

The Integration of Romanian Loan Verbs in a Bulgarian Dialect of Romania

Kenta Sugai
Hokkaido University, Japan

Abstract This study explores the borrowing of verbs in the Bulgarian dialect of Brănești in Romania and aims to investigate how bilingual speakers integrated Romanian loan verbs and why they adopted such integration strategies based on quantitative and contrastive analyses. For this purpose, the original colloquial data collected by the author in the 2010s, which included 93 Romanian loan verbs, are used. I argue that bilingual speakers choose either a direct or indirect insertion strategy, and in the latter case, they utilize the borrowed morpheme *-'askǎ* as an integration marker. The process is motivated by formal similarities and productivity.

Keywords Loan Verb. Morphological Integration. Language Contact. Bulgarian. Romanian.

Summary 1. Introduction. – 2. Previous Studies. – 2.1. Bulgarian Dialects in Romania. – 2.2. Typological Viewpoint. – 3. Analysis of Loan Verbs from Romanian. – 3.1. Direct Insertion. – 3.2. Indirect Insertion. – 3.3. The Loan Verbs with *-'askǎ*. – 3.4. Why *-'askǎ* and not *-'azǎ*?. – 3.5. *-'askǎ* as a Loan Verb Integration Marker. – 4. Conclusion.



Peer review

Submitted 2024-04-30
Accepted 2024-08-05
Published 2024-12-12

Open access

© 2024 Sugai | 4.0



Citation (2024), "The Integration of Romanian Loan Verbs in a Bulgarian Dialect of Romania". *Balcania et Slavia*, None(1), 65-78.

1 Introduction

This study investigated the borrowing of verbs in a bilingual context, specifically in the language of a Bulgarian minority in Romania, within the framework of typological studies on borrowings in the language contact situation.¹

This study provides a detailed description and analysis of Romanian loan verbs in the Bulgarian dialect and discusses the process and mechanism of verb borrowing in the context of bilingualism. Original oral data collected during the author's visits to the village in the 2010s were used for analysis. The author conducted interviews with 14 bilingual speakers in a free conversation style.

The study focuses on the Bulgarian dialect of Brănești (Ilfov County), located in the east adjacent to Bucharest. The village was first inhabited by Bulgarian immigrants from the Silistra region of northeastern Bulgaria (cf. Mladenov 1993, 34, etc.). However, the language shift has progressed to such a significant extent that there are few remaining bilingual elderly today (cf. Sugai 2021a). Most bilingual speakers whom the author interviewed were born in the 1930s and over 80 years old at the time of the author's field research. The oldest speaker among them was born in 1925 and the youngest in 1955.

2 Previous Studies

2.1 Bulgarian Dialects in Romania

Mladenov (1993, 404-8), who discussed the effect of language contact in the Bulgarian dialects of Romania in general, referred to verbal borrowing as well, providing a list of 63 Romanian loan verbs in the Bulgarian dialects of Romania. Although he analyzed the adaptation of Romanian loan nouns in the Bulgarian morphological system, he did not conduct a detailed analysis of the loan verbs from this perspective (Mladenov 1993, 372-80).

The issue concerning the adaptation of loan verbs from Romanian in the Brănești dialect was referred to partially in the author's earlier work dedicated to contact-induced borrowing in the Brănești dialect in general (Sugai 2021b, 59-61). However, only several loan verbs were examined. Thus, it hardly revealed the complete mechanism of

¹ This research is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 23K12150. The author expresses his gratitude to the informants in the village. Also, the author would like to thank the two anonymous reviewers of *Balcania et Slavia* for their valuable feedback, which helped him improve the manuscript. Any remaining errors are the author's own.

the integration process without reaching the generalization of the borrowing strategy adopted in the dialect.

Therefore, in this study, I thoroughly investigated audio data that included interviews with 14 bilingual speakers recorded during the author's fieldwork in the 2010s. I compiled a database containing 93 Romanian loan verbs in total to examine the issue on a larger scale with abundant loan verbs and reconsider the issue within the typological studies of verbal borrowing in a language contact situation.

2.2 Typological Viewpoint

Typological studies on verbal borrowing have identified four types of loan verb integration, as in (1).

- (1) Types of loan verb integration (Matras 2009, 176)
 - a. No modification of the original form of the verb ('direct insertion')
 - b. Morphological modification of the original form of the verb ('indirect insertion')
 - c. Insertion of the original form of the verb into a compound construction where it is accompanied by an inherited verb ('light verb')
 - d. Import of the original verb along with its original inflection ('paradigm transfer')

Loan verbs may or may not be modified, or even the original inflection can be transferred altogether when integrated into a recipient language. Wichmann and Wohlgemuth (2008) suggest the Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy, as in (2).

- (2) Loan Verb Integration Hierarchy (Wichmann, Wohlgemuth 2008, 108)
light verb strategy < indirect insertion < direct insertion < paradigm transfer

This hierarchy suggests that the degree of integration is the lowest for the light verb strategy and the highest for the paradigm transfer. The indirect insertion shows a somewhat higher degree of integration than the light verb strategy because only an additional suffix is required to integrate a loan verb into the recipient language's verbal morphology. The direct insertion is higher than the indirect one as the loan verb is integrated directly into the recipient language's grammar without any morphological process. As Matras (2009, 176-7) argued, the choice of form that is replicated from the donor language also differs among languages; this can be a verbal root or a default form such as an infinitive or a 3^{sg} finite form.

Therefore, which strategy and form for replication are selected by the speakers and what motivated them to choose that strategy is considered when investigating the process of verbal borrowing in the Bulgarian dialect.

3 Analysis of Loan Verbs from Romanian

3.1 Direct Insertion

Loan verbs from Romanian in the dialect have a Bulgarian inflectional suffix, i.e. the stems of the loan verbs are of Romanian origin. However, the inflectional suffix attached to them is of Bulgarian origin.

- (3) a. Še gu **sună-š** săs telefonu?
 FUT he.ACC call-PRS.2SG with telephone.DEF
 ‘Are you going to call him on the phone?’
 (< Ro. **a suna** ‘to call’)
- b. Ni moe dă **respiră-m**.
 NEG can SMP breathe-PRS.1SG
 ‘I cannot breathe.’
 (< Ro. **a respira** ‘to breathe’)

The inflectional suffix adopted is that of the Bulgarian verbs of the third inflection class. Therefore, Romanian loan verbs have the following paradigm in the indicative present: *sună-m*, *sună-š*, *sună-ø*, *sună-mi*, *sună-ti*, *sună-t*. This is a direct insertion, as no additional suffix is required to be inflected in the recipient language.

As for the form adopted for the stem, it coincides with the 3 SG/PL finite form in the indicative present of the Romanian verbs of the first inflection class (*sună* [IND.PRES.3SG/PL] < *a suna* [INF]). This 3 SG/PL inflectional suffix *-ă* formally coincides with the thematic vowel of the third inflection class in Bulgarian because the northeastern Bulgarian dialect of Brănești is characteristic of vowel reduction. Therefore, the thematic vowel /a/ is reduced to sound like [ă], which perfectly fits with the 3 SG/PL inflectional suffix of the Romanian verbs of the first inflection class *-ă*. Even though the morphological meaning differs between them (one is an inflectional suffix, whereas the other is a thematic vowel), the bilingual speakers of the Brănești dialect must have found similarities in both forms. As a result, they reinterpreted the Romanian finite form, including the ending *-ă*, as a stem of the Bulgarian third inflection class verb stem (Sugai 2021b, 60-1).

- (4) Reinterpretation process
 Ro. **sun-ă** [IND.PRS.3SG] > Br. **sună-** [default verb stem]

It should also be noted that this verb stem is applicable to any finite form in the Brănești dialect in the same way as the verb stem of the Bulgarian third inflection class can take any inflectional suffixes. In

other words, this verb stem derived from Romanian loan words seems to function as a default stem in the dialect.

I argued in my previous paper (Sugai 2021b) that the vowel *ă* is relevant to this reinterpretation process. This is supported by the fact that bilingual speakers adopt Romanian finite forms that end in *-ă* regardless of their grammatical meaning. Romanian verbs of the third inflection class take *-e* as an ending of 3 SG in the indicative mood, but *-ă* as an ending of 3 SG/PL in the subjunctive mood. When bilingual speakers replicate verb stems from the Romanian third inflection class verbs, they select the finite form in the subjunctive, as in (6).

- (5) **Petr'akă-wmi** ube.
 spend-**IMPF.1PL** good
 'We spent a good time.'
- (6) Ro. *petreac-ă* [**SBJV.PRS.3SG/PL**] > Br. *petr'akă-* [default verb stem]
 (cf. Ro. *petrec-e* [**IND.PRS.3SG**])

The verb stem *petr'akă-* can be derived only from the 3SG/PL finite form in the subjunctive for having a vowel alternation in the root (e > ea) that is reflected in the replicated form in the dialect (-rea- > -r'a-), as in (6). The selection of subjunctive finite forms instead of indicative ones is made based on the formal similarity, i.e. they take the inflectional suffix *-ă* that formally fits the thematic vowel of third inflection class verbs in Bulgarian (Sugai 2021b, 61).

Therefore, it can be assumed that the direct insertion is enabled by the identification process by bilingual speakers based on the formal similarity between the two different morphemes, i.e. the Romanian inflectional ending *ă* and the Bulgarian thematic vowel *a*. Also, the frequently observed direct insertion shows the high degree of integrity of the loan verbs in the Bulgarian morphological system.

3.2 Indirect Insertion

Furthermore, the Brănești dialect may resort to the indirect insertion strategy as well. Indeed, the loan verbs from Romanian may take the additional imperfective suffix *-wă* (<*-va*) when they are adopted in the Brănești dialect.

- (7) As *pričap-wă-m* dă šijă.
I-NOM understand-**IPFV-PRS.1SG** SMP sew
 'I can sew.'
 (< Ro. a pricepe 'to understand')
- (8) Ro. priceapă [**SUB.PRS.3.SG/PL**] > Br. *pričapă-* [default verbal stem]

> *pričap-wă*- [verb stem with imperfective suffix]
 (cf. pricepe [IND.PRS.3.SG] < a pricepe [INF])²

However, the indirect insertion strategy with the help of *-wă* is somewhat restricted in number. This is probably due to the fact that the suffix *-wă* is not a pure verbalizing derivational affix but a productive imperfective suffix. The formation of the imperfective verb with the help of the suffix *-wă* is characteristic of Bulgarian verbs in general (e.g. *opita-* > *opit-va-*).³ Thus, it is possible to assume that the suffix *-wă* is adopted only when its use is appropriate from a semantic point of view. This suggests that the indirect insertion strategy seems to be optional and generally yields to the direct insertion strategy in this specific dialect.

3.3 The Loan Verbs with *-'askă*

There are a series of Romanian loan verbs whose stems end in *-'askă*, as in (9).

- (9) a. As s kăko dă tă **serv'askă-m?**
 I-NOM with what SMP you.ACC serve-PRS.1SG
 'What can I serve you (to eat)?'
 (< Ro. a servi, -esc⁴ 'to serve')
- b. Nij sim dători dă stuvim dă **prim'askă-mi**
 we are obliged SMP stay SMP receive-PRS.1PL
 kotu ni dăde gospod'.
 what us give Lord
 'We ought to stay so that we receive what the Lord would give us.'
 (< Ro. a primi, -esc 'to receive')

The verbal stem with *-'askă* seems to have been replicated on the model of the finite form in the subjunctive present of Romanian fourth inflection class verbs that have an additional suffix *-esc* when conjugated. The additional suffix *-esc* in Romanian has two other allomorphs *-eșt-* and *-easc-* in accordance with the following vowel. While the former is realized when followed by such endings as *-i* and *-e*, the latter

² Again, the default verbal stem *pričapă-* is derived from the subjunctive but not indicative as the vowel alternation in Romanian (*-ce-* > *-cea-*) is reflected in the replicated form.

³ The same derivational process is also applied to loan verbs (e.g. *organizira-* > *organizir-va-*), although in most cases, it is still on the border of the norms (cf. Nicoletta 2008, 280).

⁴ As for the Romanian verbs that may take additional suffix in conjugation, the type of suffix (either *-esc* or *-ez*) is indicated after the infinitive form.

is conditioned only by the ending *-ă*, which is the ending of 3 SG/PL in the subjunctive present for the fourth inflection class in Romanian.

It can thus be assumed that the model for replication is a 3SG/PL finite form of the subjunctive present that ends in *-ească*. Note the formal similarity invited by the ending *-ă* to understand why the bilingual speakers selected the 3 SG/PL finite form of subjunctive present. They seem to have identified the finite form *servească* with a verbal stem of the third inflection class that involves the thematic vowel /a/.

- (10) Ro. *servească-ă* [SBJV.PRS.3SG/PL] > Br. *serv'askă-* [default verbal stem]

Therefore, it seems to be another case of the direct insertion strategy. Furthermore, as pointed out by Sugai (2021b), this verb suffix is observed not only in the loan verbs that have the equivalent suffix in Romanian *-esc*, as discussed earlier, but also in those that have another suffix *-ez*.

- (11) a. Mi kază doktoru, Mămaie, ni poate dă tă
 I.DAT told doctor.DEF grandma NEG can SMP you.ACC
uper'askă-m."
 operate-SUF-PRS.1SG
 'The doctor told me "Grandma, I can't perform an operation on you."
 (< Ro. a opera, -ez 'to operate')
- b. Pă kogă dă vizit'askă-š?
 ACC whom SMP visit-SUF-PRS.2SG
 'Who are you going to visit?'
 (< Ro. a vizita, -ez 'to visit')

What is significant here is that, although the Romanian verbs of the first inflection class with the suffix *-ez* do not have a form *-ească* in the paradigm, the equivalent form *'askă* is observed for those loan verbs. For example, the default verb form as *uper'askă* in (11) cannot be found in the paradigm of the equivalent Romanian verb *a opera* (**operească*). Therefore, it is evident that *'askă* can be applied even to the Romanian verbs that do not take such a finite form as *-ească*, namely those with *-ez* (*-ează*) (Sugai 2021b, 60-1). The quantitative analysis revealed that all 28 Romanian loan verbs with *-ez* were replicated with the suffix *'askă* in our database. It also turned out that this suffix *'askă* cannot be applied to those Romanian verbs that do not require any suffixes.⁵

It is thus suggested that *'askă* in the Brănești dialect has been recognized by bilingual speakers as an invariant independent suffix

⁵ Compare this to the case with French loan verbs in Dutch. The *-er* suffix seems to have been generalized as the marker used exclusively for loan verbs from French, even

rather than an inseparable part of the verb stem (cf. Sugai 2021b). This is probably induced, first of all, by the high degree of bilingualism spread among the speakers, which enabled them to correctly analyze the morphological structure of both languages. Also, the morphological structures that are formally quite similar to one another, as in (12), should have promoted this process.

(12)	stem	-suffix	-ending (prs.1sg)	
	Bg.	STEM	-va	-m
	Br.	STEM	-'askă	-m

It is possible to assume that the speakers identified the borrowed suffix *-'askă* with the native verbal suffixes. However, the stem with the borrowed suffix *-'askă* may have a further derivational process with the imperfective suffix *-wă*, as in (13), and it is observed for loan verbs of both inflection classes with *-ez* and *-esc* in Romanian, as in (14) and (15).

(13)	Gi	<i>film-'ask-wă-t</i>	săz	aparati	i
	they.ACC	film-SUF-IPF-PRS.3PL	with	cameras	and
		<i>puz-'ask-wă-t...</i>			
		take_pictures-SUF-IPF-PRS.3PL			
		'They film them [=people in disguise], take pictures...'			
		(< Ro. a filma, -ez 'to film'), (< Ro. a poza, -ez 'to take pictures')			

- (14) The Romanian first inflection class with *-ez*
- a. redžistr-'askă- redžistr-'ask-wă- (< Ro. a înregistra, -ez 'to record')
 - b. plant-'askă- plant-'ask-wă- (< Ro. a planta, -ez 'to plant')
 - c. âmfi-jaskă- âmfi-jask-wă- (< Ro. a înfia, -ez 'to adopt')
- (15) The Romanian fourth inflection class with *-esc*
- a. prim-'askă- prim-'ask-wă- (< Ro. a primi, -esc 'to receive')
 - b. ângriž-'askă- ângriž-'ask-wă- (< Ro. a îngriji, -esc 'to take care')
 - c. drăku-jaskă- drăku-jask-wă- (< Ro. a drăcui, -esc 'to curse')

This suggests the specific role of the suffix *-'askă* in accommodating loan verbs. We shall return to this issue later in this paper.

3.4 Why *-'askă* and not *-'ază*?

The loan verbs of Romanian that take the suffix *-ez* have a finite form that ends in *-'ază*. This form also satisfies the requirement for formal

if the original form does not contain *-er* but *-ir* (cf. Muysken 2000, 191-2).

similarity because it ends in *-ă*. However, why do bilingual speakers use the suffix *-'askă* instead of *-'ază*?

One of the two possible reasons for this choice is a productive derivational suffix *-ka* that carries a diminutive meaning in Bulgarian (e.g. *gleda* > *gled-ka-*; *zvăn* > *zvăn-ka-*) (cf. Nicolova 2008, 249; Maslov 1981, 108). The productivity of the suffix *-ka* likely caused the generalization of the suffix *-'askă* rather than the other one. There are also verbs whose stem ends in *-za* (e.g. *vliza-m*, etc.), but no verbal derivational suffixes formally correspond to *-za*. This is probably why *-'ază* was not involved in the adaptation of Romanian loan verbs in the dialect. Furthermore, in Bulgarian, there are generally fewer verbs that end in *-za* compared to those that end in *-ka*. In the reverse dictionary of the Bulgarian Academy of Sciences (Murdarov et al. 2011), there are only 24 verbs with *-za* compared with 740 verbs with *-ka*. It is thus suggested that the verb stem with *-ka* is much more familiar to Bulgarian speakers. Thus, it is more likely to be acceptable by the bilingual speakers as a general form, which could be related to the choice of *-'askă* instead of *-'ază* as well.

The other possible reason may be related to the productivity of Romanian verbs with *-esc*. Avram (2001, 200-1) reported that among the fourth inflection class verbs, the number of verbs with the suffix *-esc* is ten times more than that of verbs without it. Furthermore, there are differences in productivity between the verbs with *-ez* and those with *-esc*. She pointed out a tendency of limitation of *-ez*, but of extension of *-esc* (Avram 2001, 201).⁶ This means that the verbs with *-esc* are much more productive than those with *-ez*. Therefore, it is possible to assume that *-esc* (*-easc*) is more acceptable for bilingual speakers to borrow and divert it for the adaptation suffix.

In summary, the choice of *-'askă* instead of *-'ază* was probably motivated by the formal similarity with the Bulgarian productive verbal derivational suffix *-ka* and the productivity of Romanian verbs with *-esc*. These factors likely caused bilingual speakers to choose and generalize the suffix *-'askă* as an integrational verbal suffix applied for Romanian verbs that require additional suffixes in conjugation.

3.5 *-'askă* as a Loan Verb Integration Marker

In our data, there are no loan verbs with loan suffixes such as *-ira* and *-izira*, which are widespread in the other varieties of Bulgarian (including the standard language). Instead, in the Brănești dialect, the suffix

⁶ The Romanian fourth inflection class with *-esc* used to be the most productive, incorporating most of the loan verbs, until the 19th century. However, it seems to be rather *-ez* that is the most productive in the contemporary Romanian. (cf. Nedelcu 2013, 20-1)

-*askă* borrowed from Romanian seems to have become equivalent to those suffixes, being reserved exclusively for Romanian loan verbs.

- (16) a. Br. *angaž-askă-* < Ro. *a angaj-a, -ez*
 Bg. *angaž-ira-* < G. *angagier-en*
 b. Br. *uper-'askă-* < Ro. *a oper-a, -ez*
 Bg. *oper-ira-* < G. *operier-en*

In the list of Romanian loan verbs of Mladenov (1993, 404-8), there are only three verbs that have the same suffix -*askă* (*văn-'askă-*, *pregăt-'askă-*, *logod-'askă-*), two of which are present in our database as well (*văn-'askă-*, *pregăt-'askă-*).⁷ In contrast, there are more examples with the suffix -*isa* and the combination with the imperfective suffix -*is-va*, which indicates that -*isa* / -*osa* is the productive suffix in adapting loan verbs from Romanian.⁸

In our database of the Brănești dialect, however, there are no examples of this type of adaptation suffix. The suffix -*askă* is the one that takes over the role without permitting other suffixes to be applied. Below is a table of comparisons.

Table 1 Comparison of the suffixes applied to loan verbs from Romanian

Bg Dialects of Romania in general (Mladenov 1993, 404-8)	Bg Dialect of Brănești (Our Database)	Romanian
potriv- is-va- / potriv- isa-	potriv-' askă-	< a potrivi, -esc'to equate'
prim- is-va- / prim- isa-	prim-' askă-	< a primi, -esc'to receive'
să pomen- is-vă- / pomen- isă-	să pumen-' askă-	< a se pomeni, -esc'to find oneself'
pregăt- is-va- / pregăt-' askă-	prigăt-' askă-	< a pregăti, -esc'to prepare'
vyn- os-va- / vãn-' askă-	vãn-' askă-	< a vâna, -ez'to hunt'
să num- is-vă-	să num-' askă-	< a se numi, -esc'to be named'
tenku- is-vă- / tenk- osa-	tenkui-' askă-	< a tencui, -esc'to plaster'
serv- isa-	serv-' askă-	< a servi, -esc'to serve'
zăpăč- isă-	zăpăč-' askă-	< a zăpăci, -esc'to flurry'
puvest- ysă-	puvest-' askă-	< a povesti, -esc'to tell'
să libera- să-	să liber-' askă-	< a se libera, -ez'to liberate'

⁷ Interestingly, those with the suffix -*askă*, attested in Mladenov's list, are from Ciocânești, where the same type of northeastern Bulgarian dialect as in Brănești is spoken.

⁸ I suppose that the productivity of the suffix -*isa-* was invited by the formal similarity between the infinitival suffix of the Romanian fourth inflection class -*i* and the initial vowel of the suffix -*isa*, although a more detailed analysis would be necessary in this regard.

The morphological structure of both types of suffixes is parallel, as can be seen in (17). The only difference between them is that the speakers of the Brănești dialect opted for the additional suffix borrowed from Romanian.

- (17) a. potriv-isa- potriv-is-va- (Mladenov 1993, 406)
 b. potriv-'askă- potriv-'ask-wă-

As it is well known, the morpheme *-s-* is originated in Greek (cf. Ase-nova 2002, 64-5; Mirčev 1963, 66, etc.). According to Maslov (1981, 106), at first, it was found in the loan verbs from Greek which seemingly had a verbalizing function (e.g. *zograf* 'icon-painter' > *zograf-isa-m* 'to paint an icon'). Now the suffixes containing the morpheme *-s-* such as *-osa-*, *-isa-*, *-'asa* are among the most productive denominal/verbalizing suffixes and are found not only in Greek loans but also in Bulgarian native words (e.g. *b'al* 'white' > *bel-osa-m* 'to whiten', etc.) (cf. Maslov 1981, 106; Mirčev 1963, 66).

As for the suffix *'askă*, the original form of it in Romanian *-esc* was once an inchoative/ingressive suffix **-isk* or **-esc* that has lost its meaning in the contemporary Romance languages (cf. Maiden 2004, 2,8-9; Hall 1983, 49; Rosetti 1978, 151, etc.), including Romanian (cf. Nedelcu 2013, 19). It is this fourth inflection class verb that "was the most productive, incorporating most of the loan verbs" until the 19th century (Nedelcu 2013, 21). As Wichmann and Wohlgemuth (2008, 112) pointed out, "affixes which are used in a particular language to accommodate loan verbs, following the indirect insertion strategy, may be borrowed by another language where they continue to be used to accommodate new loan verbs." It is thus suggested that the suffix *-esc*, which used to function as a suffix that accommodated loan verbs in Romanian, was transferred to the Brănești Bulgarian dialect, in which it functions the same way: now it incorporates Romanian loan verbs into the Bulgarian dialect.

Thus, it is evident that the suffix *'askă* is parallel with the suffix *-isa* not only in its morphological structure but also in the function of incorporating loan verbs.

Therefore, I would argue that the suffix *'askă* borrowed from Romanian has become a suffix exclusively used to adapt Romanian verbs with additional suffixes in conjugation. Just as the suffix *-ira* or *-isa* is productively applied to loan verbs in the other varieties of Bulgarian, the borrowed suffix *'askă* in the Brănești dialect has been generalized as a special suffix used to adapt loan verbs from Romanian.

4 Conclusion

In this study, I attempted to reveal the adaptation strategies that the bilingual speakers of the Brănești dialect take when they borrow Romanian verbs.

Based on what we have seen, it is the **direct insertion strategy** that the speakers of the Bulgarian dialect typically resort to. However, the **indirect insertion strategy** is also observed especially for the loan verbs, originating in those inflecting with suffixes *-ez* or *-esc* in Romanian. In both cases, the Romanian inflectional suffix *-ă* is the key morpheme to the promotion of integrating the Romanian loan verbs as the Bulgarian third inflectional class verbs that have the thematic vowel *-a*. Furthermore, the indirect insertion strategy with *-askă* is the only strategy that could be adopted for the Romanian verbs with *-ez* or *-esc*, even excluding other suffixes that could facilitate the integration of the loan verbs. Therefore, the suffix *-askă* seems to have become a loan verb marker that functions solely as an integrational suffix that accommodates Romanian loan verbs with additional suffix in conjugation.

I was unable to scrutinize some issues. One of them is about non-finite forms derived from Romanian loan verbs. It seems that the past passive participles from Romanian loan verbs coincide with the corresponding form in Romanian (Br. *angažat* / Ro. *angajat*, Br. *tenkuit* / Ro. *tencuit*, etc.). The formal similarity is assumed to be relevant here, but this requires further investigation. Finally, it is interesting that the speakers of the Brănești dialect opted for the suffix *-askă* borrowed from Romanian rather than the suffix *-isa* borrowed originally from Greek. To explore the reasons behind it will be one of my future tasks.

List of Abbreviations

Bg.	Bulgarian
Br.	Brănești Bulgarian dialect
G.	German
IMPF	imperfect (tense)
IPF	imperfective suffix
Ro.	Romanian
SMP	subordinating modal particle
SUF	suffix

Bibliography

- Asenova, P. (2002). *Balkansko ezikoznanie*. Veliko Tărnovo: Faber.
- Avram, M. (2001). *Gramatica pentru toți*. Ediția a III-a. București: Humanitas.
- Hall, R.A. Jr. (1983). *Proto-Romance Morphology*. Amsterdam; Philadelphia: John Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/cilt.30>.
- Maiden, M. (2004). “Verb Augments and Meaninglessness in Early Romance Morphology”. *Studi di Grammatica Italiana*, Vol. XXII, 1-61.
- Maslov, Ju. S. (1981). *Grammatika bolgarskogo jazyka*. Moskva: Vysšaja škola.
- Matras, Y. (2009). *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511809873>.
- Mirčev, K. (1963). *Istoričeska gramatika na bālgarskija ezik*. Sofia: Nauka i izkustvo.
- Mladenov, M.Sl. (1993). *Bālgarskite govori v Rumānija*. Sofia: Izdatelstvo na BAN.
- Murdarov, Vl. et al. (2011). *Obraten rečnik na bālgarskija ezik*. Sofia: Iztok-Zapad.
- Muysken, P. (2000). *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-Mixing*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nedelcu, I. (2013). “The Verb: Inflectional Classes of Verbs”. Pană Dindelegan, G. (ed.), *The Grammar of Romanian*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Nicolova, N. (2008). *Bālgarska gramatika: morfologija*. Sofia: Universtitesko Izdatelstvo “Sv. Kliment Ohridski”
- Rosetti, Al. (1978). *Istoria limbii române. I. De la origini pînă în secolul al XVII-lea. Ediția a doua revăzută și adăugită*. București: Editura științifică și enciclopedică.
- Sugai, K. (2021a). Jazykovojsdviĝ v s. Brènešt’ (Rumynija). Xomčak, O. G. (ed.) *Mova. Svidomist’. Konzept: zbirnyk naukovyx statej*, Vyp. 11, 60-64.
- Sugai, K. (2021b) “Rūmania-no burugaria-go hōgen-ni okeru gengohenkani tsuite: buraneshuti mura-no burugaria-go hōgen-wo rei-ni ルーマニアのブルガリア語方言における言語変化について: ブラネシュティ村のブルガリア語方言を例に (Language Change in the Bulgarian Dialect of Brănești, Romania)”. *Bulletin of the Faculty of Humanities and Human Sciences, Hokkaido University*, 163, 45-76. <https://eprints.lib.hokudai.ac.jp/dspace/handle/2115/80815>.
- Wichmann, S.; Wohlgemuth, J. (2008). “Loan Verbs in a Typological Perspective”. Stolz, T.; Bakker, D.; Salas Palomo, R. (eds), *Aspects of Language Contact: New Theoretical, Methodological and Empirical Findings with Special*

Focus on Romancisation Processes. Berlin; New York: De Gruyter Mouton, 89-121. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110206043.89>.

Wohlgemuth, J. (2009). *A Typology of Verbal Borrowing*. Berlin; New York: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219340>.