

DOING THINGS REVERENTLY AMONG THE LUWIANS *

Résumé. — Bien que le lien entre *izzi(ya)*-^(di) ‘faire’, un des verbes les plus fréquents de la langue louvite, et la racine indo-européenne **H₁ag* ‘honorer, vénérer’ soit établie de manière convaincante, les détails de l’évolution formelle et sémantique de ce verbe sont restés obscurs jusqu’à présent. Dans cette contribution, je reconstruis la combinaison **izzi* + *a*-^(di) ‘agir, accomplir révérencieusement’, qui fonctionnait comme l’équivalent de **a*-^(di) ‘faire’ dans un style plus élevé.

Abstract. — One of the most common Luwian verbs, *izzi(ya)*-^(di) ‘to do, make’, has been convincingly connected with the Proto-Indo-European root **H₁ag* ‘to honour, worship’, but the details of its formal and semantic development have not been clarified up to now. The goal of this contribution is to demonstrate that we are dealing with the historical phrase **izzi* + *a*-^(di) ‘to do or make reverently’, which was specialized as the acrolect equivalent of *a*-^(di) ‘to do, make’.

1. Historical Prologue

One of the major accomplishments of Ancient Near Eastern Studies in the twentieth century was the decipherment of Anatolian Hieroglyphs. This indigenous writing system was deployed in Anatolia and northern Syria between the 14th and 8th centuries BCE and is mostly known through monumental inscriptions. In the early part of the twentieth century, they were known as “Hittite Hieroglyphs”, while the language associated with the relevant texts was called “Hieroglyphic Hittite”. Only gradually scholars came

* This paper is written under the auspices of the international project “Luwili: Luwian Religious Discourse between Anatolia and Syria”, co-directed by Alice Mouton and Ilya Yakubovich and funded by the ANR (France, ANR-17-FRAL-0007-01) and DFG (Germany, YA 472/2-1). Its preliminary versions were presented as a part of the invited talk “New Steps in the Decipherment of the Luwian Language” at the University of Munich in April 2013 and at the second workshop “Luwic Dialects: Inheritance and Diffusion” in Barcelona in October 2014. I am grateful to the audience of both these gatherings for their engaged feedback. In addition, the content of this paper has benefited from the discussions with Stephen Durnford, Alwin Kloekhorst, †Anna Morpurgo-Davies, Elisabeth Rieken, and David Sasseville. Furthermore, Alwin Kloekhorst graciously shared with me his paper on a related subject ahead of its publication, while Stephen Durnford and Alice Mouton helped me with the English and French style of this contribution. It goes without saying that none of the people mentioned or implied in this footnote are to be blamed for my possible shortcomings.

to the understanding that the Anatolian hieroglyphic inscriptions were written in Luwian, a language related to Hittite but not identical to it, and which is also attested in cuneiform transmission through incantations embedded in Hittite texts.

The crucial final confirmation of the linguistic equivalence between the hieroglyphic and cuneiform representations came from the revised phonetic values of several important glyphs, which came to be known as the New Readings (see J. D. HAWKINS *et al.* [1974]). The signs previously read as <a>, <i>, <ā> and <∆> received the new interpretation as <i>, <ia>, <zi> and <za> respectively. The New Readings effectively eliminated the majority of linguistic discrepancies between the Luwian texts in cuneiform transmission and “Hieroglyphic Hittite” inscriptions. For example, the proximal deictic stem in hieroglyphic transmission, which had previously been read as *ī-a-*, obtained the new reading *za-a-*, which exactly matched its reading *za-a-* in cuneiform transmission. In the same vein, a nominative plural ending of the common gender, previously read as *-a-i*, obtained the new reading *-i-zi*, which is perfectly compatible with its reading *-in-zi* in cuneiform transmission, since pre-consonantal /n/ is not reflected in hieroglyphic orthography.

There was, however, one fairly common item, for which the New Readings created problems, rather than solving them. This was the stem of the verb ‘to do, make’, previously read as *a-i-ā-* /*a-i-a-* /*a-i-*, which received the interpretation *i-zi-ia-* / *i-zi-i-* / *i-zi-* under the New Readings. By this time, it had already been established that the Luwian verb ‘to do, make’ attested in cuneiform transmission had two stems, *a-* and *aya-*. Hitt. *ie-*, *iya-* ‘to do, make’ and Lyc. *a-* ‘id.’ had been acknowledged as its cognates alongside the “Hieroglyphic Hittite” **aya-* (see E. LAROCHE [1959], p. 23-24). The new values of the Anatolian glyphs would sever the last link¹.

David Hawkins, Anna Morpurgo-Davies, and Günter Neumann, the scholars responsible for the New Readings, acknowledged the problem, but they failed to offer a convincing solution to it. They admitted that “this is the one occasion in which the new readings do not bring Hiero[lyphic] closer to Cun[eiform] Luwian and that the breaking of this link rests on the reading of not one but two signs” (J. D. HAWKINS *et al.* [1974], p. 186). They followed up with a cautiously expressed proposal that the *-z-* element

1. The detailed discussion of the extra-Anatolian connections of Luw. *a-* and Hitt. *ie-*, *iya-* remains beyond the scope of this paper. For my views on this subject, see I. YAKUBOVICH (2010a, p. 57), for the critique of some of these views, cf. F. SOMMER (2014, p. 317-318). Under both accounts, Tocharian A *ya-/ ypa-* ‘to do, make’ must be treated as the closest external cognate of the Anatolian verb. The Luwian stem *aya-* was analyzed as the original reduplicated variant of *ya-* in I. YAKUBOVICH (2010a, p. 56).

attested in *i-zi-ia-* may be related to the Hittite iterative suffix *-šša-* (*ibid.*, p. 187). This supposition did not find a following in subsequent literature (for its flat rejection, cf. already E. RIEKEN [2007], p. 263). We know now that Proto-Anatolian **s* was preserved as such in Luwian in intervocalic position (H. C. MELCHERT [1994], p. 257). In particular, the cognate of Hittite *-ssa-* is the identical Luwian *-ssa-* (H. C. MELCHERT [1987], p. 200). Neither did Proto-Anatolian **s* undergo affricatization before **i* in Luwian: for example, the inherited genitive in **-osjo* is reflected as *-a-si* in Luwian hieroglyphic texts (H. C. MELCHERT [2012], p. 179).

Thus, hieroglyphic *i-zi-ia-* / *i-zi-i-* / *i-zi-* initially found itself in company with certain other forms that seemingly complicated the New Readings, albeit to a lesser extent (for a list of them, see A. MORPURGO-DAVIES [1975], p. 124). Very quickly, however, scholars recognized that alongside *i-zi-ia-* / *i-zi-i-* / *i-zi-* the Anatolian hieroglyphic texts also preserved the more rare verb *á-* / *á-ia*, also meaning ‘to do, make’ (cf. J. D. HAWKINS [1975], p. 130, 141; A. MORPURGO-DAVIES [1975], p. 128). This restored the availability of a formal match with the Luwian stems *a(-a-)* and *a-a-ya-* / *a-i-ya-* attested in cuneiform transmission. The symmetrical discovery had to wait longer: this was the identification 3sg. prs. med. *iz-zi-ya-at-ta-ri* ‘appears’ in a Hittite catalogue entry (VBoT 133 obv. 7) as either a loanword from Luw. *i-zi-ia-* or a Luwian foreign word in a Hittite context (see H. C. MELCHERT *apud* E. RIEKEN [2007], p. 264)². Thus, a counterpart of the hieroglyphic form *i-zi-ia-* / *i-zi-i-* / *i-zi-* is also attested in cuneiform. Even apart from these insights, the cumulative evidence for the new values <*i*>, <*ia*>, <*zi*> and <*za*> was so overwhelming that the majority of scholars did not see a few problematic lexemes as an obstacle to appreciating the New Readings. Consequently, the hypothesis that the Anatolian hieroglyphic texts were written in a dialect of Luwian gradually won universal acceptance.

The lexical problem, however, remains as acute as it was in 1974: are the Luwian verbs *a(ya)^{-(di)}* and *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* ‘to do, make’ historically related and how to explain their synchronic coexistence³? In what follows, I will

2. Contrast the transliteration and translation of the same form as GIŠ<HUR>-*zi-at-ta-ri* ‘gives a sign’ in P. DARDANO (2006, p. 80-81). The bound transliteration *izziyattari* is found in J. PUHVEL (1984, p. 504), but without a plausible etymological solution.

3. For the conventions of Luwian interpretative transliteration adopted in this paper, which is meant to serve as the common denominator of the Luwian forms attested in cuneiform and hieroglyphic transmission, see I. YAKUBOVICH (2015). In the light of the present knowledge, it appears to be distinct from Luwian transcription. In particular, what it does not reflect is vowel length, which, as convincingly argued in A. VERTEGAAL (2018), represents an important parameter of the Luwian phonetic sys-

try to address this problem, as well as certain other issues of Luwian grammar, which must be clarified for the purpose of its adequate treatment. I present my musings as a small token of respect and gratitude to Professor Lambert Isebaert, whose warm hospitality and wide erudition made my recent visits to Louvain-la-Neuve so enjoyable.

2. Specialized meanings of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) and its cognates

There is no way around acknowledging noteworthy similarities in the synchronic behaviour of *a(ya)*-^(di) and *izzi(ya)*-^(di) ‘to do, make’. First, as should be clear from their interpretative transliterations, both verbs belong to the Luwian *di*-conjugation, showing the lenited endings in the third singular. Second, both of them can appear in the medio-passive voice with the meaning ‘to become’ (1-2), although medio-passive forms are generally infrequent in Luwian. The form *iz-zi-ya-at-ta-ri* ‘appears’, mentioned in the previous section, is likewise medio-passive, although it shows deviations in both meaning and conjugation type⁴. The third parallel is the use of the reflexive pronoun marking the specialized meaning ‘to treat, celebrate’ with a god as the object (3-5). If *izzi(ya)*-^(di) in this meaning is a finite verb, it is accompanied by the reflexive pronoun. It is worth mentioning that Hitt. *ie-*, *iya-* ‘to do, make’, the undisputed cognate of Luw. *a(ya)*-^(di), does not have the intransitive meaning ‘to become’, which is expressed instead by the dependent verb *kiš-* (cf. J. PUHVEL [1984], p. 344).

- (1) KUB 35.54 ii 42’-43’ (CTH 758), cf. F. STARKE (1985, p. 67)

[tap-p]a-ša	ti-ya-am-mi-iš	na-a-wa	a-a-ya-ri
heaven.NOM.SG	earth.NOM.SG	not	make.3SG.PRS.MED
‘Earth does not become heaven.’			

tem, potentially significant for Luwian phonology, too. A set of relevant forms addressed in the present paper includes 1sg. prs. *i-zi-i-wa/i*, 3sg. prs. *i-zi-i-ti*, 1sg. prt. *i-zi-i-ha*, 3sg. prt. *i-zi-i-ta*, etc. (cf. **Table 1** below). The consistent plene spellings in the contracted forms of cuneiform *izzi(ya)*-^(di) presumably encode the result of contraction, as will be discussed in more detail in Section 5. On the other hand, since I am not aware of a single Luwian minimal pair establishing vowel length as contrastive phonological feature, its omission in interpretative transliteration is unlikely to cause confusion, while there are too many cases where vowel length in Luwian lexemes cannot be established with certainty or varies across the paradigm. The capital letters in transliteration indicate the impossibility to distinguish between voiceless and voiced stops, for example, *tarPa* can stand for both [tarpa] and [tarba].

4. The competition among several 3sg. prt. medio-passive forms of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) represents a problem. The easiest one to interpret is ALEPPO 6 § 3 *izzitta* (11 c. BCE), which corresponds to 3sg. prs. med. *iz-zi-ya-at-ta-ri*, attested in cuneiform transmission, but shows the Late Luwian contraction (cf. Section 5). For 3sg. prt. med. *izziyasi*, presumably a secondary counterpart to 3sg. prs. med. *izziyari*, see E. RIEKEN (2004/2005). For KIRÇOĞLU § 3 *izidatta*, see I. YAKUBOVICH (2016, p. 81, with fn. 22).

- (2) KARATEPE 1 § 53, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 55)

kwa/i-pa-wa/i	za	(“CASTRUM”)há+ra/i-ní-sà-za
kwippa=wa	za	harnissanza
indeed=PTCL	this.NOM.SG.N	fortress.NOM.SG

i-zi-ia-ru	(DEUS)BONUS-sa	(DEUS)VITIS-sá-há
izziyaru	kumarmas(sa)	tiPariyas(sa)=ha
make.3SG.IMPV.MED	Grain-god.GEN	Wine-god.GEN=and

‘Let this fortress become (the abode) of the Grain-god and Wine-god.’

- (3) HİSARCIK 1 § 2, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, II, p. 483)

a-wa/i-mi	MONS-ti-na	ha+ra/i-ha+ra/i-na
a=wa=mi	wattin	harharan
PTCL=PTCL=1SG.REFL	mountain.ACC.SG	Harhara.ACC.SG

9 ta	(CAPRA)i+ra/i-wa/i-ti-i	á-ha
nuwatta	irwadi	aha
nine.times	gazelle.INSTR	make.1SG.PRT

‘I celebrated Mount Harhara nine times with gazelle (offerings).’

- (4) KIRŞEHİR lead strip § 23, cf. R. AKDOĞAN and J. D. HAWKINS (2010, p. 3)

wa/i-mi-i	DEUS-ni-na	i-zi-i-ha
wa=mi	massanin	izzihā
PTCL=1SG.REFL	god.ACC.SG	make.1SG.PRT

‘I celebrated a god.’

- (5) ALEPPO 6 § 4, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2011, p. 44-45)

z[a-t]i-i(a)-za-pa-wa/i	DEUS.DOMUS(-)ha-tà-zi!	kwa/i-i-sa
zattiyanz(a)=ba=wa	DEUS.DOMUS(-)hadanz(a)	kwis
these.DAT.PL=but=PTCL	temple.DAT.PL	REL.NOM.SG.C

PES-wa/i-i-ti	DEUS-ní	i-zi-u-na
awidi	massani	izziuna
come.3SG.PRS	god.DAT.SG	make.INF

‘Whoever comes to these temples to celebrate the god.’

These traits common to the verbs *a(ya)*^(di) and *izzi(ya)*^(di) ‘to do, make’ may either be due to secondary convergence or reflect their historical relationship. The first explanation was preferred in E. RIEKEN (2007) and followed in I. YAKUBOVICH (2010a). According to the former paper, the verb *izzi(ya)*- represents a reflex of PIE **Hiĝ-ié/ó-*, formed from the root **H₁iaĝ*. This root had traditionally been reconstructed with the meaning ‘to honour, worship’ (H. RIX [2001], p. 224-225), but E. RIEKEN (2007, p. 273) suggested that its original meaning was ‘to do, make’, in accordance with the basic meaning of Luw. *izzi(ya)*^(di). The meanings attested in the non-Anatolian Indo-European languages, e.g., Vedic *yája*^{-te} ‘to worship, sacrifice’ and Greek ἅγιος ‘holy’, developed, according to her, in the context of the ritual

jargon via the notions of ‘performing ritual (for someone)’ or ‘treating (someone) ritually’. We have already seen that Luw. *a(ya)*-^(di) and Luw. *izzi(ya)*-^(di) both feature secondary meanings referring to ritual treatment.

But the most remarkable aspect of this polysemy is that several cognates of the verb *izzi(ya)*-^(di) occur exclusively in ritualistic contexts. In the contexts below, we find *izziyatt(a/i)*- ‘offering?’ (6), *izziyana*- ‘ritual?’ (7), *izziyatr(a)*- ‘cult?’ (8), *izzista*-⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘to honour’ (9), and *izzista*- ‘reverence’ (10). While the precise translation of some of these terms may still be refined, their common association with the sphere of ritual is beyond reasonable doubt. In all the instances except for (6), this association was noted in J. D. HAWKINS (2000) on the strength of contextual evidence alone. Here one observes a clear distinction between *a(ya)*-^(di) and *izzi(ya)*-^(di): although both verbs have specialized religious meanings, only the latter one features a large family of derivatives reflecting religious or moral values.

- (6) EMİRGAZİ 1a § 11, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (1995, p. 88-89)

i(a)-zi/a-tá-sa-wa/i-tá	STELE	
izziyattas=wa=tta	waniza	
offering.GEN=PTCL=PTCL	stele.NOM.SG	
*a-pa-sa	hwa/i-sa-ti-sa	i(a)-zi/a-i(a)-ru
abas	hwasattis	izziyaru
come.3SG.PRS	sacred.stone.NOM.SG	make.3SG.IMPV.MED

‘Let that sacred stone become an offering stele⁵.’

- (7) IZGIN 2 § 9, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 316)

a-wa/i	*a-pa-sa-ha	l’á-za-mi-sa	i-zi-ia-na-zi
a=wa	abas=ha	azzamis	izziyananzi
PTCL=PTCL	that.NOM.SG=and	Azzami.NOM.SG	ritual.ACC.PL
i-zi-i-tú	*a-pa-sa-na	(DOMINUS)na-ni	CUM-ni
izzidu	abassan	nanni	anni
make.3SG.IMPV	that.POSS-DAT.SG	lord.DAT.SG	along

‘Let also that Azzami perform rituals (?) alongside his lord.’

- (8) MARAŞ 14 § 8, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 266)

a-wa/i	[[z]a-a-ti-i	l’á-sa-ti-wa/i-su-sá-na	(“STATUA”)ta-ru-ti
a=wa	zatti	astiwassan	tarudi
PTCL=PTCL	this.DAT.SG	Astiwasu.POSS-NOM.SG	statue.DAT.SG

5. Of all the examples cited in Section 2, this one is the most problematic. Its tentative interpretation presented here owes much to the focused discussion of the relevant passage with the participation of Michele Cammarosano, Elisabeth Rieken, David Sasseville and myself.

za-a	i-zi-i-ia-tara/i-za-a	sa-tu
za	izziyatranza	stu
this.NOM.SG.N	cult.NOM.SG	be.3.SG.IMPV

‘Let there be this cult (?) to this statue of Astiruwa.’

- (9) KARKAMIŠ A1b § 2, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 92)

*a-wa/i-ti	*a-mi-i-sa	VIR-ti-i-sa	
a=wa=di	amis	zidis	
PTCL=PTCL=3SG.REFL	my.NOM.SG.C	husband.NOM.SG	
kwa/i-i-ta	kwa/i-i-ta	-lá-lá/i-ma-za	i-zi-i-sa-ta-i
kwitta	kwitta	alamanza	izzistai
where	where	name.ACC.SG	honour.3SG.PRS

‘Wherever my husband honours his own name⁶ ...’

- (10) KARKAMIŠ A6 § 15, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 125)

i-zi-i-sa-ta+ra/i-wa/i-ma-za	zi-la	("L314")ka-tú-ni-zi
izzistari=wa=manza	zila	kaTuninzi
reverence.INSTR=they.DAT	thereupon	k-object.ACC.PL
(MANUS)i-sà-tara/i-i	(“PONERE”)tú-wa/i-há	
istri	tuwahha	
hand.DAT.SG	put.1SG.PRT	

‘Then I reverently put the *katuni*-objects into their hands.’

Thus, the reconstruction *izzi(ya)^(di)* < **Hiġ-ġé/ó-* advanced in E. RIEKEN (2007) was capable of bridging between the ritualistic terms attested in Luwian and non-Anatolian Indo-European languages. In this sense, it clearly represented progress over the preceding state of affairs. The reflection of Proto-Indo-European *-ġy- as an affricate in Luwian is expected, given that Luw. *zuwa-* ‘food’ is commonly taken as a derivative of PIE **ġjeuh*_{1/3} ‘to chew’ (E. RIEKEN [2007], p. 270, with ref.). The specialization of the derivatives of the basic verb ‘to do, make’ in the religious sphere has numerous typological parallels: cf., e.g., Old Norse *gørningar* ‘deeds, acts; magical acts, witchcraft’ derived from *gørva* ‘to do, make’; or Russ. *čáry* ‘spells’; *čáro-děj* ‘wizard’, ultimately derived from PIE **k^ver*, the same root that yields Vedic *kar* ‘to do, make’. Furthermore, the synchronic polysemy of *a(ya)^(di)* and *izzi(ya)^(di)*, illustrated by examples (3-5) above, supports the reality of the proposed semantic specialization in Luwian.

The comparison of Luw. *izzi(ya)^(di)* with **Hiġġ* ‘to honour, worship’ was followed in some form in all the research works dealing with the etymology of this Luwian verb. There are, however, two problems that com-

6. Cf. KULULU 4 § 12 *a-wa/i* OMNIS-*mi sa-na-wa/i-sa*₈ CUM-*ní i-zi-i-sa-ta-ha* ‘I promoted everyone’s well-being’ with the further semantic specialization of *izzista^(di)* in a secular context.

plicate E. Rieken's analysis. To begin with, as long as the Proto-Anatolian ancestor of *izzi(ya)^(di)* is reconstructed as a verb with the generic meaning 'to do, make', we are not gaining any rationale for its long-term co-existence with its synonym, the archetype of Hitt. *ie-*, *iya-* and Luw. *a(ya)^(di)* 'to do, make'. More importantly, one would have to assume that *izzi(ya)^(di)* has alone retained the original meaning of the root, while all of its internal Luwian and external Indo-European cognates have independently undergone the same specialization in the religious sphere. In purely configurational terms, the opposite solution would be considerably more economical: one could accept the traditional interpretation of PIE **Hyaǵ* as 'to honour, worship', and argue that the verb *izzi(ya)^(di)* but not its derivatives have undergone semantic bleaching in Luwian. Unfortunately, this is a case where phylogeny clashes with typology: the specialization of the basic verb 'to do, make' as a religious term is a relatively trivial process, whereas the development in the opposite direction would be highly unusual and require special pleading.

A while ago I attempted to present a scenario based on contamination as a way out of this conundrum (I. YAKUBOVICH [2010a], p. 54-62). The starting point of my reasoning was the observation that *izzi(ya)^(di)* and its derivatives are only attested in those dialects of Luwian that also feature the productive imperfective in *-zza-*, namely the dialect of Hattusa and its descendant, Iron Age Luwian. A large group of texts, primarily Luwian religious incantations associated with the ritualistic tradition of Zarpīya, Puriyanni and Kuwattalla, lack both of these features. I interpreted these facts as compatible with the re-interpretation of the verb *izzi(ya)^(di)* 'to honour, worship' as an imperfective of *a(ya)^(di)* 'to do, make' in a group of Luwian dialects. In other words, the same link between the two verbs that was tentatively entertained as a genuine historical connection in J. D. HAWKINS *et al.* (1974) was presented as influenced by folk etymology in I. YAKUBOVICH (2010a). The purpose of my analysis was to explain the semantic change 'to honour, worship' > 'to perform' > 'to do, make', running in the opposite direction to the typologically common pattern, as well as the remarkable similarity of the synchronic meaning sets that characterize *a(ya)^(di)* and *izzi(ya)^(di)*.

Ten years after the publication of my monograph I have to acknowledge that my idea of folk-etymological reinterpretation failed to find followers, and probably for good reasons. The contamination of two roots is generally a rare process, which is why proving it requires a constellation of impeccable arguments. This was hardly the case of the proposed analysis of *izzi(ya)^(di)*, whose alleged contamination with the suffix *-zza-* was based on one shared consonant. The verb under discussion reflects a different stem to that in the imperfectives in *-zza-*, and their respective conjugations are also

different. Furthermore, it is not the case that the Luwian dialects lacking the imperfectives in *-zza-* used *izzi(ya)^(di)* in a different set of meanings; they simply do not feature any attestations of this root. While I continue to regard both dialectal isoglosses under discussion as empirically founded, this second glance at my attempt to tie them to one another forces me to retract this hypothesis.

There are, however, two assumptions underlying my proposal that I consider as valid as ever. First, the original meaning of PIE **H₂iaǵ* must have been ‘to honour, worship’, and second, making sense of the attested meanings of *izzi(ya)^(di)* and its cognates requires a non-trivial linguistic explanation. In what follows I intend to present a revised historical account of this verb, which also takes into consideration its semantic affinities with *a(ya)^(di)* ‘to do, make; become; treat’.

3. *izzi(ya)^(di)* as a compound verb

I submit that the key to tracing the origin of *izzi(ya)^(di)* is tackling its stem formation. The table below contains the finite active forms of this verb that are attested in hieroglyphic transmission. It includes the potentially relevant spelling variants (such as plene writings), but excludes spelling variation that is deemed fully irrelevant for the derivational issues (e.g., <ha> vs. <há>). The set of forms can be verified through the online *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts (ACLT)*, as well as in A. KLOEKHORST (2019).

	1sg.	2sg.	3sg.	3pl.
prs.	i-zi-i-wa/i-i i-zi-i-wa/i i-zi-ia-wa/i		i-zi-i-ti i-zi-i-ti-i i-zi-ti i-zi-i-ri+i	i-zi-ia-ti
prt.	i-zi-a-ha i-zi-i-ha i-zi-ha i-zi-i-ha-a i-zi-ia-ha		i-zi-i-tà i-zi-i-tà-a i-zi-tà i-zi-lá/i i-zi/a-ia-tà	i-zi-ia-ta i-zi-ia-tá
impv.		i-zi-ia-a	i-zi-i-tu	i-zi-ia-tú

Table 1. The inflectional subparadigm of Luw. *izzi(ya)-*

The data presented above illustrate the distribution of the allomorphs of *izzi(ya)^(di)* with and without contraction. In 3pl. it is always *izziya-*, and so is it in 2sg. imperative. On the contrary, in 1sg. and 3sg. the contraction appears to be the norm, although some forms without contraction are also retrievable. The same dataset is sufficient to demonstrate that the verb under discussion lenites the inflectional endings of the third person singular. The indicators of this phonetic process include the present form with rhotacism *i-zi-i-ri+i* (cf. A. MORPURGO-DAVIES [1982/1983]), archaizing preterit *i-zi-lá/i* (cf. E. RIEKEN and I. YAKUBOVICH [2010], p. 215), and most crucially, the regular spelling of 3sg. prt. with the sign <tâ> standing for /da/ (cf. E. RIEKEN [2008]).

Now, there is another Luwian verb with a similar meaning, which displays a comparable variation between stems in *-i-* and *-iya-* and likewise lenites endings in third singular. This is *anni(ya)^(di)* ‘to cause, inflict’ attested in cuneiform transmission. Its known forms include 3sg. prs. *a-an-ni-ti*, [*a*]-*an-ni-i-ti*, *a-a-an-ni-i-t[i]* and 2sg. impv. *a-ni-ya* (cf. H. C. MELCHERT [1993], p. 17). The historical analysis of this verb, undertaken in I. YAKUBOVICH (2010b), led to the reconstruction of the prefix *anni* fused with *a^(di)* ‘to do, make’. In fact, the same verb is attested in hieroglyphic transmission without a fusion as CUM-*ni á-*, where CUM-*ni* = *anni* is the prefix encoding the addition of an indirect object to the sentence argument structure. This implies that the semantics of *anni(ya)^(di)* ‘to cause, inflict’ can be compositionally derived (cf. S. BORODAY and I. YAKUBOVICH [2018], p. 8-11). The proposed interpretation of *anni(ya)^(di)* as a result of fusion is now followed (with certain differences in phonological detail) in the recent dissertation of David Sasseville, which offers for the first time a comprehensive analysis of verbal derivation in the Luwic languages.

The morphological parallelism of *anni(ya)^(di)* and *izzi(ya)^(di)* has been outlined above. Since the expected phonological outcome of PIE **Hiǵ-iǵ/ó-* would be ***izzi^(ti)*, without lenition, E. RIEKEN (2007, p. 273) suggested that the paradigm of *anni(ya)^(di)* may have exercised secondary influence upon the conjugation of this verb. The strength of such a hypothesis should naturally depend upon the robustness of the morphological class exemplified by *anni(ya)^(di)* ‘to cause, inflict’. According to the *communis opinio*, this is not a productive stem in Luwian, so E. Rieken’s proposal is to be interpreted in terms of lexical contamination rather than analogical leveling. This weakens it to a considerable extent, since lexical contamination, as noted above in connection with my own hypothesis, represents the last resort solution in historical linguistics. Given the independent semantic problem addressed in the preceding section, one can only repeat that the etymology offered in E. RIEKEN (2007) is in need of fine-tuning. But the observa-

tion that *anni(ya)^{-(di)}* and *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* must be considered together was, in my opinion, a step in the right direction.

At the time when E. Rieken's paper was first published, the analysis of *anni(ya)^{-(di)}* as a result of the fusion *anni-* + *a^{-(di)}* was not available yet. Given the present state of our knowledge, it is legitimate to wonder whether *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* may likewise be accounted for as a combination of two roots, but the credibility of such a claim would obviously depend on finding independent confirmation for *izzi-* as the first element of a verbal compound. Luckily, the evidence is to hand: the verb *i-zi-i-sa-ta-* 'to honour' [cf. (9) above] can be analyzed as a compound of *izzi-* and **stā-* 'to stand'. The sheer length of the stem under discussion complicates its alternative derivational analysis unless one is willing to accept the chain of suffixes *-ssa-* and *-tta-* (cf. E. RIEKEN [2007], p. 266). Although the verb 'to (come to) stand' is preserved in Luwian as *ta⁻⁽ⁱ⁾*, with the expected initial cluster simplification (cf. A. KLOEKHORST [2008], p. 879-880), the original cluster /st/ should be preserved in old compounds. As for the initial element **izzi*, let us explore the hypothesis that it functioned as an adverbial modifier, as was also the case of /anni/. In this case, however, the convincing root etymology offered in E. RIEKEN (2007) implies that this was not a local adverb but rather a derivative of the verbal root 'to honour, worship'. Therefore, one can tentatively suggest the analysis of *izzi-sta⁻⁽ⁱ⁾* as 'to stand (up) honouring'. The interpretation of *izzi-sta⁻⁽ⁱ⁾* as a combination of two verbal roots is now accepted in D. SASSEVILLE (2018, p. 286-287).

Combining the segmentation results obtained for *anni(ya)^{-(di)}* and *izzista⁻⁽ⁱ⁾* yields yet another formally unproblematic interpretation of *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* as a compound verb consisting of the adverbial element **izzi* and *a^{-(di)}* 'to do, make'. The presumed literal meaning of such a compound is 'to do, make reverently'. In order to account for the contraction *izziya-* > *izzi-* one has to assume that the first adverbial element carried the stress in the new compound⁷.

The advantage of the proposed analysis over the one offered in E. RIEKEN (2007) is twofold. On the one hand, the lenition of 3sg. inflectional endings in the verb under discussion no longer requires special pleading but rather follows directly from the conjugation pattern of *a^{-(di)}* 'to do, make'. On the other hand, the basic meaning *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* 'to do, make' now follows logically from the basic meaning of *a^{-(di)}* 'to do, make', while the similarity between the secondary meanings of *a^{-(di)}* and *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* also ob-

7. A parallel for the preverbal element carrying the accent in the compound after its fusion with the verbal form is Luw. *aw-i^{-(di)}* 'to come', 3pl. *aw-inti* vs. *i(ya)^{-(di)}* 'to go', 3pl. *iyanti*. The reconstruction of the stress on the prefix *aw-* is necessary for explaining the contraction in 3pl., cf. **Table 2** below.

tains its logical explanation. The meanings of the Luwian cognates of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) discussed in Section 2, which all pertain to the religious or moral sphere, likewise logically follows from the basic meaning of **Hiġ-je/o-* ‘to honour, worship’ and the absence of fusion with *a*-^(di) ‘to do, make’ in the respective lexemes. At the same time, the use of the plene spelling in both *i-zi-i-* < **izzi a-* ‘to do’ and *i-zi-i-sa-ta-* < **izzi-sta-* ‘to honour’ underscores the synchronic connection between the two verbs. The difference in compositional syntax follows from the syntactic properties of the roots involved: *ta*-⁽ⁱ⁾ is the intransitive verb, so the compound *izzista*-⁽ⁱ⁾ takes the object of its modifier, while *a*-^(di) is the transitive verb, and therefore the historical compound *izzi(ya)*-^(di) projects the direct object of its former syntactic head.

Now it is time to return to the question of synchronic differences between *a*-^(di) and *izzi(ya)*-^(di). Only the former verb occurs in the Luwian cuneiform texts of the second millennium BCE. The reconstructed compound *izzi(ya)*-^(di) begins to compete with *a*-^(di) in the royal hieroglyphic inscriptions emanating from the Kingdom of Hattusa, but it is difficult to generalize about their distribution in this period, in part because the early hieroglyphic inscriptions are in general so hard to understand. The form *iz-zi-ya-at-ta-ri* ‘appears’ embedded in a Late Hittite text likewise suggests that the compound verb was known to Hattusa scribes in the 13th century BCE but is not conducive to further conclusions.

The distribution between the two verbs in the Iron Age is more interesting. As noted in I. YAKUBOVICH (2010a, p. 59), all of the inscriptions of the first millennium BCE that contain *a*-^(di) or *aya*-^(di) are composed by private individuals (cf. J. D. HAWKINS [2000], II, p. 469, for the dataset), while the texts of this period emanating from the chanceries of post-Hattusa rulers invariably use *izzi(ya)*-^(di). These facts are consistent with the hypothesis that the compound form was spreading from above, as the acrolect equivalent to the inherited stems *a*-^(di) and *aya*-^(di). The historical function of the preverb *izzi* in combination with *a*-^(di) may have been a politeness marker to be used in official settings (cf. English ‘I humbly accept/request’). But the synchronic meaning of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) in Late Luwian was probably closer to ‘perform/produce’ as opposed to the plain *a*-^(di) ‘to do, make’ (similarly A. KLOEKHORST [2019]).

It remains, however, necessary to demonstrate how the secondary verbal compounds could come into being in the Luwian language, since this is not a category that is usually reconstructed for Proto-Indo-European or Proto-Anatolian. In the following section I will attempt to place the proposed etymology in perspective by addressing this more general question.

4. Complex predicates in Late Luwian

A phenomenon that has long been noticed but never, to my knowledge, systematically addressed, is the group of Luwian adverbial modifiers, which have the same shape as Luwian verbal stems (or one of its variants). Thus *wala* ‘fatally’ in (11) contrasts with *wala-* ‘to die’ in (12), *tarbi* ‘aggressively’ (*vel sim.*) in (13) cannot be separated from *tarb(a)i-*^(di) ‘to march, attack’ in (14), while the possibly cognate adverb *tarPa* in (15), apparently having a similar meaning, can be compared with *tarPa-*^(di) ‘to tread, trample’. An additional likely example of the same category is *ariya* ‘in exaltation’ (*vel sim.*), an adverb paired with PUGNUS-*la/i/u-mi* ‘strongly’ in KARKAMIŠ A15b § 2 (cf. J. D. HAWKINS [2000], I, p. 131-132). As argued in D. SASSEVILLE (2018, p. 19-20), this form should not be separated from the Luwian verb *ariya-*^(ti) ‘to take up, carry’, attested in cuneiform transmission.

- (11) KULULU 5 § 8, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, II, p. 486)

wa/i-tu-ta	za-zí	DEUS-ni-zi	wa/i-la
wa=du=ttá	zanzí	massaninzi	wala
PTCL=he.DAT=PTCL	this.NOM.PL.C	god.NOM.PL	fatally

“PES”-tu

awintu

come.3PL.IMPV

‘Let these gods come fatally against him.’

- (12) TELL AHMAR 1 § 11, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 240)

ǎ-na(REGIO)-pa-wa/i-sa	kwa/i-i	ARHA	(“MORI”)wa/i-la-tá
ana=ba=wa=as	kwi	ahha	walatta
Ana.DAT.SG=but=PTCL=he.NOM.	when	away	die.3SG.PRT

‘But when he died in (the country) Ana.’

- (13) CEKKE § 22, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 146)

ní-pa-wa/i-sa	za-ti	STELE-ri+i
niba=wa=as	zatti	waniri
or=PTCL=he.NOM.SG	this.DAT.SG	stele.DAT.SG

(SCALPRUM)tara/i-pi

tarbi

aggressively

CRUS-ia

taya

stand.3SG.PRS

‘Or if he stands (up) aggressively against this stele.’

- (14) KARKAMIŠ A2 § 11, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 109)

*a-pa-ti-pa-wa/i-ta	za-sa	kar-ka-mi-si-za-sa(URBS)
abatti=ba=wa=ttā	zas	karkamasizzas
that.DAT.SG=but=PTCL=PTCL	this.NOM.SG.C	of.Carchemish.NOM.SG.C
(DEUS)TONITRUS-sa	("L464")ha-tā-ma	(PES ₂ .PES)tara/i-pi-i-tu
tarhunzas	hadamma	tarbidu
Tarhunt.NOM.SG	ruinously (?)	march.3SG.IMPV

‘Let this Tarhunt of Carchemish march ruinously’ against that one.’

- (15) ALEPPO 2 § 25, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 237)

NEG ₂ -pa-wa/i	l ¹ ara/i-pa-ia	kwa/i-sa	("CORNU")tara/i-pa
naba=wa	arpaya	kwis	tarPa
or=PTCL	Arpa.DAT.SG	any.NOM.SG.C	aggressively
CRUS-i			
tai			
stand.3SG.PRS			

‘Or if anyone stands (up) aggressively against Arpa.’

- (16) KARKAMIŠ A6 § 11, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, I, p. 124)

a-wa/i	ta-ni-mi	SUPER+ra/i-a	("PES ₂ .PES")tara/i-pa-lā/i
a=wa	tanimmi	sarra	tarPara
PTCL=PTCL	every.DAT.SG	above	trample.3SG.PRT

‘And he trampled on top of everyone.’ = ‘And he was superior to everyone.’

In all the instances mentioned above, the adverbial formations form a syntactic unit with the finite verbal forms that follow immediately afterwards. While it is formally possible to take them as dative-case nominal forms, such a solution has no intrinsic value, given that no other case forms of the same hypothetical nouns are attested. Therefore, one can analyze /wala awintu/ and similar forms as complex predicates, on a par with combinations involving local adverbs. The Latin compound verbs of the type *cale-facere* ‘to heat’, *pate-facere* ‘to throw open’, coexisting with prefixal verbs, such as *afficere* ‘to treat etc.’ or *conficere* ‘to complete etc.’ offer themselves as potential comparanda.

In fact, the significance of this parallel is more than merely typological. J. JASANOFF (1978, p. 121) makes a convincing case for the late character of fusion in Latin compounds, since otherwise the historical process of unstressed vowel reduction would have yielded ***cale-ficere* etc. The comparison with *calēre* ‘to be hot’ and other statives suggests that *cale-facere* < **calē-facere* reflects iambic shortening, but what was the original function of the first element **calē*? The solution offered in J. JASANOFF (1978, p. 122-125) and endorsed in subsequent publications of the same scholar is to

analyze it as an adverbial formation containing the etymological instrumental singular in **-eh₁*, a case that is no longer present in Latin. As a parallel, J. Jasanoff cites Vedic instrumental forms *gúhā* ‘in hiding’, used as part of a complex predicate, and *mṛśā* ‘in vain’, deployed as a stand-alone predicate in its only Rigvedic occurrence. Attractive as it is from the formal viewpoint, this solution requires a certain leap of faith, because the adverb **calē* is not synchronically attested in Latin.

I submit that the Luwian lexemes *wala*, *tarPa*, and *ariya* represent a missing link in the proposed explanation of Latin compound verbs. On the one hand they are adverbs: whether one takes them as etymological instrumentals in **-eh₁*, allatives in **-eh₂* or “a-stem” datives in **eh₂-ei*, in the absence of the contrasting case forms this is an element of reconstruction. On the other hand, they clearly represent independent phonetic words, just as is the case of the bulk of the local adverbs in Luwian. Furthermore, just as the factitives of the type *cale-facere* are productive in Latin, so apparently are the Luwian compound predicates. One likely innovation that characterizes the derivation of adverbs from verbal roots within Luwian is their alignment with the shape of the respective verbal stems. This tendency can be formulated in terms of a proportional analogy, e.g., 1sg. prs. *tarPa-wi* : *tarPa* = 1sg. prs. *tarbiwi* : *X* → *X* = *tarbi*⁸. As for the adverb **izzi* ‘reverently’, although the matching verbal stem **izzi-* ‘to honour, worship’ is not attested in our corpus, this would be the expected outcome of PIE **Hiġ-yé/ó-* ‘id.’. A possible reason for the disappearance of the base verb **izzi-* could be the competition with the innovative compound *izzi-sta-*⁽ⁱ⁾ used in the same meaning ‘to honour, worship’⁹.

What remains to be contextualized is the merger of the adverb **izzi* and *a-*^(di) yielding the stem *izzi(ya)-*^(di). This process finds several parallels involving both local and non-local adverbs in Luwian. For example, *tarPa* ‘aggressively’ merged with *ari-*^(ti) ‘to rise’ yielding the new stem *tarPari-*^(ti) ‘to befall (*vel sim.*)’, while the combination of the local adverb *pari* ‘forward, away’ and *ara-*⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘go’ was lexicalized as *parira-*⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘to become irrelevant (*vel sim.*)’. The use of these new formations is illustrated by the examples (17) and (18) below. All the three cases of merger mentioned in this

8. This was, however, still a tendency, not an absolute synchronic rule, witness the variant *tara/i-pi-wa/i* ‘aggressively’ (SULTANHAN § 21 etc.), which can hardly be aligned with any Luwian verbal stem.

9. Note that the second iteration of combining elements with these historical meanings is available in KARATEPE § 47 (Hu.) *wa/i-na* |*i-zi-sa-tu-na ta-ia* (“FLUMEN”) *há-pa+ra/i-sá* |*OMNIS-MI-i-sá* ‘The whole valley will begin to honour him’ (lit. ‘stand up for honouring him’). The combination of the infinitive and *ta-*⁽ⁱ⁾ ‘to stand (up)’ apparently yielded the inceptive verbal phrases, which is a typologically common pattern.

paragraph imply the reconstruction of vowels on both sides of the morpheme boundary, the environment that increases the likelihood of sandhi effects.

- (17) HAMA 4 § 12, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, II, p. 405)

EGO-pa-wa/i	á-mi-za	ara/i-za
ammu=ba=wa	aminz(a)	aranz(a)
I.DAT=but=PTCL	my.DAT.PL	time.DAT.PL
NEG ₂ a-tá	(“L218”)ta+ra/i-pa-ri+i-ti	ara/i-tà
na	anta tarParitti	arada
not	in befall.3SG.PRS	(disaster).NOM.PL

‘In my times the *arada*-disasters do not befall me.’

- (18) ASSUR letter c § 5, cf. J. D. HAWKINS (2000, II, p. 535)

á-pi-ha-wa/i-tu-u-ta	ni-i-’	ARHA-’
appi=ha=wa=du=ttá	ni	ahha
then=and=PTCL=thou.DAT=PTCL	PROHIB	away
ma-nu-ha	pa+ra/i-ra+a-wa/i	
manuha	parirawi	
at.all	become.irrelevant.1SG.PRS	

‘Then let me not become irrelevant to you by any means!’

Although the merger between adverbs and verbs without vocalic sandhi was more sporadic, it is nevertheless attested in Luwian. Thus, as proposed in I. YAKUBOVICH (2013, p. 332-333), although the Luwian local adverb *ahha* ‘away’ is usually spelled separately from the following morpheme in cuneiform texts, in the instance of *ah(ha)sa-* ‘to abandon’ we are exceptionally dealing with the historical univerbation of this preverb and *sa⁽ⁱ⁾* ‘to release’. As argued above in this paper, a similar process is apparently attested in the instance of *izzi-sta⁽ⁱ⁾* ‘to honour, worship’. Since the historical adverbs tend to form closer syntactic units with the nouns than with the verbs throughout the Luwic languages, one way to account for this rare phenomenon is to assume that *izzi-sta⁽ⁱ⁾* represents a derivative of the noun *izzi-sta-* ‘reverence’, cf. example (10) above. Alternatively, the rise of the complex verb *izzi(ya)^(di)* may have triggered the merger in the instance of *izzi-sta⁽ⁱ⁾*. Whichever historical scenario one chooses, *cale-facere* and similar Latin forms remain viable typological parallels, since in this case the verbal roots also begin with consonants.

5. Alternative etymology

The few years that have passed since the initial presentation, in the form of academic talks, of the ideas put forward in this paper witnessed a renewed debate on the etymology of *izzi(ya)*-^(di). In the concluding section of this paper I intend to contrast my scenario with the recent suggestion offered in A. KLOEKHORST (2019). While the present paper has been written on the assumption that my account is more plausible than the proposed alternative, its substantial discussion should help the readers to draw their own conclusions.

The main point of criticism advanced by A. Kloekhorst against the solution advocated in this paper concerns the chronological distribution in the paradigm of *izzi(ya)*-^(di). A. Kloekhorst claims that all the forms showing the variant *izziya*-, outside 3pl., can be dated to the 8th century BCE, the terminal period of Anatolian hieroglyphic literacy. In contrast, the stem *izzi*- is present throughout all the periods of the attestation of this stem in hieroglyphic transmission (12th-8th century BCE). This speaks, on face value, for the more archaic character of the stem *izzi*- (very frequently spelled *i-zi-i*). The exception seen in 3pl. forms is consistent, because of the segmentation *izziy-anti*, *izziy-anta*, which implies that the stem is still *izzi*-. In A. Kloekhorst's view, since the stem variant *izziya*- is late, it is impossible to derive *izzi(ya)*-^(di) from *izzi* + *a*-^(di). He explains the spread of *izziya*- via analogical levelling based on 3pl. forms.

Another argument advanced in the same paper against the fusion hypothesis is that it does not explain per se the absence of contraction in 3pl., which yields *izziyanti* as opposed to ***izzinti*, etc. One can contrast here several other types of Luwian stems featuring an ending in *-i*-, only one of which shows a third person plural form of the type *-iy-anti*¹⁰. The data below prompt A. Kloekhorst to assign *idi* / *iyanti* and *izzidi* / *izziyanti* to the same synchronic class and to propose the reconstruction **ih₂ġ-éi-ti* / **ih₂ġ-i-énti* on the model of **h₁éi-ti* / **h₁i-énti* 'to go'. The assumed meaning of the reconstructed verb was 'to perform, construct, execute' or something similar.

10. **Table 2** below is taken almost wholesale from A. Kloekhorst's paper, except for implementing my principles of interpretative transliteration. Accordingly, the Indo-Anatolian reconstructions in this table are those of A. Kloekhorst. For the systematic character of distinction between the representative classes 1 and 4, see already A. MORPURGO-DAVIES (1982/1983, p. 265-268) and H. C. MELCHERT (1993, p. v). Note that classes 2 and 3 are represented by one verb each. A more detailed discussion of Luwian stem formation is now available in D. SASSEVILLE (2018).

	CLuw.	HLuw.	origin
1. <i>-i-tti /-i-nti</i>	3sg. prs. <i>aritti</i> ‘to raise’ 3pl. prt. <i>arinta</i>	3sg. prt. AUDIRE- <i>titta</i> ‘to hear’ --	*-jé/ó-
2. <i>-i-di /-i-nti</i>	3sg. prs. <i>awidi</i> ‘to come’ 3pl. prt. <i>awinta</i>	3sg. prs. PES- <i>wiri</i> ‘id.’ 3pl. prs. PES- <i>winti</i>	*Hóu- <i>h₁ei-ti</i> / *Hóu- <i>h₁i-enti</i>
3. <i>-i-di /-iy-anti</i>	3sg. prt. <i>ida</i> ‘to go’ 3pl. imp. <i>iyantu</i>	3sg. prt. <i>ira</i> ‘id.’ --	* <i>h₁éi-ti</i> / * <i>h₁i-éti</i>
4. <i>-i-di /-ai-nti</i>	3sg. prs. <i>tubidi</i> ‘to strike’ 3pl. prs. <i>tubainti</i>	3sg. pres. <i>tupiri</i> ‘id.’ 3pl. pres. <i>tubainti</i>	*-éje/o-

Table 2. Luwian verbal stems ending in *-i*

To begin with the status of *izziya-* outside 3pl., A. Kloekhorst’s stratification of the relevant forms in the hieroglyphic corpus is definitely a step forward, although one can add that the distribution between the stem variants *izzi-* and *izziya-* also has a geographic component. On the one hand, all of the diagnostic forms coming from the area of Carchemish, including those of the 8th century BCE, show the stem variant *izzi-*¹¹. On the other hand, the Tabal inscriptions, which are all dated back to the 8th century BCE, show both stem variants in diagnostic forms, with some predilection for *izziya-*. Therefore, the analogical extension of *izziya-* beginning from the north-western periphery of the Luwian epigraphic area in the 8th century BCE appears the most likely scenario. A piece of data that is not addressed in A. Kloekhorst’s paper is 3sg. prs. med. *iz-zi-ya-at-ta-ri* ‘appears’, a form in cuneiform transmission which dates back to the 13th century BCE, thus predating all the hieroglyphic forms mentioned in the same paper. Yet the earliest attestation of *izziya-* is hardly the probative one, because *izziyattari* probably represents a dialectal replacement of the earlier 3sg. prs. med. *izziy-ari* (cf. the discussion in Section 2).

Thus, A. Kloekhorst can be credited with discovering a new chronological isogloss, which is potentially relevant for the dating of Luwian hiero-

11. According to A. KLOEKHORST (2019), the gerundives *iz-zi-ya-mi-na* occurring in the inscriptions CEKKE and KARKAMIŠ A4a show the secondary stem *iz-zi-ya-*. In my opinion, however, these forms are to be excluded from the discussion of the relative chronology because the variant ***iz-zi-mi-na* is not attested and may never have existed. A likely environment blocking the contraction was the position before a nasal vowel, on which see below.

glyphic inscriptions¹². Nevertheless, I fail to see why the absence of the variant *izziya-* in diagnostic verbal forms in the 12th-9th centuries BCE should be incompatible with my hypothesis. The only assumption that is needed to accommodate A. Kloekhorst's observation is that the fusion of **izzi + a^{-(di)}* was immediately followed by contraction in 1sg. and 3sg. finite forms. In fact, an independent piece of evidence can corroborate this claim. As discussed in Section 3, the formal starting point of my new proposal is grouping together *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* 'to do, make' and *anni(ya)^{-(di)}* 'to cause, inflict' as members of the same paradigmatic class. A. Kloekhorst does not comment on the origin of this verb, although he shares my scepticism with regard to reconstructing it as a **-iē/o-* present. One of the corollaries of my reconstruction *anni(ya)^{-(di)} < *anni + a^{-(di)}* in I. YAKUBOVICH (2010b) is the dialectal character of this process: the fully contracted 3sg. prs. form *annidi* is attested several times in cuneiform transmission in the second millennium BCE, whereas the compound verb without fusion, *CUM-ni a^{-(di)} = anni a^{-(di)}*, is known from Late Luwian¹³. In principle, one could use this non-trivial dialectal distribution as an argument against my etymology, but so far this has not happened, presumably because the similarity between *anni(ya)^{-(di)}* and *anni + a^{-(di)}* with identical meanings is too close to be ignored. This comparison shows, however, that the result of fusion *anni + a^{-(di)}* had already been followed by contraction in the dialects where it had occurred by the 13th century BCE. The same process of contraction is, of course, attested for **-iē/ó-* verbs in Luwian cuneiform texts (cf. H. C. MELCHERT [1993], p. v).

The question of the origin of the alternation 3sg. *izzidi* ~ 3pl. *izziyanti* is likewise aptly put, but here I can offer the answer that actually supports the proposed historical explanation of this verb. An areal innovation shared by Luwian and Lycian is the formation of nasalized vowels at the phonetic level (cf. I. YAKUBOVICH [2010a], p. 324-325). Whether the Late Luwian form *izziyanti* was pronounced [itsijānti] or [itsijāti], the segment after the glide was phonetically distinct from normal [a] and therefore could block the contraction. In contrast, the contraction of **ariyanta > arinta* and sim-

12. This is, for example, the case of the TOPADA inscription, the date of which again became debatable in the light of the recent attempt to connect its historical narrative with the events of 12th century BCE (L. D'ALFONSO [2019]). I share the traditional view that this is an archaizing text of the 8th century BCE and regard A. Kloekhorst's generalization as one more argument in favour of such a dating.

13. One has to acknowledge that the dialectal distribution of *anni(ya)^{-(di)}* and *izzi(ya)^{-(di)}* was not identical. The second verb occurs once as a code-switch embedded in a Hittite cuneiform text, which presumably reflects the dialect of Hattusa, and is found profusely in hieroglyphic texts. Since fusion is a lexical process, one naturally should not expect here the regularity typical of sound laws.

ilar forms of **-ié/ó-* verbs may be seen as preceding the formation of the nasalized vowels. Naturally, this explanation only holds water if one accepts that the form *izziyanti* arose at the point within the history of Luwian when the contraction **ariyanta* > *arinta* had already taken place. The hypothesis of the fusion [itsi] + [ãnti] is perfectly in line with the suggested relative chronology.

So far I have concentrated on demonstrating why none of A. Kloekhorst's arguments undermines the etymology of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) laid out in the preceding sections. It is now time to weigh it up against A. Kloekhorst's own reconstruction of **ih₂ġ-éi-ti* / **ih₂ġ-i-énti*. First of all, I submit that the formal parallel between *izzidi* / *izziyanti* and *idi* / *iyanti* is far from being perfect. According to the statistics of A. VERTEGAAL (2018, p. 176), *izzi(ya)*-^(di) occurs some ten times more frequently with plene than non-plene spellings. This distribution, on face value, supports the hypothesis that the plene spellings in [itsi:di] and similar forms reflect the recent phonetic contraction¹⁴. In contrast, although the Luwian stem *i-* 'to go' is phonetically spelled more than ten times in the available hieroglyphic corpus, but there are no occurrences of the plene spelling *i-i-*. In the instance of *awi*-^(di) 'to come', which is commonly taken as a prefixal derivative of *i*-^(di) 'to go', the ratio between plene and non-plene spellings is 1/3 according to A. VERTEGAAL (2018, p. 177). This is arguably due to the fact that the contraction **ei* > *i* was Common Luwic in origin, and so its orthographic notation was sporadic at best¹⁵. What is no less important is the complete absence of secondary forms in *-ya-* in the attested paradigm of *i(ya)*-^(di) 'to go', which could be compared with the progressive generalization of the stem *izziya-* in Late Luwian. In fact, the attestation gap precludes us from establishing with certainty whether 3pl. impv. *iyantu*, attested as such in cuneiform transmission, had a counterpart in Late Luwian or the proportion *awidi* : *awinti* = *idi* : *X* yielded the analogical contraction **iyanti* > *inti* etc.

14. If Assyriological conventions were followed in Luwian studies, one might be tempted to use the transliteration *izzî-* to mark the contracted vowel. One reason not to do it is the extent to which the practice of plene spellings in Luwian hieroglyphic texts is likely to be mediated by purely graphic considerations. Thus, the plene spellings are common not only in the paradigm of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) but also in *i-zi-i-sa-t(a)-* 'to honour, worship'. The orthography of the last verb appears to have been influenced by that of the more frequent verb 'to do, make' (cf. Section 3 above).

15. While I agree in principle with A. VERTEGAAL (2018) that any phonetically long vowel could occasionally be written plene in Luwian hieroglyphic texts, the unparalleled regularity of the application of this device in the instance of *izzi(ya)*-^(di) requires a special explanation. Note that the plene spellings in *PES-wa/i-i-ha* and similar forms may have also served the function of disambiguating vowel quality after the <wa/i> sign.

The absence of ***iyadi* and other forms showing analogical leveling in the opposite direction represents an argument in favour of the second solution.

Since the paradigms of frequently attested verbs are particularly likely to exhibit irregularities, the lack of synchronic congruence between the Late Luwian paradigms of the verb ‘to go’ and ‘to do, make’ would be of little consequence for the reconstruction of **ih₂ġ-éi-ti* / **ih₂ġ-i-énti* if it could be maintained on independent historical grounds. This is, however, not the case. There is simply no independent evidence for the suffix **-éi-/-i-* within Anatolian (in the instance of **h₁éi-ti* the diphthong, of course, belongs to the verbal root). Furthermore the reconstruction of **ih₂ġ-éi-ti* / **ih₂ġ-i-énti* is virtual, i.e. it is not based on the parallel juxtaposition of the same root and the same suffix in any (non-Anatolian) Indo-European language. In those rare cases where the suffix **-éi- / -i-* is reconstructed for (non-Anatolian) Indo-European, it is attached to the historical roots of the *CVC* structure and decreases transitivity (**d^hg^{wh}ei*, **tkei*, see H. RIX [2001], p. 150, 643). Therefore, the attempt to find this suffix in combination with the Anatolian transitive verb most commonly reconstructed as **Hyaġ* can be fairly described as the last resort solution. The only synchronic motivation of this endeavour is the perceived similarity of the alternations *idi* ~ *iyanti* and *izzidi* ~ *izziyanti*. We have, however, seen that, first, there are differences in the conjugation of these two verbs in Late Luwian and, second, a language-internal explanation is available for the paradigm of the second verb. If correct, it renders their remaining similarities epiphenomenal.

In contrast, the hypothesis that Luw. *anni(ya)^(di)* ‘to cause, inflict’ and *izzi(ya)^(di)* ‘to do, make’ belong to the same synchronic class does not require any special pleading. The two verbs share the semantic field and have an identical syllable structure, while their stems obviously consist of more than one morpheme. We have seen that E. RIEKEN (2007) has already compared their inflection, even though she attributed their similarities to analogical readjustment rather than common historical origin. While A. KLOEKHORST (2019), takes issue with E. Rieken’s etymological analysis of *anni(ya)^(di)*, he does not address the question of its synchronic inflectional class, because 3pl. finite forms are not attested for this verb in Luwian. But the combination of 3sg. prs. *annidi* and 2sg. impv. *anniya* matches precisely the combination of 3sg. prs. *izzidi* and 2sg. impv. *izziya* (cf. **Table 1** above). I regard this proportion as no less significant than the one addressed in the previous paragraph¹⁶. In contrast, there is no evidence that *i(ya)^(di)* ‘to go’ ever had the imperative form **iya*, and judging by the

16. The absence of contraction in *anniya* and *izziya* is compatible with the reconstruction of the stress pattern **anni á* and **izzi á* in 2sg. impv.

Anatolian and extra-Anatolian cognates of this verb, such a hypothesis appears to be unlikely. If so, this is one more argument for assigning *i(ya)*-(*di*) and *izzi(ya)*-(*di*) / *anni(ya)*-(*di*) to different synchronic verbal classes¹⁷.

It is appropriate to end this discussion at the point where we have started. The non-trivial functional resemblance of the Luwian verbs *a(ya)*-(*di*) and *izzi(ya)*-(*di*) ‘to do, make’, which hampered the decipherment of the Luwian language in the last century, still requires a historical explanation. The account of *izzi(ya)*-(*di*) as the historical compound *izzi* + *a*-(*di*) ‘to do, make reverently’ provides a straightforward solution to this problem, also taking into consideration the observed sociolinguistic distribution between the two verbs. All the forms and historical processes that have been invoked for the derivation of *izzi(ya)*-(*di*) are independently attested within Luwian. I submit that A. Kloekhorst’s alternative account is not illuminating with regard to the semantic relationship between Luw. *a(ya)*-(*di*), *anni(ya)*-(*di*), and *izzi(ya)*-(*di*). Furthermore, I have argued that it posits an *ad hoc* Proto-Indo-European stem in order to achieve its objectives. At the same time, I am glad to acknowledge the impact of Alwin Kloekhorst’s insightful audit of my work, which has helped me to sharpen my own thoughts on the subject.

Ilya YAKUBOVICH
Russian Academy of Sciences
sogdiana783@gmail.com

17. Two more verbs are assigned to the same inflectional class as *anni(ya)*-(*di*) and *izzi(ya)*-(*di*) in D. SASSEVILLE (2018). These are *wam(m)i(ya)*- ‘to find’ and *wari(ya)*-(*di*) ‘?’’. The first of them is clearly related to Hitt. *wemiya*- ‘to find’ and Lyd. *fa-kat-wāmi*- ‘to encounter’, which suggests the Anatolian reconstruction **wēmiye/o-* (*vel sim.*). Unfortunately, it seems impossible at present to assign Luw. *wam(m)i(ya)*-(*di*) to a specific synchronic class: the stem of this verb is only attested in hieroglyphic transmission, where it is usually hidden under the semi-logographic orthography *wa/i-mi-LITUUS*-. In contrast, if all the forms assigned to *wari(ya)*-(*di*) in D. SASSEVILLE (2018) are indeed verbal, this verb does belong to the same class as *anni(ya)*-(*di*) and *izzi(ya)*-(*di*), but its precise meaning cannot be contextually determined. A more detailed discussion of these issues must await the publication of David Sasseville’s dissertation.

Bibliographical references

- ACLT* = Ilya YAKUBOVICH (with the participation of T. ARKHANGELSKIJ, S. BORODAY and A. KASSIAN), *Annotated Corpus of Luwian Texts*. Public resource available at <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/>.
- StBoT = Studien zu den Boğazköy-Texten, Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- VBoT = Albrecht GÖTZE, *Verstreute Boğazköy-Texte*, Marburg, 1930.
- Rukiye AKDOĞAN and J. David HAWKINS (2010): “The Kirşehir Letter: a New Hieroglyphic Luwian Text on a Lead Strip”, in Aygül SÜEL (ed.), *Acts of the VIIth International Congress of Hittitology, Çorum, August 25-31, 2008*, Ankara, Anit, p. 1-16.
- Sergey BORODAY and Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2018): “Hittite Local Adverbs in Comparative Perspective”, in Elisabeth RIEKEN (ed.), *100 Jahre Entzifferung des Hethitischen. Morphosyntaktische Kategorien in Sprachgeschichte und Forschung: Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 21. bis 23. September 2015 in Marburg*, Wiesbaden, Reichert, p. 1-22.
- Lorenzo D’ALFONSO (2019): “War in Anatolia in the Post-Hittite Period: The Anatolian Hieroglyphic Inscription of Topada Revised”, *Journal of Cuneiform Studies* 71, p. 133-152.
- Paola DARDANO (2006): *Die hethitischen Tontafelkataloge aus Hattuša (CTH 276-282)* (StBoT, 47), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- J. David HAWKINS (1975): “The Negatives in Hieroglyphic Luwian”, *Anatolian Studies* 25, p. 119-156.
- J. David HAWKINS (1995): *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)* (StBoT, 3), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.
- J. David HAWKINS (2000): *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*. Volume I. Part I, II: *Texts*; Part III: *Plates*, Berlin - New York, W. de Gruyter.
- J. David HAWKINS (2011): “The Inscriptions of the Aleppo Temple”, *Anatolian Studies* 61, p. 35-54.
- J. David HAWKINS, Anna MORPURGO-DAVIES and Günter NEUMANN (1974): “Hittite Hieroglyphs and Luwian, New Evidence for the Connection”, *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen (Philologisch-historische Klasse)* 6, p. 145-197.
- Jay JASANOFF (1978): *Stative and Middle in Indo-European*, Innsbruck, Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Alwin KLOEKHORST (2008): *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon*, Leiden, Brill.
- Alwin KLOEKHORST (2019): “The Etymology of Hieroglyphic Luwian *izi(ya)-di* ‘to do, to make’: an Athematic *i*-Present in Anatolian”, in Ignasi ADIEGO *et al.* (eds.), *Luwic Dialects and Anatolian, Inheritance and Diffusion*, Barcelona, Universitat de Barcelona, p. 163-180.

- Emmanuel LAROCHE (1959): *Dictionnaire de la langue luvite*, Paris, Adrien-Maisonneuve.
- H. Craig MELCHERT (1987): “PIE Velars in Luvian”, in Calvert WATKINS (ed.), *Studies in Memory of Warren Cowgill (1929-1985)*, Berlin - New York, W. de Gruyter, p. 182-204.
- H. Craig MELCHERT (1993): *Cuneiform Luwian Lexicon*, Chapel Hill (NC) [self-published].
- H. Craig MELCHERT (1994): *Anatolian Historical Phonology*, Amsterdam, Rodopi.
- H. Craig MELCHERT (2012): “Genitive Case and Possessive Adjective in Anatolian”, in Vincenzo ORIOLES (ed.), *Per Roberto Gusmani. Linguistica storica e teorica. Studi in ricordo*, Udine, Forum. Vol. 1, p. 273-286.
- Anna MORPURGO-DAVIES (1975): “Hieroglyphic Hittite”, *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* 2, p. 121-133.
- Anna MORPURGO-DAVIES (1982/1983): “Dentals, Rhotacism and Verbal Endings in the Luwian Languages”, *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* 96, p. 245-270.
- Jaán PUHVEL (1984): *Hittite Etymological Dictionary*. Vol. 1: *Words beginning with A*. Vol. 2: *Words beginning with E and I*, Berlin, Mouton.
- Elisabeth RIEKEN (2004-2005): “Das Präteritum des Medio-Passivs im Hieroglyphen-Luwischen”, *Historische Sprachforschung* 117, p. 179-188.
- Elisabeth RIEKEN (2007): “Hieroglyphen-luwisch *i-zi-ia-*: ein Beitrag zur Rekonstruktion der urindogermanischen Kulturgeschichte”, in Wolfgang HOCK and Michael MEIER-BRÜGGER (eds.), *Daru Slovesiny. Festschrift für Christoph Koch zum 65. Geburtstag*, Munich, Sagner, p. 263-275.
- Elisabeth RIEKEN (2008): “Die Zeichen <ta>, <tá> und <tà> in den hieroglyphenluwischen Inschriften der Nachgroßreichszeit”, *Studi Micenei ed Egeo-Anatolici* 50, p. 637-649.
- Elisabeth RIEKEN and Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2010): “The New Values of Luwian Signs L 319 and L 172”, in Itamar SINGER (ed.), *Ipamati kistamati pari tumatimis. Luwian and Hittite Studies Presented to J. David Hawkins on the Occasion of His 70th Birthday*, Tel Aviv, Institute of Archaeology, p. 199-219.
- Helmut RIX (2001): *Lexikon der indogermanischen Verben, Die Wurzeln und ihre Primärstammbildungen* (2nd ed.). In collaboration with Martin KÜMMEL, Thomas ZEHNDER, Reiner LIPP and Brigitte SCHIRMER, Wiesbaden, Reichert.
- David SASSEVILLE (2018): *The Pre-History of the Verbal Stem Formation in the Luwic Languages*, University of Marburg doctoral dissertation [unpublished].
- Florian SOMMER (2014): “Schwarze Magie im Indoiranischen und ihr indogermanischer Hintergrund: altindisch *yātú-* und jungavestisch *yātu-*”, in H. Craig MELCHERT *et al.* (eds.), *Munus Amicitiae Norbert Oettinger a collegis et amicis dicatum*, Ann Arbor, Beech Stave Press, p. 315-330.
- Frank STARKE (1985): *Die keilschrift-luwischen Texte in Umschrift* (StBoT, 30), Wiesbaden, Harrassowitz.

- Alexander J. J. VERTEGAAL (2018): “Signs of Length: Towards an Interpretation of Non-filling Plene Spellings in Hieroglyphic Luwian”, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 123, p. 159-210.
- Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2010a): *Sociolinguistics of the Luvian Language*, Leiden, Brill.
- Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2010b): “Hittite *aniya-* ‘to do’”, in R. I. KIM, E. RIEKEN, N. OETTINGER and M. J. WEISS (eds.), *Ex Anatolia Lux: Anatolian and Indo-European Studies in Honor of H. Craig Melchert on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Ann Arbor, Beech Stave Press, p. 375-384.
- Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2013): “The Reading of Luwian *ARHA* and Related Problems”, *Altorientalische Forschungen* 39, p. 321-339.
- Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2015): “The Luwian Language”, *Oxford Handbooks Online* (21 Oct. 2015), <<http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18>>.
- Ilya YAKUBOVICH (2016): “Some Transitive Motion Verbs and Related Lexemes in Late Luwian”, *Indogermanische Forschungen* 121, p. 69-92.

