

УДК 94(37).07

TOWARDS THE PECULIARITIES OF CASSIUS DIO'S PUBLIC CAREER IN 220s

© 2016 г.

K. V. Markov

Lobachevsky State University of Nizhni Novgorod, N. Novgorod

mkv_2003@mail.ru

Поступила в редакцию 02.02.2016

Ряд пассажей «Римской истории» Диона Кассия дает читателям представление о выдающейся карьере этого автора 220-е гг., однако краткость автобиографических свидетельств приводит к возникновению спорных вопросов относительно отдельных этапов карьеры автора. К числу дискуссионных вопросов относится проблема датировки первого консулата Диона, а также вопрос о характере его конфликта с преторианцами (80. 4. 1 – 5. 2). Главная цель данной статьи заключается в том, чтобы выявить роль историка в политических событиях данного периода, а также влияние превратностей карьеры Диона на его литературное творчество.

Ключевые слова: Древний Рим, Римская империя, Дион Кассий, династия Северов, Александр Север, Ульпиан.

Cassius Dio was a high-ranking Roman senator of Greek origin who wrote eighty books of «Roman History» comprising events from legendary Aeneas' times to the rule Alexander Severus. According to modern scholars, compositional, methodological and conceptual features of this writing correlate to a considerable extent with the specificity of the author's social standing and the peculiarities of his public career [1, p. 13; 2, s. 356–360; 3, s. 126–129]. The rule of Alexander Severus is supposed to be the period of Dio's active work on his *opus* [4, p. 282; 5, p. 154], and, therefore, the exploration of the author's public activities during this period appears to be of some value for studies of Dio's historical and political thinking. In early 220-ies, Dio was at his late fifties or early sixties¹; he had already traveled to different parts of the empire, and gained considerable experience in public service. In a series of autobiographical passages, Dio provides readers with an outline of his appointments in the 220-ies (79. 36. 4; 80. 1. 2–3). He was proconsul of Africa in 220/221 or 223. Soon afterwards he was sent to Dolmatia as *legatus Augusti* (222–223/224–226) and later governed Pannonia Superior (223–227/226–228). The author mentions also his conflict with the praetorians, which resulted from his strict rule over Pannonian soldiers (80. 4. 2 – 5. 1). In 229 Dio was honored with the position of *consul ordinarius* and after the expiration of the term of the office he retired and left Rome for his native town of Nicaea in Bythnia (80. 5. 2)². Dio's brief autobiographic passages leave enough space for different interpretations of certain steps of the author's public career. In this article two of the items will be considered: the date of Dio's first consulship and the nature of his conflict with the praetorians, which might be providing a clue to understanding the role of the historian in

Roman political affairs of the period and how those affairs affected his literary work.

1. The date of Dio's second consulship (y. 229 AD) is attested by the historian's report (80. 5. 1), as well as by the epigraphic sources (AE. 1971. 430; CIL 3. 3511, 5587; 6. 2998). There are no direct references to the date of the first consulship, which is mentioned several times in «Roman History» (43. 46. 5, 60. 2. 3, 76. 16. 4). According to Roman traditions of *cursus honorum*, Dio could become consul for the first time after his praetorship in 195, but no earlier than he reached the age of forty, presumably in 203 or 204³. Therefore, many scholars suggest him to become a *suffect-consul* in 205 or 206 [2, s. 356–357; 6, s. 163]. According to an alternative version, the appointment came no earlier than in the 220-es, with possible date being 222 [7, p. LI; 8, p. 117; 9, p. 41–47], 223 or 224 [10, p. 165; 11, p. 293]. The main argument for the later dating is the following expression by Dio on Septimius Severus: «Again, he rebuked such persons as were not chaste, even going so far as to enact some laws in regard to adultery. In consequence, there were ever so many indictments for that offence (for example, when consul, I found three thousand entered on the docket)»⁴ (76. 16. 4). The suggestion has been made that, since praetors, not consuls, presided over *quaestiones de adulteries* in Severan times and, consequently, Dio's account is hardly connected with his public service, the historian might obtain the data much later. For instance, as a consul he might collect materials in the archive (i. e. *tabularium principis*) and come across the document. If so, the number of three thousand can be interpreted as the total quantity of adultery charges under Septimius Severus [11, p. 289–290; 8, p. 120–121]. There are some other options for interpretation of the pas-

sage. T. Mommsen regarded the docket (Gr. πίναξ, Lat. album) as a list of those cases that were taken into consideration, but has not yet reached the court [12, s. 220, 696]. According to T. Barnes, three thousand of indictments were unlikely to be addressed to one court only. Consequently, Dio, when consul, might have an opportunity to see the *album*, if he was responsible for the distribution of the cases among the judges. Such a responsibility of consuls is mentioned by Papinianus (Dig. 1. 21. 1). Moreover, a consul could administer justice in such cases *extra ordinem* (Dig. 48. 2. 16; 5. 30. 5). There are no clear indications to what period the three thousands of indictments belong. According to T. Barnes, they might be introduced in early years of Severus' reign [13, p. 243].

One more argument employed by the supporters of the later date of Dio's first consulate is the author's brief remark on his command in Africa in 220/221 or 223, which appears the text as ἡ ἐν τῇ Ἀφρικῇ ἡγεμονία (49. 36. 4; 80. 1. 2). This position is usually identified as proconsulship, but, according to an alternative version, Dio was sent to Africa as a commander of *legio III Augusta* [8, p. 131–135; 10, p. 158; 11, p. 291–293]. Such an interpretation seems to be based on two controversial assumptions, namely that Numidia, where *legio III Augusta* was stationed, officially did not single out as a separate province until the last years of the reign of Alexander Severus, and that Dio's «command in Africa» (ἡ ἐν τῇ Ἀφρικῇ ἡγεμονία) was somewhat different from «governing Africa» (ἡ τῆς Ἀφρίκης ἡγεμονία). It is felt that lexical difference between the expressions should be recognized insignificant, while, according to the epigraphic sources, Numidia was created in 198–209 (AE. 1957. 122; ILS 9488) [14, p. 394–395], and, therefore, Dio avoids the duality in the designation of the two territories. Africa is mentioned as a proconsular province, and Numidia – the province, where *Legio III Augusta* was stationed (55. 23. 2; 59. 20. 7) [13, p. 248].

The «later» version comes at odds also with the overall chronology of Dio's career in 220-ies. In Book 80, the author expresses regret for incapability of writing about Alexander Severus' rule in details, because he spent too little time in Rome those years. (80. 1. 2). In 218–219, he held the position of *curator* in Pergamum and Smyrna, afterwards went to his native Bithynia province and thence hastened to Africa. Dio describes his next route the following way: «...on returning to Italy I was almost immediately (εὐθέως ὡς εἰπεῖν) sent as governor first to Dalmatia and then to Upper Pannonia, and though after that I returned to Rome and to Campania, I at once set out for home» (80. 1. 2–3).

According to C. Letta's suggestion, Dio's consulate and his mission in Dalmatia belong to one and the same year – 222, but it may be also suggested that the historian left Italy no sooner than in 224 [15, s. 106]. Nevertheless, the traditional interval between consulship and governing a province normally was from three to ten years in Severan times. C. Letta presumes that in case of Dio, the principle could be violated because of the dramatic change of the regime and Alexander Severus coming to power in y. 222, who needed a faithful man in the Dalmatia and Pannonia [8, p. 135]. The version does not fit two details in the quoted passage well. The first one is the short period between Dio's returning from Africa and his departure to Pannonia. Secondly, when Dio mentions his return «to Italy», the destination implied might be not necessarily Rome, but also his villa in the vicinities of Capua, which, according to his own words, he visited every time he was in Italy (76. 2. 1).

It can be inferred from the material above, that the arguments for the later date of Dio's consulate may not be recognized decisive. Most likely, Dio, according to the traditional order of passing *cursus honorum*, first became consul during Septimius Severus' reign, and, accordingly, most plausible dating of his first consulate is 205 or 206.

2. The last years of Dio's public service were overshadowed by the conflict with the Praetorians. The author regarded the event as an illustration to the general state of Roman military forces during the reign of Alexander Severus: «They indulge in such wantonness, licence, and lack of discipline, that those in Mesopotamia even dared to kill their commander, Flavius Heracleo, and the Praetorians complained of me to Ulpianus, because I ruled the soldiers in Pannonia with a strong hand; and they demanded my surrender, through fear that someone might compel them to submit to a régime similar to that of the Pannonian troops (καὶ τοὺς δορυφόρους πρὸς τῷ Οὐλπιανῷ καὶ ἐμὲ αἰτιάσασθαι ὅτι τῶν ἐν τῇ Παννονίᾳ στρατιωτῶν ἐγκρατῶς ἦρξα, καὶ ἐξαιτήσαι, φοβηθέντας μὴ καὶ ἐκείνους τις ὁμοίως τοῖς Παννονικοῖς ἄρχεσθαι καταναγκασθῆναι). Alexander, however, paid no heed to them, but, on the contrary, honoured me in various ways, especially by appointing me to be consul for the second time, as his colleague, and taking upon himself personally the responsibility of meeting the expenditures of my office. But as the malcontents evinced displeasure at this, he became afraid that they might kill me if they saw me in the insignia of my office, and so he bade me spend the period of my consulship in Italy, somewhere outside of Rome. And thus later I came both to Rome and to Campania to visit him, and spent a few days in his

company, during which the soldiers saw me without offering to do me any harm...» (80. 4. 1 – 5. 2). The main question of scholars to this text is why the praetorians' complained about Dio's activities in Pannonia and what led to their discontent with his appointment to consulship. Since the date of Ulpian's death, according to one of the versions, is defined as 223 (or 224) [16, p. 173; 17, p. 565–611], but Dio's return to Italy happened, as it was suggested, no earlier than in 227⁵, a new interpretation of the passage (§ 2, Chapter 4) emerged. The text reads: «καὶ τοὺς δορυφόρους πρὸς τῷ Οὐλιανῶ καὶ ἐμὲ αἰτιάσασθαι... Here Dio uses the preposition πρὸς preceding the dative τῷ Οὐλιανῶ, which may define not only the person whom the complaint of the Praetorians was addressed, but also someone in addition to whom Dio was complained of, and, consequently, the aithor might regard his experience as comparable with the misfortunes of Ulpianus, who was not popular among the soldiers and required special protection from the emperor [17, p. 579; 18, p. 258–259]. Another version was suggested by R. Cleve, according to whom, the suspicions of the Praetorians would have been worthwhile only if Dio himself had claimed the post of the Praetorian prefect. It could hardly be expected that a high ranking senator completed his brilliant career this way. Therefore, the original text, distorted later by the epitomator, could contain information about the complaint of Pannonian legionnaires, who were dissatisfied with the harsh command of Dio. It is assumed that three different examples of the unruliness of soldiers were listed in the original variant: the assassination of Flavius Heracleo in Mesopotamia, the conspiracy against Ulpian, and the Pannonian soldiers' complaint of Dio followed by the demand of his extradition [19]. Such is the version of R. L. Cleve. However, some researchers find it quite plausible that the Praetorians could see a direct connection between the return of Dio from Pannonia and the appointment of a disagreeable person for the post of the Praetorian prefect. For instance, S. Faro believes that those times Dio's senatorial status could hardly be a serious obstacle to such an appointment, because after a special reform the post had become no longer incompatible with the membership in *ordo senatorius* (SHA Vit. Alex. 21. 3–6) [18, p. 259; 20, p. 43].

One more interpretation can be found in the work of R. Bauman. He focused on the verb αἰτιάσασθαι, which can be rendered as «to complain» (as we can see it in E. Cary's translation), but there are some other possible meanings: «to accuse», «to incriminate». Consequently, Dio might not be just «complained of», but charged of committing a crime, such as the abuse of power in

the office. This, according to the researcher, might be helpful for reconstruction of the chronology of Dio's career. Dio could be brought to justice only after resigning from the position, because persons performing the duties in provinces were not subject to the court before the end of their term. The R. Bauman suggests that Dio might practice unreasonably harsh penalties and prevent some of the soldiers from addressing the praetorian prefect for appeal. In this context, according to the researcher, the word ἐξαιτήσαι («to demand extradition of someone») might have a specific meaning – to require the prosecution in order to impose the death penalty. R. Bauman points to similar situations described by Dio. In 97, the praetorian guard demanded the extradition of some persons in order to subject them to the death penalty (ἐξαιτήσαι τινὰς ὥστε θανατωθῆναι) (68. 3. 3). The case of Papinianus is also supposed to be representative. When the Praetorians made accusations against him, Caracalla allowed them to execute this man, saying that he considers them as prosecutors and judges (72. 4. 1). Therefore, R. Bauman infers that Dio faced the same situation, but that time the emperor took the side of the convicted. The adjective πρὸς followed by the dative can be rendered in English as «in the presence of someone». Consequently Alexander Severus could negotiate with the Praetorians in the presence of Ulpian, as the emperor's adviser [21, p. 385–399].

As the brief survey shows, all these interpretations are based on attempts to correct the most recognizable reading of the Greek text, which had remained unquestioned until the reconsideration of the date of Ulpian's death. If we return to this initial version of translation, it should be admitted that the praetorians addressed Ulpian, the praetorian prefect. It happened no later than in the autumn of 228, which is the latest of possible dates of Ulpian's death [18, 21]. If we assume that the praetorians had demanded the prosecution of Dio, it will be difficult to define the legal basis of the accusation. The reference to the authoritative style of ruling the soldiers (στρατιωτῶν ἐγκρατῶς ἡρξῆα) is too generally formulated to suggest possible formal charges. Perhaps, we should focus on what the legal authorities of the praetorian prefect were in Severan times. According to some jurisprudential sources, the prefect exercised appellate jurisdiction (CIL 9.2438=AE1983, 331) and could take appeals against legal verdicts by provincial governors (Codex Iustiniani 4. 65. 4). This is what R. Bauman points to, but it is not clear how this procedure might work, because the prefect acted as the representative of the emperor (*vice principis*) (Digesta 1, 11, 1, 1) and in practice appeals were granted by emperors on rare occasions [22 p. 35; 16, p. 171]. Nevertheless, *Codex Ustiniani* provides one more

option for interpretation of Dio's case. According to this source, Severus Alexander decided that a governor could send accused men to Ulpianus for more severe punishment (Cod. Iust. 4, 65, 4, 1). Therefore, if we assume that the legal novelty coincided with or preceded the period of Dio's governing Pannonia Superior, it may be supposed that Dio could incur the wrath of the guard because of applying to this procedure. Anyway, the concern of the praetorians may be explained by the fact that under Severans the guard consisted mostly of the former Pannonian legionaries, who might keep in touch with their *commilitones*⁶. It was not unusual for the army of the Imperial Rome that soldiers complained about the actions of the commander, electing military representatives at a gathering and sending them to Rome [23, c. 212–213]. But, according to Dio, the main (and the only mentioned) motive of the praetorians was to prevent themselves from being ruled «with a strong hand». Their concern related not so much to Dio's personality, but to his mode of treating soldiers. Thus the praetorians might be concerned with Pannonian activities of Dio, because they regarded him as a supporter of reconsideration⁷ of imperial attitudes to army and *disciplina militaris*⁸, who was able to influence their commander either by personal example, or via changing political agenda. Therefore, it may be supposed that the whole matter was political by its nature and, if so, the praetorians might appeal to Ulpian not just as their commander, but an important adviser to the emperor (HA, Vita Sev. Alex. 26, 6; 31, 2; 68, 1. Cf. Cod. Iust. 4, 65, 4, 1; 8, 37, 4), represented by Dio himself as a true arbiter of the empire (80. 1. 1; 2. 2). Another detail, which deserves attention, is Dio's *ornamenta consularia*, which might provoke the praetorians to assassinate him (80. 5. 1). Consequently, the guard was alarmed by Dio's position and authority. This raises the question of how influential Dio was in the period of Alexander Severus' reign. The obvious indications to his prominence are the position of *consul ordinarius iterum* as a colleague of the emperor⁹, the benefits received by Dio from the emperor, who gave him support and met expenditures associated with the entry into the office of consul; the appointment to a Latinized and strategically important province of Pannonia Superior as a rare exception for a senator of Greek origin [24, p. 26].

Therefore, it may be concluded that Dio belonged to the most meritorious among friends and confidants of Alexander Severus, but, when he reached the top of his career, he found himself at exceptional risk and, finally, excluded from political life in Rome. Such a rapid turnover in his career, as it appears, might affect his literary work. For example, some expressions, especially a re-

mark on insignificance of a second consulship, in the «Consolation-Dialogue» between Cicero and Philiscus (38. 28) may be interpreted as an allusion to Dio's own misfortunes of 229 [4, p. 289–290]. It's also tempting to speculate that it was realization of the weakness of Alexander Severus' regime which instigated Dio to imbue his work, especially speeches, with numerous political messages of pragmatic nature.

Примечания

1. The exact date of Dio's birth is unknown, but it's generally recognized that he was born in y. 163 or 164 AD [2, s. 357].
2. On Dio's biography and the chronology of the steps of his career see the following [1, p. 1–4; 2, s. 356–360; 13, p. 124 f.; 24, p. 7–27; 25, p. 1–3].
3. Dio is generally recognized to be born in 163 or 164 [24, p. 13].
4. Here and later E. Cary's translation is employed.
5. See n. 2.
6. Such a solidarity might be regarded as illustration of soldiers' mentality specifics emerging in places, where Roman legions were permanently stationed in times of High Empire and especially under Severans [26].
7. Under Severans, the army was an object of constant care and support on the part of the ruling dynasty, which focused on finding additional economic incentives, by means of which it was possible to attract new recruits, and also pursued a policy aimed at strengthening the loyalty of the military forces [27, c. 54].
8. There are numerous comments on military affairs and military discipline in Dio's writing. Soldiers were regarded by him as a source of threat to internal stability of the country (68. 3. 3; 77. 4. 1; 79. 18. 5; 80. 2. 2) [28, s. 224]. The historian is concerned about the lack of discipline in the armed forces and the increase in military spending, which he saw as a potential threat to welfare of himself and others (77. 9. 1–7). The author often focuses on the maintenance of order in the armed forces and appreciates those military leaders who have achieved respect and obedience of soldiers, without resorting to large payments [28, s. 227; 29, p. 2665; 30, p. 162].
9. In Dio's times, ordinary consulship was awarded to a relatively small fraction of senators including emperors, their successors, supporters and confidants of the ruling family and the descendants of the old aristocracy. The number of *consules ordinarii* in Severan period was 84 (of 504 or 540–550 [6, p. 11] names on the full consular list). The group included 16 representatives of the imperial family and only nine easterners [31, p. 157–165].

Список литературы

1. Rich J.W. Dio on Augustus // History as Text: the Writing of Ancient History / Ed. A.M. Cameron. London: Duckworth, 1989. P. 86–110.
2. Hose M. Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994. 586 s.

3. Ameling W. Cassius Dio und Bithynien // *Epigraphica Anatolica. Zeitschrift für Epigraphik und historische Geographie anatoliens*. 1984. 4. S. 123–138.
4. Kemezis A.M. Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian. Greek culture in the Roman world. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, xii, 340 p.
5. Марков К.В. К вопросу о хронологии работы Диона Кассия над «Римской историей» // *Вестник древней истории*. 2008. № 2. С. 142–154.
6. Leunissen P.M.M. Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Kommodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.). Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Elite im römischen Kaiserreich. Amsterdam: Brill, 1989. 505 s.
7. Excerpta ex Reimari de vita et scriptis Dionis commentario // *Dionis Cassii Cocceiani Historia Romana / Cum annotationibus Ludovici Dindorfii*. Vol. V. Lipsiae, 1865.
8. Letta C. La composizione dell'opera di Cassio Dione: cronologia e sfondo storico-politico // *Troiani L., Noe E., Letta C. Ricerche di storiografia greca di eta roman*. Pisa: Giardini, 1979. P. 117–189.
9. Letta C. L' eruzione del Vesuvio del 202 d.C. e la composizione dell'opera di Cassio Dione // *Athenaeum*. 2007. Vol. 85. P. 41–47.
10. Vrind G. De Cassii Dionis vocabulis quae ad ius publicum pertinent. PhD. Diss. Hague, 1923.
11. Gabba E. Sulla "Storia romana" di Cassio Dione // *RSI*. 1955. Vol. 67. P. 289–333.
12. Mommsen T. *Römisches Strafrecht*. Leipzig: Dunker&Humblot, 1899. 1104 s.
13. Barnes T.D. The composition of Cassius Dio's Roman History // *Phoenix*. 1984. Vol. 38. № 3. P. 240–255.
14. Bohec Y. le. La troisième Legion Auguste. Paris: Éd. du CNRS, 1989. 632 p.
15. Reidinger W. Die Statthalter des ugeteilten Pannoniens und Oberpannoniens von Augustus bis Diokletian. Bonn: Beck, 1956. 128 s.
16. Mennen I. Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193–284. Leiden: Brill, 2011. 306 p.
17. Modrzejewski J., Zawadski T. La date de la mort d'Ulpien et le préfectorat de pretore pretore au début du regne d'Alexandre Sévère // *RHDFE*. Vol. 45. P. 565–611.
18. Faro S. Sull'anno della morte di Ulpiano // *Index*. 2002. Vol. 30. P. 251–287.
19. Cleve R.L. Cassius Dio and Ulpian // *AHB*. 1988. № 2. P. 118–124.
20. Jardé A. Etudes critiques sur la vie et le règne de Sévère Alexandre. Paris: de Boccard, 1925. 142 p.
21. Bauman R. The Death of Ulpian, the Irresistible Force and the Immovable Object // *ZRG*. 1995. Vol. 112. P. 385–399.
22. Howe L.L. The praetorian prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (AD 180–305). Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 141 p.
23. Makhlaiuk A.V. Soldiers of the Roman Empire. Military Traditions and Martial Mentality. Saint-Petersburg: Faculty of Philology of Saint-Petersburg University, 2006. 440 p.
24. Millar F. A Study of Cassius Dio. Oxford, 1964. 239 p.
25. Swan P. M. The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 55–56 (9 A.D. – B.C. 14). Oxford, 2004. 428 p.
26. Alföldy G. Das Heer in der Sozialstruktur des Römischen Kaiserreiches // *Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in er Römischen Kaiserzeit* / Hg. Alföldy G., Dobson B., Eck W. Gedenkschrift für A. Birley. Stuttgart, 2000. S. 33–57.
27. Сергеев И.П. Римская армия в III веке нашей эры. Проблемы социально-политической истории. Харьков: Майдан, 1999. 224 p.
28. Kuhn-Chen B. Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2 und 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio und Herodian. Frankfurt am Main etc., 2002. 430 s.
29. Blois L. de. Volk und Soldaten by Cassius Dio // *ANRW*. 1997. Teil II. Bd. 34. Hb. 3. S. 2650–2676.
30. Harrington D. Cassius Dio as a military historian // *Acta Classica*. 1977. Vol. 20. P. 159–165.
31. Okoń D. Consuls and consulars of the Severan period – a new approach // *Eltes in the ancient world*. Szczecin, 2015. P. 153–166.

TOWARDS PECULIARITIES OF CASSIUS DIO'S PUBLIC CAREER IN THE 220s

K.V. Markov

Cassius Dio's «Roman History» provides readers with general information about the author's brilliant public career in 220s, but the author's brief autobiographic accounts tempt scholars to raise questions concerning the steps of his career. One of the issues is the date of Dio's first consulate, another one is the nature of the conflict between Dio and the praetorians (80. 4. 1 – 5. 2). The main purpose of the article is to reveal the role of the historian in Roman political affairs of the period and the impact of Dio's career vicissitudes on his literary work.

Keywords: Ancient Rome, Roman Empire, Cassius Dio, Severan dynasty, Severus Alexander, Ulpianus.

References

1. Rich J.W. Dio on Augustus // *History as Text: the Writing of Ancient History* / Ed. A.M. Cameron. London: Duckworth, 1989. P. 86–110.
2. Hose M. Erneuerung der Vergangenheit. Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio. Stuttgart: Steiner, 1994. 586 s.
3. Ameling W. Cassius Dio und Bithynien // *Epigraphica Anatolica. Zeitschrift für Epigraphik und historische Geographie anatoliens*. 1984. 4. S. 123–138.
4. Kemezis A.M. Greek Narratives of the Roman Empire under the Severans: Cassius Dio, Philostratus and Herodian. Greek culture in the Roman world. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, xii, 340 p.

5. Markov K.V. K voprosu o chronologii raboti Diona Kassija nad «Rimskoj istoriyey» // *Vestnik Drevnei Istorii* (Journal of Ancient History). 2008. № 2. S. 142–154.
6. Leunissen P.M.M. Konsuln und Konsulare in der Zeit von Kommodus bis Severus Alexander (180–235 n. Chr.). *Prosopographische Untersuchungen zur senatorischen Elite im römischen Kaiserreich*. Amsterdam: Brill, 1989. 505 s.
7. Excerpta ex Reimari de vita et scriptis Dionis commentario // *Dionis Cassii Cocceiani Historia Romana / Cum annotationibus Ludovici Dindorfii*. Vol. V. Lipsiae, 1865.
8. Letta C. La composizione dell'opera di Cassio Dione: cronologia e sfondo storico-politico // Troiani L., Noe E., Letta C. *Ricerche di storiografia greca di eta roman*. Pisa: Giardini, 1979. P. 117–189.
9. Letta C. L' eruzione del Vesuvio del 202 d.C. e la composizione dell'opera di Cassio Dione // *Atheneum*. 2007. Vol. 85. P. 41–47.
10. Vrind G. De Cassii Dionis vocabulis quae ad ius publicum pertinent. PhD. Diss. Hague, 1923.
11. Gabba E. Sulla “Storia romana” di Cassio Dione // *RSI*. 1955. Vol. 67. P. 289–333.
12. Mommsen T. *Römisches Strafrecht*. Leipzig: Dunker&Humblot, 1899. 1104 s.
13. Barnes T.D. The composition of Cassius Dio's Roman History // *Phoenix*. 1984. Vol. 38. № 3. P. 240–255.
14. Bohec Y. le. La troisième Legion Auguste. Paris: Éd. du CNRS, 1989. 632 p.
15. Reidinger W. Die Statthalter des ugeteilten Pannoniens und Oberpannoniens von Augustus bis Diokletian. Bonn: Beck, 1956. 128 s.
16. Mennen I. Power and Status in the Roman Empire, AD 193–284. Leiden: Brill, 2011. 306 p.
17. Modrzejewski J., Zawadzki T. La date de la mort d'Ulpian et le préfectorat de pretore au début du regne d'Alexandre Sévère // *RHDFE*. Vol. 45. P. 565–611.
18. Faro S. Sull'anno della morte di Ulpiano // *Index*. 2002. Vol. 30. P. 251–287.
19. Cleve R.L. Cassius Dio and Ulpian // *AHB*. 1988. № 2. P. 118–124.
20. Jardé A. *Études critiques sur la vie et le règne de Sévère Alexandre*. Paris: de Boccard, 1925. 142 p.
21. Bauman R. The Death of Ulpian, the Irresistible Force and the Immovable Object // *ZRG*. 1995. Vol. 112. P. 385–399.
22. Howe L.L. *The praetorian prefect from Commodus to Diocletian (AD 180–305)*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1942. 141 p.
23. Makhlaiuk A.V. *Soldiers of the Roman Empire. Military Traditions and Martial Mentality*. Saint-Petersburg: Faculty of Philology of Saint-Petersburg University, 2006. 440 p.
24. Millar F. *A Study of Cassius Dio*. Oxford, 1964. 239 p.
25. Swan P. M. *The Augustan Succession: An Historical Commentary on Cassius Dio's Roman History, Books 55–56 (9 A.D. – B.C. 14)*. Oxford, 2004. 428 p.
26. Alföldy G. *Das Heer in der Sozialstruktur des Römischen Kaiserreiches // Kaiser, Heer und Gesellschaft in er Römischen Kaiserzeit / Hg. Alföldy G., Dobson B., Eck W. Gedenkschrift für A. Birley*. Stuttgart, 2000. S. 33–57.
27. Sergejev I.P. *Rimskaya armiya v III veke nashei eri. Problemi socialno-politicheskoi istorii*. Har'kov: Majdan, 1999. 224 p.
28. Kuhn-Chen B. *Geschichtskonzeptionen griechischer Historiker im 2 und 3. Jahrhundert n. Chr.: Untersuchungen zu den Werken von Appian, Cassius Dio und Herodian*. Frankfurt am Main etc., 2002. 430 s.
29. Blois L. de. *Volk und Soldaten by Cassius Dio // ANRW*. 1997. Teil II. Bd. 34. Hb. 3. S. 2650–2676.
30. Harrington D. Cassius Dio as a military historian // *Acta Classica*. 1977. Vol. 20. P. 159–165.
31. Okoń D. *Consuls and consulars of the Severan period – a new approach // Eltes in the ancient world*. Szczecin, 2015. P. 153–166.