabia were the subjects of a regime that had effectively cast off the yoke of Aksumite rule. In fact, it is by no means clear to what extent—if at all—the members of this diaspora continued to self-identify as Aksumite once ʾAbrāhā had achieved independence from Aksum. For this period, we are primarily dependent on Sabaic inscriptions dating from his reign as well as early medieval Arabic sources, together with a brief summary of his reign supplied by the Roman historian Procopius (d. 554). That Arabic sources show particular interest in ʾAbrāhā is due primarily to the Islamic tradition of his having led an ill-fated campaign to destroy Mecca’s Kaʿba shrine.99 Our concern here, however, shall be with the way in which the documentation for ʾAbrāhā’s reign presents the Ethiopian community in South Arabia at the time.

5.6.1 Sabaic References: CIH 541

Only once, in his famous inscription from the dam at Mārib, CIH 541, does Sabaic documentation from ʾAbrāhā’s reign allude to Aksum, and then only indirectly, in connection with the reception of a diplomatic delegation from the nagāśī, i.e. the Aksumite king (mḥs²kt ngs²y).100 When the Ethiopian followers of ʾAbrāhā are mentioned elsewhere in the same inscription, they are referred to as “Ethiopians” (Hbs²t or ḥbs²n) rather than as “Aksumites” (ʾks²m²n). Thus in one passage, ʾAbrāhā’s armed forces are said to have been comprised of both “Ethiopians and Ḥimyarites by the thousands” (Hbs²t [w-]ḥmyr²m b-ʾšf²m).101 Ethiopians and Ḥimyarites are paired in another passage recording their participation in repair work at the Mārib dam. The passage in question states that, when a plague (ḍll) struck the region and caused deaths among the tribes, ʾAbrāhā “dismissed them, his Ethiopians and his Ḥimyarites” (ṭnw l-hmw lʾḥbs²-hmw ṣḥmr-hmw), until the plague subsided.102 Apart from ʾAbrāhā himself, the dam inscription also refers to four other Ethiopians by name. The first was one Gerā Ḩūḥ-Zabānir (Grh Ḥbn-pn),103 whose name

99 al-Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. de Goeje, vol. 2, pp. 936–945. Traditions about ʾAbrāhā’s campaign against Mecca are based on Sūrat al-Fīl “The Chapter of the Elephant”, the 105th chapter of the Qurʾān, though that text, which consists of only five verses, contains no mention of ʾAbrāhā, the Kaʿba, or Mecca.
100 CIH 541/88 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 115).
101 CIH 541/25–6 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 112).
102 CIH 541/74–5 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 114).
103 CIH 541/19 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 111).
Müller associates with the masculine personal and tribal name of Gerā, attested in Tigre.\(^{104}\) This Gerā, so Cih 541 informs us, had been sent by 'Abrahā to suppress a rebellion in the region of Maṣḥriq,\(^{105}\) located in southern Yemen between the Yemeni highlands and the Ḥaḍramawt, only to be killed himself by the rebels.\(^{105}\) Two other Ethiopians are reported to have served as governors (ḥlyf) during 'Abrahā's reign, one named Waṭṭā (Wṭh) and the other ‘Awīdā (‘wdh).\(^{106}\) Although Müller identifies both as Ethiopian by origin, the inscription states that they were affiliated with Gadanum,\(^{107}\) a Sabaean tribe which probably had its homeland in the area around Mārib but also had members at Ṣan‘ā’, Jiḥāna, and Najrān, as well as in Wādī al-Jawf.\(^{108}\) It is possible that Waṭṭā and ‘Awīdā were associated with Gadanum because they exercised some form of political authority over this tribe or, alternatively, because they had been clients of the tribe—in the same way, perhaps, that non-Arab converts to Islam became clients (mawālī) of Arab tribes during the early Islamic period.\(^{109}\) Another Ethiopian affiliated with a South Arabian tribe—and the fourth Ethiopian besides ‘Abrahā to be mentioned by name in Cih 541—was one of ‘Abrahā’s own sons, referred to in the inscription as ‘Aksūm Dḥū-Ma‘āhir (‘brḥ D-M‘hr), who headed some sort of entourage (’lmtm) that accompanied ‘Abrahā to Mārib.\(^{110}\) This individual is undoubtedly the Yaksūm identified in Arabic sources as a son and successor of ‘Abrahā, the Arabic form of his name perhaps deriving from Amharic *Ya-Aksūm “He of Aksum”.\(^{111}\) Ma‘āhir, with which he was affiliated, was a Ḥimyarite princely lineage based 150–200 km southeast of Ṣan‘ā’. Once again, the nature of this affiliation is not entirely clear. Among the Ethiopians mentioned in Cih 541 there would no doubt have been those who, like ‘Abrahā, had arrived in Ḥimyar with the Aksumite invasion of 525, if not before. Others might have been among the two armed forces which, according to Procopius,\(^{112}\) Kālēb had sent to Ḥimyar in a vain effort to remove ‘Abrahā from power. Unfortunately, neither the extant Sabaic sources nor Procopius give us any sense of the size of the Ethiopian community in

\(^{104}\) Müller, “Abessinier”, p. 167.

\(^{105}\) Cih 541/19–20 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 111).

\(^{106}\) Cih 541/36–7 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 112).

\(^{107}\) Müller, “Abessinier”, p. 167.

\(^{108}\) Robin, “Matériaux”, p. 160.

\(^{109}\) Crone, Slaves on Horses, pp. 49–57 and passim.

\(^{110}\) Cih 541/82–83 (Müller, Sabäische Inschriften, p. 115).

\(^{111}\) Cf. Amharic Yāmlāk (< *ya + Amlāk), “he of God”, and Yāmrōt (< *ya + amrōt) “he of love/pleasure”. Worthy of note in this regard is a 10th-century Coptic text in which the Queen of Sheba is called Iesaba, a name which Vycichl (“Amharisme”) derives from the Amharic *ya-Sabā “she of Sheba”.

\(^{112}\) Procopius, History of the Wars, trans. Dewing, §1.20.2.
South Arabia during ʿAbrahāʾs time. As we have seen, there were some 300 Aksumites who had settled at Ẓafār alone in the aftermath of the invasion of 518. Although most of these are likely to have been killed by the forces of Yūsuf ʿAsʿar Yathʿar, the number of Aksumites residing in South Arabia would undoubtedly have been replenished because of the invasion led by Kālēb in 525. When one considers as well the deserters from the two subsequent invasions sent by Kālēb, it is likely that several thousand Ethiopians resided in South Arabia in ʿAbrahāʾs day.

5.6.2 Arabic References: al-Ṭabarī

Turning to the Arabic sources, the most detailed—if perhaps apocryphal—account of ʿAbrahāʾs coming to power is preserved by Muḥammad bin Jarīr al-Ṭabarī (d. 923) and is based on a tradition related by Muḥammad ibn Ishāq (d. 767?). According to this account, ʿAbrahāʾ seized power as a result of a single-combat encounter with one Aryāṭ, a general in the Aksumite army who remained in authority in South Arabia for several years after what was apparently the invasion of 525. Aryāṭ was rather treacherously put to death by a slave of ʿAbrahāʾs named ʿĀtwada, after which “the army of Aryāṭ flocked to ʿAbrahāʾ and all of the Ethiopians in Yemen gathered together (around him)” (insarafa jund Aryāṭ ilā Abraha fa-jtamaʿat il-Ḥabaša bil-Yaman).113 Aryāṭ, it should be noted in passing, is known solely from Arabic sources.114 It is possible that the story of his demise preserves some vague memory of ʿAbrahāʾs overthrow of Sumūyafaʿ ʿAṣḥawāʾ, an individual who is otherwise unknown to Arabic tradition. Alternatively, it is possible that Aryāṭ was the leader of one of the two punitive campaigns, which Kālēb had sent against ʿAbrahāʾ, according to Procopius, but that, with the passage of time, he came to be associated in Arabic tradition with the invasion of 525. The account of Hisḥām bin Muḥammad al-Kalbī (d. 819), also preserved by al-Ṭabarī, follows more or less the same narrative, but gives a different name to ʿAbrahāʾ’s slave, which in the extant manuscripts of al-Ṭabarī appears in the form ṣinjdh or ṭbjudh, the vocalization of which is uncertain.115

113 al-Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. de Goeje, vol. 2, p. 932.
114 ‘Alī bin al-Ḥusayn al-Masʿūdī (d. 956) gives the full name of Aryāṭ as Aryāṭ bin Aṣḥama (al-Masʿūdī, Murūj, ed. Dāghir, vol. 2, p. 52). It is possible, though, that the Aṣḥama element was borrowed from Arabic traditions about the 7th-century Ethiopian king al-Aṣḥama, who supposedly granted asylum to the Muslims when the latter were faced with persecution by the pagan Quraysh. Accounts of al-Aṣḥama may preserved memory of the seventh-century Aksumite king Ылла-Ṣахам (Fiaccadori, “Ѣла-Ṣахам”).
115 al-Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. de Goeje, vol. 2, p. 931.
6 The End of Ethiopian Rule

Whatever the origins or historicity of the story of the clash between ‘Abrahā and Aryāṭ, the regime which ‘Abrahā established in South Arabia was not to last for long. According to Arabic sources, it was brought to an end through the combined efforts of disenfranchised Ḥimyarites and their Sāsānid allies ca. 570. Once again, al-Ṭabarī, drawing on earlier sources, preserves the most detailed account. Citing Ibn Isḥāq and Hishām bin Muḥammad, al-Ṭabarī states that a Ḥimyarite nobleman named Sayf bin Dhī Yazan appealed to Kisrā, i.e. the Sāsānid emperor Khusraw Anushiruvān (r. 531–579), for aid in expelling the Ethiopians from his country. Eventually, the emperor sent an invasion force to South Arabia under the command of one Wahriz, which succeeded in killing Masrūq and bringing Sayf to power. Once in power, Sayf launched what amounted to an all-out slaughter of South Arabia’s Ethiopian population.

‘Adā ‘alā l-Ḥabasha fa-ja’ala yaqtuluhā wa-yabquru l-nisā’ahā ‘ammā fi buṭūnihā idhā afnāhā illā baqāyā dhalīla qalīla fa-ťtakḥadḥahum khawalān.118

He attacked the Ethiopians and began to kill them and ripped out (the fetuses) which their women had in their bellies, until he had annihilated all but a few wretched remnants of them, whom he seized as slaves.

It was not long, however, before a few of these slaves rose up and killed Sayf. Angered by the assassination of his client, Kisrā dispatched Wahriz once more to South Arabia. This time, the punishment meted out to what remained of the Ethiopian community was harsher still.

Ammarahu an lā yatruk bil-Yaman aswadā wa-lā walad ‘Arabiyyatin min aswad illā qatalahu ṣaghīran aw kabīran wa-lā yada’ rajulān ja’dan qaṭātan qad sharika fīhi l-Sūdān.119

He (i.e. Kisrā) commanded him not to leave in Yemen a black or the child of an Arab woman by a black without killing him, young or old; nor to let live a single curly- or crispy-haired man with whom the blacks had been involved.

---

116 Wahriz is in fact a title rather than a personal name (Potts, “Sasanian Relationship”, p. 207).
117 al-Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. de Goeje, vol. 2, pp. 945–957.
118 al-Ṭabarī, Annales, ed. de Goeje, vol. 2, p. 957.
119 Ibid.
It would appear from this passage that there was a certain degree of intermarriage between Ethiopians and local South Arabian women during the 6th century. Whether the women alluded to in connection with the slaughter unleashed by Sayf were also the South Arabian spouses (or concubines) of resident Ethiopians or were themselves of Ethiopian extraction is not clear.

As a caveat, it must be stressed that the Arabic accounts of the fall of the Ethiopian regime in Ḥimyar undoubtedly contain a large amount of spurious material, as a result of the passage of time between the events they describe and the time when they were written down, coupled with the introduction of hyperbolic and legendary elements. Nevertheless, the Sāsānit invasion—and eventual conquest—of Ḥimyar was an event known to late 6th-century Roman historians. This development is treated, if only briefly, by the late 6th-century historians John of Epiphania and Theophanes of Byzantium. Although neither author has anything to say about the fate of South Arabia’s Ethiopian community in the aftermath of the Sāsānit takeover, it is striking that the Arabic accounts of the Muslim wars of conquest in the 7th and early 8th centuries say nothing about the participation of South Arabia-based Ethiopian troops. This is despite the well-documented participation of indigenous South Arabian tribes in these wars, including groups like Mahra, which had been relatively unimportant in the context of late pre-Islamic history. Although it is not impossible that some Ethiopians were subsumed anonymously within the ranks of South Arabian tribes, one would not expect such a scenario had they constituted a large community which cohered as a self-contained block, as the Ethiopians had in South Arabia during the 3rd and 6th centuries. Likewise, while the Meccan tribe of Quraysh is known to have traded with South Arabia, contact with the Ethiopians does not seem to have taken place in the context of trade with South Arabia. More likely, Qurashī merchants encountered Ethiopians either in the course of visits to Ethiopia itself or through transactions with Ethiopians who had traveled to Mecca.

120 Theophylact Simocatta, History, trans. Whitby/Whitby, p. 85 (iii.9.3–6).
121 Photius, Bibliothèque, ed. and trans. Henry, vol. 1, p. 78 (64.15–17).
122 Al-Medej, Yemeni Relations, pp. 110–139; Smith, “Yemenite History”.
123 Hence the settlement of Mahra tribes in the conquered provinces following the Muslim invasions (al-Medej, Yemeni Relations, pp. 162; 165; 166).
124 Crone, Meccan Trade, pp. 120–124; 141–144; 149; 150; 152; 163.
125 Crone, Meccan Trade, pp. 126–128.
126 Crone, Meccan Trade, pp. 124–129. The nature of Meccan trade with Ethiopia is unclear, not least because, in contrast to other regions with which Mecca traded in late pre-Islamic times, Arabic sources fail to mention any place-names within Ethiopia (ibid., p. 125).
127 Crone, Meccan Trade, pp. 125–126.
The most plausible conclusion, then, is that South Arabia’s Ethiopian population was indeed drastically reduced in number following the overthrow of the regime established by ʾAbrḥā in the 570s, whether through slaughter of the sort described in Arabic sources, by a mass exodus of Ethiopians from the region, or, most probably, by a combination of both factors.

7 Conclusion

Sabaic inscriptions, supplemented by Syriac, Greek, and Arabic texts, provide a record of Aksumite Ethiopian contact with, and settlement in, South Arabia from the late 2nd century down to the mid-sixth. To be sure, there are some noteworthy gaps in this textual record. Thus, only one relevant text, the Sabaic inscription Ir 28, dates from the 4th century, and even this inscription documents diplomatic relations between Aksum and Ḥimyar rather than Aksumite settlement in Ḥimyar. As for the textual record for the 5th century, this remains completely silent on the issue of either a possible Aksumite presence in South Arabia or Ḥimyarite relations with Aksum at that time. The most abundant and detailed documentation of the Aksumite community in South Arabia dates from the 6th century.

It must be stressed that the textual data on which this study is largely based represents what must have been only a portion of the Aksumite expatriate community in South Arabia during late pre-Islamic times. Not surprisingly, those Aksumites who warranted mention by name in the textual sources were almost entirely of elite status, including such individuals as community or religious leaders, governors, ambassadors, and kings. Ceramics from Qāniʾ supplement this record by providing evidence of the (at least seasonal) presence of Aksumite merchants in South Arabia, a group not represented in textual sources. As in medieval and modern Yemen, there would undoubtedly have been Ethiopian slaves and laborers in late pre-Islamic South Arabia though, for obvious reasons, such low-status individuals are absent from both the textual and, so far as we can tell, the archaeological record—barring the case of ʾAbrḥā’s slave ʿAtwada, who might never have existed.

Despite the incompleteness of the extant data, it can be confidently stated that no country is known to have maintained relations with South Arabia over as long a stretch of time as Ethiopia. This is hardly surprising, given the close geographical proximity of Ethiopia and South Arabia. As observed at the beginning of this study, Aksum was the only sub-Saharan state known to have expanded outside Africa at any point in history. The record of its activities in South Arabia are equally unique in that they provide the only extensive corpus
of written material documenting the presence of sub-Saharan Africans in the pre-Islamic Near East.\textsuperscript{128}
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