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It is an honor to participate in this long overdue tribute to Emil Forrer, a scholar of unusual brilliance and originality who never received during his lifetime the recognition that he deserved. Among his many accomplishments, Forrer was one of the first to recognize Cuneiform Luwian as a language separate from but closely related to Hittite (Forrer 1919 and 1922: 215-223). He also made pioneering contributions to the decipherment of the Anatolian hieroglyphs (Forrer 1932), the language of which was eventually shown to be a form of Luwian. Thanks to the efforts of several generations of scholars and most recently to the magnificent new corpus of Iron Age inscriptions by J.D. Hawkins (2000), we may now use the evidence of HLuwian to help solve problems presented by CLuwian.

Calvert Watkins (1993: 469-477) has offered a fundamentally persuasive analysis of the peculiar-looking CLuwian word for 'oath', neum nom.-acc. sg. ḫurīn, elsewhere ḫurīr- < original *ḫurīru, *ḫurīru-. He compares for the root Greek ὄροι, Homeric ὄργ 'prayer; imprecation, curse' < *hör-a- from a base *ḫur-aw-. For the morphology he rightly addsuces Latin salita, sūlī (< *hör-sū-) beside Sanskrit adhvu etc. (< *hör-sū- or -w-). He notes that the word NINNADURU-2, huragge, hūrege, 'bread soup' appearing in Hittite contexts surely has the same structure, despite the absence of an obvious Indo-European root etymology.

Watkins' derivation is very attractive, impeccable both phonologically and morphologically. However, his formulation leaves two points about the CLuwian word unexplained. First, what is the source of the unexpected length in the -u? This is a serious problem, since it is otherwise unparalleled in an Anatolian noun root in -u-. Hittite ḫur-īr-
nud' is attested forty times without plane spelling of the second -u-. CLuvian nud' 'prosperity' appears twenty-one times without plane for the second vowel versus twice with it. In contrast, the noun ḫurriḫ/ḫurriḫ shows twenty-two spellings with plane of the -i-, against only six without it. There can be little doubt that this noun has a long -i- in the second syllable whereas the others do not. The long -i- of Latin ovis is of no help, since it is equally unexplained.

Second, there is no obvious motivation for the final -n of the nom.-acc. singular. Watkins assumes that it is merely analogical to thematic neuter nouns in -en < -em. However, once again the pattern of other neuter stems of similar structure argues against this CLuvian nud' 'prosperity' and similar 'assent' show only nom.-acc. sg. līša and ṣa respectively. Likewise HLVuvian tarut- /'status' has a nom.-acc. singular taru-nu with no trace of an -u-. Nor is -n ever attested to the nom.-acc. singular of the very numerous Luvian neuter nouns in -n (nom.-acc. singular in -n).2

A solution to these two problems is suggested by the inflectional pattern of two other HLVuvian neuter nouns. The first of these is the word for foreigner, for which we have the following relevant evidence: nom.-acc. sg. (*CASTRUM)tru-ru/i-mi-li-qa (KARATEPE, §LVI), nom.-acc. pl. (*CASTRUM)atu-ra/i-mi-li-qi-qa (KARATEPE, § XIX), dat.-loc. sg. *CASTRUM*-t (KARATEPE, § XL). These are to be read as /har̃-nis-za/ /har-nis-sa/ and /har-nis/ respectively. The second crucial example is a word for blood sacrifice (or similar): nom.-acc. sg. [ < III-a-har-ri-i-ši]-mi-zi (KARKAMIŠ A29h, frag. 3, 1), nom.-acc. pl. [ < III-a-har-ri-i-mi]-n-zi (KARKAMIŠ Á11b, § 16 and A12, § 11). These must be read as *[huš̂-har-tn-za] and *[huš̂-har-tn-sa]. For the sense see Hawkins (2000: 14); but the first example proves that the noun is a neuter and that *huš̂-har-tn-sa/ must thus be analyzed as neuter nom.-acc. plural, not feminine nom. singular (contra Hawkins loc. cit. and Stolte 1990: 554-557).

These nouns appear to show stems /har-nis-sa/ and /huš̂-har-tn-sa/, but original thematic stems in -n1- are extremely unlikely. The only Luvian stems of this shape are CLuvian bāb̄artā- (a toponymic feature) and mābabarte- l? (NB the same sequence

---

2 In the few cases where these nouns do show their nom.-acc. singular, what they show is rather restoration of the final dental stop from the root of the paradigm: HLVuvian /wu-tu-/- 'beetle' with nom.-acc. sg. wu-ri-ta (i.e. [wuš̂-ša-ša] /<wuš̂-ša-ša/>). That the spelling wu-ri-ta is to be analyzed thus (and not as a possible /wuš̂-tu-za/) is shown by CLuvian (aš-zi, išša-ši /<ašša-ša/> 'in the' /<ašša-ša/> after oblique /išša-/- (for expected *ašša-zā) see Hawkins 2000: 91 & 179-80.
-orSfA-3, and perhaps the very unclear hapax legomena alifun and hatun;2 On the other hand, there is a well-established class of Luvi an neuter nouns in -sr/; e.g. Clavian buflif- ‘illness’ (cf. gulliana- ‘to sicken’), haflif- ‘limb, member’, happef- ‘foot-stool’. One may further add -orSf- (in orSfanea-s) and *uflif- ‘spell-binding’ (cf. on all these Sturke 1990: 109-113). For /ahsmis-/ one may compare specifically Clavian *suamish- ‘examination’ (Sturke 1990: 119).

I suggest that our two Luvi an nouns likewise reflect original neuter stems in -sr/, with secondary thematic inflection, or perhaps simply addition of the thematic ending -am in the nom-acc. singular, which for Luvi an amounts to the same thing. What is crucial is that due to prehistoric changes the inflection of thematic and athematic neuter nouns became identical in Luvi an except for precisely the nom-acc. singular. Under these circumstances analogical spread of the thematic ending -am (NB the entire exodus, not merely -sr/) to the athematic type seems a trivial process. The model would have been original thematic neuters such as Luvi an /istiMae-/ ‘throne, seat’ from a virtual *istiMeto-/ (for the secondary suffix *-to- see Sturke 1990: 117 & 416 and Melchert 1999: 366)1

N-A. *haris/ /hiru/ /istartu/* /haris/* /hiru/* /istartu/*
D-L. /hamis/ /hirudo/* /istartu/* /hamisan/* /hirudo/* /istartu/*
Ab-Is. /hamisd/* /hirudud/* /istartu/*

Conformation for this reshaping of neuter stems in -sr/ in the nom-acc. singular is furnished by the Luvi an word for ‘(memorial) stele’ /tale-3/. Beside the ambiguous dat.-loc. sg. (STELE)Is-nl-si (MEHARDE, § 3) we find on the one hand nom.-acc. sg. (STELE)Is-nl-ad (SHEIZAR, § 4), which must be read as /tale-3a/ (with Hawkins 2000: 418), but on the other hand also nom.-acc. sg. (STELE)Is-nl-ad-za (MEHARDE, § 3), which must be /talezan-za/ with the added -am. A further example of a renewed athematic neuter nom.-acc. singular with -am is /parun-2a/ ‘house’ (i.e. oblique stem parun- ‘-za’ replacing *par-; the expected cognate of Hitite paH-).

2 The suggested meaning ‘tusnide’ for hungus-3 and the etymological comparison with Greek: langus by Pulvel 1900: 127-128) are attractive, but his morphological analysis fails to explain the geminate -sr-. As shown below, Luvi an neuter nouns in -sr/- show consistently single intervocalic -sr-. As E. Rieken points out (pers. comm.), we should probably view this process as taking place in two steps. First, the pattern of /istiMae-/ was spread to invariant consonant stems like /hisd-/. Then the nom-acc. singular ending -am was generalized to other neuter stems. A direct influence of /istiMae-/ on /hisd/ would likely have led to nom-acc. singular */tale/.

3 This word is transparently derived from the Luvi an stem /stara- ‘wrestled’ (for which see Melchert 1997). It thus probably did not refer to a staple in the general sense, but specifically to one used for cultic purposes such as in memory of the dead.
We may now account for the existence and shape of Cluvian nom.-acc. sg. *jhr.iₚ. 
As in the other cases cited above, thematic -en was added to the inherited form with zero ending and the new form then underwent syncope: *jhr.i-w-en > *jhr.iₚ. For the syncope one may compare Cluvian NINDA-**salum-tiₚ < *salówn-š-ty (contra Starke 1990: 46: the word cannot be a system, which would have led only to *salown-ty and the frequent reduction of neuter nom.-acc. singular -š-ty to -š in Ty in Htiuvi). That the resulting vowel is long is not unexpected and is paralleled in Latvian: cf. Cluvian a-am-ni-š-ty 'carries out' < *amnuši or *am-w-š-ty 'they put' < *alunwamt. In the word for 'sathi' the long vowel was trivially generalized from the nom.-acc. singular *jhr.iₚ to the oblique stem *jhr.iₚ-, replacing inherited *jhr.iₚ-. We thus can see and should maintain Watkins' derivation of the Cluvian word from a preform *ghr.iₚ, *ghr.iₚ-ₚ, with all of its implications for the PIE inflection of nominal stems in *-er-.
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