

DIO'S NAME

An inscription from Macedonia published in 1970 shows the name of the historian Cassius Dio as Κλ' Κάσσιος Δίων, and thus provides a previously unattested *praenomen* (Claudius).¹ Missing from this inscription, and from the six other contemporary inscriptions that bear Dio's name, is Cocceianus, the *cognomen* traditionally assigned to him.² Scrutiny of the evidence in fact suggests that this may not have been among Dio's names. Yet since the nineteenth century this supposed *cognomen* has been taken as proof that the historian was related to his compatriot Dio (Cocceianus) Chrysostom:³ so, for instance, both H. Peter and A. von Gutschmid, relying on no other evidence, pronounced him the rhetor's grandson;⁴ and F. Millar, while questioning such specificity, conceded the likelihood of a marriage-connection between the Cassii of Nicaea and Dio Chrysostom's family in Prusa.⁵ Such theories presume that the two men did have the name Cocceianus in common; but as I shall argue, the name may have been assigned to Cassius Dio as the result of confusion between the two. If this is the case, then the standard identification of the historian as a relative of the rhetor is less secure than has been supposed.

The *cognomen* Cocceianus is first attested for Cassius Dio in the ninth century, when Photius gives his name as Κασσιανὸς Κοκκιανὸς ἢ Κοκκίος Δίων (*Bibl. cod.* 71). Photius himself may well have read a copy of Dio's work, since the contents of his article imply that he drew biographical details directly from Dio; but in view of the variant names, he must also have consulted the work of an earlier lexicographer.⁶ He states further that Dio's *History* was a

1. See J. P. Touratsoglou, "Δύο νέαι ἐπιγραφικαὶ μαρτυρίαι περὶ τοῦ κοινοῦ τῶν Μακεδόνων κατὰ τὸν τρίτον μεταχριστιανικὸν αἰῶνα," in *Ancient Macedonia* (Thessaloniki, 1970), pp. 280–90, pl. lxxvii; cf. *AE* 1971, 430.

2. Cassius Dio Cocceianus is the name under which all major editions of Dio's work have appeared; for a catalog of editions, see U. P. Boissevain, ed., *Cassii Dionis Cocceiani Historiarum Romanarum Quae Supersunt*, vol. 1 (Berlin, 1895), pp. lxxxix–ci. In light of the new inscription, his name has now been expanded to Claudius Cassius Dio Cocceianus in *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*, vol. 1: *Greek Literature*, ed. P. E. Easterling and B. M. W. Knox (Cambridge, 1985), p. 891.

3. Pliny the Younger, an acquaintance of the rhetor, calls him Dio Cocceianus (*Epist.* 10. 81, 82). Since he is first called Chrysostom in Men. Rhet. 390, it has been suggested that in the late third or early fourth century this name was applied to the rhetor to distinguish him from the historian; see *PIR*² D 93, with W. Schmid, "Dion," *RE* 5.1 (1903): 848. If we believe Photius, however, he was known as Chrysostom to his contemporaries (*Bibl. cod.* 209; cf. Arethas' *vita* of Dio in J. von Arnim, ed., *Dionis Prusaensis Quem Vocant Chrysostomum Quae Extant Omnia*, vol. 2 [Berlin, 1896], pp. 325–28, esp. p. 328). See the discussion by C. P. Jones, *The Roman World of Dio Chrysostom* (Cambridge, Mass., 1978), p. 7 with notes.

4. Peter, *Die geschichtliche Literatur über die römische Kaiserzeit*, vol. 1 (Leipzig, 1897), p. 431; Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften*, vol. 5 (Leipzig, 1894), p. 547; cf. W. Pape and G. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der griechischen Eigennamen*³, vol. 1 (Graz, 1959), p. 315, and the Loeb editions of both Cassius Dio (ed. E. Cary, vol. 1 [Cambridge, Mass., 1914], p. ix) and Dio Chrysostom (ed. J. W. Cohoon, vol. 1 [Cambridge, Mass., 1949], p. i).

5. *A Study of Cassius Dio* (Oxford, 1964), pp. 11–12; Millar also offers the possibility (p. 11) that Cocceianus was simply an honorific.

6. Only one extant MS of Dio, cod. Vat. graec. 1288, antedates Photius (for the other MSS, see below); on fol. 10^v it has the subscript and name most commonly found in the MSS, ΔΙΩΝΟC ΡΩΜΑΙΚΗC ΙCΤΟΡΙΑC (see Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, 3:viii; cf. 1:lxiv, lxxiv); for the date (saec. v), see J. Irigoin, "L'Italie méridionale et la tradition des textes antiques," *JOB* 18 (1969): 37–55, 44. For Photius' familiarity with Dio, and his other sources, see W. T. Treadgold, *The Nature of Photius' "Bibliotheca"* (Washington, 1980), pp. 53, 61–62, 100, 183; N. G. Wilson, *Scholars of Byzantium* (Baltimore, 1983), p. 179.

βιβλίον ἐν λόγοις π', precisely the phrase used to describe the works of Dio Chrysostom (*Bibl. cod.* 209).⁷ Though Cassius Dio did indeed write a *Roman History* in eighty books and Dio Chrysostom's orations do number eighty, it is curious that Photius seems aware only of the latter's speeches; nowhere in his entire lengthy article about Dio Chrysostom does he mention his historical work. These details, and his uncertainty about the historian's name, suggest that Photius might have confused the two. If he did, then Photius' confusion, or rather that which he transmits, would not be an isolated instance.

The *Suda*, from the tenth century, is equally unhelpful and inconsistent. Under the entry Δίων (Δ 1239) we read Δίων ὁ Κάσσιος χρηματίσας, ὁ ἐπὶ κλὴν Κοκκήϊος· οἱ δὲ Κοκκήϊανός.⁸ The author of the entry Κοκκιανός (Κ 1914) does not share this uncertainty: he asserts that this was Dio's ὄνομα κύριον.⁹ Under ἐπιστάτης (Ε 2616), an entry from perhaps the same hand as Κοκκιανός, we find Δίων ὁ Κοκκιανός.¹⁰ To add to the confusion, the compilers of the *Suda* also credit Cassius Dio with a Γετικά and a Περσικά. Neither, however, was the work of the historian: Dio Chrysostom wrote the former, and Dinon of Colophon the latter.¹¹ Nor is a Γετικά indicated in the *Suda*'s list of Dio Chrysostom's works. Thus in the *Suda* the rhetor has definitely been confounded with the historian. Neither the *Suda* nor Photius gives precise and unequivocal information on Cassius Dio's name.

In all likelihood the compilers of the *Suda* did not consult Cassius Dio directly but rather knew his work through the then recently published *Excerpta Constantiniana* (the collective title for the *Excerpta de legatis, de insidiis, de virtutibus et vitiis, de sententiis*).¹² The name Δίων Κοκκιανός, in fact, occurs twice in the extant *Excerpta*: in one manuscript of the *Excerpta de virtutibus et vitiis* (fol. 288^v of the cod. Peirescianus, saec. x/xi), and in the list of authors found in the sixteenth-century copies of the *Excerpta de legatis Romanorum ad gentes*.¹³ This is consistent with the versions of Dio's name suggested by the entries ἐπιστάτης and Κοκκιανός in the *Suda*. But the information located under Δίων in the *Suda* appears to have originated in a biographical source that was unsure, as was Photius, of Dio's exact name. Surprisingly, however, neither the *Excerpta* nor the manuscripts of Dio ever mention the name Cassius;¹⁴ both Photius (in the conflated form Κάσσιανός) and the entry Δίων in the *Suda* do.

7. The *Suda*, by contrast, describes Dio's work as a Ῥωμαϊκὴ ἱστορία ἐν βιβλίοις π' (Δ 1239).

8. Cf. Plut. *Otho* 16. 2, where (in reference to Otho's nephew) the MSS have τὸν ἀδελφιδοῦν Κοκκήϊον, which Ziegler in his Teubner edition has emended to Κοκκήϊανόν, comparing Tac. *Hist.* 2. 48. 8 and Suet. *Dom.* 10. 3.

9. This information may be a later addition: see A. Adler, ed., *Suidae Lexicon*, vol. 3 (Leipzig, 1933), p. 144 (app. crit. to Κ 1914).

10. According to Adler, the source of the entry Κοκκιανός was probably an epitome of the *Onomatologus* of Hesychius of Miletus and, ultimately, the lexicographer Diogenianus (*Suidae*, 3:144 [Κ 1914]; on Diogenianus and Hesychius, see *ibid.*, 1:xvii, xxi). If this is correct, then the Κοκκιανός referred to must be Dio Chrysostom, since Diogenianus lived under Hadrian; the entry would be the only reference to his *cognomen* outside Pliny.

11. See E. Schwartz, "Cassius," *RE* 3 (1899): 1684; on Dio Chrysostom's *Getica*, see n. 26.

12. See Adler, *Suidae*, 1:xix, and Wilson, *Scholars*, p. 146.

13. See Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, 1:xiv, xxxiii.

14. But Ursinus' edition of the *Excerpta de legatis* (1582) gave the curious version, Dionys. Cassii Nicaei (the first name is evidently a corruption of Dionis). For this and a few other minor variations, see Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, 1:xxiv n. 1, xxxiv, xcv-vi, 2:vii.

The name most commonly found in manuscripts of the historian is simply Dio: see, for instance, the *tituli* in the early manuscripts (cod. Marc. 395 [M], saec. ix; cod. Laur. 70.8 [L], saec. x) and in two fifteenth-century manuscripts (codd. Marc. 396 and Vat. graec. 144 [V]).¹⁵ Δίων Κοκκαιανός occurs only twice, in a unique variant subscript to Book 54 in M and in its fifteenth-century descendant, codex Laurentianus 70. 10 (Lb), at the beginning of Book 42 (fol. 1r).¹⁶ It should be stressed, however, that these two isolated instances are very much exceptions to the rule, at least as far as the manuscripts are concerned. We may reasonably infer that the name originally affixed to Dio's *Roman History* was not Cassius Dio Cocceianus. In short, from neither the *Excerpta* nor the manuscripts can Dio's full name be satisfactorily restored.

The *tria nomina* customarily assigned to Dio occur together in only one source, the twelfth-century scholar John Tzetzes, although never in the order (Cassius Dio Cocceianus) adopted by modern editors. Tzetzes most often uses the name Δίων (e.g., *H.* 1. 700, 2. 133, and passim; *Schol. exeg. Hom. Il.* p. 141. 16, 21 Hermann). Where other names are given, the order varies considerably. Thus twice in the *Exegesis in Homeri Iliadem* (pp. 108, 136 H.) he is Δίων Κάσιος [*sic*] Κοκκαιανός and once Κάσιος [*sic*] Δίων (p. 76; cf. ὁ Κάσιος ὁ Δίων at *H.* 2. 84). At *Historiarum variarum chiliades* 9. 572 we read Κοκκαιανός Κάσιος [*sic*] Δίων (cf. *Schol. exeg. Hom. Il.* p. 141. 12 H.). Δίων Κοκκαιανός occurs at line 516 in the *Scholia in Lycophronem*, and Δίων ὁ Κοκκαιανός at lines 44, 633, and 912 (cf. *H.* 6. 527, *Epist.* 97 [p. 141 Leone]).¹⁷ In one letter he is simply ὁ Κοκκαιανός (*Epist.* 6 [p. 13 L.]). Tzetzes may have used the historian's work directly,¹⁸ but if the extant manuscripts, where the name Cassius is not found, are any guide to the names as they commonly appeared, he must have derived the name Δίων Κάσιος Κοκκαιανός from some source other than a copy of Dio's work.

In contrast to the preceding, all the evidence prior to Photius and the ninth century is consistent, and nowhere do we encounter the name Cocceianus. Outside of the historian Jordanes (on whom see below), the earliest literary reference to Dio occurs in Evagrius (6th century), who calls him Δίων ὁ Κάσιος (*HE* 5. 24).¹⁹ This concurs with the inscriptions, the only evidence contemporary with Dio, which must be considered the most trustworthy guide to his name. The name Cassius, misrepresented by Photius and found in neither the extant manuscripts nor the *Excerpta*, is amply attested. In addition to the

15. As remarked above (n. 6), the name Dio most commonly appears in the subscripts as well. For the names in the MSS, see Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, 1:lxiv, lxx, lxxiv, lxxxii. L, dated by Boissevain to saec. xi (1:lxix), is now generally assigned to saec. x (see Wilson, *Scholars*, p. 139); and M, dated by Boissevain to saec. xi (1:lxviii), was subsequently redated to very late saec. ix (see A. Diller, "Notes on Greek Codices of the Tenth Century," *TAPA* 78 [1947]: 184–88, esp. 184, n. 3).

16. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, 1:lxiv–lxxv. Lb is actually descended from both M and L (ibid., 1:lxv with n. 1); but since Cocceianus occurs elsewhere only in M, we may reasonably assume that M was the source for the Cocceianus found in Lb.

17. In his edition of *Schol. in Lycoph.* (Leipzig, 1811), Müller appends this note to the text at line 912: "ὁ Κοκκαιανός, a Seb[astian] additum, nostri quoque addunt"—an example of the reasoning that has perpetuated the attribution of the name Cocceianus to the historian.

18. See Wilson, *Scholars*, p. 196.

19. Though Photius knew Evagrius' work (see *Bibl.* cod. 29, with Treadgold, *Nature*, p. 182), he obviously did not rely on him as a guide for Dio's name.

inscription from Macedonia remarked above, six others survive, all of them dating from Dio's second consulship (A.D. 229, with the emperor Severus Alexander). All are brief and formulaic. Three give the name as Cassius Dio (one from Pannonia Inferior, *CIL* 3. 3511; one from Noricum, *CIL* 3. 5587; and one from Rome, *CIL* 6. 2998 = *ILS* 2177); three from Germany show simply Dio (*CIL* 13. 6752, 7337, 7502). Since these are all comparatively informal dedications cut on limited space, we perhaps should not expect to read Dio's full name. By contrast, the Macedonian inscription is a lengthier, formal document decreeing games in honor of the emperor. The mason was not working with limited space and would not have been constrained to omit names. Indeed, the emperor's name is here given in full (Μ' Αὐρήλιος Σεουήρος [Ἀλέξανδρος]),²⁰ unlike the six Latin inscriptions from Dio's consulship where his name is abbreviated as (e.g.) Seve(rus) Alex(ander). It may be, then, that on this inscription we have Dio's full name as well.

If this is the case, then at some point the name Cocceianus was erroneously assigned to the historian. Of course, we cannot strictly disprove the traditional view that Dio's *cognomen*—or *agnomen*, it now seems—was Cocceianus; moreover, there has been some speculation that Dio Chrysostom's family received the citizenship under the emperor Claudius, a notion that, if proven, would make the argument for a connection with the historian's family, and hence for the name Cocceianus, more compelling.²¹ But besides the fact that there is no proof that any of Dio Chrysostom's forebears adopted the name Claudius, we have no indication whatsoever prior to the ninth century that Cassius Dio bore the name Cocceianus; and we have seen that the later evidence for this name is rather shaky. In fact, we perhaps can go one step further: for I wish to suggest that the attribution of the name Cocceianus to Cassius Dio might have resulted from (not caused) confusion between the two authors.

First, more needs to be said about Dio Chrysostom's *cognomen*, Cocceianus. Although the name is reliably attested in Pliny's two letters, he is our sole source for the information; and it seems certain that from at least the third century on the rhetor was known as Dio Chrysostom, not Dio Cocceianus (see n. 3). There is nevertheless some tenuous evidence that his other name did not simply fall into oblivion. If the source of the *Suda*'s entry for Κοκκιανός is Diogenianus, a lexicographer from the time of Hadrian (see n. 10), then the entry must refer to the rhetor, and it would indicate that in fact he was known to his contemporaries as Dio Cocceianus, the name Pliny gives him. This would further corroborate the notion that the name Chrysostom was a later invention.

20. The restoration of Ἀλέξανδρος, obliterated on the stone in two places, is assured by other inscriptions: see Touratsoglou, "Δύο νέαι ἐπιγραφικαί," p. 282.

21. See Jones, *Roman World*, p. 4 with n. 31, p. 7 with n. 63. It would be standard procedure for a family to adopt as *praenomen* the *nomen gentilicium* of the general or emperor who granted them citizenship; see F. Millar, *The Emperor in the Roman World* (Ithaca, 1977), pp. 477–90, esp. pp. 481–82. We may surmise, then, that Cassius Dio's family received Roman citizenship under the emperor Claudius but generally suppressed the *praenomen* in accordance with the common practice; see J. Hatzfeld, *Les trafiquants italiens dans l'orient hellénique* (Paris, 1919), p. 11, and A. Cameron, "Polyonymy in the Late Roman Aristocracy: The Case of Petronius Probus," *JRS* 75 (1985): 164–82 (esp. 173–75). For a speculative discussion of the historian's genealogy, see W. Ameling, "Cassius Dio und Bithynien," *EA* 4 (1984): 123–38 (esp. 124–26).

In addition, an odd mutation of the rhetor's name surfaces in the *Capita theologica* of the seventh-century theologian Maximus the Confessor. Maximus knows the difference between Dio Chrysostom and Cassius Dio, and he cites both, the former as Δίων (PG 91:748, 760, 985) or Δίων ὁ Χρυσόστομος (ibid., 792), the latter as Δίων Ῥωμαῖος (ibid., 1008).²² The rhetor occurs in yet another guise, however, as Δίων Πεισωνιανός, whom Maximus most likely thought to be a third Dio.²³ In any case, Maximus did not invent the name Πεισωνιανός; he simply transmitted it from his source. It suggests that Dio Chrysostom's *cognomen* (or some form of it) had not entirely disappeared.

In view of the preceding evidence, it is possible that some of Dio Chrysostom's works originally circulated under the name Dio Cocceianus. As remarked above, however, by at least the third century the rhetor clearly was referred to as Dio Chrysostom, the name Cocceianus having been discarded and evidently forgotten. Thereafter the rhetor and the historian are confounded, most notably in the *Getica* of the sixth-century historian Jordanes.

Jordanes identifies as sources—and confuses—Cassius Dio and Dio Chrysostom, referring to both simply as Dio, evidently unaware that he was in fact citing two different authors.²⁴ Yet he does recognize that he is citing from two different works (*historiae*—i.e., a *Getica*—and *annales*: cf. *Get.* 40). One of the references in Jordanes definitely derives from Cassius Dio's *Roman History* (*Get.* 14; cf. Dio 76. 12 with Mommsen, *MGH:AA*, 5.1: 57, n. 6), and the information about the Po at *Getica* 150 probably has the same origin, whereas the contents of the remaining references (*Get.* 40, 58, 65) point to Dio Chrysostom's *Getica* as the source. Whether the failure to differentiate between the two authors should be attributed to Jordanes or to his source is uncertain.²⁵ But the principal error remains: here, as later in the *Suda*, the historian is credited with a historical work written by Dio Chrysostom. In short, either Jordanes or his source had before him a *Roman History* and a *Getica* that were both commonly believed to be the work of Cassius Dio.

The confusion found in Jordanes and in the *Suda*, and Photius' ignorance of Dio Chrysostom's historical works, confirm what we already knew: Dio Chrysostom was known principally if not exclusively as an orator. This in fact must have largely contributed to the confusion, if it was not the sole source. A *Getica*

22. Maximus apparently used the same tag for the historian in his *Florilegium*: see Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, I:xlII, 196–97.

23. The passages quoted by Maximus (PG 91:764) occur in Dio Chrys. *Or.* 3. 89–90, 101–3 (see A. Sonny, *Ad Dionem Chrysostomum Analecta* [Kiev, 1896], pp. 146–47). Cf. Apostolius (16th century), relying on Maximus, in E. L. v. Leutsch and F. G. Schneidewin, eds., *Paroemiographi Graeci*, vol. 2 (Göttingen, 1851): for Πεισωνιανός, 6. 100a (p. 392), 13. 10h (p. 573), 13. 13o (p. 575); for Δίων (the historian), I. 34e (p. 248) and 8. 20 (p. 431). See also Schmid, “Dion,” col. 848.

24. See T. Mommsen, ed., *Jordanis Romana et Getica*, *MGH:AA*, 5.1 (Berlin, 1882), pp. xxx–xxxii (the *Getica* is here cited from this edition); and von Arnim, *Dionis Prusaensis*, 2:iv.

25. For recent discussion of Jordanes and his main source, Cassiodorus, see J. J. O'Donnell, *Cassiodorus* (Berkeley and Los Angeles, 1979), pp. 43–54 (esp. 48–49); id., “The Aims of Jordanes,” *Historia* 31 (1982): 223–40 (esp. 229); and B. Croke, “Cassiodorus and the *Getica* of Jordanes,” *CP* 82 (1987): 117–34 (esp. 119, 123–24). See also W. Goffart's reassessment of Jordanes in *The Narrators of Barbarian History* (Princeton, 1988), pp. 20–111 (though Jordanes' confusion here goes unnoticed and is even compounded: Goffart identifies “Dio” as Jordanes' source in *Get.* 14 [pp. 89, 90 n. 334] and his index shows that he believes this to be Dio Chrysostom; but the source is Cassius Dio [see above], whom Goffart nowhere mentions as one of Jordanes' sources).

certainly would have seemed more appropriate to the historian Cassius Dio; and later writers, who knew the rhetor as Dio Chrysostom, would naturally have presumed that this history was written by the historian Cassius Dio.²⁶ If the *Getica* had circulated under the name Dio Cocceianus, then it seems all the more likely that this was how Cassius Dio acquired the name. In short, the two difficulties noted here—one concerning the authorship of the *Getica*, the other concerning the names of the two authors—appear to be interrelated. Over the course of time, other factors (e.g., the negligence of scribes and lexicographers) may have compounded or perpetuated the error,²⁷ eventually producing the sorts of inconsistency that surface in Photius' *Bibliotheca* and the *Suda*.

The confounding of Cassius Dio and Dio Chrysostom is by no means confined to antiquity. The early editors of the historian assigned to him material that properly belonged to the rhetor.²⁸ The reverse confusion occurred as well. Boissevain, deploring the frequency with which Dio Chrysostom (among others) was wrongly credited with something written by Cassius Dio, observed: "quam facile in florilegiis, lemmatibus aut loco positis non iusto aut omnino neglectis, tales errores nasci potuerint et res ipsa clamat et omnibus, qui in hanc rem inquisiverunt, notum est."²⁹ In this instance, such errors must have had their origin in, or been compounded by, the confusion of the two men's names.

Were we to rely on the evidence from the third through seventh centuries (the inscriptions, cod. Vat. graec. 1288, Jordanes, Evagrius, and Maximus the Confessor), Dio would be known as Claudius Cassius Dio. Modern scholars, seeking to supply Dio with the customary *tria nomina*, have pieced together the name Cassius Dio Cocceianus from the various bits of later evidence, some of them not very reliable. The inscription from Macedonia has confirmed that they were mistaken. Furthermore, review of the evidence for the name Cocceianus, the thread that has traditionally bound Cassius Dio and Dio Chrysostom together, has shown it to be a slender thread indeed. At the very least, there clearly is sufficient uncertainty to warrant greater restraint in offering conjectures about the historian's genealogy.

ALAIN M. GOWING

University of Washington

26. The sole ancient reference to Dio Chrysostom's *Getica*, at Philostr. *VS* I. 205, is so worded as to suggest that one will be surprised to learn that the rhetor had written history, and competently at that (ὥς δὲ καὶ ἱστορίαν ἱκανὸς ἦν ξυγγράφειν, δηλοῖ τὰ Γετικά). On the *Getica*, see Jones, *Roman World*, pp. 122–23.

27. Consider, e.g., the various permutations in the *Suda* and Photius, noted above: Κάσσιος, Κοκκίος, Κοκκήϊος, Κασσιανός, Κοκκιανός, Κοκκηϊανός. The passage from Κάσσιος to Κοκκίος to Κοκκιανός would be understandable, particularly in view of the confusion that seems to have existed.

28. See, e.g., H. Haupt, "Neue Beiträge zu den Fragmenten des Dio Cassius," *Hermes* 14 (1879): 431–46, or A. Nauck, "Analecta Critica," *Hermes* 24 (1889): 447–72 (esp. 460).

29. Boissevain, *Cassii Dionis*, I:li. This sort of error was due in part to the fact that several orations in Dio's *History* were excerpted and circulated separately, only to be attributed subsequently to Dio Chrysostom; see *ibid.*, I:li–lii.