When did \textit{nd} become \textit{nn} in which Early Irish environments?
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1. \textit{GOI}§151 (c): ‘The assimilation of \textit{nd} to \textit{nn} in proclitic words begins in the archaic period’.
\textit{inda}, Philargyrius, Wb. I; \textit{dundaib}, Cambrai; \textit{> inna} (Cambrai), \textit{donaib};
cf. \textit{POKORNY} 1923 on ‘\textit{Da}- in Irish place names’ < \textit{inda}.
\textit{GOI}§151 (c): ‘Otherwise \textit{nd} before vowels and in final position is retained in Wb.’.
Add \textit{FORTSON} 2009/10 on -\textit{gleinn} verbs (cf. \textit{GOI}§548) and pre-Wb. \textit{*e/iNd’e/i} > \textit{*e/iN’e/i}.

2. \textit{BREATNACH} 1994: 259, §7.7: ‘-\textit{nd/nn} vs. -\textit{n}. Diaidh ar ndiaidh déantar -\textit{n} singil a ghinear-
álú sa MG, ach nuair nach singil é is suntasach a annaimhe is a mheasctar -\textit{nd} agus -\textit{nn}
stairiúil i litriú an ailt, ar nós ‘\textit{sinn inud} “san áit”, \textit{LL} 31162 (\textit{TT})’ – adding ‘samplaí den
fhoirm stairiúil’ and ‘samplaí den simpliú go -\textit{n}’.

3. Compare nasalised \textit{nd-} (and \textit{mb-}):
\textit{FEUTH} 1982: 88: ‘nasalized plosives are [in Old Irish sources] uniformly written as \textit{mb},
\textit{nd}, \textit{ng}’.
If \textit{> /N/} etc., occasional phonetic spellings might have been expected, cf. (len.)
\textit{inna[f]laith} ‘into His kingdom’, Wb. 31a3; (nas.) \textit{amal dète} ‘as … goes’, \textit{Ml.} 93b12–13.
\textit{FEUTH} 1982: 91: ‘… problem … why coalescence [i.e. \textit{ND} > \textit{N}] is expressed in the spelling
in one case (viz. within words …), but not in the other (viz. in the case of nasaliza-
tion)’.
\textit{ibid.}: ‘difference in phonological environment, viz. the fact that nasal-plosive coalescence
works within words, whereas nasalization is essentially a rule operating between
words’.
Furthermore in favour of /\textit{ND}/ rather than /\textit{N}/ = -\textit{CNC-} > -\textit{CC-}?
(a) word-internal: \textit{dofoirde} … \textit{dofoirnde} ‘that … denotes’, Sg. 203b4, etc.; \textit{FEUTH} 1982: 91–3, see \textit{GOI} §180 (3); \textit{THURNEYSEN} 1905: 1–2
(b) ?between words: \textit{fritoil dée} ‘against God’s will’, < \textit{fri toil ndé}? Cf. \textit{FEUTH} 1982: 89–90
and \textit{THURNEYSEN} 1905: 6, 8, 10–12, for or implying (optional) deletion, vs. \textit{ROMA}
2018, 2020 for limitations on analogical spread (at least after stressed nominals).

4. \textit{ROMA} 2013: 255: ‘Mentre in generale -\textit{nn}e -\textit{nd} finali in MI sono grafie alternative per la
nasale non lenita/ tesa, nel caso dell’articolo la grafia con -\textit{nd} in posizione finale
rappresentava una sequenza di due consonanti, che compara di norma in IA … davanti
da vocale e \textit{f}, \textit{r}, \textit{l}, \textit{n}, lenite. La conservazione di questa grafia è tanto più notevole data
la direzione della semplificazione verso -\textit{n} semplice. Si noti che l’articolo è una forma
proclitica, che forma con la parola seguente una parola fonologica’.
\textit{UHLLICH} 2014: 160: ‘… most likely implying that the original \textit{d} was protected in this special
pattern when introducing the stressed syllable’.
For the syllabic segmentation, cf.  
\((n)d’adaig = \text{ind } adaig ‘on the (following) night’, GOI §251.3, see THURNEYS EN 1936: 356–7 (see also DIL s.v. 1 adaig 28.29–40, s.v. dadaig):  
\( nd \text{ adaig} [\text{sic leg.}, \text{Thurneysen}], \text{CompCC} \S 5 \)  
\( \text{dadaig, BDD} 91 (\S 7; \text{v.l. issin aidhqui}, \text{Eg.}, \text{s. BDD}), 133 (\S 12). \)  
in | \text{dfir} ‘of the man’, Wb. 33c9 (MS 33va23, left margin)  
cf. linking alliteration:  
\( a \text{ nduine} \). → \( \text{It } {\text{e}} \) ’their strongholds. | These are they’, \( \text{Fél.} \text{ Prol.} 68–9 \)

5. \textbf{Two general} environments distinguished by \text{GOI}, i.e. without distinguishing by syllables:  
\([\text{[]} = \text{proclitic/pretonic}, [\text{O}] = \text{tonic/stressed}, [\text{O}] = \text{enclitic/posttonic}]\):  
(a) \( \text{Ond[O]}: \text{EOIr. inda} > \text{ClassOIr. inna} \)  
(b) \( \text{Ond(O)}: \text{ClassOIr. cland (12x Wb., 40x ML.)} > \text{clan(n) (1x Wb., 2x ML.)} \)  
\( \text{legend: Érenn, Fél. Sep. 26} \)  
(or \( \text{OndO}: \text{Cenandán} > \text{Cenannán} \)  
\textbf{add} (c) \( \text{OndO}: \text{ClassOIr. ind V- (etc.)} > \text{MidIr.ind V-} > \text{in(n)} \ V- \)

6. \( \text{ROMA 2020: 190–1} \) on 5x -\( n \)- in Sg.:  
\( \text{etar n dirainn} ‘\text{between the two parts’}, \text{Sg. 2b2; + Thes. (Supplement) II, 493:} ‘\text{Apparently for etar in di rainn, with reduction of the article between the preposition and the noun [sic], ’}, \text{see STRACHAN 1903: 488.} \)  
\( \text{eter ndán · ulla ‘between the two ullas’, Sg. 45b19.} \)  
\( \text{STRACHAN 1903: 488:} \)  
\( \text{cf. also tresigné ‘by the species’, Sg. 73b1, ‘undoubtedly for tresin ñgné’, but \text{ROMA 2020: 191, n. 15:} with ‘nasalising accusative neuter singular article ... for tresaṅné(cf. DIL s.v. tre, 277.12–13).} \)  
\( \text{cf. also frisimbiat ‘with which they are’, Sg. 202b3.} \)  
\( \text{is fornón n deilb biit semper, ‘tis corresponding to one paradigm they are always (declined’), Sg. 201b6 (on the apparently “Scottish” nasalising n see \text{ROMA 2020: 190}).} \)  
\( \text{far cētnu diull ... far nóendeilb, ‘according to the first declension ... according to the same paradigm, Sg. 90b2, i.e. dat. also in 201b6 (ROMA 2020: 191).} \)  
\( \text{arbertar as noëntarmoircium, ‘they are expressed by the same termination’, Sg. 33a19a (leg. nóen-, ROMA 2020: 191, n. 13).} \)

7. \textbf{óen} in \( \text{“compounds”?} \)

(1) Cf. ModIr. \( \text{aon}: \text{Ó CURNÁIN 2007: §3.88:} only recorded as type II (= primary stress on aon-, secondary [or none] on base, ‘-’ or ‘-’ or type III (= ‘-’) never type I (= ‘-’).  
(2) \( \text{ind óen ré} ‘at the same time’ : umaide, Blathmac §87 (ll. 345–6; MS ind oen re) i n-oen-uair ‘thereupon’: sluaig, Gospel of Thomas §41 (ll. b, d; MS anaon uair) \)

\( \text{CARNEY 1964: 129, n. 345:} ‘\text{Note that oen does not form a compound with the following word; similarly i n-oen uair (anaon uair MS.), II, § 41’.} \)  
\( \text{CARNEY 1964: 163 [‘i n-oen-uair’]:} ‘\text{it would appear that in the early Old Irish period it was not uncommon for the second element in a compound to rhyme independently. Compare in Broccán’s poem on St. Brigit maith (: derglaid), noedbúil} \)
(: súil), amra (: comlabra), Thes. II, pp. 337–8. This practice may have been
imitated sporadically in the later period – but also referring to:
O’BRIEN 1955: 51, on internal rhyme Lianna : bliadna in rē œenbliadna deāc, p. 46,
§43: ‘Perhaps in the construction with deāc ölenn need not form a compound with
the following noun’.

(3) Félire Óenguso (Rinnard, 4x 62)

(a) compound:
conrecat for öenchái ‘they meet on the same road’, Fél. 10 June.
Cf. scís : öendís, Thes. II, 293.18 (rind γ airdrind)

(b) preposed adjective:
for öenlíni ‘on one line’, Fél. Oct. 2 (consonance with fēli : Eusébi)
Oct. 14 (: Paulíni, consonance ógí)
cechóin laithi ‘of every single day’, Fél. Ep. 5 (end of line a)

(4) GOI §385.1: ‘oín-, öen-, always in composition’;
Cf. §365.5 (where also on fecht n-ölenn, etc.).
Cf. (semantically no longer transparent)
öenach ‘assembly’ < *oín-o-agó- (aígí; O’Brien, see GREENE 1954: 334);
öenar ‘one alone’ < *oine-úiron (fer; HAMP 1982: 179–80);
or with enclitic voicing öenrad ‘one grace’, Wb. 13b9 (rath) (unless hypercorrect
spelling, cf GOI §130).

However, DIL s.v. oen I (f):
inna óina oinasa, gl. hos eosdem® (deos), Ml. 70a4 (also quoted GOI §351. (2)),
‘these very same ones’, GRIFFITH & STIFTER 2013.
inna oinaméite ‘of the same size’, Sg. 203a26, with proclitic depalatalisation
(contrast stressed substantivised in cuit inna aine γ inna aile ‘the part of the
one and of the other’, BCr. 31c4).
On secondary proclisis see ÚHLICH 2019: 20–7, e.g.
aile + aile > al(a)ail(a); cách > cachfer, ní (for *né) > nalled (leth).

8. Result: with öen in secondary proclisis, the pattern applicable to the development of the
dat. sg. article ind underlying fornōin n deilb, far noëndeilb, as noëntarmori cunning in no. 6
above is (cf. no. 5)

not (c) ©nd®: ClassOIr. ind V- (etc.) > MidIr. ind V- > in(n) V-
but (a) ©nd®: EOIr. inda > ClassOIr. inna

Thus as-ind-ölenn X > asinnóen X > asnóen X.

to the quite respectable number of valuable phonetic spellings in the case of nasalized
voiceless plosives, debe mec is an isolated instance as far as nasalized voiced plosives are
concerned. Therefore it looks like, and definitely must be a writing error’.

atá debe mec nand ‘there is a little difference there’, Ml. 40a20.
Cf. MidIr. *Loch nEchach n-án* ‘shining Loch nEchach’, LL I. 28572
OIr. *fis forcell 7 diledig rechto ndèè* ‘knowledge of the testimonies and rules of the law of God’, Wb. 46c8
dèè didiu nand ‘two things, then, are therein’, Wb. 1a5 (*didiu* as such neither ‘not fully stressed’ nor ‘weakly stressed’ [GOI §§41 (b), 901], see GOI p. 673)

See UHLICH 2019 for nasalisation being transferred across a secondarily proclitic word (*Echach, rechto, didiu*) to the following stressed word, and cf. MidIr. (BERGIN 1932)
a nda n-athair, Anecd. III, 57.24, ‘both of their fathers’
a da nduma, LL I. 1541, ‘their two mounds’

Pattern dèè didiu n-ànd = debe mec n-ànd, i.e. with fully proclitic /Mb/ > /M/?
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