

DOI: 10.31857/S032103910015353-1

## STUDIA DIONEIA NOVISSIMA: HISTORICAL NARRATIVE, INTERPRETATIONS OF THE PAST AND POLITICAL CONTEXTS OF CASSIUS DIO'S "ROMAN HISTORY" (Part I)

Konstantin V. Markov<sup>1</sup>, Alexander V. Makhlayuk<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> *National Research Lobachevsky State University of Nizhny Novgorod, Nizhny Novgorod, Russia*

<sup>1</sup>*E-mail:* mkv\_2003@mail.ru    <sup>2</sup>*E-mail:* makh1@imomi.unn.ru

<sup>1</sup>*ORCID:* 0000-0001-8380-0043    <sup>2</sup>*ORCID:* 0000-0002-7758-2374

*Acknowledgements:* Russian Foundation for Basic Research, project no. 20-19-50173

This article provides a general overview of the current state of research on Cassius Dio and focuses on some current trends and issues of debate in the field. The turn of the twenty-first century witnessed a real breakthrough in Dio scholarship, which has greatly advanced in many respects through increasing diversification of research topics, innovative approaches, posing new questions and producing important conceptual generalizations. International projects and wide academic collaborations, above all the *Dioneia* project (*Lire Cassius Dion: cinquante ans après Fergus Millar: bilans et perspectives*) and the *Cassius Dio Network: Cassius Dio, Between History and Politics*, have contributed greatly to this process. This intensive academic activity has resulted in new editions, translations and commentaries of Dio's *Roman History*, numerous dissertations and monographs, which make Cassius Dio a much better understood historian than twenty or even five years ago. But there are still not a few issues of controversy and debate, including the historian's approach to causation, particularly his vision of human nature as a factor of history. An analytical survey of the ongoing studies of that issue shows that Dio is treated as an author who independently elaborated on the themes he dealt with, without being entirely dependent on the interpretative models derived from Thucydides or elsewhere. This supports the status of Dio as a historian with his own voice.

**Keywords:** Cassius Dio, the *Roman History*, Graeco-Roman historiography, historical causation, human nature, state of research, Cassius Dio scholarship

---

**Authors.** Konstantin Vladimirovich Markov – Ph.D. in history, associate professor of the Department of Ancient and Medieval History at the National Research Lobachevsky State University of Nizhny Novgorod; Alexander Valentinovich Makhlayuk – D. Hab. in history, professor, chair of the Department of Ancient and Medieval History at the National Research Lobachevsky State University of Nizhny Novgorod.

We owe our deepest gratitude to Adam Kemezis (University of Alberta) for his valuable comments on a draft of this article and for improving our English.

STUDIA DIONEAE NOVISSIMA: ИСТОРИЧЕСКИЙ НАРРАТИВ,  
ИНТЕРПРЕТАЦИИ ПРОШЛОГО И ПОЛИТИЧЕСКИЕ  
КОНТЕКСТЫ «РИМСКОЙ ИСТОРИИ»  
КАССИЯ ДИОНА (Часть I)

К.В. Марков<sup>1</sup>, А.В. Махлаюк<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup> Национальный исследовательский Нижегородский государственный университет  
им. Н.И. Лобачевского, Нижний Новгород, Россия

<sup>1</sup>E-mail: mkv\_2003@mail.ru <sup>2</sup>E-mail: makh1@imomi.unn.ru

В статье дается общий обзор современного состояния исследований, посвященных Кассию Диону, и подробно рассматривается ряд актуальных тенденций и дискуссионных вопросов в этой области. На рубеже XXI в. произошел настоящий прорыв в изучении этого историка, что проявилось во многих моментах: в значительной диверсификации исследуемых тем и использовании новаторских подходов, в постановке новых вопросов и выработке важных концептуальных обобщений. Этому процессу в значительной степени способствовали международные проекты и широкое академическое сотрудничество, в первую очередь такие как проект *Dioneia (Lire Cassius Dio: cinquante ans après Fergus Millar: bilans et perspectives)* и *Cassius Dio Network: Cassius Dio between History and Politics*. Эта интенсивная исследовательская работа, нашедшая отражение в появлении новых изданий, переводов и комментариев к «Римской истории» Диона, многочисленных диссертаций и монографий, сделала Кассия Диона гораздо более понятным историком, чем двадцать или даже пять лет назад. Но остается еще немало спорных и недостаточно изученных вопросов, включая понимание историком исторической причинности, особенно его видение человеческой природы как фактора истории. Аналитический обзор текущих исследований по этим вопросам показывает, что Дион рассматривается как автор, который разрабатывал рассматриваемые темы в значительной мере независимо от моделей интерпретации, заимствованных у Фукидида или других авторов. Это подтверждает статус Диона как самобытного историка, предлагающего собственное видение прошлого.

**Ключевые слова:** Кассий Дион, «Римская история», греко-римская историография, историческая причинность, человеческая природа, состояние исследований, современная историография

INTRODUCTION. «STILL UNDERSTUDIED AND EVEN POORLY UNDERSTOOD»?

The status of 'Classics of Graeco-Roman historiography' belongs to those authors, from Herodotus, Thucydides and Xenophon to Sallust, Livy, Tacitus and Ammianus Marcellinus, who are the most read and of equal interest to literary scholars and to ancient historians. Modern scholars have long ago placed all the ancient historiographers in a certain hierarchy of ranks, classifying some as the first-rate great writers, and others as the second-rate ones. Undoubtedly, the latter, being treated as unoriginal and less brilliant talents, are usually paid far less scholarly attention. And it was among these minor historical writers that Cassius Dio (ca. 163 – after 229 CE), a Roman senator from Bithynian Nicaea, twice consul, who composed his ample *Roman*

*History* in Greek, was long listed. So it was until recently. But the turn of the twenty-first century has witnessed an increasingly changing attitude to Dio as historian and an explosive upsurge of scholarly interest in his work, with the number of studies soaring dramatically in last five years. His *magnum opus*, in its various aspects and in connection with his times, has proven to be a very popular, not to say fashionable, research subject in international scholarship.

Indeed, in the nineteenth and for most of the twentieth century, Dio was held in quite low esteem by scholars in terms of his style, historical thought and method. This view primarily dates back to pejorative remarks by E. Schwartz in his *RE* article, where Dio was characterized as inferior to Livy and Tacitus<sup>1</sup>. Since then our historian was labeled as an mediocre ‘imitator of Thucydides’, ‘copyist’ and so on. Nevertheless, the eighty books of his monumental *Roman History*, embracing the events from the legendary Aeneas’ arrival in Italy to the reign of Alexander Severus, have always been fundamental to Roman studies and definitely belong to the most frequently used sources. Apart from the mere scale of the work, which is unique for Roman historiography, Dio provides the most extensive account of the reign of Augustus and is indispensable for the study of the Late Republic and Principate, in particular the times of the Antonines and Severans. Accordingly, until the 1960s, this *magnum opus* was studied primarily as an important mass of facts of more or less historical value depending on the sources used by the author who, in the prevailing opinion, was by no means a critical investigator or original writer and political thinker. Therefore, the main emphasis was placed on the traditional *Quellenforschung* and the search for literary models for Dio’s writing, with very rare attempts to find out his political vision<sup>2</sup>. Neither Dio’s authorial and political personality, nor his intellectual background and the historical (Severan) context of his years of work, or the cohesiveness of his writing as a specific response to contemporary challenges were examined with due attention, in a monograph form.

A landmark step toward changing attitudes and permitting a radical reappraisal of Dio’s *History* as original contribution to Graeco-Roman historical writing was made by Fergus Millar’s doctoral thesis, converted into a monograph and published in 1964. It was this seminal book that worked well in drawing the attention of scholars to Dio as a historiographer and spokesperson for his class and times<sup>3</sup>, though the eminent British scholar himself could be very critical of the overall quality of Dio’s work, because of its rhetorical dimension or lack of conscious historical theory<sup>4</sup>. Therefore, for the succeeding decades, studies of Dio’s *Roman History* were centered on historical commentaries of different portions of the work, primarily late republican and Julio-Claudian books<sup>5</sup>, while other sections (above all those concerning early Rome) remained mostly neglected, with the scholarly efforts continuing to be focused on source criticism<sup>6</sup>. Nevertheless, the

<sup>1</sup> Schwartz 1899, 1719–1720.

<sup>2</sup> See, e.g., Hammond 1932; Bleicken 1962.

<sup>3</sup> On Millar’s contribution see Fromentin 2021, 23–24.

<sup>4</sup> Millar 1964, 171.

<sup>5</sup> The commentaries by Humphrey 1976; Berti 1987; Reinhold 1988 and Rich 1990 and Noé 1994 became the first works of that kind after Duckworth’s 1916 commentary on the Book 53. See also Baar 1990; Gowing 1992; Edmondson 1992.

<sup>6</sup> Fadinger 1969; Kolb 1972; Zecchini 1978; Manuwald 1979.

first monographs and dissertations on Dio's contemporary history and cultural milieu were published<sup>7</sup>, as well as on speeches in the *Roman History*<sup>8</sup>, his Republican narrative<sup>9</sup>, and author's political views as reaction to empire's growing crisis<sup>10</sup>.

These studies contributed largely to the change in scholarly attitudes to Dio. As Reinhold pointed out in the mid-1980s, "it has become clearer and clearer that he was not a mere compiler and epitomator from randomly selected sources, nor a slavish copier of his sources. <...> Dio had his own persona and was motivated by his own general conception of events"<sup>11</sup>. That trend became especially observable in the 1990s. For instance, Hose in his 1994 monograph responded to some of Millar's arguments and came to a more optimistic conclusion about the conceptual coherency of Dio's work which, according to the scholar, deserves to be characterized as 'Renaissance senatorischer Geschichtsschreibung'<sup>12</sup>. Another illustrative example is a set of articles in *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt*<sup>13</sup> foreshadowing some directions of the subsequent studies, such as intellectual context of Dio and his cultural identity<sup>14</sup>, his vision of the transition from Republic to Principate, his treatment of the Roman Empire and imperialism, attitudes to various classes of Roman society, his political vocabulary<sup>15</sup> and, of course, his model of an ideal state<sup>16</sup>. These works revealed the literary, philosophical and cultural richness that Dio offers in his *opus* and produced preconditions for those new historiographic and methodological agendas emerging at the turn of the twenty-first century and currently reaching their peak.

Noticeably, in the last two decades, hundreds of works on Dio have been published, and this amount is comparable to the total of publications from the previous more than a hundred years, which are included in Martinelli's annotated bibliography (over 480 items)<sup>17</sup>. However, the point is not only in the number of publications, but in the fact that the Dio-neian studies have greatly intensified and advanced to a much higher level in many respects, particularly in an increasing diversification of research topics and approaches, in raising new questions, in the realization of large international projects, and in producing important conceptual generalizations. By the beginning of the 2020s, in contrast to most of the twentieth century, we have really got a fundamentally new situation in the field, with productive synergies emerging between many scholars from different countries.

<sup>7</sup> Bering-Staschewski 1981; Gascó 1988.

<sup>8</sup> Stekelenburg 1971.

<sup>9</sup> Fechner 1986.

<sup>10</sup> Espinosa Ruiz 1982 (this book still remains the only all-round monograph on Agrippa-Maecenas debate).

<sup>11</sup> Reinhold 1986, 222.

<sup>12</sup> Hose 1994, 356.

<sup>13</sup> Ameling 1997; Lintott 1997; Swan 1997; Gowing 1997; Schmidt 1997 (cf. Schmidt 1999); De Blois 1997.

<sup>14</sup> Similarly Ameling 1984, 123–138; Aalders 1986; Swain 1996, 401–408.

<sup>15</sup> Freyburger-Galland 1996; 1997.

<sup>16</sup> See De Blois' 1990s works on Dio's perception of the Empire and imperial power: De Blois 1995 and 1998.

<sup>17</sup> Martinelli 1999; 2002. Fromentin 2021, 40 gives a figure of over two thousand items on Cassius Dio in the last one hundred and fifty years, and this is very plausible number.

This booming scholarly attention to Dio as historian, intellectual and politician is manifested, above all, by an unparalleled increase in the number of dissertations and monographs covering a very wide diversity of topics, many of which have never received detailed studies before. To mention only studies in monograph form, the first special studies and commentaries have been devoted to Dio's early republican books which for a long remained "the forgotten history"<sup>18</sup>. Among the new themes there is Dio's portrayal of Cicero<sup>19</sup>. The epitomized narrative of the period from Nerva to Antoninus Pius has been thoroughly examined in the light of epigraphic evidence by Migliorati<sup>20</sup>. Groot considered Dio's attitude to games and spectacles<sup>21</sup>. No less important fresh light was shed on Dio's eyewitness treatment of contemporary history in the final part of his work, which also has been provided with useful commentaries<sup>22</sup>. Modern scholars continue to pay special attention to Dio's literary technique (including the functions of fictitious speeches and language), his vision of history in general and of particular periods: these fields have produced an exclusively rich bibliography in recent decades<sup>23</sup>. Lastly, Madsen has produced a fine book on Cassius Dio, which is addressed to a wider audience, but splendidly summarizes the state of current research and provides a sound guidance on the field<sup>24</sup>.

Worthy of particular note is the great upsurge of activity in the genre of commentary of individual parts of Dio's *History*, which now frequently becomes a part of the dissertation process. In addition to earlier works in the field<sup>25</sup>, the end of the last century and subsequent decades are marked by such excellent publications as Murison's commentary on Flavian books and Swan's on the Augustan succession<sup>26</sup>. These are contributions to a long-started project initiated in 1982 at a conference in Saskatoon and aimed to preparing a commentary on the whole of Dio<sup>27</sup>. This discontinued monograph series of the American Philological Association (now Society for Classical Studies) has recently been revived by Scott's commentary on Books 79(78)–80 that had begun its life as an appendix to his PhD dissertation<sup>28</sup>. The Tiberian and Flavian books have received thorough commentaries in English and in French by Mallan, Platon and Berbessou-Broustet<sup>29</sup>, and the crucial Books 52 and 53 have been edited and commented by

<sup>18</sup> Urso 2005; 2013; Simons 2009, and especially Burden-Strevens, Lindholmer 2019.

<sup>19</sup> Montecalvo 2014.

<sup>20</sup> Migliorati 2003.

<sup>21</sup> Groot 2008.

<sup>22</sup> Andrews 2018; Biały 2018; Scott 2018 (see also his important articles: Scott 2015, 2017b and 2020b).

<sup>23</sup> Kuhn-Chen 2002 (historical concepts); Massoni 2009 (language); Rees 2011 (human nature and political constitution); Kemezis 2006 and 2014 (historical narrative); Urrutia Muñoz 2014 (historical memory); Fomin 2015 (literary and historical technique); Burden-Strevens 2015; 2020 (speeches); Schulz 2019 (imperial representations).

<sup>24</sup> Madsen 2020.

<sup>25</sup> See note 5.

<sup>26</sup> Murison 1999; Swan 2004.

<sup>27</sup> See Swan, Humphrey 1988, X. This series was started by Reinhold's commentary on Books 49–52 (Reinhold 1988).

<sup>28</sup> Scott 2008; 2018.

<sup>29</sup> Mallan 2020 (it originates from the dissertation Mallan 2015 and provides a new translation of Books 57 and 58); Platon 2015; Berbessou-Broustet 2010.

Bellissime<sup>30</sup>; additionally, the Book 43 has just now received a commentary by Jayat<sup>31</sup>. The latter four works are dissertations prepared with a view to being published in the Collection des Universités de France issued by Les Belles Lettres<sup>32</sup>. Books 53 and 78–80 have recently been published in this fine collection, which currently covers 17 of 80 books of Dio's *History*<sup>33</sup>, while most of the rest are currently in preparation under the aegis of the *Dioneia* project (*Lire Cassius Dion: cinquante ans après Fergus Millar: bilans et perspectives*), a collaboration between 24 scholars funded by the Agence Nationale de la Recherche and directed by Valérie Fromentin (Bordeaux III). All these volumes are not only indispensable working tools, but solid research contributions that increase our understanding of important parts of Dio's text. At times, the historical commentaries in the bilingual Belles Lettres editions are more expansive than in the above-mentioned books. Nevertheless, less than a quarter of Dio's whole corpus has received commentary in English and French so far, unlike the bilingual nine-volume Italian edition covering books 36 to 80, which was published in 1995–2018 (with reprints) and equipped with concise, albeit valuable footnote comments<sup>34</sup>. No less helpful in some respects can be the Spanish translation of Dio with brief commentaries, covering books 1 to 60, published in 2004–2011<sup>35</sup>.

It is hoped that all these editorial projects will be successfully completed. All in all, they serve as a good addendum to the older (minimally annotated) Loeb edition of Dio, which is evidently out of date in some places in respect of textual criticism, correctness and style, as well as to the German version, the only one covering Dio's full text, but lacking any notes<sup>36</sup>. It is also deserves noting that commented translations of Dio's *Roman History* are currently being carried out into the Slavonic languages, in particular Polish and Russian<sup>37</sup>, and this work undoubtedly stimulates the advancement of Dioneian studies in these countries. One should remember that translation of ancient literary texts into modern languages is a particular kind of comprehension and interpretation. In turn, the study of any ancient literary monument is, in large part, a more or less insightful commentary on its particular contents and historical contexts in which it emerged.

It should be emphasized that much of the above outlined research and editorial activity are fulfilled or stimulated by organizational efforts of the French, Danish and American scholars who have encouraged historians and classical philologists from various countries to participate in a number of conferences and contribute to several volumes devoted to Dio. The first is an international group of scholars, mostly those who were engaged in publishing bilingual *Roman History* within the above mentioned *Dioneia* project (*Lire Cassius Dion: cinquante ans après Fergus Millar: bilans et perspectives*) which started in 2011. This

<sup>30</sup> Bellissime 2013.

<sup>31</sup> Jayat 2021.

<sup>32</sup> This practice started earlier, in the mid-1990s, with the dissertation by Bertrand Ecanvil in 1996.

<sup>33</sup> This reedition started in 1991 by edition of Books 50 and 51 by Freyburger and Roddaz covers also Books 36–42, 45–49, 53 and 78–80. See Dion Cassius 1991–2020.

<sup>34</sup> Cassio Dione 1995–2018.

<sup>35</sup> See Dion Casio 2004–2011.

<sup>36</sup> Cassius Dio 1985–1987.

<sup>37</sup> Kasjusz Dion 2008; 2011; 2017; Kassiy Dio Kokkeyan 2011–2014.

collaboration, aimed at synthesising over 50 years of research since Millar's epoch-making monograph and at opening up new prospects for study Dio and his *History*, has resulted into two splendid volumes of collective studies *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures* published in 2016. Edited by Valérie Fromentin, Estelle Bertrand, Michèle Coltelloni-Trannoy, Michel Molin and Gianpaolo Urso, they comprise 46 articles devoted to the manuscript tradition of Dio's *History* and its reception in Byzantine, Dio's usage and treatment of various sources, authorial narrative strategies and techniques in different parts of the work, Dio's biography and cultural background, his take on the Roman political institutions and state-manship, personal characterizations, the Empire's geography and imperialism, as well as some of the ideological settings of Dio's historiographic project<sup>38</sup>.

Notably, the same year saw another collection of articles on Dio, which originated in the *Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician* conference, organized in 2014 by Jesper Madsen and Carsten Lange, now editors of Brill's *Historiography of Rome and its Empire* series<sup>39</sup>. *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*, edited by these scholars, became the series' first volume. That was another large academic collaboration which evolved into the *Cassius Dio Network: Cassius Dio, Between History and Politics* (2014–2018) as a joint venture between the University of Odense, Aarhus University and Aalborg University, in cooperation with the University of Alberta and Georgetown University. The project was supported by The Danish Council for Independent Research (DFF), and its sub-council for Humanities (FKK), and co-funded by Georgetown University, the University of Alberta and the Social Sciences and Humanities Council of Canada (SSHRC). The Network gathered a number of Dio specialists from Europe, North America and Australia, who attended a series of Dio conferences (held in Denmark, Italy and Canada) and contributed to the six Dioneian volumes. Some of the books have already been published, including Burden-Strevens & Lindholmer (eds.) *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome* (2018), Osgood & Baron (eds.) *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic* (2019), *Cassius Dio's Speeches and the Collapse of the Roman Republic* by Burden-Strevens (2020), Lange & Scott (eds.) *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War* (2020), and most recently Madsen & Lange (eds.) *Cassius Dio the Historian: Methods and Approaches* (2021), Davenport & Mallan (eds.) *Emperors and Political Culture in Cassius Dio's Roman History* (2021), Kemezis, Bailey, Poletti (eds.) *The Intellectual Climate of Cassius Dio: Greek and Roman Pasts* (2022). One other important volume is forthcoming soon from Brill: Madsen & Scott (eds.) *Brill's Companion to Cassius Dio*. Also as the product of a seminar organized by Madsen in Nyborg in January 2018 within the scope of the *Cassius Dio Network*, one more collective volume has been published just recently (edited by Burden-Strevens, Madsen and Pistellato), which covers issues concerning Dio's treatment of and attitudes to the Principate in its emergence, governmental, theoretical and personal dimensions<sup>40</sup>.

These numerous collective studies aim to emphasize the overall importance of Dio, with the main purpose of the *Network* being formulated by its co-founders as 'to take on the whole work [of Dio] and reposition it as a central achievement of Graeco-Roman

<sup>38</sup> On this edition see Makhlaiuk 2017 and in more detail Kemezis 2019.

<sup>39</sup> Lange, Madsen 2016b, 1.

<sup>40</sup> Burden-Strevens *et al.* 2020.

historiography'<sup>41</sup>. At this stage, with some of the volumes still making their way through the production process, it is hard to make final conclusions as to what extent this ambitious goal has been actually achieved. However, this project, like that of the *Dioneia*, seems to be a real breakthrough in the current Dio scholarship, with its fruitful findings being quite promising, and, as we will see, having already influenced scholarly attitudes to Dio<sup>42</sup>. The undoubted merit of both collaborative projects – and, surely, of other recent studies as well – lies in formulating and working out numerous truly innovative approaches and topics, such as specifics of Dio's understanding of violence as an interpretive category<sup>43</sup>, images and political role of women<sup>44</sup>, imperial geography of the *Roman History*<sup>45</sup>, historical temporality<sup>46</sup>, philosophic influences on historian's thinking<sup>47</sup>, and so on (there is inadequate room here to give even a short list of countless publications titled as 'Dio on something/somebody', 'Something/somebody in Dio', 'Dio and something/somebody', etc.).

Nevertheless, in 2018, the editors of the Brill series *Historiography of Rome and its Empire* referred to Cassius Dio's work as 'still understudied and even poorly understood'<sup>48</sup>. On the other hand, Mallan has stated a little later: "It can no longer be said that Cassius Dio is an understudied historian"<sup>49</sup>. Paradoxically, both assessments are valid, since still there are quite a few debatable and under-explored issues, some regrettable gaps and almost fully neglected topics (e.g., Dio's battle narratives<sup>50</sup>), but at the same time, thanks to the very bulk, scale and diversification of current research, innovative and interdisciplinary analysis of Dio's work and personality he is now much better understood historian than twenty or even five years ago.

In any event, the breathtaking revival in Cassius Dio scholarship is a very considerable historiographical phenomenon that needs to be comprehended and explained. A substantial contribution to this process, though at this moment the only one, is provided by Fromentin's thoughtful survey of Cassius Dio studies over the twentieth and twenty-first centuries<sup>51</sup>. Taking into account an enormous bibliography, she outlines all essential trends and the current state of research and editorial work over a period of a

<sup>41</sup> Lange, Masen 2016, 1.

<sup>42</sup> Fromentin 2021, 25 claims that these two projects 'establish the basis for what may well be a second "revival" of Dio studies'.

<sup>43</sup> E.g., Berdowski 2020, and, in general, Lange, Scott 2020a.

<sup>44</sup> Bertolazzi 2015; Sion-Jenkis 2016; Scott 2017a; Mastroianni 2019; Langford 2021; Jones 2021.

<sup>45</sup> Bertrand 2015a; 2016b; Coltelloni-Trannoy 2018.

<sup>46</sup> Bertrand *et al.* 2016; Coltelloni-Trannoy 2016.

<sup>47</sup> Rees 2011; Noe 2020.

<sup>48</sup> Lange, Madsen 2019, xii.

<sup>49</sup> Mallan 2019.

<sup>50</sup> Dio as military historian is undeservedly overlooked by scholars who mostly consider his warfare narratives and battle pictures merely as rhetorical exercises (Townend 1964). More positive opinion one can find only in Harrington 1977 and Bertrand 2008; see also Biały 2016. Even in the volume specifically devoted to the impact of violence and war, there is no room for an assessment of Dio as military historian (Lange, Scott 2020a).

<sup>51</sup> Fromentin 2021. We only had the opportunity to read this text when the main part of our paper had already been written, hence some involuntary overlap is possible and in some respects unavoidable.

hundred years and demonstrates how the rehabilitation of Dio is taking place and what gaps still remain in our understanding of his work<sup>52</sup>. As a bibliographic survey, the chapter concentrates on five areas of Dio scholarship: the editorial and textual history of the *Roman History*; Dio's biography and the origins of his work; Dio as a political historian; his sources, and his rhetorical and literary models. Given the ever growing stream of new publications, Fromentin's overview is far from being exhaustive, but it is very informative and saves us from having to cover all these issues once again. Instead, we are going to deal with three main streams of current Dioneian studies: Dio's ways of interpreting of the past, the characteristics of his historical narrative, and its correlation with his political thinking. In doing so, we shall focus on some most controversial and debatable issues, taking into account the latest publications (as of mid-2021) and offering a more detailed analysis of contradictory interpretations, the various methodological agendas and points of view.

Thus in what follows our aim is to trace the principal changes in how Dio is currently treated as a historical writer, politician and intellectual scrutinizing the thousand-year past of Rome in order to address live issues of his own times; we try to answer the question: has the quantity of studies dialectically changed into quality, or can one say with any certainty that Dio is still perceived by classicists as a mediocre historiographer?

#### INTERPRETATIONS OF THE PAST. HUMAN NATURE AND MORALITY IN HISTORY

We shall begin with one of the most important trends in the current work on Dio: the increasing attention to the conceptual framework of his *History* and his approach to causation. Did Dio see any regularities lurking behind the motives of politicians? What was his understanding of the driving forces of history? To what extent did he follow the traditional moralistic schemata characteristic of the Roman historians? All these questions have been intensively studied in the past decade.

As has emerged from current scholarship, Cassius Dio believed that human action constantly repeats itself, with men being predictable in their behavior<sup>53</sup>. His grim vision of the core qualities of human nature, such as vigor, aggression, selfishness and lust for power, is modeled mostly on Thucydides, as was shown already in the end of the nineteenth century by Litsch who carried out a nearly exhaustive study of Dio's thucydideanisms<sup>54</sup>. However, there are different opinions on the conceptual implications of Dio's remarks on human nature and the extent to which Dio shares a Thucydidean approach in this respect.

Thus, Millar's opinion that Dio's reflections on human nature are no more than rhetorical platitudes<sup>55</sup>, is reiterated by Kuhn-Chen, according to whom Dio lacks a coherent and consistent historical conception, but rather inclines to regard history as a

<sup>52</sup> Among these gaps, Fromentin 2021, 40–41 indicates the absence of a special study of Dio's psychological and moral vocabulary, and that of political ideas, his language and style in general, in particular his Atticism, then the intertextuality with historical sources or literary models and 'Roman imperialism' as one of the major common themes and a structural motif of the *Roman History*. The latter topic, however, has already come to the scholarly agenda (see Bertrand 2016a; 2019; Rich 2020; Lindholmer 2020).

<sup>53</sup> Pitcher 2018, 223; Reinhold 1988, 215–217; Rees 2011, 11–15, 38–39; Scott 2020a, 237.

<sup>54</sup> Litsch 1893. Some recent suggestions on this topic see in Kordoš 2010.

<sup>55</sup> Millar 1964, 16.

multi-causal process. Although the personal qualities of men in power are the main driving force, there are other equally important factors that determine the course of history, for example, the intervention of supernatural forces<sup>56</sup>. Another point is Dio's take on the role of ethnicity in shaping individual characters<sup>57</sup>. A less critical view is shared by Reinhold, Hose, and Lintott, who argue that Dio fully comprehended and accepted the Thucydidean idea of human nature's role in history<sup>58</sup>. This partly explains Dio's quite abstract, schematic style of writing<sup>59</sup>, with frequent omissions of details and analysis, which are, as Hose puts it, 'occasionally irritating' to modern scholars<sup>60</sup>. Besides, it is Dio's commitment to the 'anthropological constant' that, according to Hose, shaped his depiction of the Roman conquests. A particular characteristic of Dio's detailed narrative of Rome's path to world domination is his neglect of moral justifications of wars and application of explanatory models based on power politics: for example, an empire that does not actively strive for hegemony and refrains from military campaigns is naturally doomed to be overthrown<sup>61</sup>. Therefore, Dio may be characterized as *ein "amoralischer" Historiker* if compared to other ancient Roman historiographers<sup>62</sup>. Even if 'amorality' of Dio's views can be questioned<sup>63</sup>, he is indeed far from promoting the idea of Rome always fighting for just cause. In a passage about the origins of the First Punic War (11. F. 43. 1–3; cf. Thuc 1. 23. 5–6), Dio makes a distinction between the pretexts (αἰτίαι, σκήψεις) and the actual causes (ἡ ἀλήθεια) for clashes between Rome and Carthage. The real reason for the confrontation was the growing influence of the two powers, so that they were in state of war resulting from fear of each other and from the thirst for ever-increasing acquisitions – a desire that, 'in accordance with the instinct of the majority of mankind' (κατὰ τὸ <τοῖς> πολλοῖς τῶν ἀνθρώπων), is enhanced by the influence of success. Rich, however, has recently, after characterizing this passage as an imitation of Thucydides' famous comment on the causes of the Peloponnesian War (1. 23. 5–6), highlighted the specifics of Dio who, unlike the Athenian, depicts the

<sup>56</sup> Kuhn-Chen 2002, 243–247; cf. Swan 2004, 8–13.

<sup>57</sup> For example, Licinus (54. 21. 3–4), Caracalla (78. 6. 1<sup>a</sup>), Julia Domna 78. 10. 2. For this, see Rees 2011, 12–13, Pitcher 2018, 224.

<sup>58</sup> Reinhold 2002, 52; Hose 1994, 133; 2007, 461–467; Lintott 1997, 2497–2523. For Dio emulating Thucydides' treatment of human nature, see Rich 1990, 11; 2020, 66–85; Rees, 2011; Lange 2019a, 166.

<sup>59</sup> Millar 1964, 76; Schmidt 1997, 2594–2595.

<sup>60</sup> Hose 2007, 464.

<sup>61</sup> This idea sounds in Caesar's speech at Vesontio (38. 36. 1–3; 39. 3; 40. 2–3), with Thuc. 2. 63; 3. 37; 6. 18. 2–3 providing the model here (Hose 1994, 364–384, 389; 2007, 465–466). As Rich recently has shown, Caesar's words might not entirely correspond to Dio's own views, since the former is represented as driven primarily by his personal ambitions and Dio makes it clear to his audience that Caesar's speech is to be read ironically, though, in general, the idea ascribed to Caesar is in accord with Dio's own comments on the origins of the confrontation between Rome and Carthage as well as some other wars waged by the Romans in the republican period (Rich 2020, 71–85). Besides, in the imperial section of the work, Dio mentions the Dacians' increasing power and pride among the reasons of Trajan's campaign against them (68. 6. 1).

<sup>62</sup> Hose 1994, 386.

<sup>63</sup> Bertrand 2016a, 698; Rich 2020, 73.

ambitions, suspicions and fears of both sides, not just one of them<sup>64</sup>. Human nature is the answer again. Both parties are prompted by natural human compulsions and it is, in Rich's view, in a speech given to a pro-Hannibal Carthaginian that Dio delivers the generalization that 'all mankind is so constituted as to desire to lord it over such as yield, and to employ the turn of Fortune's scale against those who are willing to be enslaved' (36. 1. 2)<sup>65</sup>. Based on this and some other passages echoing Thucydides, Rich has come to the conclusion that Dio's realistic vision of the origins of Rome's external wars is, as Hose previously noted, 'a radical stance' against the background of Roman historians claiming that Rome's military success was a reward by gods for always fighting just wars; however, Dio can hardly be referred to as amoralist since his comments on military conflicts are not entirely devoid of moral considerations<sup>66</sup>.

One of the most detailed studies of Dio's ideas about human nature is Rees' doctoral dissertation. He rightly points to the correlation between Dio's focus on human nature and his belief in a universal relevance of his work and his desire, quite similar to that of Thucydides, to leave a *ktema eis aei* for posterity<sup>67</sup>. Indeed, Thucydides' approach was important to Dio's account of the Republican period. Even the latter's picture of Roman moral decline, as Rees demonstrates, is consistent with Thucydides' considerations on how war, especially civil strife, changes morals, with human nature manifesting itself in different ways under various circumstances (Thuc. 3. 82. 2; cf. 3. 83. 1)<sup>68</sup>. However, one of the most important conclusions by Rees is that Dio's view of the role of human nature in politics was not derived entirely from Thucydides<sup>69</sup>. For example, Dio's treatment of Roman exceptionalism appears to be a merger of Thucydides' considerations about Athenians and Dio's own view of the uniqueness of Roman virtue, taken from his extensive reading of historiography<sup>70</sup>. Besides, unlike those classical authorities who considered equality among individuals to be a key factor of stability, Dio refers to human nature as a reason why equality inevitably leads to civil discord: 'whatever is human shall not submit to be ruled by that which is like it and familiar to it, partly through jealousy, partly through contempt of it' (frg. 5. 12). As follows from this and one further similar statement of Dio's (frg. 7. 3), the innate quality of man is to dominate, rather than to share power<sup>71</sup>. This observation of Rees has become seminal for further studies devoted to Dio's treatment of 'envy' (φθόρος) as destructive for Roman public institutions and leading to the decay of the Republic<sup>72</sup>, with Dio's early books being characterized as

<sup>64</sup> Rich 2020, 76–77.

<sup>65</sup> Cf. Thuc. 4. 61. 5. See Rich 2020, 80. Alternatively, this expression is interpreted as Lentulus' claim on the natural right of the stronger to rule, an echo of the Athenians' argument in Thucydides' Melian debate (Millar 1964, 82; Fechner 1986, 232).

<sup>66</sup> Rich 2020, 84–85.

<sup>67</sup> Rees 2011, 59.

<sup>68</sup> Rees 2011, 40–42, 53. Alternatively, Hose argues that both Thucydides and Dio regarded human nature as unchanging.

<sup>69</sup> Rees 2011, 100.

<sup>70</sup> Rees 2011, 72.

<sup>71</sup> Rees 2011, 14; Burden-Strevens 2015, 201.

<sup>72</sup> Burden-Strevens 2016, 193–216; Lindholmer 2019, 190–216.

programmatic in this respect<sup>73</sup>. On the other hand, some ideas pertaining to the disadvantages of democracy and supremacy of monarchy might be borrowed from various classical political theorists, particularly from Plato and Aristotle. An example is the constitutional cycles and constitutional change theories employed by Dio for his explanation for the fall of the Republic. As Rees has convincingly shown, Dio elaborated on this theme as a historian of his own voice, not just an imitator of classical models<sup>74</sup>.

Further development of this idea can be found in a number of recently published and forthcoming works by Lange who has contributed greatly to our understanding of Dio as a somewhat cynical observer of human affairs, power, and conflicts<sup>75</sup>. Indeed, much of Dio's narrative is devoted to themes of this kind, and, as Lange argues, Dio reveals himself as a historiographer and theorist of *stasis* and civil war, someone who provides an insight into the causes and nature of the reappearing internecine conflicts in Rome. Emulating Thucydides' idea of the cyclical recurrence of *stasis*, Dio demonstrates similarities in the dynamics and trends of civil wars at different stages of Roman history. This reappearance stems from human nature, unchangeable and independent of epoch or form of government. As a follower of Thucydides, Dio repeatedly showcases its effect on human affairs, providing quite a cynical and realistic vision of human nature as an important factor of periodic outbursts of power struggle, wars and internal conflicts. Therefore, Lange rightly points to some characteristic civil war issues depicted by Dio in different sections of his work, including the imperial books. One of the trends is the change of side by civil war participants, who can flock to the banner of their previous adversaries, in order to have a chance to find themselves on the winning side. In this respect, Dio provides similar explanations for the events of the triumvirs' war against Sextus Pompeius (48. 29. 3) and civil war between Otho and Vitellius (65[64]. 1. 1)<sup>76</sup>. Besides, Octavian's civil war activities are observed by Dio through the lens of generalizations on violence as a norm in periods of *stasis*, the idea modeled possibly on Thucydides' above mentioned considerations on war as 'a violent teacher' setting its own rules and changing public morals<sup>77</sup>.

Importantly, Lange's articles provide an interpretative framework for comprehending Dio's *Roman History* in its entirety, that is quite untypical for modern studies devoted to Dio's take on human nature. In fact, most works are traditionally centered at Dio's regal and republican narratives, where the vast majority of Dio's references to ἡ ἀνθρωπεία / ἀνθρωπίνη φύσις or τὸ ἀνθρώπινον / ἀνθρώπειον can be found<sup>78</sup>. According to Pelling, Dio's conceptual point and techniques depend on history itself: abstract generalizations on the modes of human behavior did not work well for narrating on the Principate; instead Dio recognizes and highlights the impact of the imperial personality on historical

<sup>73</sup> Burden-Strevens 2019, 7.

<sup>74</sup> Rees 2011, 99; cf. also Bertrand 2015b.

<sup>75</sup> Lange 2019a, 165–166; 2019b, 236–237; 2021, 336–362; 2022.

<sup>76</sup> Lange, Scott 2020b, 4. Lange 2021, 346; 2022.

<sup>77</sup> Dio makes Catulus say that Marius and Sulla "became who they became" due to the fact that both of them commanded troops for too long, and human nature is such that a statesman possessing authority for a long time is reluctant to comply with the customs of his ancestors (36. 31. 3–4). See Lange 2022.

<sup>78</sup> Reinhold 1988, 215–216.

processes<sup>79</sup>. More specifically, Burden-Strevens focuses on Dio's commitment to the idea of the intensification of the human vices under particular circumstances<sup>80</sup>. As mentioned above, this is how Thucydides viewed human nature. However, Dio appears to be closer to Tacitus in this respect, especially in linking human morality to the collapse of the Republic. As Burden-Strevens notes, Dio assumes that human nature "did not change, but rather that integral and innate parts of it could be prompted, magnified, encouraged, or indeed suppressed by the political system"<sup>81</sup>. In other words, for Dio, the nature of a political regime dictates the behavior of those living under it. Therefore, according to Burden-Strevens, Dio viewed competition, envy and internecine conflicts as a natural consequence of Republican government, given that equality in Dio's view was incompatible with one's drive to surpass and dominate others.

This characteristic is especially detectable in the late republican narrative when the acquisition of power and money is represented as the main goal of the dynasts. Provocatively, Burden-Strevens claims that envy (φθόνος), ambition (φιλοτιμία), cupidity (ἐπιθυμία), and desire for gain or advancement (πλεονεξία) 'disappear almost entirely from the *Roman History* with the advent of Augustus' monarchy', while in the speeches of Augustan era Dio "reflects a final time upon those vices, and their replacement by a more virtuous political culture shorn of the worst excesses of competition"<sup>82</sup>. It should be however noted that, first, Dio's exploration of human nature begins with the feuds among *basileis* represented in early books<sup>83</sup>, i.e. events that happened long before the inception of the Republic, and, second, the principate of Augustus, as Lange has shown, could hardly be regarded by Dio as the end of history. *Stasis* proved to be recurrent, because of human nature, while Dio does not completely abandon his use of φύσις as an explanatory model for historical events in the imperial section of his work. Nevertheless, there is still a question to what extent this model is detectable in the Dio's depiction of the events that happened between civil wars, i.e. the bulk of the imperial narrative.

As Rees has demonstrated<sup>84</sup>, Dio appears to have been inspired by several different philosophical schools. He was certainly affected by Stoicism, one of the most popular philosophical schools under the Principate<sup>85</sup>. Noe has recently come to a conclusion that Stoicism is crucial for understanding Dio's treatment of historical developments and his evaluation of historical characters<sup>86</sup>. According to Noe, the historian shares the Seneca's idea of an emperor as the soul of the state, as well as the Platonic and Stoic theory of a ruler being 'the personified reason of the state' who superintends the rest of the elite in a way similar to how the rational part of the mind exercises control over the irrational elements. To give these elements a free hand means to let them indulge in misbehavior<sup>87</sup>.

<sup>79</sup> Pelling 1997, 122.

<sup>80</sup> Burden-Strevens 2020, 193–195.

<sup>81</sup> Burden-Strevens 2020, 194.

<sup>82</sup> Burden-Strevens 2020, 195.

<sup>83</sup> For Dio systematically calling the monarchy of the early kings a βασιλεία, see Burden-Strevens *et al.* 2020, 9.

<sup>84</sup> Rees 2011, 99.

<sup>85</sup> Burden-Strevens *et al.* 2020, 13–14; Pistellato 2020, 132–133.

<sup>86</sup> Noe 2020, 142.

<sup>87</sup> Noe 2020, 150–153.

In this respect, Noe refers to Commodus as an example<sup>88</sup>. It should be noted, however, that Dio's representation of the rule of Commodus, as well as Caligula or Claudius, is guided by a reverse logic: it is 'the irrational elements' that influence and corrupt the emperors from the very beginning of their reigns (59. 5. 2–3; 60. 2. 4–5; 73[72]. 1. 1). At all events, Noe is right when pointing to a certain ambiguity in Dio's vision of the relations between emperors and the Senate<sup>89</sup>. However, the Noe's attempt to question the common scholarly vision of Dio as a senatorial historian can hardly be characterized as convincing<sup>90</sup>. The main problem is rather vague meaning of the word 'elite', which Noe frequently uses, in particular when he argues that 'Dio is in fact not too optimistic about the elite's qualities as a leading organ' or 'sees the political elite as a potentially destructive organ'. Obviously, Dio distinguishes between different groups of influence at the imperial court according to their origin and social standing: he is definitely more optimistic about Augustus and Severus Alexander's senatorial councils (56. 28. 2; 80 Fr.) than about those imperial freedmen who corrupted Claudius (60. 2. 4–5) or Caracalla (78[77]. 18. 4). Besides, Noe's appeal for viewing the whole *Roman History* through the lens of Stoic doctrines<sup>91</sup> appears to be problematic given Dio's critical remarks on Stoics and Stoicism (65.12–13), that, unfortunately, were not addressed by Noe.

In any event, directly or indirectly, Dio was influenced by Stoicism, as well as by some other philosophical theories, due to his education or extensive reading. On the other hand, this survey of the current studies has clearly shown that Dio is treated as an author who elaborated on the themes he dealt with, without being entirely dependent on the interpretative models derived from Thucydides or elsewhere. This, again, supports the status of Dio as a historian of his own voice. More distinctly Dio's originality has been demonstrated by a number of recent studies devoted to the particularities of the compositional structure of his work as well as narrative techniques he employed for depicting different periods of the Roman History. These studies will be discussed in the next part of the article.

## References

- Aalders, G.J.D. 1986: Cassius Dio and the Greek world. *Mnemosyne* 39/3–4, 282–304.  
 Ameling, W. 1984: Cassius Dio und Bithynien. *Epigraphica Anatolica* 4, 123–138.  
 Ameling, W. 1997: Griechische Intellektuelle und das Imperium Romanum: das Beispiel Cassius Dio. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34/3, 2472–2496.  
 Andrews, G. 2018: *Rethinking the Third Century CE: Contemporary Historiography and Political Narrative*. PhD thesis. Cambridge.  
 Baar, M. 1990: *Das Bild des Kaisers Tiberius bei Tacitus, Sueton und Cassius Dio*. Stuttgart.  
 Bellissime, M. 2013: *Édition, traduction et commentaire de Cassius Dion, Histoire romaine, livres 52 et 53*. Thèse de doctorat. Bordeaux.  
 Berbessou-Broustet, B. 2010: *Édition critique, traduction et commentaire historique des livres flaviens de l' "Histoire romaine" de Cassius Dion*. Thèse de doctorat. Bordeaux.  
 Berdowski, P. 2020: Violence as an interpretive category in Cassius Dio: the terror under Sulla in 82 BCE. In: C.H. Lange, A.G. Scott (eds.), *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Boston–Leiden, 15–45.

<sup>88</sup> Noe 2020, 154.

<sup>89</sup> See also Markov 2020, 241–256.

<sup>90</sup> For Dio's focus on the senatorial class of Rome, see Rantala 2016, 175.

<sup>91</sup> Noe 2020, 154.

- Bering-Staschewski, R. 1981: *Römische Zeitgeschichte bei Cassius Dio*. Bochum.
- Bertolazzi, R. 2015: The depiction of Livia and Julia Domna by Cassius Dio: some observations. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 55, 413–432.
- Bertrand-Ecanvil, E. 1996: *Dion Cassius: Histoire Romaine, 45–47: traduction et commentaire historique*. Thèse de doctorat. Paris.
- Bertrand, E. 2010: La bataille de Philippes dans l'Histoire romaine de Dion Cassius: un aperçu du travail de l'historien. *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne. Supplément* 4/2, 329–342.
- Bertrand, E. 2015a: Ethnonymes, toponymes dans l'Histoire romaine de Cassius Dion: quelques remarques sur la culture géographique de l'historien. In F. Brizay, V. Sarrazin (eds.), *Erudition et culture savante, de l'Antiquité à l'époque modern*. Rennes, 37–52.
- Bertrand, E. 2015b: Cassius Dion et les cycles de l'histoire: du topos littéraire à la réflexion historique. In: E. Bertrand, R. Campatangelo-Soussignan (eds.), *Cycles de la Nature, Cycles de l'Histoire. De la découverte des météores à la fin de l'âge d'or*. Bordeaux, 163–172.
- Bertrand, E. 2016a: Point de vue de Cassius Dion sur l'imperialisme romain. In: V. Fromentin, E. Bertrand (eds.), *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*. Bordeaux, 679–700.
- Bertrand, E. 2016b: L'empire de Cassius Dion: géographie et imperium Romanum dans l'Histoire romaine. In: V. Fromentin, E. Bertrand (eds.), *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*. Bordeaux, 701–724.
- Bertrand, E. 2019: Imperialism and the crisis of the Roman Republic: Dio's view on late republican conquests (books 36–40). In: J. Osgood, C. Baron (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Late Roman Republic*. Leiden–Boston, 19–35.
- Bertrand, E., Coudry, M., Fromentin, V. 2016: Temporalité historique et formes du récit. Le modalités de l'écriture dans les livres tardo-républicains. In: V. Fromentin, E. Bertrand (eds.), *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*. Bordeaux, 303–316.
- Berti, N. 1987: *La guerra di Cesare contro Pompeo: commento storico a Cassio Dione, Libri XLI–XLII*. Milano.
- Biały, K. 2016: Poglądy Kasjusza Diona na sprawy wojskowe w księgach LXXIII–LXXX Historii rzymskiej. In: A. Aksamitowski, R. Gałąj-Dempniak, H. Walczak, A. Wojtaszak (eds.), *Wojna – Wojsko – Bezpieczeństwo poprzez stulecia i epoki. Studia i materiały*. Szczecin, 267–281.
- Biały, K. 2018: Severan books of Cassius Dio's "Roman History" (LXXIV–LXXX) and their Byzantine epitomators (authorial synopsis of the doctoral dissertation). *Studia Europaea Gnesnensia* 18, 477–486.
- Bleicken, J. 1962: Der Politische Standpunkt Dios Gegenüber der Monarchie: die Rede des Maecenas Buch 52, 14–40. *Hermes* 90/4, 444–467.
- Burden-Strevens, C. 2015: *Cassius Dio's Speeches and the Collapse of the Roman Republic*. PhD thesis. Glasgow.
- Burden-Strevens, C. 2016: Fictitious speeches, envy, and the habituation to authority: writing the collapse of the Roman republic. In: J.M. Lange, C.H. Madsen (eds.), *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*. Leiden–Boston, 191–216.
- Burden-Strevens, C. 2019: Introduction. In: C. Burden-Strevens, M. Lindholmer (eds.), *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden–Boston, 1–26.
- Burden-Strevens, C. 2020: *Cassius Dio's Speeches and the Collapse of the Roman Republic: The Roman History, Books 3–56*. Leiden–Boston.
- Burden-Strevens, C., Lindholmer, M. (eds.) 2019: *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden–Boston.
- Burden-Strevens, C., Madsen, J.M., Pistellato, A. (eds.) 2020: *Cassius Dio and the Principate*. Venice.
- Cassio Dione 1995–2018: *Storia Romana*. Vol. 1 (Libri XXXVI–XXXVIII); Vol. 2 (Libri XXXIX–XLIII); Vol. 3 (Libri XLIV–XLVII); Vol. 4 (Libri XLVIII–LI). Prefazione, introduzione, traduzione e note di G. Norcio; Vol. 5 (Libri LII–LVI). Introduzione di G. Cresci Marrone; traduzione di A. Stroppa; note di F. Rohr Vio; Vol. 6. (Libri LVII–LXIII). Introduzione di M. Sordi; traduzione di A. Stroppa; note di A. Galimberti; Vol. 7 (Libri LXIV–LXVII). Introduzione di A. Barzanò; traduzione di A. Stroppa; note di A. Galimberti; Vol. 8 (Libri LXVIII–LXXIII). Introduzione di A. Valvo; traduzione di A. Stroppa; note di G. Migliorati; Vol. 9 (Libri LXXIII–LXXX). Introduzione e note di A. Galimberti; traduzione e note di A. Stroppa. Milano.
- Cassius Dio 1985–1987: *Römische Geschichte*. Bd. 1–5. Übersetzt von O. Veh, eingeleitet von G. Wirth. Zürich–München.

- Coltelloni-Trannoy, M 2016: Les temporalités du récit impérial dans l'Histoire romaine de Cassius Dion. In: V. Fromentin, E. Bertrand (éds.), *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*. Bordeaux, 335–362.
- Coltelloni-Trannoy, M. 2018: La géographie dans l'Histoire romaine de Cassius Dion. In: M. Coltelloni-Trannoy, S. Moret (eds.), *Histoire et Géographie chez les auteurs grecs (République et Empire)*. Paris, 165–184.
- Davenport, C., Mallan, C. (eds.) 2021: *Emperors and Political Culture in Cassius Dio's Roman History*. Cambridge.
- De Blois, L. 1995: The world a city: Cassius Dio's view of the Roman empire. In: L.A. Foresti, A. Barzanò, C. Bearzot, L. Prandi, G. Zecchini (eds.), *L'ecumenismo politico nella coscienza dell'occidente*. Rome, 359–370.
- De Blois, L. 1997: Volk und Soldaten bei Cassius Dio. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34/3, 2650–2676.
- De Blois, L. 1998: The perception of emperor and empire in Cassius Dio's Roman History. *Ancient Society* 29, 267–281.
- Dion Casio 2004–2011: *Historia Romana. Libros I–XXXV (Fragmentos)*. Traducción y notas de D. Plácido Suárez; *Libros XXXVI–XLV*. Traducción y notas de J.M. Candau Morón y M.L. Pueras Castañios; *Libros XLVI–XLIX*. Traducción y notas de J.P. Oliver Segura; *Libros L–LX*. Traducción y notas de J.M. Cortés Copete. Madrid.
- Dion Cassius 1991–2020: Histoire romaine. *Livres 50 et 51*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par M.-L. Freyburger, J.-M. Roddaz; *Livres 48 et 49*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par M.-L. Freyburger, J.-M. Roddaz (reprint 2002); *Livres 41 et 42*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par M.-L. Freyburger-Galland, F. Hinard, P. Cordier; *Livres 45 et 46*. Texte établi par V. Fromentin, traduit par V. Fromentin et E. Bertrand, commenté par E. Bertrand; *Livres 38, 39 et 40*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par G. Lachenaud, M. Coudry; *Livre 47*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par E. Bertrand et V. Fromentin; *Livres 36 et 37*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par M. Coudry, G. Lachenaud; *Livre 53*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par M. Bellissime, F. Hurlet; *Livres 78, 79 et 80*. Texte, traduction et commentaire par É. Foulon, M. Molin. Paris.
- Duckworth, H.T.F. 1916: *A Commentary on the Fifty-Third Book of Dio Cassius' Roman History*. Toronto.
- Edmondson, J. 1992: *Dio: The Julio-Claudians. Selections from Books 58–63 of the Roman History of Cassius Dio*. London.
- Espinosa Ruiz, U. 1982: *Debate Agrippa-Mecenas en Dion Casio. Respuesta senatorial a la crisis del Imperio Romano en época Severiana*. Madrid.
- Fadinger, V. 1969: *Die Begründung des Prinzipats. Quellenkritische und staatsrechtliche Untersuchungen zu Cassius Dio und der Parallelüberlieferung*. Berlin.
- Fechner, D. 1986: *Untersuchungen zu Cassius Dios Sicht der Römischen Republik*. Hildesheim–Zürich–New York.
- Fomin, A. 2015: *How Dio Wrote History: Dio Cassius' Intellectual, Historical, and Literary Techniques*. PhD thesis. New Brunswick.
- Fomin, A. 2016: Speeches in Dio Cassius. In: J. Lange, C. Madsen (eds.), *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*. Leiden–Boston, 217–237.
- Freyburger-Galland, M.-L. 1996: Δυναστεία chez Dion Cassius. *Ktema* 21, 23–27.
- Freyburger-Galland, M.-L. 1997: *Aspects du vocabulaire politique et institutionnel de Dion Cassius*. Paris.
- Fromentin, V. 2021: Cassius Dio scholarship in the 20<sup>th</sup> & 21<sup>st</sup> centuries. In: J.M. Madsen, C. Lange (eds.), *Cassius Dio the Historian: Methods and Approaches*. Leiden–Boston, 23–59.
- Gascó, F. 1988: *Casio Dión. Sociedad y política en tiempos de los Severos*. Madrid.
- Gowing, A.M. 1992: *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*. Ann Arbor.
- Gowing, A.M. 1997: Cassius Dio on the reign of Nero. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34/3, 2558–2590.
- Groot, H. 2008: *Zur Bedeutung der öffentlichen Spiele bei Tacitus, Sueton und Cassius Dio. Überlegungen zur Selbstbeschreibung der römischen Gesellschaft*. Berlin.
- Hammond, M. 1932: The significance of the speech of Maecenas in Dio Cassius, book LII. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 63, 88–102.
- Harrington, J.D. 1970: *Cassius Dio: A Reexamination*. PhD thesis. Kentucky.
- Harrington, J.D. 1977: Cassius Dio as a military historian. *Acta Classica* 20, 159–165.
- Hose, M. 1994: *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio*. Stuttgart–Leipzig.

- Hose, M. 2007: Cassius Dio: a senator and historian in the age of anxiety. In: J. Marincola (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Chichester, 461–467.
- Humphrey, J.W. 1976: *An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History*. Book 59. *Gaius Caligula*. PhD thesis. Vancouver.
- Jayat, A. 2021: *Édition critique avec traduction et commentaire du livre 43 de l'Histoire romaine de Cassius Dion*. Thèse de doctorat. Bordeaux.
- Jones, B. 2021: Teuta and feminine exemplarity in Cassius Dio's Roman History. In: J.M. Madsen, C. Lange (eds.), *Cassius Dio the Historian: Methods and Approaches*. Leiden–Boston, 406–425.
- Kasjusz Dion 2008: *Historia rzymska (księgi 41–50)*. Wstęp, tłum. i kom. I. Ptaszek. Kraków.
- Kasjusz Dion 2011: *Księgi flawijskie (Historia rzymska LXV–LXVII)*. Tłum. M. Kaźmierska, D. Latanowicz-Domecka, red. S. Dworacki, wstęp i kom. L. Mrozewicz. (Fontes Historiae Antiquae, XIX). Poznań.
- Kasjusz Dion 2017: *Historia rzymska, księgi seweriańskie (LXXIII–LXXX)*. Wstęp, tłumaczenie i komentarz K. Biały. Szczecin.
- Kassiy Dion Kokkeyan 2011–2014: *Rimaskaya istoriya. Kn. LXIV–LXXX, kn. LI–LXIII* [*Roman History. Books LXIV–LXXX, LI–LXIII*]. Ed., commentaries, introductory article by A.V. Makhlauiuk. Saint Petersburg.
- Кассий Дион Коккеян. *Римская история. Кн. LXIV–LXXX, кн. LI–LXIII*. Пер. с древнегреч. под ред. А.В. Махляюка; комментарии и вступ. статья А.В. Махляюка. СПб.
- Kemezis, A.M. 2006: *The Roman Past in the Age of the Severans*. PhD thesis. Michigan.
- Kemezis, A.M. 2014: *Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian*. Cambridge–New York.
- Kemezis, A. 2019: Review-discussion «taking stock of Cassius Dio». *Histos* 13, 27–50.
- Kemezis, A., Bailey, C., Poletti, B. (eds.) 2022: *The Intellectual Climate of Cassius Dio: Greek and Roman Pasts*. Leiden–Boston.
- Kolb, F. 1972: *Literarische Beziehungen zwischen Cassius Dio, Herodian und der Historia Augusta*. Bonn.
- Kordoš, J. 2010: Thucydidean elements in Cassius Dio. *Acta Antiqua Academiae Scientiarum Hungaricae* 50, 249–256.
- Kuhlmann, P. 2010: Die Maecenas-Rede bei Cassius Dio: Anachronismen und intertextuelle Bezüge. In: D. Pausch (ed.), *Stimmen der Geschichte: Funktionen von Reden in der antiken Historiographie*. Berlin, 109–123.
- Kuhn-Chen, B. 2002: *Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2. und 3. Jahrhundert n.Chr. Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio und Herodian*. Frankfurt am Main.
- Lange, C.H. 2019a: Cassius Dio on violence, stasis, and civil war: the early years. In: C. Burden-Strevens, M. Lindholmer (eds.), *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden–Boston, 165–189.
- Lange, C.H. 2019b: Cassius Dio on Sextus Pompeius and late republican civil war. In: J. Osgood, C. Baron (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Late Republic*. Leiden–Boston, 236–258.
- Lange, C.H. 2021: Cassius Dio on Perusia: a study in human nature during civil war. In: J.M. Madsen, C. Lange (eds.), *Cassius Dio the Historian: Methods and Approaches*. Leiden–Boston, 336–362.
- Lange, C.H. 2022 (forthcoming): Cassius Dio on civil war: between history and theory. In: A. Scott, J.M. Madsen (eds.), *Brill's Companion to Cassius Dio*. Leiden–Boston.
- Lange, C.H., Madsen, J.M. (eds.) 2016a: *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*. Leiden–Boston.
- Lange, C.H., Madsen, J.M. 2016b: Between history and politics. In: C.H. Lange, J.M. Madsen (eds.), *Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*. Leiden–Boston, 1–10.
- Lange, C.H., Madsen, J.M. 2019: The historiography of Rome and its empire series. In: C. Burden-Strevens, M. Lindholmer (eds.), *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden–Boston, xi–xiv.
- Lange, C.H., Scott, A.G. (eds.) 2020a: *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Leiden–Boston.
- Lange, C.H., Scott, A.G. 2020b: Cassius Dio: between war and civil war. In: C.H. Lange, A.G. Scott (eds.), *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Leiden–Boston, 1–12.
- Langford, J. 2021: Cassius Dio and the dowager empresses. Part 1: Livia, the senate, and the succession struggle. In: J.M. Madsen, C.H. Lange (eds.), *Cassius Dio the Historian: Methods and Approaches*. Leiden–Boston, 426–458.

- Lindholmer, M.O. 2019: Breaking the idealistic paradigm: competition in Dio's earlier Republic. In: C. Burden-Strevens, M. Lindholmer (eds.), *Cassius Dio's Forgotten History of Early Rome*. Leiden–Boston, 190–216.
- Lindholmer, M.O. 2020: Caesar's campaigns in Cassius Dio's late republic. In: C.H. Lange, A.G. Scott (eds.), *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Leiden–Boston, 92–119.
- Lintott, A.W. 1997: Cassius Dio and the history of the late Roman Republic. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34/3, 2497–2523.
- Litsch, E. 1893: *De Cassio Dione imitatore Thucydidis*. Diss. Freyburg.
- Madsen, J.M. 2020: *Cassius Dio*. London–New Delhi–Sydney.
- Makhlayuk, A.V. 2017: Rev.: V. Fromentin, E. Bertrand, M. Coltelloni-Trannoy, M. Molin, G. Urso (eds.), *Cassius Dio: nouvelles lectures*. 2 vols. Bordeaux. *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*. URL: <http://bmcr.brynmawr.edu/2017/2017-12-15.html>; accessed on 01.08.2022.
- Mallan, C.T. 2015: *A Historical and Historiographical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Book 57.1–17.8*. PhD thesis. Oxford.
- Mallan, C.T. 2019: Review of Andrew G. Scott: Emperors and usurpers. An historical commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History books 79(78)–80(80) (A.D. 217–229). Oxford, 2018. *Sehepunkte* 19/2. URL: <http://www.sehepunkte.de/2019/02/32064.html>; accessed on 01.08.2022.
- Mallan, C.T. (ed.) 2020: *Cassius Dio. Roman History: Books 57 and 58 (the Reign of Tiberius)*. Oxford–New York.
- Manuwald, B. 1979: *Cassius Dio und Augustus: philologische Untersuchungen zu den Büchern 45–56 des dionischen Geschichtswerkes*. Wiesbaden.
- Markov, K.V. 2020: Cassius Dio on senatorial activities as a factor of political instability and civil war. In: C.H. Lange, A.G. Scott (eds.), *Cassius Dio: the Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Leiden–Boston, 241–256.
- Martinelli, G. 1999: *L'ultimo secolo di studi su Cassio Dione*. Genova.
- Martinelli, G. 2002: Nuovi studi su Cassio Dione. *Rivista storica dell'antichità* 32, 259–270.
- Massoni, L.B. 2009: *Il linguaggio di Cassio Dione: eventi, istituzioni, discorsi*. Tesi dottorato. Bologna.
- Mastrososa, I.G. 2019: Gender e potere fra tarda Repubblica e alto Imperio: la lettura di Cassio Dione. *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 71, 301–333.
- Migliorati, G. 2003: *Cassio Dione e l'impero romano da Nerva ad Antonino Pio: alla luce dei nuovi documenti*. Milan.
- Millar, F. 1964: *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.
- Montecalvo, M.S. 2014: *Cicerone in Cassio Dione. Elementi biografici e fortuna dell'opera*. Lecce.
- Murison, C.L. 1999: *Rebellion and Reconstruction: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 64–67 (A.D. 68–96)*. Oxford.
- Noé, E. 1994: *Commento storico a Cassio Dione LII*. Como.
- Noe, C.V. 2020: The 'Age of Iron and Rust' in Cassius Dio's Roman History: influences from stoic philosophy. In: C. Burden-Strevens, J.M. Madsen, A. Pistellato (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Principate*. Venezia, 141–164.
- Pelling, C.B.R. 1997: Biographical history? Cassius Dio on the early principate. In: M.J. Edwards, S. Swain (eds.), *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Oxford, 117–144.
- Pistellato, A. 2020: Δημοκρατεῖσθαι or μοναρχεῖσθαι, that is the question: Cassius Dio and the senatorial principate. In: C. Burden-Strevens, J.M. Madsen, A. Pistellato (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Principate*. Venezia, 115–140.
- Pitcher, L. 2018: Cassius Dio. In: K. De Timmerman, E. van Emde Boas (eds.), *Characterization in Ancient Greek Literature*. Leiden–Boston, 221–235.
- Platon, M. 2015: *Édition des livres 57 et 58 de l'“Histoire romaine” de Dion Cassius: établissement du texte, traduction et commentaire*. Thèse. Toulouse.
- Rantala, J. 2016: Dio the dissident: the portrait of Severus in the Roman History. In: C.H. Lange, J.M. Madsen (eds.), *Cassius Dio Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician*. Leiden–Boston, 159–176.
- Rees, W. 2011: *Cassius Dio, Human Nature, and the Late Roman Republic*. PhD thesis. Oxford.
- Reinhold, M. 1986: In praise of Cassius Dio. *L'antiquité classique* 55, 213–222.
- Reinhold, M. 1988: *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 49–52 (36–29 BC)*. Atlanta.

- Reinhold, M. 2002: Human nature as cause in ancient historiography. In: M. Reinhold (ed.), *Studies in Classical History and Society*. Oxford, 45–53.
- Rich, J.W. 1990: *Cassius Dio, The Augustan Settlement: Roman History 53–55*. 9. Warminster.
- Rich, J.W. 2020: Causation and morality: Cassius Dio on the origins of Rome's external wars under the Republic. In: C.H. Lange, A.G. Scott (eds.), *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Leiden–Boston, 65–91.
- Schmidt, M.G. 1997: Die 'zeitgeschichtlichen' Bücher im Werke des Cassius Dio: Von Commodus zu Severus Alexander. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34/3, 2591–2649.
- Schmidt, M.G. 1999: Politische und persönliche Motivation in Dios Zeitgeschichte. In: M. Zimmermann (ed.), *Geschichtsschreibung und politischer Wandel im 3. Jh. n. Chr.* Stuttgart, 93–117.
- Schulz, V. 2019: *Deconstructing Imperial Representation: Tacitus, Cassius Dio, and Suetonius on Nero and Domitian*. Leiden.
- Schwartz, E. 1899: Cassius Dio. In: *RE*. Hlbd. 6, 1684–1722.
- Scott, A.G. 2008: *Change and Discontinuity Within the Severan Dynasty: The Case of Macrinus*. PhD thesis. New Brunswick.
- Scott, A.G. 2015: Cassius Dio, Caracalla, and the senate. *Klio* 97, 157–175.
- Scott, A.G. 2017a: Cassius Dio's Julia Domna: character development and narrative function. *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 147, 413–433.
- Scott, A.G. 2017b: Cassius Dio's contemporary history as a memoir and its implications for authorial identity. *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* 17, 1–23.
- Scott, A.G. 2018: *Emperors and Usurpers: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History Books 79(78)–80(80) (A.D. 217–229)*. Oxford–New York.
- Scott, A.G. 2020a: Civil war and governmental change: from the achievements of Augustus to the failures of the Severans. In: C.H. Lange, A.G. Scott (eds.), *Cassius Dio: The Impact of Violence, War, and Civil War*. Leiden–Boston 334–355.
- Scott, A.G. 2020b: Misunderstanding history: past and present in Cassius Dio's contemporary books. In: C. Burden-Strevens, J.M. Madsen, A. Pistellato (eds.), *Cassius Dio and the Principate*. Venezia, 165–188.
- Simons, B. 2009: *Cassius Dio und die Römische Republik. Untersuchungen zum Bild des römischen Gemeinwesens in den Büchern 3–35 der „Rhomaika“*. Berlin–New York.
- Sion-Jenkis, K. 2016: Frauenfiguren bei Cassius Dio: der Fall der Livia. In: V. Fromentin, E. Bertrand (eds.), *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures*. Bordeaux, 725–740.
- Stekelenburg, A.V. an 1971: *De redevoeringen bij Cassius Dio*. Diss. Leiden.
- Swain, S. 1996: *Hellenism and Empire: Language, Classicism, and Power in the Greek World, AD 50–250*. Oxford.
- Swan, P.M. 1997: How Cassius Dio composed his Augustan books: four studies. In: W. Haase (Hrsg.), *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* II.34/3, 2524–2557.
- Swan, P.M. 2004: *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 55–56 (9 A.D. – B.C. 14)*. Oxford.
- Swan, P.M., Humphrey, J.W. 1988: Series preface. In: M. Reinhold (ed.), *From Republic to Principate: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 49–52 (36–29 BC)*. Atlanta, ix–xi.
- Townend, G.B. 1964: Some rhetorical battle-pictures in Dio. *Hermes* 92/4, 467–482.
- Urso, G. 2005: *Cassio Dione e i magistrati. Le origini della repubblica nei frammenti della Storia romana*. Milano.
- Urso, G. 2013: *Cassio Dione e i sovversivi. La crisi della repubblica nei frammenti della Storia romana (XXI–XXX)*. Milano.
- Urrutia Muñoz, N.U. 2014: *Las formas de la memoria en la historiografía griega del siglo III Romano: Utilización del recuerdo en Dion Casio y Herodiano*. Tesis doctoral. Barcelona.
- Zecchini, G. 1978: *Cassio Dione e la guerra gallica di Cesare*. Milan.