sciendo

SCP Volume 9 (2024)
Special Issue: Noun phrase and pronominal syntax in medieval and early modern Celtic languages
doi: https://doi.org/10.14746/scp.2024.9.6

GRAMMATICALIZATION AND THE ETYMOLOGY OF OLD IRISH *OCUS* 'AND'*

AARON GRIFFITH
https://orcid.org/0009-0003-2562-2498

Universiteit Utrecht

ABSTRACT

This paper integrates a philological investigation of Old Irish coordination with cross-linguistic accounts of the phenomenon in order to offer an etymology Old Irish *ocus* 'and'. It is suggested that Pre-Irish employed *ocus* in a comitative coordination strategy (i.e. 'A with B'). This started out as a nominal and adjectival coordinator. Late in the prehistory of Irish, this coordinator grammaticalized as the all-purpose *ocus* 'and' (i.e. 'A and B') that is found in Old Irish texts.

Keywords: free relative, etymology, grammaticalization, lenition, Old Irish.

While much of this paper is dedicated to coordination in Old Irish, specifically *ocus* 'and', some of the arguments make reference to wider, cross-linguistic observations and tendencies. For that reason, I begin with some more general remarks on coordination, to set the stage, as it were, before turning to the Irish facts.

* This paper has had a long gestation period and thus a long list of people to acknowledge. For helpful comments on earlier, oral versions of this paper, I would like to thank audiences at Tionól (2009), the UC Berkeley workshop on new perspectives on Celtic syntax (2012), the Göttingen workshop on nominal syntax in the medieval and early modern Celtic languages 2023), and the Utrecht Classics and Celtic Colloquium (2023). I further thank an anonymous reviewer and Elliott Lash for significant feedback on an earlier written draft of this paper.

1. The cross-linguistic synchrony and diachrony of coordination

Coordination is rather well studied in languages of the world, and there is a significant body of literature on synchronic coordination and on the diachronic sources of coordinators. In what follows, I adopt Haspelmath's (2007: 1) definition of coordination:

> The term *coordination* refers to syntactic constructions in which two or more units of the same type are combined into a larger unit and still have the same semantic relations with other surrounding elements.

This definition is, as should be obvious, semantically based in order to avoid some of the difficulties involved in syntactic definitions. The definition meshes well with Stassen's (2000) division of languages into AND-languages and WITH-languages. In languages of the former type, the two coordinands have the same syntactic status:

(1) Cormac and Ailill are leaving.

In the latter type, the two coordinands are syntactically asymmetric and the coordinator is used in comitative function (i.e. in the broad meaning of 'with'):

(2) Fergus is leaving with Medb.

English, like the majority of languages of Europe, differentiates the structures of (1) and (2), which have a similar, though not identical, meaning. These languages Stassen (2000) terms AND-languages. He has, however, also shown that a large number of languages entirely lack the strategy found in (1) and use something like the strategy found in (2) to effect coordination. These languages he calls WITH-languages. The division between the two types is not strict, and Stassen (2000) argues that there is a tendency for AND-languages to "drift" to becoming WITH-languages.

The division of languages into AND- and WITH-languages is based on a synchronic look at the syntactic status of the coordinands, but one can also take a diachronic perspective and examine the coordinators themselves. It has been well-documented that a frequent source of coordinators is comitative markers, i.e. elements with meanings like 'with'.[1] Another source of coordinators are verbs

[1] The literature documenting this connection is large. See, for instance, Stolz (1998) with references.

with meanings like ‘meet, accompany, take’ (see, e.g. Brown & Dryer 2008). In both cases, the comitative marker and verb can be grammaticalized as NP coordinators. From there, the coordinator can spread to coordinate other phrase types, e.g. VPs, APs, clauses or sentences,[2] etc. As Mithun notes (1988: 350), the spread from NP coordinator to sentential coordinator is common, but the reverse also occurs. The way in which specific coordinators spread, i.e. from which phrasal category to which phrasal category, has also been the subject of some research, and Haspelmath (2004: 12) proposes an implicational sequence of phrase types that can be marked by a specific coordinator:

(3) NP – AP – VP – S

Under this implicational sequence (not a hierarchy!), a coordinator in a language may coordinate one or more of the phrasal categories, but all the categories so coordinated must be continuous. That is, a coordinator only coordinates NPs and Ss if it also coordinates APs and VPs. A language may have multiple, partially overlapping strategies, however (e.g. one coordinator for NPs and APs and another for APs, VPs and Ss). An interesting twist is that APs can themselves split, with some patterning as NPs and others as VPs (see below for a brief note on the split).

Payne (1985) had previously proposed a similar implicational sequence. Though he did not note the adjective split, he did include an additional category, that of PPs. His sequence was thus:

(4) NP – PP – AP – VP – S

Haspelmath acknowledges Payne’s sequence, but notes that he does not provide much evidence for it (2004: 12). As it happens, Drellishak (2004), writing at the same time as Haspelmath, does provide some further corroboration of the position of PPs. While there are some exceptions to the sequences suggested by Payne and Haspelmath, most of these involve languages in which the category causing the violation cannot be coordinated at all (Haspelmath 2004: 12). It seems, therefore, that Haspelmath’s and Payne’s implicational sequences represent a robust generalization. One unresolved question is how the split of adjectives should be handled. That is, is the split NP – AP_1 – PP – AP_2 – VP – S or rather NP – PP – AP_1 –AP_2 – VP – S? This question requires empirical research and cannot be resolved here, but the first option seems more appealing at least for Irish,

[2] In what follows, I treat clausal and sentential coordination as equivalent and refer to them as sentential coordination. Differentiating the two does not appear to be critical for any arguments here.

assuming the split is AP_1 = attributive adjectives and AP_2 = predicative adjectives.[3]

This very brief overview of coordination has focused on several facts. The important take-aways can be summarized as follows. Coordination in languages generally falls into either a WITH or an AND strategy. The AND strategy involves syntactically parallel coordinands (as in (1) above), while the WITH strategy involves asymmetric coordinands (as in (2) above). WITH strategies often originate from comitative markers / adpositions or from verbs, all of which take NP arguments. As a result, the WITH strategy generally begins as NP coordination. Once established, the coordinator can spread to coordinate other categories along the implicational sequence noted by Payne and Haspelmath. If this occurs, the WITH strategy may become an AND strategy. Though there is less evidence for it, coordinators can also spread in the other direction, that is from sentential coordinators to coordinators of other phrasal types (see Mithun 1988: 350–351).

When seen again this background, the coordination facts for Classical Old Irish, i.e. the language of the eighth to ninth centuries (Stifter 2009: 55), appear to be fairly simple: the language uses an AND strategy for coordination, as the only productive coordinator is *ocus* [ogəs] 'and', and it can coordinate anything in the language.[4] The etymology of the word is not entirely clear, but it is usually connected to either the word *acus* 'near' or the preposition *oc* 'at, beside, close to'. As both of these possible sources have locative semantics, it thus appears that Old Irish is synchronically an AND-language that may have been a WITH-language. As is frequently the case, however, this simple explanation, while basically correct, does not tell the whole story. Based on comparison with other Indo-European languages, as well as remnants of earlier coordinators spread across Archaic Old Irish texts (c. seventh century; see Stifter 2009: 55) and of minor variants within Old Irish itself, we can construct a coherent picture of the diachronic developments leading to the synchronic system of coordination of the language.

2. Coordination in Old Irish

In an article from 1960, Daniel Binchy outlines the principle coordinating conjunctions in Old Irish: the clitic *-ch*, as well as the independent words *sceo* / *sceu*, *os*, and *ocus*. The first two conjunctions are relatively rare in Old Irish and have a limited distribution. The conjunction *os* is one of the regular synchronic

---

3 As Elliott Lash (p.c.) suggests to me, there may be different types of splits: predicative / attributive as suggested above or perhaps one based on derivational type (participles vs. non-derived adjectives). I cannot explore these possibilities further here.

4 While there is some disagreement as to what the correct phonological form of *ocus* is (see further below), in what follows *ocus* will be used as a general cover term for the word, unless a specific form is being discussed.

coordinators of Old Irish, though it, like *-ch* and *sceo* / *sceu*, has a restricted distribution. The fourth element, *ocus*, however, is the standard coordinating conjunction of Old Irish in nearly all environments. As such, *ocus* (MnIr *agus*) is quite familiar to all students of the language. Interestingly, however, it does not have an accepted etymology. As noted above, it is usually connected to either *acus* 'near' or the preposition *oc* 'at, beside, close to'. Determining the exact etymology is the primary goal of this paper. Before turning to that, however, it will be useful to review what we know about Old Irish coordination in some more detail.

2.1. The coordinator *-ch*

Perhaps counter-intuitively, the etymologies of the rarest coordinators are the best understood. The clitic *-ch* is well-known as the continuant of the Proto-Indo-European connector **-$k^{u}e$*. In Old Irish it functions only as a clausal connector (Thurneysen 1921: 299–300; Goldstein 2019: 5), though the form *dëec* '-teen' < **dek̂m̥-$k^{u}e$* 'and ten' (see Schrijver 1994) shows that at some earlier stage it also coordinated numerals (in Old Irish a sub-class of adjectives). This restriction of the function of **-$k^{u}e$* / *-ch* is probably due to the early sixth century apocope of final syllables and the subsequent syncope of all even numbered non-final syllables,[5] which would have produced such significant morphophonological alternations that the use of **-$k^{u}e$* / *-ch* was presumably given up at some point in the late prehistoric period.[6] The only place where *-ch* is regularly still found in Old Irish is pretonically, where it had become a fixed part of some particle chains, as in the relative negator *nach-* 'which is not' (< **ne* 'negation' + *$k^{u}e$* 'and' + further clitics) and in the conjunctions *sech* 'although, and yet' and *noch* 'but, and (yet)' (< **se* / *no* 'sentence connectors' + *$k^{u}e$* 'and' + *esti* 'is'; Thurneysen (1946: 549–550, §§880, 883)). In these cases, it should be noted, the coordinator was not only pretonic, but it was also protected from loss by a further clitic. The only other examples of *-ch* are isolated archaisms following pretonic preverbs (see Binchy 1960: 82ff.). From this description of *-ch*, we can say that in the prehistoric period, Old Irish lost its inherited coordinator in almost all environments. It is this which presumably opened the door for new coordinators to enter the language.

---

5 On the approximate dates of these changes, see McCone (1996: 127).

6 Assuming that absolutely final **-e* underwent an early apocope in clitics (see Schrijver 1994: 183), alternation like the following would have resulted: **mak^{u}k^{u}ī* > *maicc* [mak'] 'a son's' vs. **mak^{u}k^{u}ī-k^{u}e* > **mak^{u}k^{u}īh* > **maccai* [maki] 'and a son's'. This appears to have been too extreme even for speakers of Old Irish.

2.2. The coordinator *sceo* / *sceu*

The second coordinator *sceo* / *sceu* is also rare. It primarily coordinates nouns and it lenites the word following it (which is in the genitive case).[7] While its etymology is unsure, O'Brien's suggestion (apud Binchy 1960: 78) that it comes from the dative singular **sk^{u}i̯i̯ū* 'with mention of' of an otherwise unattested **sk^{u}i̯i̯om* 'mention' (verbal noun to *seichid* 'declares, asserts, mentions') is plausible. What is attractive about this derivation is the fact that it explains the distributional restrictions of the word perfectly. That is, it is a dative singular, which regularly causes lenition of following dependents (Thurneysen 1946: 142, §232A.1), and following such a relational noun, a noun in the genitive would be expected. Binchy (1960: 78) assumes that *sceo* / *sceu* was the usual coordinator after stressed words. That is, it coordinated all syntactic categories until it was ousted by *ocus*. While this could be true, it should be noted that apart from a few later Old Irish examples joining sentences, there is no evidence that *sceo* / *sceu* originally coordinated anything other than nouns.[8]

2.3. The coordinator *os*

The coordinating conjunction *os (*also *ot* before 3PL pronouns), in archaic texts at least, functioned as a clausal coordinator (see Thurneysen 1946: 549, §878 for references to some examples). In the Old Irish of the glosses, this is still true, but *os* was further restricted in that it could only appear before tonic pronouns. García-Castillero (2013), in an examination of the tonic pronouns, shows that *os* could only introduce small clauses with a pronominal subject or introduce a left-dislocated topic. The first of these is illustrated below:

(5)	*do·bertis*		*cech*	*n–olc*	*7*	*fochaid*
	PRV·give.3PL.IMPF.		each	evil.ACC.SG	and	trial.ACC.SG
	form	***os***	***me=se***	***oc=taircitul***		***cech***
	on.1SG	and	1SG=1SG	at=prophesying.DAT.SG		every

[7] While there are examples of other cases following *sceo* / *sceu* (see eDIL s.v. *1 sceo*), Thurneysen (1912) has argued that the genitive is original.

[8] eDIL s.v. *1 sceo* lists four examples from two passages of *sceo* coordinating sentences. The examples are from the *Amra Coluim Chille* (one example) and a section of rhetoric in the YBL version of the *Táin Bó Cúailnge* (three examples). Both the *Amra* and rhetorics in general are known for their archaizing character, which means that the use of *sceo* as sentence connector may not be original, but rather an attempt by the author / copyist to use an archaic word to make the text seem old. This is not the place for an extensive philological investigation of the matter, but this suggestion is at the very least a plausible interpretation of the facts.

maith ***doib=som***
good.GEN.SG to.3PL=3PL
'They used to inflict every evil and tribulation on me, and I prophesying them every good.'

(Ml. 54^{c}30)

As such, it appears that *os* was always a clausal coordinator, though by classical Old Irish, an additional restriction arose which required the clause following it to begin with a tonic pronoun.

It has been suggested that *os* is a contraction of *ocus* 'and'. This would not explain *ot*, the alternate form of *os*. Further, the loss of the medial <c> [g] would be highly irregular and this idea cannot be correct (as seen already by Binchy 1960: 79, with references to the earlier suggestion). The etymology of the form is thus uncertain.

2.4. The coordinator *ocus*

The fourth and final coordinating conjunction, *ocus*, does not appear in many Archaic Old Irish texts, but it has nearly completely eclipsed the other coordinating conjunctions by Classical Old Irish.[9] As seen below, it can coordinate anything, including bare nouns, determined nouns, adjectives, adverbs, prepositional phrases, verbs, sentences, and disparate elements (i.e. elements not of the same syntactic category):

(6) *hi=fochaidib* *7* *imnedaib*
in=tribulation.DAT.PL and affliction.DAT.PL
'in tribulations and afflictions'[SEP]

(Ml. 59a15)

(7) *ar=mu=sémi=se* *7* *mu=mindchecht*
for=1SG=thinness.DAT.SG=1SG and 1SG=misery.DAT.SG
'for my thinness and my misery'[SEP]

(Ml. 22^{d}1)

(8) *labrad* *huallach* *7* *chaintoimtenach* *dib* *fadesin*
speech.NOM.SG proud and good.opinion of.3PL self.3PL
'speech, proud and of good opinions concerning themselves'

(Ml. 31^{b}10)

[9] As a reminder, Archaic Old Irish is from the seventh century, while Classical Old Irish is the language of the eighth and ninth centuries (Stifter 2009: 55).

(9) *innunn 7 hille*
here and there
'here and there'

(Ml. 63^{b}16)

(10) *ho=ruccai 7 ho=mebuil*
because=shame.DAT.SG and because=disgrace.DAT.SG
'because of shame and because of disgrace'

(Ml.27^{c}9)

(11) *am*al *du·n-esmar 7 as·roither*
as PV·REL-pour.PRES.PASS.3SG and PV·REL\scatter.PRES.PASS.3SG
uisce
water.NOM.SG
'as water is poured forth and scattered'

(Ml. 44^{d}1)

(12) *is*=mé *bís and 7*
COP.PRES.3SG=LATIN be.CONS.PRES.3SG.REL there and
ní=ipse
NEG.COP.PRES.3SG=LATIN
'it is *mé* that is there and it is not *ipse*'[SEP]

(Ml. 62^{c}7)

(13) *tri=tudidin popuil tri=muir robur*
through=guiding.ACC.SG people.GEN.SG through=sea.ACC.SG red
7 huare romsa=ugaire doib
and because COP.PERF.2SG=shepherd.NOM.SG to.3PL
'through guiding of the people through the Red Sea, and because You (sg) were a shepherd unto them'

(Ml. 96^{d}1)

In addition, it can appear in a number of further constructions, one of which, that of small clauses, is of note for present purposes: *ocus* can introduce a small clause whose subject may be a noun or pronoun:

(14) *boí Mongán i-nna=chétud*
be.3SG.PAST PN in-3SG.M=couch.DAT.SG
in-*i-nna=rígthaig* ***7*** ***a=ben***
3SG.M=castle.DAT.SG and 3SG.M=wife.NOM.SG

for-a=deserud *os* *sí* *brónach.*
on-3SG.M=right.DAT.SG and 3SG.F sad.NOM.SG
'Mongán was on his couch in his royal house and his wife on his right, and she [was] sad.'

(White 2006: 74, ll. 1–2)

(15) *bed=n-etarscarthe* *int=í* *dia*
COP.PAST.SUBJ.3SG=REL-separated.NOM.SG the=deictic
God.NOM.SG
huaid *trí-a=buith=adi*
from.3SG.M through-3SG.M=being.ACC.SG=3SG.M
i=n-nim ***7*** ***hé=sium*** ***i=talam***
in=NAS-heaven.DAT.SG and 3SG.M=3SG.M in=earth.DAT.SG
'that God is separated from him through His being in Heaven and he on earth.'

(Ml. 30^{c}5)

It is thus like the conjunction *os* in that it can introduce small clauses, but without the restriction of appearing only before pronouns.

2.5. Interim summary

Before turning to the issues of the etymology and phonological form of *ocus*, it may prove useful to have a rough outline of what one may assume is the chronology of coordinators in Irish and the type of constituents they can coordinate. Due to the (lack of) attestation, there are large gaps in our knowledge of coordination strategies for Primitive Irish and to a lesser degree for Archaic Old Irish. The evidence for Primitive Irish is mostly comparative in nature and consists of cognate forms in Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, and other languages, which have essentially no restrictions on what they can coordinate (see Goldstein 2019: 26–28), as well as a highly limited amount of reconstructed evidence from within Irish (*dëec* '-teen' < **dek̑m̥-kᵘe* 'and ten' (see above and Schrijver 1994)). For Archaic Old Irish, we are reliant on a small number of old texts for our evidence.

Table 1. Chronology of coordinators and coordinated constituents

		S	VP	PP	AP	NP
Primitive Irish	*-ch*	X	X	X	X	X
	other strategies	?	?	?	?	?
Archaic OIr.	*-ch*	(rare)				

	sceo / *sceu*					X
	os	X				
	ocus	X	X	X	X	X
Classical OIr.	*-ch*	(rare)				
	sceo / *sceu*					(rare)
	os	X				
	ocus	X	X	X	X	X

Table 1 summarizes our current understanding of which coordinators coordinated which coordinands at what time, assuming, following Binchy (1960), that *ocus* appeared rather suddenly in Old Irish around the beginning of the written record (seventh century), and that it pushed aside other coordinators.

3. OIr. *ocus* 'and': form and function

3.1. Form

The word *ocus*, while very frequent, is nearly always written using the Tironian note *7*. This abbreviation is used in both Latin and Irish language contexts as the coordinator 'and', and it is generally assumed within Irish studies (doubtlessly correctly) that it is to be read as Latin [et] in Latin-language contexts and as Irish [ogəs] *vel sim.* in Irish-language contexts. That is indeed the assumption here, though see below for extra discussion on the Würzburg glosses. Given the frequent use of the Tironian note, it is not as easy as one might have otherwise expected to determine the precise phonological form of the word. Still, however, it is written out in full 23 times in contemporary Old Irish manuscripts: *acus* (1x: Wb. 3^{a}15), *ocus* (17x: Ml. 65^{a}7, 94^{c}5 and 15x in Cambrai), and *ocuis* (5x: in Cambrai). The source Cambrai is important, since it, while only a short text, shows a number of archaic features. As a result, the standard assumption concerning the phonological form of the conjunction is that *ocuis* [ogəs^{j}] was the oldest form, and that *ocus* [ogəs] represents the regular loss of palatalization of the final consonant in unaccented words (McCone 1996: 135). The form *acus* [agəs] in the Würzburg glosses might then be a singular error[10] or it could have been influenced by the adjective *acus* [agəs] 'near'. On the other hand, *acus* could conceivably represent the correct form, in which case *ocus* could have been

[10] As pointed out to me by David Stifter (p.c.), the single example of *acus* is surrounded by other *a*'s in context: *a adnacuil acus a báis* 'His burial and His death'. It is thus possible that the scribe simply miscopied or miswrote the word.

influenced by the preposition *oc* [og] ‘at, beside, close to’. Without a clear etymology, either scenario is possible, though the evidence supporting *ocuis* / *ocus* as the original is stronger. We will return to these issues below.

One additional important aspect of *ocus* concerns the lenition of following nouns and adjectives. For an example of lenition, see (8) above, where the adjective *chaintoimtenach* ‘and of good opinion’ shows lenition after the conjunction. Despite such examples, the facts and their interpretation are not totally clear, so they will be reviewed *in extenso* here.

Lambert (1979: 64), following up on observations found in (Pedersen 1899: 425ff.) argues that the lenition after *ocus* arose due to “a need for symmetry between two coordinated nouns or adjectives, the first of which is lenited”. He argues that the rule arose within Old Irish, in order to account for the near absence of lenition after ‘and’ in Würzburg beside its near regular occurrence in Milan, a span of about 50 years.[11] Though the time-frame for this change is rather tight,[12] we might note that, by chance, none of the 16 relevant cases of ‘and’ in Würzburg (see below for discussion of the corpus) is in a leniting context according to Lambert’s definition, meaning that the lenition after *ocus* might have been fully in place by the time of Würzburg but simply had no chance to appear (apart from one irregular case at 7^{b}4). If true, this might solve one problem, but it would create another one. Syntactic mutation is rather unexpected in Old Irish, where nearly all mutations are local. This is true of Classical Old Irish, the period for which Lambert is suggesting that the change arose, and it is even more true of Early Old Irish. That a non-local mutation would be introduced with *ocus* is thus somewhat unlikely, and an explanation of the lenition via local processes (i.e. historically justified lenition) is to be preferred.[13] Finally, it is not clear why lenition should be limited only to appearing on nouns and adjectives and not on other parts of speech. Lenition on verbal forms is also quite common in Old Irish and it might be expected that *ocus* could have lenited them also.

Regardless of whether syntactic lenition is responsible for the lenition found after *ocus*, Lambert’s data collection is very important for the arguments here. For that reason, his data from the glosses was rechecked and supplemented for the present study. A number of facts complicate the investigation of the lenition

---

11 On the dates of the Irish in the manuscripts, see Lash (2017: 149) for a brief discussion.

12 This assumes that we view the differences between Würzburg and Milan as due to linear diachronic development. This is not necessarily true, as diatopic variation or competing standards might also explain differences among the glossed corpora. This is not the place for that interesting discussion, however. I thank Elliott Lash (p.c.) for reminding me of this issue.

13 It is true that non-local mutation is attested in limited cases for nasalization (see Uhlich 2019). Illustrative is *déde didiu n-and* ‘two things, then, (are) there’ (Wb. 1^{a}5), where the nasal mutation on *and* ‘there’ skips the intervening *didiu* ‘then’. Cases such as this, however, are quite rare in Old Irish, and it is for that reason that historically justified lenition appears preferable to a new type of syntactic lenition arising.

following *ocus*. One is that the orthography of Old Irish does not show lenition on many consonants (e.g. voiced stops, liquids and nasals). Würzburg and Milan also do not note the lenition of [f], [s] or [p] (Thurneysen 1946: 24, §33.3). Even St. Gall notes the lenition of these sounds only somewhat regularly.[14] For that reason, [f] and [p] have been excluded from the data here. Finally, since *ocus* ends in *-s*, there can be no lenition of following dentals, e.g. [s] and [t] (Thurneyen 1946: 141, §231.2–3). As a result, the only reliable phoneme for checking the lenition properties of *ocus* is [k].

All the Old Irish material in contemporary manuscripts found in the Corpus Palaeohibernicum (=CorPH; Stifter *et al.* 2021) was collected, with the addition of Würzburg glosses. Only examples with a following [k] = <c> were considered, and only if the word was a noun or adjective. These restrictions severely limit the total number of examples, which are gathered in the following table; texts that were examined but had no relevant examples are the Annals of Ulster, the Vienna Bede, the Karlsruhe Bede, the Vatican Psalter and Computus, the Turin Peter and Mark, the St. Gall John, the Cambridge Psalter, the Paris Canons, the London Gospels, the Leiden Boethius, the Laon Cassiodorus, the Dublin Gospels, and the Armagh Glosses:[15]

---

[14] The lenition of [p] is written twice in St. Gall (191^{a}1 *ón chétni phersin* 'from the first person' and 200^{b}6 *foilsigdde phersin frecṅdairc* '…which demonstrate a present person') and not written 26 times where expected (39^{a}28, 41^{b}2, 42^{a}5, 52^{a}19, 140^{a}1, 157^{b}3, 163^{b}6, 165^{a}1, 189^{a}7, 9, ^{b}2 (bis), 191^{a}2, 192^{b}4, 197^{a}15, 199^{b}10, 208^{b}5, 209^{b}12 (bis), 28 (ter), 212^{b}3 (ter), 220^{a}2). This list excludes examples where [p] is the beginning of the second member of a compound (as these might conceivably follow different rules) and examples where [p] is from Latin / Greek names (even ones with Irish inflection or derivations). Including these would possibly add one more lenited example (a rather poor one: 31^{b}19 *in phirde* 'the Phirdian') and 7 non-lenited examples (95^{b}2, 161^{a}4, 208^{a}4, 5, 8, ^{b}10; K 15^{a}3). It is clear that the writing of lenition on [p] is quite rare in the Sg. glosses.

It is more common on [f]. Here there are 72 examples showing lenition via <ḟ> and 47 without (not including seven more which follow *ocus* and show no lenition). The loci for these are not given here, as it would burst the bounds of the paper, but the examples indicate that lenition of [f] is shown roughly 60% of the time. While this percentage is reasonably high, the writing lenition of [f] is still far from regular. Given the small number of examples of [f] after *ocus*, it is unclear whether these would be expected to show lenition. For that reason, these examples have been set aside here.

[15] Data from two other texts in CorPH, Blathmac and the Monastery of Tallaght, was also collected, but the texts were ultimately excluded from investigation as both are only found in later copies. In both, lenition in general of initial [k] (i.e. unconnected with *ocus* but in highly secure cases) is frequently not indicated. A quick collection of data from Blathmac yielded 52 cases of lenition both expected and written on [k] and 105 cases of lenition expected but not written. For Tallaght, the ratio was 93 cases of lenition both expected and written beside 67 cases of expected but unwritten lenition. The reliability of these texts concerning the writing of lenition is thus rather low. This underscores yet again the importance of the Old Irish glosses for investigations such as the present one and is the reason for excluding these texts from the table below.

Table 2. Examples of lenition of initial [k] after *ocus*.

	Lenition of following N / Adj	No lenition of following N / Adj
Würzburg[16]	1	15
Milan[17]	15	2
St. Gall[18]	9	4
Karlsruhe Augustine[19]	1	0
Karlsruhe Priscian[20]	0	2
Cambrai[21]	0	1

One might argue that we cannot be sure that the abbreviation *7* (the vast majority of cases in the above table) was actually pronounced as the Irish word and not as the Latin word. This is true, but we are left with little choice given the nature of the data, and the methodology used here nonetheless appears to be a reasonable way to approach the question.

That said, the rules for including data from the Würzburg glosses are slightly more stringent than for other texts. Here, the coordinator 'and' is nearly always indicated via Latin *et* (almost 600 times in Irish and Latin language contexts). The Tironian note, so common in other texts, is found only ten times: used by the main glossator once in an Irish language context (2^{b}9), once in a Latin language context (21^{c}21), and used eight times by the third Würzburg glossator, usually in Irish contexts (33^{a}2, 6, 11, 19, ^{b}17, 19, 34^{a}2, 6).[22] The principle followed here is that when the words on both sides of 'and', regardless of how it was written, are Irish, then the conjunction was treated as Irish and included in the statistics. Though this is methodologically defensible, there is nonetheless some uncertainty as to how reliable the Würzburg data are in this case.

16 With lenition: 7^{b}4. Without lenition: 11^{c}21, 12^{b}4, 13^{c}26, 14^{d}1, 19^{a}6, ^{c}21, 20^{d}6, 23^{b}1, 24^{b}28, ^{c}9, 27^{c}15, 30^{a}14, 23, ^{b}5, 31^{d}21.

17 With lenition: 31^{b}10, 36^{a}34, 37^{a}10, 47^{c}7, 51^{d}5, 72^{a}5, 94^{c}2, 99^{b}5, 101^{c}6–7, 102^{d}9, 105^{d}4, 112^{d}2, 136^{a}8, 138^{a}2 (bis). Without lenition: 41^{d}9, 111^{c}13. Two examples with *cech* / *cach* 'each, every' (45^{a}4, 111^{a}5) that do not show lenition are excluded because *cech* / *cach* does not show lenition (Thurneysen 1946: 310, §490 (b)).

18 With lenition: 33^{a}10, 77^{a}7, 144^{b}1, 194^{a} (*meisse* 7 *choirbbre*), 194^{b}1, 209^{b}16, 29, 212^{a}3, 217^{a}6. Without lenition: 9^{a}21, 26^{a}10, 31^{b}12, 172^{a}2. Again, one example with *cach* 'each, ever' (203^{b}1) was excluded because the word does not lenite.

19 With lenition: 17v.

20 Without lenition: 62^{a}1, ^{b}1.

21 Without lenition: Thes. ii, 245.13.

22 The third glossator also uses Latin *et* (mostly in a Latin language context) seven times (33^{b}19 (quater), ^{c}12, 13, 34^{a}1a).

In general, the data in table 2 is not particularly easy to evaluate. The shorter texts (Cambrai and the Karlsruhe texts) have too few examples to be indicative. For Milan and St. Gall, it is relatively clear that lenition following *ocus* is regular, though not exceptionless. For Würzburg, the opposite seems to be true. It seems, therefore, that we have a contradiction. The Würzburg data seem to demand that lenition after *ocus* only became prevalent after the writing of that manuscript around 750, which would preclude any sort of historically regular explanation of the lenition. On the other hand, as noted above, syntactic lenition is remarkably rare in Old Irish. It is not immediately clear how to solve this contradiction, but I will work from the assumption that a phonological (i.e. historical) explanation for the lenition is generally preferable, assuming that an account of some sort can be found for the Würzburg data.

3.2. Function

The function of *ocus* is, for the most part, clearer than the form. The basic observation is that it can coordinate nearly any part of speech (see the examples in (6)–(13) above). In addition to this fact, there one further point to note concerning the function of *ocus*: when coordinated subjects are structurally immediately beside the verb, the verb agrees with only the nearest conjunct:[23]

(16) ***airigth-i*** *Ailill* *7* *Medb*
notice.PRES.3SG-3SG.OBJ PN.NOM.SG and PN.NOM.SG
'Ailill and Medb notice it.'
(O'Rahilly 1976: 8, l. 230)

(17) *ind=immarslaide* *7* *in=choidech*
the=mutual.striking.NOM.SG and the=fighting.NOM.SG
bīs *foraib* *oc=imthuarcain*
be.CONS.PRES.3SG.REL on.3PL at=mutual.pounding.DAT.SG
'the mutual striking and the fighting which is on them as they pound one another'
(Ml. 16^{b}7)

The facts are considerably more complicated when other elements intervene between the verb and coordinated subjects (see Lash & Griffith 2018 for the facts as well as an analysis), but it seems that even then, the original situation was for there to be first-conjunct agreement.

---

[23] Examples of preverbal coordinated subjects (which are practically speaking entirely restricted to relative clauses) are exceedingly rare, but they do agree with the statement here.

Additionally, it may also be the case that *ocus* 'and' used to require the nominative case. Normally speaking the second coordinand is in the same case as the first (see (6) and (7) above), but following a conjugated preposition, the nominative is found (see (18) and Thurneysen 1946: 156, §247 (a)):

(18) *dún=ni* et *Barnaip*
to.1PL=1PL and Barnabas.NOM.SG
'for me and Barnabas'
(Wb. 10[d]1)

Additionally, there are other examples of the nominative after *ocus* (see (19) and Thurneysen 1946: 156, §247 (e)), though the fact that many of these are limited to poetry makes their *Sprachwirklichkeit* rather uncertain.

(19) *a=comrag* *ocus* *Cú Chulainn*
3PL=meeting and Cú_Chulainn.NOM.SG
'for him (literally 'them') and CC to fight'
(Nettlau 1893: 266)

It is now time to summarize the important facts concerning the form and function of *ocus*. Given the rarity of non-abbreviated writings of the word, there is some uncertainty about its correct form. The oldest form was probably *ocuis* [ogəs^{j}] or possibly **acuis* [agəs^{j}], which then underwent regular depalatalization to *ocus* [ogəs] or *acus* [agəs]. Which form one believes is more original depends on which etymology of the word one finds most convincing. As regards function, *ocus* is the general coordinating conjunction in Old Irish. It lenites an immediately following noun and adjective (but not other word-types). In addition, closest-conjunct agreement is the rule for verbal agreement with coordinated subjects. Also, *ocus* may have required a following nominative, though this is uncertain.

4. Past etymological suggestions

Thurneysen (*GOI* 549 §878) speculates that *ocus* 'and' might be connected to the preposition *oc* 'at, beside, close to' and denies a connection with the adjective *acus* 'near' (Middle Welsh *agos* 'id'), but he offers no specifics. Vendryes (1983 s.v. *ocus*) suggests that both *ocus* 'and' and *acus* 'near' have the same source as the preposition *oc*, but he, too, offers no specifics. The only serious attempt at an etymology for *ocus* comes from Hamp (1981), who argues against Thurneysen and connects *ocus* 'and' with *acus*, MW *agos* 'near'. Specifically, he argues that an Indo-European dative or locative **ad-ǵhos-t-(e)i* 'at hand' (with the root **ǵhes* 'hand') gave Old Irish **acuis* / *acus* 'and' directly, while a related **ad-ǵhos-tu-*

gave OIr. *acus* and MW *agos* 'near'. Given that locatives and conjunctions have affinities cross-linguistically (Stolz 1996: 144–72, 1998: 119–20), the derivation is semantically appealing. According to Hamp (1981: 160), the more common spelling *ocus* 'and' would then be due to contamination with the preposition *oc* 'at, beside, close to'.[24]

Hamp's account has the very real value of being explicit, but it suffers from some weaknesses. The word *ocus* must, under his explanation, continue something very old, which is hard to square with the fact that *ocus* appears rather to be a later intrusion, replacing other coordinators (Binchy 1960: 80). One could argue that the grammaticalization was late, but the question would then be what *ocus* was doing in the language before it grammaticalized, since the form is otherwise totally isolated. Additionally, his account does not make it clear why lenition after *ocus* should be restricted to a following nominal, or why this nominal should be in the nominative case. While a connection of the words *ocus* 'and' and *acus* 'near' is attractive, Hamp's suggestion has a few shortcomings, leaving it ultimately unconvincing.

It is possible to offer an alternative account connecting the two words that is more plausible, though it will be seen that this too suffers from weaknesses. Adjectives in Insular Celtic languages have, in addition to a positive, comparative, and superlative, a synthetic equative formation ending in *-ithir* 'as X as' (Thurneysen 1946: 232ff., §§366ff.). These equatives were originally simply abstracts: *sen* 'old', eq. *sinithir* 'as old as' < 'oldness'. There is in Old Irish a small group of irregular adjectives whose equatives are etymologically the old genitive of the positive (Bergin 1946; Jasanoff 1990: 186–8). For example, *már* 'big' has an equative *máir* 'as big as' < **mārī* 'of a bigness (with)' and *remor* 'thick' has an equative *reimir* 'as thick as' < **remrī* 'of a thickness (with)'. Now, *acus* 'near' belongs to this small irregular class of adjectives, and although its equative is otherwise unattested, one could posit that it was actually **acuis* < **aggussī*. Given that these irregular equatives ended in a pre-apocope vowel, they would be expected to lenite what follows them. Additionally, given the fact that **acuis* on this account is an equative adjective, only nominals would be expected to have followed it originally: *A acuis B* originally meant 'A (being) of a nearness with B', which later grammaticalized to 'A and B' and spread to coordinate other phrase types.

This account takes Hamp's connection of 'near' and 'and' as its basis but has some advantages over his original formulation. First of all, there is no chronological problem. The equative **acuis* would have been integrated into the paradigm of *acus* 'near' and it could have grammaticalized rather late, which is

[24] Since the preposition *oc* originally had locative meanings, the same semantic connection as noted for *acus* 'near' and *ocus* 'and' would be responsible for the contamination of Hamp's *acus* 'and' and *oc*.

necessary given the late appearance of *ocus* ‘and’. This derivation also can explain the restriction of lenition after *ocus* to nominals: only nominals would originally have followed an equative and only they were regularly lenited. Later, when the coordinator started to be used to coordinate other parts of speech, the lenition was simply not carried over.

Despite these advantages over Hamp’s derivation, there are still some reasons to reject this account. First, it must be noted that *acus* ‘near’ is a *u*-stem and as such would not originally have had a genitive in *-*ī* but rather in *-*ōs* (which would not have lenited). While the *u*-stem adjectives eventually took over the genitive ending *-*ī* (Thurneysen 1946: 227, §358–359), it is unclear whether the chronology can support the developments necessary for the account of *ocus* offered here. Further, this account also does not explain the distribution of *ocuis* vs. *ocus* in Cambrai (on which see below). In the end, this modified account of a connection between *acus* ‘near’ and *ocus* ‘and’, while more able than Hamp’s to explain the distributional facts of *ocus*, is too flawed to accept. We must therefore look for a better one.

5. A new etymology for *ocus* ‘and’

As noted above, the only explicit suggestion for an etymology of *ocus* ‘and’ has connected it with the adjective *acus* ‘near’. While the semantics are fine, other considerations make these explanations less than entirely convincing. In what follows, I will connect the coordinating conjunction rather with the preposition *oc* ‘at, beside, close to’. The semantics of *oc* ‘at, beside, close to’ are not problematic, since they involve the same type of relationship as assumed in the earlier suggestion of a connection between *acus* ‘near’ and *ocus* ‘and’. The suggestion will have to be judged on other (phonological and morpho-syntactic) criteria for how well it explains the facts. The following points are important for the argument more generally:

1) The fourth to sixth centuries were a period of cataclysmic change for the Irish language. As noted above, apocope would have made the inherited connector *-*kᵘe* almost unusable, except in certain very limited environments. Note that I assume, contra Binchy (1960: 77), that *-*kᵘe* was not restricted to pretonic position in earlier times. The etymology of OIr. *dëec* ‘-teen’ (see above and Schrijver 1994) should be enough to show this to be false; the restriction is almost certainly a late one within Irish. Binchy does recognize the difficulties (1960: 93), but I wish to stress that Irish almost certainly had an all-purpose coordinator ‘and’ until quite late in its prehistory, i.e. until the apocope of final syllables in the early sixth century (McCone 1996: 26).

2) At some point, probably in the seventh century, new nominal coordinators arose. These were *ocus* and *sceo* / *sceu*, which presumably were in competition for some time before *ocus* eventually won out, leaving *sceo / sceu* limited to a small number of surviving texts.

It is quite possible that Irish was for a time without coordinating conjunctions (except in the very limited cases where *-$k^{u}e$ was maintained).[25] Mithun's (1988: 352–357) study (see also above in secction 1) makes clear that languages not infrequently make do without any coordinating conjunctions, so this would not be surprising. She also shows that a very large number of languages acquired their coordinating conjunctions arose only very late in their histories, often due to language contact with languages with a written tradition. It is thus possible that Irish lacked conjunctions for a time until it, under Latin influence, created new ones (*ocus* and *sceo / sceu*). This is speculative, but it fits the broader cross-linguistic picture well.

Turning back to *ocus* specifically, I propose that in late Pre-Irish, speakers created a bipartite coordinating conjunction consisting of *oc(c)o* [at.3SG.M/N] 'at it, with it, by it' and **es* [COP.PRES.3SG.REL] 'which is'. Taken together, the collocation was **occo as* 'beside / with that which is', and this was then grammaticalized as the conjunction 'and'.[26] The development would have been:

(20) *A* **occo as** *B* 'A beside that which is B' > 'A and B'.

Firstly, the semantic development is unremarkable, in that a meaning 'with, beside' develops to 'and' (see above in section 1). Secondly, the phonological developments are unsurprising. It is true that there are no exact parallels for such a sequence of sounds, but an unaccented [ogo es] should develop to *ocus* [ogɵs].[27] Most important, however, is that this collocation yields a straightforward explanation for lenition after *ocus*: the relative copula *as* 'which is' regularly lenites when it is in a subject relative clause. Further, in regular copular clauses (i.e. not in cleft sentences) the copula will be followed by the predicate, which

---

25 Occasional cases of asyndetic coordination could possibly be a holdover from this period without an all-purpose coordinator, but in the absence of any collections of such examples, further speculation would be rash.

26 In what follows, I will simply write **occo as*, using the Old Irish forms of *occo* 'at it' and *as* 'which is', as a stand-in for the earlier **ogo es*. Note further that it is possible that the simple, i.e. non-conjugated, preposition *oc* could have been used in place of the conjugated preposition. The collocation would then have been **oc es* . The two proposals are not materially different.

27 This is true regardless of whether one adopts Greene's (1962) by now traditional formulation of unaccented vowels or McCone's more radical one (2015): **occo as* would yield *ocus* (via **occo 's*, assuming aphaeresis of the vowel of the copula).

should normally only be a noun or an adjective.[28] This means that both the lenition after *ocus* and the restriction of that lenition to nouns and adjectives is readily explicable. Additionally, that verbs show first-conjunct agreement with their subjects is easy to explain, as the subject in a phrase **A occo as B* 'A beside that which is B' would originally have been A alone. Finally, the fact that the noun after *ocus* is in the nominative case (as far as this is a real restriction; see the cautionary note above) also follows, since B in the phrase **A occo as B* was originally the predicate of a copular clause and would always have appeared in the nominative case, regardless of the function of A in the main clause.

An unusual feature of this proposal, both from an Irish and a cross-linguistic point of view, is that it requires a headless relative clause.[29] These are cross-linguistically somewhat rare but have been noted previously for Old Irish (see Ó Cathasaigh 1990 and Roma 2023). An example is:

(21) *at·tá* *immurgu* *as·béer*
PV·is.PRES.3SG however PV·REL\say.FUT.1SG
'there is, however, something which I will say' (Wb. 32[a]22)

Roma's (2023) study of headless relatives in the glosses shows that they can have any function in the sentence EXCEPT that of prepositional object of the matrix clause, which happens to be exactly the function required for the present proposal to work. That is, the headless relative **as B* 'which is B' of the phrase **A occo as B* 'A beside that which is B' is the object of the preposition. This might seem to be fatal for the proposal, but as it happens, prepositional headless relatives do occur in Early Irish, just not in the corpus Roma used for her study (the texts of CorPH). The following example illustrates such two such relatives:

(22) *ma-ni·taisilbt*[h]*er* *do* *bes*
IF.NEG·ascribe.SUBJ.PASS.SG to.3SG.M COP.SUBJ.3SG.REL
fíado *do·gnether*
before.3SG.M PRV do.SUBJ.PASS.SG
'unless it (testimony) be ascribed to him who is present at what was done'
(Binchy 1978: vol. II, 596.19)

---

[28] It is true that other elements, especially prepositions, can follow the copula, usually in cleft sentences. The case of prepositions will be addressed below, but the basic fact is that the copula primarily serves to join a (pro)nominal subject with an adjectival or (pro)nominal predicate.

[29] As noted by Roma (2023) there are different kinds of constructions that are sometimes called headless relative clauses. Here, a headless relative clause is taken to be a relative clause without an overt antecedent.

The preposition *fíado* [before.3SG.M] is clearly conjugated and is followed by a relative. The preposition *do* is either conjugated [to.3SG.M] or it is a bare preposition. In either case, however, it is followed by a relative. Both are of the type that I am suggesting underlies *ocus* 'and'.

There is also typological evidence from the accessibility hierarchy (Keenan & Comrie 1977) supporting the presence of Old Irish prepositional headless relatives. The accessibility hierarchy can be represented as follows:

(23) Subject > Dir. Object > Indir. Obj > Oblique > Genitive

It says that any element on the left is more likely to be allowed to participate in syntactic operations (e.g. appearing as the antecedent of a relative clause) than an element to its right. Further, if there is evidence for something on the right participating in a particular operation, it implies that all elements to its left also can do so. Since Old Irish has genitive headless relatives (see Roma 2023), it is expected to have oblique (in this case prepositional) relatives as well.

If the present proposal is adopted, we now have an explanation for much of the behavior of *ocus* 'and' as outlined earlier. There are, however, still some unexplained facts. One of these is how *ocus* spread from its function as a nominal coordinator to other phrase types. Another is how to explain the form *ocuis*, found five times in the Cambrai Homily. There is no particular reason to think that *ocuis* is a miscopying (as did Binchy 1960: 80), meaning that the form requires explanation. As it happens, these two facts can be explained together.

As argued here, **occo as* was at first only a nominal and adjectival coordinator. Extending it to, for instance, prepositional phrases would have been problematic, since the meaning 'beside that which is' is not appropriate for a prepositional phrase. One could argue that as **occo as* grammaticalized in the meaning 'and', it eventually became opaque to speakers as a phrase and simply was seen as a coordinator, which could then be extended to coordinate other phrase types. This is indeed possible, but it would not explain why there is lenition only on nouns and adjectives. That is, the lenition presumably would have spread with the form. Instead, I suggest that speakers "undid" the relative construction, replacing **as* (older **es*) with its non-relative counterpart **is* [is^{j}]. A rough parallel can be found in cleft sentence constructions, where fronted nouns and adjectives require a relative verb, but other fronted elements do not (Strachan 1929: 123, n. 7). Equally, or perhaps even more, important is that *occo* 'beside it' probably had an additive adverbial sense 'besides' = 'additionally', which could help the reanalysis (see Goldstein 2018 on additives developing into conjunctions). That is, **occo is* could mean 'additionally, it is…'. A sample sentence could then be:

(24) **as·beir* *fris* *occo*
PV·speak.PRES.3SG to.3SG additionally
is=fri=Meidb
COP.PRES.3SG=to=Medb.ACC.SG
'he speaks to him, additionally it is to Medb (that he speaks)'
= 'he speaks to him and to Medb'

Once established as a prepositional coordinator, **occo is* could then spread to conjoin verbs and sentences, following the implication sequence for coordination argued for by Payne (1985), outlined above in section 1, and repeated here for convenience (AP_1 are predicative and AP_2 attributive adjective phrases):

(25) S – VP – AP_1 – PP – AP_2 – NP

As noted above, according to the sequence, different coordinators may be used in a language, but each coordination strategy must coordinate a contiguous section of the sequence. That is, a single coordinator cannot coordinate Noun Phrases and Verb Phrases unless it also coordinates Prepositional Phrases. This means that once **occo is* was established as a coordinator of prepositional phrases, only it (and not **occo as*) could spread to coordinate verbs and clauses / sentences.

It may cogently be objected that Old Irish does not actually have an adverb *occo* in the meaning 'additionally, besides'. Assuming its presence is, however, hardly a problem. Formally, *occo* is simply the 3SG.M/N of the preposition *oc* 'at, beside, close to'. Since prepositions frequently acquire an adverbially sense when conjugated as the 3SG.M/N (cf. *and* [in(to).3SG.M/N] 'there'; *as* [out_of.3SG.M/N] 'away'; *cenae* [without.3SG.M/N] 'besides, in addition, moreover'), it is not a problem to suggest that the 3SG.M/N form *occo* of the preposition *oc* could also have done so. The meaning proposed for *occo*, 'besides, additionally', follows perfectly from the basic meaning of the preposition *oc* 'at, beside, close to'. On the way to Classical Old Irish, however, this proposed adverbial sense of *occo* 'besides, additionally' was supplanted. There are two reasons to suspect that this occurred. First, as *oc* had become associated with the progressive aspect[30], the dominant synchronic adverbial meaning of *occo* in Old Irish was rather 'at it, thereat, engaged therein' (eDIL s.v. *oc*), which reflects a further development of the earlier locative sense. That the meaning *occo* 'additionally' could remain in a set phrase is perfectly reasonable. Second, the preposition *cen* 'without' has an inflected form *cenae* with the meaning 'besides, additionally'. The meaning of the preposition reflects the semantic development 'on this side' > 'apart from,

[30] For the purposes of this argument, it is not critical whether the progressive aspect had been totally grammaticalized already in Old Irish or not (pro: Stüber 2013, contra: Ronan 2012, Ó Corráin 2013). All authors agree that the construction was firmly in place in Old Irish.

besides, except' > 'without' (see Thurneysen 1946: 501, §827; eDIL s.v. *cen*). The prepositional adverb *cenae* has had its meaning frozen in an earlier semantics of the preposition *cen*. It appears that speakers of Early Old Irish adopted *cenae* in the meaning 'besides, additionally' and pushed *occo* aside in this sense. The only remnant of the earlier sense would then be found in the collocation that eventually became *ocus* 'and'.

At this point, I hope to have adequately established **occo is* 'additionally it is' > *ocuis* 'and' as a coordinator of PPs, Ss, and VPs. One small but important difference between the **oggo is* in this function and **occo as*, which coordinates NPs and APs, is their regular phonological development in Archaic Old Irish. The copular form *is* [COP.PRES.3SG] originally had a palatalized final consonant that would have remained into the seventh century, while the copular form *as* [COP.PRES.REL.3SG] had a non-palatalized final consonant. The following derivations would have obtained in Archaic Old Irish: **occo is*^{j}, via **occo 's*^{j}, yielded *ocuis* [ogəs^{j}] while **occo as*, via **occo 's*, yielded *ocus* [ogəs]. Interestingly, this difference of form is maintained in the one Old Irish text with forms of *ocuis* 'and': the Cambrai Homily. Given that this short text has 20 forms of *ocus* / *ocuis* written out in full, i.e. not abbreviated, it is somewhat surprising that no one to date has examined their distribution. Table 3 shows the distribution of elements coordinated by *ocus* / *ocuis*.

As can be seen from the table, *ocuis* coordinates only PPs, VPs, and Ss, while *ocus* coordinates all phrase types. Seen another way, NPs are coordinated solely by *ocus*, while other phrase types have both *ocus* and *ocuis*. The derivation of *ocus* and *ocuis* proposed in this paper predicts just such a split. Since Cambrai shows the beginnings of the loss of palatalization in unaccented words (cf. *are* 'in order that' (*Thes. Pal.* II: 243.28 vs. *ara* 'id' (*Thes. Pal.* II: 243.27)), it should be no surprise that *ocus* sometimes appears coordinating non-NPs as well. We can assume that shortly before the period in which Cambrai was written down, *ocus* appeared solely in NP and AP coordination, while *ocuis* appeared for PPs, VPs, and Ss. The distribution found in Table 3 represents a time only slightly removed from that original distribution. In the later language, the two forms fall together totally, apart from the lenition following earlier *ocus* but not *ocuis*. While the distributional facts of Cambrai do not prove the proposal offered here, they are unlikely to have arisen randomly (3.25% chance), which fact makes it difficult to accept any theory without a principled explanation for why *ocuis* never appears as an NP coordinator.

Table 3. Distribution of *ocus* vs. *ocuis* in Cambrai; p = 0.0325[31]

	ocus	*ocuis*
NP Coordinator[32]	10	0
PP, VP, S Coordinator	5	5

6. Further issues

At this point, we need to return to the distribution of lenited and unlenited forms of nouns and adjectives following *ocus* in the Old Irish glosses. The main issue was why the Würzburg glosses show so little lenition after *ocus* (one case of sixteen) while Milan and St. Gall show nearly, though not totally, regular lenition under the same conditions. I do not believe that this situation is due to chronological developments but rather to different language varieties / different regularization patterns by speakers.

According to the proposal here, Old Irish of the very early historical period had two forms of *ocus* 'and': leniting *ocus* used to coordinate nouns and adjectives and non-leniting *ocuis* to coordinate everything else. Once *ocuis* began losing its palatalized final consonant due to regular sound change, only the mutational difference would have remained to distinguish the forms. While identical phonological forms do maintain mutational differences in Old Irish (cf. the possessive pronouns of the third person), these are always coupled with differences

31 The p-value was computed using Fisher's exact test and indicates the probability that there is no relationship between the two variables investigated, here the form of the coordinator and the items coordinated.

32 Note that Cambrai has no coordinated APs. I have made one important assumption regarding NPs: I have grouped together all nouns, regardless of gender and number. Originally, *ocus* could have had different forms before fem., masc./nt., and plural nouns, e.g. **okke es* [beside.3SG.F COP.PRES.REL.3SG] 'beside that (fem.) which is'. Given that the default gender in Irish is masculine, it is quite probable, especially in a cataphoric use like the one argued for in *ocus*, that the default gender would have been used regardless of the gender of the noun referred to. This is a normal development in the course of grammaticalization. For something similar, one might look at the usage of the pleonastic infixed pronoun (see Lucht 1994), which was beginning to become grammaticalized in OIr. There, the pleonastic pronoun was sometimes NT.SG regardless of the doubled noun (5 of 5 cases in Wb., 3 of 14 in Ml., 0 of 1 in Sg.). Eventually in MIr. meaningless lenition (originally a NT.SG inf. pron.) appeared frequently after initial preverbs. It thus seems safe to assume that *ocus* would either have been the sole form for NP coordination or would very early have become the sole form for NP coordination. As Elliott Lash (p.c.) reminds me, given the facts of Old Irish spelling, both [ogəs] and [okəs] would have been spelled *ocus*. This means that the spelling in the manuscripts could represent a masculine / neuter or a feminine conjugated preposition. Given the Middle and Modern Irish spellings, it is the masculine / neuter form that was generalized at some point.

in meaning, e.g. a^{L} 'his' beside a^{N} 'their'. It seems likely that the distinction of leniting *ocus* before nouns and adjectives but non-leniting *ocus* elsewhere would have been unstable once there was no phonological difference to support it.

From the data in Table 2, the Milan and St. Gall glosses appear to have maintained the lenition before nouns relatively consistently, though even here there are some exceptions. Würzburg, on the other hand, is a surprising outlier in that it appears to have almost completely erased the difference between leniting and non-leniting *ocus*. In the end, I cannot offer a definitive reason for why Würzburg would have given up the expected lenition that is still maintained in Milan and St. Gall. I would note, however, that it is quite commonplace for there to be innovation in one area of a grammar that is otherwise quite conservative. To adapt an argument made by Lionel Joseph (1987: 157) with respect to Thurneysen, the Würzburg glosses are our most faithful representative of Classical Old Irish, and their pre-eminence will hardly be diminished if they were to show the analogical loss a morphophonological feature after a single word (i.e. the loss of lenition after *ocus*). In other words, I am suggesting that once *ocus* and *ocuis* had fallen together as *ocus*, the non-leniting variety was almost completely generalized in Würzburg, while the distinction was essentially maintained in Milan and St. Gall. A close and careful examination of the Middle Irish data may help shed light on the situation. Both Pedersen (1899) and Lambert (1979) talk about Middle Irish, but a full study is needed to properly assess the data.

7. Summary

While the details of coordination in Primitive and Archaic Irish must remain unknown, it appears that, following apocope, *-ch* was all but lost as a coordinator. The language may have simply done without a coordinator for a time, which is not particularly unusual in languages of the world (see the discussion at the beginning of section 5 above). When the need for coordination was again felt, whether as the result of language contact or due to entirely internal developments, speakers created two new coordinators, both restricted to nominal coordination and employing a WITH-strategy (See section 1): *sceo* / *sceu* and *ocus*. The first new coordinator, *sceo /sceu*, functioned essentially like a preposition taking the genitive, but it developed the meaning 'and'. True to its etymology as the dative singular of a noun 'with mention of', it took a genitive "object" and, at least in older examples, primarily coordinated nouns (which it lenited). These restrictions are evidence of the etymological origin of the coordinator. Within the literature on grammaticalization, these traces of the etymological origin of *sceo* / *sceu* even after its grammaticalization as 'and' are known as persistence (Hopper 1991: 28ff.). Indeed, these traces are the only hints as to the etymology of the word, which is otherwise obscure. Thus, they are invaluable to us.

Just as *sceo* / *sceu* exhibits traces of persistence, so, too, does *ocus*, in the fact that it lenites only a following adjective or noun, but not other parts of speech. This is a remnant of its etymological origin as a phrase **occo as* 'beside that which is'. As the phrase was etymologically a copular clause, it could only be followed by a noun or adjective. This noun or adjective would naturally have been lenited as the predicate of a subject relative. In time, the phrase **occo as* began to grammaticalize as 'and', but it maintained its lenition as well as its lexical restriction to coordinating only nouns and adjectives. At some point, in order to coordinate prepositional phrases, speakers adapted the coordinator as **occo is* literally 'additionally, it is…'. This phrase did not lenite (as it contained the regular copula **is*), but it was capable of coordinating prepositional phrases and later verbs, and clauses or sentences.

The pair of coordinators *ocus*^{L} (for nouns and adjectives) and *ocuis* (for the rest) grammaticalized fully as 'and' within the Early Old Irish period and became opaque to speakers of the language. While they eventually they fell together formally in all varieties, the Cambrai Homily is especially valuable as it represents a state of the language where the distinction is still partially shown. There, *ocuis* only coordinates non-nominals (its original distribution), while *ocus*, which continues both original *ocus* as well as cases of depalatalized *ocuis*, can coordinate anything. The Old Irish varieties underlying other texts lost palatalized variant totally. They also vary in whether they maintain the distinction between leniting *ocus* before nominals and non-leniting *ocus* elsewhere (the Milan and St. Gall glosses) or give up the distinction, opting for non-leniting *ocus* everywhere (the Würzburg glosses).

REFERENCES

Bergin, Osborn. 1946. "Some Irish equatives", *Ériu* 14: 140-3.

Binchy, D.A. 1960. "IE **q^{u}e* in Irish", *Celtica* 5: 77- 94.

Binchy, D.A. 1978. *Corpus iuris hibernica*. 7 vols. Dublin: DIAS.

Brown, Lea and Matthew S. Dryer. 2008. "The verbs for 'and' in Walman, a Torricelli language of Papua New Guinea", *Language* 84/3: 528–565.

CorPH = Stifter et al. 2021. David Stifter, Bernhard Bauer, Elliott Lash, Fangzhe Qiu, Nora White, Siobhán Barrett, Aaron Griffith, Romanas Bulatovas, Francesco Felici, Ellen Ganly, Truc Ha Nguyen, and Lars Nooij. *Corpus PalaeoHibernicum (CorPH) v1.0*, 2021, online at http://chronhib.maynoothuniversity.ie.

Drellishak, Scott. 2004. *A Survey of Coordination Strategies in the World's Languages*. Unpublished MA Thesis, University of Washington.

García Castillero, Carlos. 2013. "Old Irish tonic pronouns as extraclausal constituents", *Ériu* 63: 1–39.

Goldstein, David. 2019. "Language change and linguistic theory: The case of archaic Indo-European conjunction", *Transactions of the Philological Society*, 117/1: 1–34.

Greene, David. 1962. "The colouring on consonants in Old Irish", in: Antti Sovijärvi and Pentti Aalto (eds.), *Proceedings of fourth international conference of phonetic sciences*. The Hague: Mouton, 622–624.

Griffith, Aaron. 2016. "On the old Irish third palatalisation and the 3sg. present of the copula", *Ériu* 66: 39–62.

Hamp, Eric P. 1981. "Varia III 3. *acus ~ ocuis*", *Ériu* 32: 159-61.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2004. "Coordinating constructions: An overview", in: Martin Haspelmath (ed.), *Coordinating constructions*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 3–39.

Haspelmath, Martin. 2007. "Coordination", in: Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. 2: Complex constructions*, (2nd ed.) Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1-51.

Hopper, Paul J. 1991. 'On some principles of grammaticization', in: Elizabeth Closs Traugott and Bernd Heine (eds.), *Approaches to grammaticalization, volume 1: focus on the theoretical and methodological issues*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 17–35.

Jasanoff, Jay. 1988–1990. "The origin of the Celtic comparative type OIr. *tressa*, MW *trech* 'stronger'", *Die Sprache* 34: 171-89.

Keenan, Edward L. and Bernard Comrie. 1977. "Noun phrase accessibility and Universal Grammar", *Linguistic Inquiry* 8/1: 63–99.

Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1974. "Emplois dissymétriques de la coordination", *Études Celtiques* 14: 479-502.

Lambert, Pierre-Yves. 1979. "Lenition after Ir. *ocus* 'and'", *Ériu* 30: 54-63.

Lash, Elliott. 2017. "A quantitative analysis of *e*/*i* variation in Old Irish *etar* and *ceta*", *Ériu* 67: 141–167.

Lash, Elliott, & Aaron Griffith. 2018. "Coordinate subjects, expletives, and the EPP in Early Irish". *Journal of Celtic Linguistics* 19/1: 87-156.

Lucht, Ina. 1994. "Doppelte Markierung des Akkusativs beim Transitivum im Altirischen", *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 46: 80-118.

McCone, Kim. 1996. *Towards a relative chronology of ancient and medieval Celtic sound change*. Maynooth: Department of Old Irish.

McCone, Kim. 2015. 'Unstressed vowels and consonant quality in Old Irish: *u* or non-*u*', in: Liam Breatnach et al. (eds.), *Proceedings XIV International Congress of Celtic Studies, Maynooth 2011*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies, 109–135.

Mithun, Marianne. 1988. "The grammaticalization of coordination", in: Sandra A Thompson and John Haiman (eds.), *Clause combining in grammar and discourse*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 331–359.

Nettlau, Max. 1893. "The fragment of the Tain Bó Cuailnge in MS Egerton 93", *RC* 14: 254–266.

Ó Cathasaigh, Tomás. 1990. "On the Early Irish prepositional relative without antecedent", Celtica 21: 418-26.

Ó Corráin, Ailbhe. 2013. "On the evolution of verbal aspect in Insular Celtic", in: Folke Josephson and Ingmar Söhrman (eds.), *Diachronic and typological perspectives on verbs*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 299–327.

O'Rahilly, Cecile. 1976. *Táin bó Cúailnge. Recension I.* Dublin: DIAS.

Payne, John R.1985. "Complex phrases and complex sentences", in Timothy Shopen (ed.), *Language typology and syntactic description, vol. 2: Complex constructions*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 3-41

Pedersen, Holger. 1899. “Die Aspiration im Irischen”, *KZ* 35: 315-444.
Roma, Elisa. 2023. “Headless relative clauses in Early Irish”, *Études Celtiques* 49: 114–133.
Ronan, Patricia. 2012. “Development of periphrastic tense and aspect construction in Irish and Welsh”, in: Kristin Davidse et al. (eds.), *Grammaticalization and language change: New reflections*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 227–247.
Schrijver, Peter. 1994. “Varia IV. OIr. *dëec, dëac*”, *Ériu* 44: 181–184.
Stassen, Leon. 2000. “AND-languages and WITH-languages”, *Linguistic Typology* 1/4: 1–54.
Stifter, David. 2009. ‘Early Irish’, in: Martin J. Ball and Nicole Müller (eds.), *The Celtic Languages* (2nd ed.) New York: Routledge, 55–116.
Stifter et al. 2021. David Stifter, Bernhard Bauer, Elliott Lash, Fangzhe Qiu, Nora White, Siobhán Barrett, Aaron Griffith, Romanas Bulatovas, Francesco Felici, Ellen Ganly, Truc Ha Nguyen, Lars Nooij, Corpus PalaeoHibernicum (CorPH) v1.0, 2021, online at http://chronhib.maynoothuniversity.ie.
Stifter, David. forthcoming. Review of Studies in Celtic sound changes and their chronology by Graham R. Isaac (Innsbruck: IBS, 2007). To appear in Journal of Celtic Linguistics.
Stolz, Thomas. 1996. “Some instruments are really good companions – some are not”, Theoretical Linguistics 23: 113-200.
Stolz, Thomas. 1998. “UND, MIT und/oder UND/MIT? Koordination, Instrumental und Komitativ – kymrisch, typologisch und universell”. *Sprachtypologie und Universalienforschung* 51/2: 107–30.
Strachan, John. 1929. *Old-Irish paradigms and selections from the Old-Irish glosses*. (3rd ed.) Dublin: Royal Irish Academy.
Stüber, Karin. 2013. ‘How far has grammaticalisation of the progessive progressed in Old Irish?’, *International Journal of Diachronic Linguistics and Linguistic Reconstruction* 10: 181–215.
Thes. Pal. = Stokes, Whitley & John Strachan. 1901–1903. *Thesaurus Palaeohibernicus*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1912. “Zur keltischen Literatur und Grammatik”, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 12: 271–289.
Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1921. “Allerlei Keltisches”, *Zeitschrift für celtische Philologie* 18: 297–304.
Thurneysen, Rudolf. 1946. *A grammar of Old Irish*. Dublin: DIAS.
Uhlich, Jürgen. 2019. “*Loch nEchach n-án*: Nasalierungsübertragung in den altirischen Glossen und späteren Quellen”, in: Caoimhín Breatnach, Meidhbhín Ní Úrdail and Gordon Ó Riain (eds.), *Lorg na Leabhar:Aa Festschrift for Pádraig A. Breatnach*. Dublin: National University of Ireland, 13–38.
Vendryes, Joseph. 1983. *Lexique étymologique de l’Irlandais Ancien, vol. M N O P*. Dublin: Dublin Institute for Advanced Studies.
White, Nora. 2006. *Compert Mongáin and three other early Mongán tales*. Maynooth: Department of Old and Middle Irish.