Tener as a temporal anchor

Javier Cabezas Zapata

University of Georgia – javiercz@uga.edu

Abstract

The goal of this paper is twofold. First, it aims to show the existence and use of *tener* 'have' in chronological constructions, and its consequent to the list of verbs that function as temporal anchors in Spanish, such as *hacer* 'do / make' and *llevar* 'carry'. These verbs tend to show certain grammaticalization features in these type of constructions. Consequently, I intend to examine three of the grammaticalization features proposed by Lehmann (2015) - Paradigmaticity, Intraparadigmatic Variability, and Integrity through the use of synchronic corpus data. Quantifiable results will show that *tener* is at an early stage in its grammaticalization process.

1 Introduction

This paper has two purposes. First, I intend to show the existence of a new verb that functions as a temporal anchor, the verb *tener* 'have'. For that goal, I will use two corpora — El Corpus del Español (Davies, 2002) and the microblogging platform Twitter. Verbs that show an incipient grammatical function such as *tener* tend to show grammaticalization features, such as *hacer* 'do, make' and *llevar* 'carry'. The second goal of this article is to examine the grammaticalization features that *tener* shows. I will use the grammaticalization parameters proposed by Lehmann (2015), and I will focus on three of them, namely Paradigmaticity, Intraparadigmatic Variability, and Integrity. Intensive coding and precise interpretation will allow me to use my corpus data to examine the grammaticalization features that *tener* shows.

Section two of this paper serves as theoretical background on the topic of grammaticalization. It focuses specifically on what grammaticalization is now, a study on the process of change rather than solely the outcome. Finally, I include how different proposals have given us insight on the linguistic areas affected by grammaticalization and the order of steps it usually follows, focusin on Lehmann's proposal, essential for this paper. The third section briefly explains the existence of *tener* as a temporal anchor and its similarities with *hacer* and *llevar*, that has already been attested in the literature.

The fourth sections describes the methodology used for data collection and its purpose related to Lehmann's parameters and to explain the grammaticalization features of *tener*. Section five explains the extent to which *tener* has

developed into a temporal anchor by going over each of Lehmann's parameters one by one. I conclude the analysis in section six with a summary of the results and implications the study of temporal anchors in Spanish.

2 Grammaticalization

Grammaticalization has been the focus of a more intense study since the 1980s with Lehmann (2015), Heine and Reh (1984), Heine et al. (1991),Traugott and Heine (1991), and Hopper and Traugott (2004). The term grammaticalization per se already suggests that there is a process that changes the grammatical status of a sign. A more refined definition is "the study of grammatical forms [...] viewed not as static objects but as entities undergoing change" (Hopper & Traugott, 2004, p. 19). This is a non-abrupt, gradual change, and the linguistic signs that enter this process might end up with different degrees of grammaticalization.

This focus on the process brought more insight on the levels and degrees of grammaticalization. Givón (1979, p. 209) proposed a grammaticalization path:

discourse > syntax > morphology > morphophonemics > zero

Needless to say, this is quite a simplified picture. However, it is enough to visualize the beginning, possible end, and order of change in grammaticalization. From this path we can assume that a linguistic sign starts at the discourse level being a lexical word that enjoys free collocation. Then, it is positioned inside a syntactic construction and thus, is given syntactic restrictions. In the third step, the sign is reduced from an analytic construction to a synthetic one, so that the grammatical formatives become agglutinating affixes. In the transition to morphophonemics, the unit of the word is tightened and its morphology becomes functional. Finally, the sign might end up disappearing and gives space for new entries and grammaticalization processes in the language.

Cuenca and Hilferty (1999) proposed a grammaticalization continuum that shows how grammaticalization can affect six different linguistic areas — morphology, phonology, lexicon, distribution, frequency, and semantics. The continuum (1) shows the path, from lexical to grammatical, that a sign can follow. This proposal is divided into three steps — lexical, intermediate, and grammatical. Each box shows the features that the sign shows as a result of its grammaticalization process.

A much more detailed model is the one proposed by Lehmann (2015). Lehmann divides his six parameters into two groups. The group called Paradigmatic Parameters includes Integrity, Paradigmaticity, and Paradigmatic Variability. These categories are related to the cohesion, integration, and dependence of a sign with its paradigm or category. Integrity relates to the distinctness of a sign from other signs. Decrease of integrity leads to loss of semantic and/or phonological substance, although these two phenomena do not always go hand in hand.

Lexical		Grammatical
stems	> auxiliaries, particles	> affixes
polysyllabic	> monosyllabic	> unique segment
large open classes	> large closed classes	> small closed classes
free position	> relatively fixed	> rigidly fixed
relatively infrequent	> rather frequent	> obligatory
semantically rich	> more general	> reduced or empty

Table 1: The continuum of grammaticalization (Cuenca & Hilferty, 1999)

Parameter	Weak grammaticalization	Process	Strong grammaticalization
Integrity	bundle of semantic features; possibly polysyllabic	attrition	few semantic features; oligo- or monosegmental
Paradigmaticity	item participates loosely in semantic field	paradigmaticization	small, tightly integrated paradigm
Paradigmatic Variability	free choice of items according to communicative intentions	obligatorification	choice systematically constrained, use largely obligatory
Structural Scope	item relates to constituent of arbitrary complexity	condensation	item modifies word or stem
Bondedness	item is independently juxtaposed	coalescence	item is affix or even phonological feature of carrier
Syntagmatic Variability	item can be shifted around freely	fixation	item occupies fixed slot

Table 2: Correlation of grammaticalization parameters (Lehmann, 2015)

Paradigmaticity deals with the cohesion and the "formal and semantic integration of both of a paradigm as a whole and of a single subcategory unto the paradigm of its generic category". In short, how good of a member a sign is inside a category, and how tightly connected and defined this category is. All the members of the paradigm need to be linked by paradigmatic relations. This deals with the difference between open sets of lexical items and closed sets of grammatical(ized) items. New lexical items seem to be adopted by language users rather easily; however, closed sets of words only accept new members through grammaticalization.

Paradigmatic Variability responds to the freedom that a language user chooses a sign, either from the same paradigm (intraparadigmatic) or from a different paradigm (transparadigmatic). This parameter deals with variation and its grammaticality. The more grammaticalized an element is, the least freedom for variation the language user has. The final step is for a sign to be obligatory for grammaticality purposes.

The second group, called Syntagmatic Parameters, encompasses Structural Scope, Bondedness, and Syntagmatic Variability. Structural Scope is the size of the linguistic construction that the sign helps to build. A more grammaticalized element shows a narrower scope. Bondedness is the "syntagmatic cohesion" (p. 157) that a sign has with another. The more bonded a sign is, the more grammaticalized it becomes. The final and highest level of bondedness is when a sign becomes an integral part of another, losing its complete identity. Finally, Syntagmatic Variability is related to the flexibility of a sign to be moved around in relation to the other constituents of its construction. A more grammaticalized element has a more fixed position.

In this article, I will be focusing on Paradigmaticity, Intraparadigmatic Variability, and Integrity, since these three parameters can be quantified using synchronic corpus data. As I will explain later, the section from *El Corpus del Español* I used, called "Web / Dialects", only retrieves data from texts collected between 2013 and 2014.

3 *Tener* as a temporal anchor

I refer to temporal anchors here to the linguistic elements that can act as a connector between two different moments in time. This anchor acts as a base for the vector that it projects. This vector is normally represented with a nominal expression and provides the length of such vector.

(1) *Hace* *dos* *semanas* *que* *no* *llueve.*
ANCHOR/Make-3SG VECTOR/two weeks that not rain-3SG.
'It has not rained for two weeks.' Source: Davies (2002)

(2) *Llevo* *dos* *semanas* *yendo* *al* *gimnasio.*
ANCHOR/Carry-1SG VECTOR/two weeks going to-the gym.
'I have been going to the gym for two weeks.' Source: Davies (2002)

In (1), the sign that functions as an anchor is the verb *hacer* 'do / make', and the vector is the noun phrase *dos semanas* 'two weeks'. The Real Academia Española (RAE, from now on) lists two verbs that can function as temporal anchors — *hacer* 'do / make', as in (1), and *llevar* 'carry', as in (2).There is a third one, that the RAE has not included yet, the verb *tener* 'have', as in (3).

(3) *Tiene* *dos* *días* *que* *no* *puedo* *dormir*
ANCHOR/Have-3SG VECTOR/two days that not can-1SG sleep
bien.
well.
'I have not been able to sleep properly for two days.' Source: Davies (2002)

(4) *Tengo* *un* *mes* *leyendo* *esta* *novela.*
ANCHOR/Have-1SG VECTOR/one month reading this novel.
'I have been reading this novel for a month.' Source: Davies (2002)

However, the use of this verb as a temporal anchor has already been attested in the literature. Sedano (2000) mentions that the structure of *tener* 'have' + TIME + GERUND as in (3) is "absolutely parallel" to the one with *llevar*. The Diccionario de Venezolanismos (Tejera, 1993) also gives a chronological durative function to the verb *tener*:

> TENER tr inf with names that mean time, staying in a specific location, condition, or attitude during a specific time
> Source: Diccionario de Venezolanismos (Tejera, 1993, vol. 3, p. 186); translation adapted

The dictionary also provides two examples, an affirmative (5) and a negative one (6):

(5) *me* *acordé* *que* *tengo* *tres*
Now I remember-PAST:1SG that ANCHOR/Have-1SG
días *que* *no* *veo* *mis* *caballos.*
VECTOR/three days that not see-1SG my horses.
'I just remembered that I have not seen my horses for three days.' Source: Diccionario de Venezolanismos (Tejera, 1993, vol. 3, p. 186); translation adapted

(6) *Cuando* *uno* *ha* *tenido* *tanto* *tiempo* *sin*
When one have-AUX:3SG have-PTCP much time without
vestirse, *ya* *no* *sabe* *cómo* *llevar*
dress-GER-oneself, already not know-PAST:3SG how wear-INF
la *ropa.*
the clothes.
'When one has not dress oneself up for so long, one does not know how to wear clothes anymore.' Source: Diccionario de Venezolanismos (Tejera, 1993, vol. 3, p. 186); translation adapted

This shows how *tener* 'have' can function as a both in affirmative and negative constructions, and that it is a good candidate to join the paradigm of temporal anchors, at least in the Venezuelan variety. However, the presence of the verb *tener* in corpora is yet to be attested. The next section will be dedicated to explain the methodology used to collect and code the necessary data.

4 Methodology

For the purpose of this article, I have used two corpora — the Web/Dialects section from El Corpus del Español and Twitter [1]. The former is an excellent tool for this article since it extracts data from blogs and forums from all Spanish speaking countries, especially those in which the structure in question is mostly used, Mexico and Venezuela. The latter is one of the most widely used social media platforms, so it allows to have vast amounts of data. The syntactic structure used for data collection is the one found in the example (4) from the Diccionario de Venezolanismos mentioned above. The structure is the following:

(7) *tener* + (QUANTIFIER) + TIME UNIT + *que* 'that'

The first component of the structure is the verb *tener*. I collected data using all six forms of the paradigm in the present tense. The goal is to test the level of impersonality of this construction. A more grammaticalized construction will show higher results with the third person singular, which is the preferred person in Spanish for impersonal constructions. The impersonality of this construction will be tested by comparing verb form preference of the verb *tener*, and considering conjugation similarities and differences with the verb in the second clause, wich is followed by the complementizer *que* 'that'. This search targets the parameter of Intraparadigmatic Variability. Higher use of a certain form or forms might end up in obligatorification related to grammaticality issues.

The second component in our structure is the quantifier. The goal was to collect as many entries as possible, so there was no restriction here. I performed two different searches, one that accepted any type of quantifier, and another one to include the absence of it, hence the parenthesis in (7). The quantifiers found range from cardinal numbers to indefinite determiners such as *algunos* 'some'. The parameter targeted is Paradigmaticity. A better candidate for this category of temporal anchors is able to accept a wider variety of quantifiers, both more to less definite (for the same concept applied to the grammaticalization of *hacer* as a temporal anchor, cf. Pérez Toral (1992)).

The third component is the time unit. I included five time units — *hora(s)* 'hour(s)', *día(s)* 'day(s)', *semana(s)* 'week(s)', *mes(es)* 'month(s)', and *tiempo* 'time'. Once more, the purpose was to have as much data as possible, both with

[1] Data collection was conducted during the Fall of 2016

measurable and non-measurable time units. In terms of grammaticalization, the possibility of being coordinated with an ample variety of members of a certain category, in this case time units, proves that *tener* is a more integral member of the category of temporal anchors. The parameter targeted here is, then, Paradigmaticity.

The fourth and final component of the search entry is the complementizer *que* 'that'. As mentioned above, the goal is to be consistent with the structure found in the Diccionario de Venezolanismos. This might be detrimental to test Syntagmatic Variability. However, I understand that at this point, *tener* enjoys the same syntactic freedom that *hacer* does inside its complementizer phrase layer in biclausal constructions. Consider the following examples:

(8) (a) *Hace* *dos* *días* *que* *hablé* *con* *mi* *familia.*
Make-3SG two days that talk-1SG-PRET with my family.
'I talked to my family two days ago.'

(b) *Dos* *días* *hace* *que* *hablé* *con* *mi* *familia.*
Two days make-3SG that talk-1SG-PRET with my family.
'Two days ago I talked to my family.'

(9) (a) *Tiene* *meses* *que* *no* *me* *entero* *de* *las* *buenas* *noticias.*
Have-3SG months that NEG I-REFL hear-1SG of the good news.
'I have not heard of good news for two months.'

(b) *Meses* *tiene* *que* *no* *me* *entero* *de* *las* *buenas* *noticias.*
Months have-3SG that NEG I-REFL hear-1SG of the good news.
'It's been two months since I hear of good news.' Source: Twitter

Examples (9 a) and (9 b) show the syntagmatic variability of *hacer* and *tener* inside its CP respectively. Both verbs show the same flexibility in their positional adjustment as they can appear both before and after the time unit. In any case, I will leave this for future research.

The clause followed by the complementizer *que*, or second clause, was coded for (i) verb agreement, (ii) tense of verb in second clause, (iii) existence of deictic reference to the first person in the second clause, and (iv) person and number of the verb in the second clause.

The first variable in relation to the second clause, verb agreement, responds to the agreement between the verb *tener* in the first clause and the main verb in the second clause. The clauses analyzed showed three possibilities — (i) full agreement, (ii) tense agreement, or (iii) person disagreement. I did not include an extra category for those examples that disagree in person but agree in tense since it seems that the path for temporal anchors is to lose all grammatical features, being personal markers that last feature to lose. Thus, when they lose

person agreement, having tense agreement is a mere coincidence not related to tense restrictions from the verb *tener* in the first clause. This variable targets Lehmann's parameter of Integrity, specifically, semantic loss. A high number of impersonal constructions of the verb *tener* means loss of its original meaning of possession, even of one of its most abstract senses, possession of time.

The tense of the verb in the second clause was also coded. My data showed four possible tenses — present, preterit, imperfect, and present perfect. This was intended to target two of Lehmann's parameters. First, it is related to Paradigmaticity. A sign that is capable of acting as a temporal anchor for a wider variety of tenses shows that is a better member to the paradigm of temporal anchors. Hence, showing similar numbers with both punctual and durative senses is essential, as it presents both lack of preference and better functionality. Second, a sign that has a more stable and complete functionality is closer to become the default sign for that function, at least in a certain variety. The parameter in question here is Paradigmatic Variability.

The third variable is the existence of a deictic reference in the second clause to the first person. As verbs are thoroughly coded, I reserved this category for the existence of a deictic pronoun. This coded variable is meant to shed light on the impersonality of the verb in the first clause in case there is no agreement with the verb in the second clause. The existence of a deictic reference to the first person in the second clause when the verb form of *tener* is the first person singular in the first clause means a lesser grammaticalized form than if there is no deictic reference to the first person in the second clause. On the other hand, the existence of deictic expressions in the second clause combined with the use of the third person singular of *tener* would make it the preferred form as a temporal anchor, hence a better candidate. This targets two parameters, then, Paradigmaticity and Intraparadigmatic Variability.

The last variable is the grammatical person of the verb in the second clause. As per my data, all the grammatical persons were found with the exception of the second person plural, that is primarily used in European Spanish, where this construction with *tener* is yet to be attested.The goal is to test the flexibility of the verb *tener* to accept different grammatical persons in the second clause. Again, this targets Paradigmaticity as a temporal ancho that does not rejects grammatical persons is a better candidate for the function. A comparison with the acceptance of the other verb forms in the personal paradigm in the verb in the second clause will shed some light on the preference for the default verb for impersonal constructions. This is related to Paradigmatic Variability.

5 Results

In this section, I will explain the results obtained and how it shows the incipient grammaticalization of the verb *tener*. I will start by providing some general results related to the existence of *tener* as a temporal anchor. Then, I will interpret how the data obtained relates to the three parameters in question — Paradigmaticity, Intraparadigmatic Variability, and Integrity.

The collection of data resulted in a total of 1411 tokens, from which 698 came from El Corpus del Español and 713 came from Twitter. All the tokens were coded. In the first clause, I coded the verb form of *tener*, the type of quantifier found, and the time unit. The second clause and its grammatical relationship with the first clause were also coded in terms of agreement between verbs, second clause verb tense, existence of deictic reference to first person, and grammatical person of the verb in the second clause.

The first parameter to be analyzed is Paradigmaticity. In short, Paradigmaticity responds to how good a sign is a member to its paradigm. In this case, how good of a temporal anchor *tener* is. First, I will show how many different quantifiers *tener* accepts and its acceptance of indefinite and definite quantifiers. My data shows a total of 63 different quantifiers. There are 21 different indefinite quantifiers, without counting grammatical variation for gender or number. The most used indefinite quantifier is *mucho* 'many' and its inflections, with 140 cases. There is also a vast number of tokens of no quantifier being used, a total of 344. As per definite quantifiers, there is quite some variation here, as expected. Numbers from one to six are the most used. This is not surprising, as El Corpus del Español retrieves data from pregnancy and medical blogs and forums. If we look at which type of quantifier is more used, there is almost no preference. Indefinite quantifiers as used 45% of the times, definite quantifiers have a 55% usage. This balance means that *tener* shows almost a perfect grammaticalization level so far in this parameter.

Second, I will look at acceptance of time units. I have searched for five time units — *hora(s)* 'hour(s)', *día(s)* 'day(s)', *semana(s)* 'week(s)', *mes(es)* 'month(s)', and *tiempo* 'time'. The first four time units refer to specific measurable definite units, while the latter is not measurable, hence indefinite.

Time units	Tokens	Percentage
hora(s)	20	1%
día(s)	276	20%
semana(s)	198	14%
mes(es)	352	25%
Total of definite	846	60%
tiempo (Indefinite)	565	40%

Table 3: Proportion of time units use

Table 3 shows the proportions of each time unit and percentages. The data shows that *mes(es)* is the preferred definite time unit. Most importantly, the preference for a non-measurable indefinite quantifier is clear. The question that arises is whether this is related to grammaticalization or just simple vague time references by the users. What we can see is that all time units and types are used, which gives *tener* complete functionality in terms of time unit acceptability.

The third question to consider is whether *tener* accepts both durative and

punctual senses from the verb in the second clause. Table 4 shows the number of tokens found with each tense. The present, present perfect, and imperfect tenses account for the durative sense. They show a total of 953 tokens, 68%. The preterit was the only tense found with a punctual meaning. It has 458 tokens, 32%. So far there is a clear preference for *tener* to be coordinated with durative tenses in the second clause. This might be due to consecutio tempoum restrictions, with means that this verb is at an early stage in the grammaticalization process at the moment. Further research is needed to determine if language users prefer other tenses of *hacer* when it comes to punctual contexts. This would also shed light on possible consecutio temporum restrictions.

Tenses	Tokens	Percentage
Present	896	64%
Present Perfect	32	2%
Imperfect	25	2%
Total of durative tenses	953	68%
Preterit (Punctual)	458	32%

Table 4: Proportion of tense use in the second clause

The next test for Paradigmaticity will show that *tiene* can be used when there is a deictic reference to the first person in the second clause. The results show that although there is a preference for not including a personal deixis (n = 445, 63%), users have no problem including it (n = 256, 37%), as in (10). The deictic reference in the second clause is the first person singular direct object pronoun *me* 'me'.

(10) *Tiene* *bastante* *tiempo* *que* *no* *me* *llama.*
Have-3SG quite-some time that not me call-3SG.
'They have not called me in a while.' Source: Davies (2002); translation adapted

The last test for Paradigmaticity is to check if *tiene* allows to be coordinated with verbs conjugated in all persons in the second clause. It is important to make clear that, as in most cases, the personal pronoun was not included, any case that might have been addressed to a *usted* (formal 'you') or *ustedes* (formal 'you all') was coded as third person singular or plural respectively.

Table 5 shoes that *tiene* is easily coordinated with all personal inflections. These results show that *tiene* is a stable candidate for a temporal anchor in terms of its impersonality use, as it can be combined with any personal inflection on the verb in the second clause. High numbers in the first person singular might be due to the egocentric nature of the social media, or they type of blogs and forums the data comes from, in which users post their concerns and information about themselves. In the case of pregnancy blogs and forums, it should not be a surprise to find a vast use of the third person, as parents mention their babies and infants frequently.

Inflection	Tokens	Percentage
1SG	292	42%
2SG	23	3%
3SG	311	44%
1PL	22	3%
3PL	53	8%

Table 5: Proportion personal inflections of the verb in the second clause with *tiene* in the first clause

The next parameter to be addressed is Intraparadigmatic Variability. This is a type of Paradigmatic Variability that deals with the freedom of use inside a paradigm or category. When Paradigmatic Variability is lost, it usually results in obligatorification of a certain form versus its former competitors. Normally, it is the third person singular that becomes the impersonal or default verb form for impersonal constructions. For that reason, it is necessary to compare the use of the third person singular with the rest of personal inflections in the verbal paradigm of the present tense.

The first step is to check which one of the verb forms is used the most. Table 6 shows that all the tokens are roughly divided between the first and third person singular forms. This shows that there is no consistency in the use of one single form by default. We can assume that there is almost an obligatorification of using one of the two, but not one of them, meaning that *tener* is not completely grammaticalized in terms of Intraparadigmatic Variability.

Verb form	Tokens	Percentage
tengo (1SG)	677	48%
tienes (2SG)	12	0.9%
tiene (3SG)	701	47.7%
tenemos (1PL)	9	0.6%
tienen (1PL)	12	0.9%

Table 6: Use of *tener* in the present tense as a temporal anchor

Further tests are needed to determine if language users have divided functions between these two forms. In this case, we would find these two forms in different contexts. On the other hand, if we find them in similar contexts, it means that they are in competition. This would result in one of them being dispreferred and language users would cease to use it.

To shed some light on this issue, I will show the level of acceptability each of these two verb forms has with the different personal inflections of the verb

in the second clause. This will show if there is a preference for one of them as the default impersonal verb or if both share similar functions.

Verb form in the second clause	*Tengo*		*Tiene*	
	Tokens	Perc.	Tokens	Perc.
1SG	541	79.9%	292	41.7%
2SG	0	0%	23	3.3%
3SG	92	13.6%	311	44.4%
1PL	2	0.3%	22	3.1%
1PL	42	6.2%	53	7.6%

Table 7: Proportion of personal inflections of the verb in the second clause with *tengo* vs.*tiene* in the first clause

Table 7 shows that *tengo* is mainly used as a personal verb since the verb in the second clause is conjugated in the first person singular almost 80% of the times. Moreover, a deeper look into the data shows that in all the rest of the cases, there is a deictic pronoun that refers to the first person. We can state then that *tengo* is used as a personal verb, even when the verb in the second clause shows a different inflection other than the first person singular.

The third person singular *tiene* shows different results. Even though 85% of the tokens are divided between the first and third person singular, it shows a wider functionality with the rest of the verb forms. As a result, *tiene* is able to appear both in personal and impersonal contexts, while *tengo* only functions in personal contexts. That said, even though these two verb forms are not in competition in impersonal constructions, the lack of consistency for one of them shows that *tener* is not completely grammaticalized in terms of Paradigmatic Variability.

The last parameter to be considered is Integrity. Integrity is related to semantic and phonological weight. Loss of semantic and phonological properties mean that a sign is more advanced in its grammaticalization path. For the purpose of this article, we will focus on semantic loss, specifically, the semantic loss of *tener* as a verb of possession. I understand in a more abstract sense of possession of time, or the feeling that is left due to the action included in the second clause, that verb agreement in both clauses show a closer connection with the sense of possession, as in (11).

(11) *Tengo* *tres* *días* *que* *no* *te* *veo.*
Have-1SG three days that not you see-1SG.
'I have not seen you in three days.' Source: Davies (2002); translation adapted

This is close to the sense of *tener miedo* 'to be afraid' or *tener frío* 'to be

cold', both express with the same verb *tener* in Spanish. The same concept can be applied even if the two verbs do not agree in tense, as in (12).

(12) *Tengo* *dos* *semanas* *que* *no* *he* *podido*
Have-1SG two weeks that not have-AUX:1SG can-PTCP
dormir *bien.*
sleep-INF well.
'I have not been able to sleep properly in two weeks.' Source: Davies (2002); translation adapted

However, when there is no agreement of any kind between these two verbs, and *tener* is conjugated in the third person singular, the meaning of posession is completely lost, as in (13).

(13) *Ya* *tiene* *tiempo* *que* *no* *usaba* *el* *lápiz.*
Already have-3SG time that not use-IMPERF:1SG the pen.
'I have not used the pen in a while.' Source: Davies (2002); translation adapted

Table 8 shows that all types of agreement are used, even complete lack of agreement. This means that, at least in certain varieties, language users have created a new semantic layer for the verb *tener* as a temporal anchor.

Agreement	Tokens	Percentage
Full agreement	556	+39%
No tense agreement	243	17%
No agreement	612	43%

Table 8: Agreement of *tener* with the verb in the second clause.

Going a little further, one wonders if these language users consider this *tener* the same or a different sign than the one that they use when they mean possession.

6 Conclusions

The purpose of this article was twofold. First, I have provided empirical data of the existence of *tener* as a temporal anchor. Second, I have used corpora to apply three of Lehmann's parameters — Paradigmaticity, Intraparadigmatic Variability, and Integrity, to explain how *tener* is showing incipient grammaticalization features.

To summarize, the verb *tener* seems to be an ideal candidate to function as a temporal anchor, since in terms of Paradigmaticity, it is almost completely grammaticalized. There seems to be some hesitation in speakers when it comes

to choose a default verb form for all functions of *tener* as a temporal anchor, showing that the level of grammaticalization in Intraparadigmatic Variability is not complete. Finally, tests on Integrity, specifically semantic weight, show that *tener* has lost the sense of possession for language users that produce this construction with *tener*.

In the process of measuring and applying grammaticalization concepts to specific examples, there is still a long way to go. The field of grammaticalization needs a solid system that measures grammaticalization, which includes both the synchronic and diachronic nature of language change.

References

Cuenca, M. J., & Hilferty, J. (1999). *Introducción a la lingüística cognitiva*. Editorial Ariel.

Davies, M. (2002). *Corpus del español: 100 million words, 1200s-1900s*. http://www.corpusdelespanol.org/hist-gen/

Givón, T. (1979). From discourse to syntax: Grammar as a processing strategy. In T. Givón (Ed.), *Discourse and syntax* (pp. 81–112). Academic Press.

Heine, B., Claudi, U., & Hünnemeyer, F. (1991). *Grammaticalization: A conceptual framework*. University of Chicago Press.

Heine, B., & Reh, M. (1984). *Grammaticalization and reanalysis in african languages*. Helmut Buske Verlag Gmbh.

Herce, B. (2015). *The synchrony and diachrony of time deictic adverbials: Spanish 'hacer'+time in a cross-linguistic perspective* (Doctoral dissertation). University of the Basque Country. https://www.academia.edu/20136587/The_synchrony_and_diachrony_of_time_deictic_adverbials_Spanish_hacer_time_in_a_cross-linguistic_perspective_-_Masters_Thesis

Herce, B. (2017). Spanish time constructions with hacer. *Belgian Journal of Linguistics*, *31*, 273–300. https://doi.org/10.1075/bjl.00011.her

Hopper, P. J., & Traugott, E. C. (2004, May 15). *Grammaticalization*. Cambridge University Press.

Lehmann, C. (2015). *Thoughts on grammaticalization*. Language Science Press.

Pérez Toral, M. (1992). *Sintaxis histórica funcional del español: El verbo "hacer" como impersonal*. Universidad de Oviedo, Servicio de Publicaciones.

Sedano, M. J. (2000). Perífrasis de gerundio en el español hablado de caracas. *Opción: Revista de Ciencias Humana y Sociales*, 35–53.

Tejera, M. (1993). *Diccionario de venezolanismos*. Universidad Central de Venezuela.

Traugott, E. C., & Heine, B. (Eds.). (1991). *Approaches to grammaticalization*. J. Benjamins.