Caillan Davenport/Christopher Mallan (eds.): Emperors and Political Culture in Cassius Dio's *Roman History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2021. XIV, 357 p., 1 ill. £ 90.00. ISBN: 978-1-108-83100-0.

Describing the *Juvenalia* celebrated in AD 59 on the occasion of Nero's first cutting of his beard, Cassius Dio offers readers a detailed account of the degrading spectacle of the Roman aristocracy and their emperor taking to the stage to perform (Cass. Dio 61[62].19–20). Among the many memorable and telling details of this tableau provided by Dio is the representation of Burrus and Seneca, Nero's praetorian prefect and closest advisor, gesticulating like music teachers and claqueurs as they followed his performance and encouraged others to applaud. This scene raises a whole host of questions regarding the *Roman History* of Cassius Dio. To name but a few, there are questions concerning its sources and composition, its aim(s) and readership, the relationship between past and present, and the light that it casts upon the socio-cultural and political matrix that generated it. No one can use this testimony without giving some thought to these questions. The collective volume under review here, superbly edited by Caillan Davenport and Christopher Mallan, addresses these and many related questions and therefore constitutes a felicitous and important addition to the rapidly growing body of literature dedicated to the study of Cassius Dio and that author's *Roman History*.[1] Beautifully produced and containing a series of engaging pieces that are sure to stimulate further work, it offers within the compass of a single volume what is arguably the finest successor to date to Fergus Millar's classic monograph of 1964.[2] There is ample scope for debate and dissent, but this volume provides readers with a comprehensive overview of work on one of the most fundamental and least appreciated of the historians of the Graeco-Roman world. In addition to thirteen dense essays that examine various aspects of Dio's treatment of the Principate, an introductory essay provides essential context and a concluding essay offers engaging reflections on future

1 The reviewer notes that he himself contributed to the first of the many History of Rome and Its Empire volumes dedicated to Cassius Dio, as did one of the editors (Christopher Mallan) and one of the authors (Adam Kemezis) whose work appears in the volume under review.

2 F. Millar: A Study of Cassius Dio. Oxford 1964.

avenues of research. In short, it will be a welcome addition to the library of anyone working on the Roman empire or Greek and Roman historiography.

* * *

The volume proper commences with an introduction by Davenport and Mallan (pp. 1–29) that is both programmatic and descriptive. Structured in six parts, the introduction provides an overview of the author and his work as well as highlighting the themes to be covered in the following thirteen chapters. The characterisation of Dio as a Severan author is rapidly done, but highly successful. Similarly, the concept of 'political culture' is well defined. Individuals (viz. the emperors and their supporting cast) and institutions (political) are fundamental to Dio's understanding of the Principate as reflected in Books 52–80 of the *Roman History*. Taking that premise as their starting-point, the thirteen contributions of this volume explore four distinct but related areas: Dio's handling of political narratives for the Principate (pp. 31–112); the representation of specific emperors and their biographies (pp. 113–196); the depiction of political groups and their place within the political culture of the Principate (pp. 197–286); and the reception of the *Roman History* in Late Antiquity and the Byzantine world followed by reflection on where to go from here (pp. 287–320).

The contribution of Adam M. Kemezis (pp. 33–51 = Chapter 1: "*Vox populi, vox mea*? Information, Evaluation and Public Opinion in Dio's Account of the Principate") analyses the construction and presentation of opinions of emperors by Cassius Dio in the *Roman History*. Starting with a methodological statement (53.19.3–6), Kemezis highlights Dio's strictures on the constraints of knowledge under a monarchy and his promise to offer readers the "public transcript" (p. 36) accompanied by the "hidden transcript" insofar as that is possible. Informed by scepticism and deduction, this latter version is juxtaposed with the former, thereby creating unequivocal views of the emperors and their actions. Concomitant with this approach is the presentation of the praise or blame of public opinion on a par with judgements expressed by Dio in his own voice. This sanctioning or condemning of rulers gives the public control over the honours granted to them in accordance with the "public transcript". Nostalgic for the Antonine past, Dio views the Severan present as an age of iron and rust (72[71].35.4 [EV])

culminating in emperors who are nonentities and the loss of the traditional senatorial privilege of participating in the rule of the Empire.

The contribution of Caillan Davenport (pp. 52–73 = Chapter 2: "News, Rumour, and the Political Culture of the Roman Imperial Monarchy in the *Roman History*") approaches rumour as a constituent element in Dio's representation of the political culture of the Principate. The episode of the misunderstanding over the destruction of statues of the praetorian prefect C. Fulvius Plautianus provides an introductory illustration of how rumour was often generated by a dearth of information. Rumour, thus generated, is a sense-making phenomenon, a mechanism for coping with a lack of verifiable and reliable news. Anxiety ("sustained collective tension") and limited channels of information as the causes of rumour are evident in Dio's account of the *dynasteia* period of the late Republic (133–31 BC). What rumours he records for the Principate are determined in part by the perspective of outsiders and Dio's historiographical interest in the political stability of the Roman state under a monarchy. On the other hand, there is also discernible an interest in the perspective of insiders and the use made of rumour by courtiers for self-preservation. Despite surface differences, a concern for collective stability and personal safety unite the stories related by Dio.

Cesare Letta's contribution (pp. 74–87 = Chapter 3: "Literary and Documentary Sources in Dio's Narrative of the Roman Emperors") offers a welcome synthesis and updating of his work of the past thirty years on Dio's use of sources. In view of the difficulty of identifying a single author or work as informing an extended block of Dio's text, Letta argues for Dio's use of multiple literary sources with independence and a critical spirit. On the other hand, Letta persuasively observes that numerous citations and obscure details relating to institutional history point firmly to Dio's use of documentary sources. Various examples (e.g. letters of Caracalla to the Senate when Dio was not present in Rome, the text of the dedicatory inscription for the temple of Poppaea) show what appears to be a clear reliance on documentary sources that did not reach Dio via literary sources. In fact, further evidence (e.g. the reference in a speech by Calenus to the ownership of *fullonicae* by Cicero's father, the epitaph of a Batavian cavalryman noteworthy for an extreme act of bravery in the presence of Hadrian) strongly points to consistent, extensive use of both the *acta senatus* and epigraphic documents. Letta concludes by noting that Dio used only a fraction of what he gathered, as he himself reminds readers.

The contribution of Rhiannon Ash (pp. 88–112 = Chapter 4: "'Now Comes the Greatest Marvel of All!' (79[78].8.2): Dio's Roman Emperors and the Incredible") explores Cassius Dio's penchant for reporting the wondrous and extraordinary in the *Roman History*. The historian's phrase that figures in the title derives from his account of the crowd at the Circus Maximus portentously acclaiming a jackdaw by the name of Caracalla's destined murderer. Ash begins by offering context via a review of ancient historians' ambiguous approach to θαύματα and Dio's own testimony to the influence of the supernatural in his life. An overview of the language and literary techniques that Dio employs in reporting and describing the extraordinary is complemented by two case studies: the miraculous rainstorm of AD 172 and the incredible case of Popilius Pedo Apronianus in AD 205. The first provides insight into the complex interplay of factors influencing Dio's account of contemporary imperial history (e.g. reluctance to depict Arnuphis as a *habitué* of the court), and the second offers farcically dark drama that lays bare the mechanisms of government under the Severans. Although entertaining, the extraordinary normally possesses a political or moralising point.

The contribution of Christina T. Kuhn (pp. 115–132 = Chapter 5: "Cassius Dio's Funeral Speech for Augustus: Sources, Rhetoric, Messages") explores the retrospective of Augustus' life offered by Tiberius in the funeral speech that he delivered in AD 14. The culmination of the Augustan books, this *laudatio funebris* (56.35–41) marks a significant turning-point, as it is effecttively the last of the major speeches in the *Roman History*. An admixture of praise, justification, and half-truths is identified by Kuhn as she analyses Dio's reconstruction of the imperial perspective. Relying upon the premise that the *Res gestae divi Augusti* figured amongst Dio's sources, this analysis distinguishes between contemporary themes and anachronistic features introduced by Dio. Kuhn then proceeds to explore the motivations and messages informing this speech, drawing attention to the disjunction between narrative and speech and underscoring the ideal vision of good government (e.g. no wars of imperial aggression) that is presented in the speech. This latter, as she emphasises, is something that was a going concern for Dio (who criticised Severus' eastern wars), and only possible on the basis of a selective use of the *Res gestae divi Augusti* to recover the perspective of the imperial *domus*.

The contribution of Christopher Mallan (pp. 133–157 = Chapter 6: "'... But He Possessed a Most Singular Nature': Cassius Dio on Tiberius")

deals with Dio's handling of the figure of Tiberius and that problematic emperor's reign. As of Book 51 and the commencement of the principate of Augustus, the *Roman History* is more biographical in nature, and Tiberius provides a useful case study giving insight into how Dio as a historian deals with emperors as individuals. In his treatment of Tiberius' pre-accession career, Dio can be seen to focus on his designation as successor rather than discussing the entire legal basis for his succession to the throne. Moreover, Dio can be seen to depict fear of rivals as a key characteristic of Tiberius. When he finally does get around to offering a description of Tiberius' character (57.1.1–2), at the moment of his accession, Dio highlights his propensity for *dissimulatio* as a survival mechanism. While aware of his vices and virtues, Dio is not interested in an ethical portrait of Tiberius, but rather the character of his rule. What emerges from this depiction of the tyrant acting the part of the *civilis princeps* is quite different from the vision of Tiberius offered by Tacitus.

The contribution of Shushma Malik (pp. 158–176 = Chapter 7: "An Emperor's War on Greece: Cassius Dio's Nero") explores how and why Dio's depiction of Nero fundamentally differs from those of other ancient authors. Dio's Nero is a despot without the redeeming feature of being a lover of Greek culture, and his visit to Greece is likened to a war of aggression and placed on a par with the slavery endured by Rome and Italy at the hands of Nero's minister Helios. Dio's experience of the reign of Commodus and his own *paideia* as an author of the Second Sophistic both contributed in a significant manner to the historian's depiction of Nero. Contrary to the historiographical tradition to be seen in the accounts of Suetonius and Tacitus, Dio's account consistently strips Nero of his philhellenism. Omissions and manipulations result in a narrative where there is no sense of Nero as a philhellene during things such as the celebration of the *Juvenalia* and *Neronia* in Italy. Indeed, Nero's stage performances and victories are systematically cast in a negative light, presaging the ruin that was to accompany his sojourn in Greece. In spite of his 'liberation' of the Greeks, Nero's visit is remembered by Dio for its perversions and widespread devastation.

The contribution of Caillan Davenport (pp. 177–196 = Chapter 8: "War and Peace: Imperial Leadership in Dio's Second-Century Narrative") fittingly completes the review of imperial biography by examining Dio's treatment of the emperors Trajan, Hadrian, Marcus Aurelius, Commodus, and Pertinax. This survey of 'Antonine' emperors shows what Dio considered to

be the traits that were conducive to those emperors' success or failure. Arguably juxtaposing Trajan and Hadrian in Books 68 and 69, Dio praises Trajan for his civilian government and criticises his exuberant militarism, just as he writes approvingly of Hadrian's administrative ability and attention to defense. Personal vices do not matter as long as they do not affect public life. When dealing with Marcus Aurelius, conversely, Dio explores how virtue (ἀρετή) proves superior to raw talent in producing a successful ruler. Again, through juxtaposition, the subsequent treatment of Commodus demonstrates how a vice as seemingly innocuous as cowardice (δειλία) might make a ruler a failure. Moreover, in spite of his many virtues, it was his lack of prudence that caused Pertinax to fail. Virtue and realism in warfare and peaceful administration are both required for success.

The contribution of Monica Hellström (pp. 199–217 = Chapter 9: "'The People' and Cassius Dio") looks at how Dio represents the Roman people in the aggregate so as to achieve his historiographical aims. Dio's use of various terms (δῆμος, πλῆθος, ὅμιλος, ὄχλος, ἄνθρωποι) shows that he is not interested in 'the people' in and of itself. Rather, as discernible patterns in 'people scenes' reveal, this category serves to illustrate truths regarding the ruling elite. Set pieces often tied to civil strife and events at public gatherings, these 'people scenes' depict the interaction of rulers and ruled, thereby giving the latter an opportunity to express judgement on the former. Dysfunctional rulers harm the people, and popular action is invariably a reaction to action on the part of elites or the gods. Popular action thus tends to illustrate the baseness of their rulers. Attributing to 'the people' the ability to perceive and think as a collective entity, Dio describes their reactions so as to achieve "narrative ekphrasis" (p. 214). Linked to their rulers in a symbiotic relationship, the rational 'people' interacts with and has an impact on their rulers. Thus represented, 'the people' is a literary construct that, as a "blank space" (p. 217), enables Dio to pass judgement on rulers and events.

The contribution of Myles Lavan (pp. 218–239 = Chapter 10: "Citizenship, Enfranchisement and Honour in Cassius Dio") looks at how Dio's handling of the *Constitutio Antoniniana* offers us an opportunity to explore the interpretative openness of the text of the *Roman History*. The minimal nature of the notices that Dio furnishes in the *Roman History* regarding the actual conferral of Roman citizenship demonstrates that the theme was not central to the work's macro-narrative. On the other hand, it would appear that Maecenas advocates a universal grant of citizenship (52.19.4–6) in the

course of his constitutional debate with Agrippa in Book 52. However, this proposal is part of a blueprint for the Principate as it evolved over the two and a half centuries intervening between that moment and the time of Dio's writing. Modern readers have often wondered whether Maecenas represents Dio. The fact that discordant voices can be heard in the narrative time and time again makes it noteworthy that Dio never expresses in his own voice a judgement on the desirability of extending the franchise. The distinctive indirectness of Dio's treatment of the topic leaves the question open-ended, inviting readers to reflect.

The contribution of Barbara Saylor Rodgers (pp. 240–264 = Chapter 9: "The Company They Keep: Emperors and Their Associates") explores the moral vocabulary that Dio uses for emperors and their associates in the creation of an exemplary history. Rarely does Dio in his own voice speak of someone as a 'good man'. Rather, he frequently expresses disapproval via a rich and varied ethical vocabulary, with ἀσέλγεια ("licentiousness") being the most frequent failing. A review of Dio's characterisation from the late Republic to the Severan dynasty, highlights various aspects. Sex and violence, dissimulation, and the grossest sorts of delinquency on the part of the emperor or his collaborators are recorded and highlighted, when deemed essential to a ruler's failure, but overlooked by and large when susceptible of interpretation as harmless pecadilloes. Conversely, honourable behaviour and virtue likewise receive their due, when relevant to government. Summarising this review, Rodgers notes Dio's practice of offering readers at the outset a summation of an emperor's qualities so to guide the interpretation of the narrative that follows. Last but not least, she highlights the importance of a mature ruler who selects his associates with care and monitors them closely.

The contribution of Christopher Mallan (pp. 265–285 = Chapter 12: "Dio and His Friends: Autobiography and Biography in Cassius Dio's Contemporary Narrative") that follows provides a useful complement by placing the spotlight on the historian himself. How do Dio and his peers emerge in comparison with the emperors and their ministers? A 'born prosopographer', in the felicitous phrasing of Fergus Millar, Dio in animadverting on his own life emphasises his political career as a member of the Senate, his close association with those in power, and his relationship with the divine. The image that Dio fashions of himself as a senator whose career and life were dramatically determined by the events of 193 – and who accordingly

dedicated himself to the goddess Tyche – is detailed and psychologically complex. This is autobiography at its most compelling. No less so are the biographical sketches that he offers of his contemporaries, friends and foes alike. Individuals such as Aurelius Zoticus and Pollienus Aurispex come alive with their virtues and vices, and we thereby gain a more clear understanding of how Cassius Dio positioned himself within the political culture of his time and his status within the Severan economy of honour.

The contribution of Alicia Simpson (pp. 289–307 = Chapter 13: "The Reception of Cassius Dio's Imperial Narrative in Byzantium (Tenth–Twelfth Centuries)") looks at the Byzantine reception of the *Roman History* within the context of the cultural phenomenon of the tenth to twelfth centuries that modern scholars term 'Roman antiquarianism'. Considering the Byzantine readings in their own right, Simpson traces the story over the ninth to twelfth centuries from the patriarch Photius to the classical scholar John Tzetzes. The appreciation of Dio's work by Photius in the ninth century and the excerptors working for Constantine VII Porphyrogenitus in the tenth century foreshadowed the historiographical revival that would occur in the eleventh century. Working at the court of Michael VII Doukas (1071–1078), John Xiphilinus produced an epitome of Dio's work in the form of twenty-five biographies extending from Pompey the Great to Alexander Severus. A generation later, writing in monastic retirement, John Zonaras produced an epitome of the work of Dio and other Roman historians that stretched from the Creation to the death of Alexios I Komnenos (1118). Subsequently, John Tzetzes under the later Komnenoi can be found using Dio for poetic summaries of episodes in Roman history such as "Marcus Manlius and the geese" or "Trajan and the Bridging of the Danube". Cassius Dio emerges as an author useful for reflecting on the world to which the Byzantines were heirs.

The contribution of Christopher Pelling with which the volume concludes (pp. 308–320 = "Epilogue: And Now ...?") once again situates this volume within the history of scholarship on Cassius Dio, sums up its contributions, and points out some of the possible, promising avenues for future work in the field. Since the fundamental contribution of Fergus Millar in 1964 (and then that of Alain Gowing in 1992),[3] things have visibly changed,

3 Millar (note 2); A. M. Gowing: The Triumviral Narrative of Appian and Cassius Dio. Ann Arbor, MI 1992 (Michigan Monographs in Classical Antiquity).

and there has been a welcome surge in publications of high quality in recent years. The focus has shifted (e.g. from author to audience), more attention is being dedicated to key issues such as that of structure, and there is a new appreciation of speeches and their interaction with the narrative of the *Roman History*. The 'literary turn' has, moreover, produced a new appreciation of the relationship between Dio's personal experiences and the historical perspective of the *Roman History*. Yet, Dionian historiography might arguably benefit from more literary theory. Aside from the complex relationship between history and representation, there is the question of Dio's relationship to his Greek predecessors as well as discernible need for more work on his reception. In closing, Pelling calls upon readers to take these essays as an invitation to ponder afresh the biggest questions. What, in the end, did it mean for Cassius Dio to write the *Roman History*?

* * *

Thus, in brief, the contents of this handsome volume. A few words on the execution are now in order. There is much to praise as well as much material for reflection and possible disagreement. Only items of particular note or likely use for others will be remarked here.

The borrowing of useful concepts from other disciplines to illuminate aspects of the *Roman History* of Cassius Dio and the world that it describes is one of the many pleasant surprises offered by this volume. Concepts such as 'political culture' (pp. 3–4), 'public transcript' (p. 36), and "communicative memory" (p. 178) are extremely useful analytical tools, and they are persuasively deployed in the contributions in this volume. In the same vein, it is good see not only the excellent use made of Fergus Millar's 1964 contribution (after prolonged, critical reflection), but also the employment of more recent work and categories of analysis such as the *pepaideumenos* so ably discussed by Brandon Jones in his 2016 contribution to one of the many Historiography of Rome and Its Empire volumes dedicated to Cassius Dio and the *Roman History*.[4] So, too, it is welcome to see the extensive use made of other recent publications such as the 2016 collective volume edited by

4 B. Jones: Cassius Dio – *Pepaideumenos* and Politician on Kingship. In: C. H. Lange/ J. M. Madsen (eds.): Cassius Dio: Greek Intellectual and Roman Politician. Leiden/ Boston 2016 (Historiography of Rome and Its Empire 1), pp. 297–315.

Valérie Fromentin and other French colleagues.[5] In short, this is a volume that is timely and cutting-edge in terms of what it has to offer colleagues and students.

The renewed focus upon Tiberius' funeral oration for Augustus and its relationship to the *Res gestae divi Augusti* is welcome (Letta, Kuhn). However, it is surprising to find no mention of the possibility – indeed, the likelihood – that Dio was drawing upon the autobiography of Augustus in composing this speech.[6] It is difficult not to read a passage such as that where Tiberius attributes Augustus' "actions and fortunes" in civil war to deity and where he specifically distinguishes Augustus from Sulla "who was called the Fortunate" (Cass. Dio 56.38.1, tr. Cary) and not discern the influence of Augustus' memoirs. Be that as it may, the renewed focus on Dio's use of documentary (and epigraphic) sources is salutary and welcome. On the same note, it might be further suggested that we ought to keep in mind Dio's wealth and status and the likelihood that he had a small cohort of assistants (slaves and freedmen, the ancient equivalent of today's graduate students and adjunct faculty) searching out and copying the sources for him to peruse in the relative quiet of his study. That, it is worth observing, would nicely explain the lack of first-person statements about Dio's search for and discovery of the documents that he manifestly cites on so many occasions. Modern historians' vision of the ancient historian is often an individualist model, tantamount to the vision of Raphael being the sole person to execute the paintings produced by his workshop or the idea that Henry Ford personally produced the millions of cars carrying his name.

Lavan argues in detail a reasoned and overall persuasive case for the polyphony of Dio's *Roman History* as regards the question of whether or not Roman citizenship should be an exclusive privilege that is a distinguishing marker in the economy of honour. The discussion of the meaning of πολιτεία (p. 223) is a textbook example of how to proceed, and the distinction between the beliefs of the author and the various protagonists is well observed. However, while accepting that πολιτεία must signify 'citizenship' in the key

5 V. Fromentin/E. Bertrand/M. Coltelloni-Trannoy/M. Molin/G. Urso (eds.): Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures. Bordeaux 2016 (Scripta antiqua 94).

6 For the autobiography of Augustus and its subsequent influence, the best points of departure are: FRHist no. 60 "Imperator Caesar Augustus" (C. J. Smith); C. J. Smith/A. Powell (eds.): The Lost Memoirs of Augustus and the Development of Roman Autobiography. Swansea 2009.

passage of 52.19.4–6, the reviewer strongly suspects that Maecenas is arguing only that the franchise ought to be selectively extended to all of "the more honourable men" amongst the subjects of the Roman empire. As Lavan observes (*ibid.*), that position has been taken by Valerio Marotta.[7] Had Dio meant the totality of the free population of the Empire, I believe that he would have written πᾶσι ἀνθρώποισι. As it stands, the text is arguably ambiguous and the reader is left to decide what Dio's prejudices would have rendered the most plausible reading.

On another note, the reviewer would observe that Cassius Dio is consistent in his use of the expression ὁ δῆμος to designate the *populus Romanus*. Hence, to write of "democratic" government or "democracy" (Davenport and Mallan p. 2; cf. Hellström at p. 215, where quotation marks qualify the word used as a label for Agrippa) is to offer a highly misleading rendering of Dio's thought.[8] The term 'republican' manifestly better translates the concept into standard English. To resume, indiscriminate talk of "the people" is likewise misleading. Dio is extremely sophisticated (cf. Pelling at p. 310: "very, very smart"), and one manifestation of this is his precise and varied vocabulary for indicating groups of different sizes, purposes, and legal or social standing (*pace* Hellström at p. 202: "terminology [...] is vague"). A fundamental problem with the stimulating contribution of Hellström (Ch. 9) is that it collapses the numerous, varied social and political phenomena as though Dio were an author writing in English rather than Greek (and, it bears remembering, thinking at least in part in Latin). The category of "the people" is an English analytical category being foisted upon Dio.

A final topic that comes to mind is that of religion. Cassius Dio is invariably (or so it would seem) compared to Thucydides by his modern readers. That often represents little more than a repetition of the judgement of Photius. However, acute though that ninth-century bibliophile's analysis may be, there exist other possibilities. In terms of religious sensibility and the role played in human affairs by deity, Dio is decidedly much closer to Xenophon

7 V. Marotta: La cittadinanza romana in età imperiale (secoli I–III d.C.). Una sintesi. Torino 2009, pp. 105–106.

8 Cf. M.-L. Freyburger-Galland: Aspects du vocabulaire politique et institutionnel de Dion Cassius. Paris 1997 (Collections de l'Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg. Études d'archéologie et d'histoire ancienne), p. 116. *En passant*, it is worth calling attention to this useful work's magnificent *index locorum Cassii Dionis*. A similar index for the volume under review would have been welcome.

than Thucydides. Indeed, in reading the *Roman History*, the reviewer is often reminded not only of Xenophon's taking command in the *Anabasis*, but also of the reported reading of Xenophon's *Cyropaedia* on the eve of Julius Caesar's assassination (Suet. Iul. 87). The theme of religion is largely neglected in this volume (and the current revival of scholarship dedicated to Dio) in spite of the superlative treatment of the miraculous rainstorm by Rhiannon Ash (Chapter 4) and many contributors' manifest awareness of Dio's assiduous reporting of omens (e. g. Davenport, Kemezis, Hellström, Mallan). Much more might have been done with this material.[9] As in the field of economics[10], Cassius Dio's work has immense potential if only we have the courage and insight to address the right questions to it.

* * *

In the end, this volume offers readings of individual cases or specific themes relating to the political culture of the Roman empire as it was experienced and described by Cassius Dio in his *Roman History*. Comprising a judicious selection of affirmed and emerging scholars, the contributors offer a well rounded vision of the *mentalité* and historical experience of Cassius Dio in what is a fitting sequel to Fergus Millar's classic monograph. Items such as religion or the economy may be largely absent, but sociology, anthropology, and literary criticism are clearly present, and to good effect. Therefore, this is a welcome and timely contribution to the ongoing discussion dedicated to the *Roman History* of Cassius Dio and the history of imperial Rome and its literature.

9 Cf. L. G. Driediger-Murphy: Cassius Dio 41.43: Religion as a Liability in Pompey's Civil War. In: Hermathena 196–197, Summer-Winter 2014 [2018], pp. 99–120.

10 Again cutting-edge work is to be found in the History of Rome and Its Empire series: J. Carlsen: Cassius Dio's Economic History. In: J. M. Madsen/C. H. Lange (eds.): Cassius Dio the Historian. Methods and Approaches. Leiden/Boston 2021 (Historiography of Rome and Its Empire 10), pp. 388–405. As emerges from a comparison of things such as Plutarch's and Cassius Dio's accounts of the debt owed to Caesar by the Ptolemaic monarchs (cf. R. Westall: The Loan to Ptolemy XII, 59–48 BCE. In: Ricerche di Egittologia e di Antichità Copte 12, 2010, pp. 23–41), social status influences what details an author considers significant and chooses to report.

Richard Westall, Rome
richard.westall@gmail.com

www.plekos.de

Empfohlene Zitierweise

Richard Westall: Rezension zu: Caillan Davenport/Christopher Mallan (eds.): Emperors and Political Culture in Cassius Dio's *Roman History*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press 2021. In: Plekos 24, 2022, S. 485–497 (URL: https://www.plekos.uni-muenchen.de/2022/r-davenport_mallan.pdf).