D. A. Binchy has surely defined for us the force in its original use of *co nómad n-áu* within the bounding framework of the *derbhine*. In referring to Thurneysen he calls *áu* the 'original form of the preposition ó . . . used for the conjugated preposition + dative sg. m. and n. ', and he cites GOI, where this shape of ó, *áu* would be 'possibly retained as an adverb'. Later Binchy speaks of 'the ninth man from him'. He compares *áu* in this use to and for. I have no quarrel with any of this; and, as always, I can only admire and feel gratitude to Binchy for the clear and penetrating light he has regularly shed on difficult, vexed, gratuitously muddled, and important problems of language and history. He has left the Irish phase of this riddle well scoured. I wish simply by this note pedantically to insist on certain points which this valuable archaic form documents and which may be added to our dossier of Indo-European grammar attested in Celtic.

While forms such as for (OWelsh *guar, guor, GMW*, Breton *war, Vannetais *ar*), foL (early Welsh *o, GMW, 205 § 231 n. 2), ah (Latin *ante, Latin *inter, Sanskrit *antar*), t'N (Welsh, yN Greek *iv*), tar (Sanskrit *tir'ah, Avestan *tar'oh < **tr'ésh, i.e. *trHt'esh, and trL (perhaps *tr(e)si, i.e. *trHr'esi ~ *trHt'esi) developed into simple grammatical prepositions, Indo-European adverbial particles as well as derived or inflected forms took their places as suppletive 3 sg. non-feminine (unmarked) members of the inflected ('conjugated') paradigm of the prepositions. Thus these forms of the 'conjugated prepositions' never ceased in Celtic to be adverbs, continuing their Indo-European adverbial syntax regardless of their source morphology. I have written about and in this connexion; I have suggested that *de* is to

1. *du* 'away'

---

1 The original meaning of *co nómad náu* (nó); linguists v. historians?, *Cella* 16 (1984) 1-12.
2 Ibid., 6.
5 Ibid., 6.
7 For detail on the British cognates of these two prepositions and prefixes see E. P. Hamp, *Studia Celta* 7 (1972) 155-6.
8 3 sg. *riam* 'before [it]' must be, as GOI 528 § 881 teaches us, *priamos-foremost*.
9 In 3 sg. *ether 'between (it)' we may have a convergence of *ent(e)ri-om or *ent(e)r-i- id 'between him/her' (as GOI 283-4 implies) and an old locative sg. *ent(e)-ri (Sanskrit *antar') or *enter-ei (if thematic; cf. Sanskrit *antar-ama) 'in the interval' > 'in between; at all'.
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be derived from \textipa{*dp(-)}\textsuperscript{11}, and I have stated my position on the status of the elements that have since become prepositions.\textsuperscript{12}

Thus an Indo-European particle, which could become a preverb when adjoined to a verb nucleus (\textipa{do-n-formaig} and \textipa{format}, with \textipa{*wor < *wer < *upr}) or a preposition to a noun phrase (\textipa{for a ciumn, mis for blia-drain, co n-estarwrf, cum magna fide}), or a postposition (Latin \textipa{magn cum periculo}, \textipa{quad = Oscan adpúd}, Umbrian \textipa{asam-a(ř)} ‘to/at the altar’, -\textipa{ku(m)} -\textipa{co(m) ‘al’}), or a conjunction when adjoined to a clause (Armenian \textipa{ew ‘and’}, Sanskrit \textipa{āpi ‘also’} = Greek \textipa{ἐπί}, Latin \textipa{ante} = English \textipa{and}, perhaps OIr. \textipa{sír(L)} ‘for’ as a conjunction \textipa{GOI}, 559–60 § 906), or a captured grammatical clitic or affix (OIr. \textipa{r o}, \textipa{Ver-cingetorix}), could also remain an independent adverbial constituent. Of course, such a constituent could make up a part of a larger phrasal structure, as the projected initial nasalization of \textipa{co nómad n-áu} makes plain.

In this sense, following Biny, I would equally render this phrase ‘until the ninth [man] away’, i.e. ‘off’, or ‘removed’. In the later bleached meaning, even, of ‘for ages’ or ‘forever’, this adverbial conserve its value (roughly ‘on’) to the vanishing point, and shows up in Thurneyesen’s [Biny’s and Bergin’s] glosses (\textipa{GOI}, 524 § 847) ‘from him on’ and ‘from that on’. Additionally to Biny, therefore, I would delete from Thurneyesen’s note (loc. laud.) the word ‘possibly’.

I would also see the -\textipa{d} of (\textipa{h}uád (\textipa{huaid}) as a genuine inheritance in the grammar, and not by analogy with \textipa{and, indi, etc. I take this 3rd person -\textipa{d} (also in \textipa{samalaid} and in the Welsh second conjugation) to be cognate with the Hittite dental adverbial ending.\textsuperscript{13}

Our forms of \textipa{ó/úáL} are therefore pure Indo-European, with syntax suffering appreciable attrition only in pre-verbal nexus.

It is now time to consider the shape of this particle. It is immediately clear that (\textipa{n-})\textipa{áu} conserves the stressed configuration seen in \textipa{áu ‘ear’ and áue ‘grandson’; cf. GOI, 44 § 69. It is not at all clear that it is necessary to have an *s following in order to preserve an earlier *au in this rather sparsely occurring diphthong; cf. ibid., 40 § 60 and 44 § 69. We might rather see áu as the earlier Old Irish outcome of main stressed *au, and \textipa{ó} (merging with *ou) as the similar outcome of clitic *au. This would accord perfectly with the attested forms of our free-standing particle. Then by analogy the \textipa{ó} vocalism would have been transported to the stressed ‘conjugated’ forms, as well as to the compound \textipa{háu-bela} and its descendants (a type which Sanskrit attests; note \textipa{atapána- ‘drinking place’, atapàna- ‘fallen down’}).

\textsuperscript{11} \textit{American Journal of Philology} 101 (1980) 190–93.


\textsuperscript{13} See extensively on such adverbs and local cases the pair of articles by Philo Houwink ten Cate and by Folke Josephson, \textit{Revue Hittite et Asiatique} 24 (1966) 123–32 and 133–52.
In any event, we seem now to be assured that the background of our etymon is *au, and not *apo > *ao, which we might in any case assume to have given OIr. tâ. The cognacy of Latin a-ferō and Slavic u 'from' now appears to be beyond doubt. The Indo-European particle in question is */Hesu*; the Sanskrit preverb *āyu* is an extended form.

This fits well, too, with our British evidence. Welsh a 'from' goes naturally in its phonology with a clitic reduction from *au*. Then Welsh a (GMW, 37 § 39) 'of' and Cornish and Breton a are best credited, as I have claimed, to *apo*.

K. H. Jackson, *Historical phonology of Breton* (Dublin 1967) 312 § 426, then, requires correction in this respect.

2. ní '(any)thing'

*DIL* N–41 observes for ní (n. and m.) 'a thing' that the 'transition from indef. pron. to subst. is gradual' and begins as early as Old Irish in the glosses with móir ní 'a great thing' = 'greatly'. The account continues, 'Preceded by indef. pron. adj.: na ní aravagart som “anything which he has forbidden” Wb. 5 c 23. na ní robu thol dō do frithoircmúb “whatever injuries he wished (to do)” Ml. 33 a 18.... The transition was further aided by confusion with the OIr. demonstr. pron. i, in neut. with art. a n-i (siu, sin) “this, that” which was later analysed as a-ní; a-ní is common in Mid.Ir. both as demonstr. and introducing rel. clause, being used indifferently with the forms anní, in ní. The observations of the material here are useful, but the reasoning on the transition from indefinite pronoun to noun is awed. The principal error lies in negligence of conservative Irish (and Scottish Gaelic) phonetics and phonology; so too *LÉIA* N–14 s.v. ní.

We must first make clear what we understand as the phonological (the phonetic and morphophonemic) shapes of the relevant forms. The indefinite pronoun should have been [nih] Ní. The ultimate noun must have been [nih] Ní. Articulated, this became [s'ñi] aN Ní (neut.) and [in'ñi] or [s(n')ñi] in Ní (masc.); the accusative of the masculine was [in'ñi] or [s(n')ñi] inN Ní. All of these noun-phrases could have sounded alike [s'ñi] or [s'ñi]; the masculine forms may have been heard as [iñi] or [tñi]. One can imagine that the indefinite pronoun and non-definite noun were [nih], while the definite nouns were sometimes [ñi].

We know that eclipsis before vowel resulted in a weak nasal. Therefore the demonstrative neuter (employing the article) must have been [s'ñi] 18 aN-i 'this/that object/matter'; the demonstrative masculine

---

15 In view of Greek ἄνο, Sanskrit āpa, Hittite āpsa, Albanian hap 'open(s)', this must be IE *hēpo*.
16 *Dictionary of the Irish language* (Dublin 1913–76).
17 J. Vendryes et al., *Lexique étymologique de l’irlandais ancien* (Paris and Dublin 1959–).
18 For a clear perception of the difference today between /n/ and /n/ the dialect of Colonsay is excellent.
[\[i[nt'\text{it}] \text{i}N{\text{i}t} \text{--i} \text{or} \text{i}N{\text{ab}} \text{--i} \text{‘this/that one’ is not essential to our argument.} \text{We see immediately that no native speaker could have confused} \text{[s'ni] aN} \text{--i} \text{‘this/that thing’ and} \text{[s'\text{n}i] it} aN{\text{N}} \text{‘the (this/that) thing’. Only a non-native or a modern speaker of an acculturated variety could miss the distinction; the difference in tension, pressure, length (nasal duration), and palatal contact must have been substantial, noticeable, even visible.}^{19}

Thurneysen shows (GOI, 310 § 489b) that he grasped all this by noting the alternatives an-i, the indefinite pronoun ni ‘anything, nothing’ and the combination nan-i, i.e. na\text{h}^-{-}Na\text{t}; and by suggesting that an\text{h} Mi. 90 b 13 is a hybrid form developed from these. The weakness, however, of Thurneysen’s argument is that it is incomplete. We wish to know what the conditions were for such a ‘hybridization’. It is preferable not to say simply that na\text{h} Na\text{t} got in the way of an\text{h} to produce a\text{h} Na\text{t}, just as we have avoided imagining that a\text{h} reminded speakers of a\text{h} Na\text{t}. In fact, the latter proposal at least has on its side a shared syntactic noun-phrase structure.

I think there is a much simpler explanation of the genesis of ni ‘thing’ that lies to hand. We must start from the given that Old Irish had the locution na-n\text{mi} na ni ‘anything whatever’ (GOI, 310 § 489 b), glossed with a comma ‘anything, whatever’in DIL N=5, [\text{na'\text{n}{\text{t}}} na\text{h}^-{-}Na\text{t}]. The internal syntax of this expression seems to be in origin a sort of reduplication, na\text{h} adjectival ‘any’ (GOI, 309–310 § 489b) + ni ‘anything’ (GOI, 309 § 489a), perhaps < *ne\text{h}^-{-}ni < *ne{\text{k}}[\text{a}] + n\text{e} () (cf. Thurneysen’s perplexity GOI, 311 § 491). Synchronously this sequence in Old Irish was an adjectival plus a pronoun, perhaps with a heightened value ‘anything at all’ vs the simple ni ‘anything’.

The emergence of the neuter noun ni is correlated with the frequency of the grammatically neuter concatenation na-n\text{mi} in Old Irish. The appearance of the noun n\text{e}ch ‘a person’ (DIL N=18), not dealt with at all in L\text{EIA}, only in Middle Irish matches the fact that such a syntactic concatenation was not exploited in anything like the same fashion in the masculine.

Now the construction of indefinite nach/na\text{h} + noun was perfectly regular in the grammar; cf. GOI, 309 § 489b, DIL N=4/5. So we find en na for\text{cor}n Wb. 28 a 17 [\text{gen na 'for\text{cor}}n\text{] g\text{en}^L \text{na\text{h} for\text{cor}na\text{t} N} \text{‘without any end’}. It is clear then that at any time na-n\text{mi} could have been reinterpreted as indefinite adjectival + noun. Thus in the phrase na\text{h} + Na\text{t} the second element was taken as a noun and the whole phrase was understood as ‘any + thing’.

I assume that the Old Irish phrase m\text{or} ni was taken as a loose compound m\text{or}^L Na\text{t} \to m\text{or} ‘ni.

\text{\footnotesize{19Our insistence on careful reconstruction of hypothetical phonetics is not aimed at false realism or mime, but is to provide clear disputable criteria for the understanding and interpretation of graphs, syntaxes, and linguistic changes.}}
The vocalism of \( n^h \) would appear to be related to the *ę of the Slavic indefinites in *nę-. I find Lewis and Pedersen's 'loss of final -od' in *ne-kęod\(^{20}\) unmotivated, as well as being unexplanatory as a reconstruction.

Eric P. Hamp
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