

Kenta Sugai¹
(Sapporo)

**Past passive participles of intransitive verbs
in the language of the Bulgarian minority in Romania:
A closer look at contact-induced grammatical change
Našite bălgari să *dojdeni* or *dušleli*?^{2,3}**

Keywords: language of Bulgarian minority, language contact, Romanian, past passive participle of intransitive verbs, contact-induced grammatical change

Introduction

Numerous ethnic groups have crossed the Balkan Peninsula throughout history. In the years of the Byzantine Empire and especially under the rule of the Ottoman Empire, a certain multi-ethnic environment was created in the Balkans that has persisted to the present day despite the formation of nation-states from the second half of the 19th century to the first half of the 20th century. In the Balkans, where many ethnic groups generally lived together without being separated based on ethnicity, language convergence has advanced drastically as a result of intensive language contact, bringing about language features known as Balkanisms, i.e. those common to the Balkan languages.

This study focuses on the Bulgarian language, the dialects of which are spread not only within the borders of today's Republic of Bulgaria, but also outside. Apart from the Bulgarian minority in historical regions, such

¹ ORCID: 0000-0002-2011-6604.

² This research is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 19K1317509.

³ The author would like to thank two anonymous reviewers for their suggestions and comments which helped him to improve the manuscript.

as Bessarabia and Banat, there are speakers of Bulgarian in the region of Bucharest, the capital of Romania, where they form so-called “language islands” without direct contacts with neighboring Bulgarian settlements or their fatherland. These Bulgarian settlements were formed by the Bulgarian immigrants who crossed the Danube mainly in the 19th century in search of a peaceful life without wars and taxes (Младенов 1993: 12–16, 31–47). Brănești is one of those settlements in which ethnic Bulgarians still speak an archaic northeastern type of Bulgarian dialect. Since the speakers of the dialect are bilingual, they are being assimilated by the surrounding majority, i.e. the Romanians. Their dialect is thus endangered, as it is preserved only by the elderly speakers in the village. Under such circumstances, it is not surprising that their dialect shows innovative grammatical features under the influence of Romanian.

The author of this article has been working on problems of contact-induced changes in the dialect (cf. Cyraи 2015a, 2015b, 2016; Sugai 2018) in order to reveal the mechanism of contact-induced grammatical changes observed in the Bulgarian dialect spoken in the village of Brănești. In this study, we will describe and analyze a grammatical phenomenon that has presumably resulted from the influence of Romanian. The main target of this study is the use of the past passive participle of intransitive verbs such as *dojden*, as seen in the following example:

(1) *Našite bălgari ut našitu selu tukă / sã dojdени ut Kalipetrovo.*

‘The Bulgarians of this village have come here from Kalipetrovo.’

The structure of this study is as follows: first, general information on Brănești and the language situation in the village will be provided. Second, the framework of contact-induced grammatical changes from a typological perspective will be reviewed briefly, based on the previous studies. Third, the use of past passive participles of intransitive verbs will be analyzed to identify the kind of innovative structure that has arisen in the dialect. Finally, the structure will be examined in terms of whether it has resulted from language contact with Romanian.

General information on Brănești and its language situation

Brănești is located 23 km east of Bucharest in the county of Ilfov. The village itself is a settlement of Bulgarian immigrants. The inhabitants are descendants of the so called *Grebenci*, originally from villages along the Danube in the Silistra region of northeastern Bulgaria (Романски 1930: 432, Mladenov 1993: 34). Stojan Romanski, who visited Brănești at the beginning of the 20th century, reported: “Brănești is truly the home of ‘Grebenci’ (...). The village still has 466 houses with 2110 inhabitants, almost all of whom are Bulgarian. Only about 10 houses of them are Wallachian, so the Wallachians know the Bulgarian language” (Жечев 1983: 59). In 2012, when I visited the village for the first time, only elderly people over the age of 80 could speak the local dialect of Bulgarian. Their sons and daughters practically do not know Bulgarian, though they understand some of it. The youngest generation in the village does not know Bulgarian at all. Almost no effort is being made to preserve the Bulgarian language and culture in the village. It is therefore expected that the Brănești dialect will probably cease to exist within the next decade. Since the immigration preceded the formation of the standard Bulgarian language and the inhabitants of the village were separated from their land of origin without having had the chance to learn Bulgarian in school, the speakers of the Brănești dialect do not know either the standard Bulgarian language or, of course, the Cyrillic alphabet. Instead, they learn standard Romanian language at school. They do not have a written language for the Brănești dialect, unlike the language of Banat Bulgarians.

The linguistic materials of the Brănești dialect used in this study, were collected by the author of this paper during his field work in the village of Brănești, conducted mainly between 2012 and 2015. The data were collected through interviews recorded using an IC recorder. The informants of this study were 7 men and 7 women, all of whom were elderly people representative of the present language situation in the village. The table below shows the informants’ years of birth:

(2) Informants of Brănești Bulgarian dialect and their years of birth

Men	DD (1925), DM (1931), GG (1932), DG (1935), AG (1936), RUS (1955), DF (1934)
Women	BP (1930), BV (1932), TO (1932), TM (1939), BA (1938), TF (1935), TMita (1930)

The framework of contact-induced grammatical changes

In this study, we will follow the definition of language contact proposed by Weinreich (1968: 1), according to which “two or more languages will be said to be in contact if they are used alternately by the same persons. The language-using individuals are thus the locus of the contact”. If we take this definition into account, the Brănești Bulgarian dialect and Romanian language are in close contact because every speaker of the dialect in the village is bilingual and uses the two languages alternately.

Language exposed to contact tends to show deviation from earlier norms, giving birth to various new features in the language. In most cases, such contact-induced changes are characterized by transfers of linguistic materials from one language to another in a process often referred to as linguistic transfer. As pointed out by Heine, Kuteva (2005: 2), transferred linguistic materials can be of any of the following kinds:

- (3) Kinds of linguistic transfer (Heine, Kuteva 2005: 2)
- a. Form, that is, sounds or combinations of sounds;
 - b. Meanings (including grammatical meanings or functions) or combinations of meanings;
 - c. Form-meaning units or combinations of form-meaning units;
 - d. Syntactic relations, that is, the order of meaningful elements;
 - e. Any combination of (a) through (d).

In this study, we will focus on linguistic transfer of grammatical meanings or functions since we are concerned precisely with contact-induced “grammatical” changes. The mechanism of such transfer can be explained as follows: bilingual speakers tend to apply a linguistic feature originating in one language that serves as the model language to another, which in turn serves as the recipient language, so that features develop in the recipient

language are equivalent to those in the model language. Therefore, in the process of linguistic transfer, a certain linguistic feature is replicated in the recipient language in accordance with the model language.

When linguistic transfer occurs, an entirely new grammatical concept or structure may emerge in the recipient language. However, as typological studies of language contact have revealed, in most cases, a corresponding grammatical concept or structure is already present in the recipient language, although restricted in its use. Heine, Kuteva (2005: 45–46), for example, claim that “contact-induced new use patterns do not normally emerge *ex nihilo*; rather, they are likely to be the result of a process whereby an existing minor use pattern gives rise to a major use pattern”. It means that an existing grammatical concept or structure develops into a frequently used pattern, acquiring a new function as in the model language. The rise of a new grammatical function in contact-induced replication, therefore, often consists of the following stages: a) an existing use pattern is used more frequently, b) it is used in new contexts, and c) it may become associated with a new grammatical function (Heine, Kuteva 2005: 45).

In the following sections, we will discuss the use of past passive participles (in short, PPP) in the Brănești Bulgarian dialect.

Past passive participles of intransitive verbs

In standard Bulgarian, a past passive participle (PPP) is formed from a transitive verb. It cannot usually be formed from an intransitive verb, as Lyubomir Andreychin et al. (Андрейчин 1977: 286), for instance, show. According to Petar Pashov (Пашов 1999: 207), however, “PPPs of intransitive verbs are regularly used in the neuter as a constituent of predicates in passive-impersonal voice.” (cf. also Nicolova 2017: 606)

(4) *V stajata e vlizano.* (Nicolova 2017: 606)

[lit.] ‘The room has been gone into.’

They do not inflect in number and gender and thus cannot be used in forms other than in the neuter. The lack of a full paradigm for PPPs of intransitive verbs in standard Bulgarian suggests that they are specific forms with constraints on their use.

Nevertheless, PPPs of intransitive verbs that inflect in gender and number are observed in some Bulgarian dialects in Romania. Maksim Mladenov (Младенов 1993: 378), for example, reports that they are used instead of corresponding aorist active participles (in short, AAP), as he shows examples in which PPPs of intransitive verbs inflect. He lists the following PPPs of intransitive verbs observed in the Bulgarian dialects in Romania: *dojden*, *zămărăznăt*, *legnăt*, *padnăt*, *pučinăt*, *stanat*, and *ul'azăn*. He also claims that they become a constituent of compound predicates in the passive voice (Младенов 1993: 283). Kiril Dimchev (Димчев 1974: 256–257), whose work focuses on the Bulgarian dialect in Valea Dragului, Romania, also points out the use of such PPPs instead of AAPs of intransitive verbs. According to Todor Boyadzhiev (Бояджиев 1991: 93–94), interestingly, PPPs of intransitive verbs are observed in some Thracian dialects as well. Moreover, he argues that the combination of PPP of intransitive verbs with auxiliary verb *săm* 'be' ascribes resultative state to the subject of the sentence. It is suggested from his argument that the structure with PPPs of intransitive verbs seems to have the same function as the periphrastic verbal form of the perfect tense, in which AAP participates, instead of being understood as a predicate of passive voice.

PPPs of intransitive verbs are observed in the Brănești dialect as well. In our data, there were at least three intransitive verbs that seemed to be capable of forming PPPs: *dojda* 'come', *trăgna* 'leave, start', and *otida* 'go'. Among these verbs, the most frequently used intransitive verb in PPP seemed to be *dojda* 'come'. Most frequently they were combined with the auxiliary verb *săm*. In this study, we refer to this periphrastic verbal form simply as Structure №1 for convenience. Here are some examples of Structure №1:

(5) **Structure № 1: auxiliary verb *săm* + PPP of intransitive verbs**

a. *Ut tam să dojdeni tij tuk.*

'They have come here from there.'

b. *As săm dojdină nă tos sf'at nă trijs godin.*

'I have come to this world [= I was born] in the year of (19)30.'

c. *Tij să utideni (...) nă nejn'u tejku, nă nejntă majkă, nă Černikă.*

'They have gone to her father and mother in Cernica.'

d. *Mumičitu i trāgnatu u Olanda.*

‘The girl has left for Holland.’

Although the combination of past passive participles and auxiliary verb *sām*, that is, Structure №1 in these examples, may give the impression that it forms an ordinary passive construction, it is probably more appropriate to consider it as a periphrastic verbal form of the perfect tense, as Boyadzhiev (Бояджиев 1991) insisted for the similar structure observed in the Thracian dialects. In this sense, Structure №1 may be considered an innovative grammatical structure that does not exist in standard Bulgarian. Besides, since Ivan Kochev (Кочев 1969), who contributed to the description of Greben dialects of Silistra, does not mention a similar structure in his monograph, it can be assumed that these dialects lack it in much the same way as Standard Bulgarian does.

This, however, does not mean that AAPs of intransitive verbs are completely replaced by PPPs in the Brănești dialect. In fact, the Brănești dialect has another way to form the verbal form of the perfect tense, using AAP the same way as in standard Bulgarian and in Greben dialects of Silistra (Кочев 1969: 75). As a result, in the Brănești dialect, there seem to be two formal variations for marking perfect tense. See the following examples where AAPs are used together with the auxiliary verb *sām*, which we will refer to as Structure № 2 in this study:

(6) **Structure № 2: auxiliary verb *sām* + AAP of intransitive verbs**

a. *B'a maj dušlală tukă tāj.*

‘She had already come here.’

b. *Ti si sāmīčik, pāk si trāgnal ud vas, (...) ti dodi tukă.*

‘You are only a child, but you have left your home... You came here.’

c. *Kat b'af mladă, dă as sām utišla tam na bālgarte.*

‘When I was young, I should have gone to where Bulgarians are [= Bulgaria].’

It is thus possible to claim that two structures are available for expressing a grammatical meaning of (past) perfect tense in the Brănești dialect, since both active and passive participles may be used alternately, being in free variation at least in certain conditions. It seems, however, that only

PPPs of transitive verbs cannot form Structure № 1 in the perfect sense. It is probably due to the inevitable competition between the grammatical meanings of passive voice and perfect tense. Unlike intransitive verbs, transitive verbs constitute PPPs productively to form passive constructions. This could be the reason why PPPs of transitive verbs seem to be unable to form Structure № 1 to express a grammatical meaning of perfect. This, however, should be examined more precisely in future research. In the following, we try to reveal how Structure №1, which is generally used only for passive constructions, at least in the standard language, acquired the new grammatical function of expressing perfect tense in the Brănești dialect. We will consider the possibility of contact-induced grammatical change.

Analysis of contact-induced grammatical change

As we have seen, the Brănești dialect seems to have developed a new grammatical structure to express perfect tense with the help of the PPP, as in the following example:

- (7) *Našite bălgari ut našitu selu tukă / să dojdjeni ut Kalipetrovo.* (=1)
 ‘The Bulgarians of this village have come here from Kalipetrovo.’

It is extremely difficult to establish the reason for the rise of an innovative structure in a language without historical data to track the process of change, but in this study, we will consider the influence of Romanian, which has been in intensive contact with the Brănești dialect for almost two centuries.

In the standard Bulgarian language, PPPs are used to form passive constructions together with an auxiliary verb *săm* ‘be’, but they do not form a periphrastic verbal form of the perfect. The verbal form of perfect is formed only via combination of an auxiliary verb *săm* ‘be’ and an AAP. Although the same auxiliary verb is used for forming both verbal forms, verbal forms for the perfect and passive can be explicitly distinguished by the past participles used in combination, that is, active or passive respectively.

(8) Standard Bulgarian

a. **Passive voice:** auxiliary verb *săm* 'be' + past **passive** participle (=PPP)

Toj e izvikan. 'He was called.'

b. **Perfect form:** auxiliary verb *săm* 'be' + aorist **active** participle (=AAP)

Toj e izvikal edin prijatel. 'He has called a friend.'

By contrast, in Romanian language, past participles (PP) do not have different forms for active and passive voice as exist in Bulgarian. Nevertheless, verbal forms of the passive and perfect are formally distinguished by the auxiliary verbs used in combination. The verbal form of passive voice takes the auxiliary verb *a fi* 'to be' in the same way as in Bulgarian. On the other hand, that of the perfect takes the auxiliary verb *a avea* 'to have'. Instead of PPs, it is obviously the auxiliary verbs that serve to distinguish the different verbal forms in Romanian.

(9) Romanian

a. **Passive voice:** auxiliary verb *a fi* 'to be' + **past** participle (=PP)

El este chemat. 'He was called.'

b. **Perfect form:** auxiliary verb *a avea* 'to have' + **past** participle (=PP)

El a chemat un prieten. 'He has called a friend.'

Significantly, PPs in Romanian appear in periphrastic verbal forms of both the passive and perfect. Therefore, it is likely that a speaker of the Brănești dialect would interpret, based on the Romanian model, that the participle used in the verbal form of the passive voice (in the case of Bulgarian and the Brănești dialect, the PPP) is capable of forming a perfect tense form as well. However, it should be noted that the verbal form 'be + PPP' in Bulgarian is usually used to denote passive voice, as in (8a). It is thus possible to assume that the preexisting 'be + PPP', which denotes passive, might have acquired a new grammatical meaning, i.e. perfect, as a result of language contact with Romanian.

As pointed out by Uriel Weinreich (1968: 39), "if the bilingual identifies a morpheme or grammatical category of language A with one in language B, he may apply the B form in grammatical functions which he

derives from the system of A.” In our case, the bilingual speaker identifies PPP in his Bulgarian dialect with PP in Romanian, and thus he applies the PPP in the same grammatical function as in Romanian, namely to denote the perfect with the help of the auxiliary verb. In this way, the Brănești dialect seems to have extended the use of PPP to form not only the periphrastic verbal form of passive voice as in standard Bulgarian, but also that of perfect tense on the model of Romanian, as in the schema in (10).

(10) The relationships between forms and grammatical meanings

Romanian	Standard Bulgarian	Brănești Bulgarian
be + PP — Passive	be + PPP — Passive	be + PPP — Passive
have + PP — Perfect	be + AAP — Perfect	be + AAP — Perfect

It can thus be argued that ‘be + PPP’ in the Brănești dialect seems to have acquired a grammatical meaning of perfect as a result of extending the use of PPP on the model of the PP in Romanian. The extension itself should have been triggered by transferring the grammatical function of PP in Romanian to PPP in the Brănești dialect, which was apparently motivated by the inclination of the bilingual speakers to create “equivalence relations” in the sense proposed by Heine, Kuteva (2005: 4). Consequently, what has happened to the Brănești Bulgarian dialect could be regarded as contact-induced grammatical change.

However, it should be noted that such a verbal form as ‘be + PPP’ for perfect is observed only when a PPP derived from intransitive verbs is involved, as seen in the previous section. It is, therefore, even possible to assume that this is a new grammatical form of perfect used exclusively for intransitive verbs. This fact in turn suggests that the verbal form ‘be + PPP’ that denotes perfect has still not extended its use so as to be applied to all kinds of verbs, including transitive ones. In other words, it is still considered a minor use pattern as understood by Heine, Kuteva (2005: 44–45). What is particularly significant is that the verbal form ‘be + AAP’, instead of being replaced completely by ‘be + PPP’, continues to be used alternately in free variation at least by today’s speakers of the Brănești dialect. As a matter of fact, as we have seen in (6), the preexisting perfect, i.e. ‘be + AAP’, is still fully available for intransitive verbs as well. Therefore, one

and the same grammatical meaning is expressed by two different grammatical structures, at least at this stage of development, as in the table below.

(11) The place of the new grammatical structure in the Brănești dialect⁴

	Romanian	Standard Bulgarian	Brănești Bulgarian
<i>Passive</i>	be + PP	be + PPP	be + PPP (v.t. only)
<i>Perfect</i>	have + PP	be + AAP	be + PPP (v.i. only) be + AAP (v.i. / v.t.)

Speaking of grammatical replication, it is of significance to note that the Brănești dialect did not adopt the auxiliary ‘have’ to complete the equivalent grammatical structure as in Romanian. Due to this ‘incompleteness’ in grammatical replication, the influence of Romanian is restricted only to the extension of the use of the PPP to form the new grammatical structure denoting perfect with the use of the model of the Romanian PP. A possible account for this could be sought in the presence of the preexisting ‘be + PPP’ structure for passive. Although it is associated with quite a different grammatical meaning, bilingual speakers might have avoided the entirely new structure formed with auxiliary verb ‘have’, which is not common in any periphrastic verbal forms in this specific Bulgarian dialect.⁵ Moreover, it is expected that the so-called “predicates in passive-impersonal voice,” in which PPPs of intransitive verbs are regularly used (Пашов 1999: 207, cf. Nicolova 2017: 606, etc.), might also have been present in the dialect.⁶ As Example (4) shows, the predicate in passive-impersonal voice is somewhat associated with the meaning of perfect due to the nature of the PPP itself. Hence, such periphrastic verbal form as ‘be + PPP (v.i.)’, which is

⁴ In Table (11), v.t. stands for transitive verb, v.i. intransitive.

⁵ An exception can be found in some Balkan Slavic dialects, where ‘have’ is adopted as an auxiliary for the sort of grammatical structure that denotes perfect (cf. Маринов 2017, etc.). However, such a structure is not mentioned, at least in Kochev (Кочев 1969).

⁶ Unfortunately, this is not mentioned by Kochev (Кочев 1969), and thus it is unknown whether it exists in the Greben dialects of Silistra. However, it may only be undescribed because, as pointed out by Heine, Kuteva (2005: 45), such minor use patterns “usually go unnoticed, that is, they are ignored by grammarians” as a marginal phenomenon. In any case, it remains a task of the future to examine whether a similar structure exists in the Greben dialects of Silistra as well.

most likely to have existed already before contact, seems to have served as the basis of further development. In other words, the preexisting grammatical structure for passive and/or passive-impersonal voice served for the development of an innovative grammatical structure with the PPP of intransitive verbs to express perfect, instead of bringing about an entirely new structure involving the auxiliary 'have'. The expected development of 'be + PPP' for perfect in the Brănești dialect can be summed up as in the table below.

(12) Expected grammatical development of 'be + PPP' for perfect in the Brănești dialect (based on Heine, Kuteva 2005: 46)

Stage	Form		Context	Meaning
I	be + PPP (v.i.) in neuter <i>*e dojdeno</i>	PPP (v.i.) is invariable	Restricted	Passive-impersonal voice
II	be + PPP (v.i.) <i>e dojden, -a, -o</i> <i>să dojdeni</i>	PPP (v.i.) in- flects in gender and number	Extension to new contexts	An additional gram- matical meaning (i.e. to mark perfect) emerges in the new contexts
III	be + PPP (v.i.) / v.t.)	No restrictions as to transitivity of the verb from which PPP derives	Generalized	Generalization of the new grammati- cal meaning

On the whole, today's Brănești dialect is posited at Stage II. The pre-supposed progress from Stage I to II seems to have been encouraged most probably by language contact with Romanian, more precisely by the extension of the PPP on the model of the Romanian PP as a result of transfer of grammatical function, i.e. grammatical replication. On the other hand, the further development, i.e. Stage III, is only theoretically assumed and might not be expected to progress due to the presence of the passive constructions that would be formed in one and the same manner.

What is particularly noteworthy is that the innovative grammatical structure in question seems to have been created on the basis of the

preexisting structure. This process of development suggests that a grammatical structure such as *Našite bălgari să dojdene* 'Our Bulgarians have come', which has occurred in the Brănești dialect, could be regarded as a typical product of language contact, since contact-induced new grammatical structures do not emerge on their own, but rather on the basis of an already existing structure in the recipient language, as argued by Heine, Kuteva (2005: 40–41).

In the end, as we have seen, the grammatical structure in question is also present in some Thracian dialects which are apparently not in contact with Romanian language. This may serve as a counter-example for the influence of Romanian on the development of the structure in the Brănești dialect. The structure with the PPP of an intransitive verb may well be understood as an independent development without the influence of Romanian. Nevertheless, it is significant enough to consider it as a contact-induced grammatical change under the influence of Romanian, if we take the language situation in the village into account. Language contact seems to have played at least a marginal role in the emergence of the new grammatical structure in the Brănești dialect.⁷

Conclusion

In this study, I have tried to demonstrate the mechanism of the contact-induced grammatical change that has occurred in the Brănești dialect. It is generally difficult to establish the effect of language contact on the grammatical system of a language in a case where there is no direct evidence. However, the accumulation of small pieces of evidence will certainly eventually lead to the understanding of the development of certain grammatical structures.

⁷ In this respect, it is significant that Blazhe Koneski (Конески 1965: 170), pointing out the fact that a similar grammatical structure is also found in the southwestern area of Macedonia, where Aromanian and Albanian dialects are distributed, claims that the Aromanian influence on the Balkan Slavic dialects should be considered to have caused the birth of such structure. The parallel development of a similar structure as a result of language contact with Aromanian, i.e., a Balkan Romance language, suggests that contact-induced grammatical change is involved in the case of Brănești as well, but must be studied in terms of the uses and meanings of the structure through contrastive analysis (cf. Маринов 2017, etc.).

In conclusion, it can thus be argued that the grammatical structure which consists of PPPs of intransitive verbs has been replicated in the Brănești dialect based on the model of Romanian. As a result of the linguistic transfer of grammatical function, the use of PPPs of intransitive verbs has been extended to function used in the same manner as in Romanian, which made it possible for periphrastic verbal forms with PPPs of intransitive verbs to be associated with the new grammatical function to mark perfect tense. The similarity in function made the bilingual speakers identify the Bulgarian PPP with the Romanian PP, which accordingly caused them to apply these for the same function. Consequently, it can be argued that it is precisely language contact with Romanian that brought about the grammatical structure with PPPs of intransitive verbs that expresses perfect. The existence of parallel structures observed in other Bulgarian dialects in Romania may serve as supporting evidence for this claim.

Unfortunately, scarcity of examples with the grammatical structure with PPPs of intransitive verbs did not allow us to analyze it in more detail. This is due to the method we used to collect linguistic materials for the research. We collected examples with the structure in question from our oral data, which consist of spontaneous utterances. More advanced investigation using questionnaires is undoubtedly necessary.

In addition, quantitative analysis will certainly be required, and this will be the next step in further research. At the same time, it is of importance to conduct a more detailed analysis of the innovative grammatical structure in terms of meaning as well, particularly in comparison with the preexisting structure for perfect (= Structure №2). Finally, a comparative study with the other Balkan Slavic dialects, where similar structures with PPPs of intransitive verbs are observed (cf. Маринов 2017, etc.), will also be needed for a better understanding of the structure in the Brănești dialect.

Bibliography

- Heine, B.; Kuteva, T. (2005). *Language Contact and Grammatical Change*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Nicolova, R. (2017). *Bulgarian Grammar*. Berlin: Frank & Timme GmbH.
- Roman, L. (1984). Așezări de bulgari și alți sud-dunăreni în Țara Românească (1740–1834), *Relații româno-bulgare de-a lungul veacurilor. Studii*, vol. II, 126–143.

- Sugai, K. (2018). On Contact-induced Grammaticalization of the Clitic Doubling Construction: A Case of the Bulgarian Northeastern Dialect in Romania, Gutiérrez Rubio, E. et al. (eds.), *Contributions to the 21st Annual Scientific Conference of the Association of Slavists (Polyslav)*. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz Verlag: 272–281.
- Weinreich, U. (1968). *Languages in contact: Findings and Problems*. Hague – Paris: Mouton.
- Андрейчин, Л. и кол. (1977). *Граматика на българския език*. София: Издат. „Наука и изкуство“.
- Бояджиев, Т. (1991). *Българските говори в западна (Беломорска) и източна (Одринска) Тракия*. София: Унив. издат. „Св. Климент Охридски.“
- Димчев, К. (1974). Морфологично-синтактични модели, установени под румънско влияние в българския говор на с. Валя Драгулуй (Румъния). В: Андрейчин, Л. и др. (ред.), *В памет на професор Стойко Стойков (1912–1969). Езиковедски изследвания*, София: БАН, 255–259.
- Жечев, Н. (1983). Към историята на изучаването на българските емигрантски заселища в Румъния през Възраждането. (По случай 100 години от рождението на акад. Стоян Романски). *Българска етнография*, кн. III, 51–60.
- Конески, Бл. (1965). *Историја на македонскиот јазик*. Скопје: Книгоиздат. „Кочо Рацин“.
- Кочев, Ив. (1969). Гребенският говор в Силистренско: С особен оглед към лексикалната му система. *Трудове по българска диалектология*, кн. V. София: Издат. на БАН.
- Маринов, Вл. (2017). Начини за изразяване на минало резултативно време в българските диалекти. *Orbis Linguarum*, vol. 15 (1), 30–37.
- Младенов, М.Сл. (1993). *Българските говори в Румъния*. София: Издат. на БАН.
- Ничолова, Р. (2008). *Българска граматика, морфология*. София: Унив. издат. „Св. Климент Охридски“.
- Пашов, П. (1999). *Българска граматика*. София: Издат. къща „Хермес“.
- Романски, Ст. (1930). *Българите във Влашко и Молдова: Документи*. София: Държавна печатница.
- Стойков, Ст. (1993). *Българска диалектология*. София: Издат. на БАН.
- Сугай, К. (2015а). Към въпроса за удвояването на прякото допълнение в българския говор в Румъния (Анализ в съпоставка с румънския език). В: Младенова, М. и др. (ред.), *Сборник от Дванадесетите международни славистични четения, София, 9–10 май 2014*, Том I. *Езикознание*, София: Унив. издат. „Св. Климент Охридски“, 94–102.

- Сугаи, К. (20156). За някои специфични характеристики на местоименните клитики в гребенския говор в Румъния. *Българска реч*, XXI (2), 102–109.
- Сугаи, К. (2016). Структура удвоения допълнения по модели левой дислокации в болгарском переселенческом диалекте в Румынии. *Славянский альманах*, Вып. 3–4, 344–354.

Summary

This article discusses an innovative grammatical structure with past passive participles of intransitive verbs observed in the language of a Bulgarian minority in Brănești, Romania. The aim of this article is to reveal the mechanism of contact-induced grammatical change which seems to have occurred in the Bulgarian dialect of Brănești under the influence of the Romanian language. The results of the analysis, based on materials from the author's fieldwork, indicate that a grammatical structure involving the past passive participles of intransitive verbs has arisen in the Brănești dialect as a result of grammatical replication of Romanian past participles.

Kenta Sugai is a linguist in the field of Slavic linguistics and associate professor at the Faculty of Humanities and Human Sciences, Hokkaido University. His main research interests include descriptive work on the languages of Bulgarian minorities outside Bulgaria from the viewpoint of language contact and change, as well as sociolinguistic analysis of contemporary situation of minority languages in today's world.

e-mail: ksugai1227@hotmail.com