

Feel the Wrath of Their Anger:
Aristoxenus' Proem to the *Iliad* and the Rhetoric of Anger
Vincent E. Tomasso (Stanford University)

Commenting on *Iliad* 1.1 the A scholiast states that the variety of words Homeric diction uses to describe Achilles' anger are actually synonyms (συνωνύμοις). Recently, however, scholars have demonstrated that the three most common anger-terms have their own distinct semantic and formulaic fields, which can be retrieved through separate contextual analyses (Muellner's *The Anger of Achilles* [1996] on μῆνις and Walsh's *Fighting Words and Feuding Words* [2003] on χόλος and κότος). These studies have contributed greatly to our knowledge of Homeric diction, and in this paper I would like to nuance them further by examining the rare instances in which two of these terms are conjoined. Aristoxenus preserves such an instance in a multiform proem to the *Iliad* (*apparatus criticus* at Allen 1.1), the first line of which declares that the poem will depict how μῆνις and χόλος seize Achilles and Apollo.

Muellner discusses how this proem highlights the divine Apollo's anger in contrast to the Homeric version, which centers to exclusion on Achilles' wrath, but he does not consider the implications of the collocation of μῆνις, a response to the violation of cosmic rules (Muellner 1996.15), and χόλος, an unmarked term for anger of relatively short duration (Walsh 2003.23). The diction of the Aristoxenian proem is by no means a fluke, since this same combination of terms also appears at *Iliad* 15.122, where Athena describes an emotional state of Zeus that never actually manifests; at 3.337 in Apollonius' *Argonautica*, where Argus tells Aeëtes that they will not escape Zeus' ire before they bring the golden fleece back to Greece; and at line 350 in the *Homeric Hymn to Demeter*, where Hermes tells Hades that he should release Persephone so that her mother will stop being angry. That the μῆνις-χόλος combination is attested only in these four passages in poetry indicates that it has particular significations that each term by itself cannot realize.

In this paper I argue that Aristoxenus' proem demonstrates that μῆνις and χόλος interact in ways that have not yet been appreciated in studies of Homeric anger. In so doing I have two aims: first, to determine what sorts of semantic and formulaic fields an audience of hexameter poetry would have recognized for a two conjoined anger-terms as opposed to one semantically and formulaically distinct term; and, second, to establish why the narrator of Aristoxenus' proem rhetoricizes anger in a fundamentally different fashion than the Homeric narrator does. By analyzing this proem's deployment of anger-terms and comparing it with the Homeric version, we gain important insights into the oral tradition's semantic, formulaic, and rhetorical conceptualization of character and emotion.