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REMARKS ON A CRETAN GLOSS
IN THE HESYCHIAN LEXICON

The gloss βαίκαν · … Κρῆτες is usually treated as corrupt. In this paper the author suggests that it should be read as βαίκ’ · ἄν. Κρῆτες. The dialectal form βαίκα, as well as its elided variant βαίκ’, corresponds to Attic εἰ ἄν (also ἐὰν, ἄν, Ionic ἤν) and represents the Cretan conjunction μαί ’if’ (= Doric αἰ, Attic-Ionic εἰ) connected with an enclitic particle κα (= Epic and Aeolic κε, Doric κα).
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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:

βαίκαν · …… Κρῆτες, 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 βαίκαν · Κρῆτες 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

βαίκ’ · ἄν. Κρήτες.

It is worth emphasizing that the Attic form ἄν (with the long vowel ā) represents a contracted form of ἐάν (earlier εἰ ἄν), whereas the lemma βαίκ’ appears to be an elided form of the Cretan βαίκα (originally Doric *ϝαίκα). A similar gloss (α–1904) is attested in the Hesychian lexicon: αἴ 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; αἴ in Lesbian, Thessalian, Boeotian (ἡ), 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 *(ϝ)αι ‘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 *(ϝ)αι) ‘if’ is frequently replaced by εἰ in the late ancient times. In the mixed system of writing there appears the form εἰ κα instead of αἴ κα (or perhaps αἴκα). In an inscription from Hierapytna (2nd century B.C.) we can read αἰ δέ κα σίνηται (line 28) and εἰ δέ τί κα ἵ Ἐραπότνιος ὕπέκθηται ἐξ 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 αἴ 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 εἰ κα is the rule in the later inscriptions of most West Greek dialects” (BUCK 1955: 106).

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

---

1 Both SCHMIDT (1868: 352) and KLEEMANN (1872: 28) also refer to Vossius’ reconstruction: βαίκαν · αἴγα. Κρήτες, 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 inscriptions\(^3\), as well as in the Hesychian lexicon (see above, α–1904). The elided version αἴ κ’, which is compatible with the lemma βαίκ’ and the literary form αἴκ’ found in Epich. 8.1, Sophr. 33, B17.64 (ADRADOS 1980: 74–75), is soundly attested as well, e.g. αἴ κ’ ἀνέρ [κ]αι γυνᾶ διακρ[ι]νόν[τ]αι (CALERO SECALL 2000: 164) ‘if a husband and wife should be divorced’ (WILLETTS 1986: 144), αἰ κ’ ὁ ἀνέρ αἴτιος ἐι (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 ἤν) in his poems, e.g. ὄψεαι, αἴ κ’ ἐθέλῃσθα, βοῶπις πότνια Ἡρη (Hom., II. VIII 471) vs. διον, ἰν ἐθέλησθα καί αἴ κέν τοι τά μεμήλη (Hom., II. 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 ἄν, later shortened to ἄν [ἀν] in Attic and ἤν in Ionic (GOODWIN 1974: 277, 294; BASILE 2001: 745–746). In other words, the suggested Cretan lemma (βαίκ’) 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.

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{αβέλιον} & \cdot \text{ἥλιον. Κρῆτες, cf. Epic ἠέλιος, Attic ἥλιος m. ‘sun’ (< Proto-Greek *ῃϝέλιος < PIE. *sāweliyos); see BRAUSE (1909: 55).} \\
\text{βαλικίωτᾶς} & \cdot \text{συνέφηβος. Κρῆτες, cf. Attic ἡλικιώτης m. ‘an equal in age, fellow, comrade’, see PISANI (1973: 111).}
\end{align*}
\]

The basic problem is whether the Doric and Aeolic conditional conjunction αἴ ‘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 / αἴ ‘if’ is unclear, cf. “Wunsch-, Konditional- und Fragepartikel unsicherer Herkunft” (FRISK 1960: 450): “Ei.: incertainae” (CHANTRAINE 1970: 316); “ETYM Uncertain” (BEEKES 2010: 379). They refer to SCHWYZER – DEBRUNNER (1950: 557, 683) for an interjectional origin of αἴ and at the same time they repeat the

\(^3\) E.g. αἴ κα μὴ τι πόλε[μος κολύση] (line 4) and αἴ κα μὴ ἀμφότερος δοξῆ (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 δὲ τί κα … λάβωμεν).
old suggestion by BRUGMANN – THUMB (1913: 616), according to which εἰ 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 εἰ / αἰ. On the other hand, the interjection αἴ or αἶ (also αἰαῖ), expressing an exclamation of surprise, pain or sorrow, seems to be a separate word (BEEKES 2010: 30), which probably begins with a digamma (*ϝ-), if it is related to Armenian vay ‘woe, misfortune’, Latin vae ‘ah! alas!’ (an exclamation of pain or dread), Gothic wai ‘woe’, Middle Irish fāe, Welsh gwaie ‘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 αἴ ‘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 *ϝαι (‘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 *ϝαί κα). What is more, the initial digamma ϝ- appears to be confirmed by a different gloss (β–93) registered by Hesychius of Alexandria:

βαίταν · Ἕλληνες.

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 Ἕλληνες (ethnic form). In my opinion, the gloss should be reconstructed as follows:

βαί τ’ · ἄν. Ἕλληνες.

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 ϝαι ‘if’ (written as βαι) accompanied by the enclitic particle τε ‘and’ (= Latin -que) elided before a vowel in the original text. The ethnic designation Ἕλληνες 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 (ϝ-). 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 [vanni] n. ‘lamb’ (< Late Laconian *ϝαννίον

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

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 svai, 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 (*ϝ) in Proto-Greek.

It is uncertain whether the Greek dialectal forms for ‘if’ (Attic-Ionic, Arcadian εἰ vs. Aeolic, Doric αἰ, Cretan ϝαι) are related in any way to the Latin and Italic conjunctions (see OLat. sei vs. Osc. svai, 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-).
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⁴ It cannot be excluded, however, that the Latin forms (OLat. sei, Lat. sī ‘if’, sīn ‘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. sover ‘father-in-law’ (< PIE. *swekuros), Lat. soror f. ‘sister’ (< PIE. *sweśōr 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).
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