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Ascoli-Cantù: alcune lettere inedite (con un’appendice di Valussi e Carcano)

Del carteggio tra Ascoli e Cesare Cantù erano note finora solo le lettere connessa alla polemica con Tommaso, fatte conoscere più di quarant’anni fa da Alfredo Stussi⁶. Una ventina di lettere di Ascoli (di cui molte sono semplici biglietti), scritte in un arco di tempo che va dal 1854 al 1892, si conservano tra le carte di Cesare Cantù depositate alla Biblioteca Ambrosiana. Di Cantù restano invece, tra le carte Ascoli alla biblioteca dell’Accademia dei Lincei, solo alcuni biglietti di auguri o di ringraziamento, per lo più senza data, e solo una lettera, di qualche interesse però perché riguarda il primo numero dell’“Archivio glottologico italiano”. Lo scambio epistolare tra i due non è certamente di quelli più intensi e significativi: come d’altra parte si poteva immaginare, dato che le occasioni di incontro e di contatti diretti, senza bisogno di una “conversazione a distanza” con l’ausilio della penna, dovevano essere numerose a Milano, dove Ascoli si era trasferito per il suo insegnamento all’Accademia scientifico-letteraria dall’anno accademico 1861-62, e dove entrambi partecipavano attivamente alla vita delle più importanti istituzioni culturali⁵. Spero comunque di fare cosa gradita all’amico e colleghi che qui festeggiamo pubblicando nella miscellanea in suo onore alcune lettere del linguista goriziano⁷, in attesa che il ricordo del Fondo Ascoli alla

⁵ STUSSI 1982, pp. 95-96. Si tratta della copia della lettera di Ascoli a Cantù del 25 aprile 1873 e del foglio inserito, in originale, a Cantù per Tommaso, conservati alla Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze (Tommaso P 60.29), mentre finora non è stata ritrovata la lettera di Cantù a Ascoli. L’originale autografa di Ascoli (A) è conservata tra le carte di Cantù alla Biblioteca Ambrosiana di Milano (BAM, Fondo Cantù, R 12 inf. Ins. 6) e presenta poche varianti grafiche e di punteggiatura rispetto alla copia (pubblicata in STUSSI 1982, pp. 90-92): Archivio (A); Archivio; ai suoi dati ed alla sua bontà (A) ai suoi dati e alla sua bontà (A); vecchiaia (A); vecchia; v’insiste, con molta pertinacia (A); v’insiste con molta pertinacia; incoraggiare (A); incoraggiare; ammonimento, e io mi son provato (A); ammonimento e io mi son provato; ribatter le obiezioni (A); ribatter le obiezioni; Sua preziosa benevolenza (A); Sua preziosa benevolenza; Archivio (A); Archivio; bizzarria del T.; è il D’Ascoli (A) sottolinea due volte D’; bizzarria del T. è il D’Ascoli; l’immaginazione del T. (A); l’immaginazione del T.; nobiltà tedesca, a proposito (A); nobiltà tedesca a proposito.


Il ricordo va naturalmente alla sua relazione del 5 dicembre 2002 nella sala conferenze del Senato della Repubblica in commemorazione di Ascoli (cfr. GUSMANI 2003).
1. Bechtel’s list of Greek personal names (1917) is now out-of-date for a number of reasons, including above all the immense increase in our knowledge of Greek names, but Bechtel’s own statements about word formation and name interpretation must still be taken seriously. Of him one can say what used to be said about Mommsen: if you cannot prove that he is wrong, accept what he says. Here I want to discuss a minor problem where, thanks to the new evidence, I think that we can go further than Bechtel did. In exploring this area a number of questions also arise which touch on word formation, sociolinguistics and interference; I shall not aim at solving them but only at highlighting the interconnection of detailed analysis and more general discussion. In his work about the minor Anatolian languages and about interference Roberto Gusmani has gone much further than I can ever hope to go and has shown that he is a master of both types of analysis. I hope that he will not find this small token of my respect and affection too remote from his own interests. The Greek name quoted in my title was deliberately chosen.

When confronted with the compounds of γείτων ‘neighbour’ (Ἀριστωγείτων, etc.) BECHTEL (1917, 163 f.) noted that there are also forms in -γείτος (cf. Ἀριστόγείτος etc.) and commented on the oddity of the formation. As he pointed out, the replacement of -oν stems with o-forms in the first element of a compound is normal (cf. ἄρεινος-κλῆς next to ἄρειον) but the phenomenon does not occur in the second part of a compounded name. As usual, Bechtel provided only a few examples of both -γείτων and -γείτος compounds and did not explicitly comment on their distribution. Owing to the publication of four and in practice five volumes of the Lexicon of Greek Personal Names (LGPN) (FRASER and MATTHEWS 1987-2005) we are now in a position to explore the problem further.¹

2. We may start with a brief summary of what we know about the γείτων-names.² Louis ROBERT (1959, 230 f.) noticed long ago that the Black Sea
colonies of Megara had a number of names which ended in -γεῖτος and suggested that these names originated in Megaris and Boeotia. The observation was clearly correct but at the time could not be supported by exact statistics which contrasted the use of those two regions with that of other Greek regions. Currently, thanks to the four, soon to be five, published volumes of the LGPN, we can go much further. In a previous contribution (MORPURGO DAVIES 2001) I have analysed the evidence which supports Louis Robert’s suggestion: γεῖτον-names are frequent in Boeotia and Megaris; but they also have a reasonable, though much lower, frequency of occurrence in neighbouring regions: Oropos, Euboea and to a certain extent Attica. It may be worthwhile to rehearse here a few figures. The LGPN lists 172 persons from Boeotia who have names ending in -γεῖτον,-γεῖτος or -γεῖτος. By contrast in the whole of Peloponnesse, according to the LGPN, we know only of 10 persons who have a name ending in -γεῖτον or, in one case, in -γεῖτος. For Athens we know of 97 persons with a name ending in -γεῖτος and of 6 with a name ending in -γεῖτος\(^5\).

The numerical differences between regions are remarkable in any case but are even more striking when considered against the total figures for the respective regions as shown in Table 1. This repeats the figures provided by the web site of LGPN (http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk), except for Attica (see note 4).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>LGPN Persons</th>
<th>LGPN Persons with -γεῖτος &amp; -γεῖτος Names</th>
<th>Approximate Percentages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Peloponnesse</td>
<td>19404</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attica</td>
<td>ca. 64000</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Euboea</td>
<td>8884</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boeotia</td>
<td>16921</td>
<td>172(^6)</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Megaris</td>
<td>1689</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>2.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1

The figures speak for themselves; a strong hypothesis would suggest that the -γεῖτος-γεῖτος names originated in Boeotia and /or Megaris and spread from there, being particularly successful in the neighbouring areas; a weaker version might assume that the names or some of them originated independently in more than one region but were particularly successful in Boeotia and Megaris which then became a centre of diffusion, as it happened with Megara’s colonies. That there was some form of onomastic diffusion even outside the colonization process can hardly be denied for a number of reasons. The most immediately convincing is the presence in Euboea of the two names Δυργεῖτος and Δημητερία, with an -ονος termination which is well known as a Boeotian suffix and cannot be Euboean\(^5\). But it is also important that the chronology of attestation speaks for earlier dates in Boeotia than elsewhere. Finally it may not be due to chance that one of the first -γεῖτος names attested in Athens is that of the tyrannicide Aristogeiton and that Aristogeiton was one of those Gephyraioi who were deemed to come from Tanagra in Boeotia, even if other hypotheses were made for political or other reasons (cf. DAVIES 1971, 472; PARKER 1996, 288 ff.).

2.1. A final point about the Boeotian forms of these names. It has not been sufficiently noted that the -γεῖτος and -γεῖτος names (as contrasted with -γεῖτον

\(^{3}\) These figures are important. Robert refers to SOLMSEN’s early discussion of these names (1909, 146-147) and points out that Solmsen had already noted that there was a concentration of the -γεῖτος-γεῖτος names in Megaris and Boeotia. However, Solmsen in the further discussion rejected his initial suggestion that this distribution pointed to West Greek forms and argued that the occurrence of these names in Athens, Keph, Naxos, etc. excluded a West Greek origin and pointed rather to a pre-West Greek substratum. We now realize how sporadic the occurrences outside the basic area of concentration are and how unlikely it is that they can be used to answer the question of origins.

\(^{4}\) In the web site of the LGPN there is a long list of corrections to vol. II (Athens), but the corrections are not included in the statistics produced by the same web-site (which mentions 62361 persons). If we add up the ‘new’ persons mentioned (indicated with figures like 1a, 2a, etc.) and remove from the total the number of ghost persons who have been identified together with those who have been discovered not to belong to Athens we obtain a figure slightly higher than 1700. My total figure of 64000 is necessarily arbitrary. As for the -γεῖτος and -γεῖτος names I have tried to produce a more exact account of the additions and corrections. The one attestation in Athens of Ἰππεῖτας is now read Ἰππεῖτας and we know of 7 further persons called with -γεῖτος names (3 Ἰππεῖτος, 2 Δυσπεῖτος, 2 Εὐπεῖτος). For the other regions I have not tried to go beyond the figures and lists provided by LGPN; consequently some data will be slightly out-of-date, but I doubt that this would alter the basic argument. For the same reason I have not offered exact references for the names quoted; they can all be found in LGPN.

\(^{5}\) I have excluded from my figures for Boeotia 9 persons listed in Oropos, though the LGPN counts Oropos as part of Boeotia.

\(^{6}\) Both names are attested in the dative; the first ends in -ον, the second (in a Delphic proxeny decree) in -έ. Clearly the first name preserved the original form and did not even replace Boeotian long ι with ξ; the second may have done so but we cannot be certain how much this is due to the Delphic stonemason.
and -γειτος) are practically all used for Boeotian men and are not really found outside Boeotia. The figures are not negligible: 121 persons have -γειτος names and 7 have -γειτος names. Of course the form is not unexpected. In the standard Boeotian pronunciation the diphthong [ei] was replaced first by [ie], sometimes written E and sometimes written with a special sign I, and then by [i], written I. The exact date cannot be easily established, but the first examples, in names at least, are found in the fifth century, even if this spelling is not generalized in the lexicon until the Fourth Century BC. -γειτος and the feminine -γειτα appear in that period. Clearly, if Boeotia is one of the sources of diffusion of these names, it did not succeed in exporting its spelling. This might be used as an argument either against Boeotian origin or in favour of an early diffusion (at the time when Boeotia still adopted the EI spelling). The vast majority of -γειτος names both in and outside Boeotia belong the fourth, third and second centuries BC, but this is no doubt due to the nature of our evidence. As for the first suggestion, when we find in Euboea a form like Διονυσίων, which must have a Boeotian origin because of its suffix, we are again confronted by an EI and not an I spelling. One cannot be certain but this consistency in the EI spelling outside Boeotia is remarkable, when contrasted with the prevalence of the -I- spelling in Boeotia. There is little doubt that across dialects most Greek regions would have recognized a [gi:to:n] compound as equivalent to their own [gei:to:n] or [gei:to:n] form and presumably would have substituted their pronunciation and spelling for the one they first heard or saw. The Boeotian spelling was too regionally specific to be acceptable, but note the contrast with [a:] written A in the termination of the name. This is clearly acceptable even if it clashes with the regular Euboean pattern which requires an H spelling. We get a valuable insight in the dynamics of interdialectal interference and the importance of dialect markers.

3. We must now return to the -γειτος and -γειτος forms from which we started. Here the statistics are again significant: LGPN lists in its five volumes 12 different names in -γειτος carried by 81 different persons, as well as 6 names in -γειτος carried by 7 different persons.8

Both the -γειτος and -γειτος compound names match almost entirely the -γειτος and -γειτος names, as shown by Table II, which lists all the -γειτος and -γειτος forms found in LGPN. Each lemma is followed by an Arabic number in brackets which indicates the number of persons who have that name and are listed in LGPN (whatever their provenance and their period). Roman numbers in brackets refer to centuries (all BC), but dates are only given for the first attestation and only if this is relatively early. In addition to the total number of persons for each name information is provided about the number of persons with that name in Boeotia (B), Megaris (M), Athens (A) and Euboea (E). Occasionally other information is provided. So, Αριστοςτευτος (17) A x 1 (V), M x 5 means that there are 17 persons called Αριστοςτευτος in all regions and periods. Analysed by LGPN I-V; of these one is in Athens in the Fifth Century BC and 5 in Megaris (the others dispersed through various places).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>-γειτος</th>
<th>-γειτος</th>
<th>-γειταν</th>
<th>-γειταν</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Αριστοςτευτος (17)</td>
<td>A x 1 (V), M x 5</td>
<td>Αριστοδευτος (1)</td>
<td>Αριστοδευτος (60)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Β x 1 (V)</td>
<td>Ε x 6, A x 17 + 3, Β x 11, Οπως 4</td>
<td>Αριστοδευτος + Αριστοδευτος 37, Β x 37 (V)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Διογενες (13)</td>
<td>Διογενες (2)</td>
<td>Διογενες (38)</td>
<td>Διογενες (10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Α x 3, B x 1, M x 4</td>
<td>Β x 2 (1 x VIC)</td>
<td>Ε x 2, A x 23+2, Β x 7</td>
<td>Β x 10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστοςτευτος</td>
<td>Αριστοςτευτος</td>
<td>Αριστοςτευτος (77 or -77)</td>
<td>Αριστοςτευτος (77)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E x 1</td>
<td>Αριστοςτευτος</td>
<td>Β x 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 A Sixth Century Genitive Αριστοδευτος is attested in Sicily at Selinus, a colony of Megara Hyblaia, which in its turn was a colony of Megara. Sicily has other instances of the name but they are much later.

10 The name appears twice in the koine genitive Διογενες; there is a presumption that the
3.1. The -γεῖτος names ('Ἀριστογέιτος, Διόγειτος, Θεόγειτος, Καλλίγειτος, Καραύγειτος, Πολύγειτος) are all Boeotian, as expected, and they range from the Sixth/Fifth Century to the Third Century BC. It is interesting that in Third Century Thrace we have a Καλλίγειτος, Καλλίγειτος, i.e. a Kalligeitos son of Kalligos. Unless it is a spelling mistake by the stonecutter, we must assume that the son had been given the more modern (i.e. closer to the koine) spelling of the name. Of the 81 persons with a -γεῖτος name 32 come from Megaris and mostly belong to the Third or Second Centuries B.C.; a few are from the Fourth Century and one, named by Thucydides, from the Fifth Century. Kalligeitos son of Laphon, was a Magarian exile and an emissary of Pharnabazus (Thuc. VIII 6 1); see also note 9 about the Sixth Century Aristogeitos from Selinus in Sicily.

Of the others, four or five are Boeotian and no earlier than the Third Century; two are Thessalian (in the Hellenistic period); six come from Athens (Aristogeitos in the Fifth Century, two persons called Diogeitos in the Fourth Century, one Eugeitos, who could be Megarian, and one Heroeitos in the Third Century, a third Diogeitos in the Second Century). The fourth volume of LGPN lists two men called Kalligeitos in the Cymmerian Bosporus (Fourth Century) and in Olynthus (Fourth Century); but the ending is restored and we may have a -γεῖτος rather than a -γεῖτος name. More interesting are the nine persons...
called Herogeitos (from the Fourth / Third century BC to the Second Century AD) in Tauric Chersonese. Here we are in places directly or indirectly colonized by Megara and, as Robert had noted (1959, 231 note 1), Hero- is a frequent element in Megarian names.

Further evidence for -γειτος names is provided by the Islands: interestingly Eubea, which is rich in -γειτος compounds, does not seem to have the -γειτος forms, but Keos, Rhodes, Cos, Telos, Delos, Naxos, Thasos all have a very few instances of these names (17 in toto) between the Fourth/Third and the First Century BC.

4. Clearly the only concentration of persons with -γειτος and -γειτος names is found in Megara (32) and in Boeotia (13), as was suggested with far less evidence a long time ago. The preponderance of -γειτος in Megara, even if we forget the colonies, is spectacular: 32 persons out of the 1689 whose name we know means 1.8% as contrasted with 0.076% in Boeotia. The proportions for other regions are so low that they are not even worth mentioning.

Even more impressive, as Robert pointed out, is the Third-Century list of Megarians who arbitrated between Corinth and Epidauros in a boundary dispute (IG IV (1) 71): if we count both names and patronyms we find the names Diogeitos, Eugeitos, Herogeitos, Theogeitos, Kalligeitos (as well as Eugeit and Eugeiton), but the persons involved are far more. There are six men called Kalligeitos (Kalligeitos son of Puthodoros, Kalligeitos son of Hermon, Kalligeitos son of Herogitos, Kalligeitos son of Kleodromos, Kalligeitos father of Theodos, listed among the Hylleis, and Kalligeitos father of Euphronios listed among the Pamphylloi), two men called Theogeitos (the Hylleus father of Apelleas and the Pamphyllos Theogeitos son of Dion) and two men called Eugeitos (Eugeitos son of Damairetus, one of the Pamphylloi, and Eugeitos father of Akaatios, one of the Damairets). In a single inscription this type of onomastic concentration is truly exceptional, spread as it is between different tribes. Not only has Megara a large proportion of these names scattered through its history, but this inscription also reveals how frequent the -γειτος names could be at any given moment in time.

No doubt they were preferred to the -γειτος names, since in Megara we have evidence for only two persons with these names. Here Boeotia differs: we know of 159 persons called with names which ended in -γειτος or -γειτος vs. 13 called with -γειτος or -γειτος names. It may seem, therefore, that we must turn to the region of Megara, if we want to account for the origin of the -γειτος formation. However, the lists above show that there is a clear link between -γειτος and -γειτος compounds. With two possible exceptions (the hapax Aneinogeitos

---

12 Robert loc. cit. distinguishes a Θεόγειτος and a Θεόγειτος, but neither the IG text nor the LGPN support two different readings.

---

from Keos, and the Boeotian Karageitikes/Karaiogetes), all -γειτος names correspond to -γειτος names; while vice versa is certainly not true. We do not know the etymology of γειτον 'neighbour', but the word is old (it is found in the Odyssey) and all the evidence speaks for an n-stem, which is the reason of course why Bechtel found the γειτος forms surprising. Clearly -γειτος is a secondary formation built on -γειτος; it would be impossible to assume that γειτον was built on -γειτος. We may also note that there are lexical compounds of γειτος (δευτερπεις, etc) at least from Aeschylus' time (Risch 1949, 259), but there do not seem to be -γειτος compounds outside onomastics. If so, their creation must have occurred in a geographical and chronological context where the -γειτος names were present. This may speak against the Megara region where we have found so few -γειτος compounds and in favour of Boeotia which is rich of them, but we cannot exclude that at an earlier stage Megara too had -γειτος forms which later were replaced by the newly created -γειτος compounds. We may return to this later but now the question is how an n-stem came to be replaced by a thematic formation.

4.1. The fact that -γειτος is only found in personal names indicates that its creation must be explained within onomastics. This leads us to explore further the onomastic links of our -γειτος names. It is striking that in Boeotia (but not elsewhere) we find next to the -γειτος/γειτόν and -γειτος/γειτός compounds an unexpected number of feminine names in -γειτος/γειτόν attested from a relatively early date. Table III below gives the names in question accompanied by the first date at which they are attested and the number of women who are known to have had that name. The last column repeats the list of -γειτος/γειτός male names providing detailed information for Boeotia and Megaris (but not for the other regions) and indicating the date of first attestation.

Table III

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feminine Names</th>
<th>Number of Women</th>
<th>Dates</th>
<th>Male Names</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ἀθηναγήτα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Tanagra III</td>
<td>Cf. Ἀθηναγήτων III</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ἀθηναγήτα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Skaphel IV</td>
<td>Cf. Ἀθηναγήτων IV</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αποστολεύτα</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Tanagra IV, V</td>
<td>Αριστολεύτα (1) Keos III (hahaha)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Αριστοφάτα</td>
<td></td>
<td>III/II x 2, Thebes II</td>
<td>Αριστοφάτα (1) Thibes V</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Cf. Αριστοφάτων V
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Αριστογέιτος</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>Tanagra III/II, Thebes II, Thespiai? II/II. Thirse IV/III</th>
<th>Αριστογέιτος (17)</th>
<th>M x 5 from IV to III</th>
<th>Cf. Αριστογέιτος</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Διογέτα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Thebes V</td>
<td>Διόγέτος (2)</td>
<td>Akraiphia II, Thebes VI/V</td>
<td>Cf. Διογέτων, Διογέτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Διόγετος (13)</td>
<td>B x 1, M x 4 IV to III</td>
<td>Cf. Διογέτων, Διογέτων</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ερυθήτα</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Glisas III</td>
<td>Cf. Πρόφητας (12), M x 2 III</td>
<td>Πρόφητας</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Εύρητα</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Chaironeia II, Plataniai II, Tanagra hell.</td>
<td>Cf. Εύρητος (7)</td>
<td>M x 6 III</td>
<td>Εύρητος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θευτός</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Θεό- Thebes V, Θεό- Ochomemos V, Tanagra x 2? III-III</td>
<td>Θεότος (1)</td>
<td>Thespiai imp.</td>
<td>Cf. Θεότος, Θεότος</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Θουγέτα</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Θουγέτας</td>
<td>Thespiai imp.</td>
<td>Cf. Θουγέτας, Θουγέτας</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. LGPN III B s.v. lists another Fifth Century example, possibly from Lebadeia, but the last letter is missing and it would be possible to restore a final ι or a final ο as (Θουγέτας is attested; see below); hence I have decided to omit this form.
5. The match between male and female names is impressive, given the obvious gaps in our evidence and the fact that we have so very few female names. Only three -γείτως names do not have a feminine equivalent, while only two of the feminines do not have a masculine equivalent in -γείτως or -γίτως. All the feminines, however, have a matching -γείτως or -γίτως compound. Confronted with this evidence we must now reformulate the question with which we started. We wanted to know how a thematic form like -γείτως could be built to an n-stem. That problem has not gone away but we now also need to know how an a-feminine like -γείτως can be built to an n-stem.

5.1. Strangely enough, it is easier to account for the feminines. The term γείτως was used both as an adjective and a noun but did not have a special feminine form; a word like γείτωτα has a shadowy existence among the grammarians or perhaps the poets and it is disputed whether it is old or a late innovation. It is certainly not productive and does not play a role in onomastics. Hence the need for a feminine of the -γείτως compounds. The phenomenon is typical of onomastics and clearly due to pragmatic reasons. In Greek terms personal names must be marked for gender in contrast with adjectives or nouns which can have their gender syntactically determined. Other formations show it all too clearly. Compounds of the type θεοδότος do not have a special form for the feminine nor do words like ἱππος; yet it is well known that we find feminine names like θεοδώτη or εὐσκέφη, i.e. feminines formed in contrast with the standard rules of lexical word formation (MORPURGO DAVIES 2000, 17). But what feminine do we expect for -γείτως? We may not be all that clear about this, but the Greeks, or perhaps the Boeotians, were not either. Various attempts were made. In addition to θεοδύτη, ἀριστόγειτα and κοιλάγαμα we also find ἀθανασία (Tanagra V) and ἠθανασία (Kreusis), ἀριστόγειτα (Thespiax 2: III/II and III), and κοιλάγαμα (Thespiax II/II). Both [ε] and [α] are typical feminine markers and in onomastic formations they frequently alternate. A third frequent feminine suffix is -ά, which is extensively used in onomastics. In our set of names, next to θεοδύτη, which first occurs in the fifth century (see above), we also have a feminine σύναγωγα (Athoned VI-V), a unique example in our list of an -ά feminine of -γείτως. For the a-stems there are obvious synchronic models which can be followed. Cf. for instance Φίλων vs. Φίλα, ἀγάθων vs. ἀγάθα, Τίμων vs. Τίμη, etc. The a-forms have various origins: normal feminine adjectives, a-stem nouns, etc. What matters is that for one or the other reason -ά names come to be matched by a-feminines, a pattern which can then be extended. Cf. for instance Κλέων vs. Κλέω or Κλέα in all these instances, next to the a-forms, we also find feminines like Φιλόθ, ἀγαθός, Τίμα, Κάλλος, Κλεός, etc. In other words, it is true that the creation of e.g. θεοδύτη from θεοδύτω breaks the normal rules of word formation, but it nevertheless fits within the standard onomastic patterns of feminine creation. We are lucky in that normally we have far less evidence for the forms of feminine names. It is puzzling, however, that nowhere outside Boeotia we find feminine names which match the -γείτως masculines. We might have expected, for instance, to find some evidence in Athens where far more women are known than in Boeotia, but we do not. One cannot argue from argumenta ex silentio but it is just conceivable that this may support the view that the -γείτως compounds were not at home in Athens but had started in Boeotia or Megaris.

5.2. We are still left with the problem of the -γείτως or -γίτως masculines. What prompted the creation of ἀριστόγειτα, etc.? In onomastics terms a form like ἀριστόγειτα is marked for masculine and another masculine is not needed. Yet the new masculine can be explained provided we are prepared to accept that the -γείτως/-γίτως compounds are secondary formations built on the feminine -γείτως-γίτως on the model of standard pairs like, say, fem. θεοδώτη and masc. θεοδάνες or, to adopt more Boeotic forms, θεοδάνες and θεοδάνες. Even closer would be the model of υπαγέμενα and υπαγέμενα, two good Boeotian names.

How exceptional is this type of masculine formation which starts from a feminine form? The answer is not easy because we normally cannot know the chronology of the various stages of name formation. However, even in the lexicon, as contrasted with onomastics, there are a few famous and well defined cases which are generally accepted. Earlier forms like ἑταῖρος and ἕταῖρα, where the diphthong of the feminine is due to the phonetic development of an original *-για sequence, were replaced by ἕταῖρος and ἕταῖρα where the masculine can only be explained as built on the feminine (cf. RISCH 1974, 167). For onomastics, HEUBECK (1957, 274) surmised (rightly in my view), that the replacement of the earlier compounds in -ανόρ - ανόρ (Ἀγαθάνορ, Τεθανόρ, Ἀναθανόρ, etc., Myc. Nestiánor) with -ανόρ compounds (Ἀγαθάνορ, Τεθανόρ, Ἀναθανόρ, etc.) may be explained if we start from a feminine in -άνορ (cf. Myc. Aλεξάνδια) with the expected zero grade and assume that a new masculine was built on it in pre-Mycenaean times. The question about the origin of Alexandros is too disputed to be considered here (see e.g. the references in HEUBECK loc.cit.) but, even without this particular example, there is little doubt that a native speaker confronted with names like the fem. ἀριστονήκεια - ἀριστονήκτικα (obviously linked with the noun νίκη «victory» and the verb νικάω) and the corresponding masc. ἀριστονήκτος would have seen this as part of a regular pattern. On this basis to create next to the feminine ἀριστονήκτικς a new masculine ἀριστονήκτος does not seem an unexpected
development. Indeed this is not the only innovation. Just as next to γετος we find new feminines ending in -γετις and in one case a feminine in -γετο, next to Ευγετις-Ευγετος we find not only Ευγετις (six times in Megarid) but also one instance of Ευγετις in Third-Century Megara. Now and why Ευγετις was formed is not immediately clear, given that Ευγετος was available, but here too, if we start from the earlier creation of a γετος feminine, we may appeal to the pattern exemplified in Boeotia by e.g. Δαμιάνος - Δαμιάντια, Τιμάγος - Τιμάγοντια, Ζενοκλής - Ζενοκλήτια. And finally the simple Γετος, the name of a Third-Century Euboean, must be a back formation from Ευγετος or the like. A similar process may conceivably have yielded the hapax Γετος attested once in Thracia in the Second/Third Century AD.

If this account may explain the creation of the -γετος, -γετος compounds, two problems remain. We may speculate but it is unlikely that we shall reach a firm solution unless new evidence becomes available. First, what is the function, if any, of the -γετος - γετος contrast? Is the second term equivalent to a diminutive or is it a more expressive or less formal and more colloquial formation or does the function change from place to place? All these hypotheses are possible but remain unproven. Secondly, where did the -γετος forms originate? Boeotia and the area of Megara remain the likely places but can we choose between the two? That Megara does not have -γετος feminines is not a counter-argument because the onomastic evidence is very limited and we never have sufficient evidence about female names, which are rarely attested in most regions. In other words Megara cannot be excluded on the basis of an argumentum ex silentio and the preponderance of -γετος names speaks for it. On the other hand, we cannot exclude Boeotia because it has fewer -γετος or -γετος names than Megara. If, for instance, for a Boeotian the contrast between -γετος or -γετος forms on the one hand and -γετος forms on the other was comparable to that between Tom and Thomas or between Dick and Richard we would only rarely expect to find the less formal names in inscriptions. In my view the question remains open and we cannot even exclude that the two regions created the same form independently.

6. We may now summarize. As Bechtel pointed out, the names in -γετος or -γετος which we find spread through the Greek world and which seem occasionally to be substituted for, or to alternate with, the similar -γετος compounds, require a linguistic explanation. There is little doubt, as Bechtel knew, that we are dealing with an innovation rather than with an inherited form. If so, in a country such as Greece where different areas follow different linguistic paths, any account must first establish where the innovation started. Thanks to the new collections now at our disposal it is possible to confirm that there is a concentration of -γετος forms in Central Greece and particularly in the territory of Megara and in Boeotia. The -γετος form is simply due to the phonetic development of Boeotian vowels and diphthongs and is limited to Boeotia exactly as -γετος, the Boeotian counterpart of -γετος. The Peloponnesian remains largely untouched by these forms. We seem to observe a pattern of diffusion which proceeds from Boeotia to the neighbouring areas: Oropos and Euboea on the one hand, perhaps Athens on the other. At the same time we note, as Louis Robert had done long ago, an increasing number of -γετος forms in Megara's colonies. Remarkably, onomastic diffusion does not depend on dialect or ethnic: Megara spoke West Greek, Boeotia an Aeolic dialect and Euboea Ionic.

In purely statistical terms -γετος is far more frequent in the Megara area than in Boeotia. However, we know that its creation must be based on the presence of -γετος names which, perhaps through the vagaries of survival, are far less frequent in Megara than in Boeotia. This effectively prevents us from dismissing Boeotia from our inquiry. If we then look at the Boeotian data we are struck by the presence of a number of feminine nouns in -γετος or -γετος (e.g. Αριστογετος or Αριστογετος) which start as early as the Sixth/Fifth century, i.e. at least as early, and possibly earlier, as the first instances of -γετος or -γετος. It seems obvious that these forms were created in order to provide for the -γετος names a feminine counterpart which is marked as such. Αριστογετος is immediately recognizable as a feminine name corresponding to the masculine Αριστογετος. The phenomenon is well known in onomastics even if it has no exact counterpart in the lexicon. Other attempts to answer the same need led in Boeotia to the creation of the attested but rarer feminines in -γετος (Αριστογετος) and (once) in -γετος (Ομηρογετος). It is puzzling that other parts of Greece, including Megara, provide no evidence for the feminines, though in the case of Megara at least this may be due to the paucity of our evidence. It then seems plausible to assume that in Boeotia and/or conceivably in Megara, next to the pair -γετος - γετος or -γετος - γετος, a more 'regular' -γετος or -γετος form was created which enjoyed a certain level of success in the area of maximum diffusion of the compounds of -γετος but also spread to other regions. Once again onomastics follows linguistic rules of its own which partly match, partly break those of the lexicon. What determined the patterns of diffusion must be established case by case, but we must be prepared to admit that lexical diffusion and onomastic diffusion are unlikely to move along the same paths.
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