Nordic Journal of Linguistics (2023), page 1 of 11
doi:10.1017/S0332586522000270

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS

SHORT COMMUNICATION

Thoughts on the etymologies of *enn* and *hinn* in Nordic

Eric T. Lander

Department of Philosophy, Linguistics and Theory of Science, University of Gothenburg, Renströmsgatan 6, 412 55 Göteborg, Sweden
Email: jet.lander@gmail.com

(Received 16 March 2022; revised 28 November 2022; accepted 5 December 2022)

Abstract

This contribution focuses on Stroh-Wollin's (2020 in *NJL*) etymologies of the Nordic definite articles *enn* and *hinn* and contrastive *hinn*/*hitt*. While I do not contest her central claim that Old Icelandic *enn* and Mainland Scandinavian *hinn* have separate historical origins, I do argue that her etymologies should not be accepted over more conventional ones already present in the literature. First, the etymology of *enn* should, along traditional lines, be connected to Germanic cognates such as Gothic *jain-*, German *jen-*, and English *yon* (rather than derived from an ancient PIE **eno-*).[1] Furthermore, contrastive *hinn*/*hitt* and definite *hinn*/*hit* should be considered a doublet, both ultimately deriving from a distal/contrastive element (rather than the article having separate origins in an innovated Proto-Nordic proximal demonstrative).

Keywords: definite article; demonstrative; etymology; Germanic; Scandinavian

1. A recent take on *enn* and *hinn*

In recent work, Stroh-Wollin (2016, 2020) puts forth a detailed picture of the history and development of the definite articles *enn* and *(h)inn* in older stages of Nordic. Using data from early Norwegian and Icelandic manuscripts, Stroh-Wollin (see especially 2020:215 Table 1) argues that the preadjectival article in Old Icelandic was *enn*, to be distinguished from preadjectival *hinn* and suffixed *-(h)inn*[2] found on the mainland. According to her, the insular form *enn* later developed into *-enn* and *-inn* (with vowel *i* due to lack of stress), in turn resulting in preposed *inn* and *hinn*, forms which happened to converge with the article on the mainland (see Stroh-Wollin 2020:219–220).

Demonstrating that there is a real synchronic division between insular *enn* and mainland *hinn* is a true service to the field, but when it comes to the etymologies offered by Stroh-Wollin (2020), there are reasons to be skeptical. She posits, on the one hand, that the Old Icelandic article *enn* is a Nordic retention of PIE **enos* 'that'

Table 1. PIE **áno-* and **nó-*, and their cognates in Indo-European languages, from Dunkel (2014a:247, 2014b:55–58, 386).[a] Reconstructions in parentheses are based on attestations in only one IE dialect; see especially Melchert (2009) on the Hittite deictic elements

	**nó-*	
**áno-*	**é no-* 'that mentioned'	(**i̯ó no-*) 'and that'
PA **áno-* 'this' (Hitt. *ana-* 'this', *anišwat* 'today', ?Lyd. *ãn(a)-*) ?Ved. *áraṇa-* 'foreign, far' ?Toch.B *-ne*, A *-ṃ* (3SG pronominal clitic) PSl. **onŭ* etc. 'that, he' (continuations throughout Slavic) Lith. *anàs* 'that', dial. 'he'; *antaĩ* 'see there!' etc.	PA **anno-* 'that' (Hitt. *anniš* 'that', *annaz* 'earlier, once', *annalla-* 'former', Pal. N.NOM/ACC.PL *ānnī*; potentially also related forms in Luwian and Lydian) PII **aná* 'thus, hereby' (Ved. *aná*, Av. *anǎ*) < **e nóh₁* Gr. *ἔνη* 'the day after tomorrow' Lat. *enim* 'because, namely' Umbr. ENUK 'then' < **eno-ḱe* ?Toch. B *intsu*, A *äntsaṃ* 'which?, any' Arm. *ayn* 'that over there' < (**é h₂i no-*)	OE *geon-* 'that' Go. *jains* 'that' (<**i̯ó h₂i no-* 'and also that') and related adverbs like *jaind* 'thither', *jainþro* 'thence', *jaindre* 'thither'

[a]Forms which Dunkel explicitly rejects are, for obvious reasons, not included in the table.

(see Table 1 for relevant forms). On the other hand, she claims that the Old Mainland Nordic article *hinn/hit* developed from a Proto-Nordic proximal demonstrative, PN **hi̯ĭ-na-* 'this'. This proximal demonstrative is claimed to be distinct from the formally identical PN **hi̯ĭ-na-* 'the other/former', which gave rise to the contrastive *hinn/hitt/hint* 'the other/former' found throughout Nordic. Both forms – the proximal and the contrastive – would have had their ultimate origins in PIE **ḱi-* ∼ **ḱei-* (see Section 3 for cognates) plus **eno-*,[3] but supposedly they emerged at different times: the proximal in Proto-Nordic or Common Nordic, and the contrastive in pre-Germanic.

In this short contribution I will argue that Stroh-Wollin's reasons for positing these unconventional etymologies are not strong enough to justify abandoning more traditional views, which are perfectly sufficient to explain the origins of *enn* (discussed in Section 2) and *hinn* (discussed in Section 3).

2. The etymology of *enn*

OI *enn* is commonly associated with Go. *jains*, OHG *jen-*, OE *geon*, forms which go back to PG **jaina-* ∼ **jena-* ∼ **jana* 'that, the other' (on which see Hoffmann-Krayer 1897, Cercignani 1984:322–327, Klingenschmitt 1987:178–182, among others). The handbook version of this complex etymology is that **jaina-* is needed to account for Go. *jains*[4] and MHG *geinir*; **jena-* is needed to account for OHG *jen-*, MLG *jene*, and ON *enn*; and finally **jana-* is needed for OE *geon* (< unstressed **jon-*) (Krahe 1969:§39, Fulk 2018:198). The first element in PG **ja-na-* can be identified with the discourse particle 'yes' (Go. *ja*, OHG *ja* < **i̯ó* 'thereto, and', possibly

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

cognate with Hitt. *-ya* 'and'; Dunkel 2014b:384–385), with the related alternants **je-na-* and strengthened **jai-na-* (compare Go. *jai*, WS *gēa* 'verily') (Klingenschmitt 1987:178; see also Dunkel 2014b:387).[5]

The details of this etymology have been debated from seemingly every angle. Cercignani (1984:323–324, 327), for instance, does not accept <ei> in MHG *geinir* as evidence of a stem with **-ai-*, but sees both the Gothic form and possibly even East OF *iēna* as continuing PG **jaina-*. He also points out that **jena-* is strictly necessary only for West OF *ien* and OE *bā-gen*/*bē-gen* 'both', since both OHG *jen-* and ON *enn* have alternative explanations, though for ON *enn*, notably, he considers 'the postulation of a Proto-Germanic uncompounded stem */ena-/' in, for example, de Vries (2000:286 s.v. *inn*) to be 'quite unnecessary' (Cercignani 1984:324–325). The root vowel in various West Germanic forms, moreover, makes *i*-umlaut relevant to the discussion. Cercignani (1984:325, with references) is confident that OHG *jen-* comes 'from the new formation /*janiz/' (vs. **janaz* for OE *geon*); furthermore, WS *giend*, *gind*, *gynd* 'through, over, etc.' point to **janði* (vs. **janðe* for OE *geond*, *giond*) (Cercignani 1984:325). Klingenschmitt (1987: 178–182), for his part, suggests that umlaut was triggered by the formative *-in-* in the accusative singular (compare Kjølevik **minino** 'my'), i.e. **ja-n-in-* > **jęn-*, with a root vowel that was later generalized throughout the paradigm. *I*-mutation of **jan-* could be relevant for North Germanic too, but of course not for Gothic (and besides, the M.ACC.SG form in Gothic is *jainana*, with *-an-*). In short, while the interrelationships between the forms are not always entirely clear, with various plausible ways of dividing up the data, the postulation of three separate but clearly related stems is unavoidable, and it seems perfectly reasonable to think that OI *enn* (assuming with Stroh-Wollin that it is an ancient inheritance) should be considered a member of this cognate family.

As an argument against the idea that OI *enn* is a continuation of PG **jaina-* ∼ **jena-* ∼ **jana* 'that, the other', Stroh-Wollin (2020:221) claims that the semantic fit is awkward insofar as the Gothic and West Germanic cognates have a contrastive interpretation available, while OI *enn* does not. The more appealing option, according to her (see also a tentative Prokosch 1939:273), is to derive OI *enn* directly from PIE **eno-* 'that' (with reservations about transmission via any 'homogeneous' stage of Proto-Germanic; see Stroh-Wollin 2020:224–226). As we saw above, this option has been called 'unnecessary' by Cercignani, and indeed, in order to accept this view one cannot be swayed by the 'certain reluctance [in the literature] toward etymologies that do not link Scandinavian to other Germanic varieties' (2020:225). Now, there is of course nothing wrong, in principle, about viewing OI *enn* as a Nordic retention of PIE **eno-*. It is perfectly possible that Old Icelandic was the only Germanic variety that happened to preserve this ancient element. Still, if we have a choice between two formally acceptable etymologies with one presenting few to no Germanic cognates and the other presenting many Germanic cognates, then clearly the latter option must win out.

With that in mind, consider the broader Indo-European cognate situation regarding the elements PIE **áno-* and **nó-*, both distal stems thematically derived from the particle **án* 'on the other side; possibly' (Dunkel 2014b:64). See Table 1. It is striking that there are zero Germanic cognates under **áno-* and **éno-*. Adding OI *enn* to either the first or second column might then appear to be a reasonable

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

supplement from yet another Indo-European dialect, were it not for the fact that *ịó *no-* (related to the other forms through its stem **no-*) – which has ONLY Germanic cognates – is a perfectly viable option for deriving OI *enn*, too. As Stroh-Wollin (2020:221) recognizes, it is 'formally … unproblematic' to derive OI *enn* from PG **jenaz*, with (i) loss of initial *j-* as expected (e.g. Noreen 1923:§231 on ON *enn* and Go. *jains*) and (ii) absence of subsequent breaking of **e* considering that OI *enn* is a western form (see e.g. Schulte 2018:62–63 on the geography of breaking).

The availability of a contrastive reading of the pronoun in East and West Germanic does not justify severing ties to the North Germanic form. In fact, the semantic change that needs to be assumed is not dramatic at all. If there is (something like) monogenesis of Go. *jains*, OHG *jen-*, OE *geon-*, OI *enn* < PG **jaina-* ~ **jena-* ~ **jana* 'that, the other', then the only additional assumption needed is that some relatively cheap semantic change has occurred: the contrastive meaning originally present in Proto-Germanic has been retained in Gothic and West Germanic but lost in North Germanic, as part of the semantic bleaching we must otherwise assume in the grammaticalization from demonstrative towards article status.[6]

3. The etymology of *hinn*

The demonstrative *hinn* is composed of the deictic particle PIE **ḱe* (Lat. *hi-c*, *hae-c*, *ho-c* 'this', *nun-c* 'now', OCS *se* 'this', **ḱi* > Hitt. *kī(-)* 'this', among many others) plus the pronominal stem **no-* (**áno-*) already discussed above (Dunkel 2014b:58, 396–401; see also e.g. Prokosch 1939:273). As a distal and contrastive pronoun, *hinn* (with N.NOM/ACC.SG *hitt* in Old Icelandic and unassimilated *hint* also attested in older Danish and Swedish) is to be connected to Gr. κεῖνος 'that' < **ḱe e no-*, which has undergone a similar semantic development as the Nordic form, where the distal stem **no-* has cancelled the proximal meaning of the initial particle (Dunkel 2014b:64 fn. 55), which is to say that the pronoun **no-* provides the main deictic force while the particle is merely a (distance-neutral) reinforcer (compare Lat. *illi-c* = *ille* 'that'; see Klingenschmitt 1987:177–178). Indeed, Pokorny explicitly puts it in diachronic terms, stating that **ḱV-* was 'ursprünglich ich-deiktisch, später auch "jener"' (1959:609 s.v. *ḱo-*, etc.). That this deictic bleaching happened independently in Greek (e.g. Beekes 2010:397 s.v. ἐκεῖ, ἐκεῖνος) and Nordic (and Latin) seems beyond question.[7]

As for the article OMN *hinn*/*hit*, the simplest analysis, given the above information, would be to assume that it too ultimately derives from **ḱe no-*, though of course at some point having diverged onto an independent path of development from the contrastive pronoun. On this view, *hinn*/*hitt* and *hinn*/*hit* constitute a doublet (see also Fulk 2018:198). Stroh-Wollin (2020:220–224) does not, however, opt for a doublet analysis. For her, the definite article *hinn*/*hit*, which is specific to the mainland, derives from a proximal PN **hĭ-na-* (which is considered not to have arisen any earlier than Proto-Nordic, but if back-projected is composed of the same basic elements as the contrastive pronoun, which she writes as PIE **ḱei* and **enos*).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

One of her main reasons for providing separate etymologies is the seeming unlikelihood 'that one and the same *hin-* stem gave rise to all the diverse functions of *hinn* forms on the mainland' (Stroh-Wollin 2020:221). The 'diverse functions of *hinn*' in question are: (i) contrastive/distal 'the other/former', (ii) antecedent to relative and 'that'-clauses, (iii) attributive demonstrative with (weakly) proximal deixis or anaphoric reference, (iv) preadjectival article 'the', and (v) postnominal article 'the' (see Stroh-Wollin 2020:218, her Table 2). Generally speaking, there is nothing peculiar about one element with different functions. In cases where very different functions – the notion of 'very different' of course always being up for debate – are at stake, one might argue for separate lexical entries displaying homophony, but the functions mentioned above seem to be closely enough related (see below for discussion of the proximal) that such an analysis is not immediately obvious.

It is instructive to consider the case of the demonstrative *den* in modern Swedish, which can be used contrastively, anaphorically, with distal deixis, among other uses (see SAG II:322–326). We might also distinguish the article *den*, which is not only the preadjectival article but can also be used to determine a relative or 'that'-clause (see SAG II:302–304). The point here is not how similar these functions are to the ones mentioned above for *hinn*, but rather to point out that Sw. *den* is highly polyfunctional. While we might distinguish the DEMONSTRATIVE from the ARTICLE on the synchronic level, no one is tempted to provide separate etymologies for demonstrative *den* vs. article *den*. However the rather complex situation of *den* actually came to be (see Stroh-Wollin 2015a), is there really any doubt that contrastive *den* (e.g. *Ge mig* ***den*** *boken* 'Give me **that** book') and preadjectival article *den* (e.g. *den fina boken* 'the nice book') both ultimately come from **sa/þa-*?[8]

The fact that the N.NOM/ACC.SG form is systematically distinguished as *hitt* in the contrastive pronoun and *hit* in the article might appear to support two separate etymologies, but this is not an unexpected state of affairs: the definite neuter singular form with a single *-t* can be thought of as the result of analogy with **þat* and/or the result of phonetic erosion during the grammaticalization process.[9] Even the phonological facts about Sw. *den*/*det* here provide some perspective, with /dɛnː/ and /deː(t)/ in the demonstrative but 'reduced' /dɛn/ and /dɛ/ in the article. Again, whatever the exact explanation for this difference might be, it is not sufficient to prop up two separate etymologies for these items.

Nevertheless, Stroh-Wollin suggests that the association of both 'a strong distal deixis and a clear proximal deixis' with the demonstrative *hin-* means that more than a single kind of *hin-* is at stake (2020:217–218). Stroh-Wollin (2016: 143–145, 2020:211–212) capitalizes on a handful of interesting attestations to offer a new etymology for the definite article *hinn*/*hit*, namely that it derives from a more recently formed proximal PN **hi-na-*. I summarize her evidence in (1–3).[10]

(1) a. **hita · kiarþi** 'made this(?)' (U NOR2000;27A, late 11th century)
b. **litu · gera : stain · hinna** 'had this stone made' (G 5, late 14th century)
c. **l-t : (h)-ga : hina : stan** 'had this stone cut' (G 55, 1459)
d. **lit : giara : stan : hi**-- 'had this stone made' (G 66, 13th or 14th century)
e. **lit : gerra : hila : mur:uerk** 'had this wall made' (G 78, 1487)
f. **h(a)r sum : hita lisa** 'whosoever reads this' (G 83, 1582)
g. **lit gera : hua-- : (h)-ta** 'had this vault made' (G 101, mid-14th century)

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

h. **li(t) : giara : stain [hissan]** 'had this stone made' (G 102, 15th century)
i. **l[it] : ger[a] : hin[na] : s[ta]in** 'had this stone made' (G 103, 14th century)
j. **hisun : kirkiu(n)** 'this church' (G 104E, 15th century)
k. **lit : gera : stain : hisan** 'had this stone made' (G 231, 1326)
l. **hina kamb** 'this comb' (G 240, 13th century)
m. *hitta* (*Gutalagen*, c. 1300)

(2) a. **han : kaf : hit** 'he gave this' (G 206, c. 1300)
b. **lit : kara : hin : st**... 'had this stone made' (G 39, late 14th century)

(3) a. **hali hino** 'this whetstone' (Strøm, c. 600 AD)
b. **stainin** 'this stone' (if read *stain [h]inn*) (G 110, c. 1000)
c. **a ᛁ hin dʀr** 'on this door' (DR 47, 1100–1500)
d. fyrr en hon have golldet *hína skulld* 'before she has paid this debt' (*Den ældre Gulathings-Lov*, early 13th century)

There are good reasons to think that these forms do not constitute evidence for a Proto-Nordic proximal. Above all, I take issue with the 'strengthened variant[s]' (Stroh-Wollin 2016:145) in (1), which are all, with the exception of (1a), from medieval Gutnish. These forms clearly have the structure of the reinforced demonstrative **sa-si* 'this' (e.g. **hina** *hinna* = ON *þenna*, **hita** *hitta* = ON *þetta*); the forms with *-ss-* are especially indicative of the reinforced demonstrative, where the stem ON *þess-* (e.g. *þessu*, *þessum*, *þessar*, *þessir*, etc.) has been extended to the M.ACC.SG (*hinna* → *hiss-an*) and the F.NOM.SG (*hiss-un*, where *-un* is probably from *hun* 'she'; Kock 1895:132–136). The initial consonant is readily accounted for by debuccalization (*þ-* > *h-* > ∅) targeting high-frequency items, such as the reinforced demonstrative. Other examples of such debuccalization include Faroese *hósdagur* 'Thursday', *har* 'there', and *hesin*, *henda*, *hetta* 'this' (Árnason 2011: 122); Övdalian *isn*, *isų*, *ittað* 'this' (Steensland 2021:464); (eighteenth century) Norn *ita* (< **hitta*) < *þitta* 'this' (Barnes 1998:13, 17, 19). See Ralph (1975:129–131) and Barnes (1985, contra Braunmüller 1980); see also Lander (2020:20–21 fn. 13).

All of the forms in (1) can be explained not as forms of a new **hi-na-* 'this' but rather just as medieval outcomes of the old reinforced demonstrative **sa-si*. Note also that even if analogy, rather than sound change, turns out to be the correct way of accounting for the anlaut in these forms, this would not endanger the analysis that the forms in (1) are actually reinforced demonstratives. As for the two forms in (2), these can be viewed simply as the neuter demonstrative (compare OSw. *þæn* and *þæt*), with debuccalization of the initial consonant, or as 'endingless' variants of the reinforced demonstrative (see Lander 2020:161–163 for discussion).

The forms in (3) do not provide much better evidence for the 'new' proximal. The form **hino**[11] (3a) on the Strøm whetstone is plausibly analyzed as the OLD proximal PG **hi-* (compare Go. M.ACC.SG *hina*, N.NOM/ACC.SG *hita*, M/N.DAT.SG *himma* 'this'). Since there are no word boundaries indicated (Jansson & Wessén 1962:195), **stainin** on G 110 (3b) does not necessarily have to be read as **stain in** at all; it could be an early attestation of the suffixed definite article (compare Sö 41 **mirkit** + **mikla** 'monument.the big'). The form **hin** (3c) on DR 47 (an iron fitting for a door) is a N.ACC.PL attributive demonstrative going with **dʀr** *dyr(r)*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

'door' (plurale tantum, usually feminine but sometimes neuter). This example may well illustrate weak proximal deixis associated with **hin-*, but the simplest explanation here is that the incipient definite article, having evolved away from its mother form (i.e. the contrastive/distal pronoun), had developed 'neutral' deixis, with both weakly proximal and weakly distal readings available, much like Fr. *ce*, *celle*, *ces*.[12] Finally, the example in (3d) would be amenable to the same kind of analysis: the word *skulld(-)* is mentioned a number of times before *hina skulld*, giving *hina* an 'article-like' feel (Stroh-Wollin 2020:212). Indeed, as a neutral demonstrative, *hina* need not be interpreted with proximal deixis here – distal 'that debt' is a perfectly reasonable interpretation as well.

In sum, the evidence for a 'new' Proto-Nordic proximal evaporates upon closer inspection, and with this also the alleged source for the definite article on the mainland. It should be mentioned that the more conventional etymology (i.e. article *hinn/hit* has the same source as contrastive *hinn/hitt*) also puts the grammaticalization of the article on more typologically natural ground, since definite articles very often develop from distal demonstratives (Greenberg 1978:61). This generalization is not exceptionless, with proximal demonstratives also attested as a source (see Heine & Kuteva 2002:109–111), and Stroh-Wollin (2016:145 fn. 22) emphasizes that as long as we assume that these pronouns are weakly deictic, there is little reason to doubt that such a development was possible. In other words, while the typological argument is not enough on its own to discard the 'new proximal' etymology of OMN *hinn/hit*, it could be considered the final straw.

4. Summary

In conclusion, I have argued in favor of two quite conventional etymologies in this paper. The first is that, if we assume that the definite article OI *enn* is in fact an old retention, then the simplest etymological explanation is that it comes from PG **jena-*. Germanic is the only Indo-European dialect showing the combination **i̯ó no-*, and since it is formally and semantically trivial to derive *enn* from **jena-* (∼ **jana-*, *jaina-*), this analysis is more straightforward than deriving *enn* from PIE **áno* or **é no* (for which Germanic continuations appear to be absent). Furthermore, I propose that both the pan-Scandinavian contrastive *hinn/hitt/hint* and the Old Mainland Nordic definite article *hinn/hit* are descended from the same item, namely distal/contrastive PG **hin-* (compare Gr. *κεῖνος*), contra Stroh-Wollin (2020), who derives only the former from this item. Put differently, contrastive *hinn/hitt* and article *hinn/hit* are a doublet, in exactly the same basic way that modern Swedish demonstrative *den/det* and article *den/det* are a doublet. Crucially, just because an old demonstrative evolved into a definite article does not mean that the demonstrative went extinct in the process. Rather, PN **hina-* split into two lineages: on the one hand a contrastive pronoun (> N *hinn/hitt*), and on the other hand a proto-article (> OMN *hinn/hit*), the latter of which at some point went from being purely distal to being weakly distal OR weakly proximal on its way to becoming a true article. The developments I assume are summarized in (4).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(4) PN *e-na-R CONTR/DIST → OI *enn/et* DEF

PN *hi-na-R CONTR/DIST → N *hinn/hitt/hint* CONTR

→ OMN *hinn/hit* DEF

The grammaticalization of a definite article from a distal demonstrative should come as a surprise to no one, and (4) does not amount to much more than this. While Stroh-Wollin's dual etymology of *hinn/hitt* and *hinn/hit* makes use of the available evidence in an inventive way, I would contend that the evidence she presents in favor of the more complicated etymology (article < proximal demonstrative) can actually be recast as evidence in support of the etymology in (4), with the neutral semantics of *hin-* as a missing link in the development from distal demonstrative to definite article. In other words, (4) is simply the less complicated – and therefore the preferable – explanation.

Acknowledgements. I am tremendously grateful to Ulla Stroh-Wollin for reading and commenting on an early version of this short communication. I would also like to thank three anonymous reviewers and an *NJL* editor for insightful comments and generous feedback on my work. Any errors or shortcomings are completely my own.

The author has no competing interests to declare.

Notes

1 ACC = accusative; Arm. = Armenian; dial. = dialectal; F = feminine; Go. = Gothic; Gr. = Ancient Greek; Hitt. = Hittite; INSTR = instrumental; Lat. = Latin; Lith. = Lithuanian; M = masculine; MHG = Middle High German; MLG = Middle Low German; N = neuter; NOM = nominative; N = Nordic; OCS = Old Church Slavonic; OF = Old Frisian; OHG = Old High German; OI = Old Icelandic; OMN = Old Mainland Nordic; ON = Old Norse; PA = Proto-Anatolian; Pal. = Palaic; PG = Proto-Germanic; PIE = Proto-Indo-European; PII = Proto-Indo-Iranian; PL = plural; PN = Proto-Nordic; PSl. = Proto-Slavic; SG = singular; Skt = Sanskrit; Sw. = Swedish; Toch. = Tocharian; Umbr. = Umbrian; V = vowel; Ved. = Vedic; WS = West Saxon.

2 Consider *hunzhins* 'the dog's' (*Saga of Olaf Tryggvason*, mid-13th century) (Stroh-Wollin 2016:149), with the cliticized article *-hins*.

3 When discussing Stroh-Wollin's etymologies, I use her spelling of the proto-forms. Elsewhere I rely on Dunkel (2014a,b).

4 Stroh-Wollin (2020:221, 225; see also Stroh-Wollin 2015b:167) endorses Lehmann (1986:210 s.v. *jains*) in the view that the digraph <ai> in Go. *jains* represents /ĕ/. This would mean that Go. *jain-* had developed from a lenis variant, which is the special circumstance under which Go. <ai> continues PG **e* (e.g. Klingenschmitt 1987:178 fn. 29). In that case, PG **jena-* might unify the Gothic, West Germanic, and North Germanic forms. However, I am less confident that there is consensus around ascribing any particular value – let alone /e/ – to <ai> in *jains*. It is worth pointing out that the general consensus around Go. <ai> is that it usually represents a monophthong of a different sort: short /ɛ/ before /h, ʜ, r/, and long /ɛ̄/ elsewhere. Of course, just because <ai> was a monophthong does not change the fact that this digraph in many cases unquestionably tracks a Proto-Germanic diphthong **ai* (e.g. Go. *ain-*, OE *ān-*, ON *ein-* < PG **ain-* 'one'). That is to say, we cannot rule out Go. *jain-* < PG **jain-* (see e.g. Cercignani 1984:323, 327, Klingenschmitt 1987:178, Harðarson 2017:926–927) purely on the basis of a monophthongal pronunciation of <ai> in Gothic.

5 Note that Dunkel (2014a,b) does not take the first component here to be the relative stem **h₂i̯ó-* 'which, the' (compare Ved. *yás*; Dunkel 2014b:312), despite a long history of associating the initial glide in the Germanic pronoun with this element (see e.g. Hoffmann-Krayer 1897:144 for early references). Also note that the initial component PG **jai-* is not considered to be a locative PIE **i̯oi̯-* (for which see Cercignani 1984:323, 327, citing Lidén 1886:242–243) but rather PIE **i̯ó h₂i* 'and also' (Dunkel 2014b:386). Nor does

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Dunkel's etymology involve PG **ainaz* 'one' < PIE **oi̯nos*, which has played a role for other scholars (e.g. Brugmann 1904:113), but as Prokosch (1939:273) points out, the drawback is that this would appear to put the Gothic form (probably reflecting **-ai-*) on a very different footing compared to the West Germanic forms (which probably do not reflect **-ai-*).

6 Consider also the Limburgish-Ripuarian article *gənə/jənə* (Jongen 1970, Wynants 1972), which quite possibly shows the same historical trajectory. Thanks to a reviewer for bringing this to my attention and for the relevant references.

7 Stroh-Wollin (2020:224–226 and personal communication) is, however, more agnostic on this point, emphasizing that the earliest Germanic must have shown a great deal of dialectal variation. While she does not commit herself either way, this appears to suggest the unlikely possibility that the development towards distality was a very old innovation shared between (some variety of) pre-Greek and (some variety of) pre-Germanic. In any case, it is important to recognize that there is evidence that such a semantic shift had already occurred by the time of Proto-Germanic, considering that all three branches of Germanic display formations where **ĥe* no longer appears to contribute proximal deixis: Go. *hindar* (= PIE **ĥe n-tér* < **ĥe n̥-tér*) 'behind', Go. *hindana* (= PIE **ĥí ndʰe nehₗ*) 'from beyond', ON *hann* (= PIE **ĥe e no*) 'he' (on which see also Stroh-Wollin 2015b), perhaps also OHG *hina* < PG **hinē* 'away from here' [= 'there'], among others (Dunkel 2014b:30, 43, 62; Klingenschmitt 1987:177–178). See also Stiles (2017) on *h-* in the West Germanic anaphoric pronoun.

8 Consider also Greenberg (1978:62): '[The definite article] may, as with G[erman] *der*, be an unstressed variant of the demonstrative, which continues in its former use in stressed form.'

9 The same explanation can be given for OI *et* (see Stroh-Wollin 2020:223). Even though **enaz* > OI *enn* 'that' is specifically insular, it is not hard to imagine that this phonetic erosion occurred either as an independent, typologically natural development in this branch, or as part of a broader interaction with the earliest stages in the grammaticalization of **hin-* in Common Nordic.

10 I have made use of the Runor platform (https://app.raa.se/open/runor/search) of the Swedish National Heritage Board (Riksantikvarieämbetet), which builds on Uppsala University's *Samnordisk runtextdatabas* (https://www.nordiska.uu.se/forskn/samnord.htm/).

11 Usually the debate around **hino** is cast as a choice between an older proximal *hi-nōⁿ* (from the ancient and defective **hi-*) or a newer distal *hinnōⁿ* < **hininōⁿ* (compare **minino** on the Kjølevik stone) (in which case it is the ancestor of ON *hinn*). Stroh-Wollin (2016, 2020) posits a third option, namely a new proximal with the form *hinnōⁿ* (presumably a syncopated form of **hininōⁿ*, though this is not explicitly mentioned by her).

12 Or like the neutral demonstrative *sa/þa-* in Nordic, which was not only distal but also proximal (e.g. **runaʀ þaʀ** 'runes these' on the Rök stone).

References

Árnason, Kristján. 2011. *The Phonology of Icelandic and Faroese*. Oxford & New York: Oxford University Press.

Barnes, Michael P. 1985. A note on Faroese /θ/ > /h/. In *Faroese Language Studies* (2001), 61–64. Oslo: Novus Forlag.

Barnes, Michael P. 1998. *The Norn Language of Orkney and Shetland*. Lerwick: Shetland Times Ltd.

Beekes, Robert. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*, vol. 1, with Lucien van Beek. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Braunmüller, Kurt. 1980. Bifurcating changes in morphology: The case of demonstrative pronouns in West Nordic. In Even Hovdhaugen (ed.), *The Nordic Languages and Modern Linguistics: Proceedings of the Fourth International Conference of Nordic and General Linguistics in Oslo 1980*, 223–232. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Brugmann, Karl. 1904. *Die Demonstrativpronomina der indogermanischen Sprachen: Eine bedeutungsgeschichtliche Untersuchung* [The demonstrative pronouns of the Indo-European languages: A historical semantic study]. Leipzig: B.G. Teubner.

Cercignani, Fausto. 1984. The enfants terribles of Gothic 'breaking': *hiri*, *aiþþau*, etc. *Journal of Indo-European Studies* **12**(3–4), 315–344.

Dunkel, George E. 2014a. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, vol. 1: *Einleitung, Terminologie, Lautgesetze, Adverbialendungen, Nominalsuffixe, Anhänge und Indices*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270 Published online by Cambridge University Press

[Dictionary of Indo-European particles and pronominal stems, vol. 1: Introduction, terminology, sound laws, adverbial endings, nominal suffixes, appendices and indices]. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Dunkel, George E. 2014b. *Lexikon der indogermanischen Partikeln und Pronominalstämme*, vol. 2: *Lexikon* [Dictionary of Indo-European particles and pronominal stems, vol. 2: Dictionary]. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Fulk, R. D. 2018. *A Comparative Grammar of the Early Germanic Languages*. Amsterdam & Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Greenberg, Joseph. 1978. How does a language acquire gender markers? In Joseph H. Greenberg, Charles A. Ferguson & Edith A. Moravcsik (eds), *Universals of Human Language*, vol. 3: *Word Structure*, 47–82. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Harðarson, Jón Axel. 2017. The morphology of Germanic. In Jared Klein, Brian Joseph & Matthias Fritz (eds.), *Handbook of Comparative and Historical Indo-European Linguistics*, vol. 1, 913–954. Berlin & Boston: De Gruyter.

Heine, Bernd & Tania Kuteva. 2002. *World Lexicon of Grammaticalization*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hoffmann-Krayer, Eduard. 1897. Got. *jains*, ahd. *jenēr*, *enēr*, mhd. *ein* und verwantes [Gothic *jains*, Old High German *jenēr*, *enēr*, Middle High German *ein* and related]. *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung auf dem Gebiete der Indogermanischen Sprachen* **34**(1), 144–152.

Jansson, Sven B. F. & Elias Wessén. 1962. *Gotlands runinskrifter*, vol. 1 [The runic inscriptions of Gotland, vol. 1]. Stockholm & Uppsala: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Jongen, René. 1970. L'article défini « gen » dans les dialectes bas-franciques méridionaux [The definite article 'gen' in southern Low Franconian dialects]. In Élie Nieuwborg (ed.), *Mélanges offerts au professeur J.L. Pauwels à l'occasion de son éméritat* [Medley offered to Professor J.L. Pauwels on the occasion of his emeritus status], 169–202. Louvain: Bibliothèque de l'Université Bureau de Recueil & Publications Universitaires de Louvain.

Klingenschmitt, Gert. 1987. Erbe und Neuerung beim germanischen Demonstrativpronomen [Inheritance and innovation in the Germanic demonstrative pronoun]. In Herbert Kolb, Klaus Matzel, Karl Stackmann, Rolf Bergmann, Heinrich Tiefenbach & Lothar Voetz (eds.), *Althochdeutsch*, vol. 1: *Grammatik: Glossen und Texte* [Old High German, vol. 1: Grammar: Glosses and texts], 169–189. Heidelberg: Carl Winter Universitätsverlag.

Kock, Axel. 1895. Studier i fornnordisk grammatik [Studies in Old Nordic grammar]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* **11**, 117–153.

Krahe, Hans. 1969. *Germanische Sprachwissenschaft*, vol. 2: *Formenlehre* [Germanic Linguistics, vol. 2: Morphology], 7th edn, revised by Wolfgang Meid. Berlin & New York: Walter de Gruyter.

Lander, Eric T. 2020. *The History of the Reinforced Demonstrative in Nordic: Regional Variation and Reconstruction*. Leiden & Boston: Brill.

Lehmann, Winfred P. 1986. *A Gothic Etymological Dictionary*, based on the 3rd edition of *Vergleichendes Wörterbuch der Gotischen Sprache* [Comparative dictionary of the Gothic language] by Sigmund Feist, with Helen-Jo J. Hewitt. Leiden: Brill.

Lidén, Evald. 1886. Etymologiska bidrag. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* **3**, 235–243.

Melchert, H. Craig. 2009. Deictic pronouns in Anatolian. In Kazuhiko Yoshida & Brent Vine (eds), *East and West: Papers in Indo-European Studies*, 151–161. Bremen: Hempen.

Noreen, Adolf. 1923. *Altnordische Grammatik*, vol. 1: *Altisländische und altnorwegische Grammatik, unter Berücksichtigung des Urnordischen* [Old Nordic Grammar, vol. 1: Old Icelandic and Old Norwegian grammar, with Proto-Nordic taken into consideration], 4th edn. Halle (Saale): Max Niemeyer.

Pokorny, Julius. 1959. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1 [Indo-European etymological dictionary]. Bern: Francke.

Prokosch, Eduard. 1939. *A Comparative Germanic Grammar*. Philadelphia: Linguistic Society of America.

Ralph, Bo. 1975. *Phonological Differentiation: Studies in Nordic Language History*. Gothenburg: Acta Universitatis Gothoburgensis.

Runor [Runes]. Swedish National Heritage Board. https://app.raa.se/open/runor/search.

SAG II = Teleman, Ulf, Staffan Hellberg & Erik Andersson. 1999. *Svenska Akademiens grammatik*, vol. 2: *Ord* [The Swedish Academy Grammar, vol. 2: Words]. Stockholm: Norstedts Ordbok.

Samnordisk runtextdatabas [Scandinavian runic text database]. Uppsala University. https://www.nordiska.uu.se/forskn/samnord.htm/.

Schulte, Michael. 2018. *Urnordisch: Eine Einführung* [Proto-Nordic: An introduction]. Vienna: Praesens Verlag.

Steensland, Lars. 2021. *Älvdalsk ordbok* [Övdalian dictionary], 2nd edn. https://dalsk.ordbok.gratis/pdf/bred.html (accessed 22 August 2022).

Stiles, Patrick. 2017. The comparative method, internal reconstruction, areal norms and the West Germanic third person pronoun. *Amsterdamer Beiträge zur älteren Germanistik* **77**(1–2), 410–441.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2015a. Från *gammal man* till *den gamle mannen*: Definitmarkering i fornsvenska nominalfraser med adjektivattribut [From *gammal man* to *den gamle mannen*: Definiteness marking in Old Swedish nominal phrases with adjectival attributes]. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* **130**, 101–138.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2015b. *Han* and *hon*: Anaphoric pronouns in Early Scandinavia. In Martin Hilpert, Jan-Ola Östman, Christine Mertzlufft, Michael Riessler & Janet Duke (eds), *New Trends in Nordic and General Linguistics*, 162–180. Berlin, Munich & Boston: De Gruyter.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2016. The emergence of definiteness marking in Scandinavian: New answers to old questions. *Arkiv för nordisk filologi* **131**, 129–169.

Stroh-Wollin, Ulla. 2020. *Hinn* and *hinn*: Early Icelandic as the clue to the history and etymology of two Old Scandinavian words. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* **43**, 205–228.

de Vries, Jan. 2000. *Altnordisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, vol. 1 [Old Nordic etymological dictionary, vol. 1], 2nd edn. Leiden, Boston & Köln: Brill.

Wynants, Armel. 1972. Het bepalend lidwoord *gənə/jənə* [The definite article *gənə/jənə*]. *Taal en Tongval* **24**, 28–66.

Cite this article: Lander ET. Thoughts on the etymologies of *enn* and *hinn* in Nordic. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics*. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0332586522000270