

THE RHODIAN ORATION ASCRIBED TO AELIUS ARISTIDES

Among the works of Aelius Aristides is preserved one entitled the *Rhodian* (*Ῥοδιακός*, sc. λόγος, no. 25).¹ It concerns an earthquake which has recently struck the city of Rhodes, and since Keil's edition of 1898 it has usually been considered spurious.

The work reproduces a true speech, not something like an open letter: the clearest sign is when the author uses the deictic pronoun *τουτί*, 'this here', of the place in which he is speaking (53).² One question is best discussed at the outset, since later it will prove vital to the question of authenticity: does the speaker claim to have been in Rhodes at the moment of the earthquake? Keil assumed without argument that he does.³ He had clearly visited the city before the disaster as well as after it (4, 32), but despite the vividness of his descriptions he nowhere says that he was present, and this reticence surely implies that he was not; and if he had been it is odd that he should talk of 'the actual climax of the thing that befell you' (*τὴν ἀκμὴν αὐτὴν τοῦ περιστάντος ὑμᾶς πράγματος*, 19), using the second person plural. I infer that the speaker had not been present, but gave the speech several months after the event (*εἰς μῆνας*, 28); in the last part of this paper I will argue that he is Aristides, stopping at Rhodes on his way back from Egypt to Smyrna in or about 142.

Though Rhodes was affected by several great earthquakes in the course of its history, this one can be identified with reasonable certainty. The author claims that six hundred years have passed since the founding of the city in 408 B.C. (33). Strictly this would yield a date in the late second century; but it can be presumed that the author is rounding the number and that the event is the famous earthquake which struck Rhodes, Cos, Caria and Lycia early in the reign of Pius. This is known from many sources both literary and documentary,⁴ and its precise dating is another question which bears on the authorship of the *Rhodian*.

¹ When referring to individual works of Aristides without section numbers, I shall use 'no.'; for his text I use the edition of C. A. Behr (Leiden, 1976–80) for nos. 1–16, that of B. Keil (Berlin, 1898) for nos. 17–53. For clarity I shall refer to no. 25 as the *Rhodian*, to no. 24, the *Letter to the Rhodians on Concord*, as the *Letter on Concord*. I have used the following special abbreviations: Behr, *Aristides: Works* ii = C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides: The Complete Works* ii (Leiden, 1981); Behr, *The Sacred Tales* = C. A. Behr, *Aelius Aristides and the Sacred Tales* (Amsterdam, 1968); Bull. ép. = J. and L. Robert, *Bulletin épigraphique*, appearing almost every year between 1938 and 1984 in *REG* (reprinted in 10 vols., Paris, 1972–87); Pernot, *Discours siciliens* = L. Pernot, *Les Discours siciliens d'Aelius Aristide* (New York, 1981); Robert, *Documents* = L. Robert, *Documents d'Asie Mineure*, BEFAR 239 bis (Paris, 1987); Robert, 'Séismes' = L. Robert, 'Stèle funéraire de Nicomédie et Séismes dans les Inscriptions', *BCH* 102 (1978), 395–408 = *Documents* 91–104; Schmid, *Atticismus* ii = W. Schmid, *Der Atticismus in seiner Hauptvertretern* ii (Stuttgart, 1899). All dates are A.D. unless otherwise indicated. This study would not have been possible without the index of Aristides made available by the *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae* (Irvine), and I am grateful to the Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, where I had access to this index in the year 1986–7; when I refer in general terms to Aristides' practice (e.g. on 7), it should be assumed that my evidence is drawn from the *TLG*. I have also profited from the comments of a reader for *CQ*.

² See below. Note also *τουτουσί* (14), *ταυτησί* (38).

³ Keil, p. 72 app., p. 87 app.

⁴ Most are collected by D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton, 1950), ii.1491–2; cf. Robert, 'Séismes', p. 402 n. 57 = *Documents* 98 n. 57. Note also the inscription honouring Antoninus Pius as *σωτήρ καὶ κτίστης* of Rhodes, G. Pugliese Carratelli in *Studi di antichità classica offerti a Emanuele Ciaceri* (Genoa, Rome, Naples, Città di Castello, 1940), 255; cf. *Bull. ép.* 1946/47.156.

A *terminus post quem* is provided by the dossier of the benefactions of Opramoas of Rhodiapolis, who showed his generosity to many communities after the event; one of the many testimonies of gratitude to him involves the legate Q. Voconius Saxa, who governed from early 144 to 147.⁵ For a more precise dating recourse must unfortunately be had to undisputed works of Aristides, which comport notorious problems of chronology. He heard of the earthquake while visiting Egypt, and he was there, probably in Alexandria, when a Rhodian delegation arrived with news of the disaster (24.3).⁶ It is generally and rightly agreed that he was in Egypt for part at least of the tenure of his later friend Avidius Heliodorus, which ended between February and July of 142.⁷ From Egypt Aristides returned to Smyrna before setting out on a long and fateful journey to Rome; this took place in a winter which is probably that of 142/3.⁸ It therefore seems prudent to put the earthquake in a year as late as possible in the tenure of Heliodorus, 141 or 142.⁹

Only Keil and following him Charles Behr have offered positive arguments against the authenticity of the speech. Keil's general arguments, not all of them very perspicuously expressed, are as follows:¹⁰

(1) Writing to the Rhodians some time after the earthquake on the subject of concord, Aristides declares that this was the first time he had written to them (*τὴν πρώτην*, 24.1): but the *Rhodian* must be earlier than the *Letter on Concord* since the author of the *Rhodian* was present at the time of the disaster. (Even though this last point is erroneous, and some months had passed [25.28], still the priority of the *Rhodian* can be assumed.)

(2) In the *Letter on Concord* Aristides claims, 'How I reacted to the disaster of the earthquake, and how I behaved towards your ambassadors to Egypt at that time, you might best learn from them' (24.3). Keil argues that, had Aristides wished to prove the sincerity of his earlier feelings towards the Rhodians, he had only to mention the present work; since he does not do so, he cannot have written it.

(3) The *Rhodian* was delivered in Rhodes, whereas Aristides was in Egypt at the time.

(4) The speech has several features 'which are foreign to Aristides' character and manner' (*quae ab Aristidis indole et arte abhorrent*).

To take these arguments in turn, the first rests on an unfortunate mistranslation. *τὴν πρώτην* means 'for the time being', as elsewhere in Aristides, not 'for the first time'.¹¹ As for the second, in the *Letter on Concord* Aristides means to contrast his reaction to the first news of the earthquake with his reaction to the first news of the recent troubles in the city; since the *Rhodian* was only composed some time after the

⁵ TAM ii.905 (IGR iii.739), col. xiii, lines 48–60, cf. 72. For Saxa's tenure, G. Alföldy, *Konsulat und Senatorenstand unter den Antoninen* (Bonn, 1977), p. 257; cf. M. Wörrle, *Stadt und Fest im kaiserzeitlichen Kleinasien* (Munich, 1988), p. 38 n. 94.

⁶ There seems no basis for Behr's assertion, *Sacred Tales* 16, that 'Aristides delivered [to the Rhodian ambassadors and to the Alexandrians] a speech of consolation, which is no longer preserved'.

⁷ On the dates of Heliodorus' tenure, G. Bastianini, *ZPE* 17 (1975), p. 288, cf. 38 (1980), p. 81.

⁸ Return to Smyrna: inferred with good cause from the *Hymn to Serapis* (no. 45), which seems to have been delivered in Smyrna after Aristides' safe return from Egypt (Behr, *Sacred Tales* 21 n. 72). Aristides actually started out for the capital 'from home' (48.60), presumably from Hadrianoutherai. On the date, see below at n. 28.

⁹ For 142, Behr, *Sacred Tales* 15 n. 44, arguing against Magie's date, 'as early as 139'.

¹⁰ Keil, apparatus on pp. 72, 79, 87, 91.

¹¹ Rightly observed by Behr, *Sacred Tales* 16 n. 48. Keil comments on a different nuance, 'at first', in his apparatus to this very speech, 25.51 line 23.

event, it was of little relevance to his present situation. Keil's third consideration is ruled out by something already noticed, that the author makes no claim to have been present at the time, and strongly implies that he was not.

There remain the arguments from Aristides' 'character and manner'. These will be examined in more detail later, but a heuristic problem which they raise may be noticed here. With his profound knowledge of Aristides, Keil observed many similarities of phrase and language between him and the author of the *Rhodian*. 'Though in his manner he has a number of points in common with Aristides, he is not an imitator of his; nor is there any likelihood that the work will be taken as a scholastic forgery; it follows that the author is of the same rhetorical school as that which produced Aristides; perhaps both are imitating the same teacher. This is important for a correct assessment of Aristides' art'.¹² Behr has recently offered a variant of this view. A copy of the original 'may well have been found among Aristides' papers [since] it seems that [he] was familiar with this speech and borrowed from it for his own later works'.¹³ These formulations come close to being incapable of disproof, and thus useless for argumentation, since only differences between the *Rhodian* and other works of Aristides would count, not similarities.

It is not merely the style of the work that recalls Aristides, but also what the author reveals about himself. Aristides had visited Rhodes before the earthquake, and had seen the great triremes which were still preserved from the city's age of glory (24.53). He must therefore have visited it before crossing to Egypt, though not necessarily just before, and that helps to explain why the Rhodian ambassadors to Egypt approached him in person with the news (24.4). The author of the *Rhodian* likewise comments on the triremes which 'it was possible to see' (*ὑπῆρχεν ἰδεῖν*) before the earthquake (25.4). While it is not attested that Aristides visited Rhodes after the earthquake, it was an obvious stop on the journey from Alexandria to Smyrna; the author of the *Rhodian* put in there a few months after the event.¹⁴ Aristides in the *Letter on Concord* mentions the ambassadors he had met in Egypt; the author of the *Rhodian* mentions the ambassadors 'going round and making different requests of different peoples' (25.43).

The range of authors cited or alluded to in the *Rhodian* also makes an interesting comparison with those known to Aristides. It is no surprise to find Homer, Hesiod and Pindar cited by name; the work of Pindar is the seventh *Olympian*, which Aristides cites elsewhere in a way that shows his knowledge of the commentaries.¹⁵ A well-known sentiment of Alkaios, cited as a saying (*λόγος*, 64), returns in two other works, once under the author's name and once as 'that old maxim' (*τὸ παλαιὸν τοῦτο*).¹⁶ There is a glancing allusion to a fragment of early Spartan poetry also cited by Dio Chrysostom.¹⁷ Among Attic dramatists, the author cites Sophocles' *Oedipus Tyrannus* and Aristophanes' *Acharnians*, both known to Aristides.¹⁸

In general the vocabulary of the work, as Keil admitted, does not deviate far from Aristides' norm. *ἡμιρραγής* (32) is unique; *εὐκληρος* (45) is first found in the Septuagint; *δεδομημένος* (64) from *δομέω* is a clear lapse from classical usage, found

¹² Keil, apparatus on p. 91.

¹³ Behr, *Aristides: Works* ii.371 n. 1.

¹⁴ Note also his allusion to the noise of the Egyptian cataracts, 25.25; Aristides visited these while in Egypt (36.46–52).

¹⁵ Homer: 30, 40, 45 (*οἱ ποιηταί*). Hesiod: 39. Pindar: 30, cf. 39.16 with Keil's apparatus.

¹⁶ Fr. 426 Lobel–Page; cf. below, on section 64.

¹⁷ οὐ πάτριον τῇ 'Ρόδῳ, 43; Wilamowitz *apud* Keil saw the reference to Dio Chrys. 2.59 = Page, *Poetae Melici Graeci* no. 856, οὐ γὰρ πάτριον τῇ Σπάρτῃ.

¹⁸ Sophocles: 16, cf. 28.11. Aristophanes: 17, cf. 33.5.

also in Josephus and Arrian. It is worth comparing Laurent Pernot's analysis of the language of the Sicilian declamations: 'un certain nombre de tours grammaticaux ou de termes employés dans les *Discours Siciliens* s'écartent quelque peu de l'emploi classique. Ces gauchissements témoignent qu'Aristide écrit une langue qu'il ne parle pas: ils marquent le fossé, étroit mais infranchissable, qui sépare l'écrivain atticiste des auteurs attiques'.¹⁹ In what follows I discuss in order of occurrence some passages which might be, or have been, cited to show the work spurious, and others which tend to show the opposite.

2, μὴ θρήνω προσεικός, ἀλλ' ἐκπληξιν καὶ ζήλον ἔχον. Aristides is fond of the neuter participle of ἔχω with abstract nouns: for cases in which this appears in the second member of a phrase, as here (apart from sections 7, 14), 3.413, ἀμάρτημα οὐκ ἀπαραίτητον, ἀλλ' ἔχον...εὐπρέπειαν; 10.27, πῶς ἀνεκτὸν ἢ πῶς δόξαν μετρίαν ἔχον; 26.53, κουφότερόν τε καὶ ἡττοὺς ἔχον τοὺς φόβους.

3, πεδίῳ κρεμαστῷ. The comparison of the roofs of Rhodes to a 'suspended plain' recalls the description of the multi-storeyed houses of Rome, 26.8.

5, τῶν ἄλλων ἔργων. Keil takes offence, but the point is (as correctly implied by Behr's translation) that each public building is so beautiful as to deserve to be a thank-offering for all the others.

6, λαμπρὰν λαμπρῶς ἀποτεταμένην. On Aristides' fondness for polyptoton, Schmid, *Atticismus* ii. 275–6; cf. esp. 30.10, λαμπροὶ λαμπρῶς; 36.9, λαμπρὸς ἐν λαμπροῖς ἑτησίαις.

7, ὀφθαλμοῖς κόρον οὐκ ἔχον. Cf. 17.17, οὔτε γὰρ...τὰ προάστια ὀρῶντι κόρος, κτλ.; 20.14, οὔτ' ὀφθαλμῶν κόρον ἦν λαβεῖν (both passages describe Smyrna before the earthquake of 178).

7, ἀντὶ λαμπτηρῶν τοῖς προπλέουσιν ὄν, 'as good as beacons'. This use of ἀντί (LSJ s.v. III 2) is a veritable tic with Aristides (cf. also below, on 28): to take only examples with εἶναι, 3.470 ἦν ἀντὶ τείχους τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν; 34.45, οἱ δ' ἀντὶ ξύλων...καὶ λίθων εἰσὶν τῷ μὴ κινεῖν; 36.123, (ὁ θεὸς) τὸν Νεῖλον ἐπήγαγεν...ἀντὶ ὀμβρῶν εἶναι τοῖς ταύτῃ; 37.7, ἀντ' ἐξηγητοῦ τίνος οὐσα τοῖς θεοῖς.

7, ὥστε στέφανον (Keil: ὥσπερ edd.). There does not seem to be another example of this poeticism (LSJ s.v. ὥστε A) in Aristides.

8, καθαρὰ καθαρώς. Cf. 28.21, καθαρὸς καθαρώς and section 6 above.

9, εἰκόνων ἀμφοτέρων ἀμύθητος ἀριθμός. This difficult phrase has been interpreted in several ways: Keil understood ἀμφοτέρων to mean 'of gods and men', though condemning the language. Aristides very frequently uses ἀμφοτέροι as a pronoun to refer to two plural groups (thus 1.71, 98, 113, 172, etc.); in 43.22, ἀμφοτέροις refers to gods and men. That is not an exact parallel to the present phrase, in which the word is used adjectivally, but is perhaps close enough.

10, ὦν μὲν ἀρτίως ἐμνημήμην. Aristides several times combines this verb and adverb, cf. 3.482, ἥς ἀρτίως ἐμνήσθην (again, 28.148); 36.78, ἥς ἐμνήσθην ἀρτίως; 36.89, ὦν ἀρτίως ἐμνήσθην.

10, ὄρος ἄωρον. Keil criticizes the phrase as a 'lusus ineptus', but paronomasia is one of Aristides' favourite figures: Schmid, *Atticismus* ii. 276–8 gives over thirty instances, which could easily be multiplied.

14, μένετε ἐν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν. This 'strange but well attested idiom'²⁰ occurs in two other passages of Aristides: 22.13, νῦν γέ τι ἐν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν ἔσεσθε; 24.59, γένεσθε ἐν ὑμῶν αὐτῶν (borrowed by Libanius 35.15).

¹⁹ Pernot, *Discours siciliens*, pp. 117–46; the quotation is from p. 145.

²⁰ Gomme and Sandbach on Men. *Samia* 339.

14, αἰσχροὺν καὶ οἰκοθεν ἔστ' ἔχον τὸ ἔγκλημα. See above on 2.

18, σοφιστής. Behr counts this favourable use of the word as a sign of spuriousness, but Festugière has shown that Aristides does not always use the word in a derogatory sense: thus 23.2, τῶν ἐλλογίμων καὶ τῶν παλαιῶν σοφιστῶν.²¹

18, λέγειν οὐ λέγοντες. Criticized by Keil, but see Schmid, *Atticismus* ii. 281–3, giving over forty examples of oxymoron in Aristides: thus 3.225, μήτ' ἀκούοντας ἀκούειν τὰ δεινὰ μήθ' ὀρώντας ὀράν; 48.23, οὐδ' ὀρώντες τὰ ἄλλα ἐδόκουν ὀράν.

22, κακῶν ἐπιθήκη. The same phrase in 1.163, 6.15, 12.16. Discussing 6.15, Pernot observes on ἐπιθήκη, 'Ce mot, qui n'apparaît chez aucun autre écrivain du Haut-Empire, paraît avoir été exhumé par Aristide, qui l'emploie souvent, surtout dans l'expression κακῶν ἐπιθήκη'.²²

27, ὁξύτερον, εἰ δὲ βούλει, μακρότερον. Aristides often uses εἰ βούλει to correct or amplify something just said: cf. 36.35, ὠμαλῶς, εἰ δὲ βούλει, ἀνωμαλῶς.²³

28, ἀντί δὲ χρυσείων καὶ ἀργυρείων μετὰλλων διώρυχος τοῦδαφος τῆς πόλεως παρείχε καὶ εἰς μῆνας ἐκκαθαίρειν τοὺς κειμένους. Behr translates, 'Instead of the excavations of the gold and silver mines, the land of the city was sufficient to dispose cleanly of the dead for months', but there are no definite articles in the prepositional phrase and no gold or silver mines on Rhodes. ἀντί is used in the sense discussed in section 7, 'like', 'as if'; παρείχε ἐκκαθαίρειν is not 'was sufficient to dispose of' but 'yielded up the dead to be cleared away' (cf. LSJ s.v. παρέχω A II 1, ἐκκαθαίρω 2). The speaker could not talk of the Rhodians using the soil of the city to bury the dead when he is just about to observe that they were compelled to burn them within the walls. He means, however his taste may be judged, that for months afterwards the citizens came across buried bodies in their soil like veins of gold or silver in a mine.

29, ἐπείδεν Ἥλιος ἐν Ῥόδῳ τὰ ἀθέατα θεάματα αὐτῷ. Cf. 19.3, ἄωρότατον θεαμάτων ἀποπέφανται, on Smyrna after the earthquake of 178; 24.52, ἄωρον θέαμα.

31, δεικνύειν ὥς... Schmid, *Atticismus* ii. 25, shows that Aristides uses both -μι and -ω forms of *v*-stem verbs, usually making his choice so as to avoid hiatus; thus δεικνύναι is used over twenty times before consonants or at the end of sentences, as in this speech (33), while δεικνύειν is used here and at 2.382, 3.42, 452, 26.4, 14, and 40 before vowels.

32, σῶν. For this form of the neuter (also in section 42) cf. 3.195, 36.116 (Schmid, *Atticismus* omits these last two).

32, σχῆμα ἀκτῆς μετείληφεν. σχῆμα is one of Aristides' favourite words: cf. 1.68, τὸ ἐκείνων σχῆμα μετείληφεν; 28.8, μετείληφας ῥήτορος σχῆμα.

33, ὦ δαίμονες. Condemned by Keil as un-Aristidean. He is right that this particular phrase does not recur in Aristides, but the author uses other cases of the plural as a synonym or near-synonym for the gods: 37.25, 45.32, 46.24.²⁴

33, κοσμοῦντες τὴν πόλιν...ἀντεκοσμοῦντο τῇ μνήμῃ. LSJ cite ἀντικοσμέω only from Plutarch and this passage. Aristides has a liking for unusual compounds with ἀντι-; thus 1.126, ἀντεκπλήττω (LSJ cite only this passage and one in Aelian); 1.225, ἀνταπολαμβάνω (LSJ cite only Plato and Demosthenes); 1.296, ἀντεφίστημι (apparently unique); 3.441, ἀντικατασκευάζω (LSJ cite Dion. Hal., Jos., Dio Cass., but not Aristides); 3.668, ἀντιπροσείπον (LSJ cite ἀντιπροσαγορεύω from Plutarch,

²¹ Behr, *Aristides: Works* ii.371 n. 1. A. J. Festugière, *REG* 82 (1969), 148–9 = *Études d'Histoire et de Philologie* (Paris, 1975), 120–1.

²² Pernot, *Discours siciliens* 139, citing this passage.

²³ Schmid, *Atticismus* ii.64–5.

²⁴ Cf. J. Puiggali, *C&M* 36 (1985), 123.

but for this form note only 'in earlier prose' Theophr. *Char.* 15.3); 3.672, ἀνταφαιρέω (LSJ cite Antiphon, and otherwise only this passage and 23.50); 5.36, ἀντιπρεσβεύω (for the active as opposed to the middle voice, LSJ cite only this passage and App. *Mithr.* 87; cf. Pernot, *Discours Siciliens* 143).

37, καίτοι παράδοξον ποιῶ, cf. 43, εἰ μὴ λίαν παράδοξον ἔρεῖν ἔμελλον. Aristides is fond of describing his ideas as 'paradoxical': thus 1.136, εἰ καὶ παράδοξον εἰπεῖν; 1.238, εἴ γέ τι δεῖ καὶ παράδοξον εἰπεῖν; 3.46, καὶ μηδεὶς θαυμάσῃ τὸ παράδοξον; 8.5, εἰ καὶ τῷ παράδοξον φανείται; 19.4, παράδοξον μὲν οὖν οἶδα ἐρῶν λόγον.

38, Σύμης ταυτησί. For this deictic with a geographical name, cf. 33.27, περὶ Κῶν ταυτηνί; note also Keil's suggestion of Ἑλαία ταυτηρί (ταύτη MSS.) at 48.54.

38, ἐπεὶ δὲ ἔδει καὶ τῶν ἐναντίων πείραν λαβεῖν. Keil compares 20.15 (on Smyrna after the earthquake), ἐπεὶ δὲ καὶ τῆς ἐτέρας ἔδει μερίδος πείραν λαβεῖν.

38, μέγιστα δὲ ἔχοντες μεγίστων ἐξεπέσετε. Cf. section 44, μέγιστοι τῶν Ἑλλήνων μέγιστα ἐπλήγητε, 19.1 (on Smyrna after the earthquake), Σμύρνα τοι μέγιστα δὴ τῆς νῦν Ἑλλάδος εὐτυχήσασα...μέγιστα δὴ καὶ πέπονθε. On Aristides' liking for polyptoton, above, on section 6.

41, καὶ δῆτα καὶ ἀπορήσαι τις ἂν ποτέροις νῦν μάλλον ἄξιον ὁδύρασθαι, πότερον τοῖς θεατοῖς τῆς πόλεως ἢ τοῖς ὠμιληκόσιν· οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἐστέρηνται τοῦ καλλίστου θεάματος, οἱ δ' ὦν εἶδον τοῦ μεγίστου. Keil compares 22.12 (on Eleusis after the raid of the Costobocoi), ποτέροις καὶ ἄξιον στενάξαι μείζον, πότερον τοῖς ἀμυήτοις ἢ τοῖς μεμνημένοις; οἱ μὲν γὰρ ὦν εἶδον, οἱ δ' ὦν εἶχον ἰδεῖν τὰ κάλλιστα ἀπεστέρηνται.

42, μάρτυρας τοῦ πῶς αὐτὰ διοίσετε. For this idiom (LSJ ὁ B I 5), cf. 2.30, 322 (παράδειγμα τοῖς ἄλλοις γιγνόμενοι τοῦ πῶς δεῖ καρτερεῖν), 3.213.

48, οὔτε καθήρκεν οὔτε μὴ καθέλη ποτε. Cf. 43.8, οὐδ' ἐκινδύνευσεν οὐδὲ μήποτε κινδυνεύσῃ, and Schmid, *Atticismus* ii.276.

49, εἰ καὶ παράδοξον εἰπεῖν. See above, on section 37.

53, ἡγωνισάμεθα. Aristides often uses ἀγωνίζεσθαι of public speaking: thus 4.5, ἵνα προθυμότερον ἀγωνιζοίμην; 50.8, ἀγῶνας ἐντελεῖς ἡγωνιζόμεθα οἴκοι τε κἂν τοῖς δημοσίοις. Behr has suggested that the χωρίον in which the speaker has often performed was the ecclesia or the council chamber,²⁵ but these have already been mentioned separately in what just precedes (οὔτε βουλευτήριον οὔτε θέατρον): perhaps therefore a second theatre or an odeion is meant.

53, ἐκ παλαιᾶς νέαν ποιῆσαι. Cf. 19.4 (urging the emperors to rebuild Smyrna), ὑμεῖς νέαν ἐξ ἀρχῆς ἀποδείξατε.

56, ὦ μάλιστα χρὴ δοκεῖν εἶναι διὰ σπουδῆς ὡς ἂν οἷόν τε ἢ τὴν πόλιν ἀναλαβεῖν, ὡς μὴ...ἐπὶ γῆς κέοιτο μηδὲ σκόπελοι...τὰ Ῥόδου πράγματα εἴη τὸ λοιπόν. Keil objects to the optatives, but Schmid, *Atticismus* ii.58–9, cites many passages in which Aristides neglects sequence of moods: thus after ὡς, 3.592, 5.14, 23.68, 36.52, 43.1 (where Keil emends).

58, οὐκ ἡκρίβωσεν, 'was not so thorough', Behr. For Aristides' use of the word in this sense, Schmid, *Atticismus* ii.74.

62, ὥσπερ ἀνὴρ ἀθλητῆς ἐν ταῖς εὐτυχίαις καταλύσας τοὺς πόνους. καταλύω with or without an object is a technical term for the retirement of athletes, and their πόνους are often mentioned.²⁶ For someone so unathletic, Aristides uses the language of sport with surprising frequency; e.g. 7.27, we think athletes wise if νικῶντες καταλύωσι.

²⁵ Aristides: *Works* ii.373 n. 47.

²⁶ καταλύω: L. Robert in *L'Épigramme grecque*, *Entretiens Hardt* 14 (Geneva, 1969), 221–2 = *Opera Minora Selecta* vi.357–8; id., *BCH* 102 (1978), 539 n. 10 = *Documents* 235 n. 10. πόνους: Robert, *Hellenica* 11/12 (1960), 344–9.

64, χρή...τὸν λόγον βεβαιῶσαι ὅτι οὐκ οἰκία καλῶς ἐστεγασμένοι οὐδὲ λίθοι τειχῶν εὖ δεδομημένοι...ἡ πόλις, ἀλλ' ἄνδρες χρήσθαι τοῖς αἰὲ παροῦσι δυνάμενοι. Behr compares 3.298, δείξαι...ἀληθῆ τὸν λόγον ὄντα...ὥς ἄρα οὐ λίθοι οὐδὲ ξύλα οὐδὲ τέχνη τεκτόνων αἱ πόλεις εἶεν, ἀλλ' ὅπου ποτ' ἂν ὦσιν ἄνδρες αὐτοὺς σφύζειν εἰδότες, ἐνταῦθα καὶ τείχη καὶ πόλεις; 23.68, ἐὰν...πιστεύσῃτε ἀληθὲς εἶναι τὸ παλαιὸν τοῦτο, ὡς ἄρα οὐ τείχη οὐδὲ ᾠδεῖα...αἱ πόλεις εἶεν, ἀλλ' ἄνδρες αὐτοῖς εἰδότες θαρρεῖν. Cf. [Epict.] *Gnom.* 61 (p. 491 Schenkl), γινώμεις γὰρ ἀνδρῶν εὖ οἰκοῦνται πόλεις, ἀλλ' οὐ λίθοις καὶ ξύλοις; Philostr. *Vita Apoll.* 4.7, φρονεῖν ἐκέλευεν ἐφ' ἑαυτοῖς μᾶλλον ἢ τῷ τῆς πόλεως εἶδει· καὶ γάρ, εἰ καὶ κάλλιστη πόλεων..., ἀλλ' ἄνδρασιν ἐστεφανῶσθαι αὐτὴν ἥδιον ἢ στοαῖς τε καὶ γραφαῖς καὶ χρυσῷ πλειόνι τοῦ δέοντος (*scripsi*: ὄντος MSS.).

65, ἑβδομηκόντα. The author here says that seventy men were involved in the seizure of Phyle, whereas at 1.254 Aristides gives the number as 'little more than fifty'. This discrepancy, if it is one, does not constitute a reason to suppose the speech spurious.²⁷

65, τὴν ἀρχὴν τῆς θαλάττης ἀναλαβεῖν δι' ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς φυγάδος Κόνωνος (referring to the battle of Cnidos). Cf. 1.252, δι' ἐνὸς ἀνδρὸς ἀφείλετο τῆς θαλάττης τὴν ἀρχήν; 26.49, ἡττῶντο μὲν εὐθέως ἐνὸς φυγάδος (both passages referring to the same battle).

66, καρτερίᾳ ψυχῆς τὰ πολλὰ τῶν πραγμάτων, ἀλλ' οὐ τῷ πλήθει τῶν ὑπαρχόντων κρίνεται. Keil compares 24.32, οὐ τῷ θυμῷ κάλλιστα τὰ πράγματα κρίνεται.

68, Ζεὺ καὶ πάντες θεοί. Cf. 3.466, 11.15, 23.57, ὦ Ζεὺ καὶ θεοί; 6.22, ὦ Ζεὺ καὶ πάντες θεοί; 9.32, ὦ Ζεὺ καὶ Πόσειδον καὶ πάντες θεοί.

I conclude that the *Rhodian* is a genuine work of Aristides, and from this point will use his name for the author. It remains to draw some consequences that would follow for his life and works, and for ancient institutions, if this conclusion were correct.

Externally Aristides' life was as unadventurous as that of academics often is, with most of the vivid experiences crowded into his youth. Born in 117, by the age of twenty-five he had made the Great Tour of Egypt, where he visited the Cataracts and sailed on the Nile; he had visited Rhodes soon before and soon after the devastating earthquake; and had made his first and, it seems, his last visit to the west, which culminated in the triumph of his speech *To Rome*, probably in the year 143.²⁸ For the remaining thirty-five years or so he travelled little, staying mainly within the province of Asia; his only known excursion is the journey to Athens on which he delivered the *Panathenaicus*.²⁹ His final years saw a sequence of events which bound his name inseparably with that of his adopted city, Smyrna. First, Marcus Aurelius and the young Commodus visited the city in 176, and Aristides declaimed before them with great success, perhaps the greatest public triumph of his career; two years later, the city was ravaged by an earthquake, and by his written entreaties he helped persuade the emperors to rebuild it.³⁰

This event led Aristides to write a series of short works, the *Monody for Smyrna* (no. 18) composed on the first news of it, the *Letter to the Emperors* (no. 19) written shortly afterwards, the *Palinode for Smyrna* (no. 20) and an address, probably to a

²⁷ For the contrary view, Behr, *Aristides: Works* ii.371 n. 1.

²⁸ For a convenient summary of Aristides' life, and for the date of the *Roman Oration* adopted here, see Klein, *Die Romrede des Aelius Aristides* i (Darmstadt, 1981), pp. 71–90, esp. 76 n. 17; I previously favoured the date of 144 (*JRS* 62 [1972], p. 150 n. 159). I continue to believe, however, that Aristides delivered the speech *To the King* while making this visit.

²⁹ The date of 155 assigned by Behr (*Sacred Tales* 87 n. 91) is far from certain.

³⁰ Cf. Behr, *Sacred Tales* 111–14; A. R. Birley, *Marcus Aurelius*² (London, 1987), 193–4, 205.

proconsul (no. 21), celebrating the beauty of the rebuilt city. This group of works has many affinities of thought and style with the *Rhodian*, and Aristides' fortunes in the two earthquakes are similar in other ways.³¹ He was not present for either one, and yet the intensity of his reactions and the vividness with which he conveys it in words can easily give the reader the impression, as the *Rhodian* did to Keil, that he wrote as an eyewitness: Defoe's *Journal of the Plague Year* may be compared. Though Aristides may not have had in 141 or 142 the influence that he had in 178, still it is notable that the Rhodian ambassadors visiting Egypt sought him out and described their city's disaster to him.

The practice of sending embassies to seek help after earthquakes has many antecedents. In the Hellenistic period such embassies went to the kings of friendly states as well as to kindred cities. An example recently made known by epigraphy concerns the little city of Cytenion in Doris. The walls of the cities of Doris had been weakened by earthquakes, and subsequently (probably in 227) Antigonos Doson invaded the region and destroyed their defences completely. Over twenty years later, in 206/5, the Cytenians sent embassies to 'the kindred cities and the kings descended from Heracles, Ptolemy [IV Philopator] and Antiochus [III]'; the extant dossier was found at Xanthos in Lycia.³²

The best known of such incidents, which Aristides might have cited but does not, is the great earthquake which struck Rhodes about 227 B.C. and overturned the Colossos. In a famous passage Polybius praises the Rhodians for their diplomacy on this occasion: 'by laying stress on the greatness of the calamity and its dreadful character, and by their embassies conducting themselves at public audiences and in private interviews with the greatest seriousness and dignity (σεμνῶς καὶ προστατικῶς κατὰ τὰς πρεσβείας χρώμενοι ταῖς ἐντεύξεσι καὶ ταῖς κατὰ μέρος ὁμιλίαις), they had such an effect on cities and especially on kings that not only did they receive most lavish gifts, but that the donors themselves felt that a favour was being conferred on them'.³³ So also at the time of the earthquake of Aristides' day, Rhodian ambassadors are 'going round and making different requests of different people...imposing general contributions on all the Greeks as if your fellow-citizens (ὥσπερ πολῖταις ἅπασιν τοῖς Ἑλλήσιν εἰσφορὰς κοινὰς ἐπιτάττοντες)' (43), and he anticipates that 'many of the Greeks will as it were pay a common contribution to their race' (55).

In the Roman period cities could no longer play on the rivalries of kings, and for their chief help looked to the emperor.³⁴ Aristides expects that 'the ruler', here Antoninus Pius, will be concerned to prevent 'the fairest of his possessions from lying dishonourably on the ground' (25.56).³⁵ As for other cities, his anticipation is illustrated by many parallels. On the occasion of this same earthquake, many cities

³¹ As Keil notes on 25.25, in 18.7 Aristides claims that the earthquake at Smyrna 'has eclipsed the fall of Rhodes'.

³² J. Bousquet, *REG* 101 (1988), 12–53; text on pages 14–16; the lines cited are 74–6. On the historical context, F. W. Walbank, *ZPE* 76 (1989), 184–92; on the geography of Doris, Denis Rousset, *BCH* 113 (1989), 199–239.

³³ Polyb. 5.88–90; the passage cited is 88.4 (Paton's translation, slightly modified). On this passage, M. Holleaux, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques* i (Paris, 1938), pp. 445–62; Walbank, *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* i (Oxford, 1957), pp. 616–22 (note, however, that the *Deigma* mentioned by Polybius, 88.8, as a building of Rhodes has nothing to do with the use of this word in Arist. 25.53, where it means 'sample'). On a misguided attempt to fix the date of this earthquake precisely in 228, *Bull. ép.* 1971.621, pp. 504, 507.

³⁴ Cf. Robert, 'Séismes' 401 = *Documents* 97, 'l'intervention de l'empereur est attendue et normale'.

³⁵ ὃ χρὴ δοκεῖν εἶναι διὰ σπουδῆς is 'whom we must suppose to have at heart', not 'who should certainly decide apace', as Behr, *Aristides: Works* ii.70.

of Lycia received help from Opramoas of Rhodiapolis.³⁶ After the earthquake of 178 Smyrna received help not only from the emperors and the province of Asia, but from the great cities of both continents (no. 20.15–18). In the grave earthquake of Gordian's reign, the provincial council of Asia passed a resolution associating cities of the province in the efforts for the victims (*εἰς κοινωνίαν τῆς πρὸς τοὺς ἀτυχήσαντας ἐπικουρίας*). When Aphrodisias protested, the emperor tactfully reminded them how, 'when some building is going up, you assist those who ask you with the construction'; the reference seems to be to some practice like the barn-raising of rural North America.³⁷

As for Rhodes, it may be wondered whether its appeals were not facilitated by the Panhellenion recently founded by Hadrian. On the present evidence this included Rhodes among its members, but neither Rome nor cities of Egypt, and such mutual help is not attested among its functions: but an organization designed to foster the unity of the Greeks would seem a natural source of help for a member-city in the circumstances of Rhodes.³⁸

University of Toronto

C. P. JONES

³⁶ Robert, 'Séismes' 405–6 = *Documents* 101–2; A. Balland, *Fouilles de Xanthos* vii: *Inscriptions d'époque impériale du Létéon* (Paris, 1981), pp. 193–4.

³⁷ HA *Gord.* 26.1–2; J. M. Reynolds, *Aphrodisias and Rome* (London, 1982) no. 21 = J. H. Oliver, *Greek Constitutions of Early Roman Emperors* (Philadelphia, 1989) no. 281; cf. *Bull. ép.* 1983.382. On barn-raising, James T. Adams, ed., *Dictionary of American History* (New York, 1940), i.164 s.v.

³⁸ On the Panhellenion, see now A. J. Spawforth and Susan Walker, *JRS* 75 (1985), 78–104, 76 (1986), 88–105 (1985), pp. 79–81 on membership and 82–4 on activities.