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PROBLEMS IN THE DIALECTRONIC DIFFERENTIATION OF NEAR-HOMOPHONES

Yakov Malkiel
University of California, Berkeley

This paper falls into a shorter general part and a longer special part. Part 1 is concerned with the various solutions which a speech community may seek in the event of a threatening collision of two homonyms or near-homonyms; a careful distinction is drawn, in almost every category, between strictly lexical and lexic-grammatical homophony. Four characteristic patterns are established: (a) The speakers, after some wavering, in the end accept both partners, because of contextual disambiguation or because the words at issue pertain to different social dialects (or registers)—or else because one is common, and the other relatively rare, e.g. technical. (b) The stronger word dislodges the weaker word, eliminating it altogether or driving it into a corner, sometimes only temporarily; strength, in this context, is measurable by sheer frequency, or by smoothness of structural integration, or by ready availability vs. total absence of suitable substitute items. (c) The two words merge, producing a third word, usually of extended semantic ambit. (d) The partners are gradually differentiated in meaning and, above all, in form, through complicated and less than obvious analogical processes—with the further dichotomy of either (α) a single partner or (β) both partners undergoing such polarizing changes. Throughout Part 1, examples are adduced from a mixed bag of European languages.

Part 2 involves a microscopic study of one particularly arresting instance of differentiation of two near-homonyms, namely two OSp. prepositions, faza ‘toward’ and (f)ata ‘until’, whose etymologies were established long ago (Lat. FACIE AD ‘with one’s face to’ vs. Arabic hattâ ‘until’). No satisfactory solution has so far been proposed for certain idiosyncrasies of their development at the late-medieval stage, when faza assumed the shape fazi > (h)acia, and fata almost simultaneously became fasta, (h)asta. Older, mutually exclusive explanations are reviewed here and rejected. The new interpretations proposed—in one case, the example of f(i)uza ‘confidence’ (from fiducia) yielding ground to fuzia, haizia; in the other, an assumed merger with the last remnants of usque ad to the south of the Pyrenees (a hypothesis buttressed by Fr. jusque, OfR. enjusque etc.)—may seem, at first glance, far-fetched and unconvincing, the former because of the inherent semantic gap, the latter in view of certain missing links (though OSp. fascas ‘almost’ lends powerful support). Such skepticism may be overcome by the supposition that the actual driving force behind the intercalation of /j/ and /s/, respectively, was not analogy, but the powerful urge toward differentiation of near-homonyms, which was apt to avail itself of models like f(i)uza > fuzia or hattâ × usque as mere pretexts. Many side-issues (the growth of Ptg. até, Arag. enta etc.) are also subjected to diachronic analysis.

Can two word histories—each fraught with all sorts of difficulties, as long as it is examined separately—acquire a higher degree of transparency once they are studied jointly? Normally (if one can at all appeal to norm in such an uncommon situation), one would expect the two words to be at least linked with each other through some kind of tight relationship: as synonyms, homophones, semantic opposites, adjoining members of a close-knit series (such as numerals), ingredients of a bi- or pluri-nominal formula, or the like. The lexical pair here selected for leisurely inspection are two Hispanic prepositions of long standing: hacija ‘toward’ and hasta ‘until’—oft-discussed, but never satisfactorily traced to their respective bases—which indeed exemplify an unusual variety of near-homophony.
Because certain effects of full and partial homophony have never been explored in depth, no ready-made frame of reference exists for scrutinizing the records of these two prepositions and for proposing an explanation for their seemingly erratic courses. It thus seems advisable to start out from an at least randomly documented review of the various major categories of (near-)homophones possibly subject to collision, as observed in some of the better-known European languages, with particular attention to lexical and grammatical differentiation as the development most relevant to the vicissitudes of the chosen prepositions.

Before we go any farther, it appears helpful to introduce the distinction between pairs, or triads, of (a) lexical homophones, involving essentially root morphemes, as in Eng. mien 'manner, appearance', mean1 'low in quality', and mean2 'halfway between extremes'; and (b) grammatical homophones, comprising inflectional and affixal-componential elements, as in Lat. vir-i 'man's' and 'men'—or in adversative in-, used chiefly with nouns and adjectives, e.g. inimicus 'enemy', lit. 'non-friend', as against illative in-, peculiar to verbs, cf. inferre 'to bring in or forward'.

1. Studies in diachronic lexicology—the rubric under which the effects of homophony are predominantly investigated—usually distinguish between the following results of clashes between homophones, on the tacit assumption that homophony, in each characteristic instance, represents a supervenient event, caused by gradual or sudden changes in form undergone by either partner or both, or else through infiltration of at least one borrowing:

(a) The two homophones (x, y), often after some initial indecision on the part of the speakers, in the end continue to be used side by side, on the formal if not necessarily the colloquial level of discourse—in the absence, one gathers, of any prohibitive excess of bothersome mutual interference. It is the diverse contexts, grammatical and/or referential, that presumably provide the necessary measure of disambiguation.

(b) One of the rivals overpowers the other, then either dislodges it altogether or drives it into a corner. Some of the reasons for the victor's superiority are, on the positive side: (a) higher frequency or (b) smoother integration with a favored pattern; also, on the negative side, (γ) temporary unavailability of any suitable substitute term. If x proves stronger than y, it can happen that the latter is merely lowered in status (e.g. relegated to certain congealed, formulaic phrases, where its survival receives support from binomial structure, rhyme, assonance, or alliteration—unless the lag is attributable to plain inertia); or y can be completely evicted. Occasionally, depending on the dialect, x lingers on in one territory and y in another nearby; such clean-cut distribution may point to a significant difference

1 For the purpose of this study, it would be otiose to toy with several additional distinctions. Thus, even though there is no lack of triads and still richer constellations of homophones, these cases receive no separate treatment here. Again, it would only complicate matters to set apart such instances of obvious homophony as are traceable, etymologically, to polysemy (as with Russ. mir, 'world', mira 'peace'—and, according to some analysts, mira 'peasant commune'; or svetl, 'profusion of light' and sveta, 'universe, world'); significantly, in the older orthography, the words for 'world' and 'peace' were not even spelled alike. I have used subscript numbers to discriminate between homographs.
between two sets of conditioning factors, despite geographic proximity—or, alternatively, may demonstrate the narrowness of the margin of superiority. A rarer and more radical solution consists in the eventual elimination of both troublemakers.

(c) If \( x \) and \( y \), in addition to sharing the same form, also display a strong dose of semantic affinity (or, minimally, compatibility), their clash can be resolved by merger. Typically, if the blend has been consummated, \( x \) and \( y \) cease to exist as neatly distinguishable items and give rise to \( z \)—often a word displaying, semantically, a more intricate structure than did its two predecessors and original constituents. In addition to this extreme case of complete amalgam, all sorts of sporadic contacts and overlaps occur, as when, with some speakers, \( x \) acquires certain semantic shades originally idiosyncratic to \( y \), or vice versa, while other members of the community favor total collapse of \( x \) and \( y \)—i.e. use a single word \( z \) of expanded referential range. In such a ‘fuzzy’ situation, \( x \), \( y \), and \( z \) may, at least for a while, co-exist in adjacent or even interlocking idiolects and dialects.

An over-abundant literature has accumulated on all these processes, which need not be recapitulated here in any detail.

Category (a) is very copiously represented. Where different form classes are involved, speakers ordinarily encounter no difficulties: Ger. heute ‘today’ and Hāute ‘skins’, though pronounced alike, are not in each other’s way; neither are Leute ‘folk(s), people’ and läute ‘may ring’, nor indeed Eng. flea (< OE flēa) and (to) flee (< OE flēon). In such cases no remedial action whatever is called for. Even if the contenders happen to belong to the same form class, certain circumstances tend to avert the conflict. Ger. Saite ‘string (of musical instrument)’ is too technical to interfere with Seite ‘side, page’, while Ger. Lärche ‘larch’ and Lerche ‘lark’, being both narrow-gauged, hardly qualify as rivals. Ger. rein ‘pure’ and Rain ‘boundary (between fields), edge (of a wood)’ have the dual advantage of belonging to different form classes and to entirely different tiers along the scale of generality; the hydronym Rhein, being a proper name, does not in the least affect them. Another palliative, where two nouns are involved, may be the difference in gender: Ger. See (m.) ‘lake’ and See (f.) ‘sea’—true homophones at present, even though traceable to a single source (Klug & Mitzka 1960:696b)—are seldom, if ever, ambiguous. Nevertheless, the co-existence of grammatically identical homophones usually entails minor side-effects. The contiguity of Ger. Waise ‘orphan’ to Weise ‘manner, tune’, both feminine in addition to being pronounced alike—and to the family of weise ‘wise’—has often prompted speakers to use unequivocal Waisenkind. French tolerates lover, ‘to praise, commend’ (laudère), normally governing the name of a person as its direct object, alongside louver 2 ‘to lease, rent’ (locère), which attracts other nouns; but for ‘hiring’, unambiguous engageur is more and more preferred. Under pressure from Eng. straight ‘unbent’, a cognate of (to) stretch, strait ‘narrow’ has lost considerable ground—though it is still clearly recognizable in strait ‘passageway’, straits ‘situation of distress’, and the compound straitjacket; (to) straiten, a fairly infrequent verb, can be pitted against (to) straighten out. With another pair of adjectives the situation is slightly different: light, (the opposite of dark) and light 2 (the opposite of heavy) have fully maintained a balance, even though some speakers extricate themselves from the residual
hazard of haziness by favoring light-colored vs. light-weight. Verbs of like shape offer, as one would expect, the richest spectrum of problems. Standard English does not bar the co-existence of (to) lie₁ (= Ger. liegen) ‘to be in a reclining position’ and (to) lie₂ (= Ger. liegen) ‘to make a false statement (deliberately)’; but in colloquial and dialectal varieties, all sorts of substitutes and circumlocutions have been tried out: (to) lie down, with adjustments in construction, and even (to) lay for lie₁, as against (to) tell a lie for lie₂—although few speakers would hesitate to use liar. So much for co-existent lexical homophones; as regards their grammatical counterparts, much will depend on the tolerance of the given language. Sp. cantamos₁ ‘we sing, are singing’ and cantamos₂ ‘we sang, started to sing’ are noteworthy, because few members of a Hispanic verbal paradigm straddle tenses; similar, though to a markedly lesser degree, are 1/3sg. fuese, fuerá ‘I or he/she/it might be or go’, because in approximately half of all tenses—including the present indicative, the preterit, and the future—these two persons are sharply distinguished in that language. But the enormous latitude of, say, write or wrote in English, or of chant-/-sät/ in French, has become so normal, and is being coped with so effectively by means of the prefixed personal pronouns, that one no longer visualizes any source of serious trouble in individual cases.

Category (b) was dramatized, to the point of sensationalism, by the researches in Gallo-Romance dialect geography of Gilliéron (and his disciples), throughout the first quarter of this century. To cite two celebrated examples: Where Lat. MOLERE ‘to grind’ and MULGÈRE ‘to milk’, by dint of convergence through regular sound change, collided in Fr. patois, the former invariably ousted the latter, not least because adequate substitute words for ‘to milk’ (tirer, traire etc.) were easily available to rural speakers. Or, to cite two nouns in conflict, in Gascony the descendant of GATTUS (a var. of CATTUS) ‘cat’ drove away the local representative of GALLUS ‘rooster’—probably because, within that environment, speakers could afford to fall back, by way of paraphrase, on ‘pissant’ and, facetiously, on an (amorously inclined) ‘vicar’, but not on any regional designations of ‘ocelot’ or ‘cougar’. As one moves beyond Gilliéron’s hunting ground, one detects untold instances of such eliminatory processes outside Gallo-Romance. Thus, past the Latin stage, PECTUS ‘breast, chest’ and PACTU ‘contract, agreement’, despite their wide semantic gap, ceased to be readily compatible: OSP. pecho, OPtg. peito in the long run could hardly serve to perform both duties (1. ‘breast’, orig. -os; 2.

---

2 Interestingly, though German distinguishes between licht and leicht, the former is being crowded out more and more by hell, conceivably because speakers welcome the wedge thus driven between noun (Licht ‘luminosity’) and corresponding adjective. Elaborations such as light-weight are obviously not confined to homonymic tangles; contrast Eng. left-, right-hand with Ger. links, recht(s), devoid of any specification. Could English be slightly more vulnerable to polysemy? To revert to homophony, joint consideration of the two languages is often very enlightening; thus the noun loaf ‘portion of bread baked in one piece’ is undamaged by the colloquial verb (to) loaf ‘to loiter, lounge about’, whereas its congénere Ger. Leib has yielded ground to Leib ‘body’, since here two nouns—of the same gender, to make things worse—are opposed. The winners have been Brot and the var. Leb-, as in Lebkuchen. Kluge & Mitzka (418b), in confirming this homonymic tension, report that the difference in spelling (Leib ~ Leib) represents a gratuitous last-minute attempt, on the part of older normative grammarians, to avoid the clash.
‘payment agreed upon, tax levied’), with the result that pag-a, -o ‘payment’ (lit. ‘appeasement’) emerged as a substitute for the reflex of factum—a newcomer doubly welcome because of the use of its counterparts in neighboring cognate languages. Concurrently, the verb pagar pushed back pechar. Another example pinpoints even better the impact of a sound change on the internal economy of the lexicon: Soon after Ptg. cætã became de-affricated (except at the northern fringe of the territory), the weight of aceitar ‘to accept’ (from acceptare, the intensive-frequentative of acciperere) forced speakers to jettison asseitar ‘to ambush’ (from assectari, akin to sequi ‘to follow’) in favor of a suddenly emerging competitor, namely the Provençalism espreitar (related to Fr. exploiter)—truly a ‘Verlegenheitswort’. In contrast, Spanish never stopped tolerating ace(þ)tar alongside acechar, even though the spread of -c- /θ/ in lieu of expected -s(s)- points to partial contamination. Eng. (to) cles, cleeve ‘hew asunder, split’ (OE cleofan) reduced (to) cleeve2 ‘stick fast, adhere’ (OE clesfan/clifian) to a precarious status, confining it to a single, strictly ritualistic context, even after the initial near-homophones (Onions 1966:180b, 181a) had developed into full homophones; significantly, the latter’s Ger. congener kleben, unencumbered by homophony, has continued to thrive to this day. Languages abound in indirect repercussions (often difficult to detect) of internecine homophony; thus, if one asks why the Latinism error has struck root in Spanish, but not Portuguese, the answer is that in the center of the Peninsula the growth of the native deverbal yerro (from errar ‘to err’) has been held in check by the transmutation of OSP. fierro ‘iron’ into (h)ierro; but in the West, erro ‘error, mistake, blunder’ has managed to steer clear of ferro, obviating the need for the introduction of a Latinism.

The treatment so copiously documented within the lexicon is also observable in the ranks of grammatical morphemes—except that, through a whim of circumstances (including an arbitrary tradition), the two closely-related phenomena are seldom viewed as two sides of essentially the same coin. Consider the Romance re-organization of the Latin tense system: Although Portuguese and older Spanish experienced a conflation between the past future and the subjunctive of the perfectum, identical in five out of a total of six forms (3sg. laudare (OE) lēwar, lōare), the alliance of these tenses and moods (see immediately below) dislodged the old impf. subj. laudaret—the more plausibly because post-tonic I, having advanced to /e/, underwent a positional merger with /e/ < ë, amid a situation of total homophony. In most sister languages the development was even more violent, entailing the collapse of all three tenses. Again, in certain conjugation classes, the Classical future tense coincided in one out of its six forms with the pres. subj., as in tegam ‘I shall or may cover’; this overlap could have been at least a contributing factor toward the replacement of the old future, since effective circumlocutions

---

3 Illustrative of conflicts within the Gmc. strain of English, as distinct from the afore-cited case of straight vs. strait, is the dialectal polarization of gate ‘gateway’ (< OE gatu, the pl. of gate) and gates ‘road’. On impact, neither word was entirely discarded; but, as E. R. Williams 1944 has demonstrated, speakers manipulated (a) g- and y- variants and (b) clashing singular and plural forms so deftly as, in the end, to achieve adequate differentiation.

4 The half-brackets, following Jakob Jud, indicate that a form is cited as a representative of a class.
were immediately available, and also because speakers had been sensitized to the obnoxiousness of such ambiguity where helpful distinctions were freely drawn in other wings of the edifice (cf. the remaining paradigms of these very same tenses as well of other categories of verbs: "DÉLEAM" ‘I may destroy’ vs. "DÉLÉBÔ" ‘I shall destroy’). The true nature of these processes was long ago correctly identified by a few scholars. (Grandgent 1907, §410, took a position much closer to the one here advocated than did Meyer-Lübke 1920, §186, whose view drew a qualifying comment from his translator, A. Castro.)

For category (c), one may adduce, by way of illustration, the oft-assumed partial coalescence of OFr. a(i)mer ‘to love’ (< AMÆRE) and esmer ‘to value, esteem’ (< AEST-IMÆRE, -UMÆRE) in mod. aimer, conceivably recognizable in certain phraseological and paremiological details. The conflation of two Latin tenses in Hispano-Romance has just been mentioned; grammatically, the merger was splendidly consummated, since by endowing the newly-emergent tense with the (previously unknown) function of the fut. subj., speakers salvaged vital ingredients of the two elements so felicitously fused (perf. subj. and past fut. ind.) Also, the Latin prepositions PER ‘through(out), all over, along, by means of, for the sake of, with a view to’ and PRÔ ‘before, in the presence of, in behalf of, instead of, in return for, in comparison with’ influenced each other in many significant ways, as a consequence of striking formal resemblance and initially-peripheral semantic affinity. Pressure of PER and other prepositions (including INTER ‘between’), plus the pre-existence of the prefixal vars. POR-, POL- (in, say, POrRIGERE ‘to reach out’, POLlicère ‘to promise’, PollüCère ‘to offer, serve’), sufficed to pit against PER not PRÔ, but refashioned *POR; witness par beside pour in French. In certain cognate languages, the two prepositions merged, in favor of either per (as in Tuscan and Rumanian) or por (as in Spanish, including its medieval prelude); whenever the resultant form, the local heir to the two prepositions controlled a vast syntactic domain, equal to the sum of the two domains conjoined. There may have been subsidiary factors at work (pressure from PROPTER ‘on account of’, as visualized by Rajna 1927, or wavering of unstressed o~e after bilabials); but they hardly blurred the main outline.

The compression into a single wide-gauged verb of a(i)mer and esmer exemplifies lexical merger; the felicitous reconciliation of the two ancestral tenses in Hispano-Romance illustrates grammatical merger; the tendential confluence of PER and PRÔ/POR occupies the middle ground between these two extremes—inasmuch as prepositions unquestionably constitute neatly-circumscribed lexical items, but actually function almost like inflectional and derivational morphemes, e.g. through their obligatory co-occurrence with other words. Awareness of this intermediate status of prepositions may yet stand us in good stead when we shift attention, as promised, to Sp. hacia vs. hasta.\footnote{I refrain from drawing here certain very fine distinctions, based on unverifiable psychological assumptions, proposed by Wartburg (1922, 1925:16–17), as between crossing (x, y, and z all three, in the end, co-exist), contamination (as when CRASSUS yields Fr. gras ‘fat’ under the influence of gros ‘thick’), and folk etymology (a regrouping of word families).}

\footnote{The best-known of Gilliéron’s shorter studies, many of them slanted in the direction of homonymics, are presumably those collected in Gilliéron & Roques 1912, though the problem...}
THE DIACHRONIC DIFFERENTIATION OF NEAR-HOMOPHONES

No watertight division can be claimed for the three categories of outcome from the homophonic tensions so far isolated. Thus one observes a gradual transition from (a) the survival of both partners, provided it is achieved at the expense of some ground lost by either, all the way to (b) almost-total, or even total, extinction of the weaker contender. Again, if in the course of (c) merger, the nascent product (z) absorbs very little grammatical or semantic substance from either x or y, and if the loser, within the original pair, disappears altogether in the process—or, better still, if both x and y, after the crystallization of z, cease to exist independently—then z, ideally the sole survivor, gives the impression of representing little more than a slightly bolstered descendant from the more resistant of the original partners. All of this takes us practically to the threshold of category (b).

1.1. In addition to these three recurrent, ‘classic’ situations, which represent the core of historical homonymies, there exists a fourth context (d), by no means unfamiliar to scholars, but usually examined (or rather hinted at) under a different rubric, e.g. under inflection (‘special cases’) or analogy. Let us label it DIACHRONIC DIFFERENTIATION. Thus, older Italian possessed, among its impf. ind. sg. endings, -ava both for the 1st and the 3rd persons, in faithful perpetuation of -aba(M) and -aba(T); but the present trend runs toward contrasting 1 -avo with 3 -ava, presumably in harmony with comparable pre-existent oppositions in the other principal tenses of the indicative: pres. -o vs. -a, pret. -ai vs. -d, fut. -(er)ò vs. -(er)à.

continued to haunt him in later years; he even polemicized with Saussure's position toward folk etymology. For a sympathetic survey of Gilliéron's entire œuvre, as well as of characteristic writings by his immediate followers and imitators (with repeated attention to homophony), see Jordan & Orr (1937:144–278). Some of Orr's own long-scattered lexical studies (assembled only in 1953, 1962, and 1963, when they had become almost anachronistic, but going back mostly to an earlier period), as well as certain monographs bracketing World War I, viz. Thorn 1913 and Gamillscheg 1922, assuredly signaled the high-water mark of the fad and justified the strong qualifications made, first, in a philosophical key by Richter 1926, and subsequently—on a minor scale—by Marchand (1954:105–7), at that point in his career no less a Romanist than an Anglist.

The pioneering task of testing on slices of (British) Eng. material some of the techniques and more theoretical approaches developed by Romance lexicologists was undertaken by Menner 1936, which led to E. R. Williams 1944—which in turn provoked a few critical reactions, all of them disappointingly short. The monograph, clearly, appeared at the wrong moment and made no impact.

Not long thereafter, I devoted explicitly to this topic two exploratory Hispano-Romance studies (1952, 1953); of these, the first concerned itself with the lexical 'knot' or 'tangle' pech-. In addition, I have touched upon homonymy more or less incidentally in a number of other articles, written for the most part at an earlier stage; this applies particularly to the analysis of the clash (here already alluded to) between asseitar and aceitar in older Portuguese (1949b:223–4; see also 207–8 on sectari 'to follow' vs. *sectar 'to cut, mow, harvest', with an outcome pointing toward differentiation).

Space is unavailable for any elaboration on previous inquiries here mentioned in passing, except for remarking that the prefixes per-/-por-, pre-, and pos- display an astonishing degree of interchangeability; and that porfa 'stubbornness' < perfidia 'treachery', an unchallengeable etymology, supports the conjecture here proffered (Malkiel 1949a, 1977b). Dobie's shrewd parenthetic remark (1945:271) to the effect that the brevity of words increases their vulnerability to homophony—and that the speakers' therapeutic measures applied to ambiguity and excessive erosion may, consequently, be mutually resonant—has a definite bearing on most primary prepositions.
Also, in archaic Hispano-Romance, the reflexes of es ‘thou art’ and est ‘he (she, it) is’ would have been identical (Proto-Ptg. es, Proto-Sp. es or yes, depending on the heaviness of the stress). Because these two ‘slots’ have been scrupulously distinguished for virtually all other verbs, in all tenses and across all conjugation classes, speakers here introduced the necessary differentiation, the mortgage being the breaking of a solidly-entrenched sound correspondence (Ptg. 2 es, 3 é) or even the unique transplant of one form from the future tense (ERIS): Sp. 2 eres, 3 es. Similarly, in tribute to the fact that mutually corresponding indicative and subjunctive forms have, from the start, been carefully kept apart in Spanish, the one medieval set of exceptions, namely 4 vamos ‘we (may) go’ and 5 vades ‘ye (may) go’, was removed through introduction of innovative vay-amos, -áis, unmistakably patterned on hay-amos, -áis (from haber, orig. aver ‘to have, be in existence’); the lone remnant of the old order is exhortative ¡Vamos! ‘Let’s go!’ Portuguese allows its speakers to override its phonemic structure to distinguish, uniquely, between the stressed a’s of cantamos, /a/ ‘we sing, are singing’ and cantamos, /a/ ‘we sang’. The optional spread, in Old French, of the segment -es/-is- from certain forms of the signficant preterit (e.g. 2sg. mesis, presis from metre ‘to put’, prendre ‘to take’) to other verbs—where, far from being etymological, it represented a kind of interfix (e.g. 2sg. fenis ~ fenesis, from fenir ‘to finish’, with still further possibilities of spread to 1/2pl. as well as the past subj.)—drew considerable strength from the differentiation thus concomitantly achieved between corresponding niches in the paradigms of the pres. ind. and the pret. ind. (Malmberg 1945:16–19).7

Most instances of such processes of differentiation pertain to the domain of inflection, where the fairly free play of analogy offers numerous remedies—and where the most plausible alternative cure, namely the total loss of the weaker partner, our category (b), would entail much heavier risks and far more painful sacrifices than in the case of individual lexical units.8 Interestingly, Latin was

7 The type *io cantavo*, in lieu of older Florentine *io cantava* (Dante, Petrarch, Boccaccio), may have spread from such Tuscan urban centers as Siena and Lucca; it was to achieve an irreversible breakthrough only in the mid-19th century (Rohls 1954:331). As regards the competing reflexes of es vs. est, an alternative possibility of differentiation loomed for a while in archaic Spanish, namely yes vs. yet, both forms arrived at under heavy stress; the eventual abandonment of this solution may have hinged on the loss of inflectional -t (Menéndez Pidal 1950:592c, with further clues). As regards the relation of OSp. va to saya, Hanssen (1913, §231), sailing in the wake of Meyer-Lübke, on the whole correctly assessed the interplay of forces, except that at one point he might have sharpened his formulation: For arch. vaamos (from subj. vādāmus), speakers discernibly accepted the help of the model hayamos (from habeāmus) at the very juncture where the hazard of collision with the ind. vamos < vādimus arose, through obligatory contraction of successive pretonic a’s. On the conspicuous split of Ptg. -amos between present-tense /a/ and preterite /e/—though not found in all metropolitan dialects—see E. B. Williams (1962:193), who prefers a radically different, more mechanically slanted explanation. Much of the credit for conjoining all such grammatical varieties of homophonous with their lexical counterparts must go to Richter’s trail-blazing essay. Note the lukewarmness with which a young Malmberg proffered his own conjecture; in later writings (1964: 64), his attitude toward homonyms has remained singularly evasive.

8 Therefore scholars hesitate to interpret the disappearance of the preterit from spoken French solely as a consequence of homophonic tensions, though such sources of confusion may have
distinctly more tolerant of ambiguity between tenses than are its descendants; thus the classical language offered such obstacles to quick comprehension as BIBIT ‘drinks’ and ‘drank’, LAMBIT ‘licks, laps’ and ‘licked, lapped’, MANDIT ‘chews, devours’ and ‘chewed, devoured’, PANDIT ‘extends’ and ‘extended’, to say nothing of compounds of such verbs as displayed a reduplicative preterit: INTENDIT ‘stretches, aims’ and ‘stretched, aimed’ (see Ernout 1953:197). Here Romance broke away from a tradition of ambiguity, either by lexical changes (as when it preferred easily-manageable MANDUCARE to MANDERE) or by the refashioning of the past tense: cf. Fr. boit ‘drinks’ vs. but ‘drank’, Sp. entiende ‘grasps’ vs. entendió ‘grasped’ etc.—and, correspondingly, It. beve vs. bevè ~ bevette, intende vs. intese. Speakers are apt to display extraordinary ingenuity in applying a wide range of ‘tricks’ to disambiguate rather isolated, so-called irregular forms. As a result, in only a small residue of cases in Luso- and Hispano-Romance have the 1/3 sg. forms remained identical in the preterit (Ptg. disse ‘said’, soube ‘learned’, trouxe ‘brought’). Otherwise, through the interplay of analogical -o and of metaphor in its bearing on the nuclear vowel, speakers have achieved differentiation of Ptg. fiz ‘I did’ and féz ‘he did’; fui ‘I (suddenly) was, went’ and foi ‘he was, went’; pude ‘I could’ and pôde ‘he could’; pus ‘I placed’ and pós ‘he placed’ (from FÉCÍ, FÉCIT, FUI, FUÍT, POT(U)Í, POT(U)IT, POS(U)Í, and POS(U)IT, respectively); or of Ptg. vim ‘I came’ < VÉNI and veio ‘he came’ < VÉNI; or of Sp. pude ‘I could’ and pudo ‘he could’ etc.. To this series, one can add, for a fraction of the medieval period, OSp. bevia ‘I was drinking’ vs. bevié ‘he was drinking’ (Malkiel 1959a, 1969).

Granted the importance of inflections, adjoining provinces of morphology deserve to be combed with equal thoroughness for additional illustrations. One telling example, which straddles the zones of composition and affixation, concerns the partial escape, by speakers and (especially) writers of French, from the occasionally misleading convergence of early-medieval adverbial -MENTE (as in joliment ‘prettyly, nicely’, coll. ‘extremely’, doucement ‘gently’) with the suffix -MENTU which served as early as Classical Latin to derive verbal abstracts (e.g. INSTRUMENTU ‘tool’, from INSTRUERE ‘to build up, furnish, deploy’). In neither case could the service of -ment /mâ/ be wholly dispensed with; but a modicum of differentiation was reached, within the crucial antensusfixal segment, through tendential bifurcation: adv. -ément /emâ/, as in énormément ‘enormously’, vs. abstr. -ement /(œ)mâ/, as in achevément ‘completion’—the source of Eng. achievement. Although the agency of disambiguation as the major force behind this astonishing evolution has been challenged, the independent evidence of a typologically almost parallel re-alignment of the locally convergent products of -MENTE and -MENTU in Old Aragonese—i.e. at a considerable temporal and spatial remove—makes such an

been a major contributing factor; witness (je) dis ‘I say, said’, (je) finis ‘I end, ended’ etc.—also, tendentially, (j’)allai ‘I went’ vs. (j’)allaïs ‘I used to go’, among those speakers who fail here to distinguish sharply between /ɛ/ and /e/. For one voice in the chorus of skepticism, see Zieglschmid (1930:170–75), with additional discussion of ideas aired by Reis (1891:14) and Meillet (1909) in reference to similar losses sustained, respectively, in southern and central Ger. dialects and in Indo-European as a whole.
interpretation, 'einem Deutlichkeitsstreiben zuliebe' (as Zieglschmid would have put it), very tempting indeed.⁹

Many promising studies in anti-homophonic differentiation could thus be conducted in diversified morphological contexts; on numerous occasions one inclines to dub such differentiation compensatory or remedial, either because the forms at issue became subject to ambiguity as a result of shriveling (especially if the shrinkage affected word-initial or word-final markers), or, in a less physical sense, because the degree of comprehension itself was impaired. Certain remedial actions border on the status of universals, e.g. the increased role of prepositions where the case endings have been sloughed off, or the enhanced importance of personal pronouns where the conjugational suffixes have been eroded; cf. the evidence of French and English, with countless parallels. Where serial compensation occurs, the process of differentiation is not restricted to a weaker partner, but involves all links in the chain.

1.2. The next question before us is whether this category (d) of a smoothly solved homophonic tension, namely diversificatory change of at least one partner, is encountered not only in historical grammar, but also in the lexicon, if viewed in diachronic perspective. A side issue, familiar by now, is whether, in the process of differentiation, only one partner swerves from the expected orbit, or whether both partners (assuming there are no more than two) reel back, so to speak, from an embarrassing involvement. Where the former eventuality prevails, the classic problem of diachronic etiology arises: What factors made one partner more resistant, or more aggressive, than the other? We shall cursorily examine a few apparently relevant case histories, to sharpen our sensitivity to the ingredients of typical situations; then, as previously announced, we shall turn our attention to microscopic examination of a single, ill-explored conflict, between the two OSp. prepositions faz(i)a 'toward' and fat(s)ta ‘till, until’ —the predecessors of modern hacía and hasta, of which only the latter has a counterpart in Portuguese (até).¹⁰

A relatively simple situation obtains in the case of TRAHERE (var. TRAGERE) 'to

---

⁹ See my initial attack on this problem, conducted with greater attention to Old Navarro-Aragonese (1959b: 689–90), a bundle of dialects in which such dichotomies as learned vs. vernacular transmission and presence vs. absence of epenthetic /r/ tend to produce contrasting pairs of suffixes, like -ment beside -miento (BerCEO); and cf. my more recent two-pronged approach, with heavier emphasis on the state of affairs in modern French (1977a: 89–101). Add the convergence of outrémement ‘excessively’ and autrement ‘differently’, posited by Orr 1953—a conjecture allowed for even by his acerbic critic Marchand.

¹⁰ This is my first attempt to describe faz(i)a and fat(s)ta as counterforces, though I have on earlier occasions examined each of them separately. The shift faza > fazia, within late Old Spanish, is tangential to a paper centering about the fragmentation in Romance of fidúcia ‘confidence’ (1977b). The emergence of OSp. (f)at(s)ta, Ptg. até etc. has been twice contrasted with the perseverance of (de) USQUE (AD) 'until', to the north of the Pyrenees (1975a: 258–60, 1977a: 85–9). Also, (f)at(s)ta has been examined as a foil to its semantic opposite desde 'from', itself a newcomer (ms a). I shall curb the temptation to expatriate on certain minor disagreements among these four consecutive expositions. Let me thank sophisticated audiences on the San Diego and the Berkeley campuses of my university for their critical reactions to earlier oral presentations of the problem (February and May 1977, respectively). Later I received similar help at several Swedish, Spanish, and Italian research centers.
draw, drag, trail vs. TRÁDERE ‘to hand over, surrender, deliver’. Both verbs should, through regular phonetic attrition, have yielded traer in Old Spanish; instead one finds traer vs. trair. We may hypothesize, ex post facto, that speakers, at a crucial point, refused to endow a single sequence of sounds, fitted out as a verb, with such semantic latitude (category c), both because homophony fell short of engulfing the entire paradigm and because intermediate semantic hues between ‘dragging’ and ‘betraying’ were unavailable. Two rival remedies were tried out (more or less simultaneously?): traer ‘to bring’, as the more frequent and (functionally) more vital verb, always remained invariable; while the verb for ‘betraying’, as the two were approaching a state of homophony, fell prey to experimentation. On the one hand, speakers profited from the extensive flux between the -er and the -ir conjugation classes to shunt off the product of TRÁDERE to the latter category—hence, to this day, long after the extinction of the verb, the agentive traidor ‘traitor’ as against (fairly infrequent) traedor ‘bearer, carrier’.

Or, alternatively and belatedly, they coined the paraphrase traicionar (cf. Ptg. atraíçoa) lit. ‘to commit treason’, based on the semi-learned verbal abstract traición (Ptg. traíção, orig. -com) < TRÁDITIO < betrayal, treachery’. In the end, the second remedial operation succeeded, inasmuch as traer and trair, though secondarily polarized as infinitives, were still in each other’s way in major sectors of their respective paradigms (e.g. in forms such as 2sg. pres. ind. traes, 3sg. trae, 3pl. traen, 1sg. impf. ind. traiá, 3sg. traié etc.) If so, (partial) differentiation appears to be a precarious measure, leaving open the possibility of an eventual triumph of category (b), brought to bear on two near-homophones (traer vs. trair); in this particular instance, however, the existence of an alternative, also differentiating in essence (traicionar), cushions the defeat.

Not implausibly, the counter-homonymic gambit TRÁDERE > trair, successful for a while, had repercussions among other offshoots of the far-flung DÁRE family. Thus CONDERE ‘to build, found, store, hoard, preserve, pickle’ gave rise to Sp. cundir ‘to spread’, as does a seasoning or dressing (cf. Eng. condiment). And REDDERE ‘to return’ led to render ‘to yield’, (refl.) ‘to surrender’—its erratic -n- caused by lexical polarization—with a switch -er > -ir no longer strongly motivated

11 Spitzer’s conjecture (1929), though not infelicitous, left various circumstances unmentioned and others unexplained. One is left wondering whether trair, prior to its disappearance at the dawn of literature, had not become a defective verb. Further facts on traer have been brought to light in conjunction with my own inquiries into that verb’s preterit (1968a) and present tense (1974). Corominas—who, bizarrely, discusses this crippled verb and its offshoots s.v. dar (1955:110a)—supplies interesting data on residual wavering, in the Middle Ages, between -er and -ir, -edor and -idor; he makes it clear that traicionar is of late vintage, and was preceded by traicionero ‘treacherous’. Could Ptg. atraíçoa, which looks like a verb of old standing, have cut the path for traicionar?

12 Our grasp of the distribution of -er and -ir has of late become firmer, as a result of probings by Togeby 1972, Nelson (1972:268–82), Montgomery 1976, and Dworkin 1977. Nelson was the first to disclose a correlation between a verb’s alliance with a prefix and its predilection for the -ir class, a tendency which was to be corroborated by Malkiel 1976 and Tuttle 1976 with different, if less finely-meshed, slivers of material. The diffusion of the inchoative augment or prefix -sk- also sharpened the polarization -ir/-ecer; see the latest investigations of Blaylock 1975 and Allen 1977.
by anything, it seems, except the verb's tenuous link to the -DÈRE group (in addition to cundir and tair, also RÌDERE 'to laugh' > OSp. ri-, re-ir). 13

1.3. While lexical differentiation, not unlike its grammatical pendant, thus applies to conflicts between straight homophones, supplying one of four major solutions, it could be that it asserts itself more strongly in the domain of near-homophony—a peculiarly neglected stretch of territory, as Gilliéron may have sensed in the opening years of this century. 14 It is safe to surmise that near-homophony is, broadly, subject to the same remedial processes as plain homophony, including the radical cure of the weaker contender's replacement. Undoubtedly, it also has its special dimensions; thus, in characteristic European languages, any difference in word-initial consonants would not be conducive to a state of near-homophony: Russ. delo 'deed, business' and telo 'body' are hardly quasi-homophones—despite the articulatory, acoustic, and auditory affinity of d to t. In the Semitic languages, where the interlocutors' attention is riveted to every root consonant as one clue to the message's semantic content, any such consonant is fairly well protected from confusion through inattention. Are Sp. tomo 'I take' and tomé 'he took' near-homophones? They would be in languages less neat about silhouetting word stress. Can Eng. on and onto be described as near-homophones?

Here is one example of how lexical near-homophony can be handled. The traditional Russ. words for 'red' and 'black', čèrmyj and čèrnyj, happened to be uncomfortably similar (Vasmer 1953–58: 3.325–7). Though the former has left stray vestiges in rural speech (e.g. čèrëmnyj 'red-haired'), it has been replaced in urban discourse by krasnyj, orig. 'beautiful, brilliant, radiant'—a substitution which also effectively protects the chromonym čèrnyj.15 The solution here chosen pertains to category (b). Note also the gradual advance in standard German of Samstag over Sonnabend 'Saturday', too close to Sonntag 'Sunday'; and observe the artificial resurrection 'from above' of zwö 'two'—preferred, chiefly over the

13 Fr. rendre (tr.) 'to return', (refl.) 'to surrender, betake oneself' has been convincingly shown to owe its medial nasal (at present, merely a nasal resonance) to the pressure of its near-antonym prendre 'to take' < Pers-(AE)-(H)ENDERE 'to grasp, seize'; and Pig. render 'to subdue, conquer, relieve, produce' has been similarly explained as patterned (more in terms of synonymy) on prendre (tr.) 'to bind, fasten, entangle, apprehend', (intr.) 'cling'. But in Spanish, despite a certain semantic overlap (rendir 'to conquer, subdue, surrender, exhaust, hand over'; prendre 'to seize, catch, take prisoner, arrest, pin'), reinforced by the frequency of the nuclear -nd- cluster, the two verbs have in the end parted company as regards their conjugational classes. Corominas (1956:1087) sides with the near-consensus of opinions concerning the spread of -nd- from prendre to archaic OSp. render, but neglects to explain why this connection failed to retain within the ranks of -er verbs.

14 But he did not anticipate any salient differences between full and partial homophones: 'La forte ressemblance peut jouer dans l'histoire du mot un rôle égal ou presque égal à celui de l'homonymie parfaite'; '... un état qui, s'il n'est pas l'homonymie exacte, y ressemble de bien près' (Gilliéron & Roques, 11, 18).

15 Regarding the semantic range of krásnyj, Vasmer is quite certain (1953–58: 1.657) that its meaning 'red' was secondary. The Russian translator and annotator of Vasmer's dictionary (1964–73: 4.344–5) adds only a reference to Herne (1954: 33–4). At present, Čèrnnoe More 'Red Sea' has a Biblical tinge; in other contexts only Krasnoe More is admissible.
telephone, to zwei, which is acoustically too close to drei 'three'. Again, Lat. deus 'god', dea 'goddess' and filius 'son', filia 'daughter' overlapped only in part of the paradigm; in formulaic sequences, dat. abl. deabus 'goddesses' and filiabus 'daughters' appeared occasionally in lieu of standard dets and flets, afflicted with ambiguity.

Merger—and, of greater relevance here, differentiation—have likewise been available as escape routes from irksome near-homophony. The grand alternative to all three patterns of change is, once more, eventual co-existence of the two partners—not necessarily as equals: i.e. essential preservation of the status quo, despite all attendant hazards.¹⁶

1.4. How can one, concretely, expect the process of differentiation of lexical near-homonyms to materialize? In the data-oriented research which has amassed hundreds of local equivalents of a given lexical type (e.g. in dialect geography), it has become apparent that, usually at the areal periphery or at the margin of a social scale, unforeseeable variants come into existence—through blends, analogical adjustments, effects of folk etymology, and other interferences. Such erratic variants (let us label them x', x", x‴ and y', y", y‴, etc.) are, as a rule, quickly wiped out;¹⁷ or, more important for our purpose, they may be held in check and sealed off through confinement to an outlying zone, where they ordinarily eke out a miserable existence and eventually expire. But if the mood of the speech community turns against the continued use of x and y, on account of their unwelcome mutual proximity obstructive of smooth communication, then such pre-existent variants, long-banished to the periphery, may re-emerge—at first no doubt in territories adjacent to their obscure birthplaces or 'exiles', and later, through diffusion in a

¹⁶ Occasionally one is left wondering whether full or partial homophony is involved. In focusing attention on infinitives as the foremost category of verbal nouns, one is free to contend that the decline of OsP. decir 'to descend' < discERERE 'to walk away', under pressure from dir-, de-zir > decir 'to say' (< dicere), coincided roughly with the phonemic merger of [sǐ] and [sǐ], characteristic of 16th century Spanish (give or take a few decades). But if one switches attention to the verbal paradigms, one discovers that—granted, impf. decia fell prey to ambiguity ('used to descend' ~ 'used to say')—the preterit maintained a sharp distinction (dicio 'he descended' vs. dixo /dizox/ 'he said'). This seems to presuppose partial homophony sui generis; in pursuing such matters further, the analyst may have to determine the actual incidence of certain key members of the paradigm, etc. Some broad connection between the homophonically 'ailet' of decir with its impaired viability is practically guaranteed by the fact that in Portuguese—where [zǐ], after their de-affrication, were kept apart by the feature of voice—descer and dizier have to this day peacefully co-existed.

Another borderline case between full and partial homonymy has been reported by Anglists (cf. E. R. Williams, 47–55). The two anatomical terms ear (< OE èare) and near/nere 'kidney' (in all likelihood also of OE stock), though neatly enough separated as dictionary entries, are less so in phrasal context; an ear is dangerously, if not critically, close to a near. With the apparent exception of a single British dialect, substitute words have been called upon to break the deadlock: Depending on the region, either ear is paired off with kidney (as in the standard), or lug accompanies near. Contrast this disentanglement with the state of affairs in German (Ohr, Niere). But Eng. ear₁ (= Ohr) and ear₂ (= Ahre) do not normally hamper each other, because of the safe semantic distance between them.

¹⁷ This canceling-out process was beautifully evoked by Sapir 1921 in the opening paragraphs of Chap. 7 ('Drift').
context of multidialectalism, on a rapidly-increasing scale, until they ultimately
dishodge the originally-favored standard forms from the core areas. Thus, once
speakers feel that x blocks y, they may substitute y’ for y, while leaving x alone.
They also may go distinctly farther and give gradually increasing prominence to,
say, x’’ and y’, at the expense of both x and y—a step that may indeed ease com-
unication between naïve speakers, but is apt some day to complicate the task
of the analyst, since x’’ and y’’ are by definition less faithful reflexes of parental
X and Y than were x and y respectively. There is no limit to variations on this
theme; with almost equal plausibility, speakers will pair off x’ and y’, or x’’ and y.
Single deviations from the norm, with either x or y preserved in its unadulterated
form, are likely to be more common than the radical solution of dual departure
from the anticipated course (with speakers discarding in the end both x and y).\(^\text{18}\)

One telling example of unilateral differentiation is the transmutation, toward the
end of the Middle Ages, of OSp. *pora* ‘for’ into *para*, as if to accentuate its dis-
tinctness from *por*. Initially, *pora* was simply a compression of the sequence *por a*;
consequently, its relation to *por* was that of a compound to the simple preposition
constituting its initial segment, along the line of Eng. *into, onto* in their relation to
*in* and *on* respectively. But when *por* became charged with an extraordinary range
of syntactico-semantic responsibility, the more dynamic speakers must have sensed
the wisdom of transferring some of these to an entirely autonomous preposition.
Spanish is known for favoring *a* before *r* in unstressed syllable (cf. *mirabilla*
‘wondrous things’ > *maravilla* ‘marvel’, as against Fr. *merveille*, It. *meraviglia*
etc.); so the sporadic change of *pora* (unstressed by definition) to *para* causes no
surprise. But the standardization of the once erratic variant represents an entirely
different problem: The neatly-contoured dichotomy *por/para* offered major
advantages over the fuzzier pair *por/pora*.\(^\text{19}\) Interestingly, Eng. *onto* has almost
disappeared from all levels of discourse.

If the model sketched here has any merit, then some of its presuppositions
deserve to be explicated, before we turn our attention to the more intricate case of
bilateral differentiation (as with *hasta vs. hacia*). To the extent that etymological
problems are involved, it again becomes patent that the rise of a word and its
subsequent spread, at times with a major time lag, often represent two thoroughly
different processes, inviting on the part of the analyst radically dissimilar tactics
and strategies.\(^\text{20}\) As regards the general theory of language growth, a voluntaristic
framework—allowing for certain (subconscious, or at least inarticulate) decisions,
preferences, recoils etc. on the part of the given speech community—is far more

\(^{18}\) Though some scholars have been skeptical about the possibility of mutual extermination
by contending homophones (for a hint to this effect, see Meyer-Lübke 1920, 186), Gilliéron
offered actual demonstration of such a phenomenon—apropos the conflict, in certain Gallo-
Romance patois, of spínu ‘thorn’ and spíca ‘ear’ (Gilliéron & Roques, 149–50).

\(^{19}\) The situation in Portuguese was slightly different: There *por* and *pera* < *per* AD abutted
on each other, after the extinction of *per* on the local scene. Moreover, there developed a late-
medieval variant *pra*, which struck root in folk speech. Does *para* represent an importation
from Spanish? For further elaboration on various problems concerning this cluster of pre-
positions, with full attention to Cat. *per a*, cf. Malkiel, MS b.

\(^{20}\) I barely scratched the surface in my previous note on this vital distinction (1968b).
smoothly reconcilable with the posited course of events than would be an alternative model limiting even the imaginative speakers of that community to an entirely passive role. On the operational level, the separation of the strands of two interwoven word biographies demands techniques of analysis similar to those that have been devised for grappling with, say, lexical polarization and with binomials: In all these contexts, the search for the stronger partner or the leader word within a series is of paramount importance. Finally, the special relevance of prepositions to this kind of research has been recognized: Like pronouns and conjunctions, they straddle the dividing line between lexical and grammatical tangles.

1.5. No systematic attempt is made here to place the new findings against any older discussions, for the simple reason that the literature on near-homonymy is virtually non-existent. An exception must be made in favor of Coates’ very competent and, despite its emphasis on Gmc. material, entirely relevant article (1968), which derives added value from its repeated references to Kieft 1938, written unfortunately in Dutch, and from certain Gk. parallels, communicated to Coates by Warren Cowgill. Peculiar to Coates’ approach is his assumption not only of the occasional loss of one partner in a typical homonymic relationship (he does not operate with the possibility of dual loss), but also of the expansion of partial into full homonymy, conducive to a development seemingly contrary to laws of regular sound change (467). Characteristic of the Gk. material is the susceptibility of near-homonyms to shifts in the position of stress. A few Gmc. and Gk. specimens exemplify the preservation of the unendangered derivative, while the simplex is ousted under near-homonymic pressure. On the side of theory, Coates’ major innovation lies in the assessment of his data and conjectures against the background of the distinctiveness vs. redundancy issue. His article and my own thus display only a minimal overlap—but, encouragingly enough, a large measure of reconcilability.

2. The purpose of the more technical section of this paper is to test some of the broader ideas on homophones through meticulous examination of two closely correlated (if my contention is borne out) case histories, namely those of the familiar Sp. prepositions hacia ‘toward’ and hasta (Ptg. até) ‘until’. Since the crucial phases of the two developments at issue pertain to the late Middle Ages, heightened attention will be paid to the full gamuts of the OSp. variants: faz(i)a and (f)a(s)ta. The individual trajectories traced by both word histories have long been known to be highly erratic; despite this forewarning, they have been, it seems, again and again examined separately, with predictably unsatisfactory results. (As a matter of fact, fasta has been more frequently associated with its semantic polar opposite des(de) ‘from’ than with its near-synonym fazi.) The main contention of the concluding part of this paper is that most puzzling difficulties, if not all, can be dispelled once the biographies of faz(i)a and (f)a(s)ta are scrutinized jointly, the obvious implication being their strong interdependence.

This hypothesis of reciprocal conditioning is geared to the discovery that the two most baffling moves performed by the two otherwise etymologically trans-

---

21 See my earlier essays on these topics (1951, 1957: 103–6).
parent words, namely the unexplained gambits *faza > fazia* and *(f)ata > fasta*, occurred at approximately the same time, a period which fortunately does not fall into prehistory. Though either saltatory change may (and indeed should) be explained separately on a low level of causal analysis, one suspects that both leaps, viewed on a higher plateau, represent a single two-pronged attempt on the part of the speakers to circumvent an infelicity traceable to the local influx of Arabisms into the Hispano-Latin lexicon. The awkwardness consisted in the presence, side by side, of two referentially (or imagerially) similar prepositions—both directional in essence, with but a minimal formal differentiation. At the crucial juncture, the dominant variants *faza* /fa\(^4\)za/ and *fata* sounded (and, in written records, looked) almost alike. Even the one remaining contrast between them, namely the opposition /\(a^2\)/ : /\(t\)/, was far from sharp, because of the shared distinctive feature of dentality. The speakers were thus, at bottom, faced with a choice: There was no insuperable difficulty in blending the two words (let us leave unanswered the side issue in favor of which partner), but one could also have tried, by way of strong alternative, to differentiate them beyond the ever-present risk of confusion. Apparently, for reasons that elude us, the prospect of remedial differentiation won out. In each instance it was carried out in an unusual direction, simply because marginal opportunities existed for changing *faza* to *fazia* and *(f)ata* to *fasta*. Had other, conceivably less peripheral possibilities for mutual estrangement been available at the decisive stage, they might—if our broad suspicion is tenable—very well have been seized upon by speakers bent on driving a wedge, or rather widening the wedge, between *fata* and *faza*. Thus the speech community’s inclination to keep ‘toward’ and ‘until’ apart, in order to preclude sporadic confusion and to avert the threat of eventual coalescence, emerges as the basic drive. The circumstance that the menacing clash involved one word of Indo-European and another of Semitic ancestry is noteworthy only to the extent that it justifies the late date of the confrontation.

The choice, for illustrative purposes, of two prepositions (i.e. of relative isolates in a rather highly-inflected language) is clearly advantageous. Where two nouns approach collision, disambiguation can often be achieved through use of the diminutive form for one. With verbs, one is free to assign a personal construction to one contender, and an impersonal one to the other. Such avenues of escape are cut off in the case of particles—an added reason, perhaps, for the speakers’ appeal to bidirectional differentiation.

The paradox in the intertwined histories of *hacia* and *hasta* is that, ordinarily, it is the temporally most remote segments of lexical biographies that are clouded in uncertainty. Here, for once, the reverse is true. At no time has any serious doubt been cast on the derivation of *faza* from Lat. FACIE AD ‘with one’s face to’ and of *fasta* from Ar. *hattà* ‘until’;\(^{22}\) it is the intermediate phases that have so long proved rebellious to analysis.

2.1. As regards Sp. *hacia* (OSp. *faza*)—a word that has sparked relatively little discussion so far—its first noted peculiarity, in all likelihood, is its original confinement to the center of the

\(^{22}\) The transliteration ò is used, following A. Steiger and E. Neuvonen, to indicate that the lengthening of the vowel is, in certain cases, compensatory.
Iberian Peninsula, not unlike *alrededor de* (OSp. *al, en redor de*) ’around’. Latin equivalents of ‘toward’ included:

(a) **VERSUS/VORSUS** ‘in the direction of’ (from *vertere* ’to turn’), often used in postposition: *Si in urbem versus venturi sunt* ’If they intend to come into the city’; *subversus versus* ’upward’. A fuller form was AVERSUS.

(b) **CONTRA** ’facing, toward, against’ (frequently adveretative), the specific overtones being ‘if facing, if placed opposite, if brought in contact’, e.g. *Elephanti tanta clementia contra minus validos ut ...* ’The elephant is so gentle toward [others who are] weaker [than he] that ...’

(c) **ERGA** ‘to, toward’, ‘against’ (for the most part neutral); in post-Augustan authors (especially in Tacitus), generally, of every kind of mental relation to a person or a thing: *prisco erga duces honore* ’on account of the old esteem for the leaders’; *erga Germanicos exercitus laudes gratesque* ’expressions of praise and gratitude toward the Germanic armies’.

(d–e) **IN** (with obligatory accusative), **AD** (both of them less explicit than [a, b, c] unless reinforced by **VERSUS**): *in liberos nostros indulgentia* (Cicero) ’our tenderness toward our children’, *castra movet ... in Arvernos versus* (Caesar) ’he moves his quarters toward the territory of the A.’, *in Galliam versus movere* (Sallust) ’to move toward Gaul’.

With respect to the general situation in Romance, one notes that postpositions have yielded ground to prepositions, and that the functional burden on these has increased through widespread loss of the nominal, if not pronominal, category of case. Consequently, the descendants of **IN** no longer qualify for this particular service. Specifically, one observes the excellent record of preservation for **VERSUS**, now transmuted into a full-fledged preposition; cf. Fr. *vers ce temps-là* ’toward that time’, (en)*vers moi* ’toward me (or myself)’. The geographic sweep is impressive, as one gathers at a glance from Meyer-Lübke (1930–35, §9247): *It. verso, Engad. vers; Friul. viers, Fr. vers*, OProv. *ves, vas* (with the change e > a produced by the contiguity of r before the disappearance of that consonant).24 One also finds, chiefly in Gallo-Romance, the expected quota of compounds: not only *envers*, but also *devers*, which may in turn be preceded by some other, shorter preposition: *Il a les papiers par devers lui* ’He is possessed of the papers’, *Il vient de devers ces pays-là* ’He comes from somewhere about those parts’ (cf. OProv. *devas*).

Another organic survival of Latin usage is the service which Ptg. *contra* occasionally still provides as a directional (not only as an adveretative) preposition, but ordinarily with an over-tone of confrontation (‘facing, fronting, over against’: *contra o sul* ’toward the south’, beside more common *arrimar-se contra o muro* ’to lean against the wall’). Over against these outgrowths of older preferences, one discovers several noteworthy innovations. In the Iberian Peninsula, the most characteristic substitute for the Latin models, aside from *faza*, have been *para*, orig. *pera* (in the West) < per **AD** alongside *pora* (in the

---

23 I am following here, for interpretation, Ernout & Meillet (1959–60:725b); and, for documentation, Lewis & Short ([1879] 1969:1978b). Broadly speaking, the -ors- forms preceded those displaying -ers-; the -um variant is older than its counterpart -us; and adverbial use, re-interpreted as postpositional, paved the way for prepositional use at the Romance stage. Note the separate channel of learned transmission, as in Eng. *versus*. On **IN**VERSUS, Fr. *devers* beside *devers*, *par devers*, and related local innovations, see Gamillscheg 1952, with full attention to the appended bibliography (216–17, 224, 235).

24 It is not unlikely that the fragmentation of **VERSU** into an excessive number of variants contributed to its decline in Hispano-Romance. The rule governing the behavior of *r* before *s ch* was ill-defined (contrast OSp. *almuerno* with Ptg. *almoço* ’luncheon’, lit. ’bite’)—though most speakers would, with respect to **VERSU**, have toed the line of (a)*traversar* ’to cross’, *travesio* ’naughty, mischievous’. Diphthongization of *£* in a lightly-stressed preposition was hardly mandatory—witness *pero* ’but’ < OSp. *però* < per **HOC**; OSp. *pos, pues* ’after’ < post. Variants involving *-as-* could also have arisen sporadically, judging from Sp. *basura* ’garbage’ < **VERSURA**, Ptg. *vass-oira*, *oura* ’broom’ < **VERSORIA** (cf. the similar bifurcation of **VERSU** in Old Provencal). Fragmentation as an obstacle to smooth communication, and hence to the word’s survival—entailing one of several remedial actions—has occasionally been appealed to in Romance linguistics (see Malkiel 1975b).
Center) < PRÔ AD, especially in conjunction with con < CUM; cf. Sp. para con sus padres ‘toward his parents’. In Rumanian one encounters a spectrum of mostly totally different solutions: not only către/cătră (spatial, temporal, friendly, neutral; in older texts mainly adversative), from CONTRA, but also spre (< SUPER ‘above’); aproape lit. ‘near’ (< AD + PROPE); non-Lat. pentru; and, interestingly, față de, involving FACIES/-A ‘face’ (reminiscent of Fr. vis-à-vis, lit. ‘face to face’ and, of course, of OSP. faza).²⁶

2.2. In part as a result of fazi(a)’s practically transparent connection with Lat. FACIES -ēl ‘shape, face, appearance’, and in part as a consequence of the pioneers’ inadequate grasp of the relation between Class. FACIES and its Late Latin var. FACIA, the discussion of the rise and spread of fazi(a) fell flat at the start. At present, scholars realize that the innovative type FACIA, of late vintage, underlies Fr. face and It. faccia (> coll. Sp. facha ‘look, figure, appearance’, a Renaissance borrowing), whereas deeply-rooted FACIES underlies Ptg. face ‘cheek’, Sp. faz ‘face, aspect, obverse’ and its doublet faz (f.) ‘face, surface, right side, straight line’ (with a semantic range in part attained through contamination with ACIE ‘sharp edge’).²⁶ Unawareness of these facts distorted much of the earlier lexicological thinking.

Thus only a small, almost random selection of the previous lackluster pronouncements needs mention. Even before the 19th century, the link with haz was already sensed by an occasional aficionado etymologist.²⁷ With the formal organization of philological research, stray attempts were made to arrive at sharper formulations; thus, Diez referred briefly to Sp. hación as a descendant of FACIES in his selective inventory of prepositions (1858: 453) and, more interestingly, toyed with the possibility of a blend of haz (i.e. fazia) and fata ‘until’ (1853: 500).²⁶ In the early 20th century, Sarofhandy (1902: 210) had no qualms about tracing OSP. faza to FACIA and, paradoxically, (pl.) fazes ‘faces, battle-lines’ to FACIES. Tallgren (1907: 84), an otherwise judicious and sensitive scholar, was uncertain, at the height of the controversy about the OSP. sibilants, whether faza represented a Romance coalescence of FACIA and AD, or a direct continuation of FACTIA(M)—a margin of doubt already rather damaging; worse, he proposed a ludicrous syntactic explanation, unworthy of further discussion, for the shift faza > fazia (a phase which, at least, bothered his conscience). To Menéndez Pidal 1908–11 (296, 683) we owe an extremely important statement, made by him in elaboration on earlier exegetes (Damas-Hinard, O. L. B. Wolff), to the effect that OSP. faza stranded the semantic domains of ‘toward’ and ‘until’. Genetically, the Madrid scholar opted for vernacular faza as a starting point (omitting any reference, as he could afford to do in that medi evalistic context, to the side issue of -za > -zia). Hansen (1913, §102) mentioned fazia in the framework of synaloepha; in his view, fazia crystallized before Proto-Sp. faze, abutting on a, had sloughed off its -e. This reconstruction of events was obviously wrong, since it failed to consider the all-important

---

²⁶ On Rum. cătere (vars. câtre, citră), Mac.-Rum. cătră, căt(r)ă, Mgl. cutru, cotru, Istro-Rum. cătere, see Puşcariu (1905: 27)—who, by excluding prentu from his inventory, ruled it to be of non-Latin stock. One cannot help noting the silence on this score of Meyer-Lübke 1930–35. What about the base PER + INTRÔ, by way of alternative? The two ingredients assumed have both lingered on in the Lower Danube area.

²⁷ I examined the vicissitudes of FACIES (var. -A) and ACIES, as well as the separate trajectory of FASCE ‘bundle’ (which was to become a homonym in Spanish, except for the difference in gender), on an earlier occasion (1949a: 52–61). The derivation of spatial prepositions and adverbs from anatomical terms has always been common, the specific frames of reference being the ‘chest’ (It. rimpetto [adv.] ‘face to face’, di rimpetto a [prep.] ‘opposite’); or, more frequently, the ‘face’ (Heb. lifney ‘before’; cf. ab ante faciem sanctorum in the literalistic rendering of the Itala, Gamillscheg [1952: 216, 219]); or else the ‘hinder surface’ (Eng. back and aback; Ger. zurück, lit. = auf den Rücken; Russ. zad ‘buttocks’, nazad, vzd ‘backward’).

²⁸ The statement of Covarrubias 1611 is unimpeachable in its succinctness, and deserves to be quoted: ‘HAZIA, Latine versus. Dixose de haz, porque bolvemos la haz y el rostro hazia aquella parte. Hazia el mercado, vale tanto como quien va “al mercado”. Hazia acá y hazia acull; hazia oriente y hazia poniente’ (fol. 464v; cf. 1943: 679b; italics supplied).

²⁹ See the following discussion of hasta (f)as(t)a.
chronology of the strata: The original OSP. form was, consistently, *faza*; the shift to *fazia*, and soon thereafter *hazia*, is characteristic of the late Middle Ages and must be justified—if a new explanation is to be proffered at all—strictly within the framework of late-14th or 15th century Spanish.

Of the two difficulties that have blocked the path of earlier biographers of *faz(i)a*, one, we may rest assured, has been definitively laid to rest: While experts may disagree on whether OSP. word-final *z* corresponded to a voiced or a voiceless sibilant, the coalescence of *faz* and *a* within older Sp. folk speech could have produced only *faza*, with [*z*], on the model of such fixed sets as, in nominal plural formation, *luz* ‘light’, *luzes* ‘lights’; *voz* ‘voice’, *vozes* ‘voices’—or, in conjugation, *dizes* ‘thou sayest’, *diz* ‘(s)he says’; *fazes* ‘thou doest’, *faz* ‘(s)he does’—or, in suffixal derivation, *luz*, *luzero* ‘bright star’. By the same token, the conglomeration of *facie* + *A(D)* at the Latin stage would inevitably have generated *faça*, with [s]; cf. FACIAC(-M, -T) ‘I, (s)he may do’ > Ptg. *faça*.

The remaining difficulty, namely the late-medieval leap from *faza* to *fazia*, allows for no comparably simple and clear-cut solution. True, there are cases on record of -io, -ia instantaneously replacing -a, -aa (e.g. *agrio* ‘sour’, in lieu of older *agro* < ACRU, under pressure from *agriar* ‘to sour’); but the formations at issue were predominantly adjectival. Moreover, in most instances the segments -io, -ia dislodged their rivals long before the waning of the Middle Ages. Then again, under the increasing weight of learned words, certain vernacular suffixes yielded ground to their erudite counterparts, so that OSP. *-enca* < -ENTIA disappeared altogether in favor of *-encia*, leaving temporarily just a few traces (*fimienca* ‘fervor’ < VE(R)EMENTIA × FIDE, *simienca* ‘seed’ < SEMENTIA). But there was little more than a hazy resemblance—namely the sharing of an *excrecent* /j/-—between *faza* > *fazia* and, say, *fimienca* > *fimencia*; and, once more, one detects a disturbing temporal discrepancy. Scattered over the dialect map of Spain, one finds such regionalisms as *caria* ‘toward’; but the spatio-temporal record makes

---

28 Not unlike *nadi* ‘no one’, the older form, *faza*, traceable to the Cid, at the outset was used very sparingly in the conventional literary genres. After its expansion into *fazia*, by the end of the 14th century, it began to ‘surface’ at more frequent intervals. Thus, in the Escorial Glossary (cf. Castro 1936, p. 384), it served to translate versus (note the deviant spelling *faca*); in the Juan Ruiz manuscripts, one finds *fazia* in quatrains 833b and 960a, plus the stereotyped phrases *fazia yuso* ‘downward’ and *fazia suso* ‘upward’ (412bc). In the roughly contemporary Grall fragments (Pietsch 1924–25), one encounters *fazia* again in a formulaic sequence (*fazia baxo* and in free use (fols. 275v*, 279r*). The Confesión del amante (Knut 1909), translated from John Gower’s Middle English via a lost OPtg. intermediary version, offers additional examples of spatial formulas: *fazia arriba* ‘up’ (83v*, 137r*, 289r*), *fazia ayuso* ‘down’ (178r*), plus a temporal phrase: *fazia la manñana* ‘toward morning’ (46r*, 277r*); noteworthy is the ‘progressive’ graphy *hazia* (un cabo) (264v*). For further illustrations of *fazia*’s coming-of-age, see 49r*, 80r*, 249r*. Nebrixa 1493 favored *hazia*. For an early alteration of the realistic spelling *azia* (Lledesma), see the preclassical play Auto del repelón, v. 302. Syntactically remarkable is the fact that, not long after 1500, Bartolomé de Las Casas already had recourse to *viento de hazia Poniente* (Bataillon 1953:46).

30 This question was, for decades, very much on Menéndez Pidal’s mind—for the last time, probably, when he was at work on the supplement to his Cid commentary (1946:1198–1200). He favored the assumption of voicing.

31 My own earlier study (1967:1228–39) certainly does not exhaust the subject. Add, on the side of proper names, Eleuterio (Lat. -ERUS), which may echo Desiderio; and Dionisio(s)—which, without the -s, closely matches the Christian name ‘Dionysius, Denis’, while with the -s it corresponds to pagan ‘Dionysos’, tending to crowd out Dionisos. (One is reminded of the replacement of *vedro* ‘glass’ by *vidrio*, lit. ‘glassy’; cf. Fr. *verre* < VITRU.) The entire process contains an ingredient of hypercorrection.


33 One also finds vestiges of the variant *carria* (e.g. in the Sayagués dialect which permeates
it clear that the analogical expansion ('proportional pattern') ran from fazia to cara 'face' (or caria (and vars.) rather than in the inverse direction.

If we now, in a narrower frame of curiosity, ask ourselves whether one detects in any other Sp. lexical family the shift -za > -zia during the critical time span, the answer is that a single major family indeed displayed that tendency. Lat. fiducia 'confidence' crumbled into certain keenly competing variants: (a) semielarned fiuza /fjużə/ and, through dissimilatory adjustments, (b) fiuza and (c) fuzia. During the late Middle Ages, fuzia (and, on a minor scale, fiuza) were rapidly overtaking fiuza, as can be shown under a powerful philological lens (Malkiel 1977b). On the purely formal side, the gradual transmutation of, say, fiuza into fuzia seems to afford a splendid precedent for faza > faziia, given the various identities and near-identities between the two partners (stress, number and configuration of syllables, conspicuous distribution of certain phonemes over key positions, and the like). But, even though fuzia > hucia very opportunely entered into certain racy adverbal phrases, the semantico-grammatical distance between fuzia and faziia (or hucia and haciia) remained forbiddingly great.

Opinions differ on how close the formal and/or semantic bonds between two given words must be for analogical influence flowing from one to the other to assert itself. But surely, measured by any standard of common sense, the precedent of fuzia > faziia could, at most, have smoothed the transition of faza to faziia; it might very well have been a concomitant, but scarcely the major force at issue. Above all, its pre-existence falls short of explaining the sharp increase in frequency which faziia underwent once it was expanded to faziia. This partial inadequacy of our first conjecture may yet become a trump card in our hands after the inspection of the record of faziia’s near-homophone, fata.

2.3. For a variety of reasons (including its ‘colorful’ Oriental provenience), (f)uza(s)ta has for over a century stimulated the thinking of scholars distinctively more than has its paler counterpart faziia. But before delving into its checkered record and examining the conjectures so far advanced, we shall once more be well advised to look at its Latin prelude and at its extra-Hispanic Romance counterparts.

2.31. The devices available to speakers of Latin for suggesting an ending point, in terms of space and time, were, broadly, (a) AD ‘until, up to’; more graphically and specifically, (b) USQUE AD ‘all the way to’; and (c) TENUS ‘as far as, up to, down to’—which lent good service as a postposition following an ablative, e.g. NOMINE TENUS ‘as far as the name goes, nominally’. AD had a much wider semantic range, of course; we have encountered it at an earlier point, used as an occasional equivalent of ‘toward’. TENUS is, syntactically, reminiscent of VERSUS/VERSUS; it was doomed to extinction in Romance, in the company of other postpositions, unless speakers opted to convert it into a preposition. In contrast to VERSUS, they apparently

the pastoral plays by Lucas Fernández); Lihani (1973:229, 391) correctly analyses this preposition as a merger of cara (var. carra, as in Juan del Encina) with (h)aziia, also peculiar to Fernández; and he strengthens his argument by referring to yet another blend, cacia, extracted from the writings of D. de Torres Villarroel, an 18th century Salmantino.

The involvement of cara becomes less startling once we focus attention on such stereotyped phrases as (naut.) orientarse de cara al viento and hablar cara a cara (see Beinhauer 1941:25, 185). In Old Galician-Portuguese one runs across the phrase sair de cara ‘to confront’ (Cantigas, n° 148.5f), while ‘toward’ was normally expressed by contra (Cancioneiro da Vaticana, n° 617; Cantigas, n° 148.7) or, spatially, by em dereito de (lit. ‘straight toward’). For one striking example of the last-mentioned item, from Fernão Lopes de Castanheda’s mid 16th century chronicle História da Índia, see Daupiás (1930:51).

34 For instance, de hucia ‘indeed, forsooth’.

35 Without going back all the way to the controversy between Gilliéron and Dauzat, which raged in the early twenties, I may refer to Schmid’s opinion (1949:55) that certain Romance verbs dissimilar in shape and meaning have nevertheless demonstrably altered each other’s course. But in the case here under scrutiny, fuzia and faziia did not even belong to the same form class.
refused to do this on any appreciable scale, either because the equally venerable USQUE AD had excellent potentialities (which were put to use in certain regional varieties of Latin, including that of Gaul), or because all sorts of innovations happened to sprout—crowding out, within this semantic field, the entire Latin heritage in other provinces of the Empire. 36

Like VERSUS/VORSUS and TENUS, USQUE within the bounds of Latin lent itself to postpositional use: cf. quodUSQUE? 'how far, how long, up to what point?' This particular construction, foreseeably, did not fare well in Romance. Conversely, the composite preposition USQUE AD was long ago recognized as being somehow connected with Fr. jusque, in older usage also jusques 'until'. The difficulty of linking the segment jus- to us- was circumvented when etymologists, becoming aware of OFr. (en)jOSQUE, started operating with the longer phrase INDE USQUE 'thence all the way to', a legitimate gambit in view of the widespread survival of INDE. The further growth of jusque—including such supervenient episodes as the intrusion of u/y from dessus: 'up' < δé s0(r)su, and the strengthening or restoration of s before consonant under pressure from the close-knit series à ce que 'so far as', parc(e) que 'because', presque 'almost', and tandis que 'while'—has been investigated in minute detail, 37 leaving few unknowns. Significantly, for the purpose of our own study, this lexical type extended to Southern France: OProv. enjusca.

2.32. OFr. entrosque a—surrounded by such phonological and morphological variants as entr(u)esque, trosque, tresque, trusque—unequivocally presupposes a base closely akin to the one just introduced, namely INTRÔ USQUE AD. 38 It appears to be sparingly (or not at all) attested in texts, but a less complexly structured sequence can be quoted from Terence: Intron ad nos venit (Eun. 5.7.2), which reminds one faintly of coll. Eng. Come on in! Since INTRÔ meant 'inwardly, internally, on or to the inside', it is not implausible that INTRÔ USQUE AD was originally used in conjunction with such verbs as 'driving, screwing, cutting, sinking, plunging'. The motley OFr. descendants are best recognized by the nuclear /sk/ cluster; as for the phono-tactic encounter of -ô and -û- and their subsequent compression into a single vowel, the results vary substantially. The base acquires major importance for the Hispanist, inasmuch as, beyond the Pyrenees, ONav.-Arag. Entro a 'until' (cf. Tilandier 1951, §§63, 209, 319)—the staunchest rival of OCast. (j)u(s)ta—clearly reflected a slightly concentrated version, something like

36 Certain features in the record of TENUS (which, incidentally, seems to be unrelated to the verb TENÈRE 'to hold') pointed to its gradual loss of vitality. Thus its occurrence in texts fails to extend beyond Apuleius and Ammianus, who consistently assigned to it a secondary meaning ('judging from')—a shift often indicative of decay. Writers (and presumably speakers) wavered between constructions with the ablative and, less frequently, the genitive, reminiscent of Gk. mékhri: NÔTRICUM TENUS 'up to the breasts' (Catullus), CRÔRUM TENUS 'down to the shins' (Vergil). Symptomatically, a rival construction also appeared (albeit rarely) with the accusative which, as Ernout & Meillet explicitly state (685a), was adopted in imitation of usque; the latter thus emerges as the stronger competitor. TENUS entrenched itself in various adverbial compounds: PRÔTINUS (VAR. -TENUS) 'straight on, forward', HACTENUS 'to this place, thus far' etc.

37 The older studies were thoroughly digested, in the tradition of conventional Scandinavian dissertations, by Falk 1934. A later (1952) and much shorter piece is of indirect relevance, showing how Latin particles were strung in Old French to produce lexical items more resistant to erosion.

38 For a brief but effective confrontation of (en)josque and (en)trosque, see Gamillscheg (1952:218). Since Jusque made its appearance as early as the Song of Roland, trusque may echo its stressed vowel. The contrast between (en)trosque and (en)tr(u)esque (> tresque) may be caused by the fact that -ôfr-, in regional Latin, lent itself to contraction either to ô or ô (> uv)—unless one prefers to appeal to the synonymic impact of enfosque on entrosque. On the marginal monophthongization of stressed uv to e in Old French, as in AB + HôC > avuec > avec 'with', see Meyer-Lübke (1913, §98). Tresque may have drawn additional strength from the existence of tres < TRÅNS-, used inter alia as a prefix to sharpen or reinforce the meaning of a verb (see Falk 1955:21).
INTRÒ AD. Such bulky juxtapositions of relatively short standard prepositions (e.g. DĒ EX, DĒ AB, AD IN) were highly characteristic of late colloquial Latin.39

2.33. Tusc. fino a, sino a involve a completely new starting point. Experts are agreed that fino somehow belongs to fine (f.) ‘end’; (m.) ‘aim, purpose’; and the shift from -e to -o in such a particle can be easily explained (cf. dopo, ‘after’ < DĒ POST in the closest semantic and grammatical vicinity; and note the development in reverse direction underlying Q(UT)OMODÔ ‘how’ > OI. como > It. come). But the analysis of sino as a contamination of fino by si < siC remains controversial.40 The entire issue has become unexpectedly complicated by the discovery of (per)hina, fino (prep.) and hin que (conj.) in early 16th century Spanish pastoral plays and racy narratives, dialectically flavored—and, independently, of fin a in modern Judeo-Spanish (Balkan branch).41 An Italianism adjusted, in part, to local rustic pronunciation (f. > h-) is probably involved, but the organic survival of FINE cannot yet be altogether ruled out.42

2.34. Rum. pìndai opens up entirely different possibilities. It is ordinarily traced to Pæne Ad ‘almost to’ (a derivation confirming the closeness, in terms of universals, between ‘toward’ and ‘until’). The var. pàrdai may offer a clue to an alternative etymon: PòRRÓ ... AD ‘toward toward’, with the recurrent sequence pàrdai in being held responsible for the eventual infiltration of the -n-.43

2.4. We must now attempt to integrate the Hispano-Romance absorption of Ar. hattà into the mainstream of events, viewed on a pan-Romanic scale. Over the centuries, hattà has been reflected in the Peninsula by five sharply-profiled lexical types, of which at least two admit still finer subdivisions. Although these five main representatives—semantically interchangeable—could be classified by the territories they have occupied, it seems advisable to subordinate, at least at the outset, any areal considerations to purely linguistic patterns. On formal grounds, then, the five principal variants can be subsumed under two nuclei—depending on whether each constituent, during the crucial phase (i.e. before 1500), began with a vowel or with a consonant.44

39 In addition to Gamillscheg’s oft-cited article, see also the remarks by Svennung 1951 and Wartburg 1952.
40 See Migliorini & Duro (1964:220b, 525b) and Devoto (1966:170a, 395b); only the latter strongly endorses the interpretation of sino as a blend. Unlike the state of affairs in cognate languages, entire families of offshoots (mostly compounds) have clustered around fino and sino: finanche ‘even’, finora ‘until now’, perfino ‘as far as’, insino a ‘even, including’ etc. Persino is noteworthy because, like hasta, it shows the transition to the meaning ‘even’.
41 Abundant illustrations were collected by Gillet (1951:163), though his analysis lacked firmness. Among earlier scholars whose verdicts he cited, C. M. Crews and H. Keniston subscribed, with varying degrees of conviction, to the hypothesis of an Italianism—which, if the conjecture is correct, derives a certain piquancy from its subsequent partial camouflaging. One important detail, namely the accurate meaning of sin que (‘in addition to, to say nothing of”), was set straight in Bouzet’s weighty review (1952:435) of Gillet. The picture is further complicated by the (continued) use of the conj. fin(s) que ‘until’ in Catalan.
42 The ablative of ancestral FINIS, namely FINI (var. FINIE), occasionally qualified for use as a direct predecessor of It. fino a. Ernout & Meillet (236a) trace this idiosyncrasy to early Republican Latin (Plautus, Cato) and liken FINI to TENU (both were used in postposition, governing an ablative: OSSE FINI ‘with a bone as a limit’—or, later, a genitive). To eke out an existence in Romance, FINI, not unlike VERSUS, had to change from a post- to a pre-position.
43 Such, at least, was the opinion of Puščarîu (§1319). Meyer-Lübke, in his revised etymological dictionary, supported PÖRRÔ, for which he also produced medieval Gallo-Romance and present-day Italian dialectal evidence (1930-35, §6960).
44 The fact that, in modern speech, hasta begins with a stressed a can thus be disregarded. True, the variant ASTA, in isolated instances, appears in texts normally credited to the Middle Ages; thus in MS B of the Poema de José (or Yúcf), ASTA (quatr. 27a, 28d) and FastA (quatr. 41a) seem to be locked in rivalry. But the early dating of this copy has recently been challenged.
2.41. Kernel A comprises three neatly silhouetted types:

(1) Ptg. até—characterized (a) by a shift in stress from the first to the second syllable, and (b) by a fronting of the newly-accented vowel—has for many centuries hugged the Atlantic Coast. Syntactically noteworthy is the fact that até is ordinarily followed by a when preceding a noun (including a substantivized adjective), but is allowed to abut directly on adverbs: até logo ‘see you soon’, até já ‘I’ll be right back’ thus contrast with até a volta ‘until your return’, até a médula dos ossos ‘to the marrow of the bones’, até ao infinito ‘to the infinite’, até às últimas ‘to the last’. This modern peculiarity obliquely echoes a very ancient usage—obliquely, because it once involved em ‘in’ rather than a ‘to’: Old Galician-Portuguese here exhibited a profusion of variants, among which ata em seems to represent the basic type. Our best guess is that, starting with the late Middle Ages, ata em tended to be pronounced as a single word—a change in juncture which entailed the gradual assimilation of the second a to the following em /ĕ/, and eventually triggered a dislocation of the original stress; witness such medieval spellings as aeteem. Still another, long-forgotten variant, namely aetes (i.e. atées), shows the optional elaboration, familiar from numerous adverbs and an occasional conjunction in Hispano-Romance, by means of -s; cf. OsP. mentre ‘while’ > mod. mientras, and the like.\(^{45}\) Até would then emerge as a back-formation from aeteem and aetes.

(2) OsP. ata, apparently the most straightforward representative of the Ar. model, was also found in the central dialects, where its second syllable suffered no deflections. Some groups of speakers may have favored the stress pattern até, at least in certain contexts. Ata is adequately, if not amply, represented in medieval texts, but perished at a fairly early date.\(^{46}\)

(3) Arag. enta, or entá,\(^{47}\) has spilled over into Gascon, across the Pyrenees. The prefixes a- and en- very frequently compete in the same dialect or in rival dialects, over most of the Romania; cf. Sp. a-, en-dulzar ‘to sweeten’. Shifts from unstressed a- to en-, and in the opposite direction, have consequently occurred again and again, even in a few borderline cases where

—T. Fornés 1903:260(a).

In the footnotes accompanying this section of the text, the documentation will be skeletal; to flesh it out, readers so inclined may go back to the companion studies identified in fn. 10.

\(^{45}\) For a richly nuanced philological and linguistic analysis of the state of affairs in Old Galician-Portuguese (with the Alfonsine Cantigas providing the prime frame of reference), one may turn to Neuvonen (1951:318-20). Additional details (e.g. the reduction of [ata >] até > tá in certain formulaic contexts, including ‘tá hoje ‘until today’) and the dependence of aetes on foras ‘outside’, certas ‘to be sure’, nuncas ‘never’, bées ‘well’ etc. are best studied under the guidance of Lapa (1930:59, 61). The rise and well-documented occurrence of aetes in Old Portuguese casts doubt on Alonso’s interpretation (1943:34-6) of Ast. hasta s a(g)ora ‘until now’—a phrase in which he invited fellow scholars to recognize a last vestige of these used as a definite article, as in Sardinian and Balearic Catalan. It seems far more realistic to assume the extension of hasta to hastas. In fact, a Vatican ms of the General Estoria contains the passage: ‘un cuchillo en la mano con que está tajando el filo fastas ...’ (example supplied by Teresa Maria Rossi).

\(^{46}\) Ata occurs, e.g., in the Auto de los Reyes Magos, known for its unretouched archaicism (v. 116: ata que lo lo veo ‘until I see it [with my own eyes!’).

\(^{47}\) The medieval graphy ata (which practically never occurred in rhyme) was prosodically interpreted as até by Baist (1891:365), and later by F. Hånsen (§729)—both of them highly qualified analysts. In support of his view, Hanssen produced several examples of what he considered apheresized ta from Old Navarro-Aragones sources, starting with ta mientras in a late 10th century Silos gloss (Nº 195 according to Priebsch’s original, and Nº 226 according to Menéndez Pidal’s revised, numbering). But Hanssen’s argument was knocked out by MP’s discovery (1950:369) that ta mientras echoes TAM INTERIM.
neither a- nor en- is, strictly speaking, affixal—especially in Arabisms: Sp. ajuar ‘trousseau’ beside Ptg. enxoval; Sp. azufre ‘brimstone’ beside Ptg. enxôfre; Sp. azuela ‘chip ax’ beside Ptg. enxô. Because prepositions, in most languages, are inherently unstressed, a switch from ata to enta poses no insuperable difficulty.\(^{48}\) If the question were raised why entà was restricted to Navarro-Aragonese, to the exclusion of Old Castilian, the implied objection could be parried by reference to the synonym (en)tróa < INTRÓ AD, which also lingered on chiefly in the sub-Pyrenean zone. Thus one arrives at the revised formulation: enta is a local blend of ata and entro a, facilitated by the speakers’ widespread vacillation between the prefixes and prefixoids a- and en-. The possibility of a Latin–Arabic blend is nothing new, but its extension to the ranks of prepositions, as here proposed, will yet stand us in good stead.\(^{49}\)

Até, ata, and enta clearly belong together, because both até and enta smoothly lend themselves to analysis as secondary variations on, or deviations from, ata.

2.42. Kernel B comprises two forms: fata and fasta, both abundantly documented in medieval texts. Fasta, which was to outlive its closest rival, has participated fully in the ulterior development of f[—whence such later variants, or rather stages, as hasta and asta. But these vicissitudes of its further growth and spread are not directly relevant to the problem at issue. If fata, in some corner of the Peninsula, lingered on long enough to have undergone the change to (h)ata, it might here and there have coalesced with (equally moribund) ata. The key questions, in any event, are (a) the relation of Kernel A to Kernel B; and, (b) within the scope of the latter, the hierarchy of fata and fasta, with special attention to the ‘non-etymological’ -s-.

Taken globally, the f-variants are characteristic of the central dialects rather than of the western or eastern fringes of the ancient (or even the modern) Peninsular dialect map—though the center, we recall, at one time, also tolerated ata.\(^{50}\)

\(^{48}\) The Eastern flavor of enta—which some scholars, foreseeably, prefer to stress entà—was discovered by Umphrey (1911:42). In Gascon, entà, nta, ta are amply represented, but display a different meaning, namely ‘for’; for ‘until’, Old Gascon used (en)trò a, of which the modern dialects have preserved a lone trace (entò), yielding in importance to dinquí’d, dinco, and other descendants of dÉ-HINC. Rohls (1970:201) traces (en)trò to INTER HOC and (en)ta to INTUS AD.

\(^{49}\) Some fairly recent ramifications of the discussion centering about (en)ta cannot be examined here beyond a few broad hints. A couple of 19th century Spanish Orientalists (Pascal de Gayangos, Eduardo Saavedra), stumbling over Arag. enta, had already thought of the Ar. preposition ‘inda ‘near’, which very old lexicographic authorities (Vocabulistá in Arabico, Pedro de Alcalá) had equated with Lat. apud. In her ambitious monograph on a 16th century Aljamíado ms, Labib (1968:68, 80) took up the thread where the trail-blazers had left off: Placing ta and enta on the map of medieval and modern Aragon (Ansó, Benasque, Embún) with the help of Umphrey (1911, §57), Kuhn (1935:87), and Zamora Vicente (1960:212), she argued that this (entà) need not go back in a straight line to INDE AD, via *enda (as Meyer-Lübke, Richter, and Corominas, ever since his youthful Aragonese study, had maintained in unison), but could well represent a blend of ‘INDA with some Hispano-Latin word. The one drawback of this conjecture, of which she is aware, is the fact that ‘inda referred to a location near rather than a movement toward something. In an elaboration on Labib’s laconic comments, Kontzi (1970), a very competent younger Hispano-Arabist, defined his slightly divergent position thus: As to form, enta is purely Latin; but of its two still discernible semantic kernels, one (‘toward’) continues the Latin line, whereas the other (‘near, beside, next to’) is best explained through assumption of a temporary contact of the base with ‘inda. (In the seventies, the debate has spilled over to some reviewing media.)

\(^{50}\) One finds, in Diez 1853, hasta classed with a rare (spurious?) verb hastar ‘to extend’ which one is, at first blush, tempted to link with the common Ptg. verb (tr., refl.), afastar, OPtg. fastar ‘to move away’—the exact counterpart of Sp. alejar—on the assumption that Sp. fasta or its (dubious) derivative might have infiltrated into Portuguese. Such was the thinking (in the wake of Diez) of Coelho 1890 (s.v.) and, to the last, of Meyer-Lübke. Corominas, who is not unaware of the problem and has marshaled a further piece of evidence from modern Galician (subdialect of Limia), namely fastar ‘to walk back’, toys with the idea of a rapproche-
The consonant phoneme /h/, which represented the initial segment of the Ar. etymon, lacked any exact or even approximate counterpart in Old Spanish. In borrowings, it was ordinarily replaced by f, as in Mafoma (mod. Mahoma) < Muhammadu, the alternative being its omission; witness maḥḍa > OSp. almexia 'sort of medieval garment'; suṭaḥa > OSp. açutea, Sp. azotea, Ptg. açoteia 'flat roof'; faḥha > OSp. atafea 'surfeit'. One telling parallel is on record: Where Old Spanish borrowed an OFr. word involving Gmc. h (at that time pronounced roughly as, to this day, in English and German), Sp. speakers would render the unfamiliar sound by f or zero; e.g. hon[e] 'shame' (from *huṇita) > OSp. fonta ~ onta.89

The residual problem, namely the formal relation of fata to fasta, turns out to be by far the most recalcitrant of all; it has also sparked livelier discussion than the others.89 The observer's curiosity is further whetted by the discovery of very keen competition between fata and fasta, even in the same (or in closely-related) manuscript copies of characteristic medieval texts.84 For a while, fata and fasta must have been used almost interchangeably in the same regions, perhaps even in smaller speech communities. We can thus expect to watch their rivalry virtually under laboratory conditions.

There are on record three different approaches to the problem of the intrusive s of fasta (the tacit implication being that fata, because of its greater proximity to the Ar. model, represents the normal outcome):

(1) Contamination with some other word, of comparable use, may have occurred. The idea as such is unassailable, but its application has so far been gauche. Those who have joined Díez,

81 Steiger (1932, §33) devoted fully twenty pages to the rendering of Ar. h in Hispano-Romance, making allowance for a good deal of wavering. From his data, some of them toponymic, it clearly follows that word-initial ḫ was represented in Old Spanish by f for h, while word-medially the same phoneme was intermittently apt to become zero (I disregard here the sprinkling of word biographies in which ḫ gave rise to /k/); see the three examples cited by Steiger (p. 265). Since the opening consonant of prepositions, for rhythmico-prosodic reasons, often develops as if it were intervocalic, it is small wonder that on Spanish soil hattā should have yielded both atā and fata.

82 Meyer-Lübke (1930–35, §4080) adduces only fonta, conceivably because this happens to be the variant familiar from the Mio Cid epic (verses 942, 959, 1357; cf. Menéndez Pidal 1908–11: 694, who offers one supporting example). But copious illustrations also exist of both the noun onta (Grail fragments, ed. Pietsch, 276n; Crescentia, ed. Mussafia 1866, chaps. 7, 11 [twice], 27; Carlos Maynes, ed. Bonilla 1907–08, chaps. 4, 10, 17, 21, 23) and of the corresponding post-nominal verb ontar 'to put to shame' (Crescentia, chaps. 4 and 22).

83 It seems unprofitable to examine here in any detail obvious blunders made, in passing, by present-day scholars, as when an otherwise well-informed Pottier 1952, apparently in a moment of distraction, declared not only Arag. enta, but also Ptg. até—in contrast to Sp. hasta—to be of Hispano-Latin provenience. We shall further skip the discussion of such older conjectures as Baist's unsubstantiated idea (1891:365) that fata (hata) may indeed have descended from hattā, but that fasta (hasta), até and atē—as well as enta and certain marginally recorded ancient variants (datać, atanesquī)—though related to each other, must go back to some other, still unidentified source. Covarrubias' etymon rás 'divine' right' is hardly worthy of mention.

84 Specifically, the unique extant manuscript (ca. 1310) of the Mio Cid epic usually shows fata in conjunction with some other preposition, of invariably Latin provenience, e.g. fata cabo or fata (dentrō) en; but it also exemplifies the very same usage with fasta a and fasta cabo (Menéndez Pidal 1908–11: 682–3). Again, a single page (730) of the Alfonsoine Primera crónica general exhibits the prep. fasta and the conj. fanta que (also found twice on the following page) alongside fata que.
who argued that *fasta represents a blend of *fata and *faz((a)},\textsuperscript{56} seem to be oblivious of the fact that Old Spanish tolerated, if only peripherally, the medial clusters -zd-, -zt-, and -ct-;\textsuperscript{56} thus *fata and *faz((a), in merging, surely would not have produced a nuclear -st- group. Unfortunately for the proponents of this hypothesis, the -st- of *fata was, from the start, very stable; and there is not a shred of evidence of any archaic variants involving, say, *st-. Moreover, the advocates of this conjecture have neglected to tackle one vital question: What expressions for ‘until’ were, in all likelihood, available to speakers of Hispano-Romance before the infiltration of the Arabism *hatta? \footnote{56}{A very uncertain Diez wondered (1853: 500, 530) whether *fasta could represent a conflation of facia and ata, on the understanding that the latter was an Arabism, while Ptg. (a)tè, OSP. atanes reflected AD TENUS. This cautious formulation, reiterated in Diez’s grammar, caught the attention of Menéndez Pidal—who accepted it as one possible, if not the best conceivable, genetic analysis of fas(a)ta (1908–11: 683). Entwistle (1936:130) subscribed to it wholeheartedly, dropping Diez’s studied restraint. Spaulding’s (1943:61) modified it, laconically mentioning the merger of faz ‘face’ and fata as one of two equally plausible hypotheses.}

(2) The medial pillar -t- may have expanded to -st- in partial response to the lexical polarization desde : hasta. This idea, tossed off by a half-convinced Ford (1911: 227b),\textsuperscript{57} was, more than thirty years later, briefly mentioned by a lukewarm Spaulding (61) as an alternative to the preceding causal explanation, so that one can hardly invoke any continuous school of thought. To those who, like myself, believe in the strong agency of lexical polarization, it seems undeniable that desde and hasta have conditioned each other—though it is the dissyllabicity of OSP. fas(t)a and its variants that has been the prime mover in this context, since it best explains the shift from des, desque to desde, desde que (Malkiel, ms a). Had a strong pressure been exercised in the reverse direction, one would have expected a tendential change from fata, via fata, to something like ffasda, ffasde—forms that, so far as we know, have never jelled anywhere. At best, the co-existence of desde may rank as a weak concomitant in the eventual triumph of fata over (f)ata: If this is true, both partners of the polarization became, on a modest scale, beneficiaries of their relationship.\footnote{57}{‘The s is unexplained, but cf. the s of the correlative desde.’ Ford did not pause to point out that the graphy s here stood for two different phonemes (the [z] of mod. desde is, of course, a mere allophone of [s]).}

(3) The third hypothesis, a phonological rather than a lexical one, has won wide support in different quarters over the last sixty years or so; it goes back to an alternative to Diez’s conjecture, at first formulated almost parenthetically by Menéndez Pidal (1908–11: 683). Over the next two decades, this accidentally mentioned possibility hardened into a strongly-held belief, buttressed by a battery of proofs, as shown by MP’s subsequent writings.\textsuperscript{58} Essentially, he felt that Hispano-Arabic -tt-, in its transmission to a Romance vernacular, could have been dissimilated to -st-.\footnote{58}{It is sufficient to refer here to his last pronouncement, in his prehistory of Spanish (1950: 374–5). His handbook of historical grammar (1941, §129) does not go into details; also, through a slip of the pen, the Ar. etymon appears there as FATTA.}

\textsuperscript{56} Suffice it to refer to LICITTA > OSP. lezda ‘kind of tax’; ACCÉPÒRE > ac(t)or > mod. azor (but Ptg. aço) ‘goshawk’, future-tense forms like conçoit ‘I shall know’; creçrá ‘he will grow’ (where the t is, historically, a buffer consonant); and many similar manifestations of the unimpaired vitality of such clusters; even x’ystré /iʃtré/ ‘I’ll go out’ is on record.

\textsuperscript{57} ‘The s is unexplained, but cf. the s of the correlative desde.’ Ford did not pause to point out that the graphy s here stood for two different phonemes (the [z] of mod. desde is, of course, a mere allophone of [s]).

\textsuperscript{58} The idea of a widespread dissimilation of medial geminates was voiced, possibly for the first time, by Vendryes 1906, apropos of certain Fr. toponyms of Gaulish ancestry, such as Chauourse (Aine), Chauourse (Aube) < *CADUSSI(A); Marseille < MASSILIA; Nemours < NEMÖSSON. MP may very well have read this note and hastily assimilated its message, which Wahlgren (1928: 33–6) later proved to be utterly misleading. According to the Swedish scholar, the forces actually set in motion were (a) hypercorrection (as in velours ‘velvet’ beside, let me add on my own, velouté ‘velvety’), and (b) associative interference (Marcellus and, on a smaller scale, Mars in the case of Marseille). An attempt to explain the -nd- of Fr. rendre, Sp. rendir etc. as an expressive dissimilation of -DD- (Lat. REDDERE ‘to return’ [tr.]) was undertaken
MP operated with two, mutually unrelated classes of evidence: One of these might be labeled by younger scholars as typological; for the other—which he ordinarily manipulated with consummate skill—no better tag is available than philological. Typologically, he observed how, in present-day standard Spanish, atmósfera and atlas are pronounced with medial [ð], and how in sub-standard Spanish, through an even more radical evolution, [ðm] can further advance to [ðn] (witness the pertinent variant of atmósfera), or even to [s(ln)] (as in loosely uttered aritmética). Forearmed with this knowledge, he stated (with far greater assurance than in his work of 1908–11) that certain very rare and scattered graphies which he had meanwhile detected, while sifting thousands of medieval charters—graphies like ade and adta—represented the intermediate form between hattā and fasta, with dt /ðt/ constituting a crucial step in the dissimilatory process -tt- > -st-.60

This interpretation does not hold water. Aside from the detail, by no means negligible, that ade, because of its embarrassing final vowel, hardly qualifies as a stepping stone from hattā to fasta, MP’s hypothesis runs afoul of the crucial fact that (in terms of a pervasive phonological pattern) all lengthened consonants, in Hispanic borrowings by word of mouth from Maghrebi Arabic, underwent exactly the same treatment as their Hispano-Latin counterparts: They were either degeminated, so that -bb- and -dd-, say, emerged as -b-, -d-; or else, in a few special cases, they were allowed to develop into a new consonant absent from the original phonemic inventories of both ancestral languages, as when Ar. -nn- became [ɲ], in perfect parallelism to annu ‘year’ > Sp. año, canna ‘reed’ > caña, pannu ‘cloth’ > paño, pinna ‘pinnacle’ > pena ‘rock’.61

Aside from its vulnerability on the linguistic side, MP’s conjecture seems not to do justice to the paleographic-philological dimension of the issue. Does it not stand to reason that clumsy scribes of the period 950–1100, accustomed to the use of a very awkward notarial Latin, should have waivered between ad (better still, ad tenus, whether or not it is vestigially preserved in much later by Schwzyer (1934:235), against the background of well-authenticated developments so slanted in Late Ancient and in Modern Greek. Whatever the wisdom of operating with non-organic n in the prefixes san-, zam-, son-, zom-, in certain names of exotic fruits (e.g. almen dra ‘almond’), and in an occasional dendrornym (sambugo ~ sab(b)uico ‘elder’), the truth is that redere does not in the least belong with these categories of words; it is distinctly closer to, say, in[n]addere ‘to add’, which yielded a neatly delineated añader in Old Spanish (later añadir), without a trace of consonant dissimilation. All this fully justifies Corominas’ tepid reaction (1956:1087b) to the ill-starred idea of Vendryes.

60 Here are the bits of documentation on which MP’s plea rests: via que discurrir tris y beetron adta lacuna de Vitagan ‘a road that runs [from] behind B. to the pond of V.’ (in the cartulary of the Monastery of Cardeña, A.D. 945—but the copy was executed around 1085); ipso vino adta Sancto Martino (León, A.D. 1069); adte seus pedes (Bezdemarban, ca. 1050); ... non desfásatis que ade capo de anno ‘do not destroy [them] until the end of one year’ (Sahagún, A.D. 1902).

61 With negligible (and easy to explain) exceptions, Ar. -ll- yielded /l/ in Spanish, but /l/ in Portuguese; Ar. -nn-, similarly, resulted in /p/ and /n/, in this order: ballata > Sp. bellota ‘acorn’; gull > Sp. argolla, Ptg. argola ‘large iron ring’; balla’a > Sp. al- ar-bollón ‘sewer, drain’; musalla > OSP. almuzalla ‘kind of rug’; an-nil > Sp. añil, Ptg. anil ‘anil, bluing, indigo’; an-natuřa > OMurc. (a)raora, Ptg. nora ‘chain pump’ (cf. cognate Sp. noria); an-nafir > Sp. añafil, Ptg. anafil ‘Moorish trumpet’; hinna’ > Sp. alheña, Ptg. alfena ‘henna, blight, mildew’. With all other geminates, the reduction of quantity was the central event, sometimes with co-occurent minor adjustments in quality: xarruba > Sp. algarroba ‘vetch, carob bean’; fattasa > Ptg. fateixa ‘anchor, harpoon’; rabb-adha’ñ > OSP. rabbadan ‘Muslim month of prayer’; fazzar > Sp. afla(h)ar ‘pottery’; mu’addin > OSP. almúedano, Ptg. almua- dem ‘muezzin’ (mod. Sp. almuecin is the result of indirect transmission); muddil > Sp. almudi ‘public grain exchange’. Examples can be multiplied almost indefinitely. (I have followed here Steiger’s transliteration but I have omitted some of his examples, to the extent that they involved controversial etymologies such as Sp. gánán ‘farm land’, [fig.] ‘husky fellow’, which not every Hispanist would agree to trace to Ar. ḍannām.)
Romance and the new exoticism (f)ata, not yet entrenched in the literary language? Viewed in this light, adta and adte represent lame compromises between the old ad t(e)inus and the new (f)ata, bringing to life a period of transition and trilinguism (colloquial Arabic, scribal Medieval Latin, and the gradually emerging Romance vernaculars) which was characteristic of the chosen cultural scene.

It bespeaks the universal esteem for MP, but not his followers’ independence of judgment, that this uncharacteristically assailable ‘solution’ should have won wide acceptance. Particularly regrettable is the endorsement it received from a few highly competent and influential scholars, who were unhurriedly at work on this issue.

2.5. If a fresh start is to be made, then the first step must be a temporary veering-away from the disputed Arabism and a return to the pre-Moorish map of the Peninsula. From the scattering of (en)tro a over the entire territory and its heavy concentration in the northeast, intrð AD emerges as the principal erstwhile contender for leadership. There is an off chance, but no real assurance, that intus AD was also represented, at least in and near the Pyrenean zone. If one discounts a few inconsequential circumlocations, there arises the problem whether usque AD—which was so solidly entrenched in northern and southern Gaul—could not also once have extended to a section of Roman or even Visigothic Spain.

The next question is whether, in principle, coalescences of nearly synonymous prepositions, including those of divergent backgrounds, can be defensibly hypothesized. The answer is emphatically in the affirmative, with the qualification that one must often operate, in this terrain, with ‘educated guesses’ rather than demonstrable facts. OPrG. atens, OSp. atanés may

---

62 Meyer-Lübke maintained that it was (1930–35, §201)—on the basis of OPrG. atém, mod. até; but he tended to view OSp. atanés as spurious, under the influence of Castro (1918: 25–6), who recognized in atanés a scribal garbling of ata (or fasta) en es aqui. Even if one disagrees with these verdicts, ad tenus could still have enjoyed vitality in (notarial) Hispano-Latin. Gamillscheg (1952: 217) valued this entry in Meyer-Lübke’s dictionary.

63 Let me mention two exceptions, from among MP’s closest adherents. Lapesa (e.g. 1959: 102) repeatedly subscribed to the operation hattà > (f)ata, hasta, but made a point of leaving the aberrant feature unexplained and even unexplicated. Castro might have used the biography of hasta as grist for his mill in 1948; but he judiciously refrained from doing so, no doubt sensing the hazardous margin of uncertainty.

64 Particularly pathetic were the performances by Steiger (258), who accumulated an enormous collection of valuable data on hattà, delving into the study of Ar. dialects and ferreting out, in the process, such (completely irrelevant) monographs as Růžička’s 1909 treatise on consonantal dissimilation in Semitic, but overlooked the basic flaws in MP’s analysis; and by Corominas (1955: 884b), doubly strange because he accurately pointed out how speakers had ordinarily disposed of the unwelcome -ct- cluster. Corominas apparently did not avail himself of the chance of self-correction afforded him by the successive editions of his one-volume epitome of the larger dictionary. Pellegrini (1972: 60, 214) laconically mentioned Sp. haste, but was exempted from going into details because of hättå’s failure to strike root in Sicily.

65 Polemicizing with Hansen (§733), who had declared (en)tro, entro (en, a, que) idiosyncratic to Old Navarro-Aragonese, Menéndez Pidal (1950: 375–6) extended its territory in two directions, so as to encompass the zones of (a) Old Catalan, and (b) Old Spanish proper (including both Castiles) and Old Leonese. Actually, he could have gone farther, all the way to the Atlantic, since intrð also left stray vestiges in the Old Galician Cantigas composed by King Alfonso. Present-day information on Old Aragonese is so plentiful as to allow the introduction of many more nuances. Thus, judging from Tilander’s authoritative glossaries, the text of the Fuerzas de Aragón favored tro, whereas the didactic treatise Vidal Mayor (1956: 32–3, 118) graphically shows en troa and entro (a) que locked in struggle with the intruding Arabism ata and ata (en, que).

66 Such as de aquí a—which, through a peculiar development, may ultimately usher in the terminal point (Corominas 1954: 244a).
represent a blend of *hattā* and *tenus*; Arag. and Gasc. *enta* may involve a merger of *intus ad* and *hatta*; the archaic scribal blunders *adta, adte* etc. may testify to diffraction of attention, on the part of inattentive copyists, as between *ad tenus* and *hatta*.

Assuming that *usque ad*, though overshadowed by *intró ad*, had lingered on in the Peninsula, its blend with the intruder *fata < hattā* could very well have produced, in some obscure corner of the Peninsula, the form *fasta*, with the nuclei /sk/ and /t/ being both adequately represented in the compromise cluster /st/—given the mutual affinity of /t/ and /k/ as voiceless occlusives. But why should this regional variant have eventually become so attractive to speakers as to dislodge the incomparably better-rooted forms *ata* and *fata*?

Before trying to dispel the skepticism presiding over that question, we must attempt to make a stronger case for the hypothesized contamination of *hattā* by *usque*. While -st- as a compromise between /t/ and /sk/ is not implausible, the broader conjecture here proposed would gain considerable strength if evidence of another blend were independently available—e.g. one involving the coalescence of *(f)ta- with -sec- (as the more clearly recognizable residue of *usque)*. Fortunately, an OSP. lexical unit matching that description as closely as one could possibly hope indeed happens to be on record.

In several genres of Sp. medieval literature (including Alfonsoine prose), one runs across the word *fascas*—which, judging from the contexts, meant ‘nearly, well-nigh, up to’ and whose etymology is reputedly obscure.67 Functionally, it once occupied the same niche in the total vocabulary as *casi* does at present.68 Here and there in one’s readings, one stumbles, foreseeably, over the var. *hascas*; and in Old Catalan, *fasques* left sporadic vestiges (e.g. in *Fuero de Jaca* §196). Juan Ruiz, to whom we owe the best early 14th century specimens of uninhibited colloquial Spanish, had recourse to the compound conjunction *fascas que* on two occasions (quatrains 826d and 964c); in the ARag. legal text *Vidal Mayor*, the sequence *fascas como si* (2.5.34) is tantamount to ‘almost as if’. None of these satellite formations and peripheral uses sheds much additional light on the ancestry of this head of small and doomed family. Thus the etymologist must start directly from coarsely-attested *fasca*; after slicing off the common adverbial-conjunctive segment -as (as in *a ciegas* ‘blindly’, *mientras* ‘while’ etc.), he is left with a nuclear *fasc-/hasc-* which, taken as an indivisible unit, cannot be smoothly traced to any parental language. But if one is willing to posit, once more, the concrescence of *hatta* and *usque*, then the genesis of *fasc-as* ceases to be unaccountable. The picture that now unfolds is one of, at least, two clashes between aggressive *hatta* and gradually retreating *usque*, with slight semantic differentiation of the resulting blends: ‘until’ vs. ‘almost’. The co-occurrence of *fasta* and *fascas* in certain Eastern texts (e.g. the *Libro de Apolonio*) points toward Aragon as the cradle or, at least, the focus of these contaminations. In a superficial view, *fasca/hascas* appear to have completely disappeared in the 15th century; closer inspection arouses the suspicion that *fasta/hasta* may have inherited, and in due time reshaped, certain uses of *fascas/hascas*.

67 The etymological literature on *fascas* somehow lacks class, even if one disregards the untenable starting-point [*] *fazcaso* ‘acaso’ of the pioneer T. A. Sánchez (1779–90). Díez, at least, assembled the three vars. *hascas, fascas, fasca* (in this strange order)—and, by operating with a supposed compression of *hast(a)-cas(i)* ‘bis fast, fast sogoar’, allowed his flair for a certain genetic link between *hasta* and *hascas* to assert itself (1853:500, and later editions). Baist (1883:120) had nothing original to propose, but insisted on placing the main stress on the first syllable, and felt that the var. *fasca*, lacking an -s as it did, militated against Díez’s conjecture. Michaëlis de Vasconcelos preferred tracing *fascas* to the far-flung progeny of *facere* (1886:130), and won a few adherents—not only Richardson (1930:109), but also, significantly, Meyer-Lübke in both editions of his dictionary (1911–20 and 1930–35, §3128).

68 *Hascas* was still used, at the threshold of the 16th century, in the Sayagués (i.e., rural Salmantino) dialect, pressed into service by authors of farces; see Lihani (463), whose etymological comments are, unfortunately, disastrous. The shift from *hascas* to *fascas* was strictly phonetic (cf. the verbal suffix -esco > -ezco and the like); but once it had been completed, secondary association with *hacer* indeed ensued—and this new link, in turn, entailed the coinage of the adv. *dizar* ‘allegedly’ (lit. ‘so he says’), rare in literature but recorded by several Golden Age lexicographers (Lihani, 433).
2.6. Our brief excursus on the extraction of *fascas/hascas* has served a good purpose if it has transmuted a mere suspicion into a near-certitude: Lat. *usque*, represented quite vigorously to the north of the Pyrenees, may also have lingered on to the south for centuries—long enough, in any event, to have encountered Ar. *hattâ*, as can be inferred from both *fasta* and *fascas*. The parallelism went even farther, since in both territories *usque* survived as the second member of a compound—welded to *inde* and to *hattâ*, respectively.

But while the mystery surrounding the rise of *fasta* has, one hopes, been dissipated, it still remains far from clear why this variant, found only marginally before 1300, should—within little more than a century—wholly dislodge (*f*)ata. It is wholesome to remind oneself of the ever-present need to separate one’s account of the rise of a given feature or unit from one’s explanation of its subsequent spread or diffusion.

Here we can, at long last, return to *fata*’s semantic neighbor in the prepositional field of Old Spanish, namely *faza*. Individually, *fata* and *faza* were unimpeachably structured and each might have indefinitely lent excellent services to the speakers of central Hispano-Romance. The only trouble they produced was the bare fact of their coexistence: They were too close in form and meaning to be long tolerated side-by-side by a speech community bent on economy and clarity of its lexical and grammatical resources. (English, in contrast, tolerates *till* beside *until*, as Portuguese does *após* beside *depois* ‘after’; both languages are famous for their comparative lack of tightness in regard to their lexical endowment.)

*Faza* and *fata* were both relative newcomers in medieval Spanish, though for radically different reasons. *Faza* was a new compound (though one formed from old ingredients), produced to give added plasticity to certain faded particles—since its rivals *contrâ* and *versu* had become, pictorially, stricken with exasperating paleness. *Fata* was imported by Moors, whom the local population observed using it, again and again, as sophisticated land surveyors. Being newcomers, both words had formidable rivals at the crucial stage of their infiltration into the general lexicon.

The speakers, obviously, had several choices before them after beginning to fret about this bothersome near-homonymy of *faza* and *fata*:

---

69 Most of the OSp. literary texts, including those traceable to the 12th and the 13th centuries, have been preserved in post-1300 copies whose wording was tampered with (‘rejuvenated’) by uninhibited scribes; thus *fasta*, deceptively enough, emerges as the favorite from the start. Conversely, as Menéndez Pidal has made unequivocally clear, legal documents, which have eluded this kind of tinkering, seldom if ever contain *fasta* before 1300. Thus the prep. *fasta* and the conj. *fasta que* can be traced to a wide spectrum of characteristic texts, some of them dialectally tinted, e.g. *Elena y María*, *Alexandre* (P), *Proverbios morales*, st. 472; *Engaños e asayaminhos*, II, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122; *Libro de miseria de omne*, st. 35, 63, 76, 149, 262; *Danza de la muerte*, 3c; *Grail fragments*, fol. 258r; the medieval Latin–Spanish glossaries made accessible by Castro 1936, s. vv. *hac*, *a(e)-tenus, ubiqueaque, usqucumque*; and a practically unlimited number of 15th century writings. Conversely, one must comb the few untouched archaic texts for sporadic traces of *ata* or *fata*; the latter was used, e.g., in the municipal ordinances of Madrid, which antedate the year 1202. This phase of the inquiry gradually loses its linguistic character, shading off into a pre-eminently philological analysis.
(a) They could have replaced one or both of the partners, which stood somewhat in each other's way, with the aid of miscellaneous near-synonyms (para con, car(r)ia; de aqui a, (en)tro a, enta).

(b) They could have allowed one of the competitors to absorb the other, given their formal and semantic affinity, leaving us with an expanded, almost inflated faza (→ haza) or fata (→ hatá).

(c) They could have differentiated the two near-rivals, altering either one of them, or even both, under some suitable pretext—an opportunity for which a speech community must learn to wait. When a regional variant of fasgas arose, namely fasta—through conflation of hattà and usque—that variant, which in the normal course of events might have been quickly obliterated, on the contrary acquired soon considerable prominence. A seemingly unrelated and initially insignificant lexical episode, namely the triumph of f(i)uzia 'confidence' over another offshoot of t̥dūcia, namely fiuza, somewhat later afforded the last generations of speakers of Old Spanish the model for switching unobtrusively from faza to fazia. In the end, fasta and fazia emerged from these various interludes and episodes vastly fortified and immunized against the hazard of merger.

This concatenation of events, tentatively reconstructed on the basis of philological findings, lends itself to diverse interpretations; thus one may affirm or deny that the speakers' eagerness to keep apart the intimately-related concepts of 'toward' and 'until' was the decisive factor—everything else being but an arsenal of instruments, or an interplay of coincidences, appealed to in an effort to implement it. Whatever one's philosophical attitude toward such bold interpretations, the specific aim of this segment of the paper has been the demonstration, under a powerful lens, of the seldom-observable process of bidirectional differentiation of two near-homophones.
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