The above quotes embody my incentive for having chosen prepositions [à/a - de/de (a/d) in particular] as the topic for my thesis. Prepositions are among the most unsystematic and unpredictable parts of speech, various factors account for this incohesiveness (described in section one of thesis). One of the main lessons that I have learned from my research is that there really is no precise, neat "system" for the analysis and categorization of prepositions, because they are susceptible to innumerable influences that determine their use. This is true for a/d above all the other prepositions and realizing this fact is one of the first steps in understanding the nature of a/d. The goal of this thesis however, is to try to account for some of this unpredictability (or instability) and also for when one can more or less predict (indication of possible stability) the use of a particular preposition over another. This thesis is a comparative analytical study of the prepositions à/a and de/de in French and Spanish respectively. I have chosen these prepositions due to their extensive semantic ranges and because they possess the greatest number of syntactic uses as compared with other prepositions. It is important to state that this thesis is by no means an exhaustive study of a/d, nor does it attempt to be, however it should serve as a survey of the varying environments in which a/d appear. Since spoken language serves as the most accurate representation of the current trend of language, the data I have chosen for analysis come from spoken language and reference is made to the written language solely for the purpose of making distinctions. The written language often reflects archaisms which might also be classified with
elevated speech which stands in contrast to what is ordinarily said.

The two main sections of the thesis are: 1) the historical background of the preposition, which will include its Greek influence into Latin, the two classes of prepositions, the function of the preposition, the debate over category identification, the Latin ancestors of a/d, and various influences on preposition selection - the choice of a particular preposition over another and the amount of arbitrariness involved; and 2) the presentation of compiled data for analysis and discussion based on the system employed by María Luisa López in her Problemas y Métodos en el Análisis de Preposiciones.

I will also pay special attention to idioms and to verbs which have a pronominal and non-pronominal counterparts [e.g., se décider à/ décider de (Fr) & decidirse a/ decidir (Sp)]. The Spanish personal accusative empty *a* will also be examined. At the end of the thesis I will present the statistical results of the questionnaire used to test data on informants and how these results contributed to my generalizations and provided ideas for future research.

I. Historical Analysis

"On sait qu'on peut faire une thèse sur une seule préposition, étudiée dans une seule fonction..." (Pottier, p. 275). (One knows that one can write a thesis on one single preposition, studied in one single function....") Prepositions (a/d in particular) have an almost infinite range of usage as a result of the infinite range of relations which exist, therefore I will try to only focus on the principal relations. According to the Grevisse definition, the preposition is an invariable word (meaning that it cannot be declined or express number), it serves ordinarily to introduce an element that relates and subordinates to another element of the sentence or phrase which may be a noun, pronoun, infinitive, or adverb. There are two general semantic classes of prepositions, empty (formative = void of meaning) and full (precise value). [Note that semantically empty should not be confused with phonetically empty.] Based on the data that I have gathered a/d falls into the categories of both empty and full, but according to Grevisse, a/d are considered empty because they can express varied relationships without necessarily having a particular semantic interpretation,
as in "rien de grand" (Fr) = "nothing big" (Grevisse, p. 761). In this instances de has no actual meaning; it is being used as a syntactic tool. Spanish is much more conservative than French in regards the empty preposition, in fact the only place (that I have seen) where it occurs is with the personal a (more discussion on the personal a in section two). The de in the Spanish example "hay de todo" = "there is (some of) everything" - might be considered to be empty because it can have two possible readings, one with the partitive (which would denote a full sense) and the other without the partitive (which could be considered empty), in this case, I think there is more of an argument for de being full than empty. Note also that hay todo without the preposition simply means that "there is everything" and cannot have a partitive reading.

A/d can also have the 'full' meaning depending upon if they are used to express movement, actual or figurative, a/a = to and de/de = from. Since many of the conditions under which a/d occur are not specifically directional, and because they are susceptible to an innumerable range of applications, a/d are generally classified as empty. However, a/a has the tendency to maintain a directional connotation in both the abstract and concrete sense, whereas de/de tends to be more flexible in this respect. The inclination to give a/d the blanket classification of 'empty' preposition most likely stems from the fact that they occur more often in places where they are least expected as opposed to places where they are expected. Hence, they are often considered as prepositions which have lost their precise value or meaning and are 'empty' of their original sense in order to be used as simple syntactic tools, and by so doing their only purpose is the role that Case markers played in Latin (as in the above French example) (Brunot & Bruneau p. 440). When the preposition stands by itself, i.e. not accompanied by any other lexical elements, it has an abstract significance, but when placed within a context it takes on meaning of its own (sometimes) and gives meaning, i.e., clarifies a relationship (most of the time). It is highly doubtful that empty prepositions existed in Latin. I would be inclined to think not since Latin prepositions were only used when semantically necessary. It would seem highly unlikely that Latin would use the preposition only as a syntactic tool, especially since sentence structure and word order was flexible. The lack of the empty preposition in Latin might help to account for its highly conservative, more
The preposition serves as one of the most important parts of speech because of its function as a relational word, without prepositions or an aspect of language which serves the same function (such as Case), preciseness and clarity of communication would be extremely difficult if not practically impossible. Prepositions allow for the subtle and overt distinctions in the language. The concept of the preposition as understood today dates back at least to the Greeks and was passed on to Latin and then into what we now know as French and Spanish. The Greeks were the first (known) Europeans to analyze language and divide the system of the parts of speech. The preposition was first put under the category of the conjunction which included all words which denote relationship. Dionysus of Thrace separated the 'praepositio' from other conjunctions and defined it as the part of speech which goes before other parts in syntactic combinations and in the formation of words. The Roman grammarians adopted the idea of the preposition's 'positional' characteristic. Throughout the developmental history of the preposition it has taken on new and more specific meanings (for a thorough list see López pp 17-24).

It is difficult to define the preposition in an overly confined way because it gives the appearance of functioning in many capacities which calls into question whether or not it can always be called a preposition. For example, Bernard Pottier points out three different appearances of avant (before) in French which could be regarded as a preposition, conjunction, or adverb: 1) "je l'ai su avant son départ" (preposition), 2) "je l'ai su avant qu'il parte" (conjunction), 3) "je l'ai su avant" (adverb). There is much debate over what the morpheme avant should be called, Pottier considers all these uses to be prepositional and for (3) avant just happens to be in the adverbial position (Pottier, pp 195-97). But it is argued by Galichet in his Essai de Grammaire Psychologique that certain prepositions can lose their relational function and hence convert into an adverb, e.g., contra = contre) or an adverb might lose some of its adverbial properties and behave more like the preposition, e.g. los alumnos marchaban detrás = les étudiants marchaient derrière [adverb] and los alumnos marchaban detrás del coche = les étudiants marchaient derrière la voiture [preposition] (López, pp 28, 29). Note here that Spanish requires de following detrás when it is used
prepositionally and does not require *de* when *detrás* is used adverbially; French does not require *de* in either case.

In Old French, a large number of invariable words had the dual role of preposition and adverb at the same time. But through the development of the language, the distinction between the two parts of speech was made clear. There are a few words which still tend to maintain this duality in French, e.g., *avec, contre, depuis, sans, derrière, devant, selon* (Brunot & Bruneau, p. 440). For example, today one can say in (colloquial) French, "Je viens *avec*." (adverb) or "Je viens *avec lui.*" (preposition). The acceptability of these two forms varies according to regional use, with the prepositional reading experiencing the greater currency. R. Menéndez Pidal shows in his *Manual de Gramática Histórica Española* that Spanish underwent the same interchangeability with the preposition and the adverb (Menéndez, p.338). But modern Spanish does not appear to have any remnants of this, e.g., one could not say *"Vengo con."* However this question does not arise with a/d, debate about parts of speech generally concern the compound preposition or the preposition with more than one syllable. One would be hard-pressed to find an argument for a/d as an adverb e.g. *Je vais à* *Voy a*, this sentence requires an object and has absolutely no meaning without one. In such an example à/à would be acting as a true empty preposition. The function of à/à as a preposition is rarely, if ever, put under scrutiny because it tends to maintain its directional sense, but there are some arguments for *de* as a possible complementizer under certain conditions in French (probably true for Spanish sometimes), as put forth by Daniel Leflem in his article about *de* plus the infinitive and as proposed by Fukushima (1981).

Fukushima suggests that a/d have two syntactic categories as a result of their deep structure, one as complementizer and the other as a preposition, however she only gives examples for the use of *de* in French: *Il m’a demandé de venir* (He asked me to come) [complementizer] vs *Il m’a remercié d’être venu* (He thanked me for having come) [preposition]. She claims that these sentences have different deep structures even though they appear to be the same in surface structure, because the anaphorical pronouns used to replace *de venir* and *d’être venu* are different: *Il me l’a demandé* (he asked me for it) and *Il m’en a remercié* (he thanked me for it). One
explanation for the difference in the choice of pronoun is that if a verb takes a noun complement introduced by *de* as the indirect object and can also take *de* +INF following the main verb, then *de* +INF can be replaced by the pronoun *en*, e.g., *Je vous félicitez de votre succès* (*I congratulate you for your success*) [noun complement introduced by *de*], *Je vous félicitez d’avoir réussi* (*I congratulate you for having succeeded*) [de +INF after main verb], and *Je vous en félicitez* (*I congratulate you for it*) (Fukushima, pp 102 & 104). This is an interesting hypothesis, one into which I will not delve since my focus is not on structural analysis, however, it is interesting to note that proposals such as this exist concerning the function of *de* in various syntactic environments.

As we have just seen, one of the most acute problems associated with the defining of the preposition has to do with its connection with the determined parts of speech, i.e., can a distinct line of demarcation be drawn between the preposition, conjunction, and adverb. Some linguists (very few) have gone as far as to say that there should be one category which includes all three parts of speech (López p. 30). However this would just compound the problem. Perhaps the use of a more exact terminology to account for overlapping among the different classes and the interchanging of functions might be a better approach. The discussion over how to classify the prepositions was inherited directly from the same dilemma which existed in Latin. It is easy to see why there is such a discrepancy between the preposition and the adverb, because the distinction between them was not always overtly explicit in Latin (Allen's *New Latin Grammar*, p 130).

The regular use of prepositions developed relatively late in Latin because the Case system was relied upon in order to indicate relation. But prepositions were also used along with Case in order to make syntactic relations more explicit (Ewert, p. 263). As the Case system began to weaken in (Vulgar) Latin the need for more widespread use of the preposition became essential. Prepositions generally took the accusative and ablative Cases. Of all the Latin prepositions, thirty occurred with the accusative, ten with the ablative, and three with both the accusative and ablative (see Appendix A). The predecessors of *a/d* in French and Spanish were: *ad* (*to* = à/a* (accusative) - indicates direction towards a person or object; *a, ab, abs,*(*away from, by*) and *de* (*from*) = de/*de* (ablative) - indicates the origin, point of departure. There are some verbs in French and Spanish which take
à/a when de/de might be expected - volerà/robar a, according to Judge and Healey this can be accounted for by the influence of the Latin a,ab (Judge & Healey, p. 332). However, this may or may not be the case, but at least it is a viable hypothesis since the meaning of the Latin a might have at some point passed into French and Spanish because of its phonetic similarity to à/a, e.g., the French à partir de... = from this (moment on). Note also the French verb prendre à/de= to take from, the choice of a/d depends on the complement of the verb (more on this example in the section on semantic sensitivity).

Government (called rection/rección) was one of the only predictable indicators which determined what preposition to use. Spanish does not always correspond with French in deciding the element of the sentence which determines the preposition, e.g., "Je suis dans la cour." = "Estoy en el patio". In the French sentence, la cour determines the choice of dans (because it is a limited area as opposed to the corresponding French preposition en that would be used for a larger area, a country for example), but in the Spanish sentence estoy determines the use of en. Bernard Pottier represents this construction as follows: (French) [A (R - B)] and (Spanish) [(A-R) B] (López, p.41).

Even though a/d have maintained their original identities right into their modern usage, i.e., to denote direction towards and origin, throughout their history a/d exchanged roles rather frequently in certain figurative (as in fixed expressions like à vrai dire = de verdad) and non-figurative instances, as in a few verb phrases such as continuer à/de, etc; where one preposition was expected, the other appeared and vice versa without a particularly regular pattern (Brunot and Bruneau, p. 425). An hypothesis about the existence of alternation in the first place, might be the result of not having overtly compelling reasons to adopt the choice of one preposition over another, because a certain amount of flexibility was, and to a certain degree, still is present as in the French continuer à/de. The language eventually shows a preference for one form over the other based on common usage, today continuer à is the commonly accepted usage in speech, whereas continuer de is viewed as being remote and only seen in literature, therefore in this instance it might be just to say that French will most likely gradually evolve to the point where only the continuer à form will
be acceptable. There are certain uses which have settled down more than others in French and Spanish, and these 'stabilized' uses of a/d could be regarded as fixed (that is, until something happens in the language to 'destabilize' the 'stable'). More examples of this alternation might be accounted for under the semantic sensitivity and facultative categories expounded upon in section two.

Like what presently exists in French and Spanish, the Latin a/d equivalents also had a vast range of meanings (in addition to those mentioned) and were used to denote a variety of relationships. Many of these uses are considered idiomatic (see Appendix A for a comprehensive listing). The meanings of the above-mentioned prepositions tended to overlap, this can be clearly observed by reviewing their idiomatic and non-idiomatic uses. This semantic flexibility of the prepositions in Latin more than likely contributes in accounting for what now exists in French and Spanish and how one language opted for the use of one preposition and the other language for another (in the same lexical environment), e.g. persuadir a vs persuader de (more attention will be paid to this 'phenomenon' in the idiomatic section of the paper). In addition, apart from the predominant influence of Latin, other languages exerted great influence on the development of French and Spanish. However, French underwent far more evolution than did Spanish and this helps to account for many of the differences between them. Arabic was the second major influence on Spanish for about 800 years and Spanish had already undergone most of its major evolution by the end of that time. In the XIII, XIV and XVIII centuries, French had a large impact on Spanish vocabulary (but not on its syntax) as a result of the spread of French literature (Menéndez, p. 24).

An example (not related to prepositions) of how Latin affects what exists in French and Spanish can be observed from gender assignment. Latin had three genders, feminine, masculine, and neuter, whereas French and Spanish only have the feminine and masculine. The point of interest here is how gender of the same nouns was passed into both languages and what determined the gender of the Latin neuter nouns as they passed into French and Spanish. In French, the tendency for neuter Latin nouns was to become feminine. This whole process might be viewed as arbitrary, culturally influenced, or both. Most of the nouns that were feminine or masculine in
Latin, probably stayed that way in French and Spanish, but there are some which did not. Nonetheless it is sufficient to say that the influence of Latin on gender assignment in French and Spanish is somewhat similar to its influence on prepositional selection in those languages as well.

The only two Cases which continued into Old French and Old Spanish were the nominative and oblique (included all Cases other than nominative). In French and Spanish, the equivalent of the genitive is formed by *de* + oblique Case, the equivalent of the dative by *à* + oblique Case, and most of the functions of the ablative Case are expressed by *de* and also by other prepositions (e.g. *par*, *avec* - to denote the instrument; *à*, *en avec* - manner; *à*, *dans* - place). The genitive construction most likely developed from the Latin ablative as a result of the Latin *de* being used in the figurative sense of *concerning, about, of* (see Appendix A, section 2, part B, (b) for an example). Due to the frequent use of *à/d* they have come to be considered as the equivalent of former Case inflexions which existed in Old French and Old Spanish and as a result of performing a multi-purpose role they have lost their individual explicitness under several conditions. This helped to give rise to the compound preposition (also prevalent in Latin) or prepositional phrase, e.g., *à cause de/la causa de, de la part de/ de la parte de*. However, the most common way in which to express the explicitness of a preposition was the prepositional use of the adverb, adjective, and participles (again this is not applicable to *à/d*) (Ewert, p.263).

Apart from having descended from Classical and Vulgar Latin, there are many influences which affected the development of certain prepositional uses. During medieval Latin there was complete confusion between Cases and prepositions in the spoken language. In fact many of the prepositions of Classical Latin were not even used in popular speech, i.e., Vulgar Latin (Elcock. p. 148). In spoken Latin, the relation between a preposition and a given Case was very vague, this also varied from region to region and was influenced by one's education. It would probably be safe to say that the more normative the education, the more acute was one's attention to the Case system and to the use of prepositions. It is important to keep in mind that the spoken, Vulgar Latin had a greater effect on the development of French and Spanish than did written Classical Latin. This certainly contributes to the assessment of the vast number of additional uses *à/d* can have apart
from their standard meaning of expressing the movement of to and from.

There is very little written about the development of the prepositions into French and Spanish, much is left to speculation and hypothesis. In fact I only found two books which were devoted entirely to the study of prepositions in French in Spanish, also, the historical references in each book only spanned a few pages. However, based on the chaotic history of the use of prepositions and Case, it is understandable why the prepositional "system" consists of many unexplainable uses and applications. The use of prepositions in a language can vary within a community and from individual to individual. In some instances, the individual has a certain amount of liberty in the selection of one preposition over another depending upon the situation (this corresponds to the semantic sensitivity and facultative categories of section two). One's choice of a preposition might be affected depending on if the mode of communication is written, spoken, formal, colloquial, etc. Certain peculiar uses of a given preposition can also gain popularity and spread throughout a language with the usage eventually becoming normative, i.e., standard 'official' usage. Other influences on prepositional use include "certain sociological phenomena such as fashion, tradition, etc., can temporarily limit the use of prepositions in such a way that they continue throughout centuries changing very little, significantly, or without changing at all" (López, p.148). Based on these data we can see how difficult it is to predict exactly why certain prepositions occur where they do, however based on where they do occur, we can predict that in certain environments certain prepositions can be expected. When we are unable to predict the occurrence of a particular preposition, then we may consider it to be idiomatic, however, all available alternatives should be tested before relegating a prepositional occurrence to this category (more attention paid to the idiom in section two).

II. Data Analysis

There are immumerable ways to analyze a/d and the choice of one way over another will depend upon the objective of the analyst. My objectives in this section are to: present an overview
of some of the syntactic possibilities of a/d; use the format developed by María Luisa López which establishes three categories for a/d - this includes the normative uses of a/d, their semantic sensitivity and facultative behaviour; present an analysis of à/a and de/del compared with the absence of the preposition; discuss the empty preposition 'personal a' in Spanish; examine the occurrence of a different preposition after the pronominal verb and its non-pronominal counterpart; present an idiomatic analysis of a/d; and finally, present the responses to the questionnaire completed by informants and make general comments on the results which (I claim) are affected by linguistic background of the informants, regularity of French use, and age group.

Some of the syntactic possibilities of the occurrence of a/d include: 1) within a clause, (a) introducing a locative, (b) introducing an argument (the participant of the event); 2) introducing an infinitive (note that this cannot be done by all prepositions); and 3) word formation (agglutination might be considered part of this classification). Recognizing the syntactic possibilities of a/d does not necessarily help one to understand why they are in those positions and how the overall reading of a phrase would take on different connotations depending upon the prepositions used. This is precisely where López's analysis is useful.

Even though I have adopted López's categorizations, I have not limited myself to the analyses and examples that she uses. I have also organized the categories in order to include the analysis of French, since López only gives Spanish examples, however her analysis is easily applied to French. In her text Problemas y Métodos en el Análisis de Preposiciones, López places a/d under three distinct categories: a) normative - fixed uses of a/d; b) semantically sensitive - change of meaning in the same syntactic phrase depending upon whether a/d, is used; and c) facultative (optional) - indifference to a change in preposition, i.e., whether à/a or de/del the overall meaning remains the same. The option of a/d in this category is generally one between what is spoken vs written, e.g. the French commencer à vs commencer de - the former for the most part would always be used in speech, whereas the latter would be used in writing or in a very elevated level of speech (this distinction also holds true for Spanish, but there seems to be a bit more flexibility in the optional choice of the preposition in spoken Spanish). Despite the fact that the general meaning
does not change with the optional use of a/d, semantic nuances do exist and the choice of one preposition over another will vary from speaker to speaker and also upon the given situation.

It is important to bear in mind that the following categorizations are meant to be generalizations about what takes place, and that exceptions to every generalization exist. It is also important to remember that there is considerable overlap on all levels of categorization, and the various relationships do not always fall neatly into a particular category, hence categorization is highly subjective.

**Normative Categorization**

The normative category includes the most standard, more or less predictable uses of a/d, in that the majority of what takes place in this category shows the effects of the Latin normative uses of *ad* and *de*, but as to be expected, exceptions exist. It is accurate to say that any 'proper', standard use of a/d is normative, however, other factors interact with normative use in such a way as to necessitate the consideration of the normative within other contexts, such as the semantically sensitive and the facultative. In my discussion of a/d compared with the absence of a preposition later in the paper, I will outline normative uses of a/d in addition to the primary meanings and uses outlined in this section.

The preposition *à/a* is defined normatively as representing movement toward a limit, also it can express the end of the movement (destination) or actual location at the limit, in this instance the sense of *at* instead of *to* is understood. There are three general uses of *à/a* in discourse: 1) spatial - towards, in the direction of, situation (at): *voy a Paris*/*je vais à Paris, a tu lado/ à coté de toi*; 2) temporal - until, at the end of: *al quinto día de navegación/ au quinzième jour de navigation, a mediodía/ a midi*; 3) notional - includes all other nuances of designation, e.g., price, to denote purpose: *a seis pesetas/à dix francs, une tasse à thé* (exclusive to French) *(Ibid. p. 134-35 (ref. to Spanish examples))*. There is a fourth use, however, which would only be applicable to French, that of the genitive construction with *à*: e.g., *c'est à moi* (*It is mine*). In colloquial French, one can say *le livre est à moi*, but not considered normative (more discussion on this in the facultative
section). The empty preposition personal a in Spanish is normative, but since it requires special attention, I will discuss it at the end of the section.

Some other normative uses of a/a include: Adjectives which denote similarity require a/a before their complement - igual/égal, paralelo/parallèle, semejante/semblable, parecido/resssemblant, e.g., igual a dos/égal à deux, etc. Verbs of attachment and unification like - unir/unir, atar/attacher, amarrar /amarrer- require a/a before their complement which designates the place to which the person or thing is attached or united, e.g., una barca amarrada al puerto/ un bateau amarré au port, atado a la argolla/attaché à l'anneau.; modality - a series of constructed complements which denote manner that include a/a, e.g., a la francesa/la française and various other expressions which are peculiar to each language; and also to show the instrument or means by which something is done, e.g., cosido a mano= cousu à la main =sewn by hand, note that this usage is specific to certain types of expressions and would represent the more idiomatic interpretation instead of one that would have been predicted.

The preposition de/de represents movement of distance from a limit and can express the end point or the situation 'away from'. Four uses of de/de in speech are: 1) spatial: vengo de casa/ je viens de chez moi, salió de Roma/ je suis parti de Rome; 2a) temporal I - point of departure: de la mañana a la tarde/ du matin au soir, de un momento a otro/d'un moment à l'autre; 2b) temporal II - duration: no duerme ni de día ni de noche/ elle ne dort ni le jour ni la nuit 3) notional - origin (cause, agent, condition, etc.): morir de hambre/ mourir de faim, picado de viruelas/ piqué de variole, cubierto de nieve/couvert de neige, el hombre del paraguas/l'homme de la parapluie; 4) static relation - genitive: el hijo de Jorge/le fils de Georges (Ibid. p. 135). Samuel Gili Gaya includes the following examples in his listing of the normative uses of de/de in his Curso Superior de Sintaxis Española which could be placed under the notional heading: pertinence - with the attributes of a person or a description of an object, or area, e.g., la autoridad del alcalde/l'autorité du maire, los árboles de este jardín/les arbres de ce jardin, el azul del cielo/le bleu du ciel. Under this heading expressions such as el amor de Dios/l'amour de Dieu, have a double meaning, which
could mean the love that one has for God, or the love which God has for us; (more on this distinction in the semantic sensitivity category); 2) material (actual and figurative - the material of which something is made, e.g., reloj de oro/montre d'or in this example French has the choice between de or en, e.g., montre en or; de/de can also indicate the content of something, e.g., une tasse de thé/una taza de té, also it can have the meaning of subject matter, as in - un libro de geografía/un livre de géographie, also used in the description of a condition or character of a person: hombre de talento/l'homme de talent, alma de niño/l'âme d'enfant; partial quantity - in this sense de/de is partitive: una de las mujeres /l'une des femmes. Certain verbs require de to precede the infinitival complement, these verbs denote 'distance from' an activity either figuratively or physically, e.g., cesser de = cesar de, blâmer de = culpar de (tener la culpa de), finir de = terminar de (acabar de), craindre de = tener miedo de.

There is not much commentary to make about the normative category since the behaviour of a/d is quite 'regular', i.e., behaves as might be anticipated, with the exception of the peculiarities that I pointed out for further discussion. Much of this predictability can be attributed to the Latin origins, where we can see how a/d have replaced the Case markers by playing a multi-purpose role, i.e., filling lexical gaps. However there are some normative uses which did not originate from Latin constructions and have developed separately into French and Spanish, some examples include: [the indefinite pronoun + de + adjective] in French (does not occur in Spanish, however does occur in Italian): quelque chose de facile (something easy); the de after negation in French in order to replace the indefinite article: il a un chat (he has a cat) - il n'a pas de chat (he does not have a cat); personal a in Spanish; the possessive a in French: c'est à toi (its yours), in this usage, as stated earlier, the noun cannot be used in subject position in modern French, except for in songs or poetry, and even then the possessive adjective is needed, e.g., mon mec à moi (my guy) [mec is a colloquial term which means a guy, fellow] and in colloquial speech where the noun phrase denotes a person, e.g., la femme à Paul est arrivée hier = Paul's wife arrived yesterday, however this would not be found in standard writing. The above sentence is equivalent to the standard French sentence la femme de Paul...the choice of one over the other would be optional, but the
latter is preferred.

In French, the verb *demander* can occur with *à* or *de* before the infinitive without being either semantically sensitive or facultative, but normative. It takes a direct object and requires *de* before the infinitive, but can also occur without the direct object and take *à* before the infinitive: *Il demande à venir*—He asks to come—and *Il me demande de venir*—He asks me to come. In the first example we could impose a direct English translation matching *à* with *to*, in the second example the same type of translation can be done, in this case *de* would be translated about, "he asks me about coming." (see Appendix B for a normative listing a/d in French).

**The Spanish Personal *a* = the Empty Accusative *a***

The Spanish personal *a* belongs to the normative category, but since it is peculiar to Spanish and has many interesting properties, it is necessary to examine it separately. There is much debate over whether the personal *a* is truly a preposition, even though it looks like one. There is hesitation to call it a preposition because of its highly restricted use (only with [+ human] direct object or personification) and also because it never has a 'full' meaning, it is for the most part semantically void. Nonetheless, it can be considered as an empty accusative preposition, which is what I am inclined to call it. The empty accusative *a* should not be confused with the full accusative *a* which occurs before objects. An example of the full accusative *a* is: *voy a la tienda* (I go to the store).

The personal *a* receives its particular designation not only because of where it occurs but because it is always semantically empty or void in and of itself, but fills a syntactic function and can indicate semantic subtleties. Also, it is not to be confused with the dative *a* which almost always has a full meaning and thus is both semantically and syntactically necessary. However, an example of the dative *a* being empty and exclusive to + human: *le prometí a Juana que lo haría* (I promised Joan that I would do it), one can only make promises to people (see page 39 for further discussion of this example). The dative *a* occurs before +human and objects, regardless of
animation. However, in examples such as Juan sirve a su amo, a certain amount of confusion arises whether the a is accusative or dative. The sentence has two possible readings: 1) Juan serves his boss (transitive), 2) Juan is of service to his boss (intransitive) (Spaulding, p. 118). The distinction in this sentence can only be made by context, but despite the ambiguity, the general, overall meaning remains the same.

Even though the personal a plays a semantically empty role, it is used as an indicator for semantic nuances. It is used before the direct object which is human or personified, but never occurs before unpersonified objects or unpersonified animals, e.g., busco a Maria = I am looking for Maria (the preposition for is a part of the verb buscar = to look for) and busco un libro = I am looking for a book. In the first example, Maria is the direct object just as un libro is also the direct object in the second example. The personal a can occur in personification as follows: le teme como al fuego" = he fears you like fire and also llamar a la muerte = to call to death. All of the examples so far demonstrate the basic normative use of the personal a (López, p. 148). Other languages such as Romanian and Hindi also use special markers to make the distinction between the direct objects which are people and those which are not (Butt & Benjamin, p. 269). However, the origins of the development of the personal a into Spanish are not easily traceable. The use most likely did not develop from Latin since there is no record of its appearance in Latin, therefore, Spanish was probably influenced by a different language. (The empty accusative construction does not occur in Arabic.)

The personal a can occur with animals, but under particular conditions. For example, pets generally take on a certain degree of personification out of sentimental attachment to the animal, hence almost always takes the a, but the use of a in other instances is determined by context. If one is at the zoo and wants to express a particular affinity for a group of animals, one can say: quiero ver a los monos = I want to see the monkeys, but with animals for which one might not have affinity, one would omit the a: quiero ver los insectos = I want to see the insects. In scientific and clinical environments the use of a would probably be more reserved (Butt & Benjamin, pp 269-70).
The personal *a* can be omitted sometimes before the direct object of person. The distinction has to do with the specific vs the general, e.g., *busco una criada* = *I am looking for (any) maid* but *busco a una criada* = *I am looking for a (particular kind of) maid*. Another distinction arises depending upon the verb which is used: *quiero una criada* = *I want a maid (any maid)*, BUT *quiero a la criada* = *I love the maid (particular maid)* [however, *quiero la criada* = *I want the maid (specific)*]. In this example the presence of the personal *a* implies an entirely different meaning of the verb (López, p. 149). Another distinction also occurs with the verb *tener*: *tengo un hijo y una hija* = *I have a son and a daughter* (general -no need for the *a* ) but, *tengo a un hijo en casa y a una hija en el ejército* = *I have a son at home and a daughter in the army* (more specific) (Butt & Benjamin, p.271). Distinctions can also be made between the use of the definite and indefinite articles after the personal *a*: *busco a un médico* = *I am looking for a (particular kind of) doctor* vs *busco al médico* = *I am looking for the doctor (the only one here)*. Both of these examples deal with a specific person, but the distinction is a matter of degree.

Generally, the personal *a* is omitted before collective nouns pertaining to people but it can also be optionally included without changing meaning: *vimos mucha gente* = *we see many people* and *miramos el grupo* = *we are looking at the group* (the *at* in this phrase is part of the verb *mirar* just like *for* in *buscar*). One could also say: *vimos a mucha gente* and *miramos al grupo*. But the personal *a* must always be omitted before the direct object of innumerations which includes objects as well as people, e.g., *me atraía el afán de conocer su aldea, las cosas que fueran suyas, las gentes que él quería* = *my desire to know his village, the things that were his, the people that he loved.*

The personal *a* is omitted in order to avoid ambiguity when the dative *a* is also present: *presenté Miguel a Antonia* = *I introduced Miguel to Antonia*. This also applies to the verb *preferir* as in *prefiero Dickens a Balzac* = *I prefer Dickens to Balzac*.

The personal *a* is used before all pronouns denoting person, except the pronoun *que*, e.g., *la persona que yo había visto* = *the person who I had seen*, but, *he visto a alguien en el pasillo* = *I have seen someone in the corridor* (Ibid. p. 271).
Even though the personal *a* does not exist in French, there are certain instances in French which appear to resemble the Spanish. The personal *a* provides an interesting distinction between French and Spanish, in that Spanish is very concerned in clarifying who the direct object is, whereas French does not concern itself with who (whether person or not) the direct object is, as long as the direct object is identifiable. However, there are instances in French when the full accusative *à* is used to indicate + human, as in the verb *plaire à* = *to please (someone)* (takes *à* before the NP and the infinitive). *Plaire à* could be considered a locked form in that it never normatively takes an object which is non-human, i.e., the nature of the verb requires a specific type of object. But this *à* is not empty, it has a full meaning, which appears to be redundant in modern usage. In French, as in Spanish, the indirect object is generally + human, hence will require the dative *à*.

The French dative *à* also correlates to the Spanish dative *a* with verbs of request and advice. In Old French, the name of the person is constructed directly after the verb, one would say "demander quelque chose *mon père*" whereas in modern French it would be "demander quelque chose *à mon père*. The Spanish equivalent is: "preguntar algo *a mi padre". The French and Spanish are behaving the same way in these two examples, both use *à* / *a* because the verbs *demander / preguntar* require the *à / a* to precede the indirect object, however it might be suggested that in the Spanish example the position of the dative *a* before the [+ human] might give the impression of it also being the personal *a* just because it is before a human, but as stated earlier, this cannot be so because the 'personal *a*’ is the accusative empty *a*.

**Semantic Sensitivity Categorization**

This categorization deals with the semantic difference which takes place within the same phrase depending upon whether *a/d* is used. In this analysis there will not always be a French counterpart to the Spanish example or vice versa, however, what is important is the fact that this construction exists in both languages regardless of corresponding counterparts. An example of this construction
is the Spanish: *ir a pie* vs *ir de pie*, the first example indicates the action of "to go by (means of) foot" as used in a phrase, *fui a pie a la escuela* = *I went by foot to school*, whereas the second example describes a state, position = "to stand" as in, *iba de pie en el autobús* = *I was standing in the bus*. The French equivalent to the first example would be *aller à pied*, it carries the same connotations as the Spanish. [It should be noted that it is very unusual for French to have a common noun (*pied*) which is preceded by the preposition *à* not accompanied by an article (in this construction, by the definite article), however this a remnant of Old French.] The expression of modes of transport presents an interesting example of innovation in French and in Spanish, 'antiquated' means of transport are always preceded by *à/a*, as in *ir a pie/aller à pied, ir a caballo/aller à cheval*, however, for modern means of transport the preposition *en/en* is used, e.g., *ir en coche/aller en voiture, ir en tren/aller en train, etc.* As far as the equivalent to the Spanish *ir de pie* French does not say *aller de pied*, but instead *être debout* or *se tenir debout*.

To express travelling by bicycle, there is the choice between *à* and *en*. This might be due to the fact that the bicycle had a gradual development into the form as we know it today, and when it was first invented, the tendency might have been to use *à* because it was still in its primitive stages, however as it progressed, the tendency probably shifted to using *en* (this is an hypothesis on my part, but might still be plausible). This hypothesis could be justified by the fact that in Spanish, one can say *andar a bicicleta* (literally, *to walk by bicycle*), however in present day usage, this sounds very strange, and it would be by far more common to say *andar en bicicleta*, or even more preferred, the expression *ir en bicicleta* which always occurs with *en*. In French, one can use either *en* or *à*: *aller en* (or) *à biciclette*, both uses are common, but the *en* form is preferred in speech.

The verbs which appear to have semantic sensitivity with *à/d* tend to be more or less random, in that they seem to have no unifying trait by which they can be classified; they probably have maintained a former meaning while developing a new one. Some verbs have more drastic sensitivity than others, which means that depending upon whether *à/d* is used or no preposition at all, the meanings of the verb phrase are completely different. Forms such as these are often considered idiomatic. For example, the French verb *tenir* can occur three different ways: *tenir à* =
to value, to be fond of; tenir de = to resemble, take after (only occurs with the noun phrase); tenir = to hold (something) (regular normative meaning). [Tenir de tends towards being a bit archaic, the expression ressembler à is preferred: je ressemble à ma mère and which also has the reciprocal pronominal form: elles se ressemblent (they resemble each other). The Spanish paracerse a is equivalent to ressembler à: ellas se parecen =they resemble each other.] In both languages, se is the indirect object which is supported by the test of: elles se ressemblent l'une à l'autre and ellas se parecen la una a la otra. Another verb which behaves similarly to the examples of tenir is venir: venir à =to happen to (by chance), venir de = to have just (used in present and imperfect tenses) e.g., elle vient d'arriver = she has just arrived, venir = to come (regular normative meaning).

The Spanish verb acabar completely changes its meaning based on the preposition which it takes before the infinitive: 1) acabar de + INF = venir de + INF, e.g., acaba de volver de la escuela = I have just returned from school, in this instance the Spanish counterpart behaves like the French; 2) acabar por + INF = to end by, to finally..., e.g., Cayó enfermo y acabo por morir = He fell (became) ill and finally died. The use of acabar por in Spanish is also comparable to the French finir par: Il est devenu malade et il a fini par mourir. Spanish also has the occurrence of venir a + INF = to come with a motive in mind (note that this has a different meaning than the French venir a ) e.g. qué venía usted a buscar? = what are you looking for here? Another example of the effect of a/d on the verb's meaning is the Spanish pasar a ser vs pasar de ser: no pasará a ser un escritor = he will never arrive at being a writer and no pasará de ser un escritor = he will only be a writer (in that being a writer is the best job for him). This particular example could also be categorized under the facultative category.

It is more common for the change of preposition to occur before the noun phrase than before the infinitive, e.g., the Spanish dar a = to face, to look out upon: las ventanas dan a la avenida = the windows look out upon the future and dar con = to come upon, to find: dimos con Juan en el cine anoche = we came upon John at the movies last night. Some other examples of verbs which have a change of preposition before the noun phrase do not change meaning completely based on
whether they are followed by a/d, but instead the verb meaning remains the same, the difference is that the preposition changes based on the type of object that follows the preposition, e.g., the Spanish *cuidar a = to take care of a person* (this is probably the personal *a*) and *cuidar de = to take care of a thing*. The French counterpart *soigner* does not take a preposition and can occur before the INF and the NP, however, the verbal expression *avoir (prendre) soin de = to take care of* does not distinguish between caring for a person or a thing, and it requires the preposition before the INF and NP.

The semantic sensitivity of a/d occurs within noun phrases as well. The complement of nouns of sentiment such as, *amor, odio, terror, miedo, etc.*, can be constructed with *a* if it designates the object of the action 'loving', 'hating', 'fearing', etc., and it can be constructed with *de* if it designates the subject of the action: *el amor a Dios = the love for (towards) God, el amor de Dios = God's love (the love of God), el odio a Juan = the hate for (towards) Juan, el odio de Juan = Juan's hate, el temor a los enemigos = the fear for (towards) the enemies, el temor de los enemigos = the enemies' fear* (López, p. 157). The French counterparts behave differently than the Spanish in that they use a different preposition altogether in the 'object of the action' construction: *l'amour pour Dieu, la haine pour Jean, la crainte envers les ennemis*. Even though the French *à* can function as a genitive marker in certain types of phrasal environments, its meaning in the above mentioned phrasal environments would be underdetermined (however, note my previous discussion in the normative category about the colloquial usage of genitive *a*). But in the genitive constructions the French *de* operates like its Spanish counterpart. However there can be a sort of 'neutralization' when the genitive is the object, like in the following example, *el temor a la guerra* and *el temor de la guerra* both phrases have the same meaning, they both have the genitive interpretation. However, the first example is preferred in modern usage because it dentotes that one has a 'fear of war' and that it is not 'war' which has 'fear '; the second usage is considered archaic, might be used by an older person (more attention will be paid to examples of this nature in the facultative category). The French genitive counterpart would be: *la crainte de la guerre = the fear of (the) war, à could not be used in this instance.*
In French the distinction is made between the use of *de* in the sense of containing, and *à*, meaning designed for, or for the purpose of, e.g., *une tasse de thé* = a cup of tea and *une tasse à thé* = a teacup. Spanish does not make this distinction. One would say: *una taza de té*, but not *una taza a té*. *Una taza de té* has two meanings depending on the context, one of *a cup of tea* and the other of *a tea cup*. One possible reason for the absence of this distinction in Spanish may be due to the structure of Spanish word formation, more specifically, compounds. Spanish has less strict rules in compound structure than French. Another hypothesis might be the fact that in *une tasse à thé*, the *à* is not acting as one might expect, ideally one would think *une tasse pour thé* would be said, since *pour* is an indication of purpose. Chances are that the choice between *à* or *pour* is a purely idiomatic one. I tested this phrase on informants and the response *une tasse à thé* was unanimous. But I believe that this construction could have been a trace of an Old French expression, somewhat similar to the *aller à pied* example given earlier in this section, in that *à* could have the meaning of not only *by means of* but also *purpose*. The tendency is to call such phrases which have maintained their archaic usage, idiomatic, because the origins of the usage is forgotten.

Another semantically sensitive occurrence is between the passive and the impersonal in French, as in, *il était facile de faire le travail* = *it was easy to do the work* and *le travail était facile à faire* = *the work was easy to do* (Amsco: *Cours Supérieur de Français*, p. 101). In this instance semantic sensitivity does not affect the overall meaning of the action only the way in which the action is perceived. This case may be an exception since the syntactic structures involved are different, whereas in most of the semantically sensitive categorizations listed the syntactic structures are the same, this, however, is still a matter for discussion. The main distinction in the above examples is most likely phonetic. In the first example the accent falls on *facile* whereas in the second example the accent falls on *travail*, hence the focus of the action in each example is different.

In the following example, the verb form requires a particular preposition and the noun form of the same verb requires another: *oler* [can also occur with the preposition *a* following it but takes on a different connotation, see section on the semantically sensitive use of *a* vs the zero preposition]
= sentir (always without a preposition): huelo las rosas = je sens les roses (I smell the roses); but un olor de rosas or un olor a rosas, French can only have une odeur de roses. There is a distinction between the use of a vs de in the Spanish noun phrases, the first example is abstract in the sense that 'a perfume', 'a place', or anything, could 'smell like roses', but only 'roses' can be classified as having un olor de rosas. This follows logically because the actual 'smell of roses' can only come from the direction of the rose, so the de here could be called genitive (as like the French). Hence the choice of a/d in this instance will depend upon where the 'smell' or 'odor' comes from.

A similar example to that above is the French jouer à/de: il joue au tennis = he plays (at the) tennis or il joue aux échecs = he plays (at the) chess, but il joue de la trompette = he plays (of) the trompet. The first example concerns playing sports or games and the second example deals with the playing of a musical instrument. My hypothesis for the choice of different prepositions might have something to do with the animate vs the inanimate. When one plays an instrument one brings 'life', so to speak, to the instrument, something actually is produced from the instrument, i.e., sound. Whereas, when one plays a game or sports, the actual game cannot 'produce' anything itself, in fact, a game is a concept, an idea, a type of system for doing a particular activity. Note that in both uses, the definite article is required after the preposition. When the definite article in il joue au tennis is translated literally into English, it sounds awkward. The 'rule of thumb' in English translation is, the preposition and the definite article do not need to be translated in the a construction of sports and games and the de does not need to be translated in the musical instrument construction. There is also the French expression faire de + definite article + name of a sport, which is a fixed expression, e.g., faire du tennis, faire du ski, etc. Spanish uses two different verbs to describe playing an instrument and playing a game or sport, tocar and jugar: él toca la trompeta and él juega al tenis (él juega tenis tends to be common in South America but is not considered normative use in Spain, nevertheless, él juega al tenis is normative in both areas).

Finally, the French prendre à/de = to take from maintain the general verb meaning regardless of which preposition is used after it. But the complement of the verb determines the choice of
preposition within a particular context, which thereby determines the verb's semantic sensitivity, e.g., j'ai pris le stylo à ma soeur = I took the pen from my sister, in this example, à is used before the dative animate object. However, de is used before the dative inanimate object: j'ai pris le stylo de la table = I took the pen from the table. The sentences j'ai pris le stylo de ma soeur (I took the pen of my sister = I took my sister's pen) and j'ai pris le stylo à ma soeur, are not the same. In j'ai pris le stylo de ma soeur, the de indicates the genitive construction. Therefore, the distinction between using different prepositions before the dative animate and inanimate objects, possibly comes as a result of trying to avoid confusing the dative and genitive constructions. It is also important to note that prendre à should not be confused with the English reading of "to take to", instead one uses the verb apporter à, as in, j'apporte le livre à ma mère = I take the book to my mother. Spanish always makes the distinction between the animate vs the inanimate object, whereas French rarely does this (except for the above examples). In Spanish, there are many verbs which can be used to mean "to take from", in Spain it is common to use the verb coger (which can also have other meanings) e.g., se lo cogí a él = I took it from him and lo cogí de la mesa = I took it from the table, but it is incorrect to say *se lo cogí de él. The a in the first example is often considered to be the 'personal a', because it occurs before + human, however, in this case it is the full dative a, which should not be confused with the empty accusative a, often called the 'personal a'. The confusion arises as a result of the fact that a always occurs before person whether it is the direct object or the indirect object, but in both cases the a is behaving differently.

**Facultative (optional) Categorization**

This category deals with those expressions which are indifferent to change of meaning regardless of whether à/a or de/de are used. However, it is important to state that there is no such thing as complete indifference to meaning, connotations based on the speaker's intent can be discerned based upon the choice of preposition. The fact that a/d can replace each other and still maintain their overall meaning is the reason for them having the designation of facultative,
however, this does not mean that they are on completely equal terms without any nuances. Therefore, my analysis under this category will differ quite a bit from that of López. López includes some examples which denote considerable semantic sensitivity under this category, whereas I have classed them under the semantically sensitive heading above. In this category, I have only included those examples which have more or less optional usage with minimal nuances. López oversimplifies the optional uses of a/d by referring to certain examples as completely facultative, just because the option exists to use a/d in the same situation, however I do not agree with her judgment in such instances. On the surface, many examples may seem not to change meaning at all and thus employ the facultative use of a/d, however, the distinctions are subtle and underlying.

The focus of this thesis so far has been what takes place in spoken language as being the most accurate representation of the trend of language innovation. However, in this category I will also pay attention to what takes place in writing versus speech, since many of the examples of facultative contrast involve the difference between speech and writing and not a facultative choice within speech. In fact many of the examples which López uses involve the difference between speech and writing, and also between different social registers of speech. Her examples for analysis come from a variety of Spanish contemporary novels which display colloquial, regional, and non-normative uses, however, she does not make these distinctions when discussing the examples, i.e., she presents no context for the choice of one preposition over another. This could account for the odd reaction received from various Spanish speakers when presented with some of her examples.

The purpose of the facultative category is to show the tendency or lack there of, in French and Spanish, to choose one preposition over another even when the choice might be considered optional. As stated earlier on, Spanish is much more flexible than French when it comes to the facultative category. French seems to be more 'stabilized' in its selection of a/d, i.e. there are few in stances of facultative choice. Again this may be attributed to the innovative development of French in contrast to the more conservative development of Spanish, but as we shall observe from
the following examples French can also display conservative tendencies while Spanish displays innovative tendencies.

According to López, when there is the option of a/d in some instances, a process of neutralization occurs on the spatial and notional level. Neutralization means that a/d can be used interchangeably while maintaining the same relation. She admits that explaining the process of neutralization is difficult because each example carries its own set of connotations and that there are restrictions on how freely this interchange can take place (López, p. 158). However, by looking at various examples it might appear that this neutralization is representative of language in transition, i.e. moving from one tendency to another, but in the meantime still allowing two uses, with one ultimately being preferred over the other.

Our first example is semi-facultative in that many connotations can be inferred based on the choice of a/d. The Spanish *dar vueltas en torno de la mesa vs dar vueltas en torno a la mesa*, both sentences have the general meaning of "to go around the house", literally, "to give turns around the house", in both constructions movement is being expressed as well as the same overall meaning and the direction is made clear by the adverb *en torno =about*, but *a* can be used to signify "around" (from the spatial point of view) or equivalent to the notional concept of "about" or "with regard to"; *de* is used only when there is spatial value, but not in other instances, e.g *en torno de la mesa* is perfectly fine because there is the actual spatial connotation, however one could not say *en torno de la lengua de Cervantes*, it would have to be *en torno de la lengua a Cervantes = with regard to the language of Cervantes* (Ibid., p.160). The adverb *en torno* is not commonly used in modern speech, hence it is a remote example (are as many of López's examples since most facultative possibilities concern the archaic vs current usage), the adverb *alrededor de* (which only occurs with *de*) would be preferrable. However, if the remote adverb were used, *entorno a la mesa* is preferable (it denotes direction) to *en torno de la mesa* (which is only descriptive). The French equivalent *autour de =alrededor de* only takes *de* after it and not *a*, either spatially or notionally.

An example of the notional (designation) in Spanish: *dar a beber/ dar de beber = to give to drink* where *a/de =para (in order to, for the purpose of)*. *Dar de beber* would be preferrable over...
the a form, however, *dar para beber* is even more preferred to the de form. *Dar a beber* is never used in speech and might be found in an extremely remote old text. The a form here is really an archaism. The French equivalent of *dar de (para) beber* = *donner à boire* cannot occur with de before the verb, however, de can precede the noun as in, *donner de l'eau* = to give some water. The de before the noun is an instance of the partitive use and therefore no option is present. Spanish also has an equivalent partitive use, *dar del agua*, like in French, the a cannot preceded the noun. The fact that French does not even have the facultative choice of a/d before the verb even in an archaic sense might suggest that Spanish will gradually drop (if it has not already) its literary use of a before the infinitive.

There are instances when French has the facultative choice and Spanish does not. In these instances French is being conservative and Spanish is being innovative, e.g., *commencer a/de* but *empezar a*. *Commencer à/de* is an interesting case because two different readings can be gleaned from the use of either à or de: *commencer à* = to start to (to immediately do something, launch into a project or task - the directional sense of action is clearly expressed) but with *commencer de* = to start by (it does not necessarily express the action of 'starting' per se but more descriptive of how something could be started) the key words in comparing this facultative occurrence are 'action' vs 'description'. *Commencer de* would only be used in writing or in some type of elevated speech, but if one wanted to capture the meaning of 'to start by' then *commencer par* would be preferable (many inchoative verbs in French tend to behave like *commencer à/de*). It is important to note that there are no Spanish examples in which the facultative use of a/d occurs after the general usage (i.e., not in a fixed use) of a verb and before the infinitive and noun phrase, e.g. no choice between *empezar a* = to begin to and *empezar de*.

Noun phrases which denote a design or pattern of cloth or material in Spanish have the facultative choice: *un pantalón de rayas* or *un pantalón a rayas* both mean "a striped pants". An example like this might give the impression of being 'completely' optional. In this instance there is no indication of movement, direction, temporal, or spatial relationships, in both examples a/d have a static behaviour. The only hypothesis I could formulate to account for why both are acceptable is
the possibility of de being the description of what something is composed or made up of (in this case in the figurative sense) and a being a 'genitive like construction' also in a figurative sense (like in the French possessive â). The de usage is more common (because it denotes a descriptive quality) than the a usage. However this happens to be one of those unusual cases in which the choice of a/d could be considered completely optional in speech, i.e. it does not seem unusual (at least to Spaniards but it does to Mexicans), but nevertheless the preference for the de construction remains (in Spain and Mexico). The French equivalent is un pantalon à rayeurs or un pantalon rayé, the fact that French can use the adjectival form rayé suggests that when put in the un pantalon à rayeurs construction, it is more than likely genitive (again we have an Old French remnant). The adjectival use is also possible in Spanish, un pantalon rayado. But note that in French *un pantalon de rayeurs cannot be said to mean the same as un pantalon à rayeurs, because it is a fixed noun phrase (just like how une tasse à thé is fixed and the de cannot be substituted for a without changing the meaning of the noun phrase).

According to López, the use of a/d in some constructions is completely optional, e.g., el hombre a mi lado and el hombre de mi lado, both mean "the man to (at) my side" or "the man beside me". The choice between these two examples exist in speech (however at two different levels) and they embody a variety of connotations, therefore, I would not call their use completely optional; it is only optional depending upon what the speaker means to say. When a is used, the directional and situational readings are implied, when de is used a more static, stationary type reading is understood. The French equivalent is l'homme à mes cotés, it never occurs with de and it would take on the connotations of the above mentioned readings, directional and static.

The presence of a/d compared with its absence (zero P)

- à/a

López lists some normative occurrences (outside of personal a) of à/a compared with the
absence of the preposition: 1) before the infinitival object of certain verbs which can be either semantically or morphologically similar, e.g., ir/aller, volver/revenir, llegar/arriver, venir/venir. These verbs all represent a spatial aspect and are semantically similar, and take a/a before the infinitive; some verbs which do not require a/a are verbs of ability, belief, and desire such as: poder/pouvoir, saber/savoir, creer/croire, desear/désirer; with verbs of abnegation, which tend to be morphologically similar such as renunciar/rénoncer, resignarse/se résigner (more attention to reflexives later on) take a/a before the infinitive and the noun phrase (NP). [There are many other types of verbs which require a/a before the infinitive, but they are so numerous that they are virtually impossible to define explicitly because many times the reason why they take a/a opposed to another preposition is little more than arbitrary. Also there are times when the Spanish might take a and the French might take de or vice versa]; 2) before indications of time, but within certain time frames, e.g., before the hour, a las dos/à deux heures, but not before days of the week, e.g., vengo martes/je viens mardi (before months and years en/en is used, en julio/en juillet, en 1990/en 1990), however, before designated parts of the day, a medianoche/à minuit, a la tarde/au soir, etc. (Ibid., p. 151).

For the category of semantic sensitivity, I will give examples which present drastic differences between the appearance of a/a vs its absence. Due to the nature of the category, there is rarely a time when the Spanish example will have an equivalent in French and vice versa. This suggests that each language has different motivations for when the preposition is included or excluded. The reasoning for this is also similar to when both languages use a different preposition when the same type of preposition is expected.

The Spanish verb dar can be constructed in three ways which all have different meanings: dar la luz - la compania de electricidad dio la luz (the electric company gives (provides) light; dar a luz - María dio a luz una hermosa niña (Maria gave birth to a beautiful girl) [note in this instance the lack of the personal a before a person]; dar a la luz - el profesor dio a la luz un libro sobre prehistoria (the professor brought to light a book about prehistory). These examples serve to show how vastly different the interpretations can be, based on the absence or presence of a or the
absence or presence of the definite article (Ibid.).

As mentioned earlier in the semantic sensitivity category, the verb oler in Spanish can occur with or without a accompanied by a change of meaning, but the French verb can only occur without the preposition. When a is used, the 'smell' is an attribute of the subject (no article is used after a, because the smell is general, might not necessarily be a specific scent), e.g., la mujer huele a lejía = the woman smells like (of) lye; in contrast to when the a is not present, means that the subject 'smells' the direct object (note the presence of the definite article after the verb - indicates the specific smell), e.g., la mujer huele la lejía = the woman smells the lye. The French equivalents to the above uses are: la femme à une odeur de lessive = la mujer huele a lejía (la mujer tiene un olor a lejía), and la femme sent la lessive = la mujer huele la lejía.

The construction of the adverbs bien and mal qualifying the verb tomar in Spanish have two forms of construction depending on the use of a or no preposition (these examples do not occur in French): el niño se lo tomó mal = the child took it badly and el niño se lo tomó a mal = the child goy upset (over) something (Ibid. p. 152).

There are also facultative instances of a/a or no preposition, again the usage in one language does not always correlate in the other language. There are not many examples of the optional use of a/a (except for when dealing with the personal a in Spanish). Also in this category the choice of of a or zero P tends to do with the distinction between old usage and modern, current usage, nevertheless both forms tend to be accepted in modern usage, e.g., visitaremos a Cádiz vs visitaremos Cádiz, both mean we will visit Cádiz. However, the latter usage (without the a) is more common (Ibid.). The French is somewhat equivalent to the Spanish in this example: nous allons visiter à Paris = nous allons visiter Paris, however, the à form is preferrable to the zero P which is mainly a colloquial usage. Spanish has more flexibility than French when it comes to the use of the preposition before the names of cities and countries. The normative rule in French is that à precedes the name of the city and en precedes the name of the country (there are some exceptions to this rule as in en Avignon as opposed to *à Avignon and au Canada vs *en Canada), e.g., je vais à Ouagadougou but je vais en Burkina Faso, however in Spanish: voy a Ouagadougou and
voy a Burkina Faso, but estoy en Burkina Faso = je suis en Burkina Faso.

- de/de

López only lists various normative, required uses of *de* under this section, without making comparisons to when the preposition is not present. However, after certain verbs and before the infinitive in French and Spanish *de/de* is required, such as verbs of attempt, effort, fear: *essayer d'aller = tratar de ir; avoir peur de nager = tener miedo de (a) nadar*. Spanish tends to have some arbitrariness with the use of *tener miedo de/a*, the choice between which to use varies from speaker to speaker, the choice between *a/d* also exists before the NP, hence one can also say *tener miedo al león = I am afraid of the lion* (note that the *a* in this phrase is not the personal *a* but instead a requirement of the verb phrase *tener miedo*). Many of the occurrences of *de* before the infinitive come as a result of the reflexive form vs the non-reflexive, I will discuss the distinction between the two a little later on in the paper. There are many verbs which require *de* before the infinitive, but their semantic natures are so different that they defy classification, the same applies for those verbs which do not take a preposition.

*De/de* is required after the impersonal expression in the interrogative and in the affirmative: *qu'est-ce qu'il y a de bon? = qué hay de bueno?* (in these two examples the *de* is an empty preposition), and in the affirmative, *il y a de bon = hay de bueno*.

There are semantically sensitive aspects to the use of *de* or zero *P*: e.g., *comía del postre = je mangeais du dessert* (the partitive *de* in French and Spanish) and *comía el postre = je mangeais le dessert* (in this usage the sense of 'eating' the entire dessert is implied as opposed to the partitive meaning of 'some').

The Spanish verb *tirar* can have *a* or zero *P*: *tirar de una caja = to haul (pull) a box* or *tirar una caja = to throw a box*. An equivalent to this particular example does not exist in French (that I know of). The French semantic equivalents are: *traîner une boîte*=*tirar de una caja* and *jeter une boîte*= *tirar una caja*. 
Another semantic example is with the verbs *cambiar* = *changer*. Both verbs can occur with or without *de* with the basic meaning of "to change" remaining, but the verb complements which follow the verb determine the choice of *de* or zero P: *debes cambiar de vestido* = *tu dois changer de vêtements* and, *debes cambiar el vestido del bebé* = *tu dois changer les vêtements du bébé*. In the first example, the subject of the verb performs the action on itself, whereas in the second example, the subject of the verb performs the action on something else.

The facultative use of *de/de* vs zero P is limited. In French and Spanish, *de/de* precedes verbs which denote emotion (*plaisir=gusto, gaité=alegría, pena=peine & honte*, etc.), however its absence can be optional in Spanish. e.g. *qué gusto sentir el agua* or *qué gusto de sentir el agua* = *quel plaisir de sentir l'eau* (the French requires *de*) (Lópeze, p. 177). For the Spanish examples, the use of *de* or zero P is completely facultative in speech. It is more common to omit the *de*, but it is equally acceptable to include it even though its use is declining, hence it appears to be moving out of Castillian Spanish. However, it is interesting to note that the *de* is always included in Catalán, which is more conservative than Castillian, this is probably a French influence since like Catalán, French also maintains the use of *de*.

The Pronominal Verb and Its Non-Pronominal Counterpart

The traditional tendency is to label most pronominal verbs as reflexive verbs, but in actuality, reflexives (where the subject performs the action on itself), constitute a relatively small percentage of the pronominal verbs (Butt & Benjamin, p. 134). There are three general classifications of the pronominal verb: reflexive, *je me lave* = *me lavo*; reciprocal (the verb is always plural), *se querían* = *ils s'aiment* ; and neither reflexive nor reciprocal, hence idiomatic (Barson, p. 87), these examples will not be uniform in both French and Spanish, *je me souviens* = *I remember* (se
souvenir only occurs in the pronominal form) and se bebió una botella de zumo entera= he drank the entire bottle of juice. Most of the examples which appear under the idiomatic category have no semantic correlation with each other hence tend to defy classification.

The focus of this section will be the examination of those pronominal verbs and their non-pronominal counterparts which have a different preposition (or none at all) after it depending on its form. The choice between a/d often appears to be intrinsically related to the nature of the verb, since some verbs use the same preposition after the pronominal as well as after the non-pronominal (se plaire à, plaire à). Some verbs can maintain their basic overall meaning regardless of whether they are pronominal or not, however, there are many verbs which change their meaning considerably when they are used pronominally.

When a verb form becomes pronominal it automatically becomes somewhat intransitive because the subject and the direct object are basically (truth-functionally) the same, or at least takes on an intransitive quality, i.e., there is a sort of "detransitivization" which takes place. For example, the verb preocupar: preocupo a alguien = j'inquiète quelqu'un = I worry someone and me preocupo = je m'inquiète = I am worried (I worry myself). However, I would not agree that complete "detransitivization" takes place. There are certain pronominal verbs which are always intransitive, i.e. they cannot be made passive, since they only occur pronominally, e.g., il se repent (he repents) = se arrepentió.

The comparison of the non-pronominal with its pronominal counterpart, for the most part, fits into the category of semantic sensitivity, which includes varying degrees of semantic change. First I will present examples which have the least semantic change and then those which have the greater semantic change, however there is much overlap on the various levels of analysis. Keep in mind that this listing is by know means exhaustive, but attempts to be representative and cannot help but be subjective. It is difficult to make generalizations about what takes place in both French and Spanish since oftentimes they rarely do the same thing in the same place, i.e., they can behave differently under the same conditions. For example, some verbs in Spanish do not take the a/d before the infinitive, whereas the French counterpart does. Since for the times when French does
not take a/d it also tends to be absent in Spanish, one might say that the set of French verbs that do not have a preposition introducing the infinitival complement could be considered a proper subset of the corresponding Spanish verbs. French has narrowed the range of the infinitival complements which require a preposition before them. For example, décider de (Fr) and decidir (Sp): \(\text{ella decide hacerlo} = \text{elle décide de le faire}\), when the de is used this implies a more spontaneous decision, on the spot, however, when used pronominally (se décider à /decidirse a) à/a is used instead of del/ϕ and a different implication is made: \(\text{je me suis décidé à le faire} = \text{me decidī a hacerlo}\) (I decided to do it). The pronominal form suggests a lengthier process of decision making took place, and that after the actual 'decision' was made, there was 'motion' towards an 'action', hence justifying the use of à/a (the accusative Case). Only the individual speaker will be able to determine if their decision is spontaneous or drawn out, and make the choice between the pronominal or the non-pronominal form.

Sometimes French requires \textit{de} before the infinitive (INF) and Spanish requires a for a verb of similar meaning. For example, défier de and desafiar a (to challenge) (I have not been able to account for whether or not there are instances in which French takes à when Spanish takes de.): \(\text{je vous défie de faire mieux} = \text{le desafío a hacer mejor}\) (I challenge you to do better). However, before the noun phrase (NP) in French, no preposition is used, \(\text{je défie mon adversaire}\) (I challenge my adversary). In Spanish, the personal accusative a is used: \(\text{desafío a mi adversario}\) (I challenge my adversary). A variety of changes take place when the pronominal form is used in French. The meaning of the verb changes completely \(\text{se défier de} = \text{to distrust}\) and the de remains before the NP, e.g., \(\text{je me défie de ses promesses}\) (I distrust his promises). This verb is one of those which changes meaning completely depending upon whether it is pronominal or not. It might be safe to generalize that all other verbs which fit this category might also retain the de before the NP, however these verbs are not necessarily semantically similar. Spanish does not have a pronominal counterpart for desafiar a. But, to distrust in Spanish = desconfiar de: \(\text{desconfío de sus promesas}\) (I distrust his promises) (note that, like the French, the de is used).

An interesting distinction exists between negative and positive meanings in Spanish when the
The verb *to trust* is used: *confiar en él* (I trust in him), but for the pronominal *fiarse de* = *to trust,* is generally always used in the negative construction, as in *no me fío de él* (I do not trust him). All the examples which I have seen for this construction in grammar texts, dictionaries and tested on native informants, all appear with the negative construction, maybe the negative construction with this verb form is preferable, but can also occur in the affirmative. In this construction the personal accusative *a* is not used because the verb requires *de.* Therefore, it is incorrect to say *me fío a él* but it is correct to say *me fío de él* (see questionnaire results for Spanish No.20). The form *se fíer à* (in someone or something) is equivalent to *fiarse de.* The French equivalent to *confiar en* = *confiar à:* *je confie à lui* or *je lui confie,* however in French the connotation is that of 'confiding in' instead of just 'trusting'; one could technically 'confide' in someone who is not 'trusted'. The expression *avoir confiance en (something or someone)* means the same as *confiar à (someone),* the difference is based upon what one 'trusts in'. The Spanish, equivalent to *avoir confiance en = tener confianza en (someone or something).* The similarity between these two forms in both languages might be attributed to their conservatism in emerging from Latin. Note that one can also say *avoir confiance dans (something),* e.g., *j'ai confiance dans la capacité de mes collaborateurs (I have confidence in the abilities of my collaborators)* and *avoir confiance dans un remède (to have confidence in a remedy).* In the second example the choice to use *dans* might be in order to avoid hiatus, and also in general because, *dans* might occur more frequently with objects and things, than with people.

In dealing with pronominal verbs, the choice of *a/d* is based upon the 'direction' of the action. Earlier on we have seen the pronominal use of *à* and the non-pronominal use of *de,* in the following example, the positions reverse: *cacher à (to hide (something/someone) from)* and *se cacher de (to hide oneself from).* The idea of direction is still maintained, when one "hides something" one goes "to" a different location which happens to be "away from" something else. In the pronominal reflexive form, one "hides oneself" instead of an object or another person, by creating a sense of distance or separation. This is an hypothetical suggestion which may or may not be accurate.
There are a variety of verbs in both French and Spanish which change meaning completely depending on if they are pronominal or not, e.g. (Fr) plaindre à (to pity) and se plaindre de (to complain): je plains les gens qui n'ont pas assez à manger (I pity the people who do not have enough to eat) and les étudiants se sont plaints de la mauvaise qualité de la cuisine (the students complained about the bad quality of the cooking) (Barson, p. 91). A Spanish example would be the verbs negar (to deny) and negarse a (to refuse): ella negó participar en la fiesta (she denied participating in the party) and ella se negó a participar en la fiesta (she refused to participate in the fiesta) (López, p. 50). Note that the Spanish makes the choice between the a and zero P and that the meaning of the verb can take on various connotations depending on how it is read.

A most interesting example exists in French of a verb phrase (the impersonal s'agir de that only has il as its subject) which does not change preposition but can have two entirely different meanings depending on whether it appears before the noun phrase or before the infinitive: il s'agit d'usages régionaux (it concerns regional usages) and il s'agit d'analyser les résultats de l'expérience (it is a matter of analyzing the results of the experiment) (Barson, p. 92). The Spanish expression equivalent to il s'agit de + noun, is se trata de + noun e.g., se trata de música (it concerns music). Se trata de + infinitive also behaves like the French e.g., se trata de leer (it's a matter of reading). In French the verb s'efforcer (to make an effort, to force oneself) takes de + infinitive and à + noun: il s'efforce de me convaincre (he made an effort to convince me) and il s'efforce à un travail soigneux (he forces himself (makes an effort) to work carefully). This verb only occurs pronominally.

**The Idiom**

In the study and analysis of prepositions, it is impossible to avoid idioms, or idiomatic uses, i.e. the unexplained uses of a/d. A large percentage (if not most) of prepositional usage is considered idiomatic. In French and Spanish a/d might be used in a particular expression in one language which may or may not necessarily be used in the other.
There are two ways to describe the idiom, opaque or transparent. The opaque idiom is not easy to trace, in fact it is usually impossible to trace and what might be expected is not what takes place, e.g. in Fr. *il y a* ... = *there is (are)* and in Sp. *tiene que ver con*... = *it has to do with*.... Some other examples of the opaque idiom: (Sp.) *mirar de hito en hito* = *to stare at blankly* and (Fr.) *en dehors de* = *outside of*. In the transparent idiom, its origins can more or less be determined and its meaning easily figured out. The transparent idiom should have the appropriate or expected semantic preposition, e.g., (Fr.) *être en train de* = *to be in the process of*, and (Sp.) *a la vez que* = *at the same time that*. The amount of predictability for the choice of one preposition over another can be used as a test for transparency. It does not seem quite clear why or how the transparent idiomatic phrase is even called idiomatic if its origins can be traced and the preposition used is predictable. It would appear that the transparent idiom should be regarded as ordinary usage and therefore not count as idiomatic. It would also seem more plausible that only the opaque idiom should be classified as an idiom. This dilemma arises out of the subjective nature of the idiom and out of what determines the idiomatic classification.

It is interesting to observe certain 'dislocated' uses of *à/d*, i.e., not used in their predictable semantic use. For example, verbs like *voler à* = *robar a* and *emprunter à* = *pedir prestado a*. As mentioned in the historical section of the paper, the Latin *ab* has been cited as a possible explanation for these occurrences. However, one might also argue that these verbs are not idiomatic because the preposition *à/là* often occurs before the indirect object which is a person. It can generally be assumed that whatever preposition was used with a particular verb in Latin would most likely pass down into the Romance languages, but this is not always the case as in, *persuadir à + INF = persuader de = INF*, both verbs descended from the second conjugation Latin verb *suadere* whose complement had to be in the accusative Case.

Based upon what I have seen from Latin texts, no preposition came before the infinitive in Latin as a rule, as exists in French and Spanish. Hence, there does not seem to be any logical reason as to why this difference exists before the infinitive. In this instance, the French selection of *de* might be as a result of its innovativeness as a language (since most French verbs tend to require
de before the infinitive and in adjectival expressions, e.g., responsable de). Whereas Spanish tends to use a more than de before the infinitive - this might be due to its conservative nature. However, with adjectival expressions Spanish behaves like French e.g. responsable de = responsable de (same spelling in both languages but different pronunciations). But, there are instances when French tends to prefer à over de and Spanish will prefer de over a, e.g., l'enfant aux yeux noirs = la niña de los ojos negros and le moulin à café = el molinillo de café (coffee mill) (the French example is equivalent to the earlier mentioned une tasse à thé. As we have seen, Spanish does not have the same kind of 'sensitivity' which French displays in this type of relationship, but Spanish does in others, for example, the distinction between the internominal relation: la vitre de la fenêtre = el vidrio de la ventana (the glass of the window), and the verb-noun relation: je l'ai vu de la fenêtre = lo vi desde la ventana (I saw it from the window) (López, p. 181). In these examples Spanish is more explicit than French, this could be accounted for by the fact that desde seems to have an adverbial function in this sentence. The French equivalent of desde is depuis = since, but it would be incorrect in French to say *je l'a vu depuis la fenêtre.

The ever-present dilemma remains as to how can the inconsistencies between French and Spanish be resolved. In adjectives of proximity, when certain uses of a/d are expected and might even be predicted, the unexpected occurs, e.g., es un parque vecino al museo = c'est un parc voisin du musée also hay un cine próximo al hotel = il y a un cinéma à coté de l'hôtel (Latargez, p. 93). Based upon the data here and elsewhere in the thesis, when there is a difference between the use of a/d, Spanish is more prone to use a when French uses de.

**Summation and Analysis of Questionnaire Results**

In gathering data for a thesis of this nature, there is no immediate, systematic way in which to collect them. Data come from everywhere, conversations, the newspaper, dictionaries, grammar texts, etc. After the data are gathered, there are many different ways in which they can be analyzed, and the choice of one way instead of another is subjective. There are many problems
which one encounters in research of this kind, and the main one is that of accuracy. Since language is constantly changing and various speakers of the language employ certain usages while others do not, it is difficult to keep track of all the variations which take place. In order to obtain more precise data, all the data which are acquired need to be tested on all the informants. However, given time constraints, the amount of testing I could do was limited. Also, due to the fact that one never collects all the data at one time, i.e., data gathering is an ongoing process, it is necessary to use multiple questionnaires or testing sessions. As the research progresses, one becomes more aware as to what needs to be tested. I sent out one questionnaire half way through the data gathering process to ten informants, five in each language, and for the data which I gathered afterwards, I conducted individual testing sessions with certain individuals. Due to the fact that I was unable to test all the new data on all ten informants, there might be a certain degree of variability in the responses due to varying geographic usage, etc. I selected a group of informants who are on the whole representative of a broad base of the speakers of French and Spanish, they include a range of ages, educational backgrounds (professors, students), and those who speak the language more frequently than others. Some, if not all of these factors, plus others which I may have overlooked, more than likely influenced prepositional choice, when responses varied significantly.

Listed below are the questions asked of informants on the questionnaire and their responses. I have included, where necessary, annotated remarks on various responses. There are ten categories of informants divided into two groups of five [A-E], with each category representing one informant: in Spanish, A = native of Barcelona, Spain, professor of grammar and literature, normative years spent in Spain, age 37-40; B = native of Madrid, Spain, college student in the USA, nonnative years spent in Spain and the USA, raised bilingually (Sp/Eng); C = native of Mexico City, Mexico, college student in the USA, normative years spent in Mexico and the USA, raised bilingually (Sp/Eng); D = native of Brussels, Belgium, college student in the USA, normative years in Belgium and Chile (Chilean parents), raised bilingually (Fr/Sp); E = native of Santiago, Chile, college student in the USA, normative years spent in Chile. French, A = native of
Grenoble, France, professor of French grammar, spent all normative years in France, age 25-30; B = native of Paris, France, professor of French grammar and literature, normative years spent in France, age 38-45; C = native of Brussels, Belgium, college student in the USA, normative years in Belgium; D = native of New York City, with a French mother and an American father, raised bilingually (Fr/Eng), college student, spends summers in France, but resides in the USA; E = native of Maryland, with a Japanese mother and a French father, college student, spends summers in France, speaks French exclusively at home (does not speak Japanese).

Letters placed after responses indicate how each informant responded. First I will list the Spanish responses and then the French responses separately. At the end of the data presentation, I will try to classify the data according to the following patterns (all the responses do not necessarily fit into these classifications): 1) the predictable behaviour in both languages, 2) both languages do the same thing, but not the predicted response, and 3) where both languages differed.

**Spanish Data**

1. a Chinese teacup  
   - una taza de té china (A, B, D, E)  
   - una taza china de té (C)  
   - taza china (E)  

   [the response of (C) arouses some suspicion because different meanings might be obtained as a result of the position of the adjective.]

2. a cup of Chinese tea  
   - una taza de té chino (all)

3. a cake knife (knife for cutting cake)  
   - un cuchillo de pastel (C)  
   - un cuchillo de tarta (B)  
   - un cuchillo para cortar tartas (B)  
   - una pala para pasteles (A)
- un cuchillo para cortar un pastel (D)
- un cuchillo cortar (E)

4. a silver knife (a knife made of silver)
- un cuchillo de plata (all)

5. I begin to speak
- comienzo a hablar (B,C,E)
- empiezo a hablar (A,D,

6. they continue to run
- ellos siguen corriendo (B,E)
- ellos continúan corriendo (C,D) [this phrase is considered ungrammatical by A]
- continúan corriendo (A)

[the responses of C and D are not normative for many Spanish speakers]

7. a sailboat
- un barco de vela (2)
- un barco (1)
- un (barco) velero (2)

8. I teach Joan how to read Urdu
- Enseno a Juana a leer Urdu (D)
- Yo le enseñó a Juana como leer Urdu (B)
- Le enseñó a Juana a leer Urdu (A,C, 
- Le enseñó a leer Urdu a Juana (D,E)

9. I promised Joan to do it.
- le prometo a Juana que lo haría (all)

[note here that the indirect object pronoun le which refers to Juana, is being used normatively (que lo haría = the direct object) and the a is the dative 'personal' empty a]

10. I forced Joan to read it.
- forcé a Juana a leerlo (A,C)
- le forzé a Juana que leyese (B)
- obligué a Juana a leerlo (D,E)
- le forzé a Juana leerlo (B)

11. he asks to come
- él pide venir (C,D)
- pregunta si puede venir (A)
- él ruega venir (B)
- él pidió venir (E)
- él preguntó si podía venir (E)

12. he asks me to come
- él me pidió que viniera (D,E)
- él me pide que venga (C)
- él me pide venir (B)
- me dice que vaya (A)
- él me preguntó si podía venir (E)
13. I challenge you to duel.
- te reto a un duelo (A,C)
- te desafío a un duelo (B)
- te pido en duelo (D)
- le desafío a duelo, señor (E)

14. I hesitate to go
- me da no sé qué ir (colloquial) (E)
- no sé si ir (C,D)
- vacilo en ir (B)
- no creo que vaya (A)

15. If I happen to see him, I will give it to him.
- sí lo veo, se lo daré (A,D)
- si acaso lo veo, se lo daré (C)
- si por casualidad le veo, se lo daré (B)
- sí le veo, se lo daré (E)

[The last two above responses are said in spoken Spanish, however, using the le (which is the indirect object pronoun) instead of lo as the direct object pronoun is incorrect, but widely used, especially in Spain. This confusion probably comes as a result of the personal Accusative empty a being mistaken for the Accusative full a. People often forget that the a in Veo a él is empty hence, Lo veo is correct instead of *Le veo.]

16. We happen to meet our neighbors every morning.
- Sucede que nos encontramos con nuestros vecinos cada mañana (1)
- Solemos ver a nuestros vecinos cada mañana (1)
- Por casualidad, nos encontramos con nuestros vecinos todas las mañanas (1)
- Cada mañana ocurre que vemos a nuestros vecinos (1)
- Nos encontramos con los vecinos cada mañana. (1)

17. she has just arrived
- ella acaba de llegar (all)

18. a four-door car
- un auto a cuatro puertas (E)
- un auto de cuatro puertas (D)
- un cuarto puertas (B)
- un coche con cuatro puertas (A)
- un coche de cuatro puertas (C)

19. a smile on one's face
- una sonrisa en los labios (all)
- una sonrisita (A)
- una sonrisa a los labios (C)

20. I trust him.
- Creo en él (E)
- Confío en él (B,C,D)
- Me fío de él (A)

[Informant C could not say the last example, and only felt comfortable with it in the negative, whereas the informant who said it did not have a preference for the negative. This is an example]
which needs broader testing in order to observe more precisely how it behaves.]

21. I trust my dog to remain faithful to me.
- Yo me fío de mi perro (A)
- Confío en mi perro que me sea leal (C)
- Confío que mi perro se mantendrá fiel conmigo (B)
- Confío que mi perro me será fiel (D)
- Estoy seguro que mi perro será fiel (E)

22. He does not trust his friend.
- él no tiene confianza en él (E)
- él no confía en su amigo (B,C,D)
- no se fía de su amigo (A)

23. I read it in the book yesterday.
- Lo leí en el libro ayer (B,C,D,E)
- Lo leí ayer (A)

24. His mother cares for him.
- Su madre se cuida de él (B) [in this response one would expect a instead of de, but the verb cuidarse requires de]
- Su madre lo cuida (C)
- Le cuida su madre (A) [see No. 15 above for explanation re: the use of le]
- Se preocupa por él (E)
- Su madre lo quiere (D)

25. She takes care of her house.
- Ella mantiene su casa (E)
- Ella arregla su casa (A)
- Ella cuida su casa (B,C,D)

26. His mother takes care of him.
- Su madre lo cuida (A)
- Su madre cuida de él (E)
- Su madre le cuida a él (B) [same as No.15 above]
- Su madre lo cuida a él (C)

27. John was blessed by his father.
- Su padre le dio el visto bueno (A)
- Juan fue bendecido por su padre (C)
- Juan tiene la bendición de su padre (E)
- Juan fue bendito por su padre (D)
- Juan fue bendecido por su padre (B)

[In the fourth response above, the use of the adjective instead of the past participle raises suspicion, it also seems to indicate a more colloquial usage]

28. the Kreutzer Sonata (name of a piece of music)
- la Sonata de Kreutzer (A,B,C)
- la Sonata Kreutzer (D)
- la Kreutzer Sonata (E)
29. Laura took the pen from me.
- Laura me cogió el bolígrafo (A)
- Laura me quitó la pluma (C)
- Laura me tomó el lápiz (pencil) (D)
- Laura me quitó el bolígrafo (B)
- Laura me quitó el lápiz (E)

30. Wolfgang plays the bagpipes.
- Wolfgang toca la gaita (A, B, C, D)
- Wolfgang sabe tocar pipas (E)

31. Boris plays tennis.
- Boris juega a tenis (A)
- Boris juega tenis (C, E)
- Boris juega al tenis (B, D)

[the omission of the definite article in the first response is normatively permissible, but it is preferable to include the definite article; the second response (all cited by South American speakers, reflects the influence of English]

32. It tastes like peach.
- Sabe a durazno (C, D, E)
- tiene sabor a durazno (E)
- sabe a melocotón (A, B)

33. To threaten a child with punishment.
- amenazarle a un niño con castigarle (B) [redundant use of le in the verb castigarle]
  - amenazar a un niño con un castigo (A, D)
  - amenazar a un niño con castigos (C)
  - amenazar a un niño de castigarle (E)

[for the first and last responses, see No. 15 above]

34. She dreams about her vacation.
- ella sueña con sus vacaciones (B, C, D, E)
- ella sueña en sus vacaciones (A)

35. They are late in arriving.
- llegan tarde (A)
- ellos llegan tarde (B, E)
- tardan en llegar (D)
- se tardan en llegar (C)

36. She persuaded me to do it.
- ella me convenció de hacerlo (D, E) [note misspelling of convenció instead of convenció]
  - me convenció de hacerlo (C)
  - me convenció a hacerlo (A)
  - ella me persuadió a hacerlo (B)
  - ella me movió a hacerlo (B)

37. She stole the book from the store.
- ella robó el libro de la tienda (B)
- robó el libro de la tienda (A)
- robó el libro del almacén (D)
- se robó el libro de la tienda (C)
- ella se robó el libro de la tienda (E)

**French Data**

1. a Chinese teacup
   - une tasse de thé chinoise (E)
   - une tasse à thé chinoise (A,B,C,D)
   [the first response is not normative, and is an error on the part of the informant, this might be due to infrequent use of the language.]

2. a cup of Chinese tea
   - une tasse de thé chinois (all)

3. a cake knife
   - un couteau à gâteau (A,B,D)
   - un couteau pour couper le gâteau (C)
   - un couteau pour gâteau (E)

4. a silver knife
   - un couteau en argent (A,B,C,E)
   - un couteau d'argent (D)

5. I begin to speak
   - je commence à parler (all)

6. they continue to run
   - ils continuent à courir (all)

7. a sailboat
   - un bateau à voile (B,D,E)
   - un voilier (C)
   - un bateau à voiles (A)

8. I teach Joan how to read Urdu.
   - j'enseigne à Joan comment lire l'Urdu (B,D)
   - j'enseigne à Joan à lire l'Urdu (B)
   - j'apprends à lire le Urdu à Joan (A)
   - j'enseigne à lire le Urdu à Joan (A)
   - j'apprends à Joan à lire le Urdu (C)
   - j'apprends à Joan comment lire le Urdu (E)

9. I promised Joan to do it.
   - j'ai promis à Joan de la faire (A,B,C,D)
   - j'ai promis à Joan que j'allais le faire (E)

10. I forced Joan to read it.
    - j'ai obligé Joan à le lire (A,C)
    - j'ai forcé Joan à le lire (A,B,D,E)
11. He asks to come
- il demande à venir (A,B,C,D)
- il demande de venir (B,D,E)

[de in the last response is not normative, however, it is often used in speech, most of the informants said that both forms are used, but the à form is preferred.]

12. He asks me to come
- il me demande de venir (all)

13. I challenge you to a duel.
- je vous provoque en duel (A,B)
- je te provoque en duel (C)
- je te défie à un duel (E)
- je te lance un défi (D)

[the last response appears to be unusual since there is an absence of the preposition]

14. I hesitate to go
- j'hésite à partir (B)
- j'hésite à aller (D)
- j'hésite d'aller (E)
- j'hésite à y aller (A,C)

15. If I happen to see him, I will give it to him.
- si jamais je le vois, je le lui donnerai (A)
- si je le vois, je le lui donnerai (B,C)
- si je le vois par hasard, je le lui donnerai (E)
- si par hasard je le vois, je le lui donnerai (D)

[in the first response, the direct object pronoun is missing, this was probably an oversight on the part of the informant]

16. We happen to meet our neighbors every morning.
- nous rencontrons nos voisins par hasard chaque matin (D)
- il nous arrive de voir nos voisins tous les matins (B) [according to the informant, this phrase would be more likely written instead of spoken]
- on voit nos voisins tous les matins (B)
- il arrive qu'on rencontre nos voisins tous les matins (E)
- nous voyons nos voisins chaque matin (C) [for informant C, voyons is preferable to rencontrons]
- nous rencontrons nos voisins chaque matin (A,C)

17. She has just arrived.
- elle vient d'arriver (A,B,D)
- elle vient juste d'arriver (C,E)

18. a four-door car
- une voiture à quatre portes (B,D,E)
- une voiture quatre portes (A)
- une auto à quatre portes (C)

19. a smile on one's face
- un sourire aux lèvres (A,B,C,D)
- le sourire sur son visage (E)
- un sourire sur le visage (A,B)
- un sourire (C)

[the second response is not completely normative, because parts of the body are indicated by the definite article when the owner of the body part is clearly identified.]

20. I trust him
- je lui fais confiance (A,B,C)
- j'ai confiance en lui (D,E).

21. I trust my dog to remain faithful to me
- je crois fermement que mon chien me restera fidèle (A)
- je fais confiance à mon chien pour me rester fidèle (B)
- j'ai confiance que mon chien me restera fidèle (D)
- je suis sûre que mon chien restera fidèle envers moi (E)
- je suis persuadé que mon chien m'est loyal (C)
- je suis persuadé que mon chien me restera fidèle (C)

22. He does not trust his friend
- il ne fait pas confiance à son ami (A,B,C)
- il n'a pas confiance en son ami (A,D,E)

23. I read it in the book yesterday
- je l'ai lu dans le livre hier (A,C,D,E)
- je l'ai lu dans un livre hier (B)

24. His mother cares for him
- sa mère l'aime (B,C,D)
- sa mère a beaucoup d'affection pour lui (E)
- sa mère s'inquiète pour lui (A)

25. She takes care of her house.
- elle s'occupe de sa maison (B,C,D,E)
- elle s'occupe de la maison (A)

26. His mother takes care of him.
- sa mère s'occupe de lui (A,B,D)
- sa mère en prend soin (C)
- sa mère prend soin de lui (E)

27. John was blessed by his father
- Jean fut béni par son père (A)
- Jean a été béni par son père (D,E)
- Jean a été blessé par son père (B)

(Informant C did not give a response)

[Informant B gives a curious use of the verb blesser = to wound, injure, hurt, hence it appears to be an anglicism to use it as a cognate for to bless = bénir]

28. the Kreutzer Sonata
- la Sonate à Kreutzer (B)
- *la Sonate Kreutzer* (A)
- *la Kreutzer Sonata* (C)
- *la Sonata de Kreutzer* (E)
- *la Sonate de Kreutzer* (D)

[the variety of responses received indicate the many ways in which the phrase can be interpreted, the first response is best, because the Sonata was not written by Kreutzer but for, i.e. on the behalf of Kreutzer]

29. Laura took the pen from me.
- *Laura m'a enlevé le stylo* (D)
- *Laura m'a pris le stylo des mains* (A,D)
- *Laura m'a pris le stylo que je tenais* (E)
- *Laura a pris mon stylo* (C)
- *Laura m'a pris le stylo* (B)

[In the above responses, the overall tendency is to designate the location "from where" something is taken]

30. Wolfgang plays the bagpipes
- *Wolfgang joue de la cornemuse* (all)

31. Boris plays tennis
- *Boris joue au tennis* (A,B,C,D)
- *Boris fait du tennis* (E)

32. It tastes like peach
- *ça a le goût d'une pêche* (E)
- *cela a le goût d'une pêche* (E)
- *cela a un goût de pêche* (B)
- *ça a le goût de pêche* (D)
- *ça a un goût de pêche* (A)
- *ça goüte la pêche* (C)

[note that the last response has the verb form, hence the informant did not feel the need for a preposition]

33. To threaten a child with punishment
- *menacer un enfant de représailles* (C)
- *menacer un enfant de punition* (A,B,D)
- *mettre en garde un enfant avec une punition* (E)

34. She dreams about her vacation
- *elle rêve de ses vacances* (A,D,E)
- *elle rêve à ses vacances* (B)
- *elle rêve en pensant à ses vacances* (C)
- *elle rêve de pensant à ses vacances* (C)

[note the facultative use of à/de in the above examples]

35. They are late in arriving
- *ils sont en retard* (B,C,E)
- *ils mettent du temps pour arriver* (B)
- *ils mettent du temps à arriver* (A,B) [considered by informant B to be the most standard usage]
-ils arrivent en retard (D)

36. She persuaded me to do it.
- elle me convaincu de le faire (C,D,E)
- elle m’a persuadé de le faire (A,B)

37. She stole the book from the store.
- elle a vole le livre du magasin (D,E)
- elle a vole le livre au magasin (A,C)
- elle a vole le livre dans le magasin (B)

[the first response is not considered normative by most French speakers, however, the informants who gave the first responses live in the USA and might be affected by the English influence.]

In the above responses, most of what takes place in both languages is predictable, and hence does not require detailed discussion, since most of the examples have already been discussed. There were no occurrences in which both languages behaved the same way but their prepositional usage was unexpected. For the most part, what takes place is either predictable or it is not. There are however (as we have seen earlier on under the idiomatic section), several instances in which the languages differ when they might be expected to behave the same. Hence, I will focus on this distinction.

There is a certain amount of flexibility in the selection of one expression over another, and by so doing one can on occasion avoid prepositional usage altogether (some Spanish examples are in Nos. 15, 21, 24, 27, 35; French, Nos. 13, 15, 20, 29). The trend seems to be that prepositional omission is more common in Spanish than in French, i.e., French tends to have more fixed uses, e.g. (Sp) the first response in No.6 vs (Fr) No. 6 in which the a has to be used. There are also times in which both languages seem to be indifferent to the use of the preposition, e.g., Nos. 18 & 28 in Sp/Fr. The optional use of one preposition over another is seen in Nos. 3, 19 and 34 in both Sp/Fr. The choice of one preposition over another might be based on the informant's reading of the phrase, and the context with which the phrase is being associated.

For certain examples, the frequency of the same response does not necessarily mean what is most common in speech, sometimes it does, and sometimes it does not, since the informant might be trying to give a 'literal' translation of the phrase, e.g. No. 29 (Fr). Also what might be frequent
in speech, may not be normative, e.g., No. 11 (Fr) and Nos. 15, 24 and 26 (Sp).

Based on all the data presented, it is clear to see that a/d are highly resistant to classification and categorization. Trying to impose a system on the complete behaviour of these 'free-spirited' prepositions might appear to be a futile endeavour, however, I make the hypothesis that there is an inherent underlying system which has been distorted, expanded, and pushed beyond its limits hence creating the impression of no system at all. My goal was to try to find that underlying system and bring a/d back into order. The Latin origins of a/d represent the underlying system, i.e., the basic normative meanings of a/d which still remain. However, as various usage of a/d developed separately into the different languages, much of this underlying system managed to corrode to a certain degree. Therefore, I set out on a type of 'archaeological expedition' to uncover the traces of the original 'system' on the 'unpredictable' or 'unexpected' uses of a/d in French and Spanish.

The linguistic confusion which exists today dating back to the Tower of Babel, has promulgated itself into the idiosyncratic uses of a/d. A/d have thus continued in the tradition of their linguistic heritage.
Appendix A

The normative and idiomatic uses of the Latin predecessors of a/d

1. Preposition with the Accusative Case:

\textit{Ad} = to, towards, at, near

- \textit{a) Place:}  
  - \textit{ad urbem} venit = he came to the city
  - \textit{ad meridiem} = towards the south
  - \textit{ad urbem} = near the south

- \textit{b) Time:}  
  - \textit{ad nonam horam} = till the ninth hour

- \textit{c) Direct Object} (with person): \textit{ad eum} venit = he came to him

\textbf{Idiomatic uses:}

- \textit{ad tempus} = at the time
- \textit{ad petendam pacem} = to seek peace
- \textit{ad hunc modum} = in this way
- \textit{ad hoc} = besides
- \textit{ad diem} = on the day

2. Prepositions with the Ablative Case:

\textbf{A.} \textit{A [ + consonant], Ab [ + vowel], Abs- (prefix) [ + word]} = direction away from the object but can also mean direction towards the speaker; off from

- \textit{a) Place:}  
  - \textit{ab urbe} profectus est = he set out from the city

- \textit{b) Time:}  
  - (1) from: \textit{ab hora tertia ad vesperam} = from the third hour till evening
  - (2) (just) after: \textit{ab eo magistrati} = after (holding) that office

\textbf{Idiomatic Uses:}

1) contrast: \textit{a reliquis differunt} = they differ from the others
2) since: \textit{a parvulis} = from early childhood [N.B. the French \textit{à partir de} ...]
3) by: \textit{occisis ab hoste} = slain by an enemy
4) near: \textit{prope ab urbe} = near (not far from) the city
5) from: \textit{liberare ab} = to set free from
6) on: \textit{ab hac parte} = on this side
7) to: \textit{a re eius} = to his advantage
8) for: \textit{a re publica} = for the interest of the state

\textbf{B.} \textit{De} = down from, from
a) **Place**: *de caelo demissus* = sent down from heaven

b) **Figurative** (concerning, about, of):
- *cognoscit de Clodi caede* = he learns about the plans of Clodius
- *consilia de bello* = plans of war [N.B. the genitive translation into Fr/Sp]

c) **Partitive Sense** (out of, of): *unus de plebe* = one of the people

**Idiomatic Uses**:

1) for: *multis de causis* = for many reasons
2) of: *de improviso* = of a sudden
3) on: *de industria - on purpose*
4) as early as: *de mense Decembri navigare* = to sail as early as December

The Latin preposition **in**: Since many times in French and Spanish the preposition *en - dans/en* appears when a/d is expected, I have enclosed the uses of the Latin predecessor **in**, which occurs with either the Ablative or the Accusative.

1) With the Ablative: in, on, among
   - *in castris* = in the camp (also: *ad castra*)
   - *in mari* = on the sea
   - *in urbe esse* = to be in town
   - *in tempore* = in season
   - *in scribendo* = in writing
   - *in ancoris* = at anchor

2) With the Accusative: into
   (a) **Place**: *in Italiam contendit* = he hastens into Italy
   (b) **Time** (till, until): *in lucem* = till daylight

**Idiomatic Uses**:

- *in aram confugit* = he fled to the altar
- *in dies* = from day to day
- *hunc in modum* = in this way
- *oratione in Caitinam* = a speech against Caitline
- *in perpetuum* = forever
- *in diem vivere* = to live for the day
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