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The Spanish preposition _para_ arises from fusion of older _por_ followed by _a_ via usage-based chunking (Bybee, 2010) associated with the frequency of the sequence. At an early stage, semantic compositionality involving an independent meaning contribution from the preposition _a_ is discernible in allative uses with a destination that is a person. A general decline of allative uses of _para_ with a nominal complement, for both person and place destinations, ensues after the 14th century. In a second change beginning in the 18th century, _para_ replaces _por_ with infinitive complements to become the majority purposive variant. Thus, allative-to-purposive grammaticalisation (Heine & Kuteva, 2002) occurs through changes both in _para_'s distribution across contexts and in its variation with the older preposition.
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1. **Introduction**

The story of Spanish _para_ is fascinating because it allows observation of how a new preposition arises, evolves and spreads in the linguistic system. _Para_ (via its 12th–13th century precursor _pora_) arises from the fusion of two earlier prepositions, _por_ (or its Latin antecedent(s) _per_ and _pro_) and _a(d)_ . A corresponding preposition developed in Portuguese (_para_) and Catalán (_per a_), but not in Romance languages beyond the Iberian Peninsula (cf. Luraghi, 2010, p. 69). Germanic languages, too, e.g., with English _for_ or Dutch _voor_, may be said to have one adposition corresponding to Spanish's two, _por_ and _para_.

From the earliest Spanish examples, _para_ appears in two contexts. One is with NP complements, with a meaning of motion to or toward a location (1a) or with abstract meanings, such as benefactive (1b). A second early context for the new
preposition is with infinitive complements as an expression of purpose, in variation with older por (2b) vs. (2a).

(1)  
\[ \text{para} + \text{NP} \]

a. Spatial (allative)
   \[ \text{Adelino pora San Pedro, olas dueñas estan} \]
   ‘He headed to San Pedro where the ladies are staying’  
   (12th c., Cid, 1392)\(^1\)

b. Abstract (benefactive)
   \[ \text{Yo adobare conducho pora mi et pora mis vassallos} \]
   ‘I will prepare food for me and for my vassals’  
   (12th c., Cid, 249)

(2)  
\[ \text{por} \text{ vs. para} + \text{Infinite} \]

a. noe tendio la mano por tomar la
   ‘Noah reached out his hand to take it [the dove]’  
   (13th c., GEI, 14r)

b. le escogio entre todos pora dezir le su uolu<n>tad
   ‘He chose him among all others to tell him His will’  
   (13th c., GEI, 11v)

After presenting the database (Section 2), we begin by tracing the origins of para (Section 3). The fusion of the two prepositions, por and a, is tied to frequent co-occurrence as predicted by the hypothesis that with repetition, sequential experiences become ‘chunked’ into new units (Bybee, 2010, p. 34). Changing distribution across contexts of occurrence indicates that para evolved through loss of compositionality, manifested in an early [para + NP\(_{\text{specific human}}\)] construction (Section 4). A first overarching change that we observe is that spatial uses steeply decline as a proportion of para + NP occurrences between 14th and 15th century texts (Section 5). A second change, observed between the 17th and 18th centuries, is that the newer preposition, para, becomes more associated with the purposive infinitive to the detriment of the older one, por (Section 6).

2. Data

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 text and the other is a chronologically corresponding sample from the Documentos lingüísticos de la Nueva España (New Spain/Mexico). Texts were selected based on the availability of reliable digital versions (see Company Company, 2006, pp. xxiv–xxvii on the corpus for the Sintaxis histórica de la lengua española).

---

\(^1\) Within parentheses following examples we indicate the century, the abbreviated name of the text (see Corpus section) and the verse, chapter, page or folio number for the edition listed.
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For each century, approximately 1,000 tokens of por and para with a nominal/adverbal 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 para in the 12th and 13th centuries. Information on the sampling procedure and exclusions is given in Torres Cacoullos & Bauman (2014, pp. 391–393).

Table 1 shows the texts and token counts. The editions are listed in the Corpus section. The last column in Table 1 gives the frequency of para relative to por by century. As we will see (Section 6), the frequency increase of the newer preposition relative to the older one from the 18th century onward has occurred disproportionately in infinitive constructions.

Table 1. Texts by century, token counts (para and por) and frequency of para relative to por

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

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

2. The figures in Riiho (1979, p. 234), which include cases of por/para + que, also indicate increasing frequency of para relative to por: 12th 8%, 13th 12%, 14th 13%, 15th 9%, 16th 22%, 17th 23%, 18th 33%, 19th 29%, 20th 26%.
3. Chunking: *para* < *pora* < *por + a*

3.1 Frequency and fusion

Most scholars agree that *para* arises from the fusion or coalescence (Haspelmath, 2011) of *por* and *a(d)*. In seeking evidence for this, we were delighted to find 12th–13th century examples in which *por* and *a* appear together in non-agglutinated form. A search of the 600,000-word digital version of the *GEI* edited by Kasten, Nitti and Jonxis-Henkemans (1997) yields 30 tokens of *por + a* separated by a space (not agglutinated). Example (3) illustrates variation between the non-agglutinated and the agglutinated form in this text, in a near-identical context.

(3) *por + al* vs. *poral* variation in *GEI*

*diz q<ue> algun bien es por al om<n> en no<n>*

*seer pecador. & maguer que non es sa<n>cto. como diz q<ue> es otrossi algo*

*poral om<n> del qui non puede seer Rey*  

(13th c., *GEI*, 57v)

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 (3) above and in the examples in (4). Most tokens of *por + a* separated by a space in the 13th century *La Fazienda de Ultramar* are also cases with *al* (Dave McDougall, p.c.). It seems, then, that the construction which most resisted the fusion of *por* and *a* is with the masculine definite article *el*, perhaps due to counteraction from the stronger contraction of *el* to the preposition *a*. Supporting this account is the persistence of the contracted form *poral*, examples of which are found until the 17th century (Riiho, 1979, p. 236).

(4) Non-agglutinated *por + al* + Noun

a. Spatial/allative

*uinieron se de su uagar por al mont synay*

‘They returned from their travels at Mount Sinai’  
(13th c., *GEI*, 176v)

*fueron se amos el mont ariba por al logar del sacrificio*

‘They both went up the mountain to the place of the sacrifice’  
(13th c., *GEI*, 63r)

b. Temporal

*et lo q<ue> uos sob<r>a`re condesad lo por al sabb<ad>o*

‘And what is left over, save for the Sabbath’  
(13th c., *GEI*, 171r)

c. Abstract

*si era sana ell animalia & q<u>a`l deuie seer por al sacrificio.*

‘If the animal were healthy and as it should be for the sacrifice’  
(13th c., *GEI*, 173r)
Nevertheless, there are examples of *por + a* in other contexts, such as with a pronoun (5a) and a bare noun (5b) in *La Fazienda de Ultramar*. We find a non-agglutinated example of *por a* preceding an infinitive in the *GEI* (5c).\(^3\) Thus, although tokens with a space between *por* and *a* are a small minority, there are enough to suggest that scribes utilised the non-agglutinated combination with some regularity in 13th century texts.

\[(5)\] Non-agglutinated *por + a* in other contexts

a. *prèdre auos por ami,*  
*por mio pueblo.*  
‘I will take you [literally: to/me] as my own people’  
(*Fazienda* 13vA25, Ex.6:7, McDougall, p. c.)

b. [...] *accarrear lenna e agua*  
*por accafia del ciador.*  
‘Bring firewood and water to/the house of the creator’  
(*Fazienda* 29vA24, Josh.9:23, McDougall, p. c.)

c. *por a yr a Egipto a uer su fio*  
‘To go to Egypt to see his son’  
(13th c., *GEI*, 108v)

It has been stated that two-preposition combinations are common in Spanish (e.g., Alonso & Henríquez Ureña, 1959, § 230; Keniston, 1937, § 41.41). Besides *por + a*, we also find sequences of *por* with prepositions other than *a*, as with the examples in (6) (as well as with adverbs, for example, *por arriba* ‘above’, *por dentro* ‘inside’, *por encima* ‘top’). Some combinations are more coherent than others; for example, the coherence of *por de* in (6a) would appear to be greater than that of the *por con* sequence in (6b), which is the fortuitous result of the versification (in *por con ellos lidiar*, the Preposition + Pronoun combination *con ellos* ‘with them’ interrupts the *por + Infinitive combination por lidiar* ‘(in order) to combat’), while *por* and *en* in (6c) seem to be semantically overlapping.\(^4\)

\[(6)\] *por + preposition other than a*

a. *la reyna Casiope presciaua se por fermosa & aun por de buenas costumbr<s>s*  
‘Queen Cassiopeia was esteemed for (being) beautiful and for (being) of good conduct’  
(13th c., *GEI*, 216v)

---

3. We are grateful to Dave McDougall for providing these examples. The agglutinated form *ami* (*a + mi*) (5a) appears in the *Fazienda de Ultramar* (see the palaeographic transcription from Arbesú (2011)).

4. We thank an anonymous reviewer for suggesting this formulation.
b. *Grandes son los poderes por con ellos lidiar*
   ‘Great is their strength to combat with them’ (12th c., *Cid*, 669)

c. *comendaro< n > ell Imperio de Costa< n > tinpla a aquel dicho Rey< n > Joh< n > n. por en toda su uida.*
   ‘They entrusted the empire of Constantinople to said King John for (in) all his life’ (13th c., *Estoria de España II*, 285r)

There has been much discussion on whether the original first element in *para* is specifically *pro* (Corominas, 1980–1983, see *para*; Menéndez Pidal, 1940, § 129; Meyer-Lübke, 1890–1906, III.168) or *per* (Hanssen, 1945, § 726). The general meaning of *pro* is ‘in front of’ (with the ablative) while that of *per* is ‘through, over’ (with the accusative) (Allen and Greenough, 1931, pp. 134–135). Alternatively, *para* could be seen as having derived from the confluence of both *pro* and *per* with *ad*. Viewing the former as conveying a sense of orientation and the latter a trajectory through space, Melis (1992, pp. 71–76) suggests that in combination with *ad*, contributing its own sense of approaching a limit, the prepositions yield *para*’s basic meaning of a trajectory oriented toward a limit. While consensus has not been reached, examples of combinations of *a(d)* with both *per* and *pro* are attested in Medieval Latin documents in Spain (9th–12th centuries), with spatial as well as abstract meanings, illustrated in (7a) and (7b), respectively (Melis, 1992, p. 77). These seem similar to the 13th century Spanish uses of *por + a* illustrated in the set of examples in (4) above.

(7) *per/pro + ad + NP in Medieval Latin* (Spain; cited by Melis, 1992, p. 77)

a. Spatial
   *vadit de Villanova per ad Sancta Maria*
   ‘[he] goes from Villanova towards Santa Maria’ *(Fueros)*

b. *jlla karera que descure pro ad Uiginagio*
   ‘The path that runs back to Viginagio’ *(Crestomatía)*

c. Abstract
   *pectet V solidos, medios per ad opus de illo senior*
   ‘(he) pays five solidos, half for the lord’s work’ *(Fueros)*

   *Dono […] pro ad illo ganato […] una baccariza*
   ‘I give […] for the herd […] a corral/enclosure’ *(Cartulario)*

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 structure, a mechanism for the creation of constituent structure is the “chunking” of a sequence of morphemes that results from frequent repetition of the sequence (Bybee, 2010, p. 34; cf. Moyna, in this volume). “Items that are used together fuse together” per Bybee’s Linear Fusion Hypothesis (Bybee, 2002, p. 112). This may occur even in the absence of semantic coherence, as with the
contraction of auxiliary will to the first person pronoun I rather than to the following verb (Bybee, 2010, pp. 136–138). Bybee (2002) shows that I will or I’ll is twice as frequent as will be, the most frequent will + Verb combination (in the Switchboard corpus).

In accordance with the hypothesis of chunking, the fused unit (> pora/para) would follow from the repeated sequence of the two prepositions por + a. The prediction is that for the sequence por + a to result in a fused unit (where por in combination with other prepositions does not), the co-occurrence of por + a must be more frequent than other combinations. The data support this prediction, as illustrated in Figure 1 below.
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**Figure 1.** Token frequency por + preposition (*Corpus del español* counts for 1200s)

Figure 1 shows token frequency counts for 13th century texts drawn from the online corpus of Mark Davies. At first glance, the por + a sequence may appear to not be much more frequent than the other por + preposition sequences (and indeed, less frequent than por + de). However, for the purposes of tabulating
co-occurrence of por + a vs. por + another preposition, we count together pora
and por + a (i.e., all cases as in (1), (2b), (3), (4) and (5)) given variation in this
period between the agglutinated and non-agglutinated forms (example (3), above)
and the lack of consistency in transcriptions (see below). 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 far more
common than any of the other combinations.

3.2 Precursors, variant forms and palaeographic abbreviations

Earlier Spanish texts are marked by variation between the modern para and the
older form pora. We find 63 tokens of pora in the 12th or 13th century Cid (8a),
compared to one token of para (9a), denoting a spatial relation (a destination). In
the analysed portion of the 13th century GEI, we count 83 tokens of pora (8b) ver-
sus only one of para (9b). In the 14th century Zifar, however, there are no tokens
of pora, and in Lucanor there is just one (Exemplo XLII, p. 219), the latest in our
corpus.

(8) Earlier form pora
a. Vansse pora San Pero
   'They go to San Pedro' (12th c., Cid, 294)
b. estas serien despues pora comer pora ell omne
   'These would be then for men to eat' (13th c., GEI, 12v)

(9) In variation with para
a. para Calatayuch quanto puede se va
   'As soon as he can he goes to Calatayud' (12th c., Cid, 775)
b. fuel aparta<n>do toda uia para si & alos suyos.
   'He divided it [the land] for himself and his own' (13th c., GEI, 5r)

This corroborates the statement that pora is the form that “is typically found”
(our translation) in the 12th and 13th centuries (Corominas, 1980–1983, see
para). According to Riiho’s (1979, p. 232) token counts, the relative frequency

5. Other related forms have also been noted: pena (Espinosa, 2010, p. 216), perad (García
de Diego, 1951, p. 128), par (Cuervo, 1886–1994, see para; García de Diego, 1951, p. 217). The
phonetic and/or phonological processes argued to account for the transition from these forms
to the modern para are discussed by García de Diego (1951, p. 128), Meyer-Lübke (1890–1906,
III.518), and Brea (1985, p. 167).

6. Although they are theoretically contemporary texts, there are only 15th century copies of
Calila available to us, while the GEI is the only part of the complete GE that is dated at the end;
we therefore know that it is from the late 13th century.
7. In example (9b) para and a appear in the same context.
of *pora* with respect to *para* decreases precipitously from 83% to 15% from the first to the second half of the 13th century, and from there to 2% in the first half of the 14th until disappearing completely by the second half of that century. We cannot know for sure if this is due to a fairly rapid sound change or if it was the graphical conventions used to represent the forms that abruptly changed (on *pora* and other forms preceding *para*, see Torres Cacoullos & Bauman, 2014, pp. 403–414).

As concerns graphical conventions, we are confronted with another issue that lends support to the assumption that *pora* and *para*, together with non-agglutinated *por + a* (Section 3.1, above), are best viewed as a single entity albeit with different orthographic and possibly phonetic manifestations. Given that at least three variants were being used simultaneously during the 13th century, it is no surprise that scribes would sometimes resolve this variation by using a fourth abbreviated form. In (10), the preposition appears three times as a conventionalised, ambiguous abbreviation without the interior graphemes, displaying only the initial *p* and the final *a*.

(10)

et qlo dēxauā pa los pobrē et pa las bestias et pa las aues [...] ‘and that he left it for the poor and for the beasts and for the birds [...]’

(Solalinde, 1930, p. 424)

The abbreviation with a horizontal bar either crossing or connecting with the descender (the vertical line) of the *p* was already a convention in the transcription of Latin *per* and *pro* (Cappelli, 1990, p. 257). In Cappelli’s dictionary of abbreviations, the horizontal bar does not cross the descender in the abbreviation for *pro*, but merely connects with its left side. With this in mind, the form of the *p* that is encountered in Medieval Spanish manuscripts, as in (10), more closely resembles the abbreviations used for *per*. Indeed, we find another example of the abbreviation, this time involving the adjective *perdonadas* (the adjectival form of the verb *perdonar* ‘to pardon’, which is unequivocally composed of the prefix *per-* and the root *donar* ‘to give’), shown in (11).

(11)

los omnes en este año se auiće to das adobar et seer todas pdonadas ‘the men in that year all had to dress and be pardoned’ (Solalinde, 1930, p. 424)
This clear abbreviation of per- using a p with a crossbar does not mean we must conclude that the examples of pa necessarily represent pera, pora, or some specific variant. Rather, all that is certain is that this abbreviation was used to represent a vowel-consonant combination (or perhaps consonant-vowel, in light of the frequent transposition of the r in Old Spanish (Corominas, 1980–1983, see por)), as with the combinations of a vowel and /r/ in pora, para, and pera.

Still, it is possible that the transcriptions from which we have extracted our data do not faithfully represent the original forms used by medieval scribes. More than 100 years ago Hanssen (1911) mentioned the “little trust that scribes, and at times also editors, deserve” (our translation) and 25 years ago Melis (1992, p. 82, n. 24) similarly alluded to the occasional lack of exact correspondence between original documents and modern transcriptions. Nevertheless, in reproductions of the original manuscripts of the GE that Solalinde (1930) includes, unequivocal tokens of para already appear (12). The new preposition indicates a spatial relationship in (12a) and an abstract relationship in (12b). The example in (12b) also provides another illustration of the occasional disagreement between manuscripts and modern transcriptions. Solalinde (1930, p. 287) transcribes this token as pora in his edition although it appears as para in the reproduction of the original manuscript on the immediately preceding page (1930, p. 287, folio VII).

(12)  **para** in 13th century original manuscript

a.  **Spatial**

\[
\text{luego e fuese para su regno por la carrera por d\ö viniera}
\]

then and he went to his kingdom by the road by which he had come

(Solalinde, 1930, p. 488)

b.  **Abstract**

\[
\text{por q fue fecha para pro delos es}
\]

by which it was made for the good of the scholars

(Solalinde, 1930, p. 287)

It is clear, then, that for some time the orthographic variants por a, pora, and para were used contemporaneously. 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 gradual and proceeded via variation between forms, as is expected with processes of change.

To summarise this section, despite the vexing problem of manuscript editions and graphic conventions, there are orthographic indications that the combination of the prepositions _por_ and _a_ as independent elements may have persisted into early (13th century) Spanish texts. Furthermore, consistent with the usage-based hypothesis of chunking with repetition, the _por_ (+) _a_ sequence is of high frequency. This pair of facts provides evidence for the view that the new preposition _para_ is an outcome of the fusion of two prepositions.

Now, where the orthographic and phonetic sequence of events must remain nebulous, there is a solid source of evidence for the origins of _para_ from the semantic functions of the new preposition, as we will see below.

4. Compositionality of _para_, and its loss

Additional evidence that _pora/para_ arises from the combination of two separate prepositions, one of which was _a_, may be adduced from early compositionality of meaning. As put forward in Bybee (2010, pp. 44–45; see also Croft & Cruse, 2004, pp. 250–253; Langacker, 1987, p. 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. In this sense, _hopeful_ is more compositional than _awful_ (the meaning contribution of _hope_ to the derived word is more discernible than that of _awe_).

Here we implement this semantic measure by operationalising semantic compositionality of a linguistic form in terms of the contexts of use of the linguistic form. In particular, we consider the kinds of object NPs with which _para_ co-occurs.

---

8. Compositional meaning in _para_ has been claimed for early examples such as _Cercar quiere a Valencia pora christianos la dar_ (Cid, 1191) ‘he seeks to besiege Valencia to give it to the Christians’, in which “la forma _a_ tiene su función propia, distinta y separada de la de _por_” ‘the form _a_ has its own function, separate and distinct from that of _por_’ (our translation) (Riiho, 1979, p. 99; see also Riiho, 1979, p. 124).

9. In contrast with the semantic criterion of compositionality, _analysability_ is a morphosyntactic parameter, referring to the degree to which the internal structure and individual parts are recognisable; for example, while _pull strings_ is not fully compositional because it has a metaphorical meaning it is analysable in that speakers are assumed to recognise an individual verb and its noun complement (Bybee, 2010, p. 45).
In early texts we find examples in which the subject of the motion verb modified by the \textit{para} phrase reaches their destination. In (13), for example, \textit{para} indicates the terminal point of the subject's movement, a use that we associate with the preposition \textit{a} in present-day Spanish. The subject not only goes 'toward' the \textit{posada} but actually reaches it, as verified by the fact that he speaks to the person there.

(13) [motion verb + \textit{para} + NP = to a location]  
\[E\text{ el pleteo con ellos e fuese \textit{para} la posada e dixole su muger commo auia pleteado con los marineros}\]  
'And he Settled with them and went to the inn and told his wife how he had Settled with the seamen' (14th c., Zifar, 87)\(^{10}\)

The endpoint of the motion may even be a person. In the examples in (14), the object NP of \textit{para} has a human referent; again, in present-day Spanish we would expect not \textit{para} in this context but the preposition \textit{a}.

(14) [motion verb + \textit{para} + NP\textsubscript{specific human}]  
a. \[\text{Venimos nós \textit{para} ti que nos consejes}\]  
'We came to you so that you may advise us' (13th c., Calila, 144)  
b. \[\text{E el moço se fue \textit{para} su padre, e dixo la respuesta}\]  
'And the boy went to his father, and told him the answer' (14th c., Zifar, 21)  
c. \[\text{y assi me fuy \textit{para} mi amo, que esperandome estaua.}\]  
'And thus I went to my master, who was waiting for me' (16th c., \textit{LT}, 1)

In this motion-verb \textit{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).\(^{11}\) 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 \textit{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).

\(^{10}\) There is no dative \textit{a} preceding \textit{su muger} in example (13) in the edition of Zifar we used.

\(^{11}\) In Calila, we count as human the personified animals.
Figure 2 shows the proportions of spatial uses of \textit{para} + NP with prepositional objects that are persons, as in (13) above, as opposed to places (as in (12)). Object NPs with a human referent as the endpoint of motion constitute a full third, 35% (50/144), of spatial instances of \textit{para} in 13th–14th century texts. A handful of cases (4/15) are still found in 15th–16th texts. But the \textit{[motion verb + para + NP\textsubscript{specific human}]} construction disappears from the corpus after the 16th c. (0/51).

We submit that this early \textit{[motion verb + para + NP\textsubscript{specific human}]} construction indicates that the semantic contribution of the preposition \textit{a} was still discernible in the new preposition, and thus a degree of compositionality in its beginnings (cf. Riiho, 1979, p. 99). Subsequently, object NPs with a human referent as the endpoint of motion disappear with \textit{para}, which indicates that \textit{a} no longer makes an independent meaning contribution.

To summarise this section, the semantic measure of compositionality of meaning is implemented to adduce evidence that \textit{para} arises from a combination of two separate prepositions, one of which was \textit{a}. Operationalising compositionality of \textit{para} in terms of the kinds of NP objects with which it co-occurs in spatial relations, we observe a robust \textit{[motion verb + para + NP\textsubscript{specific human}]} construction in early texts. Quantitative change in the contexts of use of \textit{para}, with the decline and disappearance of destinations that are persons, indicates erosion of the semantic contribution of \textit{a} as it is absorbed into the new preposition, and thus loss of compositionality of the whole.
5. Early allative use: Distributions of the preposition across its contexts of use

The uses of a preposition or the kinds of relations it signals may be classified into spatial, temporal or abstract (or, notional) (e.g., Pottier, 1968, p. 25; Delbeque, 1996, p. 252). Classifying thus tokens of _para_ with other than an infinitive complement, usually an NP, we find that, while the proportion of temporal uses (e.g., _para mañana, para las diez_) has remained steady at approximately 5% to 10% throughout the centuries, there is a notable shift in the proportion of spatial uses (Torres Cacoullos & Bauman, 2014, p. 421). In this section we provide evidence for early allative use and its decline.

Table 2 shows the most frequent motion verbs modified by a _para_ phrase among tokens of the preposition classified as spatial (rather than temporal or abstract). The grouping of the centuries into three time periods, 12th–14th, 15th–16th and 17th–20th, emerged once we considered each century separately. In the 12th–14th century data, three verbs of directional motion—_ir(se) ‘go’, venir(se) ‘come’, tornar(se) ‘return’—constitute 80% (132/164) of all spatial instances of _para_ + NP, as shown in last column of Table 2. The preponderance of directional motion verbs is consonant with an allative meaning of movement to or towards a location.

It is relevant that middle-marked _irse_ is somewhat more frequent than _ir_ (at a ratio of 1.3 to 1, or 56 to 44 tokens). This skewing contrasts with that observed in the same period for spatial uses of _por_, with which _irse_ is ten times less frequent than the unmarked _ir_ (at a ratio of 1 to 10, or 3 to 31 tokens). The co-occurrence of _para_ with se-marked motion verbs may be viewed as further evidence for the early use of _para_ as an allative, if the middle marker has telic meaning, focusing on the moment of change for the experiencer of the motion event (Maldonado, 1999, Ch. 6; Torres Cacoullos & Schwenter, 2008).

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>Tornar(se)</th>
<th>Venir(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>

Frequent co-occurrence with _ir(se) ‘go’, which alone constitutes close to two-thirds of spatial instances in the earliest period, is important for the evolution of _para_, in light of a generalisation from typological studies that “in the presence of ‘go’-verbs,
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Allatives frequently take on a purposive reading” (Rice & Kabata, 2007, p. 459). An example would be German zu, whose “allative use [...] evolves into a purposive one” (Lehmann, 2002, p. 6). Another example of allative > purpose grammaticalisation is Lezgian –z, which evolves from a direction marker as a nominal suffix (15a) to a purposive marker as a verbal suffix (15b) (Haspelmath, 1993, p. 89, p. 156, cited in Heine & Kuteva, 2002, p. 39).

(15) Allative-to-purposive grammaticalisation in Lezgian
I:ABS medical:school-DAT go- FUT
'I'll go to medical school'
b. I irid stxa čpi- n juldaš-ri-qh galaz
this seven brother selves-GEN friend-PL-POSESES with
quğwa-z fe-na.
play-INF go-AOR
'These seven brothers went to play with their friends'

What is meant by “evolves from ... into”? What happens with para is certainly not an abrupt or even linear replacement of one use by another. From the earliest texts, allative and purposive uses coexist, as illustrated in (16) (see also (14a)).

(16) Coexistent allative (16a) and purposive (16b)
a. fueron-se para la ribera de la mar
GO.PFV.3PL-REFL to ART.DEF.ESG shore of the sea
'b. para se yr
REFL go-INF
'They went to the shore to depart' (14th c., Zifar, 89)

Rather, “semantic change [...] should be manifested in changing distribution and co-occurrence patterns” (Torres Cacoullos & Schwenter, 2007, p. 357). One measure is the distribution of para across its contexts of occurrence. The line marked with diamonds in Figure 3 shows the proportion of spatial uses of para by century (not counting occurrences with an infinitive complement). First, it is evident that even in the earliest texts, para expresses spatial relations in only (approximately) half (43%–52%) of its occurrences followed by an NP (or adverb), that is, we do not find an initial period in which para, or its precursor pora, exclusively or even mostly had a spatial sense. Second, after the 14th century, during which para definitively displaces pora in Spanish texts (Riiho, 1979, p. 232), the proportion of spatial uses is no greater than 10%.

To confirm that the decline of spatial uses is not a mere accident of genre or topic, the line marked with squares in Figure 3 shows the corresponding distribution of por tokens. Naturally, in those texts in which the protagonist, for example,
the Cid, Lazarillo or Don Quijote, moves around, rates of spatial uses are higher than in texts such as the Corbacho, which is largely a sermon. Nevertheless, despite such fluctuations we can discern the stability in the overall proportion of spatial uses of por, which ranges from 10% to 30%. This contrasts with the patent drop in the proportion of spatial uses of para.

![Graph showing proportions of spatial uses of para and por]

**Figure 3.** Proportion of spatial uses of *para*, compared with spatial uses of *por* (not counting infinitive complements for either)\(^\text{12}\)

To summarise this section: in its beginnings *para* may be characterised as an allative, based on co-occurrence with directional motion verbs, often *se*-(middle-) marked, and spatial uses constituting approximately half of all tokens of *para* (not counting infinitive complements). However, not only do specific human destinations disappear, as we saw in the previous section, but there is an overall decrease in the proportion of spatial uses, which drop after the 14th century, as *para* with a nominal complement is used mostly to express non-spatial, abstract relations (such as benefactive, e.g., (1b)).

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*.

---

\(^\text{12}\) For Figure 3, Ns *para*: 12th–13th 75/173; 14th 89/170; 15th 7/120; 16th 8/115; 17th 9/122; 18th 12/134; 19th 9/122; 20th 26/261. Ns *por*: 12th–13th 164/959; 14th 71/724; 15th 51/713; 16th 55/370; 17th 160/587; 18th 92/487; 19th 157/575; 20th 85/579.
6. Rising purposive: Variation between \textit{para} and \textit{por} with infinitives

Table 3 provides two frequency measures of \textit{para} + Infinitive. The first considers distribution of the form across contexts of occurrence, namely the proportion of tokens of \textit{para} with an infinitive complement, shown in the first pair of columns. No clear rising trend is discernible. What is revealing is variation with respect to the older preposition in this context. Shown in the second pair of columns is the frequency of \textit{para} relative to \textit{por} with an infinitive complement. Here we see a reversal in the relative frequency of \textit{por} and \textit{para}, which are evenly distributed (~50%) in the [+ Infinitive] context until the 17th century, after which the rate of \textit{para} increases, reaching 85% in the 20th century.

Figure 4 displays the increasing frequency of the newer preposition relative to the older one overall (Table 1), in the line marked with squares, juxtaposed to its increasing relative frequency in the particular context of infinitives (Table 3, second pair of columns), in the line marked with diamonds. It is clear that the frequency increase of \textit{para} with respect to \textit{por} has occurred disproportionally precisely in [+ Infinitive] constructions.

Table 3. Frequency of \textit{para} + Infinitive (a) as a proportion of all tokens of \textit{para}; (b) relative to \textit{por} + Infinitive

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Century</th>
<th>% \textit{para}: proportion \textit{para} with an infinitive</th>
<th>\textit{N}</th>
<th>% \textit{para}: relative to \textit{por} with an infinitive</th>
<th>\textit{N}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12th–13th</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>77/226</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>77/187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14th</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>84/258</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>84/159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15th</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>100/221</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>100/219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16th</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>92/212</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>92/201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17th</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>111/232</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>111/272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18th</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>127/268</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>127/187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19th</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>183/307</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>183/232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20th</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>200/471</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>200/235</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Now, it is generally understood that, in present-day Spanish, infinitive constructions with \textit{por} mean something different from those with \textit{para}, the former expressing cause (or reason), the latter purpose. For example, in (17), with \textit{por}, the subject felt guilty because he married off someone, whereas in (18), with \textit{para}, the subject needed money in order to retrieve his clothing.

However, it is apparently common cross-linguistically for the same form to have both a purpose and a reason sense (among other polysemies of allatives),
as with English *for* (Rice & Kabata, 2007, p. 455). As we will see just below, for a good part of the history of Spanish, [verb + *por* + Infinitive] was used in a purpose sense. A purposive *por* is illustrated in (19), from the 15th century *Celestina*, where we might well expect to find *para* today: the meaning here is that she wants to trick him not because she is rich, but in order to become so.

(17)  [verb + *por* + Infinitive] = cause (reason)

> Se creía […] culpable *por haber casado* a Tules
> ‘He thought himself […] guilty *for having married* off Tules’

(19th c., *Bandidos*, 1)

(18)  [verb + *para* + Infinitive] = purpose

> necesitaba diez pesos *para sacar* su ropa empeñada
> ‘He needed money in *order to retrieve* his clothing that had been pawned’

(19th c., *Bandidos*, 1)

(19)  [verb + *por* + Infinitive] = purpose

> También quiere a mí engañar como a mi amo *por ser rico*
> ‘She wants to trick me as well as my master in *order to become* rich’

(15th c., *Celestina*, 5)

As a replicable measure, we operationalise the purpose sense in terms of the temporal reference of the situation. We count as purposives those cases—of either [por + Infinitive] or [para + Infinitive]—in which the situation referred to by the infinitive is posterior to that of the main (finite) verb (see examples in (18)–(19)).

Beginning with the earliest appearance of the new preposition there has been variation between *por* and *para/para* in the purposive infinitive construction.
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Figure 5 shows the relative frequency of [por InfinitiveP] and [para + InfinitiveP] in a sample of the texts. 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), but in the 19th century Regenta (Spain) and Bandidos (Mexico) the relative frequency of para is up to 90% (111/123).

From this we may conclude that para has generalised in the purposive infinitive construction, while por has greatly receded. In Modern Spanish, [para + InfinitiveP] persists in particular constructions, such as to modify aspectral verbs acabar, comenzar, concluir (for example, Comenzaron por apostar una botella [Bandidos, 1.177]), and with negated infinitives (Torres Cacoullos & Bauman, 2014, pp. 440–443).\footnote{The drop in [por + Infinitive] between the 17th and 18th centuries may be parallel to the substitution of [por + que + Subjunctive] by [para + que + Subjunctive] purposive clauses (Bolinger, 1945, p. 16). Contributing to the drop in [por + Infinitive] may have been a rise in the use of [porque + Finite verb]-clauses to express cause (Torres Cacoullos & Bauman, 2014, p. 440).}

Nonetheless, it might be objected that [por + InfinitiveP] and [para + InfinitiveP] have never meant the same thing and therefore there really has been no replacement of por by para. In other words, even as ‘purposives’ there may

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure5.png}
\caption{Rate of para relative to por with a purposive infinitive complement ([para + InfinitiveP] vs. [por + InfinitiveP]).\footnote{For Figure 5, Ns por/para + Infinitive: Celestina 70, Quijote 61, Regenta/Bandidos 123.}}
\end{figure}
be a meaning difference, such that purposive infinitive clauses with *por* express a nuance of “underlying motive or incentive” (Bolinger, 1945, p. 20) that is absent from *para*. According to this view, the increased relative frequency of *para* would reflect a sociocultural change rather than genuine linguistic change. As Bolinger put it,

> The intent of *por* to designate underlying motive or incentive also explains its relative infrequency as compared with *para*. Modern writing in general, and especially modern fiction, is far more objective than that of any preceding epoch. Where Cervantes was not averse to revealing the underlying motives and inner feelings of his characters, a modern writer would feel that he had no right to act the part of omniscience, and would prefer to let his readers guess at those internal secrets.  

(Bolinger, 1945, p. 20)

How can we determine objectively whether the rise of *para* in Figure 3 and Figure 4 reveals real linguistic change and not altered literary conventions? Evidence for a meaning difference between *por* and *para* again would be quantitative differences in co-occurrence patterns. Tabulating the co-occurring contextual elements of two apparently alternative forms offers a replicable way of characterising the semantic distinction between them.

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, p. 405). We define purposive infinitive complements (i.e., infinitives designating a situation temporally posterior to that of the finite verb) as a variable context and use this as a “heuristic device” to probe meaning differences (Poplack & Tagliamonte, 2006, p. 78). If linguistic forms mean something different, they should be preferred in different sub-contexts, in other words, they should each occur at greater than average rates in certain sub-contexts (see also Aaron & Torres Cacoullos, 2005, p. 615; Kapatsinski, 2009, pp. 160–161).

We thus examine purposive infinitive constructions in a particular sub-context, that in which the subject NP has a human referent. Our reasoning is that subject NPs with a human referent are congruent with a meaning of intention (“underlying motive or incentive”, in Bolinger’s (1945, p. 20) terms), whereas inanimate subjects are incapable of having motives (cf. Melis, 1997, p. 112). The prediction, then, is that if purposive [*por* + Infinitive

\[\text{Purposive}\]

conveys a meaning of ‘underlying motive’ or intention absent from [*para* + Infinitive

\[\text{Purposive}\]

], we expect *por* rates relative to *para* to be higher in the sub-context of human subjects (as in (20)) and conversely *para* rates should by higher in the sub-context of inanimate subjects (as in (21)).
(20) [human subject + verb + por/para+ Infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}]
   a. quería quedar \textit{por} aliviar tu cuyta\textit{do}
      'I would like to stay \textit{so as to} alleviate your sorrow'
      (15th c., Celestina, 2)
   b. quiso turbarme \textit{por} oirme decir otras docientas patochadas
      'He tried to upset me \textit{so as to} hear me say another two hundred follies'
      (17th c., Quijote II, 7)
   c. quería vencerla, \textit{para} no padecer tanto
      'He wanted to overcome it [his ambition], \textit{so as to} avoid suffering
      so much'
      (19th c., Regenta II, 16)

(21) [inanimate subject + verb + por/para+ Infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}]
   a. para qué es \textit{la fortuna} favorable y próspera sino \textit{para} servir a la honra
      'For what is \textit{fortune} favourable and propitious if not \textit{to} serve honour'
      (15th c., Celestina, 2)
   b. toda \textit{la natura} se remiró \textit{por} la hazer perfecta
      'All of \textit{nature} exerted itself \textit{to} make her [Melibea] perfect'
      (15th c., Celestina, 1)
   c. \textit{el esfuerzo} de tantos y tantos miserables servía \textit{para} minarle el terreno
      'The \textit{effort} of so many wretches served \textit{to} undermine his ground'
      (19th c., Regenta II, 22)

In the examples in (21), with inanimate subjects for the finite (main) verb (fortune, nature, the effort), the instance with \textit{por} (21b) is no more compatible with the expression of a nuance of intention in the purposive clause than those with \textit{para} (21a), (21c). On the other hand, in the examples in (20), with volitional human subjects, there would appear to be no justification for considering the instances with \textit{por}, in (20a) and (20b), as conveying more of a sense of underlying motive than the instance with \textit{para}, in (20c) (besides the argument that \textit{por} itself has such a meaning, which would be a circular argument).

Figure 6 shows the rate of \textit{para} relative to \textit{por} with a purposive infinitive complement when the prepositional phrase modifies a verb with a human subject, in the same sample of texts as for Figure 5. Comparing Figure 6 with Figure 5, we see that in the 15th century \textit{Celestina} and 17th century \textit{Quijote} the relative frequency of [\textit{para} + Infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}] in the context of a human subject (at 46\% (26/57) and 42\% (22/53), respectively) is somewhat lower than the overall rate with a purposive infinitive in the corresponding text (Figure 5). This is because the rate of [\textit{para} + Infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}] relative to [\textit{por} + Infinitive\textsubscript{purposive}] is lower with a human subject than with an inanimate subject (at 76\% (16/21), combining numbers from the two texts because of low token counts, \textit{p} < .03 in Fisher's exact test). Thus, we can say that in these 15th and 17th century texts, human subjects
favor \( [\text{por} + \text{Infinitive}_{\text{purposive}}] \), as predicted by the hypothesis of a (immutable) meaning difference between the two forms.

Nevertheless, in the 19th century texts, there is an inversion between the two prepositions and now \( \text{para} \) predominates (with a relative frequency of 89\% (102/114)), even in the context of a human subject, our operationalisation of the expression of “underlying motive”. Furthermore, the ratio of purposive infinitives with a human vs. an inanimate subject for the main verb (counting tokens of both \( \text{por} \) and \( \text{para} \)) has not decreased, as would be expected if modern authors were eschewing “revealing the underlying motives” of their characters (Bolinger, 1945, p. 20) (at 5-to-1 in the \textit{Celestina} and \textit{Quijote} (110 to 21) and 13-to-1 in \textit{Regenta} and \textit{Bandidos} (114 to 9)). Thus, what we have evidence for is genuine linguistic change. Whereas in the 15th and 17th century in the sub-context of a human subject (to whom readers may attribute intentions) we tend to have \( \text{por} \), as in (20a) and (20b), in the 19th century in the same sub-context we tend to have \( \text{para} \), as in (20c). The change accords with the variationist hypothesis of “neutralization in discourse” of meaning differences (Sankoff, 1988, p. 153).

![Figure 6. Rate of \textit{para} relative to \textit{por} with a purposive infinitive complement modifying a verb with a human subject](image)

In summary, we first observed a reversal in the relative frequency of \( \text{por} \) and \( \text{para} \) after the 17th century in infinitive constructions overall (Figure 4). 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 5). Finally, we verified the same reversal in the rate of \( \text{para} \) relative to \( \text{por} \) in the environment of purposive infinitive constructions with a human subject in the main verb (Figure 6). The conclusion is that \( \text{para} \) has generalised as a purposive
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infinitive marker. Together with the decline of allative uses after the 14th century and the displacement of *por* from infinitive constructions, this is taken as evidence for the allative > purposive grammaticalisation path.

7. Conclusion: A path and process of grammaticalisation

By drawing on grammaticalisation and variation theory we have offered a rich understanding of the rise of a new preposition. Grammaticalisation theory puts forward specifiable paths of change, such that particular lexical source meanings develop into particular grammatical meanings following similar paths (for example, verbs meaning ‘want’ participate in constructions that become futures), and processes of change, of which pertinent here is chunking and ensuing loss of compositionality.

The evidence adduced here for the evolutionary *path* followed by Spanish *para* has been two sets of changes. First is the decline of spatial allative uses of *para* + NP (after the 14th century), which includes the disappearance of destinations that are persons—NP objects with human referents (after the 16th century). The second is the increasing rate of *para* relative to *por* within purposive infinitive constructions (beginning in the 18th century). This pair of changes constitutes a quantitative demonstration, the first as far as we are aware, of the hypothesised cross-linguistic grammaticalisation path whereby allatives develop into purposives (Heine & Kuteva, 2002, p. 39).

As to the *process* of change by which the new preposition arises, we have shown loss of compositionality. *Para* begins as a sequence of two independent prepositions that, with frequent co-occurrence, are fused into a single grammatical unit. This process is known as chunking, which may be viewed as a domain-general cognitive process (cf. Bybee, 2010, p. 34). Operationalising semantic compositionality by observing prepositional objects designating destinations that are persons rather than locations, we showed an early [motion verb + *para* + NP specific human] construction, evidence for an independent meaning contribution of *a*, which is subsequently lost. The story of *para* is thus served well by grammaticalisation theory, with its predictions about paths of change, here allative-to-purposive, and processes of change, here loss of compositionality.

---

Change is (manifested in) alterations in quantitative co-occurrence patterns of the incoming linguistic form. What we have shown here is that two kinds of quantitative pattern are important. One, perhaps the more familiar relative frequency measure in historical linguistics, is the distribution of a linguistic form across its contexts of occurrence, seen here in the decline of spatial uses of para. But, as we saw with the rise of para and demise of por with purposive infinitives, crucial are the patterns of variation of the newer form with respect to the older one with which it comes to compete in a variable context.
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