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Abstract

The present paper discusses the etymology of three Gothic nouns: banja* ‘sore’, winja ‘pasture’, and sunja ‘truth’. Each of them has a cognate in Old Norse: ben ‘fatal wound’, vin ‘oasis’ and syn ‘refusal’. None of the West-Germanic languages preserves all three nouns. All are short, feminine jō-stems with an -n- in front of the stem suffix. The main issue discussed here is the etymology and formation of these nouns.

Introduction

The present paper deals with the etymology of three Gothic nouns: banja* ‘sore’, winja ‘pasture’, and sunja ‘truth’. Each of these nouns has a cognate in Old Norse: ben ‘fatal wound’, vin ‘oasis’ and syn ‘refusal’. None of the West-Germanic languages preserves all three nouns as will be evident later on. All three are short, feminine jō-stems (although ON ben can also be neuter and have the meaning ‘small wound’ outside legal vocabulary). The main issue discussed here is the etymology and derivation of these nouns. It is undisputed that Go. sunja is derived from the zero grade of the root of the verb ‘to be’, but a disputable, unique sound change is generally assumed to have been at work in this noun (see section 3).

Meid (Krahe, Meid 1967: 119–122) mentions some feminine nouns containing the Proto-Germanic suffix *-njō with a “connecting vowel” (“Bindevokal”), u or i, e.g. Go. Saurini (gen. *-jos) ‘Syrian woman; Σύρα’ from Saur ‘Syrian; Σύρος’, and

---

1 An earlier Icelandic version of this paper was read at the University of Iceland in Reykjavik on 23 April 2012. I thank my colleague, Jón Axel Harðarson, for his extensive comments on the Icelandic version.
Olc. Fjörgyn (gen. -jar) ‘Mother-Earth’ (otherwise the weak form of the suffix is used, -ynja, e.g. ljónynja ‘lioness’), possibly from Fjörgynn m. ‘name of a heathen god’. According to Chantraine (1979: 107), relics of this formation are also found in Gr. πότνια ‘goddess’ < PIE *pótnih₂ from PIE *póti- ‘lord, husband’, Gr. πόσις (Beekes 2010: 1226–1227), Skt. indrāṇī ‘Indra’s wife’ from indrah, and Slav. bogynji ‘goddess’, from bog’ ‘god’ (e.g. Russ. богиня). Meid also mentions that it is uncertain whether the suffix was found in Proto-Germanic without a connecting vowel (cf. also Casaretto 2004: 330–332).

Obviously, in the nouns under discussion the suffix is not used to form a feminine noun from a thematic masculine noun (expressing semantic relations of the type ‘goddess’ ← ‘god’). Here, whether the Gothic nouns banja*, winja, and sunja are all derived from the zero grade of the respective roots with the Proto-Germanic suffix *-njō will be examined. This termination was almost certainly two suffixes originally, PIE *-(e)n-jeh₂. Therefore, the nouns discussed possibly derived from a case form of an old n-stem having the zero grade of both root and suffix by adding to it the PIE suffix *-jeh₂ > *-iā > PGmc. *-jō to a stem form CC-n-. Then, the connecting vowel u in ON syn – and similarly in Fjörgyn – has its origin in a syllabic nasal, PGmc. *sunjō < PIE *h₁s₁jeh₂. On the other hand, the remaining two nouns, banja* and winja, were derived without a connecting vowel, as their roots ended in a vowel (after losing a laryngeal), so the nasal did not become syllabic. Lastly, Go. Saurini must have been derived from Saur through a (hypothetical) weak masculine noun Saura, i.e.: Saur → *Saura m. ‘the Syrian one’, dat. *Saurin, gen. *Saurins → Saurini. The connecting vowel i is a part of the stem suffix -in-, a descendant of PIE *-en-.

The discussion in the present paper focuses on the nouns in the following table:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>*banjō</th>
<th>*winjō</th>
<th>*sunjō</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Go.</td>
<td>banja*</td>
<td>winja</td>
<td>sunja</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ON</td>
<td>ben</td>
<td>vin</td>
<td>syn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OE</td>
<td>benn</td>
<td></td>
<td>synn</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OS</td>
<td>[beni-]</td>
<td></td>
<td>sunnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OHG</td>
<td>[winne]</td>
<td></td>
<td>sunna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Go. banja* ‘sore, wound; πληγή, ἔλκος’

The Gothic noun banja* has its cognates in ON ben and OE ben(n) ‘(fatal) wound’; the latter is confined to poetic language. The same stem is found in OS beniwunda* ‘wound (to the bone)’ (Heliand 4879; the wound of Malkus Jh 18:10). PGmc. *banjō did not survive in Old High German. The ON noun bani m. ‘death, killer’ and the verb bana ‘to kill, sly’, along with their West-Germanic cognates, will be discussed below. Two more related nouns should also be mentioned, OS banethi
'death, murder' (Heliand 5484; binithion dat. pl. 4865) and ON bend ‘wound’ < PGmc. *banjō. Most likely these nouns derived from a PGmc. weak verb, *ban-jōn- or *banjan- ‘to wound’, cf. ON benja and OE bennian.

Gothic banja* with its cognates could derive from PGmc. *banjō but the PIE form is more difficult to determine. Actually, it has not been ruled out that this noun is from the specifically Germanic vocabulary, although that observation is of little help. Some scholars tried to connect Go. banja* to the PIE root *b poison- with the meaning ‘sicken’, cf. Lehmann (1986: 61 B23). According to Pokorny (1959: 126), the meaning of this root was ‘to wound’, but Magnússon (1989: 40 [baní]) lists the meaning as ‘to hit’, cf. Barr (1971: 41 [bano]). It has been questioned whether this root existed in Proto-Indo-European, as it is found only in Avestan. Interestingly, Kroonen (2013: xxviii, 51) has restored this etymology, PGmc. *banjō < PIE *b̥onih₂, rejecting Seebold’s hypothesis, outlined in the next paragraph.

Seebold (1967: 113–114, 115; 1980: 477–478) tried to connect Go. banja* with the PIE root *g̥hen- ‘to beat, to kill’. Casaretto (2004: 152) agrees with that connection. She refers to LIV: 75, where the connection of Go. banja* with PIE? *b̥en ‘sicken’ is rejected but reference is made to the PIE root *g̥hen-. In that location it is pointed out that Lloyd, Springer (1988: 460–462) reject Seebold’s (1980: 448) hypothesis that PIE g̥en and g̥in became b in Proto-Germanic unless u followed; then the outcome was undoubtedly g, e.g. OIc. gunnr ‘battle’. In the referred location, LIV: 218–219 Go. banja* is not mentioned. Actually, Seebold’s hypothesis has older roots, as it could be maintained that Grimm (1852: 82) was the first to propose this idea, even if he was not aware of it himself. He equated Go. banja* with Gr. φόνος and φονή ‘murder’. Later, Schade (1882: 39 [bano]) took up this idea. Indeed, Seebold (1980: 450–451, 465, 476) also gives an overview of the discussions so far of the fate of the PIE voiced, aspirated labiovelars in Germanic. The conclusion that they changed to labials is disputed. Normier (Schmidt, Strunk 1989: 273) and Hartmann (2013) are in favour of a revised version of Seebold’s theory. On the other hand, Witczak (2012: 88) concludes that PIE g̥eb became PGmc. g when the accent followed; elsewhere it became PGmc. w. Here I will stick to the last hypothesis, as it is more attractive. Thus, as a possible etymology will be suggested for Go. banja*, ON ben etc., the initial b- in these and related words is proclaimed to have its origin in PIE b̥. However, a reliable cognate outside Germanic remains to be found.

The basis of Go. banja* could be a PIE root of the type *b̥eH-, zero grade *b̥e-. In LIV: 68–69 there is the PIE root *b̥eh₁₂-, zero grade *b̥eh₂-, with the meaning ‘shine, light, glow’, cf. Pokorny (1959: 104). Let us assume that from this root a noun was formed with the compound suffix *-e(n)-ieh₁₂-. PGmc. *banjō could have emerged from PIE *b̥eh₁₁₂-én-ieh₂. This implies that the noun in question possibly derived from a case form of an old (and lost) n-stem that had the zero grade of the root but the full grade of the suffix (cf. Kroonen 2011: 33–34). The laryngeal, having coloured the e, was lost, which gives us *banjā > PGmc. *banjō. Actually, the form *b̥en- could have developed from one such case form, i.e. the zero grade of the root and suffix with the accent on the second suffix, *b̥eh₁₂n-ieh₁₂-. There are more possibilities here with the e- or o-grade of the root or suffix. The combination VHR ultimately gave
a short syllable, so it is possible to reconstruct PIE *bʰe₂h₁n₁h₂. In the combination VH, the vowel is shortened (or not lengthened) ahead of ____RV, e.g. *suH-nú- > *sú-nu- > Go. sunus ‘son’; *zőH-ró- > ȥí-ró- > Go. wair ‘man’ (Dybo’s Law; cf. Schrijver 1991: 351–356). Thus, when the laryngeals disappeared from PIE *bʰe₂h₁n₁h₂, the resultant form entered the class of short jó-stems.

According to LIV: 69 a homophonous root existed with the meaning ‘to speak, to tell’. That meaning is held to have grown out of the former, as both roots are morphologically identical. The meaning development is thought to have been ‘shine’ → *‘make bright’ → *‘make clear’ → ‘speak’ (German: ‘leuchten’ → *‘hell machen’ → *‘klar machen’ → ‘sprechen’). Beekes (2010: 1551–1552 [φάος]) also mentions this possibility, as does Mayrhofer (1993: 259–260), under the root bhā ‘shining, beaming’, which is possibly connected with other roots in Sanskrit, bhan ‘speak’ and bhāṣ ‘tell’ (possibly connected with ON banna ‘forbid’ and bón ‘prayer’).

The meaning ‘shine, light, glow’ appears not to fit very well to ‘sore’ or ‘wound’. But maybe PGmc. *banjō originally had the meaning ‘a clean wound’. In Old Icelandic we have the phrase að fiegja sár ‘to polish a wound’. That which has been polished shines – and a clean wound shines’, a doctor confirmed to me.2 This could be connected with the reconstructed meaning variants *‘make bright’ and *‘make clear’, which could possibly have been used to describe the action ‘to polish a wound’. It is also possible that PGmc. *banjō was used as a euphemism or taboo for a fatal wound, but ultimately ‘sore, wound’ became its meaning. OE benn, in poetic language, means ‘fatal wound’, as does ben in Old Norse legal vocabulary.

Now, some more nouns, derived from the same root as *banjō, should be discussed shortly: ON bani ‘death, killer’, OE bana ‘killer, murderer, death’, OS/OHG bano ‘killer, murderer, executioner’ and OHG f. bana (2×) ‘death, execution’. Most likely these words did not derive directly from the root *bʰe₂h₁-. Rather, an n-stem was derived from its zero grade with the zero grade of the suffix, i.e. *bʰe₂h₁-én-, although the e- or o-grade cannot be excluded, i.e. *bʰe₂h₁-én-, *bʰe₂h₁-ón-. Supposedly, all these forms, if they entered Proto-Germanic, should have changed to *ban-, a form that cannot be divided into root and suffix, and is confined to the Germanic languages. It is possible that *ban-jō was a Proto-Germanic derivation of this new root, as it has no Proto-Indo-European cognate. The same applies to the weak masculine noun *ban-an-, which is found in ON bani etc. PGmc. *banjō ‘wound’ has – at least in Old Norse and Old English – developed the meaning ‘fatal wound’. This meaning, one could maintain, appears to be the premise for the derivation of ON bani, etc., because the original meaning of the root would give *banan- the meaning ‘the shining one, the clear one’. But if we are ready to accept this as a reference to the deathly pale colour of a corpse, ‘the cadaverous one’ (i.e. death), no such premise is needed. A further derivate from PGmc. *ban- is the verb *ban-ón- ‘to kill, to slay’, ON bana. The meaning ‘death’ in ON bani involves a personification, so it could rather easily be used as an agent noun with the meaning ‘killer’.

---

2 I thank my friend, the physician Örn Bjarnason, for useful discussion about wounds and other medical issues that turned up here.
To close this discussion, it should be mentioned that Orel (2003: 35 [*banjō]) derives *banjō from *banan-, but he does not make clear whether he assumes the PIE root to be *gʰen- ‘to beat, to kill’ (e.g. Seebold 1980: 451) or not. As was made clear above, the relations with this root are disputed, and if the PIE root *bʰen- existed, it did not have this meaning, as we saw in the beginning. 3

Finally, a few words concerning the meaning of Go. banja*. It occurs three times in the Gothic corpus. In two instances (Luke 16:20, 21, “The Rich Man and Lazarus”) clearly open ulcers and boils are spoken of, even with exudation, Gr. ἑλκος:

(1) Lk 16:20: banjo fulls ‘full of ulcers’ ἑλκωμένος
(2) Lk 16:21: hundos … bilaigodedun banjos is ‘dogs … were licking his ulcers’ κόνες … ἐπέλειχον τὰ ἑλκη αὐτοῦ
(3) Lk 10:30 banjos analag[jandans] ‘inflicting blows’ πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες.

In the third instance (Luke 10:30, “The Good Samaritan”) the Gothic phrase banjos analag[jandans] is a translation of the Greek phrase πληγὰς ἐπιθέντες (‘inflicting blows’), so, at a glance, these are not necessarily (open) wounds but could be bruises. In verse 34, which is lost from the Gothic version, we read κατέδησεν τὰ τραύματα αὐτοῦ ‘bound down his wounds’. So, as only open wounds need to be bound down, one can infer that open wounds are meant. It is possible that Wulfila chose banja* to stress that understanding. In any case, he did not choose Go. slahs* ‘blow’, a noun that is used twice as a rendering of the Gr. πληγή (2Cor 6:5, 11:23) but that also has the meaning ‘plague; μάστιξ’. It is important and should be stressed that Go. banja* did not have the meaning ‘fatal wound’.

2. Go. winja ‘pasture; νομή’

The Gothic noun winja is ἀπαξ λεγόμενον. It is attested solely in John 10:9:

(4) winja bigitiþ ‘finds pasture’ νομήν εὑρήσει.

Winja has a cognate in the Modern Icelandic feminine noun vin ‘oasis’. In Old High German dictionaries we find winne* (1×) ‘pasture’, but it is rare and only found in place names, according to Köbler (1993: 1274 [winne*]) and Trier (1963: 110). This noun is not found in the other WestGermanic languages. As a matter of fact, in Old Norse, vin is only used in place names, e.g. Björgvin ‘Bergen’ etc. (see Jansson 1951), ignoring two obscure compounds occurring in Old Norwegian legal vocabulary, vin(j)artoddi (Ólafs saga hins helga: 73) and vinjarspann (Frostafingslög, Norges Gamle Love intil 1387 I: 257). 4 Hence, it is not known how old the meaning ‘oasis’

---

3 Obviously, if Seebold’s hypothesis is accepted, the possibility arises that ON ben and bani are not derived from the same root: Possibly, then, ben etc. is derived from *bʰeh-, but bani etc. from *gʰen-.

4 Trier (1963: 109) gives vinjartoddi the meaning, ‘Abgabe für die Nutzung eines Grasplatzes’, and compares it with MHG wunnemiete. The context is indecisive but this is not a bad guess; ‘pasture charge, pasture duty’.
is in Icel. *winjō* can be reconstructed but further etymology is uncertain.


The meaning ‘grassy spot (in a desert)’ appears to be confined to Icel. *vin* but the corresponding nouns in Gothic (and Old High German) simply mean ‘pasture’. When it is assumed (e.g. Magnússon 1989: 1138 [1 vin]) that this noun originally had the meaning ‘likeable place’, it is an attempt to unite these meanings. Actually, Icel. *vin* does not have the meaning ‘likeable place’ in general. The place has to be delimited and in contrast to its (barren) surroundings, i.e. ‘oasis’ in a direct or transferred sense.

When OHG *wunna* is given the meaning ‘pasture’, it is based solely on the fact that in Middle High German there existed the phrase *wunne und weide*, where *wunne* has replaced *winne*, according to Pokorny (1959: 1147). Kluge (1995: 897 [Wonne]) has the following remark: “Das deutsche Wort bedeutet auch eine Art Weide, nach Trier die ‘Laubweide’ (das frische Baumgrün, das von den Tieren besonders gern gefressen wird).” Trier (1963: 79–82) explains that *wunne* was ‘pasture on leaf’, but *weide* was ‘pasture on grass’, and he (1963: 95) stresses that *wunne* was not ‘Weide’. Trier’s (1963: 110) conclusion is that the meaning of the two nouns, *winne* and *wunne*, had become so similar that it was impossible to keep them apart, but the *wunne* form survived. This means that in Old High German, *winne* also had the meaning ‘pasture on leaf’, and Trier (1963: 117–118) tries to connect this noun with Skt. *vanam* ‘tree’, an idea found already with Lidén (1903/4: 27), cf. Lehmann (1986: 400 W52). However, the meaning ‘pasture on leaf’ is found neither in Gothic nor in Old Norse.

Even though HG *Wonne* ‘happiness, pleasure’ can also be used for what is called *Laubweide* ‘pasture on leaf’, it has not, thereby, become equal to Icel. *vin*. Rather, the pasture on leaf is called *wunna* in OHG because domestic animals find happiness, pleasure, etc., in it. Nothing said so far involves OHG *wunna* is necessarily being derived from the same root as Icel. *vin*. The meanings Köbler (1993: 1294 [wunna*]) lists with *wunna* are ‘Wonne, Freude, Lust, Glück, Seligkeit, Wollust, Nutzung (?) Ergötzung, Genuss, Vergnügen’. As can be seen, ‘Weide’ is not amongst them. On the other hand, meaning of delight is quite clear. To stress that, OHG *wunnigarto* ‘park, paradise’ can be pointed out.

It is a bit romantic to suppose that Go. *winja* – Icel. *vin* had the basic meaning ‘likeable place’ and that they derived from the root *yṛm-, as did ON *von* ‘hope’, *vinr* ‘friend’, *yndi* ‘joy’ and others. This idea can be found as early as in the middle of
the 19th century. Munch (1849: X–XI) mentions that *vin* is quite common in place names, continuing:


When looking for a new etymology for Go. *winja* and Icel. *vin*, one can stop with the PIE root *ueij-*/*ui-*, meaning ‘twist, bend, turn’, according to Pokorny (1959: 1120–1121), Magnússon (1989: 1114 [i veggur]), and Orel (2003: 441 [*wajjuz*]); *ueiH-*/*uiH-*, according to Jasanoff (1978: 84); *uih1-i*/*uih- ‘to wrap, encase’, according to LIV: 695; and *uih1-*, according to Kroonen (2013: 568 [*wajju-*]), cf. Casaretto (2004: 199) and Lehmann (1986: 386 W1). So, then, Go. *vinja*, Icel. *vin* < PGmc. *winjó* derived from a case form of an old *n*-stem that had a zero grade of the root and the suffix, PIE *uih1-n-je∗h2 – actually the same root as in Go. -waddjus, ON veggr ‘wall’ < PGmc. *wajjuz* < PIE *wooij1-us*. Kroonen (2013: 568) assumes PIE *uih1-u- with a syllabic laryngeal for PGmc. *wajju-*. It is possible that PIE *uih1-n-> *uh1i-n; if the most vowel-like sounds became syllabic but the less vowel-like remained non-syllabic, then the laryngeal was lost without traces, yielding “ui-n- etc.

Interestingly, Lehmann (1986: 400 W52; cf. Feist 1939: 559–560 [weipan]) also chooses the root *ueij- with the ‘root enlargement’ -b-, *ueij-b-*, when he explains the Gothic verb *weipan* ‘to crown; στεφανοῦν’. The Gothic nouns *wipja and waips*, both meaning ‘crown; στέφανος’, derived from *weipan*. They are used for the thorny crown (e.g. in John 19:5). The first shows a zero grade but the second shows an *o*-grade. In LIV: 671, this is found under the root *ueip- ‘get into swinging/shivering movement’. Another variant of the root enlargement, -p-, is thought to be present in Go. *biwaibjan* ‘surround, clothe’ and ON *veifa ‘be in swinging movement’. In LIV the words just mentioned are not assumed to be connected with the same root as Go. -waddjus and ON veggr. Nevertheless, this assumption is tempting, as the meaning resemblance is great. We can assume that the root had a laryngeal, *wooj1-*, to account for the ‘Verschärfung’ in Go. -waddjus and ON veggr,

5 Translation [MSn]: It corresponds exactly to Gothic *winja*, which by Ulfilas is used in the meaning ‘pasture’, and to the OE *wynn*, the OHG *wunna*, although these are only used in the meaning ‘joy’, the Modern German ‘Wonne’. So, the word has evidently hindsight to the time when the sheep-breeding was our forefather’s most preferable livelihood, and when the best pasture also was the most likable place. Which of the two meanings is the original one is difficult to decide; but if one takes notice of the similarity and, therefore, also the relationship with the noun *vinr* x: ‘friend’, one should indeed cling to the opinion, that the word has literally signified ‘joy’, ‘likable place’, and that the meaning ‘pasture’ is derived.
and with the root enlargement -p/-b-, e.g. in weipan*, and an n-stem with the zero grade in the root and suffix, resulting in PGmc. *wi-n-jó in Go. winja and Icel. vin. It should also be mentioned that PIE *uhih,nihi₂ should give PGmc. *winjó-, as the root vowel is shortened or not lengthened in this position (Dybo’s Law; cf. Schrijver 1991: 351–356). Thus, the conclusion would be the same whether the root ended in a laryngeal or not.

The PGmc. *wajjuz ‘wall’ was supposedly a twisted wall originally. Then, by extension, it came to denote a wall of stone as well (Go. baurgswaddjus ‘townwall’). The original meaning of PGmc. *winjó could have been ‘delimited area’, or perhaps ‘enclosure’. It is also possible that in the beginning it denoted a fence, but then its meaning was extended to include the fenced in area. Probably, it also denoted an enclosure in nature, made by rock, etc. Still, it is impossible to say how Icel. vin got its modern meaning ‘oasis’.

Actually, though, a similar explanation appears for Vries (1961: 664 [vin]), whereby he finds it possible that PIE *yen- had the meaning ‘fence’, and with a dental enlargement it created *yendh-, which is found in ON vinda ‘to wring’, cf. Trier (1963: 113–114). The problem is that the meaning ‘fence, wall’ is not easily assigned to the root *yen-.

3. Go. sunja ‘truth; ἀλήθεια’

There is no disagreement about the origin in this case. Here we have a derivation from the zero grade of the PIE root *h₁es ‘to be’. It appears to be straightforward that PGmc. *sunjō < PIE *h₁es₁h₂ gave us Go. sunja ‘truth’, ON syn ‘denial, refutation’ (also the goddess name Syn; in Modern Icelandic, syn is only found in the compound nauðsyn ‘necessity’), OE synn ‘offence, sin, hostility’, OS sundia ‘truth, distress, illness’ and OHG sunna (2×) ‘truth, excuse, justification, legitimate hindrance’. However, it is usually maintained that Go. sunja etc. derived from the same protoform as OHG sunta and OS sundia ‘sin’, i.e. PGmc. *sunðijō- < PIE *h₁es₁tíh₂.

To connect OE synn and OHG sunta, Kluge (1881: 106) first floated the hypothesis that OE synn ‘sin’ was created from PWGmc. *sundjō, which had the cluster -ndj- in all inflectional forms; thus, -ndj- became -nn-. On the other hand, the nom. sg. of OE bend ‘band, fetters’ was originally *bandi, gen. sg. *bandjōs. In this paradigm, then, nd+V and nd+j alternated, and ultimately, the alternation created two variants, OE bend and benn. The latter form could have easily merged with the homophonous OE benn ‘soar’ (< *banjō; see section 1). The form benn- occurs a few times where bend- would be expected (see below). A few years later, Kluge (1885: 444, cf. 1901: 379) altered the hypothesis so that he also reconstructed the nom. sg. as PGmc. *sundi. From the oblique cases in that paradigm we got Go. sunja and OE synn because of syncope or assimilation of the dental between n and j. OHG sunta (and OS sundia), on the other hand, generalised the nominative form of the stem,
so the paradigm ultimately ended up as two separate words: OHG sunta and sunna, OS sundia and sunnia. Helten (1905) points out that the premise for a change such as the syncopation of *d* between *n* and *j* is that Sievers’ Law had ceased to work, i.e. the Proto-Germanic difference between the *j*-stems and the *i/j*-stems had disappeared: PGmc. *bandī* then had the gen. sg. form *bandjōs* but not *bandijōs*. This must have happened before the difference between the nom. sg. of short and long *j*-stems disappeared in West Germanic. Otherwise, the stem form of the nom. sg. of the long stems could not be different from the stem form of the oblique cases.

Accepting this involves the conclusion that words showing the cluster -ndj- were either created after the change had occurred or owes the cluster to analogy. As an example, Go. *bandi* ‘fetters; δεσμός’ should have the form *banjos* in the gen. sg. The actual form, *bandjos*, has been influenced by the nominative. This explanation has been long-lived. Thus, Seebold (1969: 20; cf. also 1980: 452) accepts it, but he admits that it is “nicht streng lautgesetzlich”, and actually, the word in question, Go. *sunja*, is “das einzig völlig sichere Beispiel für den Schwund eines Dentals zwischen *n* und *j*” (Seebold 1980: 452), cf. Lehmann (1986: 329 [S163]). Casaretto (2004: 440) maintains that Go. *sunja* shows, in the oblique cases, “Dentalschwund vor *-j-*” almost as though this is a regular sound change. She also agrees with the idea that here one paradigm became two. But the meaning ‘sin’ or the like is absolutely not the meaning of Go. *sunja* or ON *syn*.

Kieckers (1928: 80–81) appears to be the only to express doubt about the explanation just drafted. He mentions the possibility that Go. *sunja* was created by the loss of a dental between *n* and *j* but considers this uncertain. He points to Go. *sandjan* ‘to send’ as an exception that has to be younger than the loss of the dental, but such exceptions would be numerous. For example, *nehvundja* ‘fellowman’ and *þusundi* ‘thousand’ should have lost the *d* in the oblique cases, and actually, it should have been lost from the whole paradigm of the former word. Kieckers’s point is important. The traditional explanation of Go. *sunja* has the effect that forms such as *sandjan* ‘send’ and *bandjos* need an explanation, which they do need not if the theory on the -ndj- cluster is abandoned, i.e. it is necessary to explain why there are still word forms with the cluster -ndj-; to assume a loss from PGmc. *sunjō* only would be hard to support. Here the desire to connect Go. *sunja* with Skt. *satya- ‘true’ and OHG *santa* has been decisive.

High German appears to have lost the noun *sunna*, perhaps because it overshadowed ‘the sun’, OHG *sunna*. Similarly, the process *syn → synja* ‘to deny’ → *synjun* ‘denial’ in Icelandic has rendered *syn* superfluous; *synjun* has taken its place. OE *synn* developed the meaning ‘sin’ (and lives forth in English *sin*). Thereby, the Old English cognate of OS *sundia* and OHG *sunta* became superfluous and was subsequently lost.

The possibility should not be excluded that Proto-Germanic contained both forms, *sunjō* < PIE *h₁s-ų-t-ėh₂* and *sunōī* (obl. *sunōijō *) < PIE *h₁s-ųt-īh₂*. The former

---

7 Brugmann (1897: 707–708) mentions some examples that are meant to support this but they are hard to accept.
could have derived from an old $n$-stem with a zero grade of the root and suffix, just like *banjō and *winjō. The latter is an old present participle that did not enter into Gothic or North-Germanic (as ON synd 'sin' is generally considered a loan word). The West-Germanic forms with -$nn$- have the geminate as a result of the gemination before -$j$- (Brunner 1965: 186–187; Braune, Eggers 1975: 94–98; Gallée 1910: 157, 182). Therefore, there is no reason to assume a loss of a dental or its assimilation to $n$ to account for them. Thus, Campbell (1959: 237) says that OE synn comes from *sunjō. Brunner (1965: 159) mentions only OE synne 'sin' as an example when he discusses the loss of $d$. Sometimes $d$ also drops from the ending of the present participle (Brunner 1965: 279). Brunner refers, on this connection, to Malone (1929), who only discusses the sporadic loss of $d$ finally and in a syllable with secondary stress. On the other hand, Campbell (1959: 196) says that the change -$nd-$ > -$nn$- ocurred in Old English only four times in the forms of the noun bend 'fetters', i.e. nom. pl. benne (1×) and dat. pl. bennum (3×). It should be mentioned that in Bessinger (1978: 111) the first occurrence (Daniel 434) has been corrected to bende, but the rest has benn kept without conjecture (Genesis 1972; Andreas 962, 1038; Juliana 519). This implies that the meaning 'wound' is not considered impossible in these cases, although the meaning 'fetters' would be much more likely. See also Wülker (1888: 49, note on Andreas 1038.)

The main thing is that there is no need for the traditional explanation. In the Old High German form sunna, the -$nn$- could very well be a regular offspring of PGmc. -$nj$- in *sunjō. According to Köbler (1993: 1050 [sunna (i)]), OHG sunna had the meanings ‘Wahrheit, Entschuldigung, Rechtfertigung, gesetzlich anerkannter Hinderungsgrund’. This is in good agreement with Go. sunja ‘truth’ and ON syn. Also according to Köbler (1993: 1050 [sunta (i)]), OHG sunta had the meanings ‘Sünde, Vergehen, Laster, Schuld, Schandtat’. Clearly, the meanings of the two nouns do not overlap, as would be expected if they had grown out of the same paradigm. Summing up, Go. sunja, ON syn, OE synn, OS sunnia and OHG sunna most likely derived from PGmc. *sunjō. On the other hand, OS sundia and OHG sunta (older suntea) are descendants of WGmc. *sundojō-, which is absent in other Germanic languages. However, it was, most likely, borrowed into Old Norse.

4. Conclusion

The conclusion is that all three nouns – Go. banja*, winja, and sunja – could have derived from a case form of an old $n$-stem with a zero grade of both the root and the suffix. To this the additional suffix *-$jō$ was added. The basis of *banja is probably the same, but an $e$- or $o$-grade would give the same result: PIE *$b^h$-$h_2$-$n$- or *$b^h$-$h_2$-$en$- or *$b^h$-$h_2$-$on$- > PGmc. *ban-. Also, *$b$an- became the root of ON bani and its West-Germanic cognates (and the ON verb bana). As mentioned in the beginning, the suffix *-$nieh₂$ was originally a combination of two forms. Perhaps they never melted into a whole. The roots of banja*, winja and sunja are found outside Germanic, but probably not these specific derivations.
Go. *winja* and Icel. *vin* are derived from the same root as PGmc. *wajjuz* ‘wall’. Then, OHG *sunta* and OS *sundia* descended from PGmc. *sunðijō*-.. In Old High German this noun has also taken the nominative ending of the ō-stems; the regular form would be *sunte*. The derivation of Go. *sunja*, ON *syn*, OE *synn(e)*, OS *sunnia* and OHG *sunne* from PGmc. *sunðijō*- lacks evidence. The geminate -nn- in the West-Germanic forms is the result of a well-established West-Germanic rule. Also, the Gothic and Old Norse forms are best understood as descendants of PGmc. *sunjō*.

The derivation and development of the nouns discussed here can be said to be regular; the outcome is in accordance with well-established rules and principles connecting Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Germanic.
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