

## *Introduction*

This introduction falls into two parts. First, we discuss the scope of this volume of Latin fragmentary historians and the methodology used to edit them. In the second and longer part of this introduction, we situate the works edited here in the context of later Latin historiography, with a particular interest in the genre and circulation of the texts, as well as their social and geographical context.

### **1 Scope**

This edition presents, in roughly chronological order, the fragments of Latin histories from the period AD 300–620, that is, works that are not preserved in the direct tradition but are cited by later authors. This material has never been edited before. The classic collection of Latin fragmentary historians by H. Peter sought to be comprehensive up to the reign of Constantine and included only three later authors.<sup>1</sup> The new standard collection of Roman historians by T. Cornell and his collaborators ends in the first half of the third century, and claims that with the fourth century a new chapter in the history of Latin historiography begins.<sup>2</sup> Albeit traditional,<sup>3</sup> this claim does not survive close scrutiny and this collection makes available material that will give us a more nuanced view of Latin historiography in Late Antiquity.<sup>4</sup>

Any collection of this kind needs to make choices regarding selection. The selection in this collection has been guided by four principles.

<sup>1</sup> HRR. He includes Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3), Naucellius (FHistLA 6), and Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14).

<sup>2</sup> Cornell 2013, I, 10: 'The historiography that resumed in the fourth century represents the start of a new era, differing radically from what preceded, above all the rise of Christian historical writing.'

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Marincola 2007.

<sup>4</sup> See the conclusion to this introduction.

First, we collect fragmentary works in the sense defined above, which is indebted to the seminal work of F. Jacoby on Greek fragmentary historians (FGrHist): we gather works that are explicitly attested in later authors as having been written, but that are not preserved in the manuscript tradition. This excludes three types of works that are sometimes also called fragmentary in a less technical sense of the word: hypothetical works, partial works, and projected works. *Hypothetical* works, such as the *Enmannsche Kaisergeschichte*, are those that have been reconstructed by modern scholars without ever having been identified as a distinct work in the ancient tradition.<sup>5</sup> Even if scholarship in this case largely agrees on its existence, such *Quellenforschung* must always remain hypothetical, and cannot be treated in the same way as fragmentary works, which have a stronger claim to existence. *Partial* works are, as the name implies, partially preserved in the manuscript tradition. Ammianus Marcellinus would be a case in point, but chronicles are also regularly preserved in this way.<sup>6</sup> Such works have usually received editions and discussion. Finally, *projected* works are works that an author intended to write or was asked to write without there being any indication whether the design was ever actually executed.<sup>7</sup>

Second, we seek to avoid any overlap with other major collections available. We do not include authors who might date to after 300 but have already been discussed in FRHist.<sup>8</sup> The pseudonymous authors of the biographies of the *Historia Augusta*, for example, have been discussed there, and we shall not repeat those conversations here. As R. Burgess and M. Kulikowski are currently preparing an edition of all Latin chronicles from Late Antiquity,<sup>9</sup> we have also excluded chronicles.<sup>10</sup>

<sup>5</sup> Enmann 1884; CHAP s.v.

<sup>6</sup> Two examples are the *Continuation of Marcellinus Comes* (CHAP s.v.) and the *Chronicle of 565* (Dumville 1973; CHAP s.v.).

<sup>7</sup> E.g. the ecclesiastical history of Jerome (Jerome, *Life of Malchus* 1; CHAP s.v.); the history of Ausonius (*Discourse of thanksgiving* 2; CHAP s.v.); the history of Sidonius Apollinaris (*Letter* 4.22; CHAP s.v.). It is uncertain whether or not Protadius (FHistLA 5) and the anonymous historian of Rome (FHistLA 7) actually finished their works as the fragments only attest that they were busy writing. But at least they had moved beyond mere intention.

<sup>8</sup> Only two authors would qualify: Rubellius Blandus (FRHist 108) and Bruttius (FRHist 98), who could date to the early fourth century. We make one exception for Bruttius (FHistLA 21), where we offer a more complete edition of the fragments than Cornell and a different interpretation.

<sup>9</sup> Burgess and Kulikowski 2013a is the introductory volume. Note that the team of Bruno Bleckmann and Markus Stein plans an edition and German translation of some of the works edited here: <http://www.geschichte.hhu.de/lehrstuehle/alte-geschichte/unsere-forschung/kleine-und-fragmentarische-historiker-der-spaetantike-kfhist.html>.

<sup>10</sup> See further below pp. 11–13.

Third, we exclude texts that belong to other genres.<sup>11</sup> This is particularly relevant in two instances. In line with our predecessors we have excluded poetical works that dealt with historical subjects. Poetry and prose histories followed different generic conventions, even if it could be said that Lucan was more an historian than a poet.<sup>12</sup> Contrary to our predecessors we also exclude biography. This is a genre that in Antiquity could be situated within or outside of historiography and one that, in the guise of Christian hagiography, flourished in Late Antiquity. As research tools for and extensive scholarship on Latin hagiography already exist, we have decided to leave biography out.<sup>13</sup>

Finally, we have excluded the putative sources used by Nennius, *History of the Britons* – a work dated to the ninth to eleventh century.<sup>14</sup> It contains references to the *Books of the elders*,<sup>15</sup> the *Annals of the Romans*,<sup>16</sup> the *Annals of the Scots*,<sup>17</sup> and the *Annals of the Saxons*.<sup>18</sup> Much is uncertain about Nennius, and hence also about the sources he claims to have used. If the references are to real texts, there is a theoretical possibility that some might fall within the temporal limits of this volume, even if a date before 620 would be remarkably early.<sup>19</sup> Given these uncertainties, we have opted not to include these works.

The material we have excluded obviously needs to be taken into account when writing the history of later Latin historiography, and, in fact, it can be easily accessed in the *Clavis Historicorum Antiquitatis Posterioris* (CHAP). We shall refer to works left aside in this edition later

<sup>11</sup> On genre, see below p. 7–13 and, more extensively, the introduction to Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof 2020a.

<sup>12</sup> Jordanes, *Getica* 43 with Kimmerle 2013. This means that we exclude the following works: the epic on Magnentius attributed to Proba (CHAP s.v.), which is, in fact, most likely spurious (Schottenius Cullhed 2015, 114–17); Ausonius, *On usurpers* and *On pre-Roman kings* (Green 1991, 720; CHAP s.v.); the portraits of contemporaries by Avianius Symmachus (Symmachus, *Letter* 1.2–4; CHAP s.v.); the paraphrase of Livy attributed to Avienus, which is, in any case, spurious (Servius, *On Aeneid* 10,388; Murgia 1970; CHAP s.v.); and the paraphrase of Suetonius by Paulinus of Nola (Ausonius, *Letter* 23; CHAP s.v.).

<sup>13</sup> See esp. BHL. Some examples of fragmentary Latin biography include: Severus Acilius, presumably an autobiography from a Christian perspective (Jerome, *On illustrious men* 111; Schmidt, in Herzog 1989, 211; CHAP s.v.); Petronius, *Historia monachorum* (Gennadius, *On illustrious men* 42; CHAP s.v.); Jordanes, *Life of Boethius* (possibly spurious; CHAP s.v.). See also the works of Avianius Symmachus and Paulinus of Nola in the previous n.

<sup>14</sup> Dumville 1975–6; Morris 1978; CHAP s.v.

<sup>15</sup> Nennius, *Historia Brittonum* pr., 17–18, 27; CHAP s.v.

<sup>16</sup> Nennius, *Historia Brittonum* pr., 10; CHAP s.v.

<sup>17</sup> Nennius, *Historia Brittonum* pr., 12–15; CHAP s.v.

<sup>18</sup> Nennius, *Historia Brittonum* pr., 57–61; CHAP s.v.

<sup>19</sup> Note also that here we might be dealing with chronicles. Mommsen 1898, 143 suggests that the *Annals of the Romans* is in fact the chronicle of Jerome.

in this introduction, when we situate the fragmentary texts in the wider context of late ancient historiography.

## 2 Methodology

For the edition of the fragments, we rely on the best available edition of the citing authorities, signalling relevant variant readings. Delimitation of fragments is difficult at the best of times, and we try to give sufficient content to allow the reader to understand the context in which the fragment appears. In contrast to other collections of this type, such as FGrHist and FRHist, we have not tried to indicate what part of the fragment may reflect what the lost historian actually said and what part derives from the citing authority. Even if in some cases this may be clear from the text itself, it is a well-known fact that even seemingly literal quotations may have been altered by the citing authority. At any rate, we discuss the delimitation of the fragment in the commentary.

Regarding the selection of fragments, we follow the habitual rules as used in the study of classical fragmentary historians and most rigorously set out by F. Jacoby for his collection of Greek fragmentary historians. In his view, a collection of fragments should display what the ancient and medieval tradition reports. As a consequence, it only includes fragments that are explicitly attributed to a particular author or work. In other words, we do not include fragments that have been attributed to particular works on the basis of modern *Quellenforschung*, that is, modern hypothetical reconstructions of the relationship between various texts. Indeed, Jacoby was adamant that one should clearly distinguish collecting fragments from reconstructing a lost work.<sup>20</sup> The former task allows us to see precisely what tradition attributed to the lost text and thus provides a relatively certain basis for understanding the work. It shows, as Jacoby said, what we can know and what we cannot know. Reconstructions of lost works, on the other hand, are necessarily hypothetical, as they fill in the blanks that fragments leave, a fact that the user of a collection of fragmentary authors should be able to see clearly in order to form his or her own judgement. Indeed, Jacoby established his rules to protect scholars from themselves: the certainty of results reached through *Quellenforschung* ‘is usually

<sup>20</sup> Jacoby 1923, vi. Note also the warning of Barnes 1970, 268 against attaching names to anonymous sources reconstructed by *Quellenforschung*.

overestimated'.<sup>21</sup> The principles just formulated are self-evident in classical scholarship,<sup>22</sup> but, as if Late Antiquity really were a different field, they are rarely adopted in studies of fragmentary historians from this period. Indeed, some late antique scholarship still conflates collecting fragments, *Quellenforschung*, and reconstruction of the work.<sup>23</sup> We hope this volume will demonstrate the profit to be gained from adopting Jacoby's principles. This does not mean that *Quellenforschung* cannot be a worthwhile pursuit, but one should be aware of the limits of what it can show. In one minor aspect we deviate from Jacoby's counsel. He separates fragments attributed to specific books of a lost history from those only attributed to the work in general. In this volume, this rule would only apply to Sulpicius Alexander (FHistLA 9) and Frigeridus (FHistLA 10), the only cases for which we have fragments that have book numbers as well as fragments that do not,

<sup>21</sup> Jacoby 1926, vi–vii: 'es ist doch eine banale wahrheit, daß in der mehrzahl der fälle die tradition, wie sie von den primären autoren geformt ist, bis sie zu den uns erhaltenen kompilationen gelangt, durch eine reihe von händen gegangen ist und zahlreiche, kleine oder große, tiefgehende oder oberflächliche veränderungen erfahren hat. die aufnahme unter bestimmtem namen ist nicht möglich, und noch weniger kurze hinweise im anhang oder in einem besonderen apparat zu den einzelnen büchern und fragmenten, ohne daß sicheres mit allen graden von unsicherem gemischt und der benutzer, der schon im allgemeinen nur zu geneigt ist, solche sammlungen als autoritativ anzusehen, getäuscht wird über das maß dessen, was wir wissen und wissen können. ich kann hier nicht auf die methodischen fragen nach art und berechtigung unserer üblichen quellenkritik und dem nach der lage der sache jeweilig erreichbaren grad von sicherheit ihrer resultate eingehen. aber das glaube ich behaupten zu dürfen: diese sicherheit wird meist überschätzt.'

<sup>22</sup> Cornell 2013, I, 15–16 does not even feel the need to articulate them.

<sup>23</sup> Roberto 2005 and Mariev 2008 offer two fundamentally different editions of the fragments of John of Antioch, each reproducing one side of the nineteenth-century debate: see Van Nuffelen 2012b. The response made in Mariev 2016 is inadequate, arguing that Jacoby's principles cannot be applied to Byzantine texts, apparently ignoring the fact that many of the lost classical Greek historians are known from Byzantine sources. Moreover, contrary to what Mariev claims, the *Excerpta Constantiniana*, our main source for John of Antioch, do distinguish between John Malalas and John of Antioch, thus allowing the listing of nominally ascribed fragments. Equally problematic are Hoyland's edition of Theophilus of Edessa (Hoyland 2011, with the criticism in Conterno 2014 and in the chapters by Conterno and Debié in Jankowiak and Montinaro 2015; in the same volume, Hoyland offers somewhat of a *retractatio*) and that of the church historian Gelasius of Caesarea (Wallraff et al. 2018, on which see Van Nuffelen 2019). Treadgold 2007 *passim* freely identifies 'fragments' of lost authors like Candidus on the basis of tendencies in later sources that seem to fit the tendency of the lost author. The series *Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike* directed by B. Bleckmann and M. Stein (Düsseldorf) also edits hypothetical works, such as the so-called *Fastenquelle* of Socrates (Becker et al. 2016) and the *Ennmannsche Kaisergeschichte*. The *Kaisergeschichte* is one of the few hypothetical sources whose existence scholars generally accept, but there is a significant variety in the reconstructions (CHAP s.v.) There is, we would argue, a need for a methodological consensus when dealing with late antique fragmentary historians. Since there is no meaningful difference in transmission between classical and late antique historians, it is hard to see why late antique scholars should not adopt the consensus of classical scholars, which has led to proven results.

and in those cases a strong case can be made that Gregory of Tours transmits the fragments in the order they appeared in the lost works.

In line with Jacoby's guidance, the aim of this collection is to give the reader a clear sense of what we know and what we do not know. Our starting point is to understand the fragments correctly: as the reader will notice, we argue that many reconstructions of the works in this collection are based on mistaken or questionable interpretations of the Latin. No amount of circumstantial evidence can force the meaning of a text. If there is a logical, coherent, and grammatically correct interpretation of the text, it must take priority over circumstantial arguments. We then bring together the information the fragments provide in order to make clear to the reader the parameters within which a possible reconstruction of the work has to situate itself. Only then will we offer a reconstruction that we think most likely. Scholars have claimed a great afterlife for some of the authors edited in this collection, detecting their influence in a vast array of texts through *Quellenforschung*. This is especially the case for Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3) and Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14). We do not follow these hypotheses in our reconstruction, but discuss them in a separate section. In each case, it becomes clear that Jacoby's prudence is warranted. The case of Cassiodorus (FHistLA 17) may help us to see why. We have the full text of the *Getica* of Jordanes, which explicitly claims to have summarized the *History of the Goths* of Cassiodorus. Yet it is extremely difficult to identify unquestionably Cassiodorean material in the *Getica*. A fortiori, in cases where there is a whole set of intermediaries, this becomes even more difficult.<sup>24</sup> In sum, this volume distinguishes the certain and the possible from the hypothetical. This is the precondition for making progress with this material, and we hope that this collection will spur wider interest in later Latin historiography.

The entries are headed by the name of the author and the English title of the work: e.g. Carminius, *On Italy*. After a discussion of the person and general features of the work, fragments are presented, preceded by a Latin title. We can rarely be certain that the fragments and testimonia give us the original title: in doubtful cases we add a question mark. The commentary on the fragments is mainly focused on historiographical issues and less on historical ones. We offer elucidations regarding *realia* mentioned in the fragments mainly through notes to the translation, whilst the commentary on each fragment seeks to spell out how it informs us about the lost work.

<sup>24</sup> See, again, the quotation from Jacoby in n. 21.

When both interact (as in Frigeridus FHistLA 10 Fr1, where the dating of events impacts on our understanding of his position in the historiographical tradition), the issue is discussed in the commentary.

### 3 Genre

Relying on explicit statements by late antique writers<sup>25</sup> and on recurring formal features of the works themselves, late ancient historiography can be divided into four main genres: secular history, ecclesiastical history, sacred history, and chronicles.<sup>26</sup> As for biography, ancient authors rank it with historiography, but also differentiate both types of text.<sup>27</sup> Here we do not consider biography further as it does not fall within the scope of this collection. The aim of this section is to examine how the fragmentary works in this collection relate to these genres and their development.

Secular history comprises all works that stand in continuity with narrative Latin historiography of the Empire.<sup>28</sup> Whilst grand-scale histories of contemporary events, like those of Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus, are the paradigmatic form to ancient and modern minds,<sup>29</sup> the genre was much more varied. In the material edited for this collection, we observe several clusters of material.

The first cluster consists of histories with a geographically limited focus. Two of these have an explicit interest in the distant past and have therefore been called ‘antiquarian history’. The anonymous *On the origins of Padua* (FHistLA 2) explains a passage from Vergil and is also cited to that effect. Carminius was a grammarian and gathered religious traditions from Italy (FHistLA 1). If both are late antique, they would date to the first half or middle of the fourth century. Whilst they are obviously related to Rome, they do not focus explicitly on Rome itself: the anonymous author wrote about Padua and Carminius about Italy with, so it seems, a particular interest in nations other than the Romans. This finds an interesting parallel in the work Protadius planned to write about Gaul (FHistLA 5): relying on Roman sources like Caesar, it was bound to be a Roman history, but

<sup>25</sup> Sulpicius Severus, *Chronicle* pr.1–4; Cassiodorus, *Institutions* 1.17; Evagrius Scholasticus, *Ecclesiastical history* 5.24. See also Sidonius Apollinaris, *Letter* 4.22.

<sup>26</sup> For a full justification of this division and reflections on a flexible use of the concept of genre, see Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof, Introduction, in Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof 2020a.

<sup>27</sup> See Stadter 2007 for an overview and Van Nuffelen 2017 on the relation between both in the *Historia Augusta*.

<sup>28</sup> For a justification of the term ‘secular’, see Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof 2020a, XXV–XXVI.

<sup>29</sup> An eloquent statement of this fact can be seen in Sidonius Apollinaris, *Letter* 4.22. See below p. 25 on Ammianus Marcellinus as the ‘last’ Latin historian.

of a particular region. Such a local focus is not attested in preserved works and only seems to recur at the end of the period with works written from the perspective of particular kingdoms.<sup>30</sup>

A second cluster consists of histories of Rome that cover a wide time span. The *breviarium* has often been claimed to be the paradigmatic type of Latin historiography in the fourth century,<sup>31</sup> an impression generated by the preservation of Eutropius, Festus, Aurelius Victor, and the anonymous *Epitome de Caesaribus*.<sup>32</sup> In this collection, we encounter a number of works that display similarities with these histories. The anonymous historian of Rome (FHistLA 7) composed a history of Rome; Naucellius (FHistLA 6) translated a Greek book on the early history of Rome; and the work of Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3) is considered to be a history of Republican and/or Imperial Rome. If these date to the fourth century, the history of Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14) from the end of the fifth or early sixth century fits the pattern, as well, as does the sixth-century history of Marcellinus Comes (FHistLA 16). That of Maximian of Ravenna (FHistLA 15) certainly ran up to his own day, but its starting point is unclear. It is also possible that the history of Frigeridus (FHistLA 10) more closely resembled the *Epitome de Caesaribus* than the *Res gestae* of Ammianus Marcellinus. If the term *breviarium* still suggests a fundamentally derivative nature, it must be underscored that all four extant works covered contemporary history, as well, as Frigeridus certainly did. At any rate, this overview suggests that the dominant model of later Latin historiography was a work that covered a long time span of Roman history: even Ammianus, who started where Tacitus had left off, conforms in some way to that model. Works that focused only on contemporary events are rare. One exception may be Sulpicius Alexander (FHistLA 9), who is usually taken to be a successor of Ammianus and said to cover events from 378 until 395. But his extant fragments cover only events from 388 until 393, with the first fragment derived from book 3: we could also imagine a work on the lines of that of the Greek historian Zosimus (c. 500), whose first books quickly cover the rise of Rome and the history of the Empire

<sup>30</sup> See below pp. 9–10.

<sup>31</sup> For later Latin historiography, Marincola 2007 has chapters only on Ammianus Marcellinus and the epitomizing tradition (Banchich 2007). *Breviaria* were often supposed to indicate a decline in learning. See the memorable phrase of Syme 1968, 105: ‘Who would otherwise have written, who would read them?’ Cf. Momigliano 1963, 85–6; den Boer 1972, 10; Schmidt 1988, 94; Brunt 1980; Bird 1984, 71–2; Sehlmeier 2009, 140–212. The idea has been refuted often enough: G. Kelly 2010; Sánchez Vendramini 2012.

<sup>32</sup> One could also add the *Histories* of Orosius.



before the coverage expands when narrating the fourth century. Frigeridus (FHistLA 10) is similarly taken to be a successor of Sulpicius and an historian of exclusively contemporary events, but the high number of books (at least 12) and the rapid pace of his narration suggest either that the work consisted of short books or covered a substantial time span. The works written under the successor kingdoms mirror the common practice of historians covering a large chunk of Roman history. The *History of the Goths* of Cassiodorus (FHistLA 17) covered the past of the Goths from their distant origins until the reign of Theoderic. Other works took the establishment of the current rulers as a starting point and narrated from there until their authors' own times: Secundus of Trent (FHistLA 19) seems to have started with the arrival of the Langobards in Italy, whilst Maximus of Zaragoza (FHistLA 20) may have started when the Visigoths settled in Spain. The evidence for Roterius (FHistLA 18) is too meagre and problematic to allow conclusions. Still, by starting with the establishment of a particular kingdom, these later historians by and large conform to the pattern observed for earlier historians of Rome, who covered the whole of the history of Rome or chose a constitutional change as a starting point.

A third cluster within secular historiography has already been described: histories that focus on particular successor kingdoms.<sup>33</sup> Usually, such histories were written from within the kingdom they dealt with (Cassiodorus, Secundus of Trent, Roterius, Maximus of Zaragoza), but the earliest preserved example, the *Getica* of Jordanes, is an exception to the rule, for it was written in Constantinople by someone who had served in the Roman army.<sup>34</sup> This shows how the tradition of historiography transplanted itself into new political surroundings.

Finally, there is a group of works about which we know too little to be able to classify them (Favius (FHistLA 11), Consentius (FHistLA 12), and Ablabius (FHistLA 13)). In each case, there is doubt as to whether they even deserve a place in this collection, but if they do, they would be classified as secular histories.

The second major genre, ecclesiastical historiography, is a rare bird in later Latin historiography. Within the time frame of this volume, only two instances can be cited, each modelled on a Greek work. In 402–3 Rufinus of Aquileia translated the *Ecclesiastical history* of Eusebius of Caesarea

<sup>33</sup> This is what medievalists call national histories and *origo* writing: Wolfram 2003a; Pizarro 2003; Plassmann 2009, 2016. We do not adopt such a usage: see Coumert 2007; Van Nuffelen and Van Hoof 2020a, XXXVI; Pohl 2020.

<sup>34</sup> Cf. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017 and 2020.

and continued it until the reign of Theodosius I (379–95). Around 545, Cassiodorus modelled his *Historia tripartita*, containing translated extracts from the Greek church historians Socrates, Sozomen, and Theodoret, on a similar work by Theodore Lector, composed c. 518.<sup>35</sup> The only ecclesiastical history with no direct link to the East is that of Bede, composed in 731.<sup>36</sup> Each of these works is formally distinct from the others, illustrating that there was no clear tradition of writing ecclesiastical history in the West. The reasons why ecclesiastical history did not take off in the West are difficult to determine. Lack of literary authority may have played a role. Jerome's translation of Eusebius' chronicle became the point of reference for most of the Latin chronicle tradition, with almost all of them continuing his work or his continuators.<sup>37</sup> Jerome also planned to compose an ecclesiastical history,<sup>38</sup> but this work never eventuated, and one is left wondering if it would have had the same impact on later historiography as his chronicle. It has also been suggested that the See of Rome sought to legitimize its dominant position in the West by focusing on its foundation by St Peter and was therefore reluctant to submit itself to a historical narrative that could illustrate how Rome had changed its position in the past. Instead, the history of the See of Rome was the *Liber pontificalis*, a series of biographies of its bishops, showing how they preserved (or occasionally did not preserve) the Petrine heritage.<sup>39</sup> Thus, the ecclesiastical centre did not promote historiography as a favoured genre either. More broadly, it is clear that besides chronicle writing, the preferred literary medium for Christians to write about the past was biography, as the flowering of hagiography in this period illustrates. Whilst in Greek we see ecclesiastical histories often taking positions in doctrinal disputes, with evidence for church histories being written by all sides,<sup>40</sup> there is little evidence for such a role in the West – even though there are good reasons to believe that Cassiodorus' *Historia tripartita* wished to make a statement about Justinian's church policy and the condemnation of the Three Chapters.<sup>41</sup> For example, Donatism, which was the longest-lasting schism in the West

<sup>35</sup> For the date of Cassiodorus, see Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017, 287.

<sup>36</sup> Note that in the ninth century, Anastasius the Librarian planned to write an ecclesiastical history for which he drew on Greek sources: see CHAP s.v. Around 800, a scribe at Lorsch called a compilation of Gregory of Tours and Pseudo-Fredegair *historia ecclesiastica*: Reimitz 2015b.

<sup>37</sup> Burgess and Kulikowski 2013a, 126–31.

<sup>38</sup> Jerome, *Life of Malchus* 1.

<sup>39</sup> Kany 2007, 576; Blaudeau 2016, 129.

<sup>40</sup> Van Nuffelen 2018a.

<sup>41</sup> As was noticed by Gregory the Great, *Letter* 7.31; Beatrice 2001b, 255–6; Delacenserie 2016; Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen 2017, 287.