

Vorbedingung zur Erreichung des eigentlichen Zweckes gedacht: die Achaier sollen dazu gebracht werden, zuversichtlich in den Kampf zu ziehen, und Laertes soll in die Lage versetzt werden, das Unfaßbare zu begreifen, und ins Leben, zu sich selbst zurückgeführt werden. Dem mißlungenen Versuch des Agamemnon setzt der Dichter der Odyssee das Gelingen des Odysseus gegenüber. Die übereinstimmende Formulierung des Mittels, mit dem beide Akteure ihr Ziel zu erreichen suchen, ist für unser Empfinden seltsam; man kann περιῤῥᾶσθαι kaum adäquat übersetzen und nur versuchen, den Inhalt des Gemeinten zu rekonstruieren und mehr oder minder umständlich zu beschreiben.

*Received April 9, 1981.*

ERIC P. HAMP  
University of Chicago  
Department of Linguistics  
Chicago

UDC 807.5—541.2

### ΑΓΟΣΤΟΣ, ΑΓΕΙΡΩ

From Homer's use of ἀγοστός in the (at least once) vivid formula ἔλε γὰρ ἂν ἀγοστῶ Λ 425 'he clutched the earth/ground with his x', where a scene of high activity is depicted as well as from our knowledge of the vocabulary for 'hand' as a body-part, we find it natural that ἀγοστός is to be explained as a marked descriptive appellative rather than as a neutral, or faded, classificatory body-part term. This reasoning reinforces the clear phonetic difficulties with the initial in prompting our rejection of any attempted equation with Skt. *hāsta-* etc. The same line of reasoning guides us independently of any possible support ἀγοστός may later have received from kindred semantic notions with a similar phonetic/morphologic configuration (Faust,

Παλαστή etc.), alluded to by Frisk *GEW* 1. 14<sup>1</sup>. Yet even though I reject such a suffixal explanation I think that Solmsen was on the right track in his suggested relation of \*ἀγορ-στος : ἀγείρω. For the moment let us simply accept the proposal that a sequence \*ἀγορστος would with regular loss of ρ yield ἀγοστός.

This leads us to the problem of ἀγείρω<sup>2</sup>. Cowgill has recently, in *Linguistic and Literary Studies in Honor of A. A. Hill III* 29—31, proposed that ἀγών 'assembly', and in Boeotian with the value ἀγορά, is not to be derived from ἄγω, but from ἀγείρω, with an *n : r* alternation of an unknown type. I am not persuaded by this argument. In any event it would leave ἀγείρω unexplained, although Cowgill would have this an old IE root. I agree however with Cowgill that ἀγορά is a newer derivative, and both ἀγορά and ἄγορος could have been derived within early Greek from ἀγείρω at any time. Similarly ἄγερσις could have been productively derived from ἀγείρω within Greek; likewise ἀγερμός and Dor. ἀγέρτας.

Let us now consider ἄγυρις and πανήγυρις with its well known troublesome vocalism; ἀγύρτης, ἀγυρτήρ, ἀγυρμός, ἄγυρμα can readily be derived within Greek from ἄγυρις. I have suggested that σπυρίς σπυρίδ- with its υρ vocalism is to be traced to the stratum which has been called „Pelasgian“; I have also pointed out that πύργος seems to support strongly a derivation of γ in that stratum from \*g'h. Therefore the most principled source for ἄγυρις would contain a root in the ablaut state \*-g'h<sub>1</sub>-. We may write the proportion ἄγυρις : ἀγείρω = σπυρίδ : σπεῖρα.

In the same stratum \*o > α. Therefore ἄγαρρις may reflect \*g'hor-. We may then see in ἄγορρις a conflation of ἄγαρρις and ἀγορά or ἄγορος. It is perhaps now possible to recover in ἄγορρις<sup>3</sup> the stem which we have adopted for \*ἀγορστος > ἀγοστός; underneath ἀγοστός would be an old nomen instrumenti like σπάρτον.

The root here would thus be \*g'her- 'greifen, fassen' (Pokorny *IEW* 442); ἄ- would represent an old preverb \*ad. If this last conjecture is true, „Pelasgian“ belongs with the West Indo-European grouping.

August 26, 1980.

<sup>1</sup> See also my discussion of 'fist', *Zbornik za filologiju i lingvistiku* (Novi Sad 13, 1970, 292—3. Chantraine *DELG* 1.14 brings no additional light.

<sup>2</sup> See *GEW* 1. 8—9, Chantraine *DELG* 1. 9, 12—13; *GEW* 3. 17 adds only Mycenaean forms.

<sup>3</sup> And in Arcadian πανάγορσις.