

PIE 'sun'

1. In BCS 26 (1975) 97-102 HAMP discussed the word for 'sun'. As he did not give, in my opinion, the right solution of the major problems, i.e. Lat. *sol*, the origin of the suffix *-el-* and the stem **sHul-*, I may give my view here.

2. HAMP assumes a neuter, strong stems **seh₂uel*, gen. **suh₂ens*, weak stem **suHn-*, derivative stem **suHl-*. A neuter, however, has only two stem forms, that of the nominative and that found in the genitive.

A nom. **seh₂uel* is not correct. Not because I don't accept double full grades. In PIE, i.e. in the latest phase of the proto-language, there were many of them, e.g. **bhérete*, **ponteHm* etc. But the reconstruction is not correct in this form for several reasons. 1. I would expect *-el* to have become **-ēl* in PIE (see my *Origins*, forthcoming, § 9.2). 2. I would expect *-ol* (> *-ōl*) in non-stressed syllable (ibid. § 9.4). 3. Neuters have a zero grade or a lengthened grade suffix in the nominative, e.g. *-r* or **-ōr*, but not **-er*, **-or*. The Indo-Iranian forms in *-ar* continue **-r*, as was shown by SCHINDLER, BSL 70 (1975) 1-10.

Therefore the paradigm was as follows, parallel to that of 'fire':

nom.	<i>*seh₂-ul</i>	<i>*peh₂-ur</i>
gen.	<i>*sh₂-uen-s</i>	<i>*ph₂-uen-s</i>

(Thus also SCHINDLER l.c.) We shall see that nothing more is necessary to explain the forms of the separate languages. It is unnecessary to assume a PIE derivative **sHulio-*, for which there is also no evidence. It is found only in Skt. *sūrya-*. Neither Gr. **hāwelios* nor OIr. *súil* < **sūli-* agree with it.

The proterodynamic ending **-ens* was, in many languages, replaced by the more frequent hysterodynamic ending *-nos*, cf. Skt. *-nas* against Av. *-əng* < **-ans*. This gives gen. **sh₂unos*, and with introduction of *-l-* (see below) **sh₂ulos*. Thus originated the double zero grades **sh₂un-*, **sh₂ul-*.

3. For Lat. *sol* HAMP rejects a form in *-ōl*, which is correct: there is no other evidence for it, and a collective for the word for 'sun' is improbable. HAMP assumes assimilation in **sāuol* < **sāuel* to **sōuol*, but that is ad hoc, as he admits himself. Of course, HAMP's **sāuol* could be the direct outcome of **seh₂ul̥*. But it seems that *-āuo-* resulted in *-ā-* in Latin. Only *ā-ō* contracts into *ō*, but there was no *-ō(l)*.

Another possible development may be **sh₂ul* > **suh₂l* > **sūl* or **suuol*. I don't know how the latter form would have developed: **su(u)ul* > **sūl*? If it became **suol* > **sol*, we could assume that the length was secondary.

The simplest explanation is suggested to me by KORTLANDT: **seh₂ul* > **sau̯l* > *sōl*. The notation **seh₂ul̥*, which Indo-europeanists automatically use, is misleading. For PIE it is irrelevant, as /u/ and /l/ were phonemes. And the different languages behaved differently with regard to syllabification. Therefore a development to **sau̯l* can be considered. As regards the change to *sōl*, before *l* (as before *r*) a vowel is more closed; we know that *au* later became *ō* in Latin; this means that an earlier *-aul* > *-ōl* is quite possible.

4. For the suffix form *-el-* I see two ways of explanation. One is to assume a collective **seh₂uōl*, **sh₂uelm*, **sh₂ul-*. I would accept such an explanation for Gr. *hēmērē* and *mesēmbria* beside *ēmar*, where it is supported by Arm. *awr* < **āmōr*.

Here we may have had:

-mr	coll. -mōr
	-mer-m
-men-s	-mr-ós

Here a collective is quite understandable (in Greek *ēmar* has this value in *νόκτας τέ και ἥμαρ*). But with the word for 'sun' a collective is improbable, and there is no further evidence for it. (I withdraw KZ 86, 34)

Therefore I think the other explanation is the correct one, that (in several languages) the *-n-* of the oblique stem was replaced by the *-l-* of the nominative. There was every reason for it, as this word is the only neuter with *l/n* we know (beside this word and the *r/n*-stems there were no other heteroclitics in my opinion, see FS Hoenigswald 1985). Thus *-el-* simply replaced *-en-* of the oblique cases. This gives indirect evidence for this ablaut form (the *e*-vocalism).

Of course, each of the root forms could be generalized. Thus we get the following possible reshufflings:

*seh₂ul (*sh₂ul)
 *sh₂uens/sh₂uels, *sh₂unos/sh₂ulos (seh₂u-)

5. We may now look at the developments in the different languages.

Indo-Iranian generalized the zero grade, *sHul, *sHuens, with metathesis *suHl, *suHens. This stage is preserved in Skt. *svār*, GAv. *hvarō*, *xvōng*, /huar/, /huanh/. (I will not discuss the metathesis, which may have been different in the different languages, and which requires a broad investigation.) From *suHl-* came Skt. *sārah*, Av. *hūrō* and the derivative Skt. *sūrya-*. In Vedic *svār* *dh̥ś̥t̥ke* a genitive has been assumed (which could be *suHan(s) with *-n-* replaced by *l > r*), but see the objection by RENOUE, EVP 12, 87.

Baltic, e.g. Lith. *sáulė*, continues **seh₂ul*.

The Slavic forms go back to **sulniko-*. (HAMP is not right in rejecting this form for Old Church Slavonic. Here *slŕnŕce* represents /s_lnŕce/ < **sulniko-* as appears from Russ. *solnce*. The form **sulniko-* will contain the suffix *-iko-* after a stem **suln-*, which is a contamination of the *l-* and *n-*stems.

Albanian *diell* continues **suHel* according to HAMP, which has *-n-* replaced by *-l-* in **sHuen-* (and metathesis?).

Greek generalized the full grade and replaced *-n-* by *-l-*, which gave **seh₂uel*.

Latin *sol* was discussed above. It may be noted that it would continue the old nominative **seh₂ul* directly, like Lith. *sáulė*.

Germanic. The forms going back to **suwel* (OE *sigel*, *segl*) derive from **sh₂uel*. HAMP thinks Gothic *sauil* can also go back to this form; otherwise it would require **seh₂uel-*. Goth *sunno* etc. is based upon **sh₂un-* (cf. A.SCHERER, *Germanische Namen* 1953, 50).

Celtic. Irish *súil* < **sūli-* contains **sh₂ul-*. For British HAMP reconstructs **sāyl-*, from **seh₂ul-*.

Thus all forms can be easily derived from the reconstructed paradigm.