

FINAL SUBORDINATE STRUCTURES IN BALKAN JUDEO-SPANISH

Iskra Dobрева

Sofia University "St. Kliment Ohridski"

Докладът се фокусира върху употребата на подчинителното наклонение в подчинителни структури в еврейско-испанския, които стоят в опозиция с по-голямата част от подчинените изречения, в които се наблюдава тенденцията подчинителното наклонение да се заменя с изявително. Тази употреба се оказва силно подкрепена от замяната на инфинитивни конструкции с конструкции с лични форми на глагола в еврейско-испанския. Това следва балканската тенденция за заместване на инфинитива, като разглежданите подчинени изречения са една от най-ясните и отличителни семантично-синтактични области, където *para* + инфинитив е заменен от *para ke* + подчинително наклонение в еврейско-испанския.

Ключови думи: еврейско-испански, подчинително наклонение, заместване на инфинитива, подчинителни структури.

This paper focuses on the maintenance of Subjunctive in final subordinate structures in Judeo-Spanish (JS) in contrast to the greater part of subordinate clauses where the Subjunctive tends to be replaced by the Indicative. This maintenance is seen as highly supported by the replacement of infinitive by finite structures in JS, following the Balkan gradual pattern of Infinitive replacement, final clauses being one of the most clear and outstanding semantic-syntactic areas where *para* + Infinitive is replaced by *para ke* + Subjunctive in JS.

Key words: Judeo-Spanish, Subjunctive, replacement of Infinitive, final subordinate structures.

1. Balkan pattern in Infinitive replacement by finite (ke+Subjunctive) structure in JS

JS is a new-comer to the Balkan linguistic area and the loss of Infinitive and its replacement by ke+Subjunctive structures in JS is at a very initial, incomplete stage. Beside other cases of JS infinitive replacement mentioned in section 8 below, final clauses clearly illustrate this change in JS, although it is not complete, i.e. *para*+Infinitive coexists with *para ke*+Subjunctive. This change replicates the Balkan areal feature of gradual replacement of the Infinitive by finite forms which is almost complete in the main Balkan languages. Infinitive

replacement by *da*-headed complements in Bulgarian was the earliest detected in final Infinitive (Assenova 2002: 169) and Infinitive whereby the main verb has the semantics of desire, will and intention (Koneski 1996: 177), while use of infinitive persisted longer after modal verb 'I can', among others. Similarly in Greek, where except in some dialects, infinitive replacement by *va*-complements is nowadays complete, the earliest replacements are found in final clauses, while with other types of predicates, like modal 'I can', and auxiliary 'I have' Infinitive was used as late as in Medieval Greek (Baldissera 2012:39). The fact that final clauses are one of the most outstanding cases of infinitive replacement by finite (Subjunctive) structure in Judeo-Spanish comes to support the hypothesis by Cinque (2004) and illustrated by Baldissera (2012) about Balkan influence in Griko, that infinitive complements are replaced by finite *va*-complements when they cease to be functional heads. Final semantics is born by the complementizer *para ke/porke* which in JS is analogous to the main Balkan: *γτα va* (Gr.), *za da* (Bulg.), *ca să* (Rum.), *për tē* (Alb.).

2. Judeo-Spanish within the Balkan Linguistic Area.

Judeo-Spanish (JS) joins the Balkan Linguistic Area after the end of the 15th century and developed for a rather short period within this areal entity. The Sephardic population is a minority, and it settled in the towns of the Ottoman Empire, where JS comes into contact with several Balkan languages simultaneously spoken by local inhabitants. Therefore, Balkan JS adopted and adapted Balkan features and established them into its Hispanic system. The Balkan structures and patterns adopted into JS are very closely interconnected and dependent on the Ibero-Romance genealogy.

Within the Ibero-Romance continuum, Spanish (the Ibero-Romance based on the central-north Castilian), being more innovative, may be opposed to the peripheral Ibero-Romance varieties (Catalan, Aragonese, Portuguese) being more conservative (Sánchez/Echenique Elizondo 2005).

The largest part of Sephardic population came from Central Spain (Toledo, Zaragoza) but several peripheral Ibero-Romance and Romance features are found both in JS vocabulary and structure, incl. phonology, morphology and syntax. Balkan influence in JS is expressed as the reinforcement of certain marginal or peripheral Ibero-Romance structures, especially when they are present in the Balkan linguistic area.

After leaving Spain, Sephardic population took various directions and followed different routes and itineraries, coming into contact with various peoples and their languages. After leaving Spain, many of them spent several years and tens of years at neighboring countries, like Portugal, Navarre, Italy and France, many Sephardic Jews also settled in Western and Central European towns joining Ashkenazim and many established in the Ottoman towns joining the picturesque Jewish communities who have already been there for decades and centuries before: Byzantine Jews, Hungarian and Bavarian Jews, Italian Jews, etc.

3. Judeo-Spanish as a language of the Sephardic diaspora.

JS formed as the language of the Sephardic extra-Iberian diaspora. The Balkan JS koiné is based on 15th-century Spanish, with a huge amount of foreign influence ranging from Ibero-Romance, Romance to Hebrew, Turkish, Greek, to name but few. Frequently in JS descriptions Balkan influence is ignored or omitted, yet, during the doctoral studies (2011-2016) of the author of the present paper, it was found that the structures and patterns which JS receives from Balkan languages are Balkan areal features, rather than specific bilingual influence. To sum up, JS adopted those Balkan features which have been spread at areal level in the main Balkan languages. That is why Gabinskii 1992 calls JS a Neo-Balkan language, placing it alongside other newcomers to the Balkan Linguistic Area, like Romani. Within the Romance landscape, JS may be classified as a Neo-Balkan-Romance (Gabinskii 2009) and as Kabatek/Pusch (2011) point out:

apart from their historical kinship, the Romance languages have also had a shared contact history during their independent evolution – above all with classical Latin, but also with other languages.

...

Apart from the inner-Romance areal convergence, areal parallels have been observed with Germanic (for the Gallo-Romance and partly the Italo-Romance area) and with Balkan languages (for Balkan-Romance within the “Balkan-Sprachbund”). Kabatek/Pusch (2011: 71)

Naturally, the main features of Balkanization are found in the Balkan Romance languages (Romanian, Aromanian, Megleno-Romanian), but JS also reveals certain relevant facts of Romance-Balkan interaction.

4. Balkan areal features in Judeo-Spanish.

JS Balkanization has not lasted long enough as to create innovations, it has rather increased the frequency of structures and patterns found both in Ibero-Romance and Balkan

languages alike. Very often, JS sounds archaic to native Spanish speakers. This is due to the fact that Balkan areal features coincide with structures which existed in Medieval Spanish or exist in the peripheral Ibero-Romance languages, but have been dropped from Spanish (Castilian being the most innovative Ibero-Romance variety). Balkan areal influence reactivates these infrequent and archaic Hispanic and Ibero-Romance structures in JS. Several JS investigators (Quintana 2006) claim they are Aragonese or Portuguese or of other Romance origin. Nevertheless, the existence of the structures in question in Balkan languages as well helped to establish in Balkan JS koiné and maintain its active use for four to five centuries.

Apart from the already mentioned complex and continuous itineraries of Sephardic population prior to reaching Ottoman lands, the contact with local Jewish population (living in the Ottoman towns) also contributed to the balkanization of JS koiné, it was a continuous process which lasted few centuries. After the expulsion from Iberian Kingdoms (Spain 1492, Portugal 1496, Navarre 1497) many Sephardic Jews remained as apparently converted Christians, others left for North Africa and the Eastern Mediterranean (then within the limits of the Ottoman Empire), still others moved northwards to France and the Netherlands and many settled in the newly discovered American Lands. At a linguistic level, the Sephardic who settle in the towns of Ottoman Balkans, Asia Minor and Eastern Mediterranean Coast, form the Oriental variety of Judeo-Spanish, whose vernacular version is known as Judezmo, compared to, for instance, Haketia, the Moroccan Judeo-Spanish variety. JS developed in extra-Iberian diaspora for several centuries with almost no contact with Spanish or other Ibero-Romance languages. As Spanish Jews had a different place of origin (Aragon, Castille, Andalucia, etc.), JS developed as a *koiné* based on the Castilian, with several elements from the Ibero-Romance languages, such as Aragonese, Portuguese, Catalan, among others. Simultaneously, Italian influence is also noticeable, as many Sephardic people spent several years and decades in different parts of Italy, before moving to the Ottoman Empire. Therefore, prior to settling in the Balkans and afterwards, Judezmo natives came into contact with various non-Balkan and Balkan peoples speaking different Romance and non-Romance languages, as well as Balkan languages (spoken also by local Jews, part of the local urban population in Ottoman Europe) and received considerable Balkan linguistic influence, which in this paper is illustrated by looking into the subordinate final clauses in JS.

5. Romance features of Judeo-Spanish.

Like the rest of Romance languages, Castilian has a clear morphologically expressed distinction between Indicative and Subjunctive modes (the so-called modal vowel change inherited from Latin):

a → ě (I conj.), e → ě (II, III, IV conj.)

Indicativus/Conjunctivus praesentis activi 3 Sg:

amāt > amēt (I) delēt > deleāt (II) scribit > scribāt (III) audit > audiāt (IV), Georgieva 2006 (87-88).

Depending on the semantic of the verb in the main clause, the subordinate clause is in Indicative or Subjunctive expressing prospectiveness, uncertainty, desire, goal to be achieved or performed in the future, etc.

6. Neutralization of Subjunctive by Indicative.

The Subjunctive form in embedded clauses is rather unstable, it may easily drop and be replaced by Indicative forms in early Romance period, it has also been attested in Latin texts and described as *assimilatio (attractio) modi* (Georgieva 2012: 343-344). The more frequent case is the replacement of Subjunctive by Indicative (as Indicative is the unmarked member of the opposition Ind. / Subj.), but the opposite is also found, Georgieva 2012:344). The replacement (or neutralization of the marked by unmarked member) is also frequent in Spanish, it is typical in situations of language instability, such as creolization (in Caribbean Spanish and Portuguese-based creole versions), in situations of language contact of Spanish with other languages (English in the USA, Latin American Indian languages, etc.) or in the acquisition of Spanish as a foreign language. Pushed by the syncretism between Indicative and Subjunctive in Balkan languages, the replacement of Subjunctive by Indicative forms is rather frequent in Balkan JS, both in independent sentences or embedded clauses, for instance:

Ke me yeva, ke me traiga (JS)

"let it take me, let it carry me".

verses from the popular Balkan JS song *Una fwente*.

7. Maintenance of Subjunctive in Final Clauses.

It has been also observed in Balkan JS and many researchers (Berenguer 2012, Schmid 2016, among others) unanimously agree that there is a general trend of loss of Subjunctive forms in JS subordinate clauses, where the Spanish norm requires or prefers its use.

Simultaneously, several JS researchers (Schmid 2008, Schlumpf 2015, among others) agree that in subordinate final clauses, Subjunctive is maintained (this stable maintenance has

been noticed as early as by Luria (1930) who remarks that it is «preserved with considerable fidelity» (Luria (1930: 194) cited by Romero (2011: 92), in contrast to other types of subordinate clauses where Subjunctive tends to be replaced by Indicative.

Among the facts that contributed to this maintenance, the following may be pointed out: Unlike most Spanish subordinate clauses, where the alternation between the Indicative and the Subjunctive is used, final subordination is characterized by the alternation of the Infinitive and the Subjunctive. In particular, the Infinitive is applied when the subject of the main clause coincides with the subject of the embedded clause (S1=S2) (ex: Vengo para despedirme) and the Subjunctive is applied when the two subjects differ (S1≠S2). Nevertheless, JS presents final clauses where even though the two subjects coincide, the Subjunctive is applied:

Vengo para ke te yame. (JS)

I am coming to call you (EN), in contrast to the Standard Spanish:

Vengo para llamarte. (SP)

or the rhetorical question:

Ken eres tu para ke demandes? (JS)

Who are you to ask? (EN)

¿Quién eres tú para demandar?

The use of *para que* + Subjunctive, instead of *para* + Infinitive in final clauses is one of the cases of adoption in JS of Balkan replacement of the Infinitive by the Subjunctive.

The replacement of the Infinitive by the Subjunctive is one of the earliest attested balkanisms (Kopitar 1829). It is one of the typical Balkan areal features and is present also in JS, although it is at an initial stage of development and coexists and competes with Infinitive in the same positions.

In Modern Balkan languages, the loss of Infinitive and its replacement by finite constructions (headed by the subordinators *da*, *va*, *tě*, *sã*) has expanded to almost all the cases where in older periods Infinitive had been used (as attested in Old Greek, Romanian or Bulgarian texts) (Asenova 2002: 169).

In contrast to the main Balkan languages where the Infinitive is almost completely lost, the replacement of Infinitive by (ke + Subjunctive) in JS occurs in the following independent and complex sentences:

- the Deliberative (Dubitative) Subjunctive (mainly in auto- or rhetoric questions, whereby the subjects resonates what decision to take, that is why it is typical for the language of drama and dialogue), following wh-words or alternate questions of the type *should I or should I not?*;
 ex. 1 *Kualo ke aga?* (JS)
 ¿Qué puedo hacer? (SP)
 What should I do? (EN)
 ex. 2 *Kuando ke te vengamos a bushkar?* (JS) (Friedman/Joseph 2014: 16)
 When should we come to pick you up? (EN)
 ¿Cuándo podemos venir a recogerte? (SP)
- Deontic modal constructions (obligation)
 ex. 3 *Kale ke aga.* (JS)
 I must/have to do it. (EN)
 Debo/Tengo que hacer (SP).
- complement clauses whereby the main verb means desire, will, intention.
- final subordinate constructions
- other adverbial embedded clauses (headed by the prepositions *sin, fin, asta*), which are also characterized by the alternation of the Infinitive (S1=S2) and the Subjunctive (S1≠S2).

The use of Subjunctive in the above mentioned cases in Judezmo is not arbitrary, nor accidental. It is highly expected, as the above enumerated cases are among the most typical Subjunctive uses in Latin (Georgieva 2012: 157), Coniunctivus Deliberativus (Georgieva 2012: 160), ut finale (Georgieva 2012: 256-258) (final subordinate clauses) ex. *Haec propterea scripsi, ut me non sine causa laborare intellegeres* Cic. Fam. 13.67. I have written you this, to let you know that I do not work in vain. (Examples from Georgieva 2012) *Cupio tibi memorāre quō magis laetēre.* Verg. Aen.6.718. I want to narrate you, so that you enjoy more). Of course in Latin, the introduction of the final subordinate clause with *quo* was one of the numerous options to express goal, beside *supinum I* (with *verba movendi*), the gerund and active participia constructions (Georgieva 2012: 258).

As pointed out in the beginning of this paper with reference to Asenova (2002: 169), the earliest replacement of the Infinitive by *da, va, sã* -headed constructions is in the final subordination, and in Modern Balkan languages the final use of the *da, va, tĕ, sã* – constructions

are some of the most typical and clearly expressed. Although at earlier stage, the same process of Balkan replacement of Infinitive by finite Subjunctive clauses is attested in JS final clauses, which helped to maintain the subjunctive there, unlike the remainder types of subordinate clauses where the alternation between Indicative and Subjunctive, and frequently the Subjunctive vowel is replaced by Indicative.

At phonological level, this replacement is a rather expected change, as in unstressed position the JS middle vowel *a* frequently raises to *e*, as the Subjunctive Romance vowel (for 1st conjugation *a*→*e*). Moreover, the first conjugation is the most numerous and productive not only in Spanish, but also in JS, and most of the newly formed verbs follow the 1st conjugation pattern (e.g. *boyadear* – to paint, based on the noun *boyá* (paint, color), borrowed from Turkish into the Balkan languages, or from French or Italian (*souhaiter*, from Fr. to wish, to desire), e.g. *Antes ke nada kero suetar a todos los amigos de L/K anyada buena*. (example from the forum LadinoKomunita).

8. Illustrative examples.

The examples have been extracted from original Judeo-Spanish texts written at the end of the 19th century or the beginning of the 20th century. The texts were written in different part of the Balkans and Asia Minor, both in predominant Greek, Bulgarian or Turkish environment. But the replacement of Infinitive in the above described cases (final clauses, obligative, deliberative constructions and complements to main 'volo'-verbs) is quite stable, which shows the initial stage of adoption of this Balkan areal feature in final clauses, as found at initial stages of replacement of final infinitive by *ða-*, *va-*, *sǎ-* construction in Old Bulgarian, Greek and Romanian, respectively.

The examples presented by Berenguer (2012) and Romero (2011) will also be used, as they are also taken from original Sephardic texts of the mentioned period, when the Balkan elements in Judezmo are frequent and obvious.

The Spanish pattern in final clauses is characterized by the alternation between Infinitive and Subjunctive, whereby *para* + Infinitive is used when the main and the subordinate clause have the same subject (S1=S2) and *para que* + Subjunctive, when the subjects differ (S1≠S2). In Modern Balkan languages, *za ða* (Bulgarian), *για va* (Greek), *pentru sǎ, ca sǎ* (Rumanian), *për të* (Albanian) are followed by the finite verbal form, irrespective of whether the subjects of the main and embedded final clause coincide or differ.

The examples also show how Spanish and Balkan patterns coexist in JS. When the subjects of the main and embedded final clauses are two different persons, then the Spanish and Balkan pattern coincide and Subjunctive is 'maintained' in JS (Spanish inheritance and Balkan areal influence contribute to the maintenance of Subjunctive in final clauses):

The Spanish pattern (S1≠S2 Subj.) is preserved in the following example:

Trushe la farina para ke fagas borekas. (JS) (Romero 2011: 91)

He traído la harina para que me hagas borrekitas. (SP my own translation)

I brought the flour in order to make me pastries. (EN Romero 2011: 91)

When the Spanish and Balkan patterns differ, the Balkan pattern is preferred in JS (S1=S2 Subj.) in the following example:

Kuantes paras keris *ki mi kortes* esti arvul? (JS) (Romero 2011: 93)

¿Cuánto dinero quieres para *cortar* este árbol? (SP my own translation)

How much money do you want so that you cut this tree for me? (EN Romero 2011: 93)

Another example extracted from the studied corpus shows the use of the Balkan pattern (S1≠S2 Subj.) in JS, in contrast to the Spanish Infinitive pattern:

Tu padre me envio para ke te *yame*. (JS)

Tu padre me ha enviado para *llamarte*. (SP, my own translation)

"Your father has sent me to call you."

In the above example, the subjects of the main and embedded clause are different: your father and *me*, while the indirect object is marked by the personal pronoun *te* (to call *you*). In this case, Spanish uses the infinitive plus the enclitic atonic form of the personal pronoun (*llamarte*). The use of the Subjunctive form in this case is not ungrammatical in Spanish, but it is rather pleonastic and may be used to emphasize. JS prefers the Subjunctive as a result of a Balkan influence.

The same phenomenon of Infinitive replacement by the construction (ke + Subjunctive) is found rhetorical questions, as in the example:

Ken sos tu para ke demandes? (JS)

¿Quién eres tú para preguntar? (SP, own translation)

"Who are you to ask?"

Like in the previous case, the Subjunctive use in the rhetorical question is not agrammatical, it may be used to emphasize, but the neutral Spanish use is *para* + Infinitive, e.g. *¿Quién eres tú para burlarte de mí, para reírte de mí?* (SP) 'Who are you to make fun of / to laugh at me?'

Another example:

Es mi madre la ke me da impulso para ke eskriba. (JS)

Es mi madre la que me da impulso para escribir (SP, own translation)

"It is my mother who gave the impulse to write"

9. Reduction of *para ke* to *ke* as Balkan influence.

Another interesting feature concerning JS final clauses is the drop of the preposition *para* from the complex final conjunction *para que*. This comes mainly from the fact that the semantics of finality is understood by the context. In Balkan languages the drop of the final preposition before the finite clause is common, especially in spoken vernacular varieties (Asenova 2002: 169, with reference to Sandfeld 1930), see examples below. Balkan JS easily aligned with Balkan languages in this respect, as in Spanish (Modern and Old) this omission is also possible, but only in commands, whereby the main verb is in imperative. Nevertheless, the drop of *para* from the final conjunction *para ke* expands its use in JS not only in commands (as in Spanish), but in every other final sentence (as in Balkan languages).

The drop of *para* from *para ke* in JS has been studied by Romero 2011 based on transcripts of oral interviews made in 1920s with Sephardic people from Monastir/Bitolia, and excerpts from the comic columns of Sephardic newspapers issued in Thessaloniki in the 1930s, the summarized data in the following table:

TABLE 1. *Subordinate final clauses in Monastir and Salonika*

Construction	Monastir (1927)		Salonika (1930s)	
<i>para</i> + <i>ke</i> + subjunctive	20	(59 %)	32	(78 %)
(<i>para</i>) + <i>ke</i> + subjunctive	12	(35 %)	9	(22 %)
<i>para</i> + <i>ke</i> + indicative	0		0	
(<i>para</i>) + <i>ke</i> + indicative	2	(6 %)	0	

(Romero 2011:94)

In Balkan languages, with movement and say verbs (*verba movendi* and *verba dicendi*) the first element from the complex final conjunction may drop: Greek (γῆ) *va*, Balkan Slavic (за) *da*, Balkan Romance (*pentru* / *ca*) *să*, Albanian (*për*) *të*, JS (*para*) *ke*.

Some examples follow.

- Dropping of final preposition in Balkan languages:

GR έλα (για) να σου πω δύο λόγια

BG ела (за) да ти кажа две думи.

RO vin (la) să-ți spun două cuvinte.

AL vijnë për të ju them dy fjalë./ Ejani të them dy fjalë.

EN transl. "Come to tell you something"

- Dropping of final preposition in commands in Spanish:

Spanish (beginning XVI century)

Ven acá, saca aquí cualquier cosa que coma [saca algo para comer] (Loçana, XXVI, 125)

(example from Andres-Suárez 1994: 222)

Come on, get out of your bag something to eat. (EN, my own translation)

Modern Spanish:

Ven que te arregle la corbata. (SP)

Come so that I can fix your tie. (EN)

Escóndete que no te vea tu ex novia. (SP)

Hide yourself, so that your ex-girlfriend doesn't see you. (EN)

(Examples from Campos (1993), referred to by Romero (2011: 95))

Romero (2011) observes that:

The subordinator *ke* with finality value does occur after commands in Balkan Judeo-Spanish, as illustrated in (13) below:

Vati ki ti pagi. (JS)

Leave so that I can pay you. (EN)

But this is not the exclusive distribution of *ke* + subjunctive in Balkan Judeo-Spanish, as it is found in other subordinate final clauses not preceded by commands. Romero (2011: 95)

The expansion of functions of final *ke* (beyond commands as in Modern Spanish) may be claimed to be a Balkan feature in JS.

This areal feature, like the remainder of Balkanisms in JS, developed based on a stable Ibero-Romance inheritance. Balkan JS is a smooth example of interaction of genealogical and areal factors, whereby those areal features have been most easily adopted which have certain Ibero-Romance (or Romance) predisposition. To sum up, JS adopted those Balkan areal features which are found in Spanish or other Ibero-Romance languages or in their spoken, vernacular varieties.

10. *Por, para* as final prepositions.

Last, but not the least, another important feature relevant to final clauses in Balkan JS is the frequent lack of distinction between the final prepositions *para* and *por* and their alternative forms (*porque*, etc.). This distinction is rather strict in Modern Spanish, but was not present in Medieval Spanish, for instance:

Póngola por dos respetos: el uno, por henchir más el vocablo, y el otro, porque aya diferencia entre el toma con el acento en la o... (Dial. 73) Juan de Valdés (1509-1542), example from Andres-Suárez (1994: 223)

As it has been reported by Schulte (2007: 307) this distinction is absent in Romanian, as well as in Southern Italian dialects (Schulte 2007: 307 with reference to Ledgeway 1998). Both Romanian and Southern Italian have been in intense contact with Balkan languages. The same phenomenon is found also in Balkan JS, and the maintenance of this Old Hispanic feature may be attributed to Balkan influence.

The following examples illustrate the use of *por*, *porque* with final semantics, as allomorphs of *para que*, which is common in Medieval Spanish and XVth century Spanish:

...porke si enbezaran bien a meldar (JS)

... para que aprendan a leer bien (SP, own translation)

"...so that they learn to read well"

i la djente si lis aderesavan ande el porke lis diera consejos (JS)

y la gente se dirigía a él para recibir consejos (SP, own translation)

"and people approached him in order to seek advice".

11. Conclusions.

By coming into contact with Balkan languages, Judeo-Spanish adopted those Balkan areal features which are structurally compatible and had previous (Ibero-Romance) background for their development in JS, as has been shown above with the replacement of *para* + Infinitive by *para ke* + Subjunctive in final clauses. The replacement of the Infinitive by the Subjunctive in JS is a change at a rather initial, incomplete stage of development, as both the Spanish and Balkan patterns coexist in JS. The replacement replicates the Balkan areal trend of gradual replacement of Infinitive by finite constructions (*va*, *да*, *să*, *të* complements) which also has been attested the earliest in final clauses in the main Balkan languages, while with other predicates

(e.g. modal 'I can') Infinitive was used longer. The semantics of final clauses predisposes the replacement of infinitive by finite constructions whereby functional heads cease to be lexicalized by matrix verbs (Cinque 2004). Replacement of para+Infinitive by finite para ke+Subjunctive construction contributed to the maintenance of Subjunctive in JS final clauses, in contrast to other types of subordinate clauses where Subjunctive tends to be lost in Balkan Judeo-Spanish (again pushed by Balkan areal syncretism between Indicative and Subjunctive).

References

- Andres-Suárez 1994*: Andres-Suárez, Irene. El verbo español. Sistemas medievales y sistema clásico. Madrid: Gredos, 1994.
- Baldissera 2012*: Baldissera, Valeria. Conservative and Innovative Tendencies in Griko Infinitive Complements, in Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Modern Greek Dialects and Linguistic Theory, ed. by Brian Joseph et al., vol. 5, No 1, 35-44.
- Berenguer 2012*: Berenguer Amador. Ángel La sintaxis del subjuntivo en judeoespañol – In: eHumanista, vol. 20, 47-62, 2012.
- Cinque 2004*: Cinque, Guglielmo Restructuring and Functional Structure, in Structures and Beyond. The Cartography of Syntactic Structures, ed. by Adriana Belletti. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004.
- De nuevo sobre el infinitivo en judeoespañol 2016*: De nuevo sobre el infinitivo en judeoespañol, в Ledgeway, Adam/Cennamo, Michaela/Mensching, Guido (eds.) Actes du XXVIIe Congrès International de linguistique et de philologie romanes (Nancy, 15-20 juillet 2013) Section 4: Syntaxe, Nancy, 439-450.
- Friedman, Joseph 2014*: Friedman, V., Joseph, B. Lessons from Judezmo about the Balkan Sprachbund and contact linguistics, International Journal of the Sociology of Language 226, 3-23, 2014.
- Kabatek, Pusch 2011*: Kabatek, J., Pusch, Cl. The Romance Languages, in Kortman, Bernd/Van der Auwera, Johan (eds.) The Languages and Linguistics of Europe, volume I, Hans Hock (ed.). De Gruyter Mouton, Berlin/Boston, 69-96, 2011.
- Kopitar 1829*: Kopitar, Jernej. Albanische, walachische und bulgarische Sprache – In: Jahrbücher der Literatur (Wien) 46, 59–106, 1829.

- Ledgeway 1998*: Ledgeway, Adam. 'La ristrutturazione in napoletano', in Giovanni Ruffino (ed.), *Atti del XXI Congresso internazionale di linguistica e filologia romanza*. Centro di studi filologici e linguistici siciliani, Università di Palermo 18-24 settembre 1995. Sezione 2 Morfologia e sintassi delle lingue romanze. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 529-541, 1998.
- Luria 1930*: Luria, Max. A study of the Monastir dialect of Judeo-Spanish based on oral material collected in Monastir, Yugo-Slavia. New York, Instituto de las Españas en los Estados Unidos. Reprinted from *The Revue Hispanique* 79, 323-583, 1930.
- Quintana 2009*: Quintana Rodríguez, Aldina. Aportación lingüística de los romances aragonés y portugués a la "coine" judeoespañola', в David M. Bunis (ed.), *Languages and Literatures of Sephardic and Oriental Jews*. Proceedings of the Sixth International Congress for Research on the Sephardi and Oriental Jewish Heritage, Jerusalem, Bialik Institute and Misgav Yerushalayim, 221-255, 2009.
- Romero 2011*: Romero, Reynaldo. Variation in Balkan Judeo-Spanish final clauses, *Ianua. Revista Philologica Romanica, Romania Minor*, vol. 11 <<http://www.romaniaminor.net/ianua/>>, 89-99, 2011.
- Ruíz Tinoko 2002*: LadinoKomunita Ruíz Tinoco, Antonio. PHP-KWIC de tekstos en Djudeo-Espanyol: Letras de los miembros de LadinoKomunita. Forum Moderator: Rachel Bortnick. [last accessed: 22 May 2017]. <<http://lingua2.cc.sophia.ac.jp/diksionaryo-LK/kwic>>.
- Sánchez/Echenique Elizondo 2005*: Sánchez Méndez, Juan / Echenique Elizondo, Maria Teresa. *Las lenguas de un reino*. Estudios de Historia Lingüística Hispánica. Madrid: Gredos, 2005.
- Sandfeld 1930*: Sandfeld, Kristian. *Linguistique balkanique*. Paris: Klincksieck, 1930 [1926].
- Schmid 2008*: Schmid, Beatrice. La lengua sefardí en su plenitud, в Hassán, Iakob/Izquierdo Benito, R. (coords.) и Romero, Elena (ed.) *Sefardíes, Literatura y lengua de una nación dispersa*. Cuenca, Universidad de Castilla-La Mancha (= Colección Humanidades 96), 51-79, 2008.
- Schlumpf 2015*: Schlumpf, Sandra. *Condicionabilidad y concesividad en judeoespañol moderno escrito, Teoría y análisis de corpus*. Lausanne: Sociedad Suiza de Estudios Hispánicos, 2015.

- Schulte 2007*: Schulte, Kim. Prepositional Infinitives in Romance. A Usage-Based Approach to Syntactic Change. Studies in Historical Linguistics. Vol. 3 Davis, Graeme/Bernhardt, Karl/ Garne, Mark (eds). Peter Lang, Bern.
- Асенова 2002*: Асенова, П. Балканско езикознание (основни проблеми на Балканския езиков съюз). Велико Търново: Faber, 2002.
- Габинский 2002*: Габинский, Марк. Ibero-balcanica, в Н. Н. Казанский (отв.ред.), Е. Р. Крючкова (отв.вып.) Материалы конференции, посвященной 90-летию со дня рождения члена-корреспондента РАН Агнии Васильевны Десницкой, 15 - 17 апреля 2002 года/ Институт лингвистических исследований РАН. Наука, Санкт Петербург, 46-52, 2002.
- Георгиева 2006*: Георгиева, Н. Латински език. Морфология. София: Университетско издателство Св. Климент Охридски, 2006.
- Конески 1996*: Конески, Блаже. Граматика на македонскиот јазик. Скопје: Просветно дело, 1996.
- Латински език. Синтаксис 2012*: Латински език. Синтаксис. София: Университетско издателство Св. Климент Охридски, 2012.
- Сефардский 1992*: Сефардский (еврейско-испанский) язык, балканское наречие. Штиинца, Кишинев.