

BYZANTINE INTERFERENCE IN YEMEN: A STUDY IN MOTIVES.

ABDEL—MONEIM MOUKHTAR

The south parts of the Arabian Peninsula have been and object of the western forces since Rome came to power, as this international passage played an important role in oriental trade. The policy of the western powers always was to hold these parts in firm hands. As force and military expeditions since Aelius Gallus had failed to fulfill that policy, a new form of conquest was begun by the missions with religion. An important mediator entered the struggle with this western power, that being the Ethiopian kingdom which stood beside the Byzantine Empire's interest in this locality. The religious bonds were important in fulfilling the Byzantine policy, and from the beginning of the fourth century the Empire began to spread through this territory using religious means.

After many attempts, Nero resumed a commercial policy. Its aim was to secure the control of two trade routes which brought to the Roman markets the products of India and China. These trade routes — the south-eastern sea route, which was exploited by the southern Arabs, and the north-eastern land route — were both in the hands of middlemen. The south-eastern route was under the control of the Axumite kingdom, so he dispatched an exploratory expedition to Ethiopia in the autumn of 61. AD. As the Sabaean-Himyarite state was weak and under the domination of the Axumite kingdom, Rome concluded a treaty of friendship and alliance with it and on the basis of this treaty occupied Aden. Rome also secured indirect control of the Island of Socotra, which was leased by the king of Hadramūt and was doubtless leased to a syndicate of Roman traders from Egypt. The control of Socotra and the occupation of Aden led naturally to the opening of direct intercourse by sea between Egypt and India. The Ethiopian expedition was to complete this South Arabian Policy.¹

That was the attitude of the western powers towards South Arabia. Through the following ages one could not arrive at a firm conclusion about the conditions of that relationship, but the Sabaean-Himyarite state began to regain its power. The state penetrated deeply into the states of South Arabia, and at the close of the fourth century, all the south was dominated by the Himyarite state.

Our Arabic narrations present to us unimaginable stories about the history of that state, but one cannot depend on these narrations. The first well known king of the dynasty was Šamr Yahr^caš who was, according to the Arabic narrations, the conqueror of the world. However, one can extract from these narrations and from the Himyarite texts that this king was responsible about the unification of the small southern state.²

In 340 A. D. the Yemenite state was conquered by the Ethiopians, and their occupation lasted 38 years. The stages of that occupation, are not known but the text of Axum presented the fact of the Ethiopian occupation of the whole Arabian south.³ At this time the country was very weak, as they had lost control of the oriental trade. Of course the Roman policy, called the South-eastern trade policy, was responsible for the fate of that state, as the interior state of Yemen was very weak and the government could not keep up the Ma'rib dam which was destroyed. The state was also so weak that it could not secure its borders against the attacks of the northern tribes. It is not sure that the Empire was responsible for these attacks, but Rome had no objection and was not opposing this policy as one found that Imru' l-Qays b. ^cAmr, who was attached to the Roman service, arrived at the walls of Nağrān, city of Šammar in 328 A. D. One can guess that the Ethiopian occupation was a result of Roman instigation because the Yemenite state was beginning to revive its power and that action was dangerous to Roman interests.⁴

Economic forces and the nomadic ravens waging on the state were the main motives which encouraged the Ethiopians to attack Yemen. This occupation did not last, however, as they were obliged to forfeit their control of Yemen because of the revolts of the people of Middle Nile e. g. Pagga Kassū and some other African people.⁵ Thus king Abū Karb Yaha'man was able to expel them from his country.⁶ Up to that time, Yemen had not formed a part of any Roman policy, but the Yemenite territories were mapped by the Missions during the reign of Aezianas, the Ethiopian king, who had good relations with the Emperor Constantine the Great. To the

Emperor Theodosianus, the circular of 356 A. D. was attributed in which Himyarite and Axumite were mentioned as localities for traders.⁷ One could not say that this occupation was led by the forces of Christianity, as the Ethiopians were not at that time Christians. The forces of this occupation were economic.

Monotheistic elements began to take official form in the state as a result of foreign missionaries. Abū Karb Yaha'man dedicated a temple to the god of the Sky in 378 A. D. and forsook the gods of his fathers.⁸ Abū Karb As^cad, the new king united the rest of the states, and thus he had authority over Saba', Dū Riydān, Ḥaḍramūt, Yemen, the Arabs of the highlands, and Tuḥāma.⁹ He also placed the trade routes over the continent under his control and fortified these routes. In the reign of his successor, Šuraḥbīl Ya^cfur, the monotheistic current increased.¹⁰ As a result of the economical refreshment, he was able to reconstruct the Dam.

Religious policy was responsible for the events which took place during the reign of his successor King ^cAbd Kalāl who was appointed king as a result of a revolution against the previously governing dynasty. This revolution was encouraged by the Ethiopians because the new king was Christian.¹¹ This fact strengthened Christianity in the country although he did not reign for more than five years (455–460 A. D.). He was followed by some kings whose reigns were a field of prevalent revolts.¹² Up to that time, the religious policy of the Byzantine Empire did not threaten the country's independence. But the coming years were to be the most dangerous, as the Empire was occupied with the Persian and Barbarian wars, and with internal problems. Now came the time which the Empire had postponed.

The reign of Dū Nuwās was the point of alteration in the relationship between the East and the West. Because of the Christian interference in the affairs of Yemen, the kings began a new policy towards the religious groups which were embracing a faith contrary of the local creeds and which were spiritually tied to foreign authorities especially because they were paying money to Ethiopia. Thus they were treated severely and were under the states' religious persecution.¹³ The reign of Dū Nuwās was the terminal stage of the struggle between the East and Byzantium, and was followed by events which placed the country under the foreign yoke. The attitude of Dū Nuwās towards the Christians was not to submit to any religious element as the king was not Jewish but an idolater.¹⁴ Such cases of persecution made the Chris-

tians ask for the help of their companions in faith. Some of the Christians escaped to the king of Ethiopia and to the Byzantines. Arabic reference books give names of these people, among them Dws DūTā^clbān and Gabbār b. Fayyād.¹⁵ According to these writings, an invasion was prepared and the country was surrendered to the Ethiopians.

One has to discuss the elements of that conquest to know whether it was dictated by the aim of helping the Christians or of fulfilling Byzantine policy in that territory. The Arab historians give us a long tale of this invasion, but Yemenite documents present for us a contradicting text which is called the text of Ḥiṣn al-Ġurāb (Rep. Epog. 2633). This text informs us that the Ethiopians conquered the land of Himyar and killed its king. But the name of the king is not mentioned. The text relates to the year 640 of the Himyarit calendar, which agrees with the year 525 A. D.¹⁶

Winckler explained this text in an unimaginable way. That Dū Nuwās began that war and he attacked Ethiopia. He was accompanied by al-Samīfa^c and his sons, but he did not succeed in the invasion. So the Ethiopians invaded Yemen and put their hands upon it.¹⁷ Al-Samīfa^c Ašū^c and his sons retired and went to the fort of Māwya to take shelter. They stayed there until the Ethiopians controlled the entire country and as they had been obliged to attend this war without personal motives, the Ethiopians agreed with al-Samīfa^cAšū^c and he was appointed king of Yemen.¹⁸

If this tale is true, it presents a clear fact which contradicts all our reference books and the theory that this occupation was dictated by Byzantine policy. To reach the real motives of this aggression one has to decide if the motives of this aggression were forwarded against the persecution of the Christians by the Jews. If the above mentioned theory is true, it is a very weak addition, as our references dictate contradictory facts and show that Byzantine policy was responsible for the war. One has to go further back to discuss if the Jews were stronger in Yemen and if King Dū Nuwās was a Jew.

Procopius, in his narrations of the conquest, did not mention if the king of Homeritae was a Jew. He mentioned that the Ethiopian king was a Christian and a defender of Christianity. The King was informed that the Homeritae were persecuting the Christians, and then he appointed a Christian Homeritae king. Procopius also mentioned that many of the Homeritae were Jews, and many of them also believed in the Hellenic (idolatry) creed. He mentioned also that the king was killed but did not mention whether he

was a Jew or idolater.¹⁹ Though Philostorgius was not contemporaneous with that event, he gave us some facts about the creed of the Homeritae. He said that they were following the Abrahamic custom concerning the sacredness of Saturday. They were also sacrificing to the sun and the moon and to their local idols. He mentioned that some of them were Jews, and that they opposed Theophilus who was sent by the Emperor Constantinus to preach among the Homeritae.²⁰ Theodoros lector mentioned that the Homeritae were Jews in origin, as they embraced Judaism at the time of their queen, then they became idolaters. During the reign of Emperor Anastasius (491–518) they embraced Christianity.²¹ He did not mention if Judaism was flourishing there in his time. He and Philostorgius did not mention anything about the kings and if they were Jews.²² The Axumite narrations mention that the majority of the people of Saba' were idolaters and among them there were some Jews.²³ The persecution of the Jews by the Emperors Vespasianus and Titus made many Jews emigrate to Ḥiḡāz, where they settled in many localities. From Ḥiḡāz they found their way to Yemen where they settled in Saba' and preached among the natives. After examining these narrations, one can believe that the kings of Homeritae were not Jews and the Romans were trying to spread Christianity in this territory.

The arabic narrations made the king of Himyar a Jew. But the reference of this narration was to Ṭabaḡī who referred to Ibn Ishāq and Ibn Hišām. It is a clear fact, that Ibn Ishāq took his narrations from some persons who were of Jewish origin such as Abū Mālik b. Ṭaḡlaba b. Abī Mālik al-Qarḡī and Wahb b. Minabba and also from some narrations of al-Madīna who had some relations with the Jews.²⁴

The holy Qor'ān handled the problem of Dū Nuwās, and considered the people who committed the persecutions as infidels, while considering the Christians as believers. The Jewish creed, according to Islam, is a fidel creed like Christianity. The Qor'ān knew Judaism very well, so if Qor'ān narrated that the people who committed the persecution were infidel, that means that the kings of Himyar were idolaters.²⁵

The Ancient south arabian texts and sources did not assure that the kings of Himyar were Jews. The Classical references also did not mention anything about the kings being Jews. The narrations which mentioned this motto came only from untrustworthy narrators and from those of Jewish origin.

Muslim and Christian historians refer to these narrations about the spread

of Christianity in Yemen. One was brought to us by Ibn Ishāq who quoted from Wahb b. Minabba, a muslim narrator of Jewish origin. His narration went side by side with Christian references. It was said that Christianity entered Nağrān through Phemion in 500 A. D.²⁶ The Islamic narrations quoted that Christianity came to Nağrān by a stranger who came from Syria.²⁷

As the Empire had some coveted interest in those parts, the idea of spreading Christianity there was a highly distinguished consideration. Religious bonds between the Empire and Yemen would be able to separate this territory from Persian influence. Many missions succeeded in their work and three churches were established, in ZIFĀR, Aden and Hormoz.²⁸

The motive of Constantine in sending Theophilus Indus in 354 A. D. as a delegate to the king of the Homeritae could not be described as innocent. It seemed to have been both economical and political. Theophilus succeeded in constructing these three churches and in making Zifār, in 356 A. D., the residence of an archbishop who commanded from there the affairs of the Christians in Nağrān, Hormoz and Socotra.²⁹

According to some Christian narrations, one can understand the real motives of the Emperor. The aim of the delegation of Theophilus was to clarify the situation of Axum and Himyar and to bind them with a confederation or at least to keep these territories neutral during the struggle with Persia.³⁰

The reign of Anastasius was a time of active christianization, with missionaries moving southward to Yemen and Axum through Syria.³¹ In reality, such missions and the spreading of christianity had not religious but political aims. The unclear relation between the Christians and the Byzantine Empire made the kings of Yemen suspicious of their motives. They therefore persecuted the Christians who were considered as rebels and heretics unloyal to their country, as they were accustomed to sending gifts and loyalties to Axum.³² Such attitudes did not satisfy the kings as they carried the emblem of Ethiopian interference in local affairs, and besides it was considered an illegal relation with the enemy.³³

The Persians did not stop with galled hands but rather entered the running struggle by helping to spread the transgressing creeds which were persecuted by the Byzantines, such as the Nestorian creed, etc. Of course, such creeds, would never be appreciated by the Byzantines, and the believers could not be

on the Byzantine side. Such enmity between the Christians in the Byzantine and non-Byzantine territories would strengthen the hatred of the Christians of Yemen towards the Byzantine Empire. In 570 A. D. king Chosroes protected the Nestorians in Yemen.³⁴ As both creeds had found a fertile field in Yemen, this helped to inflame the enmity among the people of Yemen. Besides, the anti-semitic policy carried by the Empire was one of the most important elements increasing the carnage. The cruel persecution and savage oppression made the Jews collaborate with the enemies of the Empire, as the Persians were for some time lenient with them.³⁵ This policy supported the interest of the Persians. The Jewish problems and the support given to the Nestorians were the means of furthering this policy. The height of this enmity was during the reign of Dū Nuwās. The Jews and the officials won some victories over the Christians, and the carnage took place.

It is not fair to support the theory which made the carnage a result of Jewish influence. Such persecution could be attributed to the growing interest and interference of the Byzantines and Ethiopians in the local affairs of Christians considered Yemenian citizens. Such action made the ruling class there consider these people guilty, unfaithful, and traitors. As a result of this attitude the country lost its independence. Foreign aggression, carrying the motto "Rescue the Christians", subdued the country.

Anyhow, the country lost its independence and became subject to Ethiopia. It is not important to discuss the stages of military struggle as it resulted in a fulfillment of the motives for aggression. The Ethiopian king Ela Isbaha (Helletheaeus) conquered Dū Nuwās (Damianus) and appointed al-Samīfa^C (Esimiphaeus) as king demanding of him an annual royalty.³⁶ This was in 525 A. D. The classical narrators, though they failed to give the correct date of the events, presented the main and true reasons for the aggression.³⁷ It was clear that economic forces were the motives behind the attitude of Dū Nuwās towards Byzantine traders in the Indian Ocean. This fact was clarified and affirmed by a Syrian narration which gave the same reasons for the Ethiopian aggression.³⁸

The economic motive for the aggression wandered amidst the uproar and clamours which rose as a result of the carnage. These economic motives were hidden under the motto of saving the Christians. The fact was that the attitude of Dū Nuwās threatened Byzantine maritime interests and was dangerous to the Byzantines. So, the Empire seized the opportunity of the

running carnage and cooked the matter to fit her motto.

In pursuance of the causes and motives of the aggression, it is important to follow the theme of saving the Christians. This held some elements which supported the real motive. The carnage of Nağrān aroused in the Christian world sidewaves of displeasure. The special envoy commissioned by the Emperor Justinianus to al-Mundīr in Ḥīra, which aimed for the release of two generals, and to make peace by tinging him to a confederation, received the news of the carnage on 23 January 524 A. D.³⁹

Simon of Beīṭ Aršām, one of the ecclesiastic mediators accompanying the envoy, directed many messages to the Byzantine bishops and the patriarch of Alexandria asking them to mediate with the Ethiopians help for the Christians of Yemen.

It was said that Mundīr received an envoy from Dū Nuwās asking him to treat the Christians in his country in the same way as in Yemen. The Byzantine envoy also had the aim of convincing Mundīr to compel the Monophysists to change their creed. The two envoys were not interested in the same theme, as the Yemenites aimed at the non-Monophysists who were used by the Byzantines against Yemen, meanwhile the Byzantine envoy aimed at the Empire's religious enemies: the Monophysists who were supported by the Persians and the Yemenites.⁴⁰ Because of this fact, it can be said that the carnage was among the non-Monophysists.

Soon the Empire began its policy. Justinianus aimed to tie the Ethiopians and the subjected Himyar in a confederation against Persia. Thus, he commissioned Julianus as special envoy to Kāleb Ela Aşbaḥa and to al-Samīfa^c Aşū^c to convince them to confederate with the Empire forming a united front against the Persians.⁴¹

As a result of a revolt in Yemen, Abraha, the Ethiopian was able to lay his hand upon the state and come to power after killing Artaḥ (Aritas), the military ruler of the country.⁴²

This theory is supported by a classical narration⁴³, which the Arabic narrations agreed with, stating that Abraha usurped the sovereignty in Yemen, and obliged the Ethiopian king to acknowledge his sovereignty and power all over the country.⁴⁴

It could be attributed to the narrations of Theophanes and Cedrenus, who mentioned a second Ethiopian invasion of Homeritae in the 15th year of Justinianus, because of Homeritae aggression against Byzantine traders. These

events took place during the revolts against Ethiopian sovereignty. The 15th year of Justinianus's reign could be the year 541-42. It means that these events took place during the attempts of Abraha to subdue the country.⁴⁵ Of course, this invasion was not against Dū Nuwās, who was not alive at this time, but was against some revolting native chiefs.

An echo of this narration, the text of Abraha which was written after the reconstruction of Ma'rib Dam, was a self-affirmation of the main causes of the revolts.⁴⁶ It presents some facts among which are the revolts of the chiefs (*aqyāl*) of the tribes. It describes Abraha as the real ruler of the country and attributes to him also all the titles of the Saba'ian kings.⁴⁷

As it seems, the revolt of 542 A. D. was against the reign of Abraha and Ethiopian influence. The revolt, which was a huge and totally national movement, was forwarded by the ancient aristocracy in Saba'.⁴⁸

We can infer from the names of the rebellious tribes, that the revolt was located in the southern parts of the country. The leader of the revolt, Yazīd b. Kabša was supported by the chiefs of Saba', Dū Ṣaḥar, Murra, Ṭamāma, Martad, Ḥanīf, Ḥanaš, Dū Ḥalīl, Yazan and the sons of the late king al-Samīfa.⁴⁹ An army was sent by Abraha to subdue this revolt, but was defeated, and the revolt spread to Ḥaḍramūt. So Abraha, in the summer of 542, was obliged to command his army to subdue the revolt. When he arrived at the center of the revolt, Yazīd surrendered and begged pardon without any resistance. However, this action was not enough to subdue the revolt, as many chiefs were still fighting against Abraha.

The motives of the revolts were given by the attitudes of the aristocracy, who were divided into two parallel sides, the majority of the less profitable side being responsible for the rebellion. Of course, economic causes were the main motives for the revolt, as this was the motive for their aggressive attitude towards the Byzantine traders. This attitude was dictated by their loss of income from the Eastern trade which was a direct result of the Ethiopian invasion.

The local aristocracy tried to regain its class interests through this revolt. Classical narrations give the main aims of the revolt. Owing to Abraha's stay in Ma'rib where he was to reconstruct the dam, he received six delegations envoyed to him by the fighting powers of that time. The protocol of the text presented some facts which explain his attitude towards the delegations. The nominating order of the delegations in the text clarified his policy towards

current events. The synonyms of the word "delegation" used in the text also presented the same impression. The Ethiopian and Byzantine delegations were called: *MĤŠKT NGŠYN* and *MĤŠKT MLK RMN* while the Persian delegation was called *TNBLT MLK FRS*. *Mahšakit* in the south Arabian language, is a synonym for a friendly and kind envoy, while *tanbalit* means only a deputation. Thus the Persian delegation was not a favourite delegation of Abraha and this was according to political traditions that the Persian envoy was not wanted.

At the same time, three other delegations, those of al-Mundir of Hira — a subject of Persia —, al-Hāriṭ b. Gabala the Gassanide, a subject of the Empire, and Abū Karb b. Gabala, chief of the upper Arabian tribes, and also a subject of the Byzantine Empire, were all called as "RSL", a word which carried the meaning of messenger.

The purpose of these delegations was not to congratulate or to present some courtesies, but was of course far deeper. The delegations aimed to tie him to this camp or that, to suffocate trade on the Red Sea or to give it more freedom and security. Of course these actions would have caused a catastrophe for the Byzantine colonies there, a grievous loss to imperial commerce, and would have increased the gain. For a long time the policy of the Empire had been to place the peninsula under Byzantine rule and to isolate Persia from this territory. Meanwhile the Persians made attempts to destroy any front which might be inclined to their enemies. The Persians also prevented them from trading with the Arabs and their ships from sailing in the Indian ocean. The two competitor camps used means of propaganda to fulfill their plans. The Byzantine Empire tried its best to spread Christianity and to delegate missionaries. It also persuaded the Ethiopians to support this action by interfering in the local affairs of Yemen. While this action was taking place on one stage, the Persians made efforts to spread contradicting creeds which stood in enmity towards the Byzantine Empire and also to gain the support of the Jews.

The Byzantine Empire tried for a second time to be on good relations with the ruler of Yemen, as it had before, with the delegation of Julianus to al-Samīfa^c. The aim of the second delegation was to use Christianity as the main organ of their policy. Of course, these elements might enlarge their influence in the East. One finds that the delegations of confederate Arabs, who were tied to both big powers, had the same purpose. The delegation of

Abū Karb b. Gabala (Abochorabus) who was appointed by Justinianus as Phylarch of the Saracens' of Palästine, was authorized to clarify the Byzantine policy concerning the territories inhabited by the tribe of Ma^Cd. These territories seemed to be important to the Empire, as this was the second delegation to argue this problem, i. e. Julianus had previously been envoy to al-Samīfa.⁵¹

After the submission of South Arabia, the Empire spiritually watched over the peninsula, and the Empire's greediness and ambitions were almost fulfilled. Ḥiǧāz, by its central position, stood as a great and huge obstacle in their way. Ḥiǧāz could also be very dangerous if used by a foreign power. The control of this area was a great task as it would replace the lost conjecture to reach the "Arabia Felix"

The invasion of Mecca by Abraha was dictated by this fact, as the motives for the invasion could not have been religious.⁵² The failure which accompanied the Ethiopian expedition, reminds one of the failure of Aelius Gallus six centuries before. The Empire lost forever her last hope with the failure of the expedition to Mecca. It was clear that the motives of Ethiopia, supported by the Empire, were not at all religious or even dealing with humanity, but was rather dictated and directed by imperial policy and formed the last chapter of the struggle which was compiled and composed in Byzantium and Axum. It also turned the page of wide spread propaganda concealed under the motto of saving Christianity.⁵³

The last threads of hope for which the Empire was looking attentively, were cut and lost when the aristocracy in the country revolted again and succeeded in overthrowing the former sovereignty. In 575, the Persians interfered in the field of struggle and helped the representative of the aristocracy throw off the Ethiopian yoke. Sayf b. Ḍī Yazan was appointed king of the entire country.⁵⁴

Soon, this national sovereign was subdued, the country again placed under a foreign yoke and her freedom lost for ever.

NOTES

1. *Cambridge Ancient History*, X., p. 880. Krammerer A: Essai sur l'histoire antique d'Abyssinie, Paris 1926, Ch. VII.
2. Ibn Haldūn: *Tārīḥ*, Cairo 1284 h. (1870) II. p. 52; Ibn Al-Aṭīr: *Al-Kāmīl*, Cairo 1290 h. (1873), I. p. 299.
3. Hitti, Ph.: *History of the Arabs*, London 1953, p. 79, Blachère, R: *Tārīḥ al-Adab al-^CArabī*, Damascus 1956, p. 52.
4. Pigoulevskaya, N.: *Les Arabes à la frontière de Byzance au IV^e siècle*, Moscow 1960, p.1; Dussaud, R: *Les Arabes en Syrie avant l'Islam*, Paris 1907, pp. 33–36; Blachère: op. cit., p. 58
5. Philby, H. B.: *Islamic Background*, London 1928, p. 114.
6. RES: *Répertoire d'epigraphie sémitique*, VI. p. 140, tēx no. 3383.
7. *Codex Theodosianus*, éd. Gothofred, LXII, t. XII. 2 vol. IV. p. 616.
8. *Le Muséon*, (1950) LXIII, 3–4, p. 270.
9. Philby: "Note on the last kings of Saba", in: *Le Muséon*, LXIII, 3–4, p. 269; Ryckman, G.: Inscription Sud-Arabes, in *Le Muséon*, XL, p. 445.
10. Philby, H: Arabian Highland, London 1953, p. 460; Glaser: "Zwei Inschriften über den Dammbbruch von Marib", in: *Mitteilungen der Vorderasiatisch-Ägyptischen Gesellschaft*, II. (1897) p. 372, and sep. p. 13.
11. Philby: Background, p. 143, Highland, p. 260; Ġawād 'Alī: *Tārīḥ al-^CArab qabl al-Islām*, Baghdad 1948, p. 161.
12. Ġawād 'Alī: op. cit. p. 160–161.
13. Ṭabarī: *Tārīḥ al-Rusul wal-Mulūk*, Cairo 1939, II. p. 105; Blachère: op. cit. p. 53.
14. The Qurān considers the people who committed this persecution as idolaters and the martyrs as believers, Sūra LXXXV; Ibn Al-Aṭīr: op. cit. I. pp. 186–189; Ber Hebraeus: *Tārīḥ Muhtaṣar al-Duwal*, Beirut 1958.
15. Ṭabarī: II. pp. 106–7.
16. Nordmann in: ZDMG, XLIV (1890) p. 176.
17. Ġawād 'Alī: op. cit, III., p. 170, ref: Winckler: *Alt Orient. Forsch.* IV (1895), p. 327.
18. Ġawād 'Alī: op.cit. III., pp. 170–1.
19. Procopius: *History of the Wars*, ed. Bewing, p. 189.
20. Margoliouth, D. S. : The relations between Arabs and Israelites prior to the rise of Islam, p. 62 ref, Philostorgius, III. p. 5.
21. Migne in: *Patrologia Graeca*, LXXXV, p. 211.

22. Margoliouth, *ibid*, p. 63.
23. Fell in: ZDMG, XXXV (1881) p. 49.
24. Ṭabarī, II. pp. 96, 98; Ibn Al-Atīr: I. p. 188.
25. Qurān, 83:4
26. Ṭabarī, II. p. 113; Ibn Al-Atīr: I. pp. 171, 190; Ibn Qutayba: *Kitāb al-ʿImāma wal-Siyāsa*, Cairo 1937, I. p. 311.
Yāqūt: *Muḥḥam*, Cairo 1906, V. art: Naḡrān
27. Ṭabarī, II. p. 101.
28. Hitti, *ibid*, p. 61; Blachère, *ibid*, pp. 53–55.
29. Hugh Scott: *The High Yemen, Cairo*, 1960 (Arabic) p. 211 ref: Philostorgius: *Historia Ecclesiastica*, III, art. 4.
30. Philostorgius: *Hist. Eccl.* II. art. 6; Kidd: *A history of the Church*, II. p. 161, III. p. 322.
31. Nordtmann, ZDMG, XXXI (1877) p. 65; Theodorus Lector: *Hist. Eccl.*, ed. Vasesius and Nicehorus Gallistus, II. p. 567.
32. Fell, ZDMG XXXV/1881, p. 50.
33. Hitti, *ibid*, p. 61; Blachère, *ibid*, p. 21; Chikhu: *Al-Nuṣṣānīya wa-ʿĀdābihā*, Beirut?. I. p. 66; Sachau Ed.: *Zur Ausbreitung des Christentums in Asien*, Berlin 1919, transcribed in Arabic, pp. 68–69.
35. *The Universal Jewish Encyclopedia*, I. p. 350.
36. Procopius, *op. cit.* I. Ch. XX, 1–3 / p. 189.
37. Theophanes: *Chronographie*, ed: Bonn, p. 548 ref. by Nordtmann, ZDMG XXXI (1877) pp. 66–67.
Theophanes and Cedrenus mentioned that the Ethiopians invaded Damianus for the second time during the 15th year of the reign of Justinianus because he attacked Byzantine traders.
38. Assemani: *Bibliothèque Orientale*, I. p. 359; Fell, XXXI, ZDMG, p. 19, Nordtmann, ZDMG, XXXI, p. 67.
39. *Bulletin of the Scientific Arab Academy of Damascus*, XXIII. Damascus 1948, I. pp. 9–17; Assemani, *ibid*, I. p. 364; Ber Hebraeus, *ibid*, p. 87; Agapius: *Kitāb al-ʿUnwān*, Paris 1910–14 in *Pat. Orien.* p. 185 and Beirut ed. 1958.
40. *Pat. Orien: Histoire Nestorienne*, I. p. 143., Ber Hebraeus, *ibid*, p. 87.; Agapius, *ibid*, p. 165.
41. Procopius, *ibid*, art. 9–13, Fell, ZDMG XXXV (1981) p. 34.
42. Ṭabarī, II. pp. 108, 114; Ibn Ḥaldūn, II. p. 61.

43. The late narration of Procopius mentioned by Fell in ZDMG (1881) p. 43.
44. Ṭabarī, II. pp. 108–114; Ibn Ḥaldūn, II. p. 61; Yāqūt, op. cit. art: Nağrān
45. see note n. 37.
46. This text was known as Glaser 618 and CIS 541.
47. He was called as "Abrah^catly Mlkn Ag^czyn Rmḥz Zbymn Mlk Sba' w D Rydn w Ḥḍrmt w Ymnt w 'A^crbhmw Ṭwdm w Thmt". "Abraha the deputy of the King of Ga^cz Ramḥaz Zibiyam, the king of Saba', Ḥaḍramūt, Dū Riydan, Yemen, The Arabs of the highland and in Tahāma. "
48. The chiefs of the tribes who joined the revolt and were mentioned in the text, were from the ancient ruling class. Ğawād^cAli, III. pp. 88–89
49. Glaser 618 lines 17–19
50. Glaser, *ibid.*, lines 88–93
51. Procopius, p. 181 ref. in Ğawād^cAli, III. p. 205.
52. Ṭabarī, II. p. 110; Ibn Ḥaldūn, II. p. 61; Ibn Al-Atīr, I. p. 177; Qurān, Sūra 105.
53. Margoliouth, *ibid.*, p. 64
54. see note no. 52.