

LANGUAGE OF GODS AND LANGUAGE OF MEN: THE CASE OF PARIS/ALEXANDROS

Paris and *Alexandros* seem, at first reading, interchangeable names for the same figure in the *Iliad*. Closer scrutiny suggests, however, that in fact the two names are not used indiscriminately. In a recent article, I.J.F. de Jong persuasively argues that one is the private or family name of the Trojan prince, while the other is his public, or international name¹. In the following pages I shall extend de Jong's argument to show that the distinction between *Paris* and *Alexandros* is more than one of private and public usage. I shall argue that the name *Paris* is usually deployed in accordance with the literary convention of 'language of gods and language of men', that is to say, that usually when *Paris* is used, we are to understand that, for that moment at least, Paris has a divine aspect or a significant divine connection, and that when the name *Alexandros* is used, no such divinity or divine connection is operative².

In outline, my argument will establish first that double naming, such as *Paris/Alexandros*, is not unparalleled in the Homeric epics. There are, in fact, at least eight examples aside from the one under discussion, and I shall show that all these instances conform to the patterns of the 'language of gods and language of men' convention. In

¹ *Paris/Alexandros in the Iliad*, *Mnemosyne* 40, 1987, fasc. 1-2, 124-28. See also A. Suter, *Paris/Alexandros: a Study in Homeric Techniques of Characterization* (Princeton dissertation, 1984), which makes the same point, 21-23. I cannot agree with Michael Lloyd's effort at rebuttal (*Paris/Alexandros in Homer and Euripides*, *Mnemosyne* 42, 1989, fasc. 1-2, 76-79). See A. Suter, *Δύσπαρι, εἶδος ἄριστε*, QUCC, forthcoming spring 1991, for a detailed analysis. Evidence from Euripides is of course irrelevant to any analysis of Homeric usage.

When a name is italicized, I am referring to the name itself; when 'Paris' is not italicized, I am referring to the character.

² The *Paris* passages where strict deployment is relaxed are noted below, 11-12. In my interpretation, I am following the lead of R. Lazzeroni, *La lingua degli Dei e lingua degli uomini*, *ASNP*, 26, 1957, ser. II, who summarizes scholarship on the subject, and adds his own analysis as part of a larger study of the phenomenon in Vedic, Hittite and Icelandic texts as well as Homeric Greek. He considers four of the instances of double naming in the Homeric epics, arguing, as I shall here, that one of the names marks the figure named as divine. However, he deals with only the four instances where divinity or a connection with the divine is made explicit through use of the phrase θεοὶ καλέουσι. For an examination of Paris' further connections with the divine, see A. Suter, *Aphrodite/Paris/Helen: a Vedic Myth in the Iliad*, *TAPA* 117, 1987, 51-58.

some cases, the divine connection is explicit; in some, implicit. It will be seen that in all these cases, one of the two names marks the figure named as part of a special group and links him (or it) with divinity. The 'divine' name need not, it will be emphasized, be used just because the name is explicitly said to be used by gods (θεοὶ καλέουσι), but is used as well when the named himself (or itself) has some connection with divinity.

I shall then examine the only two cases of extended use of double naming in the Homeric epics, and show that the introduction and deployment of the pairs, as well as the narrative patterns of the episodes in which they appear, share similar elements. I shall then show 1) how use of the doublet *Paris/Alexandros* conforms to the general pattern established by the eight instances, and 2) how its use conforms also to the particular details established by the two extended cases of double naming. The narrative situation in which the divine name *Paris* is introduced conforms, the narrative pattern which unfolds from the situation conforms, and subsequent use of *Paris* reflects the connection with divinity demanded by the convention. Recognition of the pattern of this convention also provides an explanation for the curious form *Duspari*, to which de Jong does not address herself.

I shall conclude by suggesting that double naming was historically a phenomenon of the natural language which distinguished natural from divine naming where such distinction was desired in a religious context; that it was next used in poetry to distinguish natural from divine/divinely connected figures, with an explicit statement of the distinction indicated by the poet's use of the phrase θεοὶ καλέουσι. Lastly, that, once established in this second function, double naming was extended to instances where the poet was not explicit in identifying the connection of the figure with divinity - that is, did not use the phrase θεοὶ καλέουσι - but followed the necessary patterns in other respects.

The double name *Paris/Alexandros* is such an implicit instance. Although the name *Paris* was current from the earliest date³, the evidence shows that it was introduced into epic later than the name *Alexandros*⁴, a fact which accords not only with the special or marked

³ Such is the evidence of the Luvian tablets. See E. Laroche, *Les Noms des Hittites*, Paris 1966, s.v. Pari-LU, Pari-zitis; and E. Laroche, *Dictionnaire de la langue Louvite*, Paris 1959, 13-14.

⁴ The evidence consists in the formulaic diction surrounding the two names; for an analysis, see again Suter, QUCC, forthcoming.

use of the name *Paris* for which I shall argue, but also with the fact that *Paris* is used in instances of the implicit rather than the explicit use of the convention of 'language of gods and language of men'.

First then, it is necessary to examine Homer's use of this convention in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, and to collect the instances of double naming in the two poems: what are they, how are they deployed, and what patterns do they show in their deployment? I shall, along the way, note how the names *Paris* and *Alexandros* compare to these instances.

Apart from the major divinities, to whom Homer refers sometimes by one name, sometimes by another⁵, there are eight instances of double naming in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey*⁶. In some of these, the poet offers a comment on the double name; in some he does not.

1. A giant is mentioned at A 403: the gods call him Briareos; men call him Aigaion.

2. At B 813-14, the poet tells about a hill, called Bateia by men, the 'tomb of the much-skipping Myrhine' by the gods.

3. Sleep takes the form of a bird at Ξ 290-91; it is called χαλκίς by the gods, κύμυδις by men.

4. One of the rivers of Troy is called the Skamandros by men, Xanthos by the gods (Y 74).

5. Hektor and Andromache's son is called Skamandrios by Hektor; Astyanax by everyone else; the reason is given at Z 401-03.

6. In Phoenix's story of Meleagros, a character called Kleopatra

⁵ Ex.g., Phoibos Apollo or Pallas Athena, either separately or together; or Aphrodite/Kypris/Kythereia. No comment or explanation is ever offered in the *Iliad* or *Odyssey* to explain the numerous ways of referring to these divinities. The various names are taken to be cult titles, and the matter is left at that.

⁶ There are two more cases where the divine term only is given; κ 305 (μῶλυ) and μ 61 (Πλαγκτός). One might also include Areithous/korunetes (H 136-41) and Arktos/amaxa (Σ 486-87, cf. ε 272-73), since the poet offers an explanation for these pairs, and one of each is linked with the divine: Areithous (*nb.* the epithet διός in the next line, and the meaning - a periphrasis - 'swift as Ares') and Arktos (the name Kalypso received when she became a bear immortalized as a constellation). These two pairs raise the problem of the nature or origin of names, however, and I hesitate to include them. Are they really double names? or are κορυήτης and ἄμαξα only nouns? It seems to depend on the will of the editor: e.g., κορυήτην is not capitalized in the OCT; ἄμαξω is capitalized in the OCT of the *Iliad*, but not in the OCT of the *Odyssey*.

appears. Her parents, however, call her Alkyone, explained as a remembrance of her mother's rape by Apollo (I 561-64).

7. In the *Odyssey*, the sea nymph Leukothea helps Odysseus when his raft sinks; she was called Ino when mortal (ε 333-35).

8. Later in the *Odyssey*, a beggar is introduced. His mother had given him the name Arnaïos, but the young men of Ithaka call him Iros (σ 5-7).

In each of these instances the person or deity or natural object has two names, one clearly the common or unmarked one, the other marked⁷, used by a special person or group. The marked name, used by the special group, is in each case linked in some way with the divine: the giant has a special name used only by the gods, as do the hill, the bird, and the river; Hektor's name for his son is derived from that of a lesser divinity, the river Skamandros; Kleopatra is given her nickname as a result of her mother's rape by a god; Ino receives the name Leukothea when she becomes divine; and the nickname of the suitors' messenger in the *Odyssey* is explained as reflecting that of the divine messenger Iris⁸. The pairs on the list where this connection with the divine is most explicit are #s 1-4 and 7. Numbers 1-4 record the names used, by gods and humans respectively, for one object; #7 shows a change in name directly related to the divinization of a mortal.

Paris' names are easy to categorize in this scheme of marked and unmarked names. *Paris* is clearly the marked name, used by Hektor only⁹; *Alexandros* is used by everyone else, Greek or Trojan. By this

⁷ See comment in C. Watkins, *Language of Gods and Language of Men: Remarks on Some Indo-European Metalinguistic Traditions*, in J. Puhvel, *Myth and Law among the Indo-Europeans*, Berkeley 1970, 3: «...the basic fact that the human term in both traditions (Greek and Old Norse) is the neutral, semantically unmarked member». This parallelism between marked members for the terms connected with divinity and unmarked members for the other terms is maintained in the four additional pairs listed above.

⁸ F. Bader, *Un nom indo-européen de l'homme chez Homère*, RPh 50-51, 1976-77, ser. 3, 206-12, suggests the root is from *wiro- (force). She refers to Palmer's and Wackernagel's opinions that *Iros* is the masculine form of *Iris* (206). She appears to agree with this and implies that they are not related etymologically, without stating either point explicitly. The etymology from *wiro- is implied also by Homer (as well as the etymology from *Iris*) at σ 3, 73.

⁹ This is the point well-argued by de Jong. The names for many of the humans in the chart are, in fact, differentiated on the basis of family vs. other: Astyanax/Skamandrios, Kleopatra/Alkyone, Arnaïos/Iros. Ino/Leukothea perhaps shares this

division, *Paris* would carry the characteristic of linkage with divinity¹⁰.

The significance of the poet's explanation of the double name as due to two languages, one divine (marked) and one human (unmarked), has been examined at length by Lazzeroni with respect to the four instances where this explanation occurs explicitly (#s 1-4). The conclusions of his examination are pertinent to the other four cases also, and merit detailed exposition. Lazzeroni focuses on the way the terms appear to function in epic diction (Lazzeroni, 14-15). He concludes: first, that the language the gods use in Homer both among themselves and with humans does not have any characteristics which distinguish it from the language used by humans. But he notes the 'tabooistic' nature of the divine terms: 'the strong one' (Briareos), 'the bronze one' (χαλκίς), 'the golden one' (Xanthos), 'the tomb of the much-skipping Myrhine'¹¹.

This point, which Lazzeroni makes for the four pairs where the 'language of gods and language of men' is mentioned explicitly, is true also of *Leukothea*, of *Skamandrios* and of *Iros* in their pairs: 'the shining goddess', 'the one like the river Skamandros' and 'the one like Iris' (or 'the strong one'). *Alkyone* in the pair *Kleopatra/Alkyone* is a nickname taken *verbatim* from a figure in an earlier story, chosen as a symbol of grief. All these are periphrastic devices: they are used to avoid direct naming of objects or persons whose connections to the supernatural are felt to be too close for it to be safe to name them

characteristic, for as Ino, she is Κάδμου θυγάτηρ.

Alexandros is also used by Hektor (2x) and Priam (1x). For the purposes of establishing *Paris* as the marked name, however, this usage of *Alexandros* is irrelevant. Priam's line and one of Hektor's are identical to one spoken by a herald (Γ 87 = H 374 = H 388), who, by the nature of his employment, would use the public name. Priam and Hektor too, in their lines, are speaking in public situations to a crowd consisting of both Greeks and Trojans. The other time Hektor uses *Alexandros* (X 115) is not a public situation; the line is, however, almost identical to another line of the herald's (H 389). Perhaps the pressure of formulaic diction is operating here.

- ¹⁰ The extension to *Paris* of a linkage with divinity just because he bears a marked name is (for the present) an assumption that demands more evidence. I argue for such evidence below, pp. 18-24 (especially p. 23). For evidence independent of *Paris*' names, see Suter, 1987 (footnote 1).
- ¹¹ Here Lazzeroni is following Ipsen, *Indogerm. Jahrb.* 9, 1922-23, whose arguments he summarizes on p. 3. For similar periphrases in non-Greek cultures, see J.G. Frazer, *The New Golden Bough*, New York, 1968, 111-12.

outright. There is no way to know why it was felt necessary to give these particular persons and objects 'tabooistic', 'divine' names. For the present purposes, it is important only to note the similarity in structure of the 'divine' names: they share the periphrastic structure common also to taboo names.

The 'divine' terms have the structure, the meaning and the force of tabooistic language. This fact, which is not arguable if we interpret the Homeric word-groups in their immediate significance (it would be logical, in fact, to expect tabooistic language in the language of men and not in that of gods) is justified, on the other hand, by supposing that to the word-group which designates a divinized object corresponds some type of naming that is precisely of divinized objects. (Lazzeroni, 14; the translation is my own.)

That is, divine terms are not divine in the sense that divinities use them, although that is the poetic metaphor used. Rather they are divine in the sense that they belong to a special language which exists precisely to name divinized objects.

Lazzeroni further concludes that «Homer mentions the language of the gods only when he describes a natural object which, in a particular contextual situation, assumes a sacred character»¹², and that Homer refers to the 'language of men' when the 'natural object' appears in its natural, ordinary aspect¹³. He bases this conclusion on an examination of the deployment of the names *Skamandros* and *Xanthos*, one of the two extended cases of double naming, that is, where the river so named has an extended role to play in the poem. Lazzeroni argues that the language of the gods is used when the river - a natural object - is divinized (as in the passage beginning at Φ 332). When the river is only a river (as at M 21), the human term is used.

This analysis must be modified at several points. The divine name may be used whenever the river is being treated as divinized, but the

¹² Lazzeroni, 14. This point is strained, I think, by the narrative situations obtaining in #s 1-3, as there are no indications of an 'assumption' of divinity in the story at these points in the narrative. Here Lazzeroni's argument is based solely on the presence of the words θεοὶ καλέουσι. In the cases of extended use of a pair of double names (*Skamandros/Xanthos*, *Arnaïos/Iros*, and, as I shall argue, *Paris/Alexandros*), however, his point holds good.

¹³ When there is no reference to 'language of men' (as with μῶλυ [κ 305] and Πλαγκτάς [μ 61, ψ 327]), according to Lazzeroni, the language is altogether divine, unknown to humans.

'language of gods' (by which Lazzeroni means the words θεοὶ καλέουσι in some form) does not need to be explicitly mentioned. The name *Xanthos* is identified as a divine name at Y 74 in a fight where pro-Trojan deities are paired with pro-Greek ones; the river (*Xanthos*) is paired with Hephaistos. It is used again at Φ 332 to designate the divinized river about to fight against Hephaistos, who has been helping Achilles, and there is no mention of divine language here. Then it is also used at Φ 146 (with no mention of 'language of gods') as the source of inspiration for a man fighting against Achilles. This use of *Xanthos*, where the situational context is not divine (as in the fight in Book 21) and where the words θεοὶ καλέουσι are not used, would indicate these two factors are not necessary for the divine term to be used - at least not necessary once the divine name has already been introduced in the proper, divine context¹⁴.

It seems as though the divine name spreads from an original context, determined by the words θεοὶ καλέουσι or by certain narrative elements, into contexts in which the poet simply wishes to stress its divinity, in the case at Φ 146, as a source of inspiration. It is reasonable to assume that the original context for the river as divinized object, what I shall call the 'central' passage, was its pairing for combat with Hephaistos, simply because that is where the explanation for the double name occurs. This passage is also the one in which the river as *Xanthos* is crucial to the narrative in the sense that no other figure could be appropriately substituted for it in the fight with Hephaistos. The fact that the situation was one of combat also proves to be important.

Another pair of names has an extended narrative in the Homeric poems: *Arnaïos/Iros*¹⁵. It is a simple matter to identify the central passage for him, for his narrative is self-contained: the confrontation

¹⁴ At Φ 223, Achilles addresses the river as *Skamandros*. One might have expected the divine name, as the river has spoken, unlikely for a river *qua* river. Apparently, however, Achilles, in direct discourse, is still treating it as an ordinary river. The narrating voice of the poet also uses *Skamandros* at 305 (the next time the river is named), indicating that the river is still just a river. It is called *Xanthos* at 332 when it assumes its divine form for its fight against Hephaistos.

¹⁵ *Astyanax*, the common, unmarked name for Hektor's son, is used by Andromache twice more in the *Iliad* (X 500 and X 506). This is the expected usage (only Hektor calls him *Skamandrios*), and it is preserved in direct discourse. *Ino* appears once more also, in the narrative at *Odysey* ε 461, although the context would make one expect the divine name. All other instances of double naming occur only once.

with Odysseus in *Odyssey* 18. This is also a situation involving a mortal and his divine helper, and, on a smaller scale, it is again a combat situation. There is no explicit use of θεοὶ καλέουσι, however. Let us examine these two cases of extended use of double names to note their parallels with one another. Arnaïos/Iros finds Odysseus in the forecourt of the palace, where he himself is accustomed to sit and beg. He tells Odysseus to leave, and, when Odysseus refuses, challenges him to fight. Aided by Athena, Odysseus knocks him down with one blow, and wins the prize of the goat-stomach pudding to eat.

The river Skamandros/Xanthos has a bigger role in the *Iliad* than does Iros/Arnaïos in the *Odyssey*. In its central passage in Books 20-21, the gods decide that Achilles' *aristeia* must be curtailed, and the river joins in the battle with them. In Book 21 the scene is Achilles' slaughter; he has killed so many men that the river (*Skamandros*) is clogged with bodies. Angered by this, the river fights with Achilles and is about to drown him, when Hera sends Hephaistos down to help (Φ 331-42). So successfully does Hephaistos fight, that the river (*Xanthos* now) cries out to Hera to call him off, and she stops the fight. Hephaistos quenches his fire and the river returns to its accustomed channels (Φ 381-82). Achilles escapes to fight elsewhere.

This is clearly a combat situation where both parties are, in one way or another, divinized. Once again, as in the encounter between Iros and Odysseus, one party tries to drive the other away (Iros to Odysseus σ 15, the river to Achilles Φ 234); and a fight between the two ensues. Iros, already divinized by his name, is then confronted by Odysseus, who has Athena's help, and is speedily despatched. The fight in the *Iliad* is protracted by the shift of the fight to a completely divine level, as Hephaistos replaces Achilles and the natural river *Skamandros* becomes the divine *Xanthos*.

The two pairs of names, then - *Skamandros/Xanthos* and *Arnaïos/Iros* - share the same elements: they are used according to the rules of divine and common names established by the eight pairs of double names. They further share narrative elements in their central passages: in each case, the divine name is introduced in a combat situation between figures or objects on a natural level, one of which has divine help, and the combat is played out in similar narrative patterns.

It remains to answer three questions: first, does the use of *Paris/Alexandros* conform to the scheme of divine and common names on the basis of the distribution of their usage? In fact, it does: *Paris* is

used by Hektor alone and is thus the special, marked name; *Alexandros* is used by everyone. But, as with Arnaïos/Iros, the phrase θεοὶ καλέουσι is not present. To test the appropriateness of analyzing his names in these terms, therefore, we must, second, identify his central passage and analyze it to see: does it parallel the structure and context of the central passages of Skamandros/Xanthos in its fight with Achilles/Hephaistos and Arnaïos/Iros in his fight with Odysseus/Athena? That is: is the Paris situation one of combat between individuals who in the course of the fight are given the help of divinities or of outright divinization? Is the 'divine' name introduced in that situation?

Third, I shall examine all occurrences of the name *Paris* to see if, as should happen if the above categorization is correct, it represents - at the very least in the central passage - a mortal with a special connection with the divine.

Paris has a more extended role than either the river or the beggar, but only one long narrative sequence demands that he and no one else carry out the action. This central sequence is that which begins with his introduction in *Iliad* 3 and includes the aborted duel with Menelaos, continues in the scene with Helen at the end of Book 3, and concludes in Book 6 when Paris leaves Helen to return to battle with Hektor¹⁶. The succession of events in this sequence is more elaborate than that of the two sequences just analyzed, but shows the same structural outline, and in fact contains many analogous details to the Iros-Odysseus fight.

Paris issues a challenge to the enemy (Γ 18), just as Iros challenges Odysseus (σ 30). When Menelaos comes forward to accept the challenge, Paris withdraws in fright (Γ 31); when Iros sees Odysseus preparing for the fight, κακῶς ὠρίνετο θυμός (σ 75). Then Hektor chastises Paris for this withdrawal, calling him *Duspari...* (Γ 39). At this point in the story of Iros in the *Odyssey*, the suitors refer to Iros as *Aïros*, in one of the few other instances of this peculiar transformation of a proper name (σ 73). Hektor's rebuke leads Paris to suggest the

¹⁶ A short passage in Book 7, when he addresses the Trojan council and refuses to give Helen back, also belongs to him only. In other scenes, other Trojan warriors could play his part (e.g., Θ 82, Μ 93, Ν 769, Ο 341). References are made at times to actions which could only be his (e.g., Η 374, Η 388, Χ 115, or Ε 62 and Ζ 280) but these are past events and are not related in the *Iliad* proper. In one short additional scene - where Paris wounds Diomedes in Book 11 - it could be argued that only Paris could fill the role. The details of the wounding (in the heel with an arrow) are perhaps the poet's way of foretelling Achilles' death at Paris' hands.

formal duel with Menelaos; the suitors' frightens Iros into his confrontation with Odysseus. Iros is quickly dispensed with. The duel in the *Iliad* does not begin until Γ 346; the details of preparation are described in the intervening lines. After an exchange of fruitless spear-casts, Menelaos' sword breaks, he grabs Paris by the strap of his helmet and would have killed him then had not Aphrodite snatched him up out of the battle, and saved him.

Once again, then, this is a combat situation where one of the combatants (Paris) receives divine aid which saves his life. The other combatant has also been helped: Paris mentions later to Helen the divine aid Menelaos received during the duel (Γ 439).

Now let us turn to the occurrences of the name *Paris* to see if, when it is used, Paris is also divinized in some fashion. There is evidence that *Alexandros* was the earlier of the two names used to designate this Trojan prince (see footnote 4). If this is so, then *Paris* must be the latecomer. Its use where it does appear should have a specific purpose, as the introduction of a second name would otherwise be superfluous¹⁷. Paralleling the introduction of *Xanthos* for *Skamandros*, the introduction of *Paris* for *Alexandros* should be in the central passage and used most precisely in it. A relaxation of the careful distinction in use of the two names might occur in other passages¹⁸.

The name first appears in the form *Duspari*, the vocative of a presumed **Dusparis*, at Γ 39 in Hektor's rebuke to Paris when he has withdrawn into the Trojan ranks, frightened to face Menelaos. Until this line he has been called *Alexandros* (4x). As the poet introduces the central passage, he introduces the divine name as well, but uses a negative version of it - it seems almost a jest - because Paris is running away from a combat situation instead of entering it¹⁹.

¹⁷ The justification for this assumption is argued in Suter, QUCC, forthcoming (see footnote 1).

¹⁸ This happens with *Xanthos* (*nb.* an *explicit* case of double-naming) at Z 4 and Θ 560, where the divine name of the river is used with no apparent divine intent. In this instance, the increased need to name the river, necessitated by its extended role in the narrative, has apparently exerted pressure to loosen the strict rules of deployment.

¹⁹ This is paralleled exactly in the introduction of *Airos* for *Iros* at σ 73. This negation, or denial, of the name is, significant on the narrative level, in that it foretells the disappearance of the characters at the end of the duels - Iros being replaced by Odysseus as the beggar in residence, Paris disappearing altogether through Aphrodite's agency. It is also significant in that it may be seen as epic's

The next occurrence of *Paris* is at the crucial point of shaking lots to see who gets the first spearcast (Γ 325). The lot of Paris (*Paris*) jumps out of the helmet, showing, as the Greeks appear to have believed²⁰, that it was the will of a divinity that Paris have the first cast.

Next, at Γ 437, Paris (*Paris*) answers Helen's scornful reproach to him for having left the fighting. He suggests that they turn their thoughts to lovemaking, and describes his present desire for her, and when they first made love after their elopement. It is precisely this act - the love of Helen and Paris in epic - that will make Paris immortal, that is, acquire that perquisite of divinity. The immortality achieved through epic is asserted by Helen to Hektor at Z 356-58 when he comes to fetch Paris back to battle at the end of the central passage.

The occurrences of *Paris* at Z 503 and Z 512 when he leaves Helen to return to battle are in passages where he is compared to a horse and to the sun. They reflect the pattern of the divinization of a mortal after contact with a divinity. In this instance of the pattern, Paris has been coopted into the narrative pattern of the Dawn myth wherein mortals are regularly divinized (see Suter 1987, footnote 2).

Paris occurs eight more times. Three times (Z 280, N 769 and X 359) it is spoken by Hektor in direct discourse. This is the expected usage. In fact, the use of *Paris* at X 359 has a double motivation: it brings Paris into partnership with divinity - Apollo this time - as the killer of Achilles.

The contexts for the other five instances of *Paris* are battle scenes of no particularly marked character (M 93, N 490, N 660, O 341), and once in a list of Priam's sons (Ω 249). They are not passages where the action need be carried out by the character named either *Paris* or *Alexandros*, and may represent the same relaxation of the original purpose of the distinction which was noted in the use of the pair *Xanthos/Skamandros*. DeJong, however, finds reasons for the use of the divine, or, in her terminology, the 'private', name (see footnote 1). It is interesting to note also that in direct discourse the strict

way of naming the unnameable. The other instance of this kind of naming in the Homeric poems is Penelope's use of *Κακοῦλιον* at τ 260 (= τ 597 = ψ 19) to name the city she does not want to name. In this line the phrase ... οὐκ ὀνομαστήν is even added to gloss the prefix. The prefixes *δυσ-* and *ἀ-* function as the means by which the poet is able to name the 'taboo' names *Paris* and *Iros*.

²⁰ S.v. 'Losung' in *RE* 26, 1415, esp. 1463, article by Victor Ehrenberg.

distinction is maintained, even in a context like N 769, where it is not essential to the action that Paris himself be involved²¹.

The central passage, then, the narrative of Paris' duel with Menelaos and his rescue by Aphrodite, conforms in all essentials to the demands of a context for the strict use of a divine name, and parallels the other extended instances of double naming in its narrative pattern, especially that of Arnaios/Iros. Paris' episode is a combat situation, where the combatants are given divine aid, and where the name *Paris* is introduced and used when the character bearing that name exhibits aspects of divinity.

The use of *Paris* as a divine name differs in an important respect, however, from the use of at least some of the other divine terms and the human terms which go with them. In languages where such double designations are an integral part of the standard vocabulary, it is assumed that both terms came into the language more or less simultaneously. On the other hand, there are clear indications that *Paris* came into epic diction after *Alexandros* as a name for the Trojan prince. I suggest that this second name may have been given to him in a conscious duplication of a phenomenon of natural language, that once the metaphor of 'language of gods and language of men' had

²¹ A further question must be considered briefly here: the name *Paris* seems to have been available in the onomastic of 13th century Anatolia, at the time when the story of the Trojan war would first have been taking shape (see footnote 3). Our only record of the name is as that of a scribe, but Watkins (C. Watkins, *The Language of the Trojans*, in *Troy and the Trojan War*, ed. M.J. Mellink, Bryn Mawr 1986) sketches a plausible scenario for the parallelism of *Pari-zitis* and *Alexandros* (*Pari*-'man' and *Alex*-'man') and we do know that there was an *Alaksandus* (= *Alexandros*) of *Wilusa* at the right time in the right corner of Anatolia. Why, then, if the name was available, was it not used until very late in the epic tradition? Watkins makes another remark which may be at the core of the answer (49): «'Alaksandus' is however a historical Asianic king, and I would suggest that it is in the context of widespread Greek-Asianic bilingualism on the western coast of Anatolia that we should try to explain why a king of 'Wilusa' (= Iliion) can bear a Greek name, namely 'Alaksandus' (*Alexandros*). I take it as a sort of 'nom de plume', or 'nom de guerre' or even 'nom de commerce'. It was for him his 'international name'». Perhaps our tale of the Trojan war was told at first from the Greek - or at least from a non-Trojan - point of view, and there was no need for the intimate name for the Trojan prince. This suggestion is supported by the work of William Merritt Sale, who implies that it may have been Homer, or the generation just before him, who first located the narrative inside the city walls with any frequency (Sale, *The Formularity for the Place Phrases of the Iliad*, TAPA 117, 1987, 21-50, esp. 34). The later poets of the Trojan war, who were telling the story for the first time partly from the Trojan point of view, also may for the first time have wished to use the intimate name for one of the chief Trojan figures.

been incorporated into epic diction to explain the double terminology of, e.g., χαλκίς/κύμινδις (presumably terms in the natural language), it could be manipulated by the poet when he wished to divinize a character: Skamandros into Xanthos, or Ino into Leukothea, or Alexandros into Paris²².

The deployment of the double name *Paris/Alexandros*, then, conforms to the demands of the convention of 'language of gods and language of men'. Further, the introduction of *Paris*, the marked, divine name, and the narrative pattern of the episode which follows the introduction, conform to the pattern established by names explicitly designated as divine, and *Paris*, when used thereafter, indicates connections of the character with the divine.

The implications of the double name for Paris are far richer than those suggested simply by public and private use.

University of Rhode Island

Ann Suter

²² Compare the use of marked and unmarked words for the same object in the *Rig-Veda*, as analyzed by Watkins, esp. 16-17. See also his quote (7) from the *Keilschrifturkunden aus Boghazkoi* (VIII 41 II 8-9): «...to mankind you are Tašimmetiš, but among the gods/you are Ištar the queen».

* I should like to thank Richard Martin, Stephen Fineberg and Wally Sillanpoa for their various types of help and criticism on this article, and the ladies of Norcross Lodge for providing the ambiance to complete it.