

Cameo Roles: Dio's Portrayals of Earlier Senatorial Authors

Adam Kemezis
University of Alberta

Delivered at Conference "Greek and Roman Pasts in the Long Second Century,"
Banff AB, 25 May 2018

Cassius Dio, as I think we've all figured out, had no problem talking about himself. He has lots of aspects of his life about which he's downright garrulous, including his political career and his literary endeavors. Nonetheless, as often happens with chatty people who have lived interesting lives, there are subjects one would really like to hear more about that it turns out to be very difficult to get him on to. One of these, I would suggest, is the intersection between his writing and his politics. While he does relate his writing to political events he lived through, it is often in opaque or unsatisfying ways. In particular, what continues to frustrate at least me is the question of how his various layers of criticism of the Severan regime relate to his political relationships with the various emperors, and to whatever larger world of clandestine dissent and opposition we suppose existed from the 190s civil wars right up to Alexander's reign. To what extent can Dio's history be read not as a retrospective memoir of a discontented individual, but as a document of the political culture in which it was written and circulated? In Severan Rome, what kind of political intervention did the writing of a history constitute?

There are lots of approaches to this question, and the article by Anthony Kaldellis on my bibliography represents a stimulating recent contribution: in spite of the title, he actually talks quite a bit about Dio and Herodian and the question of their apparent endpoints. One other place I do think we can look for a sense of how Dio saw historiography in political culture, however, is in instances where senators are also authors of histories or memoirs find their way into Dio's narrative as characters. These are what I've termed the "cameo roles" of the title. They are quite numerous in surviving Dio, and stand out all the more in that Dio has virtually no source-citations as such. Historians are ostensibly only

mentioned when they perform noteworthy public actions, which in practice means that only senators get mentioned. There are no anecdotes of Livy or even equestrians such as the elder Pliny, as best we can tell. Most of them are brief mentions that do not mention the person's writing and might be considered just ordinary anecdotes about senators. I've given you in #1 a-e Cornelius Sisenna, Asinius Pollio, Cluvius Rufus, Arrian and Marius Maximus. There are also several major characters who wrote histories or *commentarii*. The works of major characters like Cato the Elder and Julius Caesar are similarly not typically mentioned even though the opportunity is evidently greater.

There are a few exceptions that I want to highlight today, these being most notably the cases of Sallust and Cremutius Cordus, with nods also to Rutilius Rufus and Cicero. What I want to argue from these, in brief, is that when Dio portrays his senatorial predecessors writing history, the main impression he leaves is that it's a dangerous and unpredictable business, partaking of the dangers and unpredictability of political life in general. He doesn't appear to stress either the pleasure or the utility of literary activity for the political man. I want at the end of the paper to consider what this means for Dio's portrayal of his own activities.

To consider first Sallust, however. It isn't clear at this point how much direct use Dio ever made of Sallust as a source, but the earlier historian does somehow manage to find his way three times into the narrative, all in basically negative contexts. In 2a he's being kicked out of the Senate by Pompey's supporters in 50, and note he's referred to as "the writer of history"; a couple of years later in 2b he's losing control of the mutinous army that Caesar will eventually dress down at Placentia; and lastly and most importantly in 2c, he's being tried for provincial extortion. As you can see, Dio takes it for granted that he's guilty, and makes a meal of the discrepancy between Sallust's moralistic pose and his actual behavior. There are any number of specific passages in the *Catiline* or *Jugurtha* that he could have in mind, but it seems likely that Dio expects readers to associate Sallust with general railing against the corruption of his times.

What I want to highlight, though, is how Dio characterizes the relationship between the histories and the accusations. Anyone reading this passage who wasn't familiar with Sallust's works would, I think, assume that the historical works in question were already in circulation, and that the αἰσχύνην ἐσχάτην that he brought on himself manifested itself at the time of the trial. This was not in fact the case. Sallust's own prefaces make it clear that the historical works are written after his withdrawal from public life, albeit their account of that withdrawal is unsurprisingly different from Dio's (3). The discrepancy seems to me deliberate on Dio's part. His language about this history coming first is ambiguous, there is a certain slippage between the judgement of contemporaries during Sallust's trial and that of posterity viewing him through his writings. Moreover, the idea writing in retirement isn't something Sallust just casually lets slip: passage #3 is a key part of a preface that Dio surely knew if he knew any Sallust at all, and the trope of history-in-retirement is a very common one that, as we'll see, Dio will go on to apply to himself.

Thus it's all the more surprising when, on the most natural reading of Dio's text, the order remains "histories first, then trial." It has a curious effect on how Sallust comes off. Instead of being a bare-faced hypocrite who castigated the very sins everyone knew he had committed, Sallust becomes almost a victim of circumstance. How could he have known when he wrote his histories that he would face a trial in which they would become his indictment? Presumably Sallust's intent in writing was to acquire glory, and he's now fallen into a bitter ironic reversal, though one for which he's entirely to blame. Sting-in-the-tail endings of this kind are a common feature of Dio's sardonic persona, but here they can encompass the writings of perhaps the most widely read Latin historian of Dio's time.

A further curious aspect of this story emerges if we consider that it has something of a contrasting prequel. The fragments of Dio's narrative of the 90s BCE include a substantial reference (4) to the trial of Rutilius Rufus, which was something of a *cause*

célèbre of the time, related at some length by Cicero in the *Brutus*. Rufus was a consular who had served as a legate to the governor of Asia and had apparently favored the interests of the provincials over Roman tax-collectors. He thus made enemies who got him prosecuted and convicted for, of all things, extortion. Dio mentions his admirable but seemingly ineffective defense speech, and how he was vindicated by the revelation of his modest means, and by his living as an honored exile in the same province he had supposedly plundered. What Dio seems (at least from these excerpts) to have omitted is that Rufus himself described the whole business in an autobiography and likely also a Greek-language history. Admittedly he's not as famous a historian as Sallust, but both Appian and Athenaeus do mention his work. It seems like this might be the perfect counter-example to Sallust, someone who got the last laugh on his unjust accusers by writing an account that he then supported with the evidence of his own conduct. This isn't a road Dio takes, and it seems like he's less interested in the possibilities of historiography-as-self-vindication than in historiography-as-self-condemnation.

The second example, that of Cremutius Cordus, points in somewhat the same direction. Cordus was a senator who was forced to commit suicide under Tiberius when he was charged, seemingly with *maiestas*, over a history in which he praised Caesar's assassins. Subsequent tradition makes him into something of a hero: Seneca writes a consolatory essay to his daughter Marcia, and Tacitus turns his trial into a set-piece in which the historian-martyr receives a long and dignified speech. Tacitus stresses that the history was secretly preserved (5a) and reflects on the continued glory such writings bring their authors. He also places Cordus' story immediately after a long reflection on his own task as a historian of the principate, including a somewhat specious claim that writing about the Tiberian era is still dangerous for him seventy years after the fact.

Dio's version includes the same basic facts as Tacitus' but it's much shorter (perhaps unsurprisingly) and very different in emphasis. As you can see (5b), Dio is much more explicit than Tacitus that the history is simply a pretext: Cordus' real crime is

that he had annoyed Sejanus, a point confirmed by Seneca. Dio goes out of his way to stress the basic inoffensiveness of both Cordus and his works. As you can see, he points out Cordus' age and mild disposition, and how long ago the history was written. His summary of the content minimizes its critical nature: you can compare it with Quintilian's assessment (6c). And Dio makes sure to tell us that Augustus had in fact read Cordus' history when it was first written. Suetonius has a slightly different version of that same fact. Tacitus' version of Cordus gives a long list of instances where Caesar and Augustus tolerated uncongenial authors, but he somehow manages not to include himself on it, and leaves one to suppose his history was a recent composition. This lapse of forensic verisimilitude is pardonable: Tacitus' Cordus is admirable because he pursues free speech and accepts the inevitable consequences of principled action under a tyrant. Dio's Cordus did everything he could to cover himself, but the moral of the story seems to be that *any* public action can end up being lethal under the wrong circumstances. Even though Cordus' history actually seems to reflect Dio's own view of the Assassins and Triumvirs quite well, he doesn't give it any praise as a lasting monument. He portrays it more as an opening Cordus left his enemies. The final note about its survival is less a vindication than a bitter irony. The most interesting thing about Cordus' seemingly pedestrian work is that its author died over it, and it's not at all clear Dio thinks it was worth it.

This stress on danger and unpredictability is curiously at odds with the last example that I want to briefly throw in the mix, which is that of Cicero's hypothetical history. Dio's relationship to Cicero is a complex one that's beyond our scope here, but what I want to single out is a brief passage of from the long consolatory speech that Dio's Cicero receives in his exile from a probably fictional philosopher named Philiscus. Philiscus, whose advice often has an Epicurean flavor, is adamant that Cicero should not attempt a return to political life, but rather he should treat his exile as a tranquil retirement. As you can see in (#6a), he suggests among other things that history-writing might be a way for Cicero to remain useful to his community. In spite of the pointedly

Greek examples that Philiscus brings up, the trope is recognizably Roman, and one is tempted to see references not only to the Sallust passage I've already quoted, but to Cicero's own musings on this question, especially from the *De Legibus* (#6b) and then even back to Cato the Elder (#6c).

We can't know that Dio read any of these works, but given that here he's putting the idea of Cicero the historian on the table, it doesn't seem unreasonable to suppose that he might have been aware that the real Cicero had made similar reflections. These reflections, though, both Cicero's own and Dio's, belong firmly in the world of alternate reality and roads not taken. And that goes not simply for the historical writings themselves, but for the whole cultural scenario of which they are a part. Cicero is imagining a stable republic made up of predictable life-patterns and safe traditional roles such as that of the elder-statesman *cum* historian *cum* all-around-sage. Dio and, I think, his imagined readers, know that this isn't a role Cicero will ever get to play or, ultimately, the world he lives in. The writings of his old age will be ostensibly non-political philosophical and rhetorical treatises, up until the *Philippics*, which will turn out to be just as fatal for their author as Cordus' histories. And as with Cordus, Dio's view of Cicero's *parrhēsia* is less than wholly admiring.

The overall picture, I'd argue, remains a pessimistic one in which history-writing is dangerous, unpredictable and perhaps futile. The natural question, then, for my last couple of minutes today, is how these examples relate to Dio's presentation of himself and his own work. As we know, this is a subject on which Dio has a great deal to say, notably in (#7a) on your handout, where he describes the genesis of his historical writings. There are lots of things evidently to say about this passage, and especially how it disavows the usual tropes of independence and impartiality. Dio is remarkably willing to associate his earlier writing projects with Septimius Severus, who indeed then returns to him in a later dream. Dio casts his younger self as a political maneuverer, for whom

historiography is a tool for political and cultural advancement. He sees the results of his first work and assumes they can be replicated on a larger scale.

We all know that this isn't exactly how it works out for Dio in the end, and this passage has been the basis of many biographical readings of Dio as "disillusioned" with the Severan dynasty. Such readings are to my mind correct, but don't always acknowledge how deliberately Dio creates this impression. Rather than inconsistency, I think we're meant to see a certain wry irony in this passage. Certainly the history we are reading will not turn out to be the one anticipated by Dio or Severus back in the 190s. Its end-point will change as emperors die, and its viewpoint will be revised based on the ups and downs of their successors. It's less clear what if any effect it had on Dio's career: there is little trace of any favor it might have helped him gain from Severus, though also no apparent sense that it has gotten him in trouble or will do so. What we do see is an peculiar emphasis on *tychē*, I think here in the sense of random unpredictability. When Dio speaks of that goddess as guiding his work, he's reflecting in part on all the vicissitudes of his own career and the place his literary work has within it. *Tychē* may offer fine hopes, but by her nature she does not deal in predictable certainties.

Dio reflects once in passing that he owns a villa in Capua that he designated as his place to write history (7b). This is perhaps the closest he comes to the idyll suggested by Philiscus and in some measure by Cicero himself. As ever, we know that it won't work out that way, at least completely. When we get to the end of Dio's history (7c), we learn that the words we read are not composed in his chosen retreat. After the debacle of his second consulship in 229, he leaves Italy altogether for his ancestral home in Nicaea. This is sometimes seen as a peaceful retirement, as perhaps the lines from Homer suggest. But one wonders: after all, context from the *Iliad* tells us that the safety Hector has found is neither congenial nor permanent. If Dio's stories of previous historians are any guide, the one predictable lesson he draws about historiography is that the past is no less unpredictable than the future.

Cameo Roles: Dio's Portraits of Earlier Senatorial Historians

Adam Kemezis
Univ. of Alberta
kemezis@ualberta.ca

Greek and Roman Pasts in the Long Second Century
Banff, AB
25 May 2018

<p>1a. Dio 36.18.1</p>	<p>καὶ Κορνήλιος Σισέννας ὁ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄρχων ἦλθε μὲν ἐς τὴν Κρήτην, ὡς ταῦτ' ἐπύθετο, καὶ παρήνευσε τῷ Μετέλλῳ φείσασθαι τῶν δήμων, οὐ μὲντοι καὶ ἀντέπραξε τι μὴ πείσας.</p>	<p>Cornelius Sisenna, the governor of Greece, when he learned about [Metellus' actions] came to Crete and advised Metellus to be lenient with the cities. Nonetheless, when his advice did not succeed, he took no action of his own.</p>
<p>1b. Dio 45.10.3-5</p>	<p>κάνταῦθα καὶ στρατιώτας καὶ πόλεις, ἄλλως τε καὶ ἐπειδὴ ὁ Καῖσαρ ἀπέθανε, τὰς μὲν ἐκούσας τὰς δὲ καὶ βία προσλαβόν (ὁ γὰρ ἄρχων αὐτῶν Γάιος Ἀσίνιος Πωλίων οὐδὲν ἰσχυρὸν εἶχεν) ὥρμησε μὲν ἐπὶ τὴν Καρχηδόνα τὴν Ἴβηρικὴν, ἐπιθεμένου δὲ ἐν τούτῳ τοῦ Πωλίωνος τῆ ἀπουσία αὐτοῦ καὶ κακώσαντός τινα ἐπανήλθε χειρὶ πολλῇ, καὶ συμβαλὼν αὐτόν τε ἐτρέψατο, καὶ τοὺς λοιποὺς ἰσχυρῶς ἀγωνιζομένους ἔπειτ' ἐκ συντυχίας τοιαῦδε ἐξέπληξε καὶ ἐνίκησεν. ἐπειδὴ γὰρ ἐκεῖνος μὲν τὴν γλαμύδα τὴν στρατηγικὴν ἀπέρριψεν ὥστε ῥᾶον τῇ φυγῇ λαθεῖν, ἕτερος δὲ τις ὁμώνυμος τε αὐτῷ καὶ ἐπιφανῆς ἱππεὺς ἔπεσε, καὶ ὁ μὲν ἔκειτο ἢ δὲ ἐαλώκει, τὸ μὲν ἀκούσαντες οἱ στρατιῶται τὸ δὲ ἰδόντες ἠπατήθησαν ὡς καὶ τοῦ στρατηγοῦ σφῶν ἀπολωλότος καὶ ἐνέδοσαν.</p>	<p>[Sextus Pompeius] gathered soldiers and cities [in Baetica], especially after Caesar's death, some willingly and some by compulsion, since the governor, C. Asinius Pollio, lacked strong forces. [Sextus] then set out against Spanish Carthage. When Pollio made attacks in his absence and inflicted some damage, he returned with a large force, fell on Pollio and routed him. And thanks to the following stroke of fortune, he stunned and defeated the rest who were fighting fiercely. First Pollio had thrown off his general's cloak, the more easily to flee undetected, and it then happened that another man of the same name was killed, a prominent equestrian. He lay there, the cloak was captured, and when the soldiers saw and heard about it, they got the mistaken idea their general had died, and surrendered.</p>
<p>1c. Dio 62.[63].14.3 (Xiph.)</p>	<p>ἠγωνίσαστο δὲ ἐν πάσῃ ὁμοίως πόλει ἀγῶνα ἐχούσῃ, κήρυκι πρὸς πάντα τὰ κηρύξεως δεόμενα Κλουουίῳ Ῥούφῳ ἀνδρὶ ὑπατευκτῷ χρησάμενος, πλὴν Ἀθηνῶν καὶ Λακεδαίμονος.</p>	<p>[Nero] competed likewise in all the cities where contests were held, except Athens and Sparta, and for all the required duties of a herald, he used the consular Cluvius Rufus.</p>
<p>1d. Dio 69.15.1 (EU)</p>	<p>ὁ μὲν οὖν τῶν Ἰουδαίων πόλεμος ἐς τοῦτο ἐτελεύτησεν, ἕτερος δὲ ἐξ Ἀλανῶν (εἰσι δὲ Μασσαγέται) ἐκινήθη ὑπὸ Φαρασμάνου, καὶ τὴν μὲν Ἀλβανίδα καὶ τὴν Μηδίαν ἰσχυρῶς ἐλύπησε, τῆς δ' Ἀρμενίας τῆς τε Καππαδοκίας ἀψάμενος, ἔπειτα τῶν Ἀλανῶν τὰ μὲν δώροις ὑπὸ τοῦ Οὐολογαίσου πεισθέντων, τὰ δὲ καὶ Φλάουιον Ἀρριανὸν τὸν τῆς Καππαδοκίας ἄρχοντα φοβηθέντων, ἐπαύσατο.</p>	<p>The war against the Jews ended at around this time, but another, involving the Alani (these are Massagetae) was stirred up by Pharasmanes [of Iberia]. It did considerable damage to Albania and Media and affected Armenia and Cappadocia. It stopped when the Alani were bribed by Vologaeses [of Parthia] and scared off by Flavius Arrianus, the governor of Cappadocia.</p>
<p>1e. Dio 79.[78].14.2-3</p>	<p>ληρεῖν δὲ πως ἔδοξεν, ὥσπερ πού καὶ ὁ Μακρίνος τὸ μέγιστον τῆς γερουσίας ἀξίωμα τοιοῦτῳ ἀνδρὶ δούς, ὅστις οὐδὲ διαλεχθῆναί τι ἐν τῷ συνεδρίῳ καλῶς ὑπατεῦων ἠδυνήθη, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο τῇ τῶν ἀρχαιρεσιῶν ἡμέρᾳ νοσεῖν προσεποιήσατο. ὅθεν οὐκ ἐς μακρὰν τῷ Μαξιμῷ τῷ Μαρίῳ τὴν τῆς πόλεως προστασίαν ἀντ' αὐτοῦ προσέταξε, καθάπερ ἐπὶ τοῦτο μόνον πολιάρχον αὐτὸν ποιήσας ἵνα μίανη τὸ βουλευτήριον</p>	<p>[Avitus] looked like an utter idiot, and so did Macrinus for having given the Senate's highest honor [i.e. the city prefecture] to a man who was supposed to be consul but couldn't even hold a respectable conversation with anyone in the Senate. For that reason he pretended to be ill on the day of the election. So it was not long before he gave the post to Marius Maximus instead, as if he had made Avitus prefect for no other reason than to defile the Senate-house.</p>
<p>2a. Dio 40.63.4</p>	<p>ὁ γὰρ Πίσων οὐτ' ἄλλως πράγματ' ἔχειν ἐθέλων καὶ πρὸς τὴν τοῦ γαμβροῦ φιλίαν πολλοὺς θεραπεύων αὐτὸς μὲν οὐδὲν τοιοῦτον ἐποίησεν, ἐκεῖνός δὲ οὐκ ἀντέπραξε πάντας μὲν τοὺς ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθέρων συχνοὺς δὲ καὶ τῶν πάνυ γενναίων, ἄλλους τε καὶ τὸν Κρίσπον τὸν Σαλουστιον τὸν τὴν ἱστορίαν γράψαντα, ἀπελάσαντι ἐκ τοῦ συνεδρίου.</p>	<p>Piso wanted to avoid trouble in general, and was lobbying many men out of friendship for his son-in-law [Julius Caesar], and he engaged in no such actions [i.e. demoting senators and equestrians as censor]. But he did nothing to resist [Marcellus] who drove out of the Senate all of the freedmen but also many men of genuine noble stock, and especially Sallustius Crispus, the writer of history</p>

<p>2b. Dio 42.52.2</p>	<p>οὗτοι οὖν τὸν τε Σαλούστιον παρ' ὀλίγον ἀπέκτειναν (στρατηγὸς γὰρ ἐπὶ τῷ τῆν βουλευίαν ἀναλαβεῖν ἀπεδέδεικτο), καὶ ἐπειδὴ καὶ ἐκεῖνος διαφυγὼν αὐτοῦς ἐς τὴν Ῥώμην πρὸς τὸν Καίσαρα ὤρμησε, τὰ γιγνόμενά οἱ δηλώσων, ἐφέσποντό τε αὐτῷ συχνοὶ μηδενὸς φειδόμενοι, καὶ ἄλλους τε τῶν ἐντυχόντων σφίσι καὶ βουλευτὰς δύο ἔσφαξαν.</p>	<p>[The soldiers] nearly killed Sallust (he had been made praetor to restore his senatorial status). And when Sallust got away from them and ran to Caesar in Rome to tell him the news, many of them followed after him, sparing no-one but murdering whoever they came upon, including two senators.</p>
<p>2c. Dio 43.9.2-3</p>	<p>καὶ τοὺς Νομάδας λαβὼν ἕς τε τὸ ὑπήκοον ἐπήγαγε καὶ τῷ Σαλουστίῳ λόγῳ μὲν ἄρχειν ἔργῳ δὲ ἄγειν τε καὶ φέρειν ἐπέτρεπεν. ἀμέλει καὶ ἐδωροδόκησε πολλὰ καὶ ἤρπασεν, ὥστε καὶ κατηγορηθῆναι <καὶ> αἰσχύνην ἐσχάτην ὀφλεῖν, ὅτι τοιαῦτα συγγράμματα συγγράψας καὶ πολλὰ καὶ πικρὰ περὶ τῶν ἐκκαρπομένων τινὰς εἰπὼν οὐκ ἐμμήσατο τῷ ἔργῳ τοὺς λόγους. ὅθεν εἰ καὶ τὰ μάλιστα ἀφείθη ὑπὸ τοῦ Καίσαρος, ἀλλ' αὐτὸς γε ἑαυτὸν καὶ πάνυ τῇ συγγραφῇ ἐστηλοκόπησε.</p>	<p>He [Caesar] took over the Numidians, made them subjects and appointed Sallust, ostensibly as their governor but in fact to ravage and pillage them. He [Sallust] duly engaged in much bribe-taking and plunder, so that he was prosecuted and incurred the deepest disgrace, since, having written the kind of histories he had, saying many harsh things about certain corrupt men, he did not fit his deeds to the model of his words. Thus, even though he was completely pardoned by Caesar, he still inscribed in his history as on a monument a most effective indictment of himself.</p>
<p>3. Sallust BC 3.3-4.2</p>	<p>Sed ego adulescentulus initio, sicuti plerique, studio ad rem publicam latus sum ibique mihi multa advorsa fuere. Nam pro pudore, pro abstinentia, pro virtute audacia, largitio, avaritia vigeabant. Quae tametsi animus aspernabatur insolens malarum artium, tamen inter tanta vitia imbecilla aetas ambitione corrupta tenebatur; ac me, cum ab reliquorum malis moribus dissentirem, nihilo minus honoris cupido eadem, qua ceteros, fama atque invidia vexabat. Igitur ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requievit et mihi reliquam aetatem a re publica procul habendam decrevi, non fuit consilium socordia atque desidia bonum otium contere neque vero agrum colundo aut venando servilibus officiis, intentum aetatem agere; sed, a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna videbantur, perscribere, eo magis, quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publica animus liber erat.</p>	<p>When I was a youth, like many men I was carried with a beginner's eagerness into politics, and there many things went against me. For instead of respectability, self-control and excellence, there flourished recklessness, corruption and greed. Although in my mind I despised these things, being a stranger to wicked practices, still amid such crimes my feeble youth was in the grip of corrupt ambition. And although I did not share the wicked ways of the rest, still my lust for distinction plagued me with the same calumny and resentment as it did others. Thus when my mind took rest from many woes and dangers and I made the decision to spend the rest of my life away from politics, my idea was not to waste my best years of leisure in sloth and idleness, nor to devote my time to farming or hunting, which are slavish activities. I decided rather to return to the undertaking and endeavor from which wicked ambition had held me back, to write, separately and fully, on those actions of the Roman people that seemed to me worthy of memory, particularly since my mind was free from ambition, fear or political partisanship.</p>
<p>4. Dio 28.97 (EV)</p>	<p>ὅτι τοῦ Ρουτίλιου ἀγαθοῦ ὄντος ἀνδρὸς ἀδικάτατα κατεψηφίσαντο· ἐσῆχθη γὰρ ἐς δικαστήριον ἐκ κατασκευασμοῦ τῶν ἱππέων ὡς δωροδοκῆ<...> Κυνίῳ Μουκίῳ, καὶ ἐξημιώθη ὑπ' αὐτῶν χρήμασι. ταῦτα ἐποίησαν θυμῷ φέροντες ὅτι πολλὰ περὶ τὰς τελωνίας πλημμελοῦντας ἐπέσχευ.</p> <p>ὅτι ὁ Ρουτίλιος ἀπελογήσατο μὲν γενναιώτατα, καὶ οὐδὲν ὅ τι οὐκ εἶπεν ὦν <ἄν> ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς συκοφαντούμενος καὶ πολὺ πλεῖον τὰ τῶν κοινῶν ἢ τὰ ἑαυτοῦ ὀδυρόμενος φθέγγετο, ἕλω δέ, καὶ τῆς γε οὐσίας εὐθὺς ἐξέστη. ἐξ οὗπερ οὐχ ἤκιστα ἐφωράθη μηδὲν οἱ προσήκουσαν καταδίκην ὀφλήσας· πολλῶν τε γὰρ σμικρότερα κεκτημένος εὐρέθη ἢ οἱ κατήγοροι ἐκ τῆς Ἀσίας αὐτὸν ἐσφετερίσθαι ἐπεκάλουν, καὶ πάντα ἐκεῖνα ἐς δικαίαν καὶ νομίμους ἀρχὰς τῆς κτήσεως ἀνήγαγεν. οὕτω μὲν ἐπηρεάσθη, καὶ τίνα ὁ Μάριος αἰτίαν τῆς ἀλώσεως αὐτοῦ ἔσχευ· ἀρίστῳ γὰρ καὶ εὐδοκιμωτάτῳ αὐτῷ ὄντι ἐβαρύνετο. διόπερ καὶ ἐκεῖνος τῶν τε πραττομένων ἐν τῇ πόλει καταγνοῦς, καὶ ἀπαξιώσας τοιοῦτο ἔτι ἀνθρώπῳ συζῆσαι, ἐξεχώρησε μηδενὸς ἀναγκάζοντος, καὶ ἐς αὐτὴν γε τὴν Ἀσίαν ἐλθὼν τέως μὲν ἐν Μυτιλήνῃ διήγειν,</p>	<p>They most unjustly condemned Rutilius Rufus, an upright man. He was indicted through the machinations of the equestrians for taking bribes [when serving in Asia as legate to] Quintus Mucius, and they inflicted a fine on him. They did this from a grudge, because he had put a stop to their many tax-farming abuses.</p> <p>Rutilius made a most noble defense, and left out nothing that a good man would say confronting a false accusation, lamenting the distress of the state much more than his own. But he was convicted and immediately deprived of his property. This actually made it clear that he in no way deserved the accusation against him. It came out that his property was much less than what his accusers claimed he had extorted from Asia. And he demonstrated possession of all of it through honest and lawful means. Thus he was unjustly persecuted, and Marius had some part in the business. He was irked by Rutilius' excellence and sterling reputation. Therefore Rutilius, disgusted with the affairs of the city and disdaining to live in such a person's company, emigrated without any compulsion. And to what place did he go but Asia? He resided for a time in Mytilene,</p>

	ἔπειτα ἐκείνης ἐν τῷ Μιθριδατικῷ πολέμῳ κακωθεΐσης ἐς Σμύρναν μετωκίσθη, κἀνταῦθα κατεβίω, οὐδὲ ἠθέλησεν ἐπανελθεῖν οἴκαδε. καὶ οὐδὲν γε παρὰ τοῦτο ἤττον οὔτε ἐν εὐκλείᾳ οὔτε ἐν περιουσίᾳ ἐγένετο· πολλὰ μὲν γὰρ αὐτῷ καὶ ὁ Μούκιος, πλεῖστα δὲ καὶ δῆμοι καὶ βασιλῆς ὅσοι ποτὲ ἐπελείραντο αὐτοῦ ἐχαρίσαντο, ὥστε πολὺ πλείω αὐτὸν τῆς ἀρχαίας οὐσίας ἔχειν.	then when that city was devastated in the Mithridatic war, he moved to Smyrna and lived out his days there, with no desire to return home. And in spite of it all, he ended up no worse off in either reputation or wealth. For Mucius made him many gifts, and all the cities and kings that he had ever had experience of him gave a great deal more, so that he had much more than his previous fortune
5a. Tacitus Ann. 4.35	Quo magis socordiam eorum inridere libet qui praesenti potentia credunt extingui posse etiam sequentis aevi memoriam. Nam contra punitis ingeniis gliscit auctoritas, neque aliud externi reges aut qui eadem saevitia usi sunt nisi dedecus sibi atque illis gloriam peperere.	Thus one may all the more deride the stupidity of those who suppose that because they are powerful at one time, the memory of ages to come can be erased. It is rather the case that when talent is punished, it gains in stature. Foreign kings, and those who have practiced the same savagery, have produced nothing but disgrace for themselves and glory for the authors.
5b. Dio 57.24.2-4	Κρεμούτιος δὲ δὴ Κόρδος αὐτόχειρ ἑαυτοῦ γενέσθαι, ὅτι τῷ Σεϊανῷ προσέκρουσεν, ἠναγκάσθη· οὕτω γὰρ οὐδὲν ἐγκλημα ἐπαίτιον λαβεῖν ἠδυνήθη (καὶ γὰρ ἐν πύλαις ἤδη γήρως ἦν καὶ ἐπιεικέστατα ἐβεβίωκει) ὥστε ἐπὶ τῇ ἱστορίᾳ, ἦν πάλαι ποτὲ περὶ τῶν τῷ Αὐγούστῳ πραχθέντων συνετεθεῖκε καὶ ἦν αὐτὸς ἐκεῖνος ἀνεγνώκει, κριθῆναι, ὅτι τὸν τε Κάσσιον καὶ τὸν Βροῦτον ἐπήνεσε, καὶ τοῦ δήμου τῆς τε βουλῆς καθήσατο, τὸν τε Καίσαρα καὶ τὸν Αὐγουστον εἶπε μὲν κακὸν οὐδὲν, οὐ μόντοι καὶ ὑπερσεμένυε. ταῦτά τε γὰρ ἠτιάθη, καὶ διὰ ταῦτα αὐτὸς τε ἀπέθανε, καὶ τὰ συγγράμματα αὐτοῦ τότε μὲν <τά τε> ἐν τῇ πόλει εὐρεθέντα πρὸς τῶν ἀγορανόμων καὶ τὰ ἔξω πρὸς τῶν ἐκασταχόθι ἀρχόντων ἐκαύθη, ὕστερον δὲ ἐξεδόθη τε αὐθις (ἄλλοι τε γὰρ καὶ μάλιστα ἡ θυγάτηρ αὐτοῦ Μαρκία συνέκρυπεν αὐτά) καὶ πολὺ ἀξιοσπουδαστότερα ὑπ' αὐτῆς τῆς τοῦ Κόρδου συμφορᾶς ἐγένετο.	Cremutius Cordus was forced to become his own murderer, because he had offended Sejanus. Since no criminal charge could be brought against him (he being on the threshold of old age and having lived with the utmost moderation), he was prosecuted for his history of the deeds of Augustus, which he had composed a long while before and which Augustus himself had read. The accusation was that he had praised Cassius and Brutus, had chastised the people and the Senate and, without actually saying anything bad about Caesar or Augustus, had still not given them any special reverence. That was the charge and for that he died. His writings were burned by the aediles if found in the city, and abroad by the various governors. They were brought back out later on (his daughter Marcia, especially, had hidden them away) and became the object of much more attention precisely because of Cordus' fate.
5c. Quintilian Inst. 10.1.104 = Cordus T5 (Cornell)	Habet amatores - nec inmerito - Cremuti libertas, quamquam circumcisis quae dixisse ei nocuerat: sed elatum abunde spiritum et audaces sententias deprehendas etiam in iis quae manent.	The outspokenness of Cremutius has its devotees, and not without justice, even though those parts have been expurgated which he suffered for having said. Even in what remains you can still find plenty of lofty spirit and daring expressions.
6a. Dio 38.28.1-2	ἂν μὲν γὰρ μοι πεισθῆς, καὶ πάννυ ἀγαπήσεις χωρίον τέ τι παραθαλασσίδιον ἔξω πάτου ἐκλεξάμενος, καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ γεωργῶν τε ἅμα καὶ συγγράφων τι, ὡς Ξενοφῶν, ὡς Θουκυδίδης. τό τε γὰρ εἶδος τοῦτο τῆς σοφίας διαρκέστατόν ἐστι καὶ παντὶ μὲν ἀνδρὶ πάσῃ δὲ πολιτεία ἀρμοδιώτατον, καὶ ἡ φυγὴ φέρει τινὰ σχολὴν γονιμωτέραν.	[Philiscus speaking] My advice to you would be to content yourself entirely with picking out an estate for yourself, out of the way and by the sea, where you can farm and also write a bit of history, like Xenophon, like Thucydides. That is the most lasting form of learning, and most appropriate for all men in all governments. And exile brings a certain productive leisure.
6b. Cicero De Leg. 1.3.10	Ego uero aetatis potius uacationi confidebam, cum praesertim non recusarem, quominus more patrio sedens in solio consulentibus responderem senectutisque non inertis grato atque honesto fungerer munere. Sic enim mihi liceret et isti rei quam desideras et multis uberioribus atque maioribus operae quantum uellem dare.	[Cicero speaking] I was really looking more to the freedom of old age, particularly as I wouldn't turn down the chance to sit in the chair in the way of our ancestors and give responses to questioners, and perform the welcome and honorable duties of an active old age. That way I'd be able to give as much attention as I wanted to the thing you're asking for [i.e. a history], and to many greater and more fruitful things.
6c. Cicero Planc. 66 = Cato F2 (Cornell)	Etenim M. Catonis illud quod in principio scripsit Originum suarum semper magnificum et praeclarum putavi, clarorum hominum atque magnorum non minus otii quam negotii rationem exstare oportere.	For I [Cicero] have always thought it was a high-minded and splendid thing that Cato wrote at the start of his <i>Origines</i> , that there should be a public accounting of the leisure time of great and famous men, just as much as of their days of work.

<p>7a. Dio 73.[72].23 (Xiph.)</p>	<p>πόλεμοι δὲ μετὰ τοῦτο καὶ στάσεις μέγισται συνέβησαν, συνέθηκα δ' ἐγὼ τούτων τὴν συγγραφὴν ἐξ αἰτίας τοιαύτης. βιβλίον τι περὶ τῶν ὄνειράτων καὶ τῶν σημείων δι' ὧν ὁ Σεουήρος τὴν αὐτοκράτορα ἀρχὴν ἤλπισε, γράψας ἐδημοσίευσεν· καὶ αὐτῷ καὶ ἐκεῖνος πεμφθέντι παρ' ἐμοῦ ἐντυχῶν πολλά μοι καὶ καλὰ ἀντεπέστειλε. ταῦτ' οὖν ἐγὼ τὰ γράμματα πρὸς ἐσπέραν ἤδη λαβὼν κατέδαρθον, καὶ μοι καθεύδοντι προσέταξε τὸ δαιμόνιον ἱστορίαν γράφειν. καὶ οὕτω δὴ ταῦτα περὶ ὧν νῦν καθίσταμαι ἔγραψα. καὶ ἐπειδὴ γε τοῖς τε ἄλλοις καὶ αὐτῷ τῷ Σεουήρῳ μάλιστα ἤρεσε, τότε δὴ καὶ τὰλλα πάντα τὰ τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις προσήκοντα συνθεῖναι ἐπεθύμησα· καὶ διὰ τοῦτο οὐκέτι ἰδίᾳ ἐκεῖνο ὑπολιπεῖν ἀλλ' ἐς τήνδε τὴν συγγραφὴν ἐμβαλεῖν ἔδοξέ μοι, ἵν' ἐν μιᾷ πραγματείᾳ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς πάντα, μέχρις ἂν καὶ τῇ Τύχῃ δόξῃ, γράψας καταλίπω. τὴν δὲ δὴ θεὸν ταύτην ἐπιρρωννύουσάν με πρὸς τὴν ἱστορίαν εὐλαβῶς πρὸς αὐτὴν καὶ ὀκνηρῶς διακείμενον, καὶ πονούμενον ἀπαγορεύοντά τε ἀνακτωμένην δι' ὄνειράτων, καὶ καλὰς ἐλπίδας περὶ τοῦ μέλλοντος χρόνου διδοῦσάν μοι ὡς ὑπολειψομένου τὴν ἱστορίαν καὶ οὐδαμῶς ἀμαυρῶσαντος, ἐπίσκοπον τῆς τοῦ βίου διαγωγῆς, ὡς εἴκειν, εἴληγα, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο αὐτῇ ἀνάκειμαι. συνέλεξα δὲ πάντα τὰ ἀπ' ἀρχῆς τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις μέχρι τῆς Σεουήρου μεταλλαγῆς πραχθέντα ἐν ἔτεσι δέκα, καὶ συνέγραψα ἐν ἄλλοις δώδεκα· τὰ γὰρ λοιπὰ, ὅπου ἂν καὶ προχωρήσῃ, γεγράφεται.</p>	<p>After this there occurred great wars and civil strife, and I compiled an account of these things for the following reasons: I wrote and circulated a book on the dreams and portents that caused Severus to hope for the office of Emperor. And when I sent it to him and he found it, he wrote back to me at length and in favorable terms. I received this letter from him one evening and then went to sleep, and as I slept, the divine spirit gave me the task of writing history. And so I wrote about the events of the stage that I have now reached. Since these histories were much approved of, by Severus especially, then I became desirous of writing up everything else that concerned the Romans. And I have thus decided not to leave this [i.e. the second work] on its own but to include it in this history, so that I can write down and leave behind in one single treatment everything from the beginning down to whatever point Fortune may choose. Since that goddess [Fortune] restores my strength to write history at times when I feel diffident or hesitant, and calls me back to herself in dreams when I am laboring or discouraged and gives me bright hopes that future ages will pass on my history and never extinguish its light, and has turned out to be the guardian to watch over the course of my life, I thus make this dedication to her. All the deeds of the Romans from the beginning down to the death of Severus [in 211] I read up in ten years and wrote in another twelve. The rest [of the events of my life] will also be written, to whatever point it progresses.</p>
<p>7b. Dio 77.[76].2.1 (Xiph.)</p>	<p>ἐν δὲ τῷ Βεσβίῳ τῷ ὄρει πῦρ τε πλεῖστον ἐξέλαμψε καὶ μυκῆματα μέγιστα ἐγένετο, ὥστε καὶ ἐς τὴν Καπύην, ἐν ἧ, ὁσάκις ἂν ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ οἰκῶ, διάγω, ἐξακουσθῆναι· τοῦτο γὰρ τὸ χωρίον ἐξειλόμην τῶν τε ἄλλων ἕνεκα καὶ τῆς ἰσυχίας ὅτι μάλιστα, ἵνα σχολῆν ἀπὸ τῶν ἀστικῶν πραγμάτων ἄγων ταῦτα γράψαιμι.</p>	<p>On Mt. Vesuvius a massive fire blazed forth and there were great roaring noises that could be heard in Capua, the town where, when I reside in Italy, I spend my time. I picked out this district especially for its tranquility, so that there, enjoying leisure from the cares of the city, I might write these lines.</p>
<p>7c. Dio 80.[80].5.1-3 (Xiph.)</p>	<p>ἀχθεσθέντων δὲ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τούτοις ἐφοβήθη μὴ καὶ ἀποκτείνωσί με ἐν τῷ τῆς ἀρχῆς σχήματι ἰδόντες, καὶ ἐκέλευσεν ἔξω τῆς Ῥώμης ἐν τῇ Ἰταλίᾳ ποῦ διατριψαί τὸν τῆς ὑπατείας χρόνον. καὶ οὕτω μετὰ ταῦτα ἔς τε τὴν Ῥώμην καὶ ἐς τὴν Καμπανίαν πρὸς αὐτὸν ἤλθον, καὶ συνδιατρίψας τινὰς ἡμέρας αὐτῷ, τοῖς τε στρατιώταις μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας ὀφθεῖς, ἀπῆρα οἴκαδε παρέμενος ἐπὶ τῇ τῶν ποδῶν ἀρρωστίᾳ, ὥστε πάντα τὸν λοιπὸν τοῦ βίου χρόνον ἐν τῇ πατρίδι ζῆσαι, ὥστε ποῦ καὶ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐν τῇ Βιθυνίᾳ ἦδη μοι ὄντι σαφέστατα ἐδήλωσεν. ὄναρ γὰρ ποτε ἔδοξα προστάσσεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ προσγράμασθαι τῷ ἀκροτελευτήῳ τὰ ἔπη τάδε, Ἔκτορα δ' ἐκ βελέων ὑπαγε Ζεὺς ἕκ τε κονίης ἕκ τ' ἀνδροκτασίης ἕκ θ' αἵματος ἕκ τε κυδοιμοῦ.</p>	<p>And when [the Praetorians] were angry at [Alexander's granting a second consulship to Dio], Alexander was afraid they might kill me if they saw me in my official character. So he instructed me to spend the period of my consulship away from Rome, but still in Italy. And later on I came to him in Rome and in Campania and spent several days with him and was seen by the soldiers without any fear. Then I took off for home, given leave on account of an ailment in my feet, to live all the rest of my days in my homeland. This indeed the divine spirit revealed clearly to me when I was in Bithynia. For in a dream it seemed that it instructed me to insert at the end of my work the following lines: <i>Zeus then led Hector off from the missiles and dust and the slaughter of men, and the blood and the noise (Il. 9.163-164)</i></p>

Bibliography

- Cornell, T. J. (ed.) (2013). *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. 3 vols. Oxford.
Eisman, M. M. (1977) "Dio and Josephus: Parallel Analyses," *Latomus* 36: 657-73.
Howley, J. A. (2017) "Book-Burning and the Uses of Writing in Ancient Rome: Destructive Practice between Literature and Document," *JRS* 107: 213-36.
Kaldellis, A. (2017) "How Perilous Was It to Write Political History in Late Antiquity?" *Studies in Late Antiquity* 1: 38-64.
Millar, F. (1964) *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford.
Syme, R. (1964) *Sallust*. Berkeley.