British *-āy- and *-āg-, and the Celtic words for ‘sun’\(^1\)

NICOLAS ZAIR

1. Introduction

Jackson’s *Language and History in Early Britain* (Jackson 1953) is still the essential handbook for British historical phonology, but given its vast scope, not all of its conclusions have withstood the test of time. One of these is the development of the sequence *-āy- before a vowel under the prehistoric penultimate British stress. It is claimed by Jackson (1953, 371, 373 f.) that this was identical to that of stressed *-ō̆y-, normally giving MW -eu, M-Bret. -ou and M-Corn. -ow, but sometimes developing to -o in Middle Welsh. More recently, Schrijver (2007, 310 fn. 9; 2011, 26) has stated, on the basis of the development of Latin clāuis ‘key’ or clāuus ‘nail’ to MW clo ‘lock, bolt’, that the reflex of stressed *-āy- was preserved in Welsh as MW -o while falling together with the reflex of stressed *-ō̆y- in Cornish and Breton. Although it will be concluded here that Schrijver is correct, further work is required, since neither he nor Jackson collects and discusses all the evidence which is required to be sure of the development posited by Schrijver. Furthermore, Jackson puts forward several forms as evidence for his development of *-āy-, and it is necessary to explain why these are not in fact counter-evidence to Schrijver’s rule.

In order to understand the evidence for stressed *-āy-, it will also be necessary to look at the reflexes of pretonic *-āy-, and also of *-āg-, which is normally assumed to have developed in the same way as *-āy-. However, it will be shown that this is not the case, and that *-āg- and *-āy- in fact developed quite differently in British Celtic.

\(^1\) Prof. Peter Schrijver most kindly allowed me access to his unpublished work, and provided extremely perceptive comments on an earlier draft of this article. Dr Anders Jørgensen also read an earlier draft and illuminated my ignorance, especially with regard to Breton. Two anonymous reviewers also provided helpful comments and advice. Their suggestions have improved it immensely; needless to say, remaining errors are my own. The research for this article was carried out while in receipt of a Rhŷs Studentship at Jesus College, Oxford.
A correct understanding of the development of */āy/ further allows us to assess possible etymologies of the word for ‘sun’ in the Brittonic languages, and to place them correctly in their Celtic and Indo-European context.

2. Pretonic */āy/ and */øy/-

It will be seen in what follows that the reflex of pretonic */āy/- is important in our discussion of stressed */āy/-; it will therefore be discussed here before moving on to the question of stressed */āy/-. According to Jackson (1953, 384 f.), pretonic as well as stressed */āy/- and */øy/- fell together in British Celtic, both giving MW -eu-. However, pretonic */øy/- did not in fact give MW -eu-, and it may be that neither did */āy/-.

Pretonic */øy/- resulted in MBret. -ou-, ModBret. -aou-, MCorn. -ow- (e.g. MBret. louen, MCorn. low-en ‘merry, jovial, happy’ < */louéno-/). In Welsh it gave MW and ModW -aw- or -u as in */louéno- > MW llawen ‘merry, jovial, happy’, *kuýánV- (or *kuýánV-) > MW cuan ‘owl’ (MBret. couhen; Schrijver 1995, 333 ff.).

The evidence for pretonic */āy/- is very slender. Jackson, along with Pedersen (1909, 62) and Lewis / Pedersen (1962, 12), supposes that MW breuan ‘hand-mill, quern, millstone’ < */brāyónV- < PIE */gərāyönV- (cf. Skt. grāv-an ‘rock used to press soma’) shows the regular result in Welsh of this sequence. However, this is his sole example; it will be suggested below (6., p. 206 ff.) that the Modern Breton form breo may come regularly from the original nominative singular */brāy- < PIE */gərāy-, via a British sound change.

If this is the case, the sequence -eu- in MW breuan may reflect the spread of the vocalism appropriate to the nominative through the rest of the paradigm, rather than the regular result of pretonic */āy/-.

There seem to be no clear-cut examples of pretonic */āy/- in Cornish or Breton at all, and I have found only two other possible examples in Welsh.

---

2 I intend to discuss these developments in greater detail elsewhere. In Gaulish too */øy/- could become */øy/-, cf. the personal names Lauenu and Cauanus. That Cornish and Breton preserved the original vocalism is shown by MW llawer, MCorn. lower ‘many’ beside OIr. roar, loor, lour ‘enough, sufficient’, all from */ro-u-er-o- (Schrijver 1995, 336).

3 Pedersen and Lewis / Pedersen also mention MW heul, supposedly from */sāgelto-, which is, however, too uncertain to be included; see below (7., p. 208 ff.) for further discussion.

4 When Uhlich (1995, 37 fn. 140) talks of breuan reflecting a ‘quasi-tautosyllabic’ reflex of */āy/-, he is presumably thinking of a similar influence of the original nominative singular, which after apocope would have tautosyllabic */āy/- versus heterosyllabic */brāy/.
The first is ModW breuad ‘graveworm’, breuog ‘graveworm, toad’, which might come from *brāu̯-V-, from the root *g’erh₂- ‘devour’ (LIV², 211 f.) found in Greek βιβρώσκω ‘eat’ (thus Joseph 1982, 33). But Schrijver (1995, 181 f. 341) connects them instead with MW breuat ‘brittle, fragile, worn away’ < *b’rus-o-. Uhlich (1995, 37 fn. 140) suggests that MW crowyn ‘shed where animals are kept, sty’ shows the regular result of pretonic *-āu- and that the variants crywyn and crewyn are back-formations. However, as noted below (4., p. 202 f.), there is no good reason to prefer a reconstruction *krāu̯- to *krāu̯-or *krāu̯- for MW creu ‘pigsty’, from which crowyn is derived. The alternative forms crewyn or crywyn could be the regular result of *krōu̯- (by internal i-affection) or *krōu̯- respectively, and crowyn would be secondary. It must be admitted that the catalyst for the analogical creation of crowyn is not clear, and crywyn and crewyn are only found in later Modern Welsh sources. Nonetheless, to argue that crowyn demonstrates the regular reflex of *-āu- when the form itself is the only evidence for the presence of *-āu- is extremely circular.

The reflexes of pretonic *-āu- are also pertinent here, because Jackson (1953, 373 f. 442 ff.) argues that *-āu- gives the same result as *-āu- in both stressed and pretonic positions. The unconditioned reflex of pretonic *-āu- certainly seems to be MW -eu-, as shown by MW breuant ‘windpipe, throat’ < *brāgántV- (cf. OIr. brágaε ‘neck, throat, gullet’) and deuaf ‘I come’ < *dāgumí < *to-agamí < *to-agó (Jackson 1953, 443; Schumacher 2004, 189 ff.). In Breton and Cornish the result was unrounding to -e-, with subsequent raising in hiatus: OBret. Brehant (in a place name), ModBret. briant, OCorn. briansen, M Corn. bryangen < *brāgántV-, ModBret. eost, eoust ‘August, harvest’ < Lat. *āgústus (Jackson 1967, 284; Schrijver 1995, 180). In the case of Old (West) British POUOIS, ModW Powys < Lat. Pāgēnsēs, the development was instead to -ow-. This may be due to the effect of the preceding labial consonant (Sims-Williams 2003, 226 fn. 1418), or may reflect a change *pōyēses > *pouēs > *poués, with loss of *-u- before a rounded vowel (Prof. Schrijver, pers. comm.).

However, as demonstrated below (5., p. 203 ff.), we cannot assume that the reflexes of *-āu- and *-āu- are necessarily identical in Brittonic. The regular reflex of pretonic *-āu- in British must remain open in the light of the lack of good evidence. It will be tentatively suggested below that pretonic *-āu- did in fact give the same result as pretonic *-ou-, but even if this is accepted it does not strongly support a similar change in tonic syllables against evidence to the contrary.
3. Stressed *-óy- and *-áy-

Proto-Indo-European *-ey-, *-oy- and *-uy- before a vowel in a British stressed syllable fell together as *-óy-. Its further development is demonstrated by the following good examples: the plural suffix *-eyes > *-óyes gave OW -ou, MW -eu, ModW -au, OBret. -ou, MBret. -aou, ModBret. -ou. MCorn. -ow (cf. Gaulish -oues in the theonym Lugoues pl. 'Lugs'); MW cigleu 'he heard' comes from *kV-klo (cf. OIr. -cúala); and *teue > *töye gave MW teu, ModW tau 'yours' (cf. Gaulish -oues in the theonym Lugoues pl. 'Lugs'); and *teue gave MW teu, ModW tau 'yours' (cf. OIr. -taí, Skt. táva). The Latin loan word Ióuis > MW ieu, MBret. iou, ModBret. yau, MCor. yow 'Thurs-day' shows the same development. For further discussion of these forms and for other, less reliable, examples, see Schrijver (1995, 328 ff.). According to Jackson (1953, 371 ff.), stressed *-óy- (which also came from PIE *-ōu) “fell together with -ó-.” Subsequent to this falling together, and after British apocope of final vowels, there was another, solely Welsh, development: “occasionally final Pr[imitive]W -ou seems to have been reduced to -o” (Jackson 1953, 379).

It is a concomitant of the hypothesis of the falling together of stressed *-áy- and *-óy- that they should subsequently undergo exactly the same developments. In the case of Jackson’s ‘occasional reduction’ of *-oy- to -o in Welsh, therefore, we should expect that original *-óy- and *-áy- both show some cases of the development to OW -ou, MW -eu, ModW -au, and some cases of the ‘reduction’ to -o. This is precisely what we do not find, since all certain examples of *-óy- give MW -eu, as shown above.

On the other hand, if Schrijver (1997, 310 fn. 9; 2011, 26) is correct, then all the examples of Welsh -o should come from *-áy-. According to Schrijver, after the regular development to *-y-, the vowel was then shortened in this environment to *-y-. The long vowel *-y- developed into MW -aw-, MBret. -ew-, and MCor. /i/ (represented by a range of spellings including -u, -e, -eu-), as in PIE *bʰrātēr > MW brawd, MBret. breur ‘brother’, *lāmā > MCor. luf etc. ‘hand’. However, short *-o- gave -o- in all three Brittonic languages, as shown by PIE *mātrVēt > *mādVē > MW modryb, MBret. mozreb, OCor. modereb ‘mother-in-law’, in which *-e- was shortened to *-e- in a pretonic closed syllable (Schrijver 1995, 195 ff. 252 f.). In South West British (Breton and Cornish) *-y- fell together with the reflex of *-óy-, but it remained separate in Welsh, giving OW -ou,

5 The subsequent difference between (secondarily) unstressed Breton -ou in the plural and stressed -aou is not important here (Jackson 1967, 262).
MW and ModW -o. As already noted, Schrijver posits this development on the basis of MW, ModW clo, OBret., MBret. clou, ModBret. klav ‘lock, bolt’ from Lat. clāuis and/or clāuus ‘nail’, but he does not put forward any other evidence. This particular word may be a loan word from Latin, although it is also possible that it is inherited: the same preform gives Ionic Greek κλῆς ‘key’, from a Proto-Indo-European root *kleh₂-y- (Schrijver 1991, 175, 298 ff.). Even if MW clo etc. reflect a borrowing rather than an inheritance, it will be shown that in this case they underwent the same development as inherited *-āy-. But it cannot be assumed that borrowed and inherited forms will always show the same developments.

The following words consist of all of the evidence found for inherited *-āy-; they are mainly taken from Pedersen (1909, 63) and Jackson (1953, pass.). MW gno, MBret. gnou ‘manifest’ come from PCelt. *gnā-yo- from a root *gneh₂- ‘know’ (LIV 2, 168 ff.). They may reflect either *gyh₂-yo- or *gneh₂-yo-, as argued for Lat. (g)nāuus ‘zealous, energetic’ and ON knár ‘hardy, vigorous’ by Schrijver (1991, 298, 299 ff.). The Old Welsh form is probably found in the name Iudnou/Iudnov from the Book of Llan Daf, in charters dated to around AD 585, 620–625 and 860 by Davies (1979, 93 ff. 104 f. 107. 176). The word is also found in Old Breton in names like Carantnou.

MW, ModW glo, OBret. glou, MBret. glou, ModBret. glaou, MCorn. glow ‘charcoal’ come from PCelt. *glā-yo- < PIE *gʰle₂h₁-yo- or from PCelt. *glō-yo- < PIE *gʰle₂h₁-yo- or *gʰlo₂h₁o-yo-. They are cognate with Germanic words such as OS glōt, OHG gluoen ‘to burn’, OE glowan ‘to glow’ < *gʰlo₁-je₁/0-, OHG glaut ‘glowing coal’ < *gʰlo₁-d₁V₁-, and perhaps also Gk. χλωρός ‘greenish yellow’ < *gʰlo₂-ro₁-, and therefore reflect a root *gʰle₂h₁o₃-

---

6 The fact that the reflexes of *-āy- and *-āy- were both spelled -ou in Old Welsh does not mean that they were the same sound; cf. OW in iu/ in pan-iu ‘when is’ = MW yw beside liu /ɨu/ = MW llw ‘colour, complexion’ (Schrijver 2011, 23, 24).

7 For expected klaou. Whether or not this is attested is unclear, but cf. ModBret. kla-outier ‘needle case’ (Jackson 1967, 266).

8 Schrijver (2011, 26) says: “[i]n view of this etymology, PBr. *āw > *ō may be re-constructed for all forms which show a MW o corresponding to a MB and MCo. ou, such as OW tonou, tonou (LL) > MW tyno, MB tno, tnaou ‘dale’, MW glo, MB glou, glaou ‘coal’, MW athro, MB autrou ‘teacher, sir’”. But he does not actually argue for the development on the basis of these forms.

9 MW Iudno may be from Iudnou, but it would also be the regular result of Iudnou < *gnāyá (Schrijver 1995, 299 f.), also found in the Llan Daf charters at LL 175 and 186; cf. OW henoid, henoeth > ModW heno ‘tonight’ (Morris Jones 1913, 113).
(IEW, 430; Zair 2012, 98). IEW (433) in fact reconstructs a different root *gʰleu- (more correctly *gʰleyH-) for MW glo, along with Gk. χλόος ‘greenish-yellow, light green colour’, χλόη ‘first shoot of plants, young verdure’ and Gothic glaggwō ‘exact’. ON glogg ‘clear, plain, accurate’. But the semantic connection between MW glo and the Germanic words for ‘burn, glow’, makes a preform *glāyo- far more likely.

The precise etymological background of MW, ModW gro, OCorn. grou, MCorn. grow ‘gravel’10 is somewhat obscure (it is discussed at greater length in Zair forthc., in which I claim that it is related to Lat. glārea ‘gravel’). However, it must go back to an original *grāyā which is also found in several modern Romance languages, e.g. Fr. grève ‘sand, beach’, Venet. grava, Catal., Prov., Arag. grava. Since the Romance forms must come from *grāyā and the Celtic ones cannot come from *grāyā, *grāyā is the only possible preform.11

These three forms, along with MW clo, suggest that the regular result of stressed *-āy- was MW, ModW -o. Another pertinent form is ModW tyno, MBret. tnou, tnaou ‘valley’. I am not aware of a published etymology of this word, but an anonymous reviewer suggests to me that it comes from *tnāyo- < PIE *tnh₂-yo- ‘strait, passage’, from the root *tēnH- found in OIr. tanae ‘tender, thin’, Gk. ταναός ‘thin’ (cf. Wodtko et al. 2008, 694 ff.). This seems to me extremely plausible. This word is important because its earliest attestations in Welsh are two forms in the Book of Llan Daf, which are spelled tnou and tonou at LL 166 and 204(a). These charters are dated to around AD 595 and 748 respectively by Davies (1979, 106, 116). The forms therefore provide our best evidence for the reflex of *-āy- being spelled -ou in Old Welsh.

A last form with Middle and Modern Welsh -o is somewhat more problematic. This is MW, ModW athro ‘teacher’, pl. athrawon (OCorn. altrou, 10 ModBret. groa, gro ‘sand, beach’ for expected *graou is surprising. Dr Jørgensen tells me that gro is a ghost-word and that groa is borrowed from Old Western French groie (OFr. groe) ‘gravel, flat terrain made of gravel or sand’ < *grāicā, a derivative of *grāvā (Baldinger 1974–1995, 1440).
11 It is often assumed that Romance *grāyā is borrowed from Gaulish (e.g. Meyer-Lübke 1968, 328; Delamarre 2003, 183). If that were correct, it is possible that the original Gaulish form could have been *grōyā < *groyā (cf. Gaul. Lauenus beside MBret. louen ‘merry’). But derivations from this word are found in the South of Italy, where Gaulish influence would not be expected, which led Campanile (1976, 133 f.) to consider it a non-Indo-European substrate word. If, as I argue, the same root is also found in Lat. glārea, this also points to a long vowel in the root.

MCorn altrow, pl. altrowon, MBret. autrou, pl. autro(u)nez).\textsuperscript{12} The final -o suggests at first sight an original *-āy-, and indeed the traditional etymology is *altrāyā from *altr-o-ayō ‘foster-uncle’ with vowel contraction (Morris Jones 1913, 108. 261). The first element is formed from the root found in ModW alu ‘bear offspring’, the second is the n-stem attested in ModW ewythr ‘uncle’ < *ayēn-ter-, Lat. aunculus ‘maternal uncle’ < PIE *aun-ko-lo.\textsuperscript{13} However, this is difficult to square with the plural; if MW -eu- is the regular result of pretonic *-āy- as supposed by Jackson, then *altrāyōnes ought to have given *athreuon,\textsuperscript{14} as in breuan < *brāyōnV-. As an anonymous reviewer points out to me, a possible explanation might be that the treatment of pretonic *-āy- was different in *altrāyōnes and MW breuan < *brāyōnV-, either because the words have a different number of syllables, or because a morpheme boundary was still present in the original compound *altrāyōnes. But as noted above (2., p. 195 f.), the evidence for pretonic *-āy- is very uncertain, and MW breuan may well have carried over its vocalism from the original nominative *brāyū; this is discussed further below (6., p. 207).

This leaves the possibility open that athrawon shows the regular result of pretonic *-āy-. If so, it would appear that pretonic *-āy- does indeed give the same result as pretonic *-oy-, as supposed by Jackson, although Jackson was wrong about the actual result of *-oy- (which, it will be remembered, can give ModW -aw- as in MW llawen < *loéno-). This might be a straightforward case of pretonic *-āy- and *-oy- falling together at a relatively early stage, or it might reflect a later change: for example, it may be that in pretonic position *-ə- < *-ə- before *-y- according to Schrijver’s rule fell together with the reflex of Proto-Brit. *-oy- before it gave -aw- in Welsh. The Cornish plural altrowon, without the characteristic Welsh change, also fits in with the falling together of *-āy- with *-oy-, although it could also have been remodelled on the basis of the singular altrow.

\textsuperscript{12} MBret. autro(u)nez has the productive plural ending -ez added to the original plural found in Welsh and Cornish.

\textsuperscript{13} A problem for this reconstruction is the fact that, according to Schaffner (2006, 35), *ayō < *a-yēh-on- without further derivation only ever means ‘grandfather’, never ‘uncle’. However, as will be seen from the following discussion, *altrāyō > *altrāyā is the most likely reconstruction for phonological reasons, whatever the precise etymology turns out to be. I am grateful to Dr Schaffner for sending me a copy of his article.

\textsuperscript{14} Strictly ’athreuan, with *-yo- > *-ya- (Schrijver 1995, 110 ff.), but the resulting *-an was no doubt replaced by the regular plural ending -on.
Alternative reconstructions for *athrawon are *altroyōnes or *altrayōnes. The former of these is etymologically unlikely; the second is, however, reconstructed by Stüber (1998, 109 f.), following a suggestion by Schumacher, as the result of *altr-āyō, with elision of the first vowel in *altro-ayō rather than contraction. The singular *altr-ayō would not have given *athro regularly, because *altrayō > *altrāyū > *altrā́yī would give *ethreu by i-affection. Stüber therefore explains the form as created by analogy on the plural, with undoing of i-affection. However, the proposed analogical pattern that plural -aw-on corresponds to singular -o depends on the assumption that either *-ō or *-u could give MW -o. If *-ō had given MW -o, then the pattern athro : athrawon could have been built on the basis of a pattern -o : -aw- < *-o- (since pretonic *-o- could give Welsh -aw-). But we have seen that *-ō never gave MW -o, only -eu. There is also no evidence that *-ū- ever gave -o (cf. ModW naw ‘nine’ < *nāwan < *neʊy). Consequently, it is most likely that athro and athrawon reflect *altrāyō > *altrāyū, *altrāyōnes respectively.

4. Counterevidence to *-āy- > MW -o

A form which is often presented as evidence for *-āy- > MW -eu is MW geu, ModW gau ‘falsehood, lie’, which is reconstructed by Jackson (1953, 373) as *gāyā. The Brittonic cognates are O Corn. gou in gouhoc (: men-dax), M Corn. gow, MBret. gou, ModBret. gaou ‘falsehood’. Uhlich (1995, 37 fn. 137; with earlier literature) notes that this word can just as easily come from *gōyā (and also from *gūyā), but in fact it almost certainly must come from one of these, and not from *gāyā, on the basis of OIr. gāu ‘falsehood’, whose gen. sg. gue (Ml. 31b12; Thes. I, 69) would be regular from *gūyās, *gūjį̆s or *gajį̆s, but not from *gāyās, which would have given *gau or *gōe. Although Thurneysen (1975, 44) considers -u- a possible reflex of *-āy- before a vowel retained after apocope, this is not the case as is shown by nau > noe, gen. sg. of OIr. nau ‘boat’ (Uhlich 1995, 17).

The etymology of MW geu etc. is uncertain. I EW (397, 414) compares Lat. haud ‘not’ < *g̣āyidom. If the connection is correct, which is doubtful, (*g̣euy- >) *g̣ou- could provide both the Celtic and the Latin forms, since

---

15 As an anonymous reviewer points out, the treatment of stressed *-āy- in a monosyllable after apocope may have been different from its treatment in a disyllable. This is certainly a possibility, but there is no other evidence for such a difference.

16 I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for drawing my attention to this point.

Another piece of evidence used by Jackson for *-āy- > MW -eu is OW dou, MW deu, ModW dau, O Bret. dou, dau, MBret. dou, daou, ModBret. daou, M Corn. dow, dew19 ‘two’, which he derives from *dyāy (cf. Skt. dvāu). However, Cowgill (1985, 20 ff.) has shown that the Celtic forms in fact go back to *diāyo, and are cognate with Lat. duo ‘two’.

Yet another form which has been supposed to include the sequence *-āy- is MW creu, ModW crau ‘sty, hovel, pigsty’, O Bret. crou, MBret. crou, craou, ModBret. kraou, Late Corn. crow ‘shed, hut, sty, hovel, cot’. This has been reconstructed as *krāyo-, for example by Pinault (1961, 605. 606), followed by Greene (1983, 3 ff.). But OIr. cró ‘enclosure’ shows that this cannot be right, because *krāyū would not give dat. sg. crú (Corm Y 306), as is shown by OIr. bráu, brao, bró ‘quern’ < *brayā (Uhlich 1995, 36). It follows that MW creu must come from *króyo- or *krūyo-. According to Pinault, the basic meaning of these words is ‘anything circular’ (thus e.g. MIr. cró ‘eye of a needle’), and he consequently dismisses an etymological connection with OCS krtyi ‘cover, hide’ < *krūje-o-, krovu ‘roof’ < *krouH-o-, Lithuanian krāuju ‘pile up, store’ < *kruyH-je/o-, which suggest a root *kruyH- (IEW, 616; LIV², 371). Instead he connects MW creu etc. with MIr. crúind, MW crwm ‘round’ < *kruindi-. Even if this is correct, and even if it weren’t contradicted by the Irish evidence, there is nothing about these forms

---

17 I am grateful to Prof. Liam Breatnach for drawing the latter reference to my attention.
18 Prof. Schrijver suggests to me that it may be derived from the root *gh₁eHu- (originally *gh₂eHu-, according to Prof. Schrijver) found in Skt. hávate ‘calls’, hávīman- ‘invocation’ (LIV², 180 f.), via a meaning ‘invoke false gods’ or ‘curse’. An anonymous reviewer suggests that it may be from a root *gh₁eu- otherwise found in the nasal present Ved. hnav-/hnmu- ‘lie’.
19 Expected dow is found only in composition (Schrijver 1995, 331 fn. 1).
British *-āy- and *-āg-

which would lead us to reconstruct *krāyo- rather than *kráyo- or *króyo-.

The etymology and morphological analysis of *cruind are very unclear: the comparison with forms like Lat. curius, Gk. κυρτός ‘curved’ is uninformative anyway, because they are also difficult to explain (de Vaan 2008, 158). The wider connections implied by IEW (935 ff.) are too variable semantically and phonologically to be taken seriously.\(^\text{20}\) Despite the semantic objections raised by Pinault, I prefer to connect MW creu etc. to OCS kryti and reconstruct *kruH-o- or *kroyH-o-.

5. The reflexes of *-āg- and *-āy-

Jackson (1953, 373. 442 f.) supports his proposed development of *-āy- with the evidence of stressed *-āg-, which he assumes gave exactly the same result: thus Lat. pāgus ‘village’ gave MW peu, ModW pau, OBret. pou, OCorn. pou, MCorn. pow ‘country’, Lat. fāgus ‘beech’ gave OBret. Fou-, -fou (in place names), ModBret. faou ‘beech’, and *upo-pro-āgeti > *yo-rāget gave MW goreu ‘(s)he did’.

However, it by no means follows that we should always use the development of *-Vg- as evidence for that of *-V- sequences, even though *-Vg- in some circumstances developed at some point into *-V-. For example, *-ągu- did give the same result as *-ąy- (e.g. ModW nav, ModBret. nav ‘nine’ < *náyan, ModW llaw ‘small’ < *lāgus, ModBret. mav ‘agile, active; āny’ < *mąg-). But *-ąg(u)- (e.g. Lat. iūgum or PCelt. *iūgo- > MW ieu, ModBret. yev ‘yoke’) did not give exactly the same result as *-ąy- (*duyo > MW deu, ModBret. daou ‘two’).

Any decision on whether the reflexes of *-ąg- and *-ąy- are the same must depend on the evidence for inherited *-ąy-, which, as we have seen, gave MW, ModW -o. It may seem strange that stressed *-ąg- should give the same reflex as *-ąy-, rather than *-ąy-, but that is what the evidence suggests. In fact, there may be two different reflexes of stressed *-ąg-. Despite the doubts of Jackson, MW daw, MBret. deu, MCorn. due ‘(s)he comes’ < *dąg- et < *to-ągetti (Schumacher 2004, 189 ff.) suggests that inherited *-ą- developed to *-ą- as usual before *-g-, and gave the same results in the Brittonic languages as *-ą- in any other environment. MW goreu can probably not be used as evidence of the regular reflex of inherited *-ąg-, because it is etymologically very uncertain. Jackson derives it from *yo-rąget < *upo-pro-ągetti.

---

20 For a possible etymology see Balles 2010, 24.
(cf. Lewis / Pedersen 1961, 336), from the same root as MW a ‘goes’ < *age/o-. But its Breton counterpart, MBret. geure, guèreu21 ‘did’, shows the usual development of long *-ā- rather than the development to -ou expected by Jackson and seen in fāgus > OBret. -fou, ModBret. faou. Schumacher (2004, 662 f.) instead derives MW goreu, MBret. geure from British *yor- 
āget < *yor-ūāgeti, with the same root as OIr. fāig ‘wove, plaited, composed’ (*yeg-; LIV2, 662). He explains the development to MW -eu, MBret. -e as reflecting a special reflex of *-āg- after *-y- also found in MW gweun, MBret. gueun ‘moor, marshland’ < *yāgno-.  

There seem to be two possible reasons for the different reflexes of *-.āg-. Either the Latin words developed differently from the inherited British words, perhaps because -ā- before a -g- in British Latin was pronounced more closely to the reflex of inherited *-o- before -y- than to *-ū- < inherited *-ā-. Or, and perhaps more likely, *-.āg- > *-y- only developed to *-y- when followed by a *-u-, as in Lat. pāgus ‘village’ and fāgus. In other cases of *-.āgV- > *-.y-, the *-y- was lost without reflex as normal (as in ModW llu, ModBret lu ‘troop’ < *sloýgos, cf. OIr. slóg) and post apocope *-.y- developed regularly to MW -au, MBret. -eu, -e, MCorn. -ue etc. This development would fit in with other developments of *-.Vg- in stressed syllables, which usually only gave *-.Vg- when followed by *-.u- (Jackson 1953, 440 ff.).22 Jackson’s assumption that *-.āg- always gave *-.y- regardless of the following vowel seems to be supported by the development of pretonic *-.āg-g- to Welsh -eu-, -ow- in bryüant and Powys; but as we will see, Breton and Cornish do not show any sign of *-.y- in brianant and bryngen respectively, and it probably developed only in Welsh as a hiatus filler.23 If this explanation is correct MW ieu, ModBret. yev ‘yoke’ must indeed be borrowed from Latin iūgum rather than inherited from *fūgo-, since they also show a development of *-.y- > *-.u-.24

21 Expected -e in a secondarily unstressed syllable has become -eu by assimilation to -eu- in the previous syllable (Schrijver 1995, 209 ff.). Other spelling variants include geureu, geru, gureu etc.

22 It would also make the development of *-.y- > *-.u- parallel to that of *-.s- > *-.h-, the development of which into a glide intervocally is governed only by the following, not preceding, vowel (Schrijver 1995, 384 f.).

23 The same development of *-.y- as a hiatus filler did not occur in *troget-g > ModW troed ‘foot’, in which the adjacent vowels formed a diphthong (Jackson 1953, 445).

24 And British Latin, at least at the time of the borrowings of fāgus and pāgus, must have retained the -u- in the final syllable, which became -o- in late and vulgar Latin (Väänänen 1981, 36 f.). But Brittonic borrowings from Latin usually show *-.u- rather than
The sequence *-āu- > *-āyu- presumably did develop to *-āyu-, in which case ModBret. eost, eoust comes from *-āyust < *-āyust < *-āgustus, with the loss of *-u- before a rounded vowel as seen in OBret. Salamun ‘Solomon’ [salaumun] > early MBret. Salaguan [salawan] > ModBret. Salawun (Jackson 1967, 600 f.). Although *-āyust > ModBret. eost gave the same result as *brogāntV- > *brogāntV > OBret. Brehant, MBret. briant, we can tell that the latter never developed an intervocalic *-u-, because *-u- is not lost before *-a- (cf. *juvānko- > MBret. youane ‘young’).

The different developments of *-āy- and *-āgu- can now be explained with regard to their relative chronology. Original *-āy- > *-āyu- underwent shortening to *-āyu-, as proposed by Schrijver, prior to the change of *-āgu- > *-āyu- to *-āyu-. The resulting *-āyu- < *-āyu- and *-āyu- < *-āgu- fell together in Breton and Cornish with the reflex of Proto-Brit. *-ou- and gave MBret. -ou, MCorn. -ow. In Welsh, however, they remained separate, only *-āyu- < *-āyu- falling together with the reflex of *-ōy- to give OW -ou, MW -eu, while *-āyu- < *-āyu- gave OW -ou, MW -o. In pretonic syllables, the distinction between original *-āy- and *-āg- may have been maintained by all the Brittonic languages. In Welsh, *-āy- > *-āyu- > *-āyu- seems to have fallen together with *-ou- to give -aw- (*altrāgōnes > MW athrawon, *løyénos > MW llawen); perhaps this had already occurred in Proto-British (*altrāgōnes > MCorn. altrowon). Proto-Brit. *-āg- > *-āyu- lost the *-y-; in South West British *-ā- was unrounded to -e- in hiatus, and subsequently raised to -i- (*brāgant- > OBret. Brehant, ModBret. briant, MCorn. bryangen). In Welsh *-ā- in hiatus developed to *-ou- and fell together with the reflex of *-ōy- in originally stressed syllables (*brāgāntV- > MW breuant), except before a rounded vowel (*pāγēnĕs > *pouyjis > ModW Powys).

The evidence presented above shows that Schrijver’s position is correct: the regular result of *-āy- > *-āyu- > *-āyu- in British stressed syllables was the same as that of *-ōy- in Cornish and Breton (OCorn. -ou, MCorn. -ow, OBret., MBret. -ou, ModBret. -aou). In Welsh, however, they remained distinct, *-ōy- giving OW -ou, MW -eu, ModW -au, while *-āyu- > *-āyu- > *-āyu-

---

25 Original *-y- was also lost in the Old South West British sequences *-Vyr- > *-yur- and *-Vyr-, which gave -Vyr- in Breton, e.g. *euyontr > *euantr > ModBret. eontr ‘uncle’ (Jørgensen 2006, 127 ff.). OBret. euonoc ‘foamy’; cf. MBret. eon ‘foam’ < *eouno- suggests that the intervening stage was *-Vyr-, which explains the loss of *-y-.

26 The raising in Middle Breton presumably occurred only before -a-.
gave OW -ou, MW, ModW -o. It should be noted that the development of *-āg- was quite different: except before *-u-, *-γ- < *-g- was lost, and remaining *-ā developed to MW -aw, MBret. -eu, -e, MCorn. -ue etc. as usual. Before *-u-, *-āg- fell together with the reflex of *-āy- and *-ūy- to give MW -eu, MBret. -ou, MCorn. -ow.

6. Another reflex of *-āy-

Knowing the usual results of *-āy- allows us to approach an interesting variation in Breton. Here, beside expected OBret. brou, MBret. brou and ModBret. brəou (Île d’Ouessant) ‘hand-mill’, and OCorn. brou (:: mola), we find also OBret. Breu (in a place name), MBret. breau and ModBret. breo. These go back to *brɔy̯i < *brɔy̯a < *gvr̯āy̯ō (cf. OIr. bráu ‘quern’, Skt. gr̯āvan ‘rock used to press soma’). Another example of this reflex of *-āy- is Early ModBret. néau, ModBret. neo, nev, néff ‘trough’, which probably goes back to *này̯i (cf. MW, ModW noe ‘kneading trough, bowl’ < *này̯ā, Lat. nāuis ‘ship’).

Schrijver (2011, 26) explains the variant forms as being due to final i-affection, an idea already raised by Thurneysen (1910, 13 fn. 1). Final i-affection involved the raising and fronting of short vowels in the syllable before British *-i and *-i- in final syllables, for example *urako > *urakū > *urākē > MW gwreic, ModBret. grek, MCorn. gurek ‘woman’. On the face of it, this explanation is extremely implausible, since i-affection does not normally apply to long vowels (Jackson 1953, 374). However, as already discussed, Schrijver posits a shortening of *-ā- before *-u-, which would therefore permit i-affection. Furthermore, his proposal has the advantage of explaining the similar results of the similar forms *brɔy̯a and *này̯i in a unified way which can also, as we shall see below (7., p. 208 ff.), be easily used to explain the otherwise problematic forms MW heul, MBret. heaul ‘sun’, which probably come from something like *hɔy̯il < *sāy̯ol.

Jackson’s (1967, 283 ff.) explanation for the -eau/-ev forms is that they reflect the retention as a long vowel and subsequent unrounding in South West British of *-ø- < PBrit. *-ē- < *-ā- by dissimilation before *-u-, beside the regular reflex of *-āy- > *-ūy̯- (> *-u- > MBret. -ou. The spelling of OCorn. brou is not reliable for telling which of these reflexes occurred in Cornish. Jackson’s explanation has the advantage of explaining the alternative Breton forms, but the existence of two different reflexes of the same sound in the same environment in the same word is very difficult to justify. In addition, the supposition of a purely Breton (and perhaps Cornish) reten-
tion of *-ā- < *-ā- does not explain the vowel of MW heul ‘sun’, which seems to show the same development. Altogether, Jackson’s explanation is rather implausible.

An analogical explanation might be possible. The original plural of MBret. brou < *brāyī will have been *brāyōnes (replaced in Modern Breton by breier). If it is not correct that unstressed *-āy- > *-ɔy- > *-oy- fell together with *-øy- as proposed above (3., p. 197 ff.), it is possible that the regular result of *brāyōnes would be MBret. *breuan. The existence of the breau type variants in Breton could then be explained by back-formation from the plural. It is just possible that the same explanation could apply to néau < *nāyī, the nominative plural of which ought to have been *nāyjās. In Welsh, the oblique stem *nāyjā- developed to noe, possibly by way of *nāyjā- > *nājā- > *nējā- > *nē (Schrijver 1995, 300). The same development in Breton might have given *neue, if analogous to ModBret. leue ‘calf’, perhaps from PCelt. *lāpegeo- (Schrijver 1995, 309 f.). Levelling across singular and plural might have produced néau. However, this is extremely speculative.

Dr Jørgensen has put forward (pers. comm.) another possibility for the Breton forms in -eau/-ev. He suggests that ModBret. néau may be a borrowing from Old French nef ‘boat, ship; nave; vessel, cup’, and that breau may possibly have been influenced by ModBret. brev ‘broken; break, fracture’. This seems feasible, and it even explains the competing forms of brou/breau. However, yet another explanation must then be sought for MW heul, ModBret. heaul, and Occam’s razor suggests that a single phonological rule applying to a single phonetic environment is more likely than three separate developments.

None of the alternative explanations is as successful as Schrijver’s in explaining the Breton forms in -eau/-ev. However, Schrijver’s account does not address the question of the variation in the Breton forms of brou/breau: if breau is the direct result of *brāyī, where does brou come from? It might be possible to explain them on the basis of the plural forms: MW breuan, derived from the oblique stem *brāyōnV-, seems to have generalised the vocalism of the nominative singular *brāyī; Breton may have done the reverse, with singular forms derived from the (unattested) original plural *brāyōnes competing with the original singular breau < *brāyī. The same removal of i-affection must have occurred in all of the Brittonic languages in MW athro,

---

27 A development to *nui is also possible, since *āyjo- gave MBret. uy, ry, ModBret. vi ‘egg’ (Schrijver 1995, 299); the distinction between *-āyjo- and *-āyjā- may have been retained only in Welsh.
Nicholas Zair

MBret. autrou, OCorn. altrow < * altrǭī < * altrāyū < altrāygō, but there might be a relic of the original form in the Haut-Vannetais dialect of Breton, where the word appears as etsru, in which the initial vowel seems to have undergone secondary internal i-affection, caused by the original i-affected vowel in the following syllable.28

7. The Brittonic words for ‘sun’

The foregoing in-depth examination of the regular result of British *-āy-, in addition to being valuable for its own sake, also allows us to address the vexed question of the Brittonic words for ‘sun’, which are OW houl, MW haul, OCorn. heul, MCorn. houl,29 OBret. houl, MBret. heaul, heol, ModBret. heol. Jackson’s (1953, 284) reconstruction *sāgeljos makes these exact cognates of Homeric Greek ἠέλιος ‘sun’, but is otherwise problematic. Since the regular development of this preform after i-affection and apocope would probably be to something like ModW †heuyl, it is necessary to assume an irregular early syncope of *sāgeljos to *sāgljos. The syncope must have occurred prior to the British Celtic development of penultimate stress, which would otherwise have protected the stressed vowel from loss, as in the regular, later, British syncope. It can therefore be shown to be very early in the development of British (Schrijver 1995, 16 ff.). This sort of syncope does seem to have occurred, but only in one other word: *kayaro- > *kāyro- > MW caur, ModW cawr ‘giant’ (cf. the Gaulish personal name Kauāroς, Cauarillus, OIr. coár ‘warrior’). In addition to this rather shaky assumption, the development of the diphthong is of course a problem. For Jackson, the development of the Middle Welsh reflex -eu- from *-āy- in a stressed syllable in the form *sāgljos is regular, but we have seen that *-āy-normally gives OW -ou, MW, ModW -o. We would therefore expect *sāgljos to give MW †hol, or †houl if we assume that the loss of final -u between Old and Middle Welsh only occurred in absolute final position. Jackson’s explanation for the Breton development, by way of an unexpected retention and fronting of *-āy- is also problematic, as we have seen. Whatever the ex-

28 Earlier, non-affected, autrou and autru are found in the Vannetais Christmas Hymns (Jackson 1967, 253), some of which were transferred from Leon-Treger-Kerneo Breton. Consequently, autrou and autru probably reflect the LTK forms (Prof. Schrijver and Dr. Jørgensen, pers. comm.). The final -u in Vannetais is quite unexpected; could it be that Vannetais, like Welsh, preserved a different reflex of *-āy-?
29 MCorn. heul is apparently a ghost word (Jackson 1967, 284).
planation, it must also apply to OCorn. *heul, although Jackson suggests that this may in fact be Old Welsh rather than Old Cornish.

Taking all this into account, it seems unlikely that Jackson’s reconstruction is correct. If MW *breuan is the regular result of *brāgōnes, it might seem possible to argue that *-ā- before *-y- had already begun to change at a very early stage, so that *sāyyljos had become something like *sīyeljos, whence, after the early syncope and after apocope, *sīyl might give the attested forms. But it has been argued above that there is a different result of pretonic *-āy-. Even if the development to *-eu- is correct, it seems clear that it is determined by the position of the accent (since *-āu- gave W -o), and this only adopted its penultimate position after the posited early syncope had already taken place.

A more promising explanation is that *-āy- developed differently before a consonant from before a vowel, as argued by Hamp (1974–76b, 78 f.). His derivation of the words for ‘sun’, although different from Jackson’s, is profoundly unlikely. He reconstructs an original paradigm with a nominative *sāyel and oblique *sūl- or *sāyl-, the oblique stem then being remodelled to *sāyl- after the nominative. There is no other evidence for such a remodelling, although Hamp suggests that MBret. *breau is to be explained as a conflation of nom. sg. *brāgō > *brāqī and remodelled oblique *brāqnuv; the remodelling in this case happening only in South West British, since MW *breuan attests to the original oblique *brāqnuv. This explanation remains merely hypothetical, but the idea that MW *heul, MBret. *heaul demonstrate a pre-consonantal reflex of *-āu- is a possibility, and is worth bearing in mind.

Two partial parallels for such a development are possible, although both would reflect *-Vʌ- from *-Vg- rather than inherited *-Vʌ-, and both are uncertain. The first is the development of *yāgnā > *ȳ̆yns3 to OW guoun, MW gweun, MCorn. goen, gon, MBret. gueun, ModBret. geun ‘moorland, heath’, by way of *ȳ̆yns according to Hamp (1974–76a). Since *-ȳ̆u- before an original vowel gives MW *-eu, MCorn. -ow, MBret. -ou, this clearly shows a different reflex before a consonant. However, as already noted above (5., p. 204), Schumacher (2004, 662 f.) considers the conditioning factor for this development of *-āg- to have been the preceding *-u- rather than the following consonant, so MW gweun etc. may not strictly be a parallel. The same goes for MW *peullawr ‘writing tablets’ < Lat. *pugillāres, where MW *-eu- is taken by Schrijver (1995, 341; 2011, 25) as the pre-consonantal alternant of the reflex of *-u- < *-ugV by comparison with the prevocalic alternant *yw- in MW Llywarch < *lugu-mārkos. But this variation is very late, since OW Lomarch shows that the diphthong only became prevocalic after *-u- be-
came -\textit{u}- between Old and Middle Welsh. It is also assumed by Schrijver that \textit{pugill\r{a}r\=es} > \textit{pu\=ill\r{a}r}, whence by syncope \textit{pu\=illa\r{r}}. However, it has been argued above (5., p. 204 f.) that \textit{-\=y}- would develop to \textit{-\textit{u}-} in British only before \textit{-\textit{u}-}. Otherwise the intervocalic loss of \textit{-\=y}- between high vowels or vowels of different quality may have occurred only after syncope (Jackson 1953, 469 f. 654 ff.; Sims-Williams 2003, 115 ff. 132 f. 220 ff. 257). If this is the case, then MW \textit{peuilla\r{w}r} actually comes from \textit{pu\=illa\r{r}} rather than \textit{pu\=illa\r{r}}, and therefore reflects a different sequence from MW \textit{Llywarch} < \textit{\=lu\=uu\=ar\=y}.

Since neither Jackson nor Hamp’s attempts at deriving the Celtic forms for ‘sun’ seem to work, we must look at alternative possibilities. It makes sense to start by considering the likely paradigm of the word for ‘sun’ that Proto-Celtic might have inherited from Proto-Indo-European. The word for ‘sun’ was apparently a ‘heteroclitic’ stem in which the stem-final consonant varied according to what part of the paradigm it was in, as shown by forms such as Lat. \textit{s\=ol} beside OHG \textit{sunno} ‘sun’ (Wodtko et al. 2008, 606 ff.). Although no other such \textit{l/n-} stem is attested, it is reasonable to assume that the paradigm was formed in the same way as the parallel \textit{r/n-} stems, which were elucidated by Schindler (1975). In the singular, therefore, the Proto-Indo-European word for ‘sun’ ought to have had an acrostic paradigm, with nominative and accusative \textit{so\=H\textendash/\=u}. This is probably the origin of Lat. \textit{s\=ol}, which would come regularly via \textit{s\=o\=u\=o\=l} (thus Ringe 2006, 277). The original genitive, standing in for the rest of the oblique forms of the singular, ought to have been \textit{se\=H\textendash/un-es}, but the weak stems of acrostatic nouns tended to be remodelled, with zero grade in the root, and full grade suffix. Thus was created a genitive \textit{sh\textendash/yen-s}. This is probably ultimately the origin of forms like Skt. \textit{sva\=rer} ‘sun, light, heaven’ < \textit{sug\=el}: the final \textit{-l} of the nominative was spread throughout the paradigm, and the stem was further remodelled to \textit{suh\textendash/el-} on the basis of the collective oblique stem \textit{suh\textendash/l-} < \textit{sh\textendash/ul-} which resulted from the regular metathesis of laryngeals in \textit{CHIC-sequences} (Mayrhofer 1986, 175).

The holodynamic collective will have had a nominative and accusative PIE \textit{seh\textendash/\=u\textendash/\=o\=l}, while the genitive was \textit{sh\textendash/un-es}. It is from the oblique stem of the collective that forms like Skt. \textit{s\=ury\=ah}, \textit{s\=ura\=h} ‘sun’ < \textit{suh\textendash/l-} are derived, via generalisation of \textit{-\textit{l-}} and laryngeal metathesis. The meaning of the collective must originally have been something like ‘(rays of) sun, sunshine’.

For OW \textit{hou\=l}, MW \textit{heu\=l}, OCorn. \textit{heu\=ul}, OBret. \textit{hou\=l} etc., either nom., acc. sg. \textit{soh\textendash/\=u\=l} or the collective nom., acc. *\textit{seh\textendash/\=o\=l} are plausible starting
The resulting preforms *sāyāl and *sāyāl have already been suggested by Jørgensen (2006, 126 fn.6). The former would give PCelt. *sāyāl > Brit. *hūyal. Apocope would then remove the vowel in the final syllable, but the *-l would probably not be lost, since its fellow liquid *-r was not lost in absolute final position in the Brittonic languages (cf. Lat. -ātor > *-ātr > MW -awdyr; Schrijver 1995, 366 ff.). The resulting *hūyal might perhaps then give the attested forms, if after apocope *-hu- < *-āy- before a consonant developed differently from word-final *-hu- < *-āy-. If Dr Jørgensen were right that other Breton examples of -eau- < *-ēyu- are to be explained as borrowings or analogical, this would be the only plausible explanation.

If, however, we accept Schrijver’s explanation of the Breton forms as being due to i-affection, a likely preform which would provide the right environment is available if we start from the collective form *seh₂-yōl > PCelt. *sāyūl > Brit. *hūyūl.31 If we derive MW heul, MBret. heaul, ModBret. heol from this *hūyūl, it is striking that the development of the sequence *-āy-, in this case in both Welsh and Breton, is similar to that of OBret. Breu, MBret. breau, ModBret. breao < *brāqā and ModBret. ne, nev < *nāyā. Since these developments are otherwise unexpected and difficult to explain, and since they can be plausibly restricted to a single shared environment, it seems sensible to appeal to Occam’s razor and to explain them in the same way. Schrijver’s proposal that *-āy- > *-hu- > *-hu- was subject to final i-affection by *-ē-, and that this resulted in MW -eu-, ModW -au-, OBret. -eu, MBret. -eau-, ModBret. -eo-/ev, therefore seems quite plausible. That Old (brou) and Middle Cornish (heaul) do not show this change32 does not mean that it did not occur, but only that the resulting sound could be written in Cornish with -ou-; cf. MCorn. newyth as well as newydh beside ModW newyd. ModBret. nevez ‘new’ < *nōyōd < *nōyo-.
8. Conclusion

The foregoing discussion has shown that the evidence does not support Jackson’s statement that stressed *-ā- and *-ō- fell together in British Celtic. Rather, Schrijver’s observation is correct: although they gave the same result in Breton and Cornish (MBret. -ou, MCorn. -ow), in Welsh they still remain distinct: *-ō- became MW -eu while *-ā- > *-ǭ- > *-ǭ- gave MW -o. The examination of the evidence has also allowed us to make some conclusions about unstressed *-ā-, which probably fell together with *-ō- in British; and about the reflexes of *-āg-, which remained largely distinct from *-āy-, giving MW -euy-, MBret. -e/-i-, MCorn. -y- when pretonic, and probably developed into *-ŋ when stressed, with the regular developments to MW -aw, MBret. -eu, -e, MCorn. -ue etc. Perhaps only when followed by *-u- did *-āg- develop differently, falling together with the reflexes of original *-ōy- to give MW -euy, MBret. -ou, MCorn. -ow, rather than with *-āy-.

This understanding of the reflexes of *-āy- allows us to assess possible preforms for MW heul, MBret. heaul, MCorn. houl ‘sun’: neither the South-West British nor the Welsh forms reflect the normal development of stressed *-ā-, as claimed by Jackson. For this and other reasons a preform *sāyeljo- is unlikely. An alternative reconstruction *sāyeljo > *hūgīl, based on an expected paradigmatic form, is more plausible. It is suggested, again following Schrijver, that the Brittonic reflexes of this form may be due to i-affection of *-ŋy- < *-ŋy- < *-āy- which also seems to have operated in the case of MBret. breau < *brāyū (indirectly attested in MW breuan) and ModBret. nev < *nāyī.

Appendix: Other Celtic words for ‘sun’

This section is not related to the reflexes of *-āy-, but may be of interest in the context of the words for ‘sun’ discussed above. In addition to MW heul etc. < *sēh-yōl (?), there are at least two other Celtic words derived from the same paradigm. One of these is OIr. sūil ‘eye’ < *sūli-, which is generally agreed to have developed semantically from ‘sun’ via a meaning ‘eye of the sky’ (Vendryes et al., S-201-2; West 2007, 198 f.). It can be easily derived from the oblique collective stem *sh₂-un-, with generalisation of *-l- from the nominative and accusative and metathesis of the laryngeal to give *suḥ₂l-, just as with Skt. sūrah.

More interesting is MW, ModW huan < *suyânV-, which can be both an adjective ‘shining, bright, sunny’, and a noun ‘sun, sunlight’. The ultimate
preform must be \textit{*suh\textsubscript{en}}\textsubscript{-}. I suggest that this reflects the original Proto-Indo-European endingless collective locative \textit{*sh\textsubscript{2}}\textsubscript{-}\textit{en}. We have already seen that in the rest of the oblique stem \textit{*sh\textsubscript{1}}\textsubscript{-}\textit{un}, a rule of laryngeal metathesis produced a form of the shape \textit{*suh\textsubscript{1}}\textsubscript{-}. Given the extreme allomorphy which now pervaded the paradigm, it is not surprising that the inherited locative \textit{*sh\textsubscript{2}}\textsubscript{-}\textit{en} was remodelled very early in Proto-Celtic, giving \textit{*suh\textsubscript{2}}\textsubscript{-}\textit{en}, which matched the other oblique cases much better.

The locative of the collective would of course have meant ‘in the sun (-shine)’. It was possible in Indo-European to derive adjectives from old locatives by the addition of the thematic vowel, which would give \textit{*suh\textsubscript{2}}\textsubscript{-en-o-} ‘(being) in the sun’.\textsuperscript{33} Formally this would give Proto-Celtic \textit{*suh\textsubscript{ano}}, and the meaning ‘shining, bright’ is very easy to derive from the meaning ‘in the sun(shine)’. Once the adjective came to have the broader meaning ‘shining, bright’, it is easy to see how it could be substantivised as ‘shining, bright thing’, of which ‘sunlight’ is of course the best example.
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