

Cassius Dio's identity as a second-generation senator has long been recognized as a key influence on the outlook of his Roman history (Millar 1964; Gowing 1992). This paper will explore how that influence is reflected in Dio's engagement with his Latin-language predecessors and their ideas of how a senator's literary and political activities are related. Dio (c. 165 - c. 235) uses both Cicero and Sallust to illustrate possible models: Cicero as someone whose political role suited him well to history but who never wrote any, and Sallust as someone whose political activities undermined the value of his histories. In Cicero's case Dio self-identifies considerably with his subject and uses him to introduce a model of senatorial historiography that he nevertheless in certain key ways characterizes as Greek, reflecting Dio's own background, whereas Sallust is rejected as a negative *exemplum*. Two main episodes from Dio will be considered, with passages from Cicero and Sallust illustrating the republican tradition in which Dio places himself.

The key scene for Cicero comes during the account of his exile in 58, when Dio imagines him meeting a philosopher named Philiscus, who gives a long speech to console him. Among Philiscus' suggestions is that Cicero employ his enforced leisure to write history. (38.28) It has already been argued (Letta 1979; Gowing 1996) that Dio sees parallels in Cicero's situation and his own. This paper argues further that Dio is trying to resolve a tension between, on the one hand, the Roman republican model of senatorial history seen in Cicero's own works (e.g. *De Leg.* 1.3.10) and in the elder Cato, whereby histories are written in retirement as a use of *otium* complementary to political activity, and on the other an oppositional, alienated stance that he codes as Greek by using the *exempla* of Thucydides and Xenophon. Dio portrays himself and Cicero as to different degrees failing in a laudable attempt to balance the two.

Sallust, despite his traditional association with Thucydides, is pointedly introduced as a counter-example. Dio mentions Sallust's historical writing only in the context of his corrupt administration of Africa Nova and the subsequent scandal. (43.9) Sallust's historical writing, and in particular its moralistic tone, is seen as increasing his disgrace by adding the charge of hypocrisy. Dio also makes a possibly intentional chronological error that makes Sallust's career seem more similar to his own. By implicitly comparing Sallust with the model suggested in the earlier Cicero passage, Dio criticizes the sharp distinction Sallust makes in his own work (*BC* 3.3-4.2) between his intellectual and political activities. For Dio, the two are not separable but need to be seen as two facets of a single senatorial identity that he is re-imagining to suit the cultural and political realities of the Severan era.