

*Volumi pubblicati con il contributo dell'Università degli Studi di Udine (Rettorato;
Facoltà di Lingue e letterature straniere; Centro Internazionale sul Plurilinguismo) e
del Consorzio Universitario del Friuli*



STUDI LINGUISTICI IN ONORE DI ROBERTO GUSMANI

VOLUME III

a cura di

RAFFAELLA BOMBI, GUIDO CIFOLETTI, FABIANA FUSCO
LUCIA INNOCENTE, VINCENZO ORIOLES



Edizioni dell'Orso
Alessandria

Indice

Silvia Morgana Ascoli-Cantù: alcune lettere inedite (con un'appendice di Valussi e Carcano)	p. 1225
Anna Morpurgo Davies Onomastics, diffusion and word formation: Greek <i>Ἀριστογείτων</i> and <i>Ἀριστόγειτος</i>	1241
Ruggero Morresi Arbitrarismo teologico e arbitrarietà del segno: Hegel e Saussure	1257
Filippo Motta Contatto culturale ed emersione di lingue: il caso del gallico	1269
Žarko Muljačić Contributo alla biografia di Antonio Udina Búrbur	1281
Mario Negri Le prime scritture a Creta: riscoperta, funzioni, complementarità	1295
Gerhard Neweklowsky Die Sammlung makedonischer Volksmärchen von Stefan Verko- vić als balkanischer Text	1307
Alberto Nocentini L'origine del lat. <i>pōpulus</i>	1319
Norbert Oettinger Pronominaladjektive in frühen indogermanischen Sprachen	1327
Renato Oniga Un'eccezione all'apofonia latina	1337
Vincenzo Orioles La confissazione e le sue implicazioni interlinguistiche	1341
Livio Clemente Piccinini Semiologia del numero	1351

© 2006

Copyright by Edizioni dell'Orso s.r.l.
via Rattazzi, 47 15100 Alessandria
tel. 0131.252349 fax 0131.257567
e-mail: edizionidellorso@libero.it
<http://www.ediorso.it>

Redazione e cura informatica: Isabella M. Grasso

È vietata la riproduzione, anche parziale, non autorizzata, con qualsiasi mezzo effettuata, compresa la fotocopia, anche a uso interno e didattico. L'illecito sarà penalmente perseguibile a norma dell'art. 171 della Legge n. 633 del 22.4.1941

ISBN 88-7694-888-0

VI	Indice		Indice	VII
Paolo Poccetti			Rüdiger Schmitt	
Fenomeni di allomorfismo flessionale in ambiente bilingue osco-greco. Un contributo alla storia di lat. <i>Aiāx</i> , <i>Bruttāx</i> e oltre	1359		Modernisierung ererbter Personennamen im Altiranischen. Von 'primären' * <i>kleues</i> - zu 'sekundären' * <i>farnah</i> -Bildungen	1559
Massimo Poetto			Diether Schürr	
L'iscrizione lidia di Tire: una revisione	1373		Elf lydische Etymologien	1569
Diego Poli			Salvatore Claudio Sgroi	
Etnicità a Belfast	1383		"Morfologi, vi esorto alla storia!"	1589
Maria Luisa Porzio Gernia			Domenico Silvestri	
La <i>fides</i> tra divino e umano	1403		Apofonie indeuropee e altre apofonie	1621
Aldo Luigi Prosdocimi			Mitja Skubic	
Il genitivo messapico in <i>-ihi</i>	1421		Lingue in contatto: elementi lessicali sloveni nel friulano sonziano	1641
Jaan Puhvel			Rosanna Sornicola	
Indo-European * <i>med</i> - in Hittite	1435		Un problema di linguistica generale: la definizione e la giustificazione degli espletivi	1651
Paolo Ramat			Harro Stammerjohann	
Marginalia sulla grammaticalizzazione	1437		Modus der unbegrenzten Möglichkeiten	1673
Umberto Rapallo			Pierre Swiggers	
Il linguaggio della vita e le convergenze tra linguistica e scienze biologiche	1445		Alf Sommerfelt: l'enjeu sociologique de la linguistique diachronique	1687
John D. Ray			Pavao Tekavčić	
Is Etruscan an Indo-European Language? The case revisited	1467		Sulla stratificazione sociolinguistica degli alloglottismi nelle opere di Željka Čorak	1697
Norbert Reiter			Recai Tekoğlu	
Die semantischen Verwandten von deutsch <i>eben</i> . Ein Beitrag zur Eurolinguistik	1483		TL 29: una nuova proposta di lettura	1703
Claude Sandoz			Johann Tischler	
L'étymologie et la formation de lat. <i>prouincia</i>	1497		Hethitische Parallelen zum althochdeutschen Wurmsegen	1711
Domenico Santamaria			Patrizia Torricelli	
La controversia tra Graziadio Isaia Ascoli e i Neogrammatici: la cifra di lettura di Benvenuto Aron Terracini	1503		Il segno metaforico. Tra motivazione e relatività linguistica	1715
Sergio Scalise – Emiliano Guevara			Fiorenzo Toso	
Towards a Typology of Compounding: Italian and Dutch V-Compounds	1525		Usi ed abusi dell'etimologia remota	1731
Karl Horst Schmidt			Salvatore Trovato	
Zum Verbalnomen im Keltischen	1551		Storie locali, miti, blasoni, paraetimologie, pseudoetimologie	1749

Jürgen Untermann Ligurisches	1759
Cristina Vallini Ancora sul metalinguaggio saussuriano	1771
Laura Vanelli Struttura delle parole friulane e adattamento dei prestiti	1785
Edoardo Vineis Per la storia della nozione di <i>aggettivo</i>	1801
Alberto Zamboni <i>Muspilli</i> : un'eco di funeraria romana nell'escatologia cristiano-germanica?	1813
Giorgio Ziffer Paleoslavo <i>junĕi</i> 'discipulus'	1829
Christian Zinko Die Bezeichnungen für "Blut" in den altindischen medizinischen Texten – am Beispiel der <i>Aṣṭāṅgahṛdayasamhitā</i>	1839

Indirizzi degli autori	1855
------------------------	------

SILVIA MORGANA

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 connesse alla polemica con Tommaseo, fatte conoscere più di quarant'anni fa da Alfredo Stussi¹. 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 1861-62², e dove entrambi partecipavano attivamente alla vita delle più importanti istituzioni culturali³. Spero comunque di fare cosa gradita all'amico e collega che qui festeggiamo pubblicando nella miscellanea in suo onore alcune lettere del linguista goriziano⁴, in attesa che il riordino del fondo Ascoli alla

¹ STUSSI 1982, pp. 85-96. Si tratta della copia della lettera di Ascoli a Cantù del 25 aprile 1873 e del foglio inserito, in originale, a Cantù per Tommaseo, conservati alla Biblioteca Nazionale di Firenze (Tommaseo P 60.29), mentre finora non è stata ritrovata la lettera di Cantù ad Ascoli. L'originale autografo 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): Archivj (A)] Archivii; ai Suoi lumi ed alla Sua bontà (A)] ai suoi lumi e alla sua bontà; vecchiaia (A)] vecchiaia; 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)] ribattere 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.

² Sulle vicende che portarono Ascoli a insegnare a Milano Grammatica comparata e lingue orientali cfr. i saggi di DECLEVA, MORGANA, LUCCHINI in BARBARISI-DECLEVA-MORGANA 2001.

³ Gran parte del carteggio, in particolare molti biglietti qui non pubblicati, si riferiscono infatti a vicende interne del Reale Istituto Lombardo di scienze, lettere ed arti e della Società storica lombarda. Sul ruolo di Ascoli in queste istituzioni cfr. LORICCHIO 1989, LUCCHINI 2002.

⁴ 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).

ANNA MORPURGO DAVIES

Onomastics, diffusion and word formation: Greek Ἀριστογείτων and Ἀριστόγειτος

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' (Ἀριστογείτων, etc.) BECHTEL (1917, 163 f.) noted that there are also forms in -γειτος (cf. Ἀριστόγειτος etc.) and commented on the oddity of the formation. As he pointed out, the replacement of -ων stems with o-forms in the first element of a compound is normal (cf. Ἀμεινο-κλῆς next to ἀμείνων) 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 -γειτος 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 γειτων-names.² Louis ROBERT (1959, 230 f.) noticed long ago that the Black Sea

¹ At the time of writing I can use vols I, II, III A and III B but vol. IV has not yet been published. However the basic statistics for it are available on the web and I am very grateful to the editors who allowed me to see the lemmata of a few names.

² In what follows I ignore the names Γείτων (3 persons in Athens, one in Epirus), Γειτονίδης (1 Athenian) and Γειτονίδας (attested in Kynouria on a Sixth/Fifth Century vase).

colonies of Megara had a number of names which ended in -γειτων 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.³ 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: γειτων-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 -γειτων/-γιτων or -γειτος/-γιτος. By contrast in the whole of Peloponnese, according to the LGPN, we know only of 10 persons who have a name ending in -γειτων or, in one case, in -γειτος. For Athens we know of 97 persons with a name ending in -γειτων and of 6 with a name ending in -γειτος⁴.

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 I. This repeats the figures provided by the web site of LGPN (<http://www.lgpn.ox.ac.uk>), except for Attica (see note 4).

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 -γειτος / -γιτος 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, Keos, 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 -γειτος and -γειτων names I have tried to produce a more exact account of the additions and corrections. The one attestation in Athens of Ἡρογείτων is now read Ἡρόγειτος and we know of 7 further persons called with -γειτων names (3 Ἀριστογείτων, 2 Διογείτων, 2 Εὐγείτων). For the other regions I have not tried to go beyond the figures and lists produced 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.

Region	LGPN Persons	LGPN Persons with - γειτων ~ -γειτος & -γιτων ~ -γιτος names	Approximate Percentages
Peloponnese	19404	10	0.05
Attica	ca. 64000	103	0.16
Euboea	8884	26	0.29
Boeotia	16921	172 ⁵	1.01
Megaris	1689	34	2.01

Table I

The figures speak for themselves; a strong hypothesis would suggest that the -γειτων/-γειτος 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 Διογείτωνδας and Εὐγείτωνδης, with an -ωνδας termination which is well known as a Boeotian suffix and cannot be Euboean⁶. 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 -γειτων names attested in Athens is that of the tyrannicide Aristogeiton and that Aristogeiton was one of those Gephuraioi 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 -γιτων and -γιτος names (as contrasted with -γειτων

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 -αι, the second (in a Delphic proxy decree) in -ει. Clearly the first name preserved the original form and did not even replace Boeotian long α with η; the second may have done so but we cannot be certain how much this is due to the Delphic stonecutter.

and -γειτος) are practically all used for Boeotian men and are not really found outside Boeotia.⁷ The figures are not negligible: 121 persons have -γίων names and 7 have -γίτος names. Of course the form is not unexpected. In the standard Boeotian pronunciation the diphthong [ei] was replaced first by [e:], 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; -γίων and the feminine -γίτα 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 -γειτων 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 Διογειτώνδας, 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 [geito:n] or [ge: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 -γίτος 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 -γίτος carried by 7 different persons.⁸

Both the -γειτος and -γίτος compound names match almost entirely the -γειτων and -γίων names, as shown by Table II, which lists all the -γειτος and -γίτος 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, 'Αριστόγειτος (17) A x 1 (V), M x 5 means that there are 17 persons called 'Αριστόγειτος in all regions and periods analysed by LGPN I-IV; of these one is in Athens in the Fifth Century BC and 5 in Megaris (the others dispersed through various places).

Table II

-γειτος	-γίτος	-γειτων	-γίων
'Αμεινόγειτος (1) Keos x 1			
'Αριστόγειτος (17) A x 1 (V), M x 5 ⁹	'Αρι]στό/γ[ι]τος (1) B x 1 (V)	'Αριστογείτων (60) E x 6, A x 17 + 3, B x 11, Oropos 4	'Αριστογίτων + 'Αριστογίτων 37, B x 37 (V)
Διόγειτος (13) A x 3, B x 1, M x 4	Διόγίτος (2) B x 2 (1 x VI/V)	Διογείτων (38) E x 2, A x 23+2, B x 7 Cf. Διογειτώνδας E x 1 Διογειτώνδης (?? or - ας??) B x 1 ¹⁰	Διογίτων (10) B x 10 Cf. Διογίωνδας B x 2

⁷ This does not exclude the odd example of iotacism.

⁸ A search on the LGPN site for names ending in -γειτος yields a longer list, but I have excluded Δαμάγειτος, which does not belong here, and I have treated as one name the various forms Θέγειτος, Θεόγειτος, Θεύγειτος. We now have an additional instance of 'Ηρόγειτος in Athens (see note 4).

⁹ A Sixth Century Genitive 'Αριστογείτο is attested in Sicily at Selinus, a colony of Megara Hyblaea, 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 Διογειτώνδου; there is a presumption that the

Εὐγειτος (7) A x 1 (?), M x 6		Εὐγείτων (41) E x 6, A x 20 + 2, B x 4, M x 1 Cf. Εὐγειτώνδης E x 1	Εὐγίτων (9) B x 9 Cf. Εὐγιτονίδα (sic! Nom.) B x 1 (VI/V)
Ἡρόγειτος (12) A x 1, M x 2, Chersonesos, Olynthos, etc. x 9		Ἡρογείτων (16) 6 in LGPN vol. I, including Samos x 1 (V), 10 in vol. IV including Cimmerian Bosporos x 3.	
Θε-/Θεο-/Θευ- γειτος (11) Θέγειτος M x 5 Θεόγειτος Delos x 1? Naxos x 1, B x 2, Thessaly x 1 Θεύγειτος Thessaly x 1	Θεόγειτος (1) B x 1	Θεο-/Θευ-/Θιο- γείτων (49) Θεογείτων (46) E x 6, A x 13, B x 8, M x 1 (V) (Macedonia x 3, Skythia x 1) Θιογείτων (1) B x 1 Θευγείτων (3) A x 1, (Cyrenaica x 2) Cf. Θεογειτώνδης B x 1	Θιο-/Θεο-γίτων (33) Θιογίτων B x 25 Θεογίτων B x 8
Καλλίγειτος (18) Thasos x 4, B x 1, M x 10, etc.	Καλλίγιτος (1) B x 1	Καλλιγείτων (17) E x 4, B x 2, Oropos x 5, (Thracia x 5)	Καλλιγίτων (14) B x 14

nominative would have the koine form in -ης but we cannot be certain, as shown by the oscillations between -ας and -ης nominatives in the same inscription.

Καραίγειτος (1) B x 1 ¹¹	Καραιόγιτος (1) B x 1		
	Πουθόγιτος (1) B x 1	Πυθογείτων (3) (Samos x 2, Hermonassa x 1) Πυθιογείτων (1) B x 1	
Τιμόγειτος (1) ? B x 1		Τιμογείτων (4) A x 2, B x 2	Τιμογίτων (5) B x 5

3.1. The -γιτος names (Ἀρι)στόγ[ι]τος, Διόγιτος, Θεόγιτος, Καλλίγιτος, Καραιόγιτος, Πουθόγιτος) 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 Thespieae we have a Κ[α]λλίγειτος Καλλίγιτιος, i.e. a Kalligeitos son of Kalligitos. Unless it is a spelling mistake by the stonemason, 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 -γειτος name 32 come from Megaris and mostly belong to the Third or Second Centuries B.C., though a few are from the Fourth Century and one, named by Thucydides, from the Fifth Century: Kalligeitos son of Laophon, was a Megarian 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 Herogeitos in the Third Century, a third Diogeitos in the Second Century). The fourth volume of LGPN lists two men called Kalligeitos in the Cymmerian Bosporos (Fourth Century) and in Olynthos (Fourth Century; but the ending is restored and we may have a -γειτ[ων] rather than a -γειτ[ος] name). More interesting are the nine persons

¹¹ This reading with -α- rather than -ο- at the end of the first element of the compound is due to a correction by Keramopoulou of the text provided in IG (which had -ο-). It must be right, but it is not easy to understand how such a compound could be formed.

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 Euboea, which is rich in -γειτων 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 -γιτος 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 Epidaurus in a boundary dispute (IG IV (1) 71): if we count both names and patronymics we find the names Diogeitos, Eugeitos, Herogeitos, Thegeitos, Kalligeitos (as well as Eugeiton and Eugeition), but the persons involved are far more. There are six men called Kalligeitos (Kalligeitos son of Puthodoros, Kalligeitos son of Hermon, Kalligeitos son of Herogeitos, Kalligeitos son of Kleodromos, Kalligeitos father of Theodoros, listed among the Hylleis, and Kalligeitos father of Euphronios listed among the Pamphyloi), two men called Diogeitos (Diogeitos son of Herakleitos, Diogeitos son of Theodoros), two men called Thegeitos (the Hylleus father of Apelleas and the Pamphylos Thegeitos son of Dion)¹² and two men called Eugeitos (Eugeitos son of Damainetos, one of the Pamphyloi, and Eugeitos father of Agasillos, one of the Dumanes). 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 -γειτων names, since in Megaris we have evidence for only two persons with these names. Here Boeotia differs: we know of 159 persons called with names which ended in -γειτων or -γιτων vs. 13 called with -γειτος or -γιτος 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 -γειτων compounds. With two possible exceptions (the hapax Ameinogeitos

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

from Keos, and the Boeotian Karaiageitos/Karaiogitos), all -γειτος names correspond to -γειτων names; while viceversa is certainly not true. We do not know the etymology of γείτων '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 -γειτων; it would be impossible to assume that -γείτων was built on -γειτος. We may also note that there are lexical compounds of γείτων (ἄστυγείτων, 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 -γειτων names were present. This may speak against the Megara region where we have found so few -γειτων compounds and in favour of Boeotia which is rich of them, but we cannot exclude that at an earlier stage Megara too had -γειτων 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 -γειτων/-γιτων and -γειτος/-γιτος compounds an unexpected number of feminine names in -γείτα/-γίτα 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/-γιτος male names providing detailed information for Boeotia and Megaris (but not for the other regions) and indicating the date of first attestation.

Table III

Feminine Names	Number of Women	Dates	Male Names
Ἀθανογίτα	1	Tanagra? III	Cf. Ἀθανογίτων III
Ἀθανογείτα	1	Skaphlai IV	Cf. Ἀθανογείτων IV
			Ἀμεινόγειτος (1) Keos III (hapax)
Ἀριστογίτα Ἀριστογίτα	5	Tanagra VI/V, V/IV. III/II x 2, Thebes II	Ἀρ[ιστόγ]ιτος (1) Thisbe V Cf. Ἀριστογίτων V

Ἀριστογείτα	4	Tanagra? III/II, Thebes? II, Thespiai? II/I, Thisbe IV/III	Ἀριστόγειτος (17) M x 5 from IV to III Cf. Ἀριστογείτων
Διογίτα	1	Thebes V	Διόγιτος (2) Akraiphia II, Thebes VI/V Cf. Διογίων, Διογιτώνδας
			Διόγειτος (13) B x 1, M x 4 IV to III Cf. Διογείτων, Διογειτώνδας
Είρογίτα	1	Glisas III	Cf. Ἡρόγειτος (12). M x 2 III Ἡρογείτων
Εὐγίτα	3	Chaironeia II, Plataiai II, Tanagra hell.	Cf. Εὐγειτος (7) M x 6 III Εὐγίων
Θειογίτα Θιογίτα Θεογίτα	4	Θειο- Thebes V Θιο- Orchomenos V, Tanagra x 2? III-II ¹³ Θεο- Plataiai II	Θεόγιτος (1) Thespiai imp. Cf. Θεογίων, Θιογίων

¹³ LGPN III B s.v. lists another Fifth Century example, possibly from Lebadcia, but the last letter is missing and it would be possible to restore a final α or a final ω (Θιογιτώ is attested; see below); hence I have decided to omit this form.

Θεογείτα	1	Thespiai IV/III	Θεόγειτος (5) Thespiai x 2: III, imp. Cf. Θέγειτος M x 5 IV to III. Cf. also Θεογείτων
Καλλιγίτα	1	Thebes V	Καλλίγιτος (1) Thespiai III Cf. Καλλίγειτος (18) Thespiai x 1 III; M x 10 V to II See also Καλλιγίων, Καλλιγείων
			Καραιόγιτος (1) Thespiai III Καραιάγειτος (1) Thespiai II
Μνασιγίτα	1	Anthedon IV/III	Cf. Μνασιγείτων (1) A IV/III; Μνησιγείτων (1)? A IV/III
Πουθογίτα	1	Thebes III	Πουθόγιτος (1) Tanagra III Cf. Πυθογείτων (3) Samos x 2 Hermonassa x 1 IV Πυθογείτων (1) Thespiai IV/III
			Τιμόγειτος (1) Κοραι II Cf. Τιμογίων (5) B x 5 IV to II

		Τιμογείτων (4)
		A x 2 V-IV,
		Thespiiai x 2 III

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 -γειτος names do not have a feminine equivalent, while only two of the feminines do not have a masculine equivalent in -γειτος or -γίτος. All the feminines, however, have a matching -γειτων or -γίτων compound. Confronted with this evidence we must now reformulate the question with which we started. We wanted to know how a thematic form like -γειτος 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 -γείτα can be built to an *n*-stem.

5.1. Strangely enough, it is easier to account for the feminines. The term γείτων was used both as an adjective and a noun but did not have a special feminine form; a word like γείταινα 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 -γειτων 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 θεόδοτος do not have a special form for the feminine nor do words like ἵππος; yet it is well known that we find feminine names like Θεοδότη or Γλαυκίππη, 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 -γειτων? 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 Ἀθανογίτα, Ἀριστογίτα and Καλλιγίτα we also find Ἀθανογιτίς (Tanagra V) and Ἀθανογετίς (Kreusis), Ἀριστογιτίς (Thespiiai x 2: III/II and III), and Καλλιγιτίς (Thisbe II/I). Both [a:] and [is] are typical feminine markers and in onomastic formations they frequently alternate. A third frequent feminine suffix is -ω, which is extensively used in onomastics. In our set of names, next to Θιογίτα, which first occurs in the fifth century (see above), we also have a feminine Θιογιτώ (Anthedon V/IV), a unique example in our list of an -ω feminine of -γειτων. For the *a*-stems there are obvious synchronic models which can be followed. Cf. for instance Φίλων vs. Φίλα, Ἀγαθών vs. Ἀγάθα, Τίμων vs. Τίμα, etc.¹⁴ The *a*-forms have various origins: normal femi-

¹⁴ I have chosen as examples forms with the West Greek final -α, but of course the same processes apply to forms with final -η.

nine adjectives, *a*-stem nouns, etc. What matters is that for one or the other reason -ων names come to be matched by *a*-feminines, a pattern which can then be extended. Cf. for instance Κλέων or Κλίων vs. Κλέα or Κλία. In all these instances, next to the *a*-forms, we also find feminines like Φιλώ, Ἀγαθώ, Τιμώ, Κλεώ, Κλιώ, etc. In other words, it is true that the creation of e.g. Θιογίτα from Θιογίτων 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 -γειτων 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 -γειτων 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 -γειτος or -γίτος masculines. What prompted the creation of Ἀριστόγειτος, etc.? In onomastic terms a form like Ἀριστογείτων 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 -γειτος/-γίτος compounds are secondary formations rebuilt on the feminine -γείτα/-γίτα on the model of standard pairs like, say, fem. Θεοξένα and masc. Θεόξενος or, to adopt more Boeotian forms, Θιοξένα and Θιόξενος. Even closer would be the model of Νικαρέτα and Νικάρετος, 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 ἔταρος and ἑταίρα, where the diphthong of the feminine is due to the phonetic development of an original *-rya sequence, were replaced by ἑταίρος and ἑταίρα 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 -ανωρ ~ -ηνωρ (Ἀγαθάνωρ, Τεισάνωρ, Ἀντήνωρ, etc., Myc. *Nestiānōr*) with -ανδρος compounds (Ἀγάθανδρος, Τείσανδρος etc.) may be explained if we start from a feminine in -ανδρα (cf. Myc. *Alexandra*) 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. Ἀριστονίκα ~ Ἀριστονίκη (obviously linked with the noun νίκη ~ νίκη 'victory' and the verb νικάω) and the corresponding masc. Ἀριστόνικος, would have seen this as part of a regular pattern. On this basis to create next to the feminine Ἀριστογείτα a new masculine Ἀριστόγειτος does not seem an unexpected

development. Indeed this is not the only innovation. Just as next to *-γῆτα* we find new feminines ending in *-γῆτις* and in one case a feminine in *-γῆτω*, next to *Εὐγείτων ~ Εὐγίτων* we find not only *Εὐγείτος* (six times in Megarid) but also one instance of *Εὐγείτας* in Third-Century Megara. How and why *Εὐγείτας* was formed is not immediately clear, given that *Εὐγείτων* was available, but here too, if we start from the earlier creation of a *-γῆτα* feminine, we may appeal to the pattern exemplified in Boeotia by e.g. *Δαμαγόρα ~ Δαμαγόρας*, *Τιμαγόρα ~ Τιμαγόρας*, *Ξενοκλία ~ Ξενοκλίας*.¹⁵ And finally the simple *Γείτας*, the name of a Third-Century Euboean, must be a back formation from *Εὐγείτας* or the like. A similar process may conceivably have yielded the hapax *Γῆτις* attested once in Thracia in the Second/Third Century AD.¹⁶

If this account may explain the creation of the *-γῆτος*, *-γῆτος* 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 *-γῆτων ~ -γῆτος* 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 *-γῆτος* forms originate? Boeotia and the area of Megara remain the likely places but can we choose between the two? That Megara does not have *-γῆτα* 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 *-γῆτος* names speaks for it. On the other hand, we cannot exclude Boeotia because it has fewer *-γῆτος* or *-γῆτος* names than Megara. If, for instance, for a Boeotian the contrast between *-γῆτος* or *-γῆτος* forms on the one hand and *-γῆτων* 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.¹⁷ In my view the question remains open and we cannot even exclude that the two regions created the same form independently.

¹⁵ I have deliberately chosen Boeotian names.

¹⁶ Of course that very late *Γῆτις* may have nothing to do with the root of *γῆτων*. On the other hand, if it does, its first vowel could be due to iotacism and have no link with the Boeotian forms.

¹⁷ In Boeotia some types of name tend to be marked by expressive gemination, which is likely to indicate a more colloquial status. This applies e.g. to the masculines in *-ει* and to the feminines in *-ω* (see VOTTÉRO 1985). In Arcadia we notice a contrast between the feminines in *-ω* which are often hypocoristics and have expressive gemination and the feminines in *-ίς* which avoid abbreviated forms and gemination, in contrast with Attica where they have both (MORPURGO DAVIES 1999, 395 f.). In Boeotia, our *-γῆτος* or *-γῆτος* compounds do not provide us with clear evidence either way. In Megaris I doubt that in the Fourth or Third Century they were particularly informal.

6. We may now summarize. As Bechtel pointed out, the names in *-γῆτος* or *-γῆτος* which we find spread through the Greek world and which seem occasionally to be substituted for, or to alternate with, the similar *-γῆτων* 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 *-γῆτος* forms in Central Greece and particularly in the territory of Megara and in Boeotia. The *-γῆτος* form is simply due to the phonetic development of Boeotian vowels and diphthongs and is limited to Boeotia exactly as *-γῆτων*, the Boeotian counterpart of *-γῆτων*. The Peloponnese 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 *-γῆτος* forms in Megara's colonies. Remarkably, onomastic diffusion does not depend on dialect or ethnos: Megara spoke West Greek, Boeotia an Aeolic dialect and Euboea Ionic.

In purely statistical terms *-γῆτος* is far more frequent in the Megara area than in Boeotia. However, we know that its creation must be based on the presence of *-γῆτων* 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 *-γῆτα* or *-γῆτα* (e.g. *Ἀριστογῆτα* or *Ἀριστογῆτα*) which start as early as the Sixth/Fifth century, i.e. at least as early, and possibly earlier, as the first instances of *-γῆτος* or *-γῆτος*. It seems obvious that these forms were created in order to provide for the *-γῆτων* names a feminine counterpart which is marked as such. *Ἀριστογῆτα* is immediately recognizable as a feminine name corresponding to the masculine *Ἀριστογῆτων*. 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 *-γῆτις* (*Ἀριστογῆτις*) and (once) in *-γῆτω* (*Θιογῆτω*). 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 *-γῆτων ~ -γῆτα* or *-γῆτων ~ -γῆτα*, a more 'regular' *-γῆτος* or *-γῆτος* form was created which enjoyed a certain level of success in the area of maximum diffusion of the compounds of *γῆτων* 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.

References

- F. BECHTEL, *Die historischen Personennamen des Griechischen bis zur Kaiserzeit*, Halle 1917 (Reprinted, Hildesheim 1982).
- J.K. DAVIES, *Athenian Propertied Families. 600-300 B.C.*, Oxford 1971.
- P.M. FRASER, and E. MATTHEWS eds., *A Lexicon of Greek Personal Names*, 5 vols, Oxford 1987-2005.
- A. HEUBECK, *Weitere Bemerkungen zu den griechischen Personenamen auf den Linear B Tafeln*, "Beiträge zur Namenforschung" 8 (1957), 268-278 (reprinted in *Kleine Schriften zur griechischen Sprache und Literatur*, Erlangen 1984, 481-491).
- LGPN see FRASER AND MATTHEWS 1987-2005.
- A. MORPURGO DAVIES, *The Morphology of Personal Names in Mycenaean and Greek: Some Observations*, in S. DEGER-JALKOTZY, S. HILLER, O. PANAGL Eds., *Florent Studia Mycenaea*, 2 vols., Wien 1999, 389-405.
- A. MORPURGO DAVIES, *Greek Personal Names and Linguistic Continuity*, in S. HORNBLOWER, and E. MATTHEWS eds, *Greek Personal Names. Their Value as Evidence*, Oxford 2000, 25-39.
- A. MORPURGO DAVIES, *Après Michel Lejeune: l'anthroponymie et l'histoire de la langue grecque*, *Comptes Rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* 2001, 173-157.
- R. PARKER, *Athenian Religion; a History*, Oxford 1996.
- E. RISCH, *Griechische Determinativkomposita. III Teil*, "Indogermanische Forschungen" 59 (1949), 245-294, reprinted in *Kleine Schriften*, Berlin 1981, 62-111.
- E. RISCH, *Wortbildung der homerischen Sprache*, Berlin 1974².
- L. ROBERT, *Les inscriptions grecques de Bulgarie*, "Revue de Philologie" 1959, 165-236, reprinted in *Opera Minora Selecta*, vol. V, Amsterdam 1989, 195-266.
- F. SOLMSEN, *Beiträge zur griechischen Wortforschung*, Erster Teil, Strassburg 1909.
- G. VOTTÉRO, *Procédés d'expressivité dans l'onomastique personnelle de Béotie*, in *Colloques internationaux du CNRS. "La Béotie antique"*, Paris 1985, 403-417.