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The period from 400 to 410 was the eye of Islam was a dangerous one for the Romano-British. The native Britons were no longer able to control theirdomain, and the Saxons were a constant threat. The Saxons had occupied the British isles for over a century, and their influence was felt throughout the region. The Britons were forced to rely on the Roman army for support, but the Romans were not willing to give it. The Saxons were a growing threat, and the Britons were forced to turn to the Saxons for help. This situation continued until the year 449, when the Saxons were defeated and the Britons were finally able to take control of their domain. The Saxons were a powerful enemy, and their defeat was a significant victory for the Britons. The victory was a turning point in the history of the Britons, and it marked the beginning of a new era of independence and prosperity.
Vandal king (110-6), who walked as a captive in Belisarius' triumphant procession in Constantinople. 

Like barbarian settlers elsewhere in the western empire, the Vandals were greatly outnumbered by the existing population. As the self-appointed chronicler of Catholic persecution by the Arian Vandals, Victor of Vita, who seems himself to have accompanied the Catholic clergy eulogized by Huneric, emphasizes the damage done by the invaders and the prosperity that had gone before. The unpopularity of the landowning class may have meant that the arrival of the Vandals was not unwelcome to some sections of the population,4 and the invaders were able to rely on Roman Africans such as Fulgentius, who was later to become bishop of Ruspe and a leader of the Catholic opposition, to maintain their administration. However, much of our literary evidence for the period comes from hostile Catholic churchmen, and the picture is necessarily mixed: moreover, direct Vandal influence was concentrated in the Proconsular province. As a consequence, the so-called arts Vandalsorum, the lands which they allocated to themselves and which represented a division between Vandals and Romans, by no means affected all Roman landowners.6

According to his biographer, although Fulgentius' grandfather had fled to Italy when the Vandals took Carthage, his father and uncle had succeeded in recovering the family estates near Thlepte in Byzaecena, and Fulgentius spent his early life managing the estates and holding the position of praefect. The Tabula Albina, wooden tablets on which are recorded in ink acts of sale from A.D. 491-6, demonstrate the continuance of late Roman landowning practice and indicate that new trees are being planted.11 While it is hard to find evidence of continuing curial patronage after the Vandal conquest, signs of continuity include attestations of a number of familiae perpetui and servillorii; even though Christian, the Roman elite continued to hold the traditional titles, whether the imperial cult had been appropriated by the Vandal kings, who called themselves magi, or whether the titles still carried an imperial connotation.12 A law of Hunicus (464) lists the Roman hierarchy in traditional terminology,13 while the Vandal kings used the mint of Carthage to issue coins with titulature and iconography deriving from imperial usage.14 By the end of the Vandal period, poets such as Luxorius and Florentius, whose poems survive in
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the Latin Anthology, were praising Vandal rule in a style reminiscent of imperial panegyric; there was clearly also some cultural and linguistic intermingling, even if on a limited scale.15 But life under such a regime was not easy: even if there was a semblance of continuity, the curial patronage so amply documented for the period before the Vandal conquest seems to have come to an abrupt end, and there are no public inscriptions from the Vandal period. When the Vandals employed Catholics in the royal palace, the Catholics found it politic to dress like Vandals,16 and the Roman poet Dracontius fell foul of Gunthamund and was imprisoned for it.17

The Catholic hierarchy, fresh from its recent harsh measures against the Donatists, soon itself experienced periods of persecution from the Arian Vandals. As a result, it developed a strong sense of identity, defined by opposition, which was to continue into the Byzantine period.18 Gesicenus had made the church a target at first with an eye to its wealth, but his successor Huneric went further and tried to enforce Arianism, calling a council reminiscent of the anti-Donatist Council of 411, and following it with a general edict against Catholics in 481 and 482.19 Gesicenus had left the see of Carthage vacant from 445 to 449, and again from 457 to 481, and forbade ordinations in Zegatina and Proconsular Africa. The extent to which Victor's evidence can be trusted in detail is uncertain, but the policy of persecution and exile continued under Gunthamund and Thrasamund, in whose reign Fulgentius of Ruspe became a leader of the bishops exiled to Sardinia and elsewhere. On their side, the Catholic hierarchy used pamphlets and propaganda to enhance their sense of living under a tyranny. A bishop's list with additional notations, known as the Notitia proconsularum et civitatum Africae, whose reliability has been doubted, gives the number of始于 the bishops attending the conference in 481, with their subsequent fates; most were allegedly exiled, either within Africa itself or in Corsica.20 Fulgentius, who had been exiled himself, later engaged in formal debate with Thrasamund on points of doctrine.21 The experience of harassment and exile served to strengthen the resolve of the bishops; at the end of the Vandal period a council held at Carthage in 115 under the more tolerant Hilderic was able to deal with issues internal to the Catholic church in Africa, and prepared some of the ground for the stand it was later to take against Justinian.22 More immediately, however, the Byzantine victory in 154 was accompanied by the public overthrown of Arianism and the reinstatement of the orthodox.
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The attempt to trace the impact of Vandal rule from the material remains yields ambiguous results, and certain developments are only visible in the fifth and sixth century, such as increased ecclesiastical building and signs of encroachment on traditional public spaces, are common to other areas in late antiquity. The evidence of the archaeological record is inevitably incomplete and often hard to interpret. At Carthage itself, some monuments may have been falling into disrepair or partly destroyed. Victor of Vita claims that the Vandals completely destroyed the odeon, the theatre, the temple of Memnon and the Via Caesarea, and some architectural confirmation has been found in the case of the circular monument near the odeon, the theatre, the Byrsa and to some extent also for the Theodosian wall, the circular harbour and the circus. The fifth and early sixth century have not yielded mosaic floors comparable with those of the fourth-century villas. But city life continued, the Vandals kings themselves engaging in building enterprises, and Vandal nobles possessed fine houses and suburban villas with gardens. Against Victor of Vita we may cite the fullest eulogy of Carthage and its buildings by Florus in the Latin Anthology. Church building also continued: the large basilica at Bir el Knisiba, Carthage, for example, which underwent substantial alterations in the late sixth century and was still flourishing in the seventh century, was built in the late Vandal period. Outside the cities, important recent evidence comes from archaeological surveys, notably for the central areas at Sbeitla and Kasserine, with important results also from Casisarea in Mauretania and the Libyan valleys; not all the final results are as yet published. These allow a far broader approach than before to North African agricultural systems — in particular, the effects of water installations; they do not suggest a sharp change in the Vandal period, which continued to benefit from the enormous growth in sedentarization in earlier periods, which brought with it economic growth on a major scale, and from the wealth of Roman Africa in the fourth century. Fortified forts or other small rural buildings, probably private in origin are a feature which was to develop further in the Byzantine period.

The understanding of the role played by Vandal Africa in general patterns of long-distance Mediterranean trade has been revolutionized in the last generation by the scientific study of African pottery (ARS, African red-slip ware) from this period, beginning with the fundamental work of John Hayes; similar results have been obtained using other evidence.

Map 12: The central provinces of Vandal and Byzantine Africa

— for instance, lamps. Far from being cut off from the rest of the Mediterranean, African exports continued throughout the period, and indeed up to the seventh century; interpretation of the evidence remains controversial, but while there is evidence of decline from the mid-sixth century, combined with a significant increase in imports of eastern amphorae to the west, the argument is one of scale. Geiser's aggressive policy against Italy cannot have helped the cause of African exports; yet ito evidence shows that at Leptis Magna, for example, production was continuous. Indeed, the ending of the annona at Rome, which had acted as a stimulus to African production but also deprived the province itself of much of the grain which it produced, may have hastened local resources during the Vandal period. It is not clear to what extent the level of long-distance exchange was affected by the substitution for Roman currency exports to North Africa of a local Vandal coinage and the continued use of fourth-century bronze.
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Western Africa. The study of Василий and Byzantine Africa of Roman Africa, has been an important aspect of the discipline of history, as it was studied by Cardew, and others. This is a continuing tradition of scholarship, and the study of Byzantine Africa has been a subject of interest for many years.

Byzantine Africa was linked to the Roman province of Numidia, and was a part of the Byzantine Empire. It was inhabited by various ethnic groups, including the Vandals, who eventually established a kingdom in the area.

The Byzantine conquest of Byzantine Africa was a significant event in the history of the region. The Vandals, under the leadership of their king, Genseric, launched a series of campaigns against the Byzantine Empire, culminating in the capture of Carthage, the capital of Byzantine Africa, in 533 AD. This event marked the end of the Byzantine Empire's control over the region.

The Byzantine Empire was a major player in the history of the region, and its influence can be seen in the development of the region's culture, politics, and economy. The study of Byzantine Africa is important for understanding the history of the region and its place in the larger context of the history of the Mediterranean world.
John Tolstoy in 1646, because of the Dutch war, restored quiet for a time, but the same sort of thing happened again in 1661. The
Africans, however, were not always as well equipped as the
Bantu, and so they were generally defeated by the Dutch.

The situation in the interior was not as peaceful. The
tribes were constantly at war with each other, and
sometimes with the Dutch. The most important of these
tribes were the Zulus, who lived in the south of the
country. They were a powerful people, and their chief,
Mahlombe, was very ambitious. He wanted to conquer all
the other tribes in the area.

The Dutch were not able to stop him, and so they
decided to make a treaty with him. Mahlombe agreed,
and in return the Dutch gave him the title of "King of the
Zulus". This treaty was signed in 1658, and it lasted for
about ten years.

During this period, the Dutch were able to extend their
colonies further south. However, the Zulus were not
happy with this, and they began to rebel. In 1664, a
battle took place between the Dutch and the Zulus at
the river Hottentots. The Dutch were defeated, and
many of them were killed. This was a blow to the
Dutch, and they were forced to withdraw from the area.

The Zulus were now in control of the region, and they
continued to expand their territory. They became very
powerful, and they were able to conquer many of the
other tribes in the area. They were known as the "King
of the Zulus" and were feared by all who knew them.

The Dutch were not able to reclaim the area, and so
they had to content themselves with their small colony
in the north. They continued to trade with the Zulus,
and they were able to maintain a good relationship with
them. However, the Zulus were always a threat, and
the Dutch were not able to completely overcome them.

In conclusion, the Dutch were able to establish a
presence in South Africa, but they were not able to
conquer all of the area. They were able to establish
a colony in the north, but they were unable to do the
same in the south. The Zulus were a powerful people,
and they were able to prevent the Dutch from
expanding further south. This was a blow to the
Dutch, and it marked the end of their attempt to
conquer the whole of South Africa.

Despite this, the Dutch were able to continue their
economic activities in the area, and they were able to
make a profit from the trade with the Zulus. However,
this was not enough to overcome the threat of the
Zulus, and the Dutch were forced to withdraw from
the area. This was a blow to the Dutch, and it marked
the end of their attempt to conquer the whole of
South Africa.
The Byzantine Conquest and Byzantine Africa

The Byzantine Empire, under Emperor Justinian I, sought to reclaim control over the territories in North Africa that had been lost to the Vandals under their king Genseric in the 5th century. This recovery effort was part of a broader strategy to secure the empire's borders and establish its authority throughout the Mediterranean. The evidence suggests that the Byzantines were motivated by a desire to protect trade routes, which were crucial for the empire's prosperity, and to assert its cultural and religious influence.

Justinian's campaign was significant for several reasons. Firstly, it was a testament to the military capabilities and administrative efficiency of the Byzantine state. Secondly, it reinforced the idea of the empire as a cultural and religious entity that spanned across different lands, including Africa. The empire's efforts to assimilate and integrate the local populations were also key factors in its success.

The Byzantine presence in North Africa was not just military; it had religious and cultural implications. The Church of Alexandria was a major center of Christian thought, and the Byzantine Empire sought to influence and assimilate the local church structures. This was part of a broader strategy to Christianize the region, which was seen as essential for maintaining the empire's moral and spiritual integrity.

The Byzantine conquest of North Africa had long-term consequences for the region. It led to the establishment of a new cultural and religious landscape, as well as changes in political and economic structures. The Byzantine influence was felt not just in the region but throughout the Mediterranean, shaping the course of history for centuries to come.
can be shed on particular aspects. The use of Greek and the presence of eastern officials, for example, are attested by their official seals, which survive even though the documents themselves have perished. Some Greek names appear among the funerary epitaphs, and eastern saints, who have already begun to feature in the North African evidence, become more numerous; there is evidence of the deposition of their reliquies at North African sites on a number of occasions in the sixth and seventh centuries, though we lack evidence of the cult of images which was now of growing importance in the east. The letters of Maximus, Confessor indicate the existence of a number of monasteries, apparently with monks and nuns of eastern origin. Other scraps of evidence from the late sixth century point to the continuing existence of Latin in monastic life, even if only to attest the carriage of manuscripts and the transplantation of monks from North Africa to Visigothic Spain. Justinian established a praetorian prefect for North Africa, with responsibility for seven governors in charge of Proconsularis, Byzacena, Tripolitania, Numidia, Maurerania Sufetula, Maurerania Caesariensis and Sardinia. Solomon, the first prefect, also held the military command, with five military duxes under him. Some of the territory assigned to the dux was more theoretical than real, but they were instructed to attempt to recover as much as possible of the former Roman areas that had been lost under the Vandals. The restoration of property taken by the Vandals was also decreed, including churches taken over by Arians; this led initially to discontent and even rebellion in the army, as we have seen. By the end of the century an exarch had replaced the magister militum, but there was still a praetorian prefect in addition in pope Gregory’s day. A major role of the new imperial administration was naturally to exact taxes from the provincials; this proved highly unpopular at first, but there is little evidence as to its later impact, and appeals made by African landowners in the later sixth century against Justinian’s relaxation of the law pertaining to adscripta show an equal concern with the continued availability of labour. There is equally little evidence for the survival or renewal of municipal and provincial organization; indeed, many cities are attested at Ammaedara, but references to local notables in general, as to the involvement of bishops with urban organization, suggest that towns were increasingly run by the combined influence of the bishop
the local patronage. A degree of local supervision evidently continued, both in relation to church building and decoration and to secular matters. This is evidenced by a corpus of dedicatory inscriptions on stone, much of it in Latin. The care and attention given to these inscriptions has been noted by Pococke and other scholars. The dedication of churches was a common practice in Christian Europe, and the inscriptions are a valuable source of information about the patrons and the dedication ceremonies.

The principal architects of the basilica complexes at Carthage and El Jem were probably either Carthaginian or Roman. The plan of the basilica at Carthage, for example, is similar to that of the basilica at Antioch in Syria. The rectangular plan with a central aisle and two side aisles was a common feature of Roman basilicas, and the use of the basilica as a model for ecclesiastical buildings was widespread in the Eastern Mediterranean.

The influence of the East on Carthage is also evident in the architecture of the basilica at El Jem. The basilica at El Jem has a similar plan to that of the basilica at Carthage, and the decoration of the church is also similar. The use of marble and other costly materials in the decoration of the church suggests that it was built for a wealthy patron, possibly a member of the local aristocracy.

The basilica at Carthage was probably built in the early 5th century AD, and the basilica at El Jem was probably built in the late 4th or early 5th century AD. Both churches were probably built for the local Christian community, and the dedication ceremonies would have been a significant event in the life of the church.

The dedication of churches was an important aspect of the life of the church, and the inscriptions on the dedicatory stones are a valuable source of information about the patrons and the dedication ceremonies. They also provide us with information about the local Christian community and the patronage of the churches.

The basilica at Carthage and the basilica at El Jem are examples of the influence of the East on Carthage, and the dedication of churches was an important aspect of the life of the church. The inscriptions on the dedicatory stones are a valuable source of information about the patrons and the dedication ceremonies, and they also provide us with information about the local Christian community and the patronage of the churches.
at Carthage where, as at other sites, it is accompanied by increasing numbers of burials within the city itself. Simpler changes can be observed, for example, at Serif.27

Carthage itself provides an instructive example, even though the archaeological evidence is concentrated in certain areas of the city, thus making a general view difficult. The new administration naturally undertook certain projects in the city, especially in the early years; thus, the Theodosian wall was repaired and a ditch dug there, and building work undertaken at the circular harbour, as well as the north side of the harbour and the island, although there is room for disagreement as to the fit between Procopius’ account at Buildings v.5.8–11 and the new archaeological evidence; as yet, the identification of his ‘maritime agora’, church of the Virgin and ‘Manastirakos’, described as a fortified monastery near the harbour, remains unclear, and the persuasiveness of his account partly depends on his claims as to the level of destruction or neglect in the Vandal period.53 Nevertheless, the Byzantines were clearly ready to invest, at least in Carthage, in urban construction that was not solely defensive or religious.54

Large urban dwellings were still in use during the sixth century, but several of those working in the UNESCO project, especially the University of Michigan and Canadian teams, have reported later subdivision and infilling within the city.55 While some of these developments have been ascribed to an influx of refugees from Egypt in the early seventh century, it is also clear that, irrespective of its particular circumstances as the political and administrative centre, the city of Carthage was experiencing the same changes that were happening on other urban sites.56

When the Arabs arrived in North Africa in the middle of the seventh century, they found a province still rich in oil and corn production. Corn was still going from Africa to Constantinople in the reign of Heraclius, although the state bread distribution there was formally ended in 644–45; the Persians took Egypt, the main source of grain for this purpose, in the following year.57 Goods were still being exported from North Africa to the eastern Mediterranean in the middle of the seventh century, but to a lesser extent than before;58 by the second half of the seventh century, imports to the province from the east, which had grown steadily by the end of the sixth century, now fell off dramatically.59 The explanations both for the growth of this extensive long-distance exchange involving North Africa and for its eventual decline, as for the role played by trade and the activities of large landowners, are as yet still unclear; within the space of two centuries African landowners had had to adjust, first, to Vandal occupation and with it the cessation of the grain annona and all that it meant in terms of production and costs, and then to a reconquest or ‘restoration’ of Roman government, with its centre at Constantinople rather than Rome—a restoration, moreover, which reimposed the land-tax and encouraged the development of an axis between North Africa and the eastern Mediterranean. After apparent success in the late sixth century, the province experienced a progressive reduction in the degree of Byzantine involvement, a process hastened by the Persian and Arab invasions of the eastern Mediterranean.60
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