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Abstract
Colloquial Paraguayan Spanish exhibits an innovative use of the preposition \textit{para} in directive constructions that is related to the Guaraní prospective complementizer \textit{haguã}. Through a process of grammatical replication (Heine and Kuteva, 2005), \textit{para} has acquired an aspectual function not evident in Normative Spanish. This semantic and grammatical shift is motivated by the intersecting semantic components of the forward projection of \textit{para} and the prospectivity of \textit{haguã}, whereby two new use patterns \textit{[para + infinitive]} and \textit{[para que + subjunctive verb]} employ the syntactic rules of Spanish to replicate the prospectivity of the Guaraní source, resulting in the abandonment of the prepositive function of \textit{para} in certain contexts in favor of an overt aspectual role. This study analyzes internal and external forces that make this grammaticalization process possible in the context of extensive contact between Spanish and Guaraní in Paraguay.
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1. Introduction

Spanish and Guaraní have a long contact history, the linguistic results of which have been documented in various studies (De Granda, 1979, 1988, 1991, 1996; Gómez Rendón, 2007; Gynan, 2011; Krivoshein de Cansesse and Corvalán, 1987; Lipski, 2004; Melià, 1974, 1992; Pottier, 1968; Usher de Herreros, 1976; Velázquez-Castillo, 1995, 2005; Velázquez-Castillo and Hudgens Henderson, 2013). This study contributes to the literature on the linguistic influence Guaraní has had on Colloquial Paraguayan Spanish (CPS).

* This research has been partly supported by a Fulbright-Hays Faculty Research Abroad Grant and an ACLS/SSRC/NEH International and Area Studies Grant.
by analyzing an innovative CPS construction, ‘prospective directives’, within the framework of grammatical replication (Heine and Kuteva, 2003, 2005), proposing as the source the Guaraní prospective complementizer *haguã*. CPS speakers use *para* either with an infinitive, as in (1), or with the complementizer *que* + subjunctive verb, as in (2), to produce a directive clause with *para* as an overt nominal prospective marker.

(1) CPS Prospective Directive Use Pattern I: [*para* + infinitive]
Entonces, el doctor me dijo *para* buscar
So, the doctor to=me say.PAST.3sg for to=seek
otro especialista. (CPSC)
another specialist.
‘So, the doctor told me to seek another specialist.’

(2) CPS Prospective Directive Use Pattern II: [*para que* + subjunctive verb]
Le decía a Stroessner *para que* se entregue y
To=him told.3sg to Stroessner for that himself surrender.3sg and
él no quería. (CPSC)
he no wanted.3sg
‘He told Stroessner to surrender himself and he didn’t want to.’

The use of *decir* ‘to tell [to]’ refers to an order given to the speaker in (1) and to the deposed Paraguayan dictator in (2); the equivalent Normative Spanish (NS) sentences would have the subordinate verb in the subjunctive, as in (3), and would not allow the use of *para*.

(3) NS Directive: [*que* + subjunctive verb]
Entonces, el doctor me dijo *que* buscara
so, the doctor to=me say.PAST.3sg that seek.SBJ.PAST.1sg
otro especialista.
other specialist.
‘So the doctor told me to look for another specialist.’

Example (2) with *para que* is closer to the NS equivalent and is used as an alternative to the infinitive clause by educated bilinguals. The fact that *para* appears in both variants indicates that it is a stable marker in CPS directive clauses.

We provide evidence that grammatical replication has taken place, exploring both internal and external motivations for this contact-induced change. The Guaraní marker *haguã* serves as the source for the replication in prospective directives, where *para* combines with a verb [*para* + verb] to form a subordinate clause (a *para*-clause) in complement position. Following the model of Guaraní *haguã*, *para* has ceased to function as a preposition in these cases, acquiring instead the role of a prospective aspect marker on a sentential
complement. The choice of para for this replication process is motivated by a semantic equivalency between the Spanish preposition and the Guaraní complementizer.

The present analysis complements a previous study (Velázquez-Castillo and Hudgens Henderson, 2013) in which the para of ‘anticipated possession’ was identified as the replicant of the Guaraní prospective aspect marker –rã, having discarded its prepositive function to mark nominal prospectivity. The Guaraní equivalent of (4) would use –rã to indicate the prospectivity of the lunch: a-japo che-rambosa-rã [1AC-make 1IN-lunch-RÃ] ‘I prepare my lunch–rã [my future lunch]’. Thus, Spanish-Guaraní bilinguals have replicated this prospectivity marker using compatible material already in existence in Spanish, i.e. para. This use pattern takes the form [para + Poss-NP]:

(4) CPS Anticipated Possession: [para + Poss-NP]
Llego, me desvisto, me cambio de ropa, después preparo para mi almuerzo. (CPSC)

‘I arrive, I get dressed, I change, then I prepare my [future] lunch.’

First, we survey the studies that have documented Guaraní influence on CPS. Next, we offer an overview of the grammatical replication framework, followed by our analysis of directive para within that framework. Finally, we examine the semantic content of para that makes it immanently compatible with baguã for Paraguayan bilingual speakers.

2. Previous Studies of Spanish-Guaraní Contact

Paraguay is unique for its significant Guarani-Spanish bilingual population, where roughly two-thirds of Paraguayans report varying degrees of bilingualism (Bakker, Gómez Rendón, and Hekking, 2008; Gynan, 2011; Zajícová, 2009: 53-68). Guaraní is a Tupi-Guaraní language that first came into contact with Spanish in the early 16th century as the conquistadors settled in the area, with the establishment of Asunción, the current capital, in 1536. Paraguay did not attract a large number of Spaniards, however, and the area was sparsely populated by Europeans. During the colonial era, the elite used Spanish for official purposes while Guaraní retained a strong presence among the mestizo and local Indian populations. Guaraní has been at times both a symbol of national pride and a symbol of primitiveness, and policies of Guaraní-Spanish bilingualism have gained ground according to the political views of the times.
In 1967 Guaraní was granted ‘national language’ status and in 1992 it became the co-official language with Spanish; a bilingual education program has since been implemented (Bakker, Gómez Rendón, and Hekking, 2008; Gynan, 2001, 2005; Russianovich Solé, 1996; Zajícová, 2009).

Spanish and Guaraní have sustained a long and extensive contact, with widespread bilingualism over several hundred years. As of 2002 census data, 10% of the population were monolingual Spanish speakers, 28.8% were monolingual Guaraní speakers, with the majority (49% in 1995) being Spanish-Guaraní bilingual; speakers of other languages amount to around 5% (Gynan, 2001: 55, 63, 2011: 355). These facts are important to consider for our analysis since forces both internal (the natural tendencies of Spanish) and external (the influence of Guaraní) are at work in the processes of ongoing change.

When considering language contact phenomena it is important to acknowledge that both languages have influenced each other. The literature on language contact in Paraguay has focused either on the influence Spanish has had on Guaraní (e.g. Bakker, Gómez Rendón, and Hekking, 2008; Gómez Rendón, 2007; Melià, 1974, 1992; Shain and Tonhauser, 2011) or on the influence of Guaraní on Spanish (e.g. Choi, 2000; De Granda, 1979, 1988, 1991, 1996; Gynan, 2011; Klee and Lynch, 2009; Krivoshein de Canesse and Corvalán, 1987; Velázquez-Castillo, 1995, 2005; Velázquez-Castillo and Hudgens Henderson, 2013). Studies of contact-induced morphosyntactic change have bestowed various names onto the phenomenon, including convergence, syntactic calquing, interference, and transfer; we aim to specify the process while avoiding terms that may be ambiguous. We identify the CPS prospective directive as a type of grammatical isomorphism in which a form adopts a new function normally absent in the replica language, thereby replicating a function from the model language, i.e. ‘grammatical replication’ (Heine and Kuteva, 2005). The next section offers a brief overview of this framework as the context for our study.

3. Grammatical Replication

Heine and Kuteva’s (2005) model accounts for contact-induced grammaticalization whereby a replica language (R) transfers a grammatical concept from a model language (M). This is a specific type of transfer (Weinreich, [1953] 1964), different from direct form-meaning unit borrowings or word-order transfer; the case that concerns us involves the transfer of a function or grammatical concept from (M) using a form in existence in (R). A grammatical
The idea is not that of simple transfers of unanalyzed grammatical features, but rather, a creative process by which selected aspects of a form’s function are transferred and even modified in the process; the existing form on which the new structure is formed also goes through a transformative process (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 40). Since what is transferred is a ‘grammatical concept’, we must examine the meaning conveyed by the replicant category and the compatibilization process between the source and replicant categories.

This framework extends the notion of grammaticalization (Hopper and Traugott, 1993), commonly understood to be a language-internal process, to include contact-induced changes. It involves a lexical item adopting a grammatical function or a grammatical category becoming even more grammatical. Identifying a grammaticalization process relies on four parameters: (i) extension of a form to new contexts with concomitant emergence of new meaning/function; (ii) desemanticization, i.e. generalization or loss in meaning content; (iii) decategorialization, or loss of morphosyntactic properties; and (iv) phonetic reduction (Heine, 2003: 579; Heine and Kuteva 2005: 15). CPS prospective directives exhibit parameters (i), (ii), and (iii).

For replication to occur, there must be a form in (R) that is compatible with a grammatical function in (M) (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 41, 45; Siegel, 2008: 166). This form is generally assumed to be invariable, easily perceptible (stressed and unbound), and with a uniform meaning, the resulting structure having also a consistent form and meaning (the ‘transparency constraint’). The phenomenon may involve single forms but Heine and Kuteva (2005: 40-78) also place significant relevance on ‘use patterns’. Typological differences can constrain but do not necessarily preclude transfer; likewise, structural features can constrain transfer, e.g., transferred forms are expected to appear in the same syntactic position as the original (Siegel [2008: 166]), but semantic parameters outweigh structural ones (p. 229).

At the root of contact-induced replication is the notion of equivalency, the correspondence of semantic elements between a form in (R) and another form in (M). The replication process starts when the bilingual speaker notes a grammatical equivalence, and this leads to entirely new use patterns (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 44-45). However, new uses do not start from zero but emerge from ‘minor use patterns’ in (R), which exhibit functional elements reminiscent of those associated with the source form in (M). Minor Use Patterns are infrequent collocations available in (R), which can be activated for the

---

1 The idea is not that of simple transfers of unanalyzed grammatical features, but rather, a creative process by which selected aspects of a form’s function are transferred and even modified in the process; the existing form on which the new structure is formed also goes through a transformative process (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 40).
creation of recurrent *Major Use Patterns*, setting in motion the grammaticalization process. Minor use patterns are limited in the types of contexts where they appear and are only marginally associated with a grammatical function, while major use patterns show increased frequency, a wider range of contexts, and a more systematic association with a grammatical meaning. The full grammatical replication path is outlined as follows (p. 75):

> minor use pattern > major use pattern > incipient category > full-fledged category

Section 4 provides evidence that *para* has extended to CPS directive contexts, where it adopts two alternating use patterns: 

\[
\text{[para } + \text{ infinitive]} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{[para} \text{ que } + \text{ subjunctive verb]}.
\]

These patterns deviate significantly from NS, putting into question the prepositive function of *para*, and are consistently interpreted as prospective, creating a new semantic-pragmatic use of *para* in Spanish.

4. CPS Prospective Directives

First, we describe previous studies of CPS prospective directives and offer a definition of the construction. Then we describe the corpus from which the data were extracted, discuss the contexts where the construction occurs, and explain how it differs from its NS counterparts. We proceed to examine the two patterns, showing that they represent extensions of prepositional *para*, which is notably decategorialized, having lost its ability to take a nominal complement.

4.1. Previous studies

CPS prospective directives were first documented in Usher de Herreros (1976: 79), although she focuses only on the 

\[
\text{[para } + \text{ infinitive]} \quad \text{pattern, attributed directly to the influence of haguã, which ‘conveys future tense in the purpose or intention to do something’ [our translation]. Haguã is one of several Guaraní prospective/irrealis postpositional markers: -ta signals prospectivity (a-karu-ta ‘I will eat’); -ne indicates probability (a-karu-ne ‘I may eat’); va’erã denotes deontic prospectivity (a-karu va’erã ‘I shall eat’); while haguã marks prospectivity in dependent clauses (de Granda, 1988: 285). Purposives are shown in (5): both the CPS (5b) and NS (5c) varieties feature para, while in directives (6) only CPS (6), not NS (6), includes para. As the directive of (6) shows, even when speakers match the NS use of the subjunctive, they keep para in its innovative prospective role.}\
\]
(5) **Purposive uses of para** (Usher de Herreros, 1976: 78):

(a) Guaraní purposive haguá

\[\text{Ne-renöi kurı nde-kyv pe-ho haguä o-ño-ndive} \]
\[2\text{AC-call kurı 2IN-brother 2\text{AC-go Haguä 3AC-rec-with}} \]
\[\text{tupa-o-pe.} \]

God-house-loc

‘Your brother called you, so that you can go to church together.’

(b) CPS purposive \[para + \text{infinitive}\]

\[\text{Te llamö tu hermano para ir juntos en la iglesia to=you call.past.3sg your brother for to=go together to the church} \]

‘Your brother called you in order to go together to the church.’

(c) NS purposive \[para que + subjunctive\]

\[\text{Te ha llamado tu hermano para que vayan juntos a la iglesia. to=you has=called your brother for that go.subj.3pl together to the church} \]

‘Your brother has called you so that you go together to the church’.

(6) **Directive use of para** (Usher de Herreros, 1976: 78, addition in brackets is ours):

(a) Guaraní directive haguá

\[\text{He'i nde-sy voí ja-ju haguä.} \]
\[3\text{AC-say 2IN-mother early 1pl=incl venir Haguä} \]

‘Your mother said for us to come back early.’

(b) CPS directive \[para + \text{infinitive]/[para que + subjunctive}\]

\[\text{Tú madre dijo para venir/[para que vengamos]. temprano your mother said.3sg for come/(for that come. subj.1pl early} \]

‘Your mother said to come/for that we come back early’.

(c) NS directive \[que + subjunctive\]

\[\text{Tú madre dijo que vinéramos temprano. your mother said.3sg that come. subj.1pl early} \]

‘Your mother said that we should come back early’.

Usher de Herreros observes that CPS tends to use \[para + \text{infinitive}\] as in examples (5b) and (6b) in contexts where NS requires a complementizer \[para que\] in purposive [5c] and \[que\] in directive [6c] and subjunctive verb. Although she notes the deviant use of \[para\], her focus is on the absence of the subjunctive rather than on the presence of \[para\].

De Granda (1988: 177) also considers the \[para + \text{infinitive}\] pattern to be a case of ‘modification of an obligatory structural paradigm in the host language’ [our translation] and sees this pattern as resulting from Guaraní interference (1988: 259-260). The ‘systematic substitution’ of the required NS \[que + subjunctive\] for \[para + \text{infinitive}\] in CPS is branded a ‘morphosyntactic calque’ based on haguä, yet its equivalency with \[para\] is mostly out of the scope of his analysis. His brief allusion to \[para\] is limited to labeling it a ‘lexical
equivalent’ of *haguã* (p. 178). No further explanation is offered for the particular choice of *para* or the extent of its ‘isomorphism’ with *haguã*. Directive clauses are described as clauses that depend on verbs of volition, command, and desire (p. 178). However, we show that directive *para* never appears with verbs of desire (*querer* ‘want’, *desear* ‘desire’, and *preferir* ‘prefer’), or with the causative *hacer* ‘make’.

Both studies have left an incomplete picture of the use conditions of directive *para*. They do not distinguish the purposive and directive uses and overlook the function of *para*, instead focusing on the use of the infinitive in lieu of the subjunctive, yet recent literature on Spanish infinitival clauses makes it clear that infinitive/subjunctive alternations are commonplace in this syntactic frame (cf. Hernanz, 1999: 2285-2290, and references therein). Neither study notes that it is in the directives, not in purposives, where the use of *para* diverges most from NS. By skirting around the role of *para*, previous studies miss the chance to capture the new prospective function of CPS *para*, which includes ‘anticipated possession’ [*para + noun*]. As noted, this new use involves *para* in slots where NS does not allow prepositions, replicating the prospective aspectual function of the nominal marker, -*rã*. We treat the use of directive [*para + verb*] as feeding into the same grammaticalization process, arguing that just as with –*rã*, *haguã* exhibits semantic equivalencies to the preposition *para*, and that these lie at the root of the replication process observed in CPS directive *para*.

### 4.2. Data Sources

CPS data for this study was compiled into a small corpus (103,000 words) consisting of (1) oral interviews conducted in 2002; (2) recorded spontaneous informal conversations of teachers; and (3) ongoing transcriptions of public speech. Without targeting any specific language features, we interviewed fifty self-identified Spanish-Guaraní bilingual speakers from urban and semi-urban areas of different regions, ages 15-60, reflecting different socio-economic classes and educational levels: 25 reported using both languages equally, having learned both languages as children; 20 reported a preference for Spanish, and 5 reported having learned Guaraní outside of home. The interviews were tape-recorded and conducted in Spanish by trained bilingual Paraguayan field helpers. The interview protocol was similar to an oral proficiency interview, beginning with family-life themes, likes and dislikes, everyday routines, and on to increasingly complex functions, including a personal narrative of 7-10 minutes where participants related something memorable that had happened to them. Only those who performed at a solid advanced level and beyond were
included in the study, thus excluding the possibility of semi-fluency. Data from three of the people interviewed were excluded from the corpus as they failed to produce complete personal narratives, one of the key indicators of the advanced proficiency level. Spontaneous conversations were recorded primarily in teachers’ lounges (elementary/secondary and post-secondary institutions) during their 15-30 minute breaks. Not surprisingly, Spanish ability levels ranked significantly above advanced in each case, all teachers having had at least four years of post-secondary education. The oral interviews and conversational recordings done in 2002 yielded 24 tokens of directive para uses. Ongoing data collection (2002–) in the form of transcription of public speech has yielded an additional 72 tokens, totaling 96 tokens of directive para use in the combined CPS corpus (CPSC, see Table 1).

In order to compare the CPSC data with other varieties of Spanish, a randomized sample of 1000 tokens of the para que construction and 1000 tokens of [para + infinitive] were extracted from Davies’ Corpus del Español (http://www.corpusdelespanol.org), identified as (CDE). This is an online Spanish language corpus ranging from the 13th to the 20th centuries, with academic, journalistic, and literary registers (100 million words). This is a valid source of comparison, due to its wide regional reach, various registers and time depth. Guaraní data were taken from published studies on the language, or extracted from Zarratea’s (1981) Kalaito Pombero, a short novel written in Guaraní. Translated examples and grammaticality judgments were provided by the first author, who is a native Guaraní speaker.

4.3. Directive uses of para: Prospectivity and other defining features

Included in the directive category are a request, an order, a prohibition, a plea, or an entreaty; situations that by their nature are not yet realized and entail an idea of prospectivity. In a general sense, ‘directive’ verbs communicate an act or intent to influence the behavior of another person. Both directive use patterns, [para + infinitive] and [para que + subjunctive], are most strongly associated with main clause verbs decir (‘to tell to’) and pedir (‘to request’); together

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Function of para</th>
<th>Number of tokens (percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anticipated Possession</td>
<td>106 (53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prospective Directive</td>
<td>96 (47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>202 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
they make up about half of the directives in the data (Table 2). Other main verbs associated with the directive are *mandar/ordenar* ‘to order’, *exigir* ‘to demand’, *obligar* ‘to force’, *rogar* ‘to beg’, and *procurar* ‘to try’, all ‘manipulative’ verbs expressing a request and requiring three participants: i) a person issuing the request (the subject); ii) a person expected to comply (indirect object); and iii) the request content (sentential direct object complement). We concentrate on *pedir*, *decir* and *mandar*, as they are the most frequent and offer clear directive clause examples in object position; *invitar* ‘to invite’ offers a slight variation in argument structure vis-à-vis other directive verbs in that it requires the person invited, not the occasion, to be expressed as the direct object. Table 2 shows the most common verbs appearing with prospective directives in the CPSC. Section 6.1 takes on *invitar* as a special verb hosting a minor use pattern that could have facilitated the entry of prospective *para* in directives.

Crucially, manipulative verbs are transitive and require a direct object (an NP in *direct dependency* to the verb). Except for the ‘accusative *a*’, NS prepositions are not acceptable in direct object position, and even there, the prepositional status of *a* is questionable (Pensado, 1995: 21-27). The constructions illustrated here are quite different and clearly not in the purposive function. Therefore, the presence of *para* in CPS directives demands an explanation, and as in the case of anticipated possession, we propose a grammatical function that is different from that of a preposition: the marking of nominal prospectivity on the model of the Guaraní prospective complementizer *haguã*.

The strong prospectivity content of manipulative verbs is commonly noted in the literature. Hernanz (1999: 2208, 2286) observes that verbs of ‘volition’ or ‘influence’ (*desear* ‘desire’, *aconsejar* ‘advise’ and *pedir* ‘request’) designate situations that point to the future with dependent clauses deriving their

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Verbs</th>
<th>Tokens (Percent)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>decir</td>
<td>23 (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pedir</td>
<td>26 (27%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mandar/ordenar/obligar/exigir</td>
<td>11 (11.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>procurar</td>
<td>9 (9.5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>invitar</td>
<td>8 (8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>recomendar/aconsejar</td>
<td>7 (7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rogar</td>
<td>5 (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td>7 (7.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>96 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
temporal interpretation from them, i.e. the situation expressed in the subordinate is necessarily interpreted as following the main verb’s reference time. Haspelmath (1989: 298) offers a useful classification of complement clause modalities and places the clausal complements of manipulative verbs in the ‘irrealis-directive’ category, where ‘the complement situation is presented as not realized and its possible realization is expected for the future, so instead of irrealis-directive, one could also say irrealis-prospective’ [our underlining]. Note that, in addition to our initial list, Haspelmath’s manipulative verbs include verbs of desire and causation. As observed, CPS directives do not involve causar ‘to cause’, querer ‘to want’, desear ‘to desire’ and preferir ‘to prefer’.

Significantly, the selectivity of prospective para-clauses closely mirrors the distribution of the proposed model, haguã.

We now outline the traits of each use pattern, documenting the extension of para to directive contexts (grammaticalization parameter [ii]), whereby a meaning transfer from haguã to para has taken place, inviting a new grammatical meaning in CPS.

4.4. Use Pattern I: [para + infinitive]

Pattern I exhibits two formal traits: i) the use of the infinitive in lieu of a verb in the subjunctive in the subordinate clause, and ii) the use of para in direct object position. We address each trait in turn, starting with the use of the infinitive.

There are two general features of Spanish infinitives we must note: i) they commonly fill the syntactic slots of nouns, and ii) they are morphologically ‘defective’, lacking both temporal and person specifications. This deficiency forces infinitives to derive their personal and temporal interpretations from other sentential elements, hence their tendency to appear in dependent structures (Hernanz, 1999: 2201-2202). With this in mind, consider CPS (7) (repeated from [1]), uttered by a teacher relating how she was sent from one place to another when seeking medical advice. The infinitive buscar ‘to look for’ is interpreted as posterior to dijo ‘told to’.

(7) Entonces, el doctor me dijo para buscar otro especialista.
‘So the doctor told me to look for another specialist’. (CPSC)

While NS infinitives are allowed in the nominal spots of verbs’ argument structure, their occurrence in these positions is constrained by co-referentiality
and temporal recoverability conditions (cf. Hernanz, 1999: 2285-2290). In *quiero comer* ‘I want to eat’ the subject of the main verb (*quiero*) and that of the infinitive (*comer*) refer to the same entity, and the temporal interpretation of the infinitive comes from the inherent prospectivity of *quiero*; a change in subject from the main to the dependent clause requires the use of the complementizer *que* and a verb in the subjunctive: ([yo] *quiero que* [tú] *comas* ‘I want that you eat’). The picture gets more complicated with manipulative verbs, however, many of which allow for a free infinitive/subjunctive alternation under conjoint reference. The subject of the infinitive in (8b) is the third person plural, co-referent with the indirect object (*les*) of the verb (*han ordenado*).2

(8) a. Les han ordenado que se *sentaran*. (Hernanz, 1999: 2287)
   b. Les han ordenado *sentarse*.

Summing up, we see that NS manipulative verbs do allow an infinitive in the subordinate, usually in conjoint reference with the main verb’s direct or indirect object. However, this is not always the case; as it happens, *decir* ‘to tell to’, one of the most frequent directive verbs, does not admit the use of the infinitive in lieu of the subjunctive: *El doctor me dijo buscar otro especialista* ‘The doctor told me to look for another specialist’. Thus, while the CPS use of *decir* with an infinitive is indeed divergent from its NS equivalent, more generally, the use of infinitival directives is not as linguistically aberrant as suggested by Usher de Herreros and de Granda. Clearly, the occurrence of the infinitive per se is not the main divergent feature in CPS [*para* + infinitive].

While the literature reveals a general agreement on the co-referentiality conditions for the use of the infinitive in NS (cf. Subirats-Rüggeborg, 1987), there is less awareness of the temporal recoverability condition (Hernanz, 1999: 2286-2288), which is of crucial importance to us. Hernanz explains that the strong prospectivity component of manipulative verbs supplies the temporal interpretation for an otherwise temporally uninterpretable clausal infinitive, another reason why the use of the infinitive in this context should not, in fact, be surprising. Haspelmath (1989: 287-288) goes a step further arguing that, though generally believed to be unmarked and meaningless, infinitives do convey a general ‘non-factual’ or ‘irrealis’ modal meaning.

---

2 Since a typical directive verb involves a second actor in the subordinate clause, it makes sense that the condition for the use of the infinitive would be object-to-subject, not subject-to-subject, co-reference.
Interestingly, he shows a diachronic thread connecting infinitival forms to the expression of allative, purposive and several nuances of futurity and unrealized expected events. Particularly relevant to us are Haspelmath’s findings of a close diachronic connection between purposives and future-marking forms.

The second formal trait of Pattern I—the use of *para* in direct object position—departs most significantly from NS. The infinitival clause headed by *para* in (7) ‘*para buscar otro especialista*’ is understood as the logical direct object of *decir*. Although the customary pronominal substitution test is not available in CPS—the accusative clitic *lo* being null in this variety—the *para*-clause expressing the doctor’s order can be substituted by the demonstrative pronoun *esto* ‘this’: *el médico me dijo esto* ‘the doctor told me this’. Since a single pronoun can replace the whole *para*-clause, we can conclude that *para* is part of the nominal constituent that fulfills the object requirement of *decir*. Example (9) shows *pedir* in the main clause, also a transitive verb whose direct object requirement is fulfilled by an infinitival *para*-clause.

(9) Natalia le pidió a Alma *para ser* su amiga en Facebook. (CPSC)
    ‘Natalia asked Alma to be her friend on Facebook.’

Clearly, the appearance of *para* in the direct object slot of a transitive verb and its regular association with the grammatical meaning of prospectivity constitute an *extension* of NS *para* (grammaticalization parameter [i]). Moreover, it calls into question the prepositional character of *para* in this construction, since, as noted, prepositions cannot appear in direct object position; requiring a nominal complement of their own, they would block the realization of the verb’s direct object, which we showed is not the case in CPS directives. Also, *para* fails to select a nominal argument. The infinitive phrase by itself cannot be substituted for a noun or a pronoun, as shown in (10) and (11). This establishes that *para* has undergone a noticeable level of decategorialization (grammaticalization parameter [ii]).

(10) Me dijo *para* *la búsqueda/*eso
    ‘She told me to *search/*that’

(11) Natalia le pidió *para* *la amistad* en Facebook
    ‘Natalia asked her for *friendship on Facebook’.
This behavior contrasts sharply with NS purposives, where *para* has its prepositional functions intact. Example (12) is a typical NS infinitival purposive, showing subject-to-subject co-reference. Crucially, purposive *para*, unlike directive *para*, retains its prepositional function—the infinitive phrase can be replaced by a pronoun or a noun as shown in (13).

(12) Llamé al médico para preguntarle el nombre del especialista
call-past=1sg to=the doctor for ask-to=him the name of=the specialist
‘I called the doctor to ask him the name of the specialist.’

(13) Llamé al médico para eso/ una reunión con
call-past=1sg to=the doctor for that/a meeting with
mi abogado
my lawyer
‘I called the doctor for that/a meeting with my lawyer’.

Thus, purposive *para* and directive *para* differ crucially in their syntactic behavior, suggesting a different categorical status. Our next question is, if not a preposition, what is the grammatical function of *para* in this use pattern? One possibility is that *para* has become a complementizer marking directive clauses. After all, complementizers often develop from purposive and allative prepositions (c.f., Haspelmath, 1989; Hopper and Traugott, 1993). A familiar example is the use of English *for* as a sentence connector, as in ‘For me to say that would be presumptuous’.

Some varieties of Spanish have developed a similar structure with *para* (cf. Lipski, 1991; De Mello, 1985). The construction involves infinitival clauses with explicit subjects: *para yo hacerlo* ‘for me to do it’; thus, in its complementizer role, *para* seems to signal a relatively loose subordination vis-à-vis other infinitival clauses. Crucially, this complementizer use of *para* occurs only in purposive clauses, never in verb complement positions, as directive *para* does.

Plausible as this hypothesis might appear, the case of CPS directive *para* calls for a different explanation. First, manipulative verbs, from which directive *para* depends, involve high clause integration levels (shared participants and temporality). Second, and most importantly, the fact that there is a parallel co-occurring directive pattern involving *para* + COMP *que* suggests that *para* itself is not a COMP, but a type of specifier to the complementizer. As shown, both directive patterns include *para* in object position and share the

---

3 NS uses [para + infinitive] primarily in the purposive function but, as Chuaqui Farrú (2005: 99) shows, there are other, minor NS uses of this sequence with conditional, concessive or consecutive interpretations.
element of prospectivity, which we propose is the main motivation for the use of \textit{para} in directives. In this analysis, \textit{para} is the same nominal aspect marker shown to operate in anticipated possession patterns (Velázquez-Castillo and Hudgens Henderson, 2013).

4.5. Use Pattern II: \([\text{para que} + \text{subjunctive verb}]\)

In (14) (repeated from [2]), the prospectivity of the order is indicated by \textit{para que} and the subjunctive. The order given to the deposed dictator, \textit{entregarse} ‘to surrender’, appears in the subjunctive and expresses the situation expected to result from the directive.

\begin{align*}
(14) & \quad \text{Le decía a Stroessner } \textit{para que se entregue} y \\
& \quad \text{To=him told.3sg to Stroessner for that himself surrender.3sg and} \\
& \quad \text{él no quería. (CPSC)} \\
& \quad \text{he no want.3sg.PAST} \\
& \quad \text{‘Le decía a Stroessner (0) que se entregara y él no quería.’ (NS)} \\
& \quad \text{‘He told Stroessner to surrender himself and he did not want to.’}
\end{align*}

Directive \textit{para que} occurs in a context where NS would require only \textit{que}. The equivalent NS construction (14) involves the same set of directive verbs (\textit{decir, pedir, mandar}), the complementizer \textit{que}—without any preposition—and a subordinate clause with a verb in the subjunctive. What contrasts most sharply with NS is the CPS use of \textit{para}; the subjunctive is the norm, although CPS uses the present, not the past subjunctive, and, as noted, this form alternates with the infinitive in this context. We address the use of \textit{para} first and the subjunctive/infinitive alternation second. We show that, as in Pattern I, i) the appearance of \textit{para} in object position represents an extension regularly associated with prospectivity; and ii) \textit{para} has lost key prepositive properties.

As stated, the directive use of \textit{decir} requires a direct object specifying the content of the order and an indirect object expressing the person being ordered. \textit{Para} marks the sentential object (\textit{que se entregue} ‘to turn himself in’); the objecthood of \textit{para que se entregue} is evidenced by the fact that it can be substituted by eso: \textit{le decía eso} ‘he told him that’. Similarly, (15) shows the use of \textit{pedir} ‘to ask’ and a \textit{para-que} clause as its sentential object specifying the content of the request.

\begin{align*}
(15) & \quad \text{Y te pido } \textit{para que te quedes a cuidarme} \\
& \quad \text{And to=you ask.1sg for that to=you stay.2sg to care.for=me} \\
& \quad \text{mi casa por un mes. (CPSC)} \\
& \quad \text{my house for one month.} \\
& \quad \text{‘And I ask you to stay and take care of my house for one month.’}
\end{align*}
Note that *que te quedes a cuidarme mi casa* ‘that you stay to take care of my house’ without *para*, cannot be replaced by the demonstrative pronoun *eso* ‘that: *te pido para *eso* ‘I ask you for that’, showing that the phrase does not function as a prepositional argument and that *para* has lost the key prepositive ability to select a nominal argument; *para*, then, does not function as a preposition in this context, and since it appears with *que*, it cannot be analyzed as a complementizer either, less two COMP elements be allowed to occupy the same syntactic slot.

These constructions indicate a new semantic-pragmatic use of *para*, which now overtly marks the prospectivity of the directive. Clearly, the temporal interpretation of the sentential objects in these cases is that of prospectivity, as it appears with the same main verbs shown in 4.3 to carry a strong futurity element in their lexical contents. This overt marking of prospectivity contrasts with its ‘covert’ nature in NS, which relies on the lexical content of the main verb, reinforced by the subjunctive in the subordinate, to indicate the prospectivity and uncertainty of the completion of the command. As explained in Section 5, it is this modal meaning of ‘questioned factuality’ expressed by the subjunctive that motivates its alternation with the infinitive, a form previously recognized as carrying modal meanings of ‘necessity’ and ‘possibility’ (Hernanz, 1999: 2272, 2286).

Being ‘temporally defective’, neither the subjunctive nor the infinitive anchors their temporal interpretations in the moment of speaking, which must be derived from the main verb or adverbial/prepositional phrases. If the NS subjunctive has a reduced number of temporally differentiated forms, this is even more so in CPS, where the past subjunctive (–ara/–iera) is practically absent, leaving a single form (the present subjunctive) for use in present and past contexts. Thus, the past version of (15) would be *…te pedí para que te quedes* ‘I asked you to stay,’ not *que te quedarás*, as is expected in NS. This ‘defective’ temporality explains the habitual association of the subjunctive and the infinitive with a subordinate position, and their alternation in this pattern. While the use of the subjunctive approximates the equivalent NS structure, the use of the present in lieu of the past suggests that the temporal interpretation of the subordinate is drawn from *para*, not from the temporal specification of the main verb.

The new prospective directive function of *para* finds its closest NS relative in purposive uses of *para*. NS *para que* is specifically assigned to a purposive subordinating function—a type of adjunct subordination, not lexically selected by the main verb. Of a randomized sample set of 1000 occurrences of *para que* from Mark Davies’ CDE, we found that 100% express purpose; (16) is a representative NS example of this use.
A purposive clause conveys, as in the case of directive constructions, an over-
tone of prospectivity; in this context, para que ‘in order that’ serves as a trigger
for the subjunctive, marking the uncertain nature of the situation, a mere
desire not yet completed at the contextually relevant time. If the subjunctive,
as well as the infinitive, is indeed temporally defective, one must ask about the
source of this prospective interpretation. Interestingly, Hernanz (1999: 2271)
attributes the prospective orientation of purposives, at least partially, to the
‘semantically dense’ lexical content of para, which supplies a ‘prospective
value’ to the subordinate. Lacking a direct dependence relation to the main
verb, the subordinate cannot derive its temporal interpretation from it.
Crucially, however, NS does not use a specifically prospective form to express
this sense, which arises instead from the invited inference of multiple contex-
tual elements, the prepositional content being only one. CPS para que directives
are quite different in that they appear in syntactic positions directly
dependent from the verb but, like purposives, are regularly associated with
prospective events.

Summarizing, Section 4 demonstrates that i) the verbs that appear in direc-
tive CPS constructions remain transitive, and as such, require a direct object;
ii) para-clauses fulfill the direct argument requirement of these verbs; iii) the
clausal units following para do not function as prepositional arguments;
iv) the extension of para to this new context has created a new prospective
meaning regularly associated with directives (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 70);
v) within the context of CPS directives, para no longer selects a prepositional
object. We have thus documented two grammaticalization parameters, exten-
sion and decategorialization.

The proposed aspectual function of para in directive clauses implies that the
grammatical expression of temporality has been displaced from the verb—its
habitual place in Spanish—to the complementizer, now grammatically incre-
mented with para. If the new para overtly marks prospectivity, then the sub-
junctive in pattern II redundantly reinforces the uncompleted state of the
situation, thus explaining its compromised stability and alternation with the
infinitive. Needless to say, the overt marking of aspectuality on a nominal ele-
ment brings CPS closer to the grammatical profile of Guaraní. It is worth
noting in this regard that NS differs radically from Guaraní in the lexical

(16) …nos los íbamos comiendo corriendo, para que no se dieran cuenta de nuestra ausencia. (CDE)

‘We were eating them as we were running, so that they would not notice our absence.’
categories that can bear grammatical markings of temporality; while in NS, tense and aspect markings are limited to verbs, Guaraní does not limit these markings in the same way, allowing verbs, nouns and even postpositions and complementizers to bear aspectual morphemes. This is related to the fact that the lexical categorization system is rather flexible in this language, allowing lexical items to function indistinctively as a noun or as a verb for the most part, a feature that could have served as a model for the phenomenon at hand.

Our next step is to establish functional equivalences with the proposed Guaraní model, haguã. We show that the semantic contents of para and haguã are eminently compatible, a key aspect of the grammatical replication process.

5. Equivalency between directive para and haguã

The replication process commences when bilingual speakers notice equivalences between a form in M (Mx) and another form in R (Rx). We begin by describing the function and distribution of the proposed Mx, haguã.

5.1. Prospectivity in haguã: Overlap with para

As explained, haguã marks the anticipated aspects of certain subordinate clauses, directives and purposives being chief among them. Usher de Herreros (1976) notes that haguã is commonly analyzed as a purposive marker, the potential source of CPS directive para. In (17), the Spanish translation is the same for NS and CPS and haguã coincides with para in that both mark purpose. Note that haguã and para appear in different syntactic slots, haguã being a clause-final element, and para appearing before the subordinate.

(17) Ña-ha’ã-uka va’e-rã jai-kuaa haguã moõ-ite-peve-pa
1acp-measure-cs rel-npr 1acp-know haguã where-sup-untiuntil-int o-ho. (TZ, 70)
3ac-go.
‘Debemos hacer medir (la tierra) para saber hasta dónde va exactamente.’ (NS/CPS)
‘We should have it measured (the land) so that we know exactly where it ends.’

However, purposives are not the only type of subordinates featuring haguã; a second type is directive clauses (18). Para is absent in the NS translation, but appears in the CPS one.
As noted by an anonymous reviewer, nominalization as a resource to subordination has weakened somewhat in present-day Paraguayan Guaraní, perhaps due to contact with Spanish; however, this is not the case here, where the morphology of aspectual markings (-gue, -guã) is clearly that associated with nouns.

(18) Mbo‘e-hara he‘i chá-ve a-ha haguã che-róga-pe.
   Teach-AG =said 1.in-loc 1.ac-go haguã 1IN-house-loc.
   ‘La maestra me dijo **para que** me vaya a mi casa.’ (CPS)
   ‘La maestra me dijo **que** me fuera a casa.’ (NS)
   ‘The teacher told me to go home.’

Common to (17) and (18) is the prospective character of the temporal relations in the subordinate clause. The purpose of ‘knowing’ and of the directive ‘to go home’ is anticipated for a time posterior to that of the main verb. It is this element of prospectivity that is expressly marked by haguã. More than specifically purposive or directive, haguã is the prospective version of the complementizer –ha (temporally neutral form) and the opposite of Hague, the retrospective form, –gue being a variant of the nominal retrospectivity marker, –kue (Tonhauser, 2006).

Another element that must be understood about hal|haguel|haguã is its nominalizing function. Subordinate clauses in Guaraní and languages of the same family tend to be nominalizations morphologically speaking, i.e. haguã marks an aspectually specified nominal, referring to an entity whose existence is intended or anticipated. Besides purposives and directives, haguã appears in other, clearly nominalized prospective clausal complements; (19a) features a clausal direct object of me‘é ‘to give’. The verb marked with haguã is understood to refer to an entity: bedding materials intended for sleeping. Interestingly, CPS uses prospective para in an equivalent construction (19b).

(19) a. Che-paño o-moi ché-ve a-ke haguã.
   1sg-godfather 3ac-put to=me 1ac-sleep haguã
   ‘My godfather gave me [something] for me to sleep.’

   b. Mi padrino me puso **para** dormir.
   My godfather to=me put for sleep
   ‘My Godfather set up [a bed] for me to sleep.’

A-ke haguã ‘for me to sleep’ is interpreted to refer to an entity projected to serve as a place to sleep, and haguã marks the prospectivity of this expected role. It is this prospective component applied to a nominal element that

---

4 As noted by an anonymous reviewer, nominalization as a resource to subordination has weakened somewhat in present-day Paraguayan Guaraní, perhaps due to contact with Spanish; however, this is not the case here, where the morphology of aspectual markings (-gue, -guã) is clearly that associated with nouns.
connects the marker *haguã* to the Spanish preposition *para*, rendering it compatible with the function of nominal aspect.

The compatibilization process can be conceived of as proceeding from the purposive uses of *para*, where the bilingual speaker establishes an initial equivalence with *haguã*. As noted, NS *para* was analyzed as the source of temporal interpretation in purposive clauses, suggesting that it assumes its clearest temporal character in this construction. The purposive is, then, the strongest candidate for having triggered the semantic equivalence between *para* (Rx) and the prospective marker *haguã* (Mx); *para* extends then to directive clauses (Rx>Ry), where (Ry) is the replicant construction. As 5.2 shows, *para* does not extend to other clearly prospective contexts that do not coincide with the distribution of *haguã*.

### 5.2. Limits of *haguã*-para equivalency

Prospectivity aside, there are significant differences between *haguã* and NS *para*, which are important for understanding the points at which prospective *para* takes on a divergent path from prepositional *para*. Distribution-wise, NS *para* diverges markedly from *haguã*, the former being a preposition and the latter a nominal aspectual marker. Syntactically speaking, a preposition is not part of the NP; rather, it selects a NP that serves as its object. A nominal marker, however, is a constituent of a NP that could be in any syntactic position, including that of a core argument. Being a preposition, NS *para* cannot mark a verb’s core argument; since directives are nominal clauses in direct object position, it follows that NS *para* would not appear in directives, as seen in (18). The appearance of *para* in directive clauses, a context in which Spanish excludes prepositions, and the close correspondence of this use with one use pattern of *haguã* suggest that this innovative use may have arisen following the model of *haguã*.

Evidence of the close connection between prospective *para* and *haguã* is that CPS *para*-clauses occur only in those contexts in which there would be a counterpart with *haguã* in Guaraní. One never finds CPS sentences like (20), even though the element of prospectivity is present here as much as in directives. Remember that ‘to cause’, ‘to want’ and ‘to prefer’ appear in Haspelmath’s (1989) list of manipulative verbs, yet the Spanish equivalents do not pattern like the other verbs in this class. Significantly, *haguã* does not appear in the corresponding Guaraní structure. Instead, appositionally linked structures are used as in (21): juxtaposed structures with fully inflected verbs and no mark of dependency. Generally, Guaraní prefers appositional structures in places where Romance languages would use a dependent clause.
(20) *Quiero para que vayas a devolver estas cosas a María.
    Want.1sg for that go.2sg to return these things to María.
    ‘I want you to go and return these things to María.’

(21) A-i-pota re-ho re-me’e jey ko’a mba’e María-pe.
    1ac-rel want 2ac-go 2ac-give iter these thing María-to.
    ‘I want you to go and return these things to María.’

When expressing a desire not directed to another person, querer ‘to want’ would be translated by the Guaraní desiderative suffix –se (22), not by a conjoined clause. Similarly, sentences expressing causation, equivalent to the manipulative verb ‘to cause’, involve the causative suffix –uka (23), not a subordinate clause, as would be the case in Spanish and other Romance languages.

(22) A-me’e -se ko’a mba’e María-pe.
    1ac-give-des these thing María-to.
    ‘I want to give these things to María.’ (Elicited)

(23) A-me’e -uka ko’a mba’e María-pe.
    1ac-give-caus these thing María-to.
    ‘I had [somebody] give these things to María.’ (Elicited)

Thus, we can confidently state that the distribution of directive para mirrors that of baguã, not only in relation to where it appears, but also to where it does not appear. We showed that CPS directive para corresponds to some uses of baguã, and that this Guaraní marker is not specifically directive but has a broader prospective function. Section 6 shows the existence of further CPS extensions of prospective para-clauses, all with matching corresponding uses of baguã, establishing the stability and advanced stage of this replication process.

6. Further extensions linked to NS Minor Use patterns

We have identified the purposive as the possible entry point of prospective para-clauses in NS; this section identifies extensions related to minor NS patterns that could have facilitated the incursion of prospective para in directives. Recall that minor use patterns in (R) get transformed in the replication process to become major use patterns modeled on a structure from (M). We start with an extension involving invitar ‘to invite’, linking directive para to a NS
minor use pattern with the noun invitación. This use is still within the directive realm; additional patterns follow which are different from directives and increasingly innovative.

6.1. Invitar + directive para-clause and related NS minor use patterns.

We begin by noting that NS invitar is a manipulative verb with the particularity of selecting as its direct object the person invited, not the occasion for the invitation, as in (24); invitar is canonically associated with the preposition a 'to' for expressing the event the person is invited to, so that, invito a salir below yields the meaning 'to invite to go out'.

(24) Siempre que la invito a salir está ocupada
    ‘Every time I ask her out she is busy.’ (NS)

There is also a minor pattern where NS allows para to follow the deverbal noun invitación, as in (25). Not surprisingly, similar uses of para abound in CPS (26); the para-clause is interpreted to be temporally posterior to the invitation.

(25) Me encontraba desempleada cuando me llegó la invitación para ir a Nueva York…
    ‘I found myself unemployed when the invitation to go to New York arrived.’
    (Rebelión.org, 09-08-11, interview with Mexican cartoonist, Cintia Bolio).

CPS diverges from NS in that it extends this use of para to the verb invitar, in lieu of a. Example (27) shows the use of directive [para que + subjunctive] with invitar as the main verb, and (28) shows a directive [para + infinitive]. While this use of para is slightly different from other CPS directives in that the para-clause is not in direct object position, the connection is clear since invitar is a manipulative verb, and the para-clause expresses the content of the directive, as in all previously seen cases of CPS directives. This is a stable pattern in CPS (8% of the main clauses of prospective directives in our corpus).
(27) Me hizo bailar y a partir de ahí le empecé a invitar para que se vaya a tomar tereré conmigo en mi casa (CPSC).

‘He asked me to dance and from then on, I started to invite him to go and drink tereré with me at my place.’

(28) Y él me invitó para ir después de la doce en Año Nuevo a bailar (CPSC).

‘And he invited me to go dancing after twelve on New Year’s.’

This use deviates notably from the equivalent NS pattern shown in (24), where the content of the invitation is marked with the preposition a. As (29) shows, NS does not allow the use of a para-clause following invitatar.

(29) La ONU me invitó *[para ir/ para que vaya] a Nueva York.

‘The UN invited me to go to New York.’ (Elicited)

We see then that invitatar-directives constitute another extension of para; the structure is clearly related to a NS minor pattern featuring invitación, which is thus a plausible trigger of the invitatar-directive (Ry > Rx). We now examine occurrences of prospective para-clauses in contexts other than directives; they are unequivocally divergent from NS and clearly relatable to equivalent occurrences of haguã in Guaraní.

6.2. Para-clause as the subject of an intransitive verb

Example (30) shows an extension of prospective [para + infinitive] in subject position. The phrase para dejarle a ello solo ‘for leaving them alone’ is the subject of the copulative verb es ‘is’, which appears with the predicate nominal difícil ‘difficult’. para marks the prospective nature of ‘leaving them alone’, a situation, which, at the moment of speaking is only an imagined possibility. Note that the equivalent Guaraní sentence involves the use of haguã, with the same prospective sense as that conveyed by para.

(30) Una mi vecina …le cuida a ella también porque ahora ya es difícil para
dejarle a ello solo. (CPSC)
leave-her to them alone

‘Una vecina (mía), le cuida a ella también porque ahora ya es difícil dejarlos solos’.
(NS)

hasy-ma ha’eño ja-heja haguã chupe kuéra (Guaraní)
difficult-perf alone 1p.ac-leave haguã 3-loc.pl
‘My neighbor cares for her also because now it is difficult to leave them alone.’

The NS version has a bare infinitive in subject position; under no circumstance would NS allow a preposition in this slot. As Section 7 explains, a preposition relates two terms, the prepositional subject (previously mentioned), and the object (immediately after the preposition). The fact that this context does not afford the possibility of a previously mentioned prepositional subject, explains why NS does not allow prepositions in this position. It follows that this use of para must correspond to a function different from that of a regular preposition.

Example (31), with the same predicate nominal, difícil ‘difficult’, shows the viability of the subjunctive variant in this pattern.

(31) Es difícil para que pueda pagar sus deudas. (CPSC)
is difficult for that be=able pay his debt
‘Es difícil que pueda pagar sus deudas.’ (NS)
‘It is difficult [for him] to be able to pay his debt.’

The sentence was uttered by a high school teacher (four years of post-secondary education), which might explain the use of the subjunctive. Though closer to the NS version, the CPS sentence still features para as an explicit prospectivity marker. The following two extension patterns do not allow the subjunctive variant and are highly innovative.

6.3. Nominalized para-clauses as complements of non-directive transitive verbs

This pattern involves nominalized infinitival complements in direct object position; the main verbs do not belong to the manipulative class. Example (32a) features a para-clause functioning as the direct object of poner ‘to put’; para dormir ‘for sleep’ refers to an entity projected to serve as a place to sleep, where para marks the intended nature of this expected role. Section 5 demonstrated the equivalence of this example to a similar use of haguã; besides the prospective meaning, [para + infinitive] replicates the nominalizing function of haguã, a grammatical effect not available to its NS equivalent. Like haguã, para registers an anticipated role change in a generic entity that will serve as a
place to sleep. The NS equivalent (32b) has a NP in object position and \textit{para} in an adjunct purposive clause, with a clear prepositional role. In (33), the speaker is grateful that she and her family now have the means to provide for life’s basic necessities; \textit{para defendernos} is interpreted as ‘[the means] to fend for ourselves’.\(^5\)

(32) a. Mi padrino me puso \textit{para} dormir. (CPSC)  
\hspace{1em} ‘My godfather set up [a bed] for me to sleep.’

b. Mi padrino me puso una cama/algo donde dormir. (NS)

(33) …pero gracias a Dios que ahora nió ya tenemo \textit{para} defenderno (CPSC)  
\hspace{1em} ‘…but thank God, we now have [the means] to fend for ourselves.’

Importantly, these examples provide a clear connection to the anticipated possession uses of \textit{para} as a nominal prospectivity marker, previously treated as unrelated to directive \textit{para}. We thus uncover the connection between two seemingly different patterns: i) prospectivized NPs (\textit{para} + NP), with \textit{para} as an overt specifier of nominal prospective aspect, and ii) prospectivized VPs (\textit{para} + verb), where \textit{para} also marks prospective aspect. Although these uses are patterned after different model morphemes (-\textit{rã} and \textit{haguã}), the aspect marker (\textit{haguã}) is in fact a nominalizer (\textit{ha}), morphologically augmented with a (nominal) prospective marker (-\textit{guã}). This establishes the basic unity of the overall phenomenon, motivating the existence of a common replica form (\textit{para}) for both cases, and the association of all innovative uses with a single, new function: nominal prospectivity. Section 6.4 documents an extension related to an NS adjunct clause (not involving verbal complementation).

6.4. Para-clause inside a noun phrase

Thus far, we addressed examples of prospective \textit{para}-clauses in core argument position; (34) illustrates a pattern where [\textit{para} + infinitive] modifies a noun, a

\(^5\) Example (33), as well as other CPS in the paper, do not follow standard orthography in all cases; rather, the transcriptions reflect the actual speaker’s pronunciation, which in many instances deviate from NS. Notice also the use of borrowed Guaraní particles, such as the emphatic marker \textit{nio} in this example.
position normally filled by a relative clause in NS; para signals a prospective temporal relation between a newly found job and the work expected to follow. The Guaraní equivalent shows a similar use of haguã.

(34) …porque siempre uno encuentra un trabajito para hacer si es que quiere, ¿verdad? (CPSC)
‘… because always one finds a little job to do if one wants, right?’

(35) …el agua se acumula …seguramente tendrá su nivel …tendrá su forma para correr… (CPSC)
‘… water gathers… it will surely reach a level… it will have a way of flowing off…’

In (35), para appears in place of de ‘of/from,’ which loses out to para in this clearly prospective context because it lacks the notion of forward projection. In NS, the prospective interpretation of the infinitive derives from the future-tensed tener ‘have’, while CPS makes it explicit through para.

(36) la directora me dio dinero para gastar…
‘The director gave me money to spend…’ (NS, elicited)
Summarizing, Section 6 shows the significant spread of prospective para-clauses beyond directive contexts, including subject positions of copulative verbs, nominalized sentential objects, and relative-like clauses in NPs, all contexts that do not support the use of prepositional para. Added to the [para + NP] pattern documented in earlier work, these extensions add up to a broad distribution linked to a single grammatical function, suggesting a replication stage that is clearly beyond the two initial stages stipulated by Heine and Kuteva (2005: 75), minor > major use patterns. As previously suggested, prospective para uses fit the profile of an ‘incipient category’ (p. 71): they exhibit a distinct function and formal behavior that differ markedly from prepositional uses and appear over a wide range of contexts, implying an increased frequency. Characteristically for incipient categories, its existence is not yet acknowledged or taught by ‘purist’ grammarians.

Another observation to be made about these extension patterns is the pervasiveness of the infinitive over the subjunctive, a phenomenon that has been documented in other varieties of Spanish (e.g. Palmer, 2008; Studerus, 1995). As stated, some patterns do not admit the subjunctive, but wherever the subjunctive appears it alternates freely with the infinitive, suggesting that [para + infinitive] is the basic unmarked form of prospective para-clauses and that the subjunctive is a marginal form that may or may not be maintained. Interestingly, para is the most frequent preposition in Spanish infinitival clauses (Lipski, 1991: 205), i.e., [para + infinitive] has a strong general presence in the language, pointing to its status as the likely chronological entry point of prospective para-clauses. As observed, the subjunctive appears primarily in the speech of educated bilinguals, but this standard-like version still features para, indicating that its prospective use is quite stable at this point.

Our next step is to elucidate the compatibilization process that allows a prepositional function to be displaced toward the grammatical expression of nominal aspect.

7. The compatibilization process: contributing semantic elements

We have shown that the prospective uses have led to the decategorialization of the preposition para, whereby some key prepositive capabilities are diluted in favor of a purely aspeetual function. By contrasting the semantics of para in its prepositional function and its newly acquired prospective function, we argue here that the new prospective function represents a generalization or ‘bleaching’ in relation to the prepositional meaning.
As Heine and Kuteva (2005: 80) note, it remains unclear which force, context extension or semantic generalization, sets off the grammaticalization process. Each mechanism seems to require the other in order to flourish. Nevertheless, the semantic compatibilities that allow speakers to ‘notice’ the replicable grammatical category in M form the crux of the equivalence relation and ultimately of context extension and semantic generalization. In the process of establishing equivalence, speakers favor semantic equivalencies over syntactic ones (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 229). It bears repeating that, being a preposition, para occurs in a different syntactic slot from the postpositional morph, haguã. Thus, it is mainly the semantic parallels that are noticed by bilinguals and that ultimately motivate the replication process.

Prepositions typically define a relationship between two entities, the external argument or prepositional subject (PS), and the internal argument or prepositional object (PO): Mary and school in, Mary goes to school; book and John in, Mary gave the book to John (Saint-Dizier, 2006: 4-5). Para defines a relation of forward projection in space or other dimensions (Saint-Dizier, 2006: 6). Cross-linguistically, physical motion forward is often metaphorically extended to indicate movement in time. Phrases such as ‘going to’ in English and ir a ‘go to’ in Spanish have grammaticalized from a physical sense to a future-time meaning (c.f. Hopper and Traugott, 1993: 2-4). Prepositional para is also used to indicate physical movement (37) and future deadlines (38) (de Bruyne, 1999: 679):

(37) ‘No, no, que es tardísimo, vamos para casa’
    ‘No, no, it is very late, we are going home’

(38) ‘Lo dejaremos para mañana’
    ‘We will leave it for tomorrow’

In (37), the physical movement use of para involves the ultimate destination of the home, whereas in (38), the destination of the motion through time is ‘tomorrow’. Thus, in both the physical and metaphorical senses, para conveys forward projection. In NS, however, this hidden temporal component is not specifically aspectual, tense and aspect being explicitly associated with the verb (the movement verb vamos ‘we go’ [37] and the future tense dejaremos ‘we will leave’ [38], or other contextual elements, mañana ‘tomorrow’).

---

6 The notion of directional movement carried by para is less specific than that conveyed by a ‘to’, which implies contact with the targeted destination, and more akin to hacia ‘towards’.
The close association of *para* with prospective contexts and nuances is often noted in the literature, but most analysts have been reluctant to attribute a specific aspectual function to prepositional *para*. Delbecque (1996: 273) notes that the prepositional object of *para* is conceptually posterior to the prepositional subject, but quickly cautions against directly equating the prepositional meaning with *temporal* posteriority. Acknowledging the semantic similarity of *para* to aspectual notions, she maintains that the preposition itself lacks a specific aspectual value. Thus, whatever temporality might arise in the interpretation of *para* is not directly contributed by the preposition, but is a by-product of the context and the verbal tenses (1996: 291).

The most common values of NS *para* are purposive and benefactive (Delbecque, 1996), themselves metaphors of the forward projection element. In the benefactive meaning of (39), *para* acts as a connector indicating the relationship between *lo recaudado* and *los pobres*; one is gathered for the benefit of the other. In the purposive use (40), *para* connects the acts of leaving and giving a message to the concierge, indicating the purpose for the first action:

(39) Todo lo recaudado será *para* los pobres. (from de Bruyne, 1999: 678)
‘All of the collections will be for the poor.’

(40) Salí un momento *para* dar un recado al conserje. (from de Bruyne, 1999: 678)
‘I left a moment to give a message to the concierge.’

What the purposive and the benefactive have in common is an implicit future-oriented component (Tonhauser, 2006: 313-314). Benefactives are described as intended or prospective possessors (in (39), the poor are the intended benefactors of the raised funds), while purposives are destinations (in (40), giving the message to the concierge is a future act at the time of leaving) (Tonhauser, 2006: 313). In the case of purposives, *para*’s prospectivity takes on more of an aspectual nuance as the preposition combines with a clausal object and its verbal elements (in infinitival or subjunctive form). Hernanz (1999: 2271) comes closest to associate *para* with a specific aspectual function. In her view, the preposition is key to supplying the temporal index lacked by the infinitive in adjunct clauses, such as the purposive, something impossible when the infinitive clause depends directly from the main verb, in which case, the infinitive’s temporal interpretation must be supplied by the main verb.7

7 Another temporal use of *para* is shown below (from Chuaqui Farrú (2005: 98); it involves a time adverb inserted between *para* and the infinitive. Here, [*para* + infinitive] communicates a strict chronological order. The example points to the inherent potential of *para* to adopt an explicitly temporal meaning:
We argue that it is precisely this implicit notion of prospectivity that makes \textit{para} an ideal candidate for a replicant of \textit{haguã}, which, as we recall, indicates prospectivity in nominalized verbal situations, and overlaps with \textit{para} in the expression of purposives. Where Guaraní uses \textit{haguã} to indicate prospectivity in directives, CPS enlists the inherent prospective content of \textit{para} to indicate the same meaning, i.e. the anticipated completion of the directive action.

The equivalence between \textit{para} and \textit{haguã} thus resides in the notion of prospectivity; as noted, exact structural similarity is not necessary for equivalence to be established. In fact, ‘[equivalence] tends to be based on an asymmetric formula $Mx = [Ry > Rx]$', where speakers grammaticalize $Ry$ to fit the $Rx$ category (Heine and Kuteva, 2005: 226). In our case, $Mx$ (directive \textit{haguã}) = $Ry$ (purposive \textit{para}) > $Rx$ (directive \textit{para}). Hence, along with normative uses, \textit{para} has been recruited to mark a similar prospective role in the context of directives.

An important change that allowed \textit{para} to shed its prepositive traits on its way to becoming a prospective marker is that it ceased to relate two nominal terms and to control the noun it precedes, functioning instead as part of the NP itself by supplying temporal specification for the head noun. We saw that some innovative uses do not even offer the possibility of a second term (e.g., \textit{[para + infinitive]} in subject position). This loss of prepositional lexical elements can be represented as in (41).

\begin{equation}
\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. Prepositional configuration} & \text{b. Aspectual marker configuration} \\
A \rightarrow B & A \rightarrow B \\
\text{\textit{para}} & \text{\textit{para}}
\end{array}
\end{equation}

As it loses key elements of the spatial orientation or trajectory configuration between two entities, \textit{para} adopts the more general meaning of prospectivity as it traces the temporal trajectory of an anticipated change of state in the nominalized clause it modifies.

8. Concluding Remarks

Along with the CPS anticipated possession, prospective directive \textit{para} has (i) extended the boundaries of its use to new contexts; ii) desemanticized by

\begin{flushleft}
\textit{El ermitaño y el rufián, que de tan opuesto camino venían, se encuentran al fin de su vida, \textit{para} luego \textit{volverse} a separar.}
\textit{The hermit and the scoundrel, who came from such opposite paths, meet at the end of their lives, only to separate again later’}.
\end{flushleft}
acquiring a new semantic-pragmatic meaning that is more general than that of prepositional \textit{para}; and (iii) acquired a new aspectual function. A new grammatical category equivalent to that of Guaraní has been created, using available material in Spanish. There are key semantic and distributional equivalencies between \textit{para} and \textit{haguã}, chief among them being the element of forward projection, which intersects with the prospectivity element of \textit{haguã}. Distributionally, \textit{para} mirrors typical grammatical collocation patterns of \textit{haguã}, heading nominalized clauses, where a preposition cannot occur. The fact that prepositional \textit{para} is associated with a nominal element is a formal trait that could have facilitated speakers’ perceptions of equivalency with \textit{haguã}. These equivalencies support the replication process despite the fact that \textit{para} and \textit{haguã} occupy different syntactic slots. \textit{Para}’s semantic transparency (the consistent semantic association with one semantic feature) and perceptibility (unbound and stressed) further explains the choice of this preposition for the replication of the aspectual Guaraní morpheme. Outside \textit{para—haguã} equivalencies, there are other elements in the affected Spanish structures that could have favored the replication process. The weak temporality of both the infinitive and the subjunctive in \textit{para}-clauses make them both eminently replaceable as the locus of temporal indexing. Aspectual \textit{para} fills this ‘semantic gap’ by providing the missing temporal element, and adding in the process a new grammatical category to Spanish: nominal aspect.

Research in contact-induced language change benefits from the examination of detail-specific, ‘minor’ constructional phenomena, such as this, that have traditionally been ignored by researchers; we posit that it is in the small details of language that many fascinating phenomena can be found.
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