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This study traces two shifts in the distribution of the Spanish preposition *para* 'for, in order to': first, a drop in its allative uses and second, its replacement of the older preposition *por* 'for' with purposive infinitives. These distributional changes of the innovative *para*—across its own contexts of occurrence as well as in its variation with the older *por*—demonstrate the crosslinguistic allative-to-purposive grammaticalization path. Frequent co-occurrence of the source elements, *por* and *a*, foments their coalescence, reflected in changes in the orthographic/phonological form of the fused preposition as it loses structural analyzability. Semantic compositionality, whereby there was a discernable semantic contribution of the allative *a* component, is also lost as early prepositional objects designating persons decline. We find this account of the rise of *para*, based on gradual loss of analyzability and compositionality, to be compatible with the quantitative patterns and more insightful than an opaque and implicitly abrupt notion of reanalysis.

1. Introduction

In (1), from an Old Spanish text (the 14th c. *Zifar*), we observe variation between allative ‘to’ (1a) and purposive ‘for, in order to’ (1b) uses of the preposition *para*. In this paper we will see that the proportion of allative uses in [*para* + NP or adverb] occurrences declines on the one hand, and on the other, that the purposive infinitive construction, dominated by *por* for most of the history of Spanish, has become associated with *para*. This pair of changes indicates that the evolution of *para* is a case of the hypothesized cross-linguistic grammaticalization path depicted in (2).

(1) a. *fueron-se* *para* *la* *ribera de la* *mar*  
*go.pfv.3pl-refl* to *art.def.f.sg* shore of the sea  
‘they went to the shore to depart’

b. *para* *se* *y-r*  
*to* *refl* *go-inf* [*Zifar*, 89]  
‘they went to the shore to depart’
Grammaticalization path: 
allative > purposive 
(Heine and Kuteva 2002, 39)

We will show quantitative distributions to support our claim that the grammaticalization of _para_, which arises from the fusion of two earlier prepositions— _por_ and _a_—involves loss of analyzability and compositionality.

The corpus compiled for this study comprises 17 texts, beginning with _El cantar de mio Cid_ (1140–1207) and drawing on two prose texts for each subsequent century up to the 20th. From the 16th century onward, one of these is a peninsular (Spain) text and the other is a chronologically corresponding sample from the _Documentos Lingüísticos de la Nueva España_ (New Spain/Mexico). For each century, approximately 1,000 tokens of _por_ and _para_ with a nominal or infinitive complement were extracted (that is, not extracted were tokens of _por_ or _para_ followed by the conjunction _que_ and a finite verb). Note that counts for _para_ include tokens of the form _pora_ in the 12th and 13th century. Information on the sampling procedure and exclusions is given in Torres Cacoullos and Bauman (2014, 391–393).

Table 1 shows the texts, token counts, and frequency of _para_ relative to _por_ by century. Though not spectacular, there does seem to be an increase over time in the relative frequency of _para_ on this overall measure. As we will see, superior measures are provided by patterns of co-occurrence with contextual elements, or relative frequencies in linguistic subcontexts.

2. From allative origins to the decline of spatial uses

The uses of a preposition or the kinds of relations it signals may be classified as spatial, temporal or abstract (e.g., Delbeque 1996, 252). Applying this classification to tokens of _para_ with something other than an infinitive complement, usually an NP, we examine here the spatial uses of the preposition. Table 2 shows the verbs modified by _para_ in configurations comprised of [VERB + _para_ + NP (or adverb)]. The most frequent verbs modified by a _para_ phrase in such spatial uses are three verbs of directional motion—_ir_ ‘go’, _venir_ ‘come’, _tornar_ ‘return’. Furthermore, middle-marked _irse_ is somewhat more frequent than unmarked _ir_ in the earliest time period (at a ratio of 1.3 to 1, or 56 to 44 tokens). This does not reflect a general fact, since with the preposition _por_ the opposite obtains, with _irse_ ten times less frequent than _ir_ (3 to 31 tokens). The preponderance of directional motion verbs, especially _se_-marked motion verbs (Maldonado 1999, 363–373), is consonant with an allative usage encoding movement to or towards a location.
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Table 1. Texts by century, token counts (*para* and *por*) and frequency of *para* relative to *por*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Text*</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>% para**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th</td>
<td><em>Cid</em></td>
<td>370</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13th</td>
<td><em>Calila</em>, pp. 91–181</td>
<td>406</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>GEI</em>, pp. 5–122</td>
<td>563</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td><em>Zifar</em>, pp. 9–110</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Lucanor</em>, odd numbered <em>exempla</em></td>
<td>572</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td><em>Corbacho</em>, pp. 67–104 (Primera parte, 1–17), pp. 145–183 (Segunda parte, 1–8)</td>
<td>511</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Celestina</em>, pp. 67–214</td>
<td>556</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td><em>LT</em></td>
<td>348</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>DLNE</em> 1535–1569, pp. 109–161 (docs. 17–36)</td>
<td>364</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td><em>Quijote II</em>, odd numbered chapters between 1 and 27</td>
<td>489</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>DLNE</em> 1609–1640, pp. 240–347 (docs. 79–129)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td><em>CN/Sí</em></td>
<td>339</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>DLNE</em> 1790–1810, pp. 611–709 (docs. 258–307)</td>
<td>495</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td><em>Regenta</em>, Chapters 16, 19, 22, 25</td>
<td>433</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>Bandidos</em>, pp. 27–278 (Chapters 1–29)</td>
<td>503</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td><em>Madrid</em>, pp. 87–290 (transcripts 5–16)</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><em>México</em>, pp. 11–172 (transcripts 1–13)</td>
<td>491</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Editions are listed before the References.  
**% *para* in each century combines data from the two texts. 12th- and 13th-century *para* counts include instances of *pora*. Counts of *pora*—*para* are, respectively, 63–1 in the *Cid*, 78–1 in *GEI*, 1–83 in *Calila*.

Table 2. Most frequent motion verbs modified by *para* and their proportion of the preposition’s spatial uses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>Ir</th>
<th>Irse</th>
<th><em>tornar</em>(se)</th>
<th><em>venir</em>(se)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th–14th</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>80% (132/164)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th–16th</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29% (7/24)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th–20th</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40% (19/47)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The grouping of the centuries in Table 2 into three time periods, namely 12th–14th, 15th–16th and 17th–20th, emerged once we considered each century separately. In the 12th–14th-century data, the three verbs of directional motion together constitute 80%
(132/164)—ir(se) alone close to two-thirds—of all spatial instances of para. Repeated co-occurrence with ir(se) is important for the evolution of para, in light of the proposal from typological studies that “in the presence of ‘go’-verbs, allatives frequently take on a purposive reading” (Rice and Kabata 2007, 459) An example would be German zu, whose “allative use [ ] evolves into a purposive one” (Lehmann 2002, 6), as in (3) (intermediate stages not shown).

(3) German zu: allative > purposive > subordinator of infinitive

(adapted from Lehmann 2002, 6)

a. Der Prinz begab sich zur Königin
‘The prince betook himself to the queen’

b. Der Prinz begab sich zum Jagen
‘The prince betook himself to hunting’

c. Der Prinz entschied sich zu jagen
‘The prince decided to hunt’

Formulations such as “take on a purposive reading” or “evolves into a purposive” do not mean an abrupt or even linear replacement of one use by another. We stress that from the earliest texts, allative and purposive uses coexist, as illustrated in (1) above. Rather, “semantic change […] should be manifested in changing distribution and co-occurrence patterns” (Torres Cacoullos and Schwenter 2005, 357).

One measure is the distribution of para across its contexts of occurrence. We find that, while the proportion of temporal uses (e.g., para mañana ‘for, by tomorrow’) has remained steady at approximately 5% to 10% throughout the centuries, there is a notable shift in the proportion of spatial uses. The line marked with diamonds in Figure 1 shows the proportion of spatial uses of para by century (not counting occurrences with an infinitive complement). Even in the earliest texts para expresses spatial relations in (approximately) half (43%–52%) of its occurrences with an NP (or adverbial) object, that is, we do not find an initial period in which para, or its precursor pora, exclusively or even mostly had a spatial sense. Nevertheless, after the 14th century the proportion of spatial uses is no greater than 10%.

Comparison with por confirms that the decline of spatial uses is not a mere accident of genre or topic (for example, we would expect higher proportions of spatial uses in epics). The line marked with squares in Figure 1 shows the corresponding distribution of por tokens. In contradistinction to the decline of spatial uses with para, the stability of por in spatial uses is evident, with a proportion of approximately one-fifth (ranging from 10% to 30%).

In summary, the allative origins of para are indicated by co-occurrence with directional motion verbs, often se (middle)-marked, with spatial uses constituting approximately half of the preposition’s tokens with a NP or adverbal complement.
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After the 14th century, *para* with a nominal complement appears mostly with non-spatial, abstract senses.\(^1\)

3. **Generalization in purposive infinitive constructions**

A second major quantitative change in co-occurrence patterns concerns infinitive complements. Here it is not distribution across contexts of occurrence that provides an enlightening measure, but variation with respect to the older preposition, *por*.

Table 3 depicts the frequency of *para* relative to *por* with an infinitive complement. The two prepositions are fairly evenly distributed (~50%) in this context until the 17th century, after which the rate of *para* increases, such that it becomes two to five times greater than that of *por* (68%, 79% and 85% in the 18th, 19th and 20th centuries, respectively).

Figure 2 compares the increasing frequency of *para* relative to *por* overall (seen earlier in Table 1), in the line marked with squares, with that in the particular context of infinitives (Table 3), in the line marked with diamonds. It is clear that the frequency increase of the newer preposition has occurred disproportionally precisely in [+ infinitive] constructions.

---

1. The 14th century is when *para* definitively displaces *pora* (Riiho 1979, 232)
Table 3. Frequency of \([\text{para} + \text{infinitive}]\) relative to \([\text{por} + \text{infinitive}]\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>% (\text{para: relative to por}) with an infinitive</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th–13th</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>77/187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>84/159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100/219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>92/201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>111/272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>127/187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>183/232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>200/235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Increasing relative frequency of \(\text{para vs. por}\) overall (Table 1) and more striking increase in relative frequency of \([\text{para} + \text{infinitive}]\) vs. \([\text{por} + \text{infinitive}]\) (Table 3)

But is the displacement of \text{por} by \text{para} with infinitives a real linguistic change, or do the rate shifts merely reflect shifts in what is talked about or how it is talked about, that is, change in cultural context? (For such a scenario, see Myhill (1995) on American English modals.) In present-day Spanish, infinitive constructions with \text{por} mean something different from those with \text{para}, the former generally expressing cause (or reason) and the latter, purpose. For example, in (4a), with \text{por}, the subject felt guilty \textit{because} he married off someone, whereas in (4b), with \text{para}, the subject needed money \textit{in order to} retrieve his clothing. It is not inconceivable, then, that the increasing rate of \text{para} with infinitives reflects a shift toward more talk of purposes than of causes.

\[(4)\]  
\[\text{a. } [\text{verb} + \text{por} + \text{infinitive}] = \text{cause (reason)}\]  
\[\text{Se creía […] culpable por haber casado a Tules [19th c., Bandidos, 1.159]}\]  
‘He thought himself […] guilty for having married off Tules’
b. [verb + *para* + infinitive] = purpose

*necesitaba diez pesos* *para* *sacar su ropa empeñada* [19th c., *Bandidos*, 1.154]

‘he needed money in order to retrieve his clothing that had been pawned’

To probe this issue, we look closely at cases where the prepositional phrase modifies a verb, i.e. at [verb + *por/para* + infinitive], since this is the locus of the generalization of [*para* + infinitive].

As a replicable measure, the purpose sense is operationalized in terms of the temporal reference of the situation: counted as having a purpose sense were cases in which the situation referred to by the infinitive is posterior to that of the main (finite) verb, as in (5). Figure 3 shows the distribution of *por* and *para* in purposive infinitive constructions in a sample of the texts. We see that in the 15th-century *Celestina* and 17th-century *Quijote*, purposive infinitive complements are evenly distributed between the two prepositions (50% (35/70) and 46% (28/61) for *para* in the two texts, respectively). That is, in Old and Golden Age Spanish, infinitives with *por* could, and robustly did, express purpose (as in (5)). In the 19th-century *Regenta* (Spain) and *Bandidos* (Mexico), however, the relative frequency of *para* in this same context is up to 90% (111/123). Thus, *para* has generalized in the purposive infinitive construction, largely replacing the older preposition, in support of genuine linguistic change.

(5) [verb + *por* + infinitive] = purpose

*También quiere a mí engañar como a mi amo* *por* *ser rica* [15th c., *Celestina*, 5.173]

‘She wants to trick me as well as my master in order to become rich’

Figure 3. Rate of *para* relative to *por* with a purposive infinitive complement ([*para* + infinitivepurposive] vs. [*por* + infinitivepurposive])

2. The proportion of tokens of [*para* + infinitive] modifying a nominal element is steady over time at approximately one-fourth, whereas for *por* it has remained at 5% or lower. Nouns recurring with a [*para* + infinitive] complement are *esfuerzo(s)*, *facilidad*, *fuerza(s)*, *licencia*, *motivo(s)*, *tiempo*, *valor* and adjectives *aparejado*, *bueno*, *eficaz*, *hábil*, *mejor*, *necesario*, *suficiente*, *útil*, as in *sin fuerzas* *para llamarle* ‘without strength to call him’ [Regenta, 2.321].
Still, it might be argued that even in purposives there may be a meaning difference, such that purposive infinitive clauses with *por* express a nuance of “underlying motive or incentive” that is absent from *para* (Bolinger 1945, 20). How can we confront such a claim? The working hypothesis of the variationist method is that “within a given locus of variability, or *variable context*, […] the competing variants will occur at greater or lesser rates depending on the features that constitute the context” (Poplack 2001, 405). If linguistic forms mean something different, they should be preferred in different (sub)contexts. In other words, they should occur at higher or lower than average rates in certain (sub)contexts (see also Aaron and Torres Cacoullos 2005, 615).

Therefore, we seek corroboration of the generalization of *para* in purposive infinitive constructions to the detriment of *por* indicated above in Figure 3 by comparing the rates of the prepositions in two particular subcontexts that are compatible with purposive meaning. One is [motion verb + *por/para* + infinitive], i.e. where *por* or *para* with an infinitive complement modifies *acercarse* ‘to approach’, *andar* ‘to walk’, *correr* ‘to run’, *descender* ‘to descend’, *dirigirse* ‘to set off, go’, *entrar* ‘to enter’, *huir* ‘to flee’, *ir* ‘to go’, *llegar* ‘to arrive’, *moverse* ‘to move’, *salir* ‘to leave’, *seguir* ‘to follow’, *venir* ‘to come’, *volver* ‘to return’ and other intransitive motion verbs, as in (6). These verbs favor use of [*por* + infinitive], with *para* at 32% (27/85) until the 17th century, after which we observe a reversal, with *para* up to 90% (55/61).

(6) variation in [motion verb + *por/para* + infinitive]

a. *quiero yr ala cort, por de mandar myos derechos*
   ‘I want to go to the court in order to demand my rights.’ [Cid, 3079]

b. *dixo a su hermano que ella quería yr con él aquella noche para traer aquello*
   ‘she said to her brother that she wanted to go with him that night in order to recover that.’ [Lucanor, Ej. 47]

A second subcontext providing evidence for genuine linguistic change is that in which the subject NP has a human referent. If there is a meaning difference between [*por/para* + infinitive] such that *por* expresses a nuance of “underlying motive or incentive” (as claimed by Bolinger 1945, 20), we would expect human subjects to favor the use of *por* and inanimate subjects to favor *para*, since inanimate subjects are incapable of having motives or intentions. For example, with the inanimate subject ‘fortune’ in (8a), the main verb is a stative (*es favorable* ‘is favorable’) and the usage is that of purpose in

3. We take here the stance that the meaning(s) associated with a form are evident in its usage (i.e. usage and meaning are directly linked in usage-based theory (Bybee 2010). That is to say that the contexts in which a form appears, given frequent and sustained application to a given usage, can effect a gradual but permanent change in the meaning(s) that are assumed to be inherent to that form.
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the sense of the utility of a thing. With human subjects (7), however, *para* would seem to express the purpose of an action with a sense of intention. Note that there would not appear to be a justification for considering the instance with *por* with a volitional human subject in (7a) as conveying more of a sense of underlying motive than the instance with *para* in (7b) (besides the circular argument that *por* itself has such a meaning).

(7) [human subject + verb + *por/para*+ infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}]
   a. *quiso turbarme por oírme decir otras docientas patochadas* [Quijote II, 7.680]
      ‘he tried to upset me so as to hear me say another two hundred follies’
   b. *quería vencerla, para no padecer tanto* [Regenta, 2.22]
      ‘he wanted to overcome it [his ambition], so as to avoid suffering so much’

(8) [inanimate subject + verb + *por/para*+ infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}]
   a. *para qué es la fortuna favorable y próspera sino para servir a la honra* [Celestina, 2.130]
      ‘for what is fortune favorable and propitious if not to serve honor’
   b. *toda la natura se remiró por la hacer perfecta* [Celestina, 6.191]
      ‘all of nature exerted itself to make her [Melibea] perfect’

Figure 4 shows the distribution of *por* and *para* in purposive infinitive constructions with inanimate vs. human subjects (of the main verb). It does appear that inanimate subjects have always favored the choice of [para + infinitive] (top figure) (though Ns are low). However, while human subjects favor [por + infinitive] in the 15th-c. *Celestina* and 17th-c. *Quijote*, with *para* at 44% (48/110), the rate of *para* is 89% (102/114) in the 19th-c. *Regenta* and *Bandidos* (bottom figure). This reversal is a second measure of linguistic change: whereas in earlier times intentions of human subjects were expressed with *por*, now this function is served by *para*.

In summary, we first observed a reversal in the relative frequency of *por* and *para* in infinitive constructions overall (Figure 2). We then observed a parallel reversal more particularly with a purposive infinitive complement (counting as purposives those that are temporally posterior to the main verb) (Figure 3). Finally, we considered two replicable measures—the rate of *para* in infinitive constructions with motion main verbs and with human subjects—which again show a reversal of relative frequencies of *por* and *para* (Figure 4). The conclusion is that *para* has generalized as a purposive infinitive marker, as we may represent in (9).

(9) [verb + *para* + infinitive\textsubscript{purpose}]

Together with the decline of allative uses (Section 2), this is solid evidence for the postulated allative \(\rightarrow\) purposive evolutionary path (exemplified from other languages in Heine and Kuteva 2002, 39–40). Such changes are often thought of as reanalysis (e.g.,
Campbell 1998, 284), which has been conceived as abrupt in language change. In the following section, we argue for an alternative view based on chunking and ensuing loss of analyzability and compositionality.

4. Fusion and loss of internal analyzability: \( \text{Por} + a \rightarrow \text{para} \)

It is widely hypothesized that \( \text{para} \) arises from fusion, or coalescence (Haspelmath 2011), of \( \text{por} \) (or its Latin antecedents PER and PRO (Riiho 1979, 13-28)) and \( a(d) \). Evidence comes from 12th–13th-century examples in which \( \text{por} \) and \( a \) appear together in non-agglutinated form.\(^4\) Example (10) illustrates variation between the non-agglutinated and the agglutinated form in the 13th-century General Estoria, Primera parte (GEI), in a near-identical context.

\(^4\) 30 tokens of \( \text{por} + a \) separated by a space (i.e. not agglutinated in the 600,000-word digital version of the GEI (Kasten, Nitti and Jonxis-Henkemans 1997).
The generalization of preposition *para* via fusion and ensuing loss of compositionality

(10) *por + a* vs. *poral* variation
diz q(ue) agun bien es **por al** om(n)e en no(n) seer pecador, & maguer que non es sa(n)cto. como diz q(ue) es otrossi algo **poral** om(n)e del qui non puede seer Rey. [13th c., *GEI*, fol. 57v]

>'It is said that there is some good *for* man in not being a sinner even though he is not holy, as it is said that this is furthermore something *for* the man who cannot be king.'

The majority of the tokens of *por + a* separated by a space in the *GEI* occur with a noun as the object of the preposition and with the definite article fused with *a* in *al*, as in the first line in (10) above. That the construction which most resisted the fusion of *por* and *a* is with the masculine definite article *el* is perhaps due to countervailing force of the contraction of *el* to the preposition *a* (the contracted form *poral* persists into 17th-century texts (Riiho 1979, 236)). Nevertheless, we also find examples of non-agglutinated *por + a* in other contexts, for example, with a pronoun, as in *por ami* ‘for me’ (12th c. *La Fazienda de Ultramar* 13vA25, Ex.6, 7) (Dave McDougall, p.c.) or preceding an infinitive, as in *por a yr a Egipto* ‘to go to Egypt’ (13th c. *GEI*, fol. 108v). Thus, although tokens with a space between *por* and *a* are already a tiny minority, there are enough to suggest that scribes utilized the non-agglutinated combination with some regularity in 13th-century texts.

Indeed, in 13th-century Spanish texts, there is a range of antecedent forms for *para*. Most prominent is the agglutinated form *pora*, as illustrated in (11) and (12). The relative frequency of *pora* with respect to *para* is reported to decrease precipitously from 83% to 15% from the first to the second half of the 13th century (Riiho 1979, 232). Other candidate antecedent forms are *pera* and *perad* (García de Diego 1951, 128).

(11) Earlier form *pora*…
   a. *Vansse pora San Pero* [12th c., *Cid*, v. 294]
       ‘They go to San Pedro’
   b. *estas serien despues pora comer pora ell omne* [13th c., *GEI*, fol. 12v]
      ‘these would be then *for* man to eat’

(12) …in variation with *para*
   a. *para Calatayuch quanto puede se va* [Cid, v. 774–775]
       ‘to Calatayud as soon as he can he goes’
   b. *fuel aparta(n)do toda uia para si & alos suyos*. [13th c., *GEI*, fol. 5r]  
       ‘he divided it [the land] *for* himself and (to) his own’

However, we find inconsistency across and within editions of Old Spanish texts in the realization of ‘*para*’ and its variant forms. For example, in reproductions of the

5. In …*para si & alos suyos* [GEI, fol. 5r] (Example 12), *para* and *a* appear to compete in the same context.
original manuscripts of the 13th-century GEI there already appear unequivocal tokens of \textit{para} (13).

(13) \textit{para} in 13th-century original manuscript

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{...por q fue fecha para pro delos escolares...} \\
\textit{by which it was made for the good of the scholars}'
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

[Solalinde 1930, 287]

In the same text, scribes also used the form depicted in (14). Here the preposition appears as an ambiguous abbreviation without the interior graphemes, displaying only the initial \textit{p} and the final \textit{a} (rather than representing loss of the second syllable (see Company 1994, 11)).

(14) \textit{para}’ in same 13th-century original manuscript

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{et qlo dexaua pa los pobr\textecita et pa las bestias et pa las aues...} \\
\textit{...and that he left it for the poor and for the beasts and for the birds}'
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

[Solalinde 1930, 424]

The abbreviation with a horizontal bar either crossing or connecting with the descender (the vertical line) of the \textit{p}, depicted in (14) was a convention in the transcription of Latin \textit{per} and \textit{pro} (Cappelli 1899/1990, 257). In Cappelli’s dictionary of abbreviations, the horizontal bar does not cross the descender in the abbreviation for \textit{pro}, but merely connects with its left side. Thus, the abbreviations used for \textit{per} more closely resemble the form of the \textit{p} that is encountered in 13th-c. Spanish manuscripts, as in (14) above.

(15) Abbreviations for \textit{per}:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{...}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

Abbreviations for \textit{pro}:

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{c}
\textit{...}
\end{tabular}
\end{center}

We find another example of this abbreviation, this time involving the adjective \textit{perdonadas} (the adjectival form of the verb \textit{perdonar ‘to pardon’}, which is unequivocally composed of the prefix \textit{per-} and the root \textit{donar ‘to give’}), shown in (16). Nevertheless,
this unambiguous abbreviation of *per-* using a *p* with a crossbar does not mean we must conclude that the examples of abbreviated *pa* necessarily represent *pera, pora,* or some other specific variant. Rather, it appears that this abbreviation was used to represent some vowel-/r/ combination, including the combinations of a vowel and /r/ in *pora, para,* and *per.*

(16) los omnes en este año se auiē todas adobar et seer todas pdonadas

[Solalinde 1930, 424]

‘the men in that year all had to dress and be pardoned’

It is clear, then, despite the vexing problem of manuscript editions and graphic conventions, that for a period of time non-agglutinated (*pora*) and agglutinated (*pora* but also *para*) orthographic variants were used contemporaneously. This orthographic evidence indicates that the combination of the prepositions *por* and *a* as independent elements may have persisted into early (13th-century) Spanish. Rather than a linear, consecutive evolution (*per/pro + ad > pora > para*), the coexistence of these forms in the same text indicates that the process of the fusion of the two (groups of) structural elements was not only gradual but also characterized by variation (cf. Weinreich, Labov and Herzog 1968).

The phonological course by which the first vowel in forms spelled *pera* and *pora* ultimately became /a/ in the modern *para* has been addressed by several scholars, appealing to various phonological processes, include lowering of the *e* in *pera* before a rhotic (e.g., García de Diego 1951, 128) and vocalic assimilation (e.g., Hanssen 1945, §726). Regardless of the exact course of events, the ultimate resolution of the variation between *pora* and *para* in the single modern form *para* is further evidence of the formal fusion of the erstwhile *per/pro* and *ad.* It is telling that as *para* wins out over *pora* by the end of the 14th century, the agglutinated form is already effectively unrecognizable (from both a phonological and an orthographic perspective) as consisting of two independent elements.

A requirement for the creation of a new unit is frequent co-occurrence of its erstwhile component parts. From the perspective of a usage-based approach to grammatical forms, a mechanism for the creation of constituent structure is the chunking of

---

6. Or even a consonant-vowel combination, in light of the frequent transposition of the *r* in Old Spanish (Corominas 1980–1991: see *por*).

7. It could be argued that an additional requirement is the “semantic coherence” of the elements constituting the combination (Bybee 2010, 138). There has been discussion of the antecedent(s) of *por* (Latin *per* and/or *pro*), and their respective semantic contributions in
a sequence of morphemes that results from frequent repetition of the sequence (Bybee 2010, 34). In other words, “Items that are used together fuse together” per Bybee’s Linear Fusion Hypothesis (Bybee 2002, 112). The hypothesis of chunking predicts that for the sequence *por + a* to result in a fused unit—whereas *por* in combination with other prepositions does not—the co-occurrence of *por + a* must be more frequent than other combinations.

![Figure 5](image_url)

**Figure 5.** Token frequency of the sequence *por + preposition* (*Corpus del español* counts for 1200s)

Figure 5 shows the token frequency of *por* followed by another preposition for 13th-century texts drawn from the online corpus of Davies (2002-). For the purposes of tabulating co-occurrence of *por + a* vs. *por +* another preposition we count together *pora* ((already) agglutinated) and *por + a* (not-yet agglutinated), given the variation in this period between the agglutinated and non-agglutinated forms (example (10), above). When combined with the already orthographically fused *pora*—more than 10,000 tokens, compared with fewer than 200 cases of *por + de*—it is clear that the *por + a* sequence is indeed of high frequency compared to other sequences, as predicted combination with *ad* (see Torres Cacoullos and Bauman 2014, §13.3 for a recent review). For an assessment of the semantic compositionality of *para*, see Section 5 below.
by the usage-based hypothesis of chunking with repetition. That this fusion was likely complete by the end of the 14th century is suggested by the disappearance of the *para* variant. This leaves only *para*, a form no longer analyzable as a complex structure.

5. Compositionality of *para*, and its loss

We saw (Section 2 above) that one change in the distribution of *para* was the quantitative decline of spatial uses after the 14th century. When we look more closely at those early spatial uses, we see that the change further involves the loss of a particular kind of spatial use. In the earliest texts we find examples in which the subject of the motion verb actually arrives at or reaches their destination. For example, in (17) below, *para* indicates the terminal point of the movement, a use that we associate with the preposition *a* in present-day Spanish. In (17a) the subject not only goes ‘toward’ the *posada* but actually reaches it, as verified by the fact that he speaks to the person there. In (17b) the subject came not ‘toward’, but ‘to’, Toledo.

(17) [motion verb + *para* + NP] = to a location
   a. *E el pleleo con ellos e fuese *para* la posada e dixole su muger commo auia pleteado con los marineros* [14th c., *Zifar*, 87]
      ‘And he argued with them and went to the inn and told his wife how he had argued with the seamen’
   b. *et por ende vínose *para* Toledo *para* aprender de aquella sciençia* [Lucanor, 94]
      ‘And therefore he came to Toledo to learn that science’

The endpoint of the motion may even be a person. Cases in which the object of *para* has a human referent are exemplified in (18). Again, in present-day Spanish we would not expect *para* in this context (but *a*).

(18) [motion verb + *para* + NP_{specific human}]
   a. *Venimos nós *para* ti *que* nos consejes* [13th c. *Calila*, 144]
      ‘We came to you so that you may advise us’
   b. *E el moço se fue *para* su padre, e dixo la respuesta* [14th c. *Zifar*, 21]
      ‘And the boy went to his father and told him the answer’
   c. *y assi me fuy *para* mi amo, que esperandome estaua.* [16th c. *LT*, 7]
      ‘and thus I went to my master, who was waiting for me’

Figure 6 shows the proportions of spatial uses of [*para* + NP] with prepositional objects that are persons, as in (18) above, as opposed to places (as in (17)). Object NPs with a human referent as the endpoint of motion constitute a full third, 35% (50/144), of spatial instances of *para* in 13th–14th century texts.
In this motion-verb *para* construction with a destination that is a person, the human referent of the object appears as a personal pronoun (N = 20) or definite full NP (in which the determiner is a definite article (N = 16), possessive (N = 13), or demonstrative). Furthermore, this NP with a human referent overwhelmingly appears in singular number (92%, 46/50, of 13th–14th c. tokens). From these nominal features we may infer that the referent is specific and individuated. This is precisely the kind of referent we would expect the preposition *a* to co-occur with, in accordance with its use as a dative marker (indirect objects tend to be human) and progressively also as an accusative marker for direct objects referring to persons (on the latter, see Company Company 2002).

We submit that this early *para* use with prepositional complements designating persons indicates that the semantic contribution of the preposition *a* was still discernible in the new preposition, that is, it constitutes evidence for a degree of compositionality in the beginnings of the new preposition (cf. Riio 1979, 99). Following Bybee (2010, 44–45; see also Croft and Cruse 2004, 250–253; Langacker 1987, 292), compositionality is a semantic measure having to do with transparency of meaning, and refers to the degree to which the meaning of the whole is predictable from the meaning of the component parts (e.g. *hopeful* is more compositional than *awful*). Figure 6 indicates that cases are still found in 15th–16th texts (4/15). But the [motion verb + *para* + NP<sub>specific human</sub>] construction disappears from the corpus after the 16th c. (0/51). The disappearance of *para* object NPs with a human referent as the endpoint of motion may be taken as evidence that *a* no longer makes an independent semantic

8. In *Calila*, we count as human the personified animals.

9. In contrast with the semantic criterion of compositionality, *analyzability* is a morphosyntactic parameter, referring to the degree to which the internal structure and individual parts are recognizable; for example, while *pull strings* is not fully compositional because it has a metaphorical meaning, it is analyzable in that speakers are assumed to recognize an individual verb and its noun complement (Bybee 2010, 45).
contribution, thus demonstrating loss of compositionality, as a is completely absorbed into the new, chunked, preposition.

In summary, in addition to the presence of non-agglutinated por + a orthographic variants, another piece of evidence that para is the outcome of the fusion of two separate prepositions, one of which was a, comes from early compositionality of semantic content. We have shown how the semantic measure of compositionality can be operationalized in terms of the contexts of use of a linguistic form. In particular, we considered the kinds of object NPs with which para co-occurs in spatial relations. A robust [motion verb + para + NP specific human] construction in early texts indicates early compositionality. The decline and disappearance of this construction indicates erosion of the semantic contribution of a as it is absorbed into the new preposition, and thus loss of compositionality of the whole.

6. Conclusion: Loss of analyzability and compositionality in grammaticalization

In tracking its generalization, we have seen two principal distribution shifts in the history of para, which is a newcomer among Spanish prepositions. First is the general decline of allative uses that is observed following the 14th century, after which the proportion of spatial uses of any kind fails to rise above one tenth of the occurrences of the preposition with a nominal (or adverb) complement. The second change, beginning in the 18th century, concerns infinitive complements, with which para replaces por, to become the majority variant for the expression of purpose. This pair of distributional changes provides a quantitative argument for allative-to-purposive evolution, a change that has been put forward as a cross-linguistic grammaticalization path (Heine and Kuteva 2002). Thus, change is observable both in the distribution of the newer preposition across its contexts of occurrence and in patterns of variation with respect to the older preposition.

The generalization of para as a purposive proceeds from the fusion of its erstwhile component parts. Support for the origin of para in the fusion of the sequence of por (< Latin per and/or pro) and a (< ad) comes from early analyzability and compositionality. Structural analyzability is indicated by instances, though rare, of non-agglutinated por + a in 13th-c. manuscripts. Semantic compositionality, which involves the independent semantic contribution of the preposition a, is discernable in an allative construction where the prepositional object designates a destination that is a person (rather than a location).

The new preposition is consolidated via subsequent loss of analyzability and compositionality. On the one hand, coalescence of the two prepositions is correlated with their frequent co-occurrence and is manifested in sound change in the new fused
form. We take this as evidence for loss of analyzability. On the other hand, loss of compositionality is inferred from the decline and eventual disappearance of *para* objects designating a person.

In summary, allative > purposive grammaticalization of *para* proceeds via loss of morpho-syntactic analyzability, indicated by graphemic (and sound) change, and loss of semantic compositionality, operationalizable through co-occurrence patterns. In the loss of analyzability and compositionality the evolution of *para* is very similar to that of present-day complex prepositions such as Spanish *a pesar de* (Torres Cacoullos and Schwenter 2005; Torres Cacoullos 2006) and English in *spite of* (Beckner and Bybee 2009; Bybee 2010, 136–147). The conclusion is that what is often referred to as ‘reanalysis’ and conceived of as an abstract and abrupt change is the outcome of gradual processes of loss of analyzability and compositionality.
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