There are a number of cases in Hittite of alternation of e and a or of unexpected \( a \) for \( \text{e} \): \text{watar} / \text{wetena} \) water, \text{etltdan} / \text{isalat} \) 'sleeep', \text{letpli} / \text{letpli} \) 'rise', \text{wetpli} / \text{wetplu} \) 'run', \text{wetlalka} / \text{wetlaka} \) 'wear', \text{clothe}', \text{letlalka} \) 'above, up'; \text{ammu} / \text{me} \) 'good', \text{disu} \) 'good, dear'.

In order to account for these cases, Pedersen, Hist. 167, was led to formulate an unwaut rule, by which \( \text{e} \) becomes a before a back vowel as the following syllable. Well aware that examples like \text{pet} \) 'before' or \text{geno} \) 'knee' preclude such a general statement, Pedersen must put severe restrictions on the rule: 'Der Anschluss scheint nur ein in unangängiger Stinde zu unterlegen, und zwar nur, wenn es im absoluten Anlaut oder nach gewissen bestimmten anlaufen den Konsonanten (u.a. wohl w- und s- ja aile) (emphasis mine = HCM).

We now know that the examples of alternation of e/a cited above are all genuine reflexes of PIE ablaut — something Pedersen justifiably doubted in 1938. When we remove these cases, we are left with a small but significant residue: \text{ammu} and \text{disu}, where by the generally accepted etymologies we must begin with \( \text{a} \)-e. As already noted by \text{Cop}, Linguistica 6 (1966) 50f., these two words not only show an unexpected a-vocalism, but also an unexplained geminate consonant. This is a crucial point to which we shall return. I am aware of two recent attempts to explain the attested shape of \text{ammu} / \text{me} \). The first is that of Eichner, Sprache 23 (1986) 12\text{\textsuperscript{2}}, who equates Hittite \text{ammu} with Lydian \text{awu} and derives both from a CA *\text{wm} (for the place of the accent see Eichner's presentation in the article cited). He attributes the geminate -\text{mm} in the Hittite to an alleged rule by which continuants (especially sonorants) are geminated phonomically (see Eichner, JHS 31 (1973) 100\textsuperscript{\textsuperscript{3}}, et al).
This gemination rule is false, at least for *rn: cf. Old Hittite tumeši 'we take' < *du-meši. This is already cited by Gettinger, GRKron (1982) 166f. A further counterexample with original *m is šumäncana(-) 'cord, sinew' < šutili,μeš< (cf. Greek livδn), always spelled with single -m in OH manuscripts (see Melchert, Sprache 29 (1981) 96). Eichner does not make explicit what vowel he assumes for the initial syllable. If it is *e, we would also by his account expect initial *ø, not e.; cf. idala- 'evil' < *θedöl- and see Melchert, Phon. (1984) 106, for pretonic *ø > Hittite *e.

Beekes, Sprache 33 (1987) 9ff, has offered an alternative account of ammuš, arguing for a preform *h nel-mé-initial first laryngeal. Yet this is still problematic. Available evidence suggests that CA had both of these variants. It is still the case that in all of the Hittite, there is no solid evidence for "vocalization" of initial *ë or consonant in somonar we have the likely counterexamples of iltiš-k- 'sweat' < *hönës, (cf. Hittite kiyäm) and laman 'name' < *hönäm'mu (the dissimilation of the first nasal is unlikely to have affected the treatment of the initial laryngeal). The alternation of the type iltiš-k- 'be' may be analogical to TEF rocks like telššat- 'sleep': see among others Kimball, GRKron (1987) 160ff. In the absence of any other positive examples for *h-RV: > Hittite *aRV, Beekes' assumption of a different treatment before *m versus the other sonorants seems to be egregiously ad hoc.

Beekes' derivation of ammuš also leaves the geminate *mm- of Hittite unexplained. He dismisses this as an inner-Hittite problem, but this is not true. As demonstrated by Eichner, Sprache 32 (1986) 3ff (see esp. p. 12 with note), Lydian émmi- 'my' vs. ammu 'I, me' demands CA *HMMV for the first versus *HMMV for the second. Furthermore, Lydian -mm- with the vowel a- is a closed syllable: cf. émm- < ẹndo, anim. acc. sg. /t/ nom. acc. sg. ẹw < *ām, and éma- 'mother' < *ābna- (cf. Hittite amašu-). An accented short vowel in an open syllable before a nasal leads consistently to Lydian ﺃ: consonant kānā- 'woman'; wife < *sktāna- See for this rule Melchert, IF 97 (1992) 36f. In the case of émmi- the closed syllable can hardly be anything but *VV, Thus not only Hittite ammuš but also Lydian émmi- demands a CA preform with geminate *mm-.

Any solution for Hittite ammuš must thus also take into account the Lydian facts. As already pointed out, the latter require a CA oblique stem with two different accental patterns. This does not seem to me problematic. Before the characteristic Anatolian development of a-vocalism in the second syllable of the oblique form, we may assume a subject form *ēmm-, vs. an oblique *ēmm-. Spread of the initial *e- of the subject form to the oblique would be a trivial development: cf. Greek ém-. Notice, however, that this generalization could take place in two forms. One could spread merely the initial *e-, leaving the original accent of the oblique stem intact: hence *ēmm-. But one could carry the leveling further and generalize accent *e-, whence *ēme-. Indeed before consonant in somonar we have the likely counterexamples of iltiš-k- 'sweat' < *hönës, (cf. Hittite kiyäm) and laman 'name' < *hönäm'mu (the dissimilation of the first nasal is unlikely to have affected the treatment of the initial laryngeal). The alternation of the type iltiš-k- 'be' may be analogical to TEF rocks like telššat- 'sleep': see among others Kimball, GRKron (1987) 160ff. In the absence of any other positive examples for *h-RV: > Hittite *aRV, Beekes' assumption of a different treatment before *m versus the other sonorants seems to be egregiously ad hoc.

Beekes' derivation of ammuš also leaves the geminate *mm- of Hittite unexplained. He dismisses this as an inner-Hittite problem, but this is not true. As demonstrated by Eichner, Sprache 32 (1986) 3ff (see esp. p. 12 with note), Lydian émmi- 'my' vs. ammu 'I, me' demands CA *HMMV for the first versus *HMMV for the second. Furthermore, Lydian -mm- with the vowel a- is a closed syllable: cf. émm- < ẹndo, anim. acc. sg. /t/ nom. acc. sg. ẹw < *ām, and éma- 'mother' < *ābna- (cf. Hittite amašu-). An accented short vowel in an open syllable before a nasal leads consistently to Lydian ﺃ: consonant kānā- 'woman'; wife < *sktāna- See for this rule Melchert, IF 97 (1992) 36f. In the case of émmi- the closed syllable can hardly be anything but *VV, Thus not only Hittite ammuš but also Lydian émmi- demands a CA preform with geminate *mm-.
*VmV. The Hittite word suggests specifically *tmmV. We have an apparent change of initial accented short *t in an originally open syllable to -a- with concomitant gemination of the following consonant (for the conditioning see Pedersen’s original formulation of the umlaut rule cited above).

We already have an established diachronic rule in Anatolian strikingly similar to the putative change just formulated: ‘Cop’s Law’. As demonstrated by Cop, IF 75 (1970) 85f, in Luvian any accented short *t followed by a prehistoric single consonant (thus in an open syllable – HCM) becomes a plus geminate consonant, e.g. *melid’-honey; mead – > CLuv. mullit-, *nēb’-es’-heaven – > CLuv. tapat-, *pērvm before – > CLuv. purum, etc.

I therefore propose that a version of this rule already existed in CA, limited to absolute word-initial position. The broader rule in Luvian would then reflect an unsurprising generalization of the originally highly restricted change. By this rule a pre-CA *tme- (or already *tema) would become regularly *tmmen (resp. *tmmne), whence Hittite azimuth etc. and Lydian əmlı-. I believe that this rule can account for at least two further problematic cases of initial aCC- in Hittite and perhaps a third.

The first of these is åtla- ‘good, dear’. Before spelling out my solution, I must first discuss in some detail a very different alternate derivation of this word by Puvel, KZ 94 (1980) 65-69. Puvel rejects the commonly accepted comparison of åtla- with Greek τέλος and the implied derivation from *θελε-He offers three arguments: morphological, semantic and phonological.

First, he argues that åtla- is not an old a-stem adjective, but an innovative Hittite secondary derivative from the verb åtš- (sic) ‘be dear, good’. Second, he objects that while Greek τέλος and cognates mean ‘good’ in a moral sense, Hittite åtla- means essentially ‘beneficial, advantageous’, as well as ‘dear, favored’. He therefore supposes that åtla has, in his terminology, ‘passive diathesis’ and originally meant ‘dear’, as opposed to Luvian wala- and related forms, which have always meant ‘good’, with ‘active diathesis’. Finally, he points out the problem with which we began this discussion: both the a-vocalism and geminate -š of åtša are unexpected if it represents *θές. He proposes instead derivation from a virtual *σές, which in his view explains the phonology, relating åtša- ‘dear’ with the root

1 My formulation differs in some respects from that of Cop: see the penultimate paragraph below for details.

2 ‘Cop’s Law’ in Common Anatolian

of Gothic ans ‘favor, grace’.

Puvel’s morphological analysis is erroneous. He ignores totally the fundamental relationship between the Hittite noun åtša- ‘goods’ (gen. sg. åtšauwai) and the adjective åtša- ‘good’ (gen. sg. åtšauñai). As elucidated most explicitly by Watkins, GS Kronasser (1982) 261, this pair reflects a PIE system whereby acoustically a-stem nouns serve as the base for derived proterokinetic a-stem adjectives (details below).

It cannot be accidental that this pattern survives directly in Hittite only in this one case, probably because the noun has become lexicalized in the meaning ‘goods, property’. The derivational relationship of noun and adjective is clearly an archaism, and an innovation is not credible.

This analysis is supported by traces of the same pattern in the family of CLuvian wala- ‘good, walsis’ ‘be favourable’, which is cognate with Ved. veda- ‘good’ (with gen. sg. of noun vayus vs. gen. sg. of adjective vātris, directly equatable to the Hittite pattern cited above).

There are indeed cases of deverbative a-stem adjectives in Hittite, as claimed by Puvel, following Weitenberg, U-Südmen (1984) 78ff, but the genuine examples are from active root presents (e.g. hakes- ‘narrow’). The non-ablauting medium tantum åtša- (sic) ‘be dear, favorable’ is rather secondary from the adjective åtša-, pace Puvel and Weitenberg – likewise åtla-. The deletion of the -a- of the base again reflects an archaic pattern: cf. åtša-awar- ‘set aright, carry out < åtša-, as per Puvel himself, HED 1/2 205, and to sarka- ‘high’ the derivatives sarkals- ‘become high’, sargustu- ‘make high’ and sarkalwa- ‘raise’.

Puvel’s semantic argument is by no means compelling. The fact that the Hittites define ‘good’ and ‘bad’ in subjective terms in no way precludes deriving åtša- from *θές– ‘existing’ > *θες– > *θές– ‘good’. For Puvel, the root *θές– of Luvian wals- etc. has ‘active diathesis’ and does mean ‘good’, not ‘dear’. Yet he admits that Hittian wassan-wassar- ‘means ‘favour’ of the gods and equates functionally to Hittite åtšawar. Note also Hittian wass-wassar- ‘be dear, believed’, which falsifies Puvel’s claim that reflexes of *θές– never mean ‘favored, dear’. If we must assume a shift in the direction ‘good’ > ‘favorable’ > ‘dear’ for *θές-, then it is equally possible for *θές–, based precisely on the Hittites’ egocentric view of ‘good/bad’.

8 As indicated by Puvel, the root *θές– had already been proposed as the source of åtša-awar- ‘be dear, beloved’ by Jopson, RHA 22 (1964) 89-91. I do agree with Puvel on one point: that åtša–, åtšauwai and åtšauñai must all be derived from the same source. However, as I will argue below, the long -a- of all three words requires derivation from *θές–, not *θες–.
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shape of Hittite ēṣu-, ammuğ and ında- 'that'. This account of the Hittite words is strongly supported in the last two cases by the independent evidence of the matching Lydian forms ēmd(i)- and ēmu-, which also seem to require an explanation in terms of a CA rule along the lines offered here.
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