

Lieve Van Hoof/Peter Van Nuffelen (eds.): *The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity (AD 300–620)*. Edition, Translation and Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2020. X, 332 p. £ 89.99/\$ 115.00. ISBN: 978-1-108-42027-3.

Arnaldo Momigliano's oft-cited description of Ammianus Marcellinus as "the lonely historian" – based both on deductions about the literary character and models of Ammianus' history, and on the historian's representation of himself as intellectually isolated – has now effectively become a cliché.¹ Nevertheless, it encapsulates rather well a conventionally bleak impression of the apparently meagre state of Latin historiography after Tacitus, which compares unfavourably with a rich and vibrant tradition in Greek (as the authors of this volume note at pp. 26–27). That much more Latin historiography once existed than survives (and we should note that not even the celebrated narratives of Sallust, Livy, or Tacitus have come down to us complete) has long been clear enough from the materials assembled in Hermann Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*.² Yet that work did not extend much beyond the third century, underscoring the impression of Ammianus' isolation. Well-worn paths in late-antique scholarship did much to leave an unfavourable impression of such other Latin historical narratives as did survive: the tenuous survival of Ammianus' text has been contrasted with the rich manuscript tradition for Orosius' explicitly Christian history as "an embarrassment to the profession,"³ while the profusion of chronicles and annalistic works (in Greek as well as Latin) memorably provoked the dismay of no less a figure than Arnold H. M. Jones, who derided such works as "bald", "meagre," and "childish."⁴

Lieve Van Hoof and Peter Van Nuffelen have been at the forefront of recent reappraisals of the historical writings of Late Antiquity, above all by leading the "Late Antique Historiography" project at the Universiteit Gent. That has

- 1 A. Momigliano: *The Lonely Historian Ammianus Marcellinus*. In: *ASNP* ser. 3, 4, 1974, pp. 1393–1407.
- 2 H. Peter (ed.): *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*. Vol. 1. Leipzig 1870; second edition Leipzig 1914; and vol. 2. Leipzig 1906.
- 3 J. Matthews: *The Roman Empire of Ammianus*. London 1989, p. 6 (cf. the index entry in the same volume, p. 597, glossing Orosius as an "alleged historian").
- 4 A. H. M. Jones: *The Later Roman Empire: A Social, Economic, and Administrative Survey, AD 284–602*. Vol. 1. Oxford 1964, pp. 217, 238, 267.

aimed to reconsider historiography in its widest sense across the period 300–800, examining works in “Latin, Greek, Syriac, Armenian, Georgian, Arabic, Coptic and, to a lesser extent, Hebrew, Aramaic and Middle-Persian.”⁵ The project website includes an online database, the *Clavis Historicorum Antiquitatis Posterioris* (CHAP), of which a print version is set to appear in due course.⁶ Extant Latin narratives have loomed large in their work, with particular attention paid to authors whose works have traditionally been regarded as derivative or inferior in various ways: an important monograph by Van Nuffelen on Orosius sought to reassess that much maligned author,⁷ while Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen together have produced a translation, accompanied by detailed introduction and commentary, of both the much studied *Getica* and comparatively ignored *Romana* of the sixth-century author Jordanes.⁸

It is from these various threads of their project that the volume under consideration here has emerged. It compiles the *testimonia* for and fragments of twenty identifiable Latin historians from the early fourth century to the early seventh; they are catalogued as “Fragmentary Histories of Late Antiquity”, abbreviated as FHistLA (for ease of reference, I adopt this convention here; see also the table at the end of this review for a conspectus of the volume’s contents). Each entry, headed by a lemma giving the name of the author and

- 5 The project home page is <https://www.late-antique-historiography.ugent.be/> (accessed 2 February 2023). By way of disclaimer I should clarify that I have contributed to the project’s publications: M. Humphries: *Narrative and Space in Christian Chronography. John of Biclaro on East, West, and Orthodoxy*. In: P. Van Nuffelen (ed.): *Historiography and Space in Late Antiquity*. Cambridge 2019, pp. 86–112. I am also an editor of the series in which Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen’s translation of Jordanes (see n. 8) appeared.
- 6 P. Van Nuffelen/L. Van Hoof (eds.): *Clavis Historicorum Antiquitatis Posterioris*: <https://www.late-antique-historiography.ugent.be/database/> (accessed 2 February 2023).
- 7 P. Van Nuffelen: *Orosius and the Rhetoric of History*. Oxford 2012 (Oxford Early Christian Studies). Since then, similarly sympathetic approaches have been demonstrated in (e.g.) M. Gassman: *The Roman Kings in Orosius’ Historiae Adversus Paganos*. In: *CQ* 67, 2017, pp. 617–630; and V. Leonard: *In Defiance of History. Orosius and the Unimproved Past*. Abingdon/New York 2022.
- 8 *Jordanes: Romana and Getica*. Translated with an Introduction and Notes by P. Van Nuffelen and L. Van Hoof. Liverpool 2020 (Translated Texts for Historians 75); also L. Van Hoof/P. Van Nuffelen: *The Historiography of Crisis: Jordanes, Cassiodorus and Justinian in mid sixth-century Constantinople*. In: *JRS* 107, 2017, pp. 1–26.

a probable name for their historical work (often very speculative), comprises an introduction, and texts and translations of the relevant testimonies and fragments accompanied by commentary. Those commentaries are frequently very detailed: for instance, the six lines of the first fragment of Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus (FHistLA 10, pp. 99–130) receives six pages of commentary (pp. 104–110). In addition, the entries are supplemented for some authors by discussions of additional points of particular interest to them, such as the *Nachleben* of Ablabius (FHistLA 13, pp. 137–145) among late medieval humanists (p. 145). In addition to its twenty probable or possible historians, the volume also discusses three *Spuria et Dubia* (FHistLA 21–23): works by authors previously assumed to be historians but whom Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen categorise as writing in other genres.⁹ The authors plan a further volume, assembling “fragmentary Greek chronicles” (p. IX).

The volume supplements a number of established or recent works. For Latin historiography, it extends beyond the third century the coverage of both Peter and its much needed replacement, completed a decade ago under the general editorship of Tim Cornell.¹⁰ It also offers a Latin counterbalance to the classic studies of Roger C. Blockley on Greek historians of Late Antiquity.¹¹ It takes, however, a much wider view of historiography than Blockley, whose volumes focused on authors writing “classicising” narratives of recent (if not always contemporary) history focused on the Roman Empire (Euna-

9 These are: Bruttius (FHistLA 21, pp. 250–261), previously assumed to have written a historical account that covered a persecution under Domitian, but Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen show there is no reason why the work should have been a historical narrative; Latinus Alcimus Alethius Rhetor (FHistLA 22, pp. 262–263), mentioned by Jerome and Ausonius, and most likely a panegyrist; and Tyconius (FHistLA 23, pp. 264–267), an African writing c. 400 mentioned in Gennadius, whose description leaves considerable doubt as to whether Tyconius’ works were in any way historical.

10 For the desirability of a revision of Peter’s work, see J. W. Rich: Earlier editions. In: T. J. Cornell (ed.): *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* [= FRHist]. Vol. 1: Introduction. Oxford 2013, pp. 4–7, esp. pp. 5–6. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen consider their relationship to Peter and Cornell (and to other works, such as those of Richard W. Burgess and Michael Kulikowski, as well as Bruno Bleckmann, on chronicles) at pp. 1–2; they also offer their own edition of Bruttius (FHistLA 21) to supplement that found in FRHist 98, since the latter does not include the Armenian and Syriac attestations of Bruttius’ work.

11 R. C. Blockley (ed.): *The Fragmentary Classicising Historians of the Later Roman Empire*. Eunapius, Olympiodorus, Priscus and Malchus. 2 vols. Liverpool 1981–1983 (Arca. Classical and Medieval Texts, Papers and Monographs 6/10).

pius of Sardis, Olympiodorus of Thebes, Priscus of Panium, Malchus of Philadelphia, Candidus the Isaurian, and Menander Protector). Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen, by contrast, include a wider variety of genres. Of the twenty authors they present, only Sulpicius Alexander (FHistLA 9, pp. 81–98), Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus (FHistLA 10, pp. 99–130), and Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14, pp. 146–165) can with any degree of certainty be said to have written secular historical narratives of imperial history. Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen warn us, however, that none of these authors should be seen as successors of Ammianus in the same way as Ammianus is conventionally regarded as a continuator of Tacitus: their works differ markedly in terms of scope and literary quality. The other authors whose writings are represented in this volume worked across a wide range of historical topics, covering antiquarian accounts of the early history of Italy and Gaul, biblical history, local history, and the history of kingdoms that supplanted the Roman Empire in the West.

In this respect, a secondary (but no less important) achievement of the volume is that it offers an interpretation of the development of Latin historiography in the transition from Late Antiquity to the Early Middle Ages. The introduction (pp. 1–27) discusses a number of questions related to late Latin historiography as a cultural phenomenon. A consideration of the evidence for the circulation of the historical works represented in the volume suggests that overall their reach was limited, even when the author, like Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3, pp. 36–58) or Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14), was praised for their historical writings: in general, circulation seems to have been restricted either to a close circle personally connected to the author, or to the geographical region in which the work was produced (pp. 17–18). The socio-political context of the historians assembled in the volume is much harder to categorise simply. Some, particularly in the fourth and fifth centuries, were certainly aristocratic Romans, interested in the antiquarian traditions of their city. As we move into the sixth and seventh centuries, however, we appear to witness an increase in local historiographical traditions sometimes associated with barbarian *regna*, represented in the collection by the Spaniard Roterius (FHistLA 18, pp. 226–231) and the Italians Cassiodorus (FHistLA 17, pp. 194–225) and Secundus of Trent (FHistLA 19, pp. 232–245). In general, the interests evinced in these fragmentary histories “reflects the changing political make-up of the Latin West, but with an interesting time lag: writing history was not the first act of state building” (p. 24). Inevi-

tably, the authors must address the question of whether the writers represented in their survey represent the ‘end’ of (ancient) Latin historiography, as other genres – ecclesiastical history and the chronicle – were increasingly ascendant. Quite rightly, Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen highlight the essential subjectivity of such a question and any responses it might generate: scholars have too readily regarded “large-scale narrative histories” – often focused on imperial affairs – “as the paradigmatic manifestation of historiography” (p. 25), a perspective that leads us back to the assumed loneliness of Ammianus. On the contrary, the authors encourage us to see Latin historiography as being in a state on constant evolution, with some sort of revival in the fourth century followed by a shift beginning in the fifth century that mirrored “political fragmentation, social change, and the slow demise of traditional education,” leading to circumstances in which historiography was written by different sorts of authors (mainly clerical) in different contexts (mainly local) than had been the case in earlier periods (p. 27).

The dominant characteristic of Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen’s approach is its caution and restraint. In their description of their methodology, they note explicitly that each entry “only includes fragments that are explicitly attributed to a particular author or work” and not “fragments that have been attributed to particular works on the basis of modern *Quellenforschung*” (p. 4). This sets their collection at odds with some strands of scholarship on late Latin historiography, which, perhaps smarting at the apparent isolation of Ammianus, or frustrated that the works of intellectual ‘greats’ such as Cassiodorus are reflected only in summaries by apparently lesser minds such as Jordanes, has tended to favour elaborate reconstructions of lost works on the basis of very slender evidence. Consider, for instance, their approach to Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3). Two meagre epigraphic attestations of him as *historicus disertissimus* (CIL 6.1782) and as author of *Annales* that attracted a favourable response from the emperor (CIL 6.1783) have prompted endless speculations as to the character and content of this senator’s historical work, with theses heaped upon theses like tottering houses of cards.¹² Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen offer a level-headed and scrupulously

12 It would be impossible to provide a comprehensive account here, so I limit myself to pointing to the emblematic and acrimonious debate between Stéphane Ratti and Alan Cameron in response to Ratti’s *L’Histoire Auguste. Les païens et les chrétiens dans l’Antiquité tardive*. Paris 2016, the subject of a critical review by Cameron (BMCR 2016.09.10, <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2016/2016.09.10/>), which in

documented overview of such debates (pp. 36–45), but conclude conservatively that many of these conjectures are “methodologically unwarranted” (p. 45). They are in no doubt that such restraint will leave some unsatisfied: “This may seem disappointing after an abundance of scholarship proclaiming certainties, but a sober assessment of what we actually know is the only way to make progress” (p. 39). Such bracing honesty is refreshing here as it is elsewhere in the volume, such as when they note that it is unwise to see Jordanes’ *Getica* as little more than a source on which to mount a restoration of Cassiodorus’ lost Gothic history (FHistLA 17), or to regard Jordanes’ *Romana* as an opportunity to reconstruct the lost history of Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14); similarly Maximian of Ravenna’s lost history (FHistLA 15, pp. 166–181) should not be reconstructed indiscriminately from Agnellus’ *Liber Pontificalis Ecclesiae Ravennatis* or the so-called Ravenna Annals; nor should we assume that Maximus of Zaragoza’s *historiola* about the Goths in Spain (FHistLA 20, pp. 246–247) can be reconstructed with any confidence from so-called *Chronica Caesaraugustana* or Isidore of Seville’s *History of the Goths*. Restraint too characterises Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen’s judgment of the character of these fragmentary histories. They wisely eschew any attempt to see in the works associated with members of the senatorial aristocracy an association with any putative ‘pagan resistance’ in an increasingly Christian Empire (pp. 20–22).

These methodological questions lead to other considerations too, chiefly in terms of identifying fragments as the *ipsisima verba* of the otherwise lost historians. This is by no means a challenge unique to Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen: the two very different editions of fragments of John of Antioch published by Umberto Roberto and Sergei Mariev in the 2000s demonstrate that different methodologies can yield very different results.¹³ The conservative approach adopted by Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen, and in particular their rejection of tendencies towards reconstruction (p. 4), means that their assemblage of fragments might seem rather limited. Of the twenty authors

turn drew a response from Ratti (BMCR Rev 2016.09.22, <https://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2016/2016.09.22/>).

- 13 U. Roberto (ed.): *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta ex Historia chronica*. Berlin/New York 2005 (Texte und Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der altchristlichen Literatur 154); S. Mariev (ed.): *Ioannis Antiocheni Fragmenta quae supersunt omnia*. Berlin/New York 2008 (Corpus fontium historiae Byzantinae 47).

they present, nine are only present in the form of *testimonia* without any fragments at all (see table), while fragments of two further authors, Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3) and Secundus of Trent (FHistLA19), are presented as very doubtful indeed. Indeed, for the majority of the histories presented in the book, we are offered more *testimonia* than fragments, indicating that we know more about the existence of certain works than about their precise contents. Such caution is surely warranted. Gregory of Tours, an important source for the fragments of the late-fourth/early-fifth century imperial histories of Sulpicius Alexander and Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus (FHistLA 9 and 10), certainly abridged materials in front of him, as we can see from his treatment of passages of Orosius that we can compare with Orosius' extant text; how much he abridged the two historians for whom he is often used as a source of fragments is, in Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen's view, "impossible to determine" (p.102).¹⁴ It is only comparatively rarely that we get extracts bookended with formula that allow us to speculate with more certainty that we are dealing with verbatim quotations: this is surely the case with the longest fragment of Maximian of Ravenna (FHistLA 15), which Agnellus introduces with *sicut ipse in suis voluminibus loquitur dicens* and follows with *haec pontificis verba sunt* (p. 178).

In a work of such richness, individuals will no doubt find individual points with which to quibble – as indeed the authors anticipate in their descriptions of their conservative methodology. Real errors are hard to spot: I did wonder about the slightly different ways (with slightly different designations) in which the *Origo generis Cassiodorum/Anecdoton Holderi* was presented on pp. 153–154 and 222, though that hardly qualifies as an actual error. Elsewhere, readers will find a great deal to ponder that Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen have not been able to cover in their commentary. The testimonium for Pseudo-Hegesippus (FHistLA 8, pp. 77–80) records that the author had "narrated with" his "own pen the four Books of Kings" (*Quattuor libros regnorum quos scriptura complexa est sacra, etiam ipse stilo persecutus*) (p. 79). This is evocative of Philostorgius' report that Ulfila, when translating the scriptures into Gothic, had omitted exactly these books because they contained nothing but an account of wars, and the last thing the Goths needed was any biblical encouragement of their warlike ways; interestingly, Philostorgius (at least as

14 Compare Greg. Tur. Franc. 2.9 with Oros. hist. 7.40.3.

represented by Photius' summary) describes these biblical books precisely as *ἱστορία*, suggesting a similar attitude to these books as a historical record.¹⁵

Elsewhere, readers might entertain slightly different ideas about some of the works that Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen present as (potentially) historical narratives. Two passages of Cassiodorus' *Institutiones* are cited as evidence for historical writings by Marcellinus Comes in addition to his surviving Chronicle. The first refers to Marcellinus *quattuor libros de temporum qualitatibus et positionibus locorum pulcherima proprietate conficiens*, which, since it occurs in Cassiodorus' inventory *De historicis Christianis*,¹⁶ would appear to refer to a historical work of some sort, which Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen tentatively designate the "Historia" (pp. 183–189). The second relates to an apparently separate work, also in four books, offering what Cassiodorus calls a detailed description of Constantinople and Jerusalem (*Constantinopolitanam civitatem et urbem Hierosolymorum quattuor libellis minutissima ratione descripsit*).¹⁷ This work is also mentioned in a twelfth-century letter from Tegernsee Abbey in which one unknown correspondent asks another to send them various works, including Marcellinus' work on the layout of Constantinople and Jerusalem (*vel Marcellinum de situ Hierosolymorum, et Constantinopolitanorum*), though Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen demonstrate that this notice is itself derived from Cassiodorus and so "is not an independent witness to the work it cites" (p. 193). The question remains what sort of work this might have been, and if it belongs in a collection of fragmentary (or, in this case, lost) Latin histories. The references in Cassiodorus (who includes the work among *Cosmographos legendos a monachis*, and lists alongside it works by Julius Honorius, Dionysius Periegetes, and Ptolemy that are patently geographical) and the Tegernsee letter (describing the scope of the work with the words *de situ*) seem to suggest a work offering topographical description.¹⁸ Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen are probably closer to the mark when they posit that the work was likely "panegyric in tone" (p. 191), and that pairing Constantinople with Jerusalem al-

15 Philostorg. HE 2.5.5.

16 Cassiod. inst. 1.17.1.

17 Cassiod. inst. 1.25.1.

18 For the exegetical function of the geographical works cited by Cassiodorus, see M. Humphries: A New Created World: Classical Geographical Texts and Christian Contexts in Late Antiquity. In: J. H. D. Scourfield (ed.): Texts and Culture in Late Antiquity. Inheritance, Authority, and Change. Swansea 2007, pp. 33–67, esp. pp. 45–46.

lowed Marcellinus to draw comparisons between the capital and the holy city that were evoked by other authors writing under Justinian, and which reached their apotheosis in the legend preserved in the medieval *Patria* that the emperor regarded his rebuilt Hagia Sophia as having outdone Solomon's temple in Jerusalem.¹⁹ Certainly, panegyric works offered in praise of cities could contain a great deal of historical material in dealing with their past: Menander Rhetor recommended that ecphrases of cities dwell on their histories, and surviving fourth-century examples – such as Libanius' *Antiochikos* (Oratio 11) and extant fragments of Himerius' orations on Thessalonica, Philippi, and Constantinople – show that their treatment of historical themes could be extensive.²⁰ This indicates that whatever form Marcellinus Comes' work on Constantinople and Jerusalem took, historical discourse was not limited to historiography.

Other readers will no doubt find similar points on which to dwell; but above all they will be grateful to Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen for presenting these texts in such a scrupulous fashion. This volume reflects not only their labours on this particular corpus of historical writings; more broadly, it is representative of a wider reappraisal of the dynamism of late antique historiography in Greek, Latin, and a host of other languages. The work undertaken by Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen can be compared with other enterprises, such as that of Markus Stein and Bruno Bleckmann in editing the “Kleine und fragmentarische Historiker der Spätantike,”²¹ or by George Woudhuysen and Justin Stover on a number of late Latin historical texts.²² Ammianus,

- 19 *Patria* 4.27, in A. Berger (ed.): *Accounts of Medieval Constantinople. The Patria*. Cambridge, MA 2013 (Dumbarton Oaks Medieval Library 24), pp. 266–267, 329 nn. 63–64.
- 20 Discussion and presentation of the relevant evidence in M. Humphries: *Cities and the Meanings of Late Antiquity*. Leiden/Boston 2019 (Brill Research Perspectives in Ancient History 2.4), pp. 21–23.
- 21 Series information at <https://brill.com/display/serial/KHS?language=en> (accessed 3 February 2023).
- 22 A sample: G. Woudhuysen/J. Stover: *Jordanes and the Date of the Epitome de Caesaribus*. In: *Histos* 15, 2021, pp. 150–188, URL: <https://histos.org/documents/2021AA06Stover-WoudhuysenJordanes.pdf> (accessed 15 February 2023); G. Woudhuysen/J. Stover: *Historiarum libri quinque: Hegesippus between Josephus and Sallust*. In: *Histos* 16, 2022, pp. 1–27, URL: <https://histos.org/documents/2022AA01Stover-WoudhuysenHistoriarumlibriquinque.pdf> (accessed 15 February 2023); and the forthcoming J. Stover/G. Woudhuysen: *The Lost History*

the lonely historian, might not have had a precise peer in terms of the scope and style of his history, but by the same token he now looks much less isolated than was once thought. For these fragmentary Latin histories, the work of Van Hoof and Van Nuffelen now provides the indispensable starting point for all future research.

of Sextus Aurelius Victor. Edinburgh 2023 (Edinburgh Studies in Later Latin Literature).

Mark Humphries, Swansea University
Department of History, Heritage, and Classics
Professor of Ancient History
m.humphries@swansea.ac.uk

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Mark Humphries: Rezension zu: Lieve Van Hoof/Peter Van Nuffelen (eds.): *The Fragmentary Latin Histories of Late Antiquity (AD 300–620)*. Edition, Translation and Commentary. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2020. In: *Plekos* 25, 2023, S. 145–156 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2023/r-van-hoof_van-nuffelen.pdf).

Lizenz: Creative Commons BY-NC-ND

Table of Authors and Works

Author and FHistLA no.	Geographical origin/perspective	Date	Topic	Testimonia	Fragments
Carminius (FHistLA 1)	Italy	2nd–4th c.?	Antiquarian traditions about Italy	–	1
Anonymous (FHistLA 2)	Italy (Padua)	4th c.?	Antiquarian traditions about Italy	1	0
Virius Nicomachus Flavianus (FHistLA 3)	Italy (Rome)	4th c.	History of Rome?	2 certain, 1 spurious	4 spurious
Nummius Aemilianus Dexter (FHistLA 4)	Spain/Italy	Late–4th c.	Universal history?	1	0
Protadius (FHistLA 5)	Gaul/Italy	Late–4th c.	Ancient history of Gaul	3	0
Naucellius (FHistLA 6)	Italy (Spoleto)	Late–4th c.	Translation into Latin of a Greek work on early Rome and Italy	1	0
Anonymous (FHistLA 7)	Italy (Rome)	Late–4th c.?	Roman history (period uncertain)	1	0
Pseudo-Hegesippus (FHistLA 8)	? Italy	4th c.?	Jewish kings of the Old Testament	1	0
Sulpicius Alexander (FHistLA 9)	Uncertain (? West)	c. 400 (after 408?)	4th c. imperial history (?4 books)	–	7

Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus (FHistLA 10)	West	Mid–5th c.	5th c. western imperial history	–	6
Favius (FHistLA 11)	Uncertain	Between 3rd and 6th c.	Uncertain	–	1
Consentius (FHistLA 12)	Gaul	Mid–5th c.	Uncertain	1	0
Ablabius (FHistLA 13)	? East	c. 500	Uncertain, but included a digression on Scythia	–	3
[Q. Aurelius Memmius] Symmachus the Younger (FHistLA 14)	Italy (Rome)	Late–5th c.	Roman history in 7 books	1	1
Maximian of Ravenna (FHistLA 15)	Istria/Italy	Early 6th c.	5th c. imperial history	–	2
Marcellinus Comes (FHistLA 16)	Illyria/Constantinople	Early 6th c.	(i) World history (ii) account of Jerusalem and Constantinople	(i) 1 (ii) 2	0
Cassiodorus (FHistLA 17)	Italy	6th c.	Gothic history	4	1
Roterius (FHistLA 18)	Spain	Late–6th c.	Books on kingdoms	–	1
Secundus of Trent (FHistLA 19)	Italy	Late–6th c.	Recent local history of Trent and Val di Non	3	1?
Maximus of Zaragoza (FHistLA 20)	Spain	c. 600	The Goths in Spain	1	0