

Kaczyńska, Elwira

Remarks on a Cretan gloss in the Hesychian lexicon

Graeco-Latina Brunensia. 2014, vol. 19, iss. 2, pp. [17]-23

ISSN 1803-7402 (print); ISSN 2336-4424 (online)

Stable URL (handle): <https://hdl.handle.net/11222.digilib/131946>

Access Date: 28. 11. 2024

Version: 20220831

Terms of use: Digital Library of the Faculty of Arts, Masaryk University provides access to digitized documents strictly for personal use, unless otherwise specified.

ELWIRA KACZYŃSKA
(UNIVERSITY OF ŁÓDŹ)

REMARKS ON A CRETAN GLOSS IN THE HESYCHIAN LEXICON

The gloss βαῖκαν · Κρητες is usually treated as corrupt. In this paper the author suggests that it should be read as βαῖκ' · ἄν. Κρητες. The dialectal form βαῖκα, as well as its elided variant βαῖκ', corresponds to Attic εἰ ἄν (also ἐάν, ἄν, Ionic ἦν) and represents the Cretan conjunction φαῖ 'if' (= Doric αἰ, Attic-Ionic εἰ) connected with an enclitic particle κα (= Epic and Aeolic κε, Doric κα).

Key words: Ancient Greek dialectology, Cretan phonology, Hesychius of Alexandria.

The Hesychian lexicon contains numerous Cretan glosses, listed or discussed by modern researchers, e.g. KLEEMANN (1872: 20–44); BROWN (1985: 21–90); VASILAKIS (1998: 29–164); WITCZAK (1995: 17–25; 1998: 17–20; 2011: 49–51); KACZYŃSKA (2014: 77–85). Among them we find a Cretan gloss, which is commonly treated as “corrupt”. The editors of the Hesychian lexicon list this gloss in the following form:

βαῖκαν · Κρητες, cf. SCHMIDT (1858: 352); LATTE (1953: 307).

The same reading is repeated in numerous books and dictionaries, e.g. KLEEMANN (1872: 28); BROWN (1985: 37), ADRADOS (1991: 670). A similar entry βαῖκαν · Κρητες may be found in some other publications, e.g. LIDDELL – SCOTT (1996: 302); VASILAKIS (1998: 48). Brown does not explain the Cretan gloss in question, believing that it is “corrupt”. He adds the following comment: “The reading is too uncertain to make any use of this gloss” (BROWN 1985: 37).

In my opinion, the Cretan gloss in question was correctly explained many years ago. In his *Adnotationes* to the Hesychian gloss β–81 Mauricius Schmidt refers to two valuable suggestions proposed by Pearson and

A. Heringa: “βαί · κᾶν Pearson, p. 146; βαίκα · ἐάν Adr. Heringa ap. Valken. Herod. 350, 21 (Boeckh. C. I. II p. 504 a)” (SCHMIDT 1868: 352). The same references are given by KLEEMANN (1872: 28): “Tamen propius ad traditam glossae formam accedere videntur correctiones Pearsoni βαί · κᾶν et Heringae βαί κα · ἐάν, quarum utraque formas vere Creticas ostendit”¹. Following Pearson and Heringa I would like to propose a new (preferable) reading of the Hesychian gloss β–77:

βαίκα’ · ἄν. Κρη̃τες.

It is worth emphasizing that the Attic form ἄν (with the long vowel \bar{a}) represents a contracted form of ἐάν (earlier εἰ ἄν), whereas the lemma βαίκα’ appears to be an elided form of the Cretan βαίκα (originally Doric *φαί κα). A similar gloss (α–1904) is attested in the Hesychian lexicon: αἶ κα · ἐάν (LATTE 1953: 69).

My position is that this Cretan gloss contains the conditional conjunction ‘if’, which is attested as “εἰ in Attic-Ionic and Arcadian; αἰ in Lesbian, Thessalian, Boeotian (ἦ), and all the West Greek dialects” (BUCK 1955: 105). The Attic-Ionic dialects, as well as Arcadian, combine εἰ with the modal particle ἄν², whereas other dialects use *(φ)α ‘if’ connected with two different (enclitic) particles κα (in Boeotian and all the Doric dialects), κε (in Cypriot, Thessalian and Lesbian), also κεν (in Lesbian).

The particle κα is widely attested in the Cretan inscriptional texts, as stressed by BILE (1988: 263–264), whereas αἰ (< Doric *φαί) ‘if’ is frequently replaced by εἰ in the late ancient times. In the mixed system of writing there appears the form εἶ κα instead of αἶ κα (or perhaps αἶκα). In an inscription from Hierapytna (2nd century B.C.) we can read αἰ δέ κα σίνηται (line 28) and εἰ δέ τί κα ὁ Ἱεραπύτνιος ὑπέχθηται ἐς Πρίανσον (line 22–23), see GUARDUCCI (1942: 44), BILE (1988: 263), CHANIOTIS (1996: 255). It is commonly observed that “[t]he substitution of εἰ for αἰ belongs to the earliest stage of Attic (κοινή) influence in the West Greek dialects, but that of ἄν for κα only to the latest, being rarely found except where the dialect is almost wholly κοινή. Hence the hybrid combination εἶ κα is the rule in the later inscriptions of most West Greek dialects” (BUCK 1955: 106).

The words αἶ κα (also αἰ δέ κα) are attested not only in literary texts (cf. Ar. Acharn. 835: αἶ κά τις διδῶ, words of a Megarean), but also in the

¹ Both SCHMIDT (1868: 352) and KLEEMANN (1872: 28) also refer to Vossius’ reconstruction: βαίκαν · αἶγα. Κρη̃τες, which is hardly convincing.

² In Arcadian, like in Cypriot, the particle κε is also used (BUCK 1955: 106). For the Cypriot modal particle *ke*, see EGETMEYER (1992: 66).

famous Cretan Law of Gortyn (5th cent. B.C.) and other Cretan inscriptions³, as well as in the Hesychian lexicon (see above, α–1904). The elided version αἴ κ', which is compatible with the lemma βαίικ' and the literary form αικ' found in Epich. 8.1, Sophr. 33, B17.64 (ADRADOS 1980: 74–75), is soundly attested as well, e.g. αἴ κ' ἀνὲρ [κ]αὶ γυνὴ διακρ[ί]νδων[τ]αι (CALERO SECALL 2000: 164) 'if a husband and wife should be divorced' (WILLETTS 1986: 144), αἴ κ' ὁ ἀνὲρ αἴτιος εἶ (CALERO SECALL 2000: 165) 'if the husband [would] be the cause of the divorce' (WILLETTS 1986: 144). The elided form αἴ κ' (< αἴ κα) is also attested in some inscriptions from Locris (MENDEZ DOSUNA 1985: 256). Even Homer uses αἴ κ' (elided from the Aeolic combination αἴ κε = Epic εἰ ἄν, Ionic ἦν) in his poems, e.g. ὄψεαι, αἴ κ' ἐθέλησθα, βοῶπις πότνια Ἥρη (Hom., *Il.* VIII 471) vs. ὄψεαι, ἦν ἐθέλησθα καὶ αἴ κέν τοι τὰ μεμήλη (Hom., *Il.* IX 359), see CHANTRAINE (1953: 281–282).

It is obvious that the Doric and Cretan sequence αἴ κα (elided to αἴ κ') is an exact equivalent of the Attic-Ionic combination εἰ ἄν, which sometimes forms one word ἐάν, later shortened to ἄν [ān] in Attic and ἦν in Ionic (GOODWIN 1974: 277, 294; BASILE 2001: 745–746). In other words, the suggested Cretan lemma (βαίικ') corresponds exactly to the Attic explanation (ἄν) in the Hesychian gloss in question. Of course, the letter β seems to render the original digamma Ϝ, as it appears in other Hesychian glosses of Cretan origin, e.g.

ἀβέλιον · ἥλιον. Κρηῆτες, cf. Epic ἠέλιος, Attic ἥλιος m. 'sun' (< Proto-Greek *h₂ḗrēlios < PIE. *s₂aweliyos); see BRAUSE (1909: 55).

βᾶλικιώτᾶς · συνέφηβος. Κρηῆτες, cf. Attic ἡλικιώτης m. 'an equal in age, fellow, comrade', see PISANI (1973: 111).

The basic problem is whether the Doric and Aeolic conditional conjunction αἰ 'if' (= Attic-Ionic εἰ) originally contained an initial digamma (*Ϝ-) or not. I believe that the digamma is possible and acceptable in this word, though the authors of Greek etymological dictionaries seem to ignore it. They agree that the etymology of the conjunction εἰ / αἰ 'if' is unclear, cf. "Wunsch-, Konditional- und Fragepartikel unsicherer Herkunft" (FRISK 1960: 450): "Et.: incertaine" (CHANTRAINE 1970: 316); "ETYM Uncertain" (BEEKES 2010: 379). They refer to SCHWYZER – DEBRUNNER (1950: 557, 683) for an interjectional origin of αἰ and at the same time they repeat the

³ E.g. αἴ κα μὴ τι πόλει[μος κωλύση] (line 4) and αἴ κα μὴ ἀμφοτέροις δοξῆι (line 9) in a pact of friendship between Hierapytna and Lyctus (the end of 3rd century B.C.), cf. CHANIOTIS (1996: 241). In the same inscription we also find the hybrid sequence εἰ ... κα (line 7: εἰ δέ τί κα ... λάβωμεν).

old suggestion by BRUGMANN – THUMB (1913: 616), according to which εἶ represents the locative singular of the demonstrative pronoun *e- (< PIE. *h₁e-). The interjectional and demonstrative etymologies are completely irrelevant and do not explain the observed dialectal variation εἶ / αἶ. On the other hand, the interjection αἶ or αἶ̃ (also αἶαἶ̃), expressing an exclamation of surprise, pain or sorrow, seems to be a separate word (BEEKES 2010: 30), which probably begins with a digamma (*ɸ-), if it is related to Armenian *vay* ‘woe, misfortune’, Latin *vae* ‘ah! alas!’ (an exclamation of pain or dread), Gothic *wai* ‘woe’, Middle Irish *fáe*, Welsh *gwaе* ‘alas!’, Latvian *vai* ‘id.’ (< PIE. **wai*), cf. POKORNY (1959: 1110–1111); LEHMANN (1986: 387–388); DE VAAN (2008: 650). I am not convinced of the interjectional origin of Doric and Aeolic αἶ ‘if’, suggested by SCHWYZER – DEBRUNNER (1950: 557, 683) and other scholars, but it cannot be ignored that accepting this hypothesis means that we should reconstruct a Proto-Greek archetype *ɸαι (‘woe, alas!’ > ‘if’).

In fact, there is no obstacle to assuming that the digamma should be reconstructed for the Cretan form βαίκ(α) ‘if’ (< Doric *ɸαί κ(α)). What is more, the initial digamma ɸ- appears to be confirmed by a different gloss (β–93) registered by Hesychius of Alexandria:

βαίταν · Ἑλληνας.

This gloss demonstrates exactly the same problem, as the above-mentioned Cretan item. It contains a lemma and an ethnical specification, but no explanation of the lemma is given. It is necessary to repair the incorrect form of the gloss in question by isolating the three basic parts, namely: βαί τ’ (lemma), ἄν (explanation) and Ἑλληνας (ethnic form). In my opinion, the gloss should be reconstructed as follows:

βαί τ’ · ἄν. Ἑλληνας.

If this reading and restitution (the sequence βαίταν formed by the three original words βαί τ’ · ἄν) is correct, then the lemma must contain the conjunction ɸαι ‘if’ (written as βαι) accompanied by the enclitic particle τε ‘and’ (= Latin *-que*) elided before a vowel in the original text. The ethnic designation Ἑλληνας in the early Byzantine age indicates a folk (vulgar or pagan) character of the gloss. At any rate, it is clear that the Hesychian gloss β–93, as well as the Cretan one under discussion (β–77), documents the initial digamma (ɸ-). This phoneme was preserved for some time in the West Greek (Doric) dialects, as is confirmed by a number of Tsakonian forms, e.g. Tsak. βαννί [vanní] n. ‘lamb’ (< Late Laconian *ɸαννίον

< Doric *φανίον), cf. KACZYŃSKA (2014: 78); Tsak. δαβελέ [dhavelé] ‘fire-brand’ (< Doric *δαφελός, cf. Attic δᾶλός ‘fire-brand, piece of blazing wood; burnt-out torch’), cf. ANDRIOTIS (1974: 200). Traces of the Doric digamma (ϕ) are also attested in the Modern Cretan vocabulary, e.g. Mod. Gk. dial. (East Cretan) σκαιβός adi., also σκαιβρός ‘linkisch, ungeschickt; ungesellig; dumm’ (< Doric *σκαίφός ‘left’, cf. Epic σκαιός adj. ‘left, western; unlucky, mischievous; awkward, clumsy’), cf. ANDRIOTIS (1974: 495).

My final conclusion is that the original conjunction αἰ ‘if’ in the Doric dialects had to begin with the initial digamma (*ϕ-).

Appendix on an Italic conjunction denoting ‘if’.

To explain the possible origin of the two variant forms of the Greek conjunction εἰ / αἰ ‘if’, we should refer to the Italic forms of the conjunction ‘if’. According to UNTERMANN (2000: 725–726) and DE VAAN (2008: 561), Old Latin *sei*, Latin *sī*, Volscan *se* seem to derive from **sei* (loc. sg. m. ‘thus, so’, originally ‘in this’)⁴, whereas Oscan *svaí*, *svai*, *suae* ‘if; whether’, Umbrian *sve*, *sue*, South Picene *suai* ‘id.’ represent Italic **swai* (loc. sg. f.). In other words, at least the Osco-Umbrian conditional conjunction ‘if’ had to contain the Proto-Indo-European phoneme **w*, whose reflex is the digamma (*ϕ) in Proto-Greek.

It is uncertain whether the Greek dialectal forms for ‘if’ (Attic-Ionic, Arcadian εἰ vs. Aeolic, Doric αἰ, Cretan φαἰ) are related in any way to the Latin and Italic conjunctions (see OLat. *sei* vs. Osc. *svaí*, *svai*, *suae* ‘if’). However, the similarity of the Greek and Italic forms is more than striking, though one mysterious difference is noteworthy (namely that the Greek lexical data show no traces of the initial **s-*).

Bibliography

ADRADOS, FRANCISCO R. [ED.]. 1980. *Diccionario griego-español*. Vol. I. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.

⁴ It cannot be excluded, however, that the Latin forms (OLat. *sei*, Lat. *sī* ‘if’, *sīm* ‘but if’, *sīc* ‘thus, so’, *sīve*, *seu* ‘or if, whether’ and so on) may contain the initial cluster **sw-*, which was regularly changed to *s-*, cf. Lat. *saltus* m. ‘forest-pasture; woodland, forest’ (< PIE. **swaltus*); Lat. *sex* ‘six’ (< PIE. **sweks*); Lat. *socer* ‘father-in-law’ (< PIE. **swékuros*), Lat. *soror* f. ‘sister’ (< PIE. **swesōr* f. ‘id.’), Lat. *sulcus* ‘furrow’ (< PIE. **swolkos*), Lat. *sonus* m. ‘noise, sound’ (< PIE. **swonos*); Lat. *somnus* m. ‘sleep’ (< PIE. **swopnos*), cf. MULLER (1926: 457–462).

- ADRADOS, FRANCISCO R. [ED.]. 1991. *Diccionario griego-español*. Vol. III. Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas.
- ANDRIOTIS, NIKOLAOS. 1974. *Lexikon der Archaismen in neugriechischen Dialekten*. Wien: Verlag der Österreichischen Akademie der Wissenschaften.
- BASILE, NICOLA. 2001. *Sintassi storica del greco antico*. Bari: Levante Editori.
- BEEKES, ROBERT. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. Vol. I–II. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- BILE, MONIQUE. 1988. *Le dialecte crétois ancien*. Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner.
- BRAUSE, JOHANNES. 1909. *Lautlehre der kretischen Dialekte*. Halle a. S.: Max Niemeyer.
- BROWN, RAYMOND A. 1985. *Evidence for Pre-Greek Speech on Crete from Greek Alphabetic Sources*. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- BRUGMANN, KARL – THUMB, ALBERT. 1913. *Griechische Grammatik*. 4. Auflage. München: C. H. Beck.
- BUCK, CARL DARLING. 1955. *The Greek Dialects. Grammar. Selected Inscriptions, Glossary*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- CALERO SECALL, INÉS. 2000. *Leyes de Gortina*. (Supplementa Mediterránea 2). Madrid: Ediciones Clásicas.
- CHANIOITIS, ANGELOS. 1996. *Die Verträge zwischen kretischen Poleis in der hellenistischen Zeit*. Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag.
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE. 1953. *Grammaire homérique*. Tome II: *Syntaxe*. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck.
- CHANTRAINE, PIERRE. 1970. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. Vol. II. Paris: Éditions Klincksieck.
- EGETMEYER, MARKUS. 1967. *Wörterbuch zu den inschriften im kyprischen Syllabar*. Berlin – New York: Walter de Gruyter.
- FRISK, HJALMAR. 1960. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. B. I. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.
- GOODWIN, WILLIAM W. 1974. *A Greek Grammar*. London – Basingstoke, MacMillan.
- GUARDUCCI, MARGARITA [ED.]. 1942. *Inscriptiones Creticae, opera et consilio Friderici Halbherr collectae*. Vol. III: *Tituli Cretae Orientalis*. Romae: La Libreria dello Stato.
- KACZYŃSKA, ELWIRA. 2014. “A Newly Identified Cretan Gloss (βάρπιον).” *Graeco-Latina Brunensia*, 19 (1), 77–85.
- KLEEMANN, GUSTAVUS MAXIMILIANUS. 1872. *De universa Creticae dialecti indole adiecta glossarum creticarum collection*. Halis Saxonum: Formis Hendeliis.
- LATTE, KURT [ED.]. 1953. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I. Hauniae: Ejnar Munksgaard.
- LEHMANN, WINFRED P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- LIDDELL, HENRY GEORG – SCOTT, ROBERT. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. With a revised supplement. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- MENDEZ DOSUNA, JULIAN. 1985. *Los dialectos dorios del noroeste. Gramática y estudio dialectal*. Salamanca: Ediciones Universidad de Salamanca.
- MULLER, FREDERIK. 1926. *Altitalisches Wörterbuch*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.
- PISANI, VITTORE. 1973. *Manuale storica della lingua greca*. 2. edizione. Brescia: Paideia Editrice.
- POKORNY, JULIUS. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern – München: Francke Verlag.
- SCHMIDT, MAURICIUS [ED.]. 1858. *Hesychii Alexandrini Lexicon*. Vol. I (A–Δ). Ienae: sumptibus Frederici Maukii.

- SCHWYZER, EDUARD – DEBRUNNER, ALBERT. 1950. *Griechische Grammatik*. B. II. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung.
- UNTERMAN, JÜRGEN. 2000. *Wörterbuch des Oskisch-Umbrischen*. Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter.
- DE VAAN, MICHIEL. 2008. *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages*. Leiden – Boston: Brill.
- VASILAKIS, ANTONIS THOMAS. 1998. *Το Κρητικό λεξιλόγιο*. Ηράκλειο Κρήτης: the author.
- WILLETTS, RONALD F. 1986. *Selected Papers*. Vol. I. Amsterdam: Adolf M. Hakkert.
- WITCZAK, KRZYSZTOF, TOMASZ. 1995. "Non-Greek Elements in the Animal Terminology of the Ancient Polyrhhenians." *Eos*, 83(1), 17–25.
- WITCZAK, KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ. 1998. "Three Cretan Glosses of Pre-Greek Origin." *Živa Antika*, 48, 17–20.
- WITCZAK, KRZYSZTOF TOMASZ. 2011. "Some Remarks on the Ancient Contacts between Crete and Egypt." *Do-so-mo*, 9, 49–51.

aradaina@gmail.com

