

Дуготрајност овог стваралаштва — од самих почетака наше цивилизације, кроз читаво историјско раздобље до, без мало, наших дана — открива његове дубоке корене. Очигледно, космологија није само једно од многих учења из прошлости — ни само религија, ни само филозофија, ни само наука, она је све то заједно — сама идеологија старих друштава. Тако се људско стваралаштво указује у новој светлости — оно је у служби те идеологији и њених тежњи да проникне у више, космичке законе и појаве и сагледа своје место, место човека у космосу, Уствари то је стваралаштво човека као космичког бића.

*Примљено 30. III 1989.*

## R É S U M É

### G. *Cvetković Tomašević*: LES REPRÉSENTATIONS SYMBOLIQUES DU COSMOS DANS LE GENRE MONUMENTAL DE L'ARCHITECTURE ET DE L'ART FIGURATIF

Après avoir identifié les représentations symboliques du cosmos dans le genre monumental de l'architecture et de l'art figuratif y appliqué, l'auteur a démontré leur pérennité de cinq millénaires à peu près — depuis l'édifice récemment découvert à Tell Gubba en Iraq comme le plus ancien (3.000 avant J. Chr.) à travers toute la période historique dans l'Ancien Proche Orient, la Grèce archaïque et classique l'hellénisme, l'époque romaine et paléochrétienne, jusqu'au Moyen âge byzantin et postbyzantin.

Dans la forme et la construction des édifices et dans la composition, l'iconographie et la symbolique de l'art figuratif, l'auteur voit la manifestation d'une de deux conceptions élémentaires du cosmos, sphéristique ou cubistique. Leur succession a provoqué la succession des rotondes à coupole avec des parallépipèdes architraves dans l'architecture et la succession des compositions concentriques et circulaires de coupole avec celles symétriques et triangulaires du fronton ou celles en registres superposés projetant le cube dans l'art figuratif. Ici, les figurations constituant une composition symbolisent ou représentent les quatre domaines du cosmos soit païen ou chrétien.

ERIC P. HAMP  
Chicago

UDC 807.5—541.2

## PREHELLENICA

### 7. Words derived from IE \**gher-*

I have attributed (ŽA 31, 1981, 83—4) ἀγέρω and ἀγοστός to the stratum of Prehellenic words derived from Indo-European which have passed into the Greek language. I have also at the same time associated other Greek words with these. It will be useful now to clarify the group as a family of forms, to bring into relief their descent, and to make explicit their morphological formation. While I differ in the details of the etymologies claimed, and in particular in the descent

of the Indo-European palatals in Prehellenic (in which I see a typologically „centum“ merger of the original palatals and pure velars), I want to acknowledge my great debt to Vladimir I. Georgiev and A. J. van Windekens whose insistent marshalling of data forced me to think about the Prehellenic problem and to reach conclusions which at first I long resisted. I regret very much that they are both no longer with us.

This discussion should be added to the dossier recorded in Pokorny *IEW* 442.

It appears that there are four primary borrowings from Prehellenic that have entered the Greek language: ἀγείρω, ἄγυρις, ἄγαρρις, and ἀγοστός.

ἀγείρω could of course be descended from a formation with suffixed \*-s-, like ἀλέξω. We therefore reconstruct the Indo-European which lies behind the Prehellenic as *\*ad-ǵher(-s)-i<sup>h</sup>/o* > *\*ag(g)er-(s)i<sup>h</sup>/o-*. At an early stage of Greek the stem *\*ageri<sup>h</sup>/o-* which was taken as a simplex was derived to form ἀγορά (like τομή), ἄγορος (like τόμος), ἄγερσις, ἀγερομός (like θερομός), Dor. ἀγέρτας. The stem of ἀγείρω cannot represent an old IE primary yod-present since we should then expect zero-grade *\*ǵh<sup>h</sup>-* in the base.

ἄγυρις must be an old *i*-stem verbal noun *\*ad-ǵh<sup>h</sup>(H)-i-* like Old Irish *guin* ‘wounding’ (cf. *Listy filologické* 111, 1988, 144), and it is possible that it was originally a set base. Then, taking *\*ag(g)ur-i* > *\*agur-* as a simplex, Greek derived ἀγύρ-της, ἀγυρ-τήρ, ἀγυρ-μός, and ἄγυρ-μα.

The original \*-s- suffixation is assured by ἄγαρρις < *\*ad-ǵhor-s-i-*. Then Greek reshaped *\*agars-i-* to *\*agors-i-* just as other derivatives of *\*ageri<sup>h</sup>/o-* were formed. This resulted in ἄγορρις and Arcad. πανάγορσις.

In light of the above we may regard ἀγοστός < *\*ἀγοροστός* as refashioned by Greek from *\*agarsto-*, which would be a well formed nomen instrumenti *\*ad-ǵhor-s-to-* (cf. *NOWELE* 9, 1987, 89—90; *ŽA* 31, 1981, 95)<sup>1</sup> from a desiderative \*-s- formation. We see then that we have precisely the semantic relation reflected in Lithuanian *rankà* (= Slavic *rok'á*) : *riñkti*. We may in turn speculate that Slavic *grǫstb* ‘fist’ is to be traced to an old borrowing from a centum dialect source *\*g(h)ursto-*.

Note that for all of these the basic formation is a compound with the preverb *\*ad*, on which see *IF* 90, 1985, 70.

<sup>1</sup> Here and in *σπάρον* we might perhaps have expected Prehellenic θ, and not τ.