



Research Article

Borrowability of Loanwords by Semantic Fields in Tanzanian Ethnic Community Languages: Case of Hehe Language

Fahamu Kasavaga^{1*} | Chrispina Alphonse² | Damasi Mapuga³

¹ Lecturer, National Institute of Transport, Dar es Salaam, Tanzania

² Lecturer, University of Dodoma, Dodoma, Tanzania

³ Assistant Lecturer, Local Government Training Institute, Dodoma, Tanzania

<https://doi.org/10.70847/690088>

Article history:

Received: 15 February 2026

Revised: 19 April 2026

Accepted: 24 May 2026



© The Author(s) 2026. This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

Abstract

While investigating aspects of loanwords offers useful insights for tracing linguistic and socio-political background of its speakers, information regarding the influence they have brought in the lexicon of the Tanzanian Ethnic Community Languages (henceforth ECLs) is scanty. This paper looks at the loanwords found in Hehe, shedding light on the semantic fields that are susceptible to borrowing and reasons accounting for. It is based on data that were collected using oral elicitation, text analysis and focus group discussion in Kiponzelo, Nzihi, Ifunda, and Mibikimitali villages. The findings indicated that the semantic fields of the Hehe lexicon have changed due to importation of 1152 loanwords from 11 languages; that is, four neighbouring ECLs (i.e. Bena, Kinga, Kimbu, and Gogo), Swahili, Hindi, Arabic, French, Portuguese, English, and Latin. These loanwords fall into 28 semantic fields. Clothing and grooming (7.38%) are the most borrowed while basic actions and colour (0.69%) are least borrowed. Borrowing is a function of linguistic and non-linguistic reasons. The linguistic reason is based on the need to fill lexical and semantic gaps caused by differences in the cultures and levels of technology between the Hehe and communities speaking source languages. The non-linguistic factors are prestige and absence of policies and regulations that legalize the use of ECLs in formal domains from the 1960's until 1990's. As such, it is clear that while words belonging to all semantic fields have a chance to be borrowed, borrowability might vary from language to language due to speakers' differences in culture and nature of the contact.

Keywords: loanwords, Hehe, cultural vocabulary, semantic fields, basic borrowing

1. Introduction

Borrowing is one of the commonest causes of language change. According to Winford (2013), it has become an inevitable phenomenon because whenever languages come into contact for any reason such as trade, political control, globalization, or missionary activities; they affect each other as they exchange linguistic materials. This means that, as speakers of a certain language lack a word that can be used to refer to a concept or object imported by the communities they are in contact with, or use the term to describe certain phenomena, they find themselves compelled to borrow. Hence, this introduces new words (loanwords) into their language's lexicon. Durkin (2014) points out borrowing as a source of mixing up lexical items of different semantic fields in languages.

This bases on that, in a recipient language, a loanword can enter along with its semantic field such as religion and beliefs, the physical world, basic actions, clothing and grooming, or law. Besides, linguists have it that the borrowability of words differs across languages depending on semantic fields which belong to either cultural vocabulary or basic vocabulary (Hock & Joseph, 1996).

For instance, Carling, Cronhamn, Farren, et al., (2019) specify clearly the difference between them that since they do not refer to concepts and objects that are universal, words belonging to cultural vocabulary pertaining to the social and political relations, law, warfare and hunting, modern world, religion, clothing and grooming, the house, agriculture and vegetation, and food and drink are far more borrowable than those belonging to basic vocabulary such as sense perception, spatial relations, body terms, kinship, motion words, the physical world, emotions, and space and time.

From this statement, we can deduce that a loan basic vocabulary can penetrate to a recipient language even though it already has a counterpart word; thus, duplicating words of such nature. Nevertheless, evidence from the current literature shows that borrowability occur inconsistently across the semantic fields. Polishchuck and Yorava (2023) point out the reason that this occurs because speakers mainly borrow words to facilitate communication. The present study examines loanwords in Hehe to find out the fields whose words are most susceptible to borrowing and show the reasons behind their higher level of borrowability.

1.2 Hehe

Hehe is an ethnic language spoken mainly in Iringa region in the Southern highlands of Tanzania. The Ethnologue (2023) report indicates that



Hehe is a first language with more than 1,425, 000 speakers; and belongs to the Niger Congo language family of Bantu languages. Besides, in Guthrie's (1967-71) language classification, this language is categorised as belonging to Zone G60 of the Bena-Kinga language group.

There are three major dialects of Hehe; that is, Kosisamba, the Central dialect, and Kisungwa (Walsh, 2004; Haonga, 2013). The focus of this study was on the central dialect because it constitutes pure Hehe as per Madumulla's (1995) argument.

1.4 Literature Review

Importation of loanwords appears to be responsible for many of the changes that occur in semantic fields of languages. This occurs when speakers of a particular language borrow words from other languages to fill lexical gaps or just for prestige. Evidence shows that words belonging to cultural vocabulary are borrowed more easily than those belonging to basic vocabulary (Hock & Joseph, 1996).

The most cited reasons for this endeavour are that there is no need to borrow basic vocabulary because they represent objects and concepts which accompany human beings in their day-to-day communication regardless of their environment and cultural differences. However, current literature shows that the semantics of basic vocabulary can be borrowed in some languages; and that borrowing occurs inconsistently even within the fields whose semantics are cultural in nature.

In English, most of the loanwords belong to cultural vocabulary. Polishchuck and Yorava (2023) affirm that a limited list of loanwords belonging to basic vocabulary falls into only four semantic fields of sense, perception, spatial relations, body terms, and kinship. Mutual intelligibility and prolonged contacts between English and German, Yiddish, Afrikaans, Norwegian, Swedish, and Swiss German enhanced the borrowing of items from basic vocabulary (Hock & Joseph, 1996).

Similarly, in the Japanese Koguryo language, most loanwords fall into the category of cultural vocabulary. However, according to Beckwith (2007), unlike in English, a small number of the borrowed words that belong to basic vocabulary falls into only three fields of semantics including body parts, fundamental verbal notions and personal pronouns. The borrowing of items belonging to cultural and basic vocabulary is prominent in Dutch and Chichewa languages as well.



In Chichewa, the borrowed words that belong to basic vocabulary fall into four semantic fields of kinship, cognition, sense, and perception while in Dutch they fall into five fields namely the physical world, kinship, body parts, sense, and perception (Der Sijs, 2009; Matiki, 2016). In fact, there is inconsistency in the borrowability between cultural and basic vocabulary. As such, while this substantiates the statement that words referring to essential human activities are resistant to borrowing because such activities are universal, there is hardly a gap in the domain.

So far, Polishchuck and Yorava (2023) argue that, in contact, words from all semantic fields can be borrowed in order to facilitate communication, depending on speakers' exposure to source languages and differences on the levels of technology. This assertion, therefore, proves that all words including those associated with cultural and basic vocabulary can be borrowed. Consequently, all words are prone to borrowing in order to facilitate communication because distinction of loanwords according to cultural and basic vocabulary appears to lack a theoretical base. An intensive study to examine the borrowability of words in other languages was therefore deemed necessary.

In Tanzania, information regarding changes of ECLs (including Hehe) due importation of loanwords seems to lack research-based basis. This is due to restrictions that have been put by the authority to disallow documentation, translation or conducting research on them for fear that they would lead to tribalism and pose hardship in unifying the nation (Muzale & Rugemalira, 2008; Blommaert, 2013).

As such, there has been no policy or regulation that legalize their use in formal domains such as school, political campaign, etc., for a relatively long period of time; that is, more than three decades (i.e. since 1960's until 1990s) when cultural policy that allow linguistic tolerance was established. Thus, this made them borrow from Swahili and English, the languages which are used freely.

Nonetheless, the lexicon of Hehe is pointed out to have massive loanwords of different semantic fields triggered by borrowing that took place when its speakers had contacts with speakers of those languages for various reasons such as trade, the campaign of spreading Islamic culture, missionary activities, and colonization.

These include its four neighbouring ECLs (i.e. Bena, Kinga, Kimbu, and Gogo), Swahili, Hindi, Arabic, French, Portuguese, English, and Latin. This is based on Kasavaga and Alphonse's (2023) statement that, in Hehe, the language

that contributed most loanwords is Swahili, followed by English and Arabic. Table 1 summarises the distribution of loanwords in Hehe by source languages.

Table 1: Source of Hehe Loanwords

S/n	Source Language	Number Of Words	%
1	Hindi	4	0.34
2	English	354	30.72
3	French	2	0.17
4	Swahili	671	58.24
5	Arabic	85	7.37
6	Latin	10	0.86
7	Bena	7	0.6
8	Kimbu	5	0.43
9	Portuguese	7	0.6
10	Gogo	3	0.26
11	Kinga	4	0.34
Total		1152	100

Source: Kasavaga and Alphonce (2023).

Therefore, it is plausible to say, in Hehe, the language that contributed the most loanwords is Swahili (58.24%), followed by English (30.72%) and Arabic (7.37%). It is upheld that Hehe have acquired Swahili loanwords most due to the authority's reluctance to allow the use of Tanzanian ECLs, including Hehe in the formal domains because of fear that they would lead into tribalism and pose hardship to unify the nation (Blommaert, 2013). As such, the current study focuses on the borrowability of words by the semantic fields in Hehe language.

2. Materials and Methods

The data for this study were collected in Kiponzelo, Nzihi, Ifunda, and Mibikimitali villages in Iringa district. These villages are located in the Southern Highlands of Tanzania. Selection of villages was based on being located near



Kalenga area where the central dialect commonly known as Kihehe icha wikalo uwa avatwa (i.e. the Hehe of the seat of Hehe chiefs) and considered as pure Hehe is mainly spoken (Madumulla, 1995). Researchers followed Bloomberg and Volpe (2012) statement that a case for study on a linguistic phenomenon that occurs naturally should focus on a site presenting a unique situation. Both primary and secondary data were collected for the study. Primary data were collected through oral elicitation and focus group discussions. To obtain the data through oral elicitation. Researchers visited the sites where native speakers of Hehe reside and did face-to-face conversations with informants. These included farms, households, and dispute-negotiating meetings.

Thus, at the farms the informants were asked to narrate stories about drought, floods, harvesting and growing of various crops with the aim of collecting information which display the use and change of some aspects in the natural settings. The exercise also involved informants found in different sites too. In order to ensure consistency in the informants' responses, unstructured questions and probing questions phrased differently were used to seek information related to the already asked questions.

Oral elicitation was used to collect data from 30 informants until the saturation point was reached. To rule out any effect which might occur as a result of age, gender and educational level, the informants from whom the researchers collected data had varied demographic and socio-economic characteristics; that is, youth and old, male and female, educated and less-educated, employed and non-employed, etc. They took written records of the information which were then transcribed intuitively where a total of 1,200 loanwords were identified.

Secondary data were collected to supplement the primary data to ensure that the collected data reflected the contemporary state of the Hehe language. So, two written texts, namely 'Riddles and riddling among the Hehe of Iringa' by Redmayne and 'Tukumwiwuka Uyuvetu Telesa' by Malangalila were reviewed to obtain secondary data. Selection of these texts was based on the fact that they contain stories, dialogue and narrations which reflect the native use of the language under investigation. The information obtained was then transcribed and 152 loanwords were identified. Therefore, a collective total of 1,352 loanwords were obtained from both the primary and secondary sources.

In order to validate the collected data and get more information regarding sources, 8 participants were selected purposely to take part in a focus group discussion. The selection of these individuals was based on the resourcefulness they had exhibited during the oral elicitations. This enabled the researchers to crosscheck the status of the 1,352 loanwords based on the Length and Morphosyntactic criteria. According to Poplack (1980), on the basis of the length criterion, the integrated words, non-integrated words and phrases of other languages in the lexicon of a recipient language counts loan while on the basis of

the morphosyntactic criterion, the replication of foreign affix in a recipient language's words or phrases counts loan. Nevertheless, as loanwords are usually related to cognates, identifying them is usually problematic (Waldman, 1989). Thus, being aware of this challenge, researchers crosschecked the collected information using a list of Proto-Bantu vocabularies to ascertain themselves that they were true loanwords. Ultimately, a total of 1,152 were confirmed to be true loanwords. These loanwords were then analysed qualitatively to determine their semantic fields based on Tadmor (2009) division typological criterion before presenting the findings descriptively.

3. Results

The analysis of the collected data revealed that loanwords found in Hehe belong to 28 semantic fields. As presented in Table 2, these fields involve both cultural vocabulary and basic vocabulary.

Table 2. Borrowability by Semantic Fields

S/n	Semantic Field	F	%	Examples
1	Kinship	25	2.17	mama 'mother', sangaasi 'aunt', mujomba 'uncle'.
2	Agriculture	51	4.43	ipolooti 'field', litelekeeta 'tractor', isebeeto 'spade'.
3	Quantity	50	4.34	eluufu 'thousand', insuusi 'half', iloobo 'quarter'.
4	Time	28	2.43	italehe 'date', umweesi 'month', umwaaka 'year'.
5	Health and medicine	44	3.82	isiliinsi 'syringe', isibitaali 'hospital', umuganga 'doctor'.
6	Carpentry	47	4.07	idilili 'drilling', imeesa 'table', ilikabati 'cupboard'.
7	Transportation	62	5.38	liteeleni 'train', isitendi 'bus stop', umutuka 'car', ligeeti 'gate'
8	House and building	59	5.12	ikivanza 'ground', isemeendi 'cement', ikufuli 'padlock'.
9	Entertainment and festival	48	4.16	italuumbeta 'trumpet', igalamufoni 'gramophone'.
10	Animal naming	30	2.6	libaata 'duck', ilikondolo 'sheep', insiiva 'dove'.
11	Business and Banking	42	3.65	ibeengi 'bank', ulupila 'ancient money', uwusulu 'tax'
12	Modern world	39	3.38	ilapitoopi 'computer', isiimu 'telephones', isaala 'watch'

13	Spatial relation	12	1.04	pakatikati 'middle', kuliya 'right side', kumbele 'behind'
14	Warfare and hunting	44	3.82	ibundundi 'gun', indovaano 'fish hook'
15	Law	41	3.56	ukulamuula 'to judge', iseliya 'regulation or law'
16	Basic action	8	0.69	tembeela 'visit', ukuwumba 'to create', and ukufwa 'to die'.
17	The physical world	22	1.9	umulima 'mountain', idalagya 'bridge', limemi 'storms'.
18	Political relation	45	3.9	ibendela 'flag', iselikali 'government', sabikiifu 'chief'.
19	The body	15	1.3	ikisogo 'nape', ikigaansa 'palm', imbaafu 'ribs'.
20	Clothing and grooming	85	7.38	ilikooti 'coat', igawuni 'gown', ibaangili 'bracelet'.
21	The food and drinks	57	4.94	umukate 'bread', ihaalagi 'beans', ilidifu 'milk'
22	Religion and beliefs	74	6.42	umukilisitu 'Christ', ukubatiisa 'baptize', isaambi 'sin'.
23	School and learning	64	5.56	kupaasa 'pass exams', ibalula 'letter', ikalamu 'pen'
24	Home	65	5.64	ibaakuli 'bawl', libotolo 'bottle', ikolobiyi 'lamp'.
25	Car and repair	44	3.82	iboliiti 'nut bolt', igiliisi lubricant', umutukaa 'car'.
26	Vegetable and fruits	43	3.73	ikitungulu 'onion', ikaaloti 'carrot', ikaabinsi 'cabbage'.
27	Place naming	12	1.01	kukibao, kumlandege, kujonsikona, kukiponseelo
28	Colour	8	0.69	iyeeelo 'yellow', ilaangi 'colour', and ikidifu 'grey colour'
Total		1152	100	

From Table 2, it is obvious that loanwords belonging to fields of clothing and grooming constitute 7.38% of all loanwords that were investigated. So, this is the field that is most susceptible to borrowing. This field is followed by religion and belief (6.42%), home (5.64%), school and learning (5.56%), and transportation (5.38%). Then, the fields of basic action, and colour collectively comprise only 0.69% of the loanwords. Hence, they are fields that are the least susceptible to be borrowed. This observation is inconsistent with the results presented in the World Loanword Typology project where the semantic fields with highest proportion of borrowing are religion and belief, clothing and grooming, house, and law; and that religion and beliefs is shown to be highly borrowable, making up to 41.2% of all the loanwords (Tadmor, 2009).



The cultural differences between the speakers of Hehe and the speakers of the source languages were shown to explain the difference among the semantic fields in terms of borrowability. For instance, in order to fill lexical gaps, the Hehe has been borrowing various terminologies that refer to the concepts and objects that come from the speakers of source languages. As Swahili and English speakers brought new objects and concepts related to religion and beliefs, clothes, and grooming into the community; the Hehe speakers had no option other than adopting them along with the terminologies referring to them.

At the same time, the fact that in Tanzania education is provided in Swahili and English languages since the arrival of colonialists in the 1880s also explains why Hehe has borrowed more terminologies in the fields of school, medicine, agriculture, and carpentry. So, since the Hehe had and still have low development in these fields, they attract borrowing. Hence, this explains why most of the concepts related to these fields are foreign in nature.

The difference in level of technology between Hehe speakers and speakers of the source languages also explains the difference of borrowability between cultural vocabulary and basic vocabulary. As per the analysis, whereas words belonging to the fields that are foreign to the Hehe community such as cars repair, school and learning, clothing and grooming, health and medicine, and building are highly borrowed; words that belong to the semantic fields that fall under basic vocabulary category such as time, basic actions, and kinship are the least borrowable. This corroborates Carling, Cronhamn, Farren et al., (2019) who argue that, in a contact situation, words belonging to the cultural vocabulary are more borrowable than those which belong to basic vocabulary because they refer to concepts that do not exist in the community that speaks the recipient languages.

As in some other languages, the difference in the borrowability of words based on the cultural vocabulary and basic vocabulary in Hehe appears to exhibit peculiarity. For instance, in English, most of the loanwords fall into the cultural vocabulary pertaining to the modern word, sports, foods and drinks, and clothing, but the loanwords that form basic vocabulary fall into only four fields of sense perception, spatial relations, body terms, and kinship (Polishchuck & Yorava, 2023).

In Hehe, the semantic fields associated with cultural vocabulary are also borrowed more than those which are associated with basic vocabulary. The fields associated with basic vocabulary are seven in total while those which are associated with cultural vocabulary are up to twenty-one. This means that there are more loanwords which are related to basic vocabulary in Hehe than in English. These explain as to why Hehe borrows more loanwords from basic vocabulary than English does.



Similarly, in Japanese Koguryo and Chichewa, most of the loanwords fall under cultural vocabulary. However, while there are only three semantic fields falling under the basic vocabulary namely body parts, fundamental activities and personal pronouns in Japanese Koguryo, there are up to four fields of basic vocabulary such as kinship, cognition, sense and perception in Chichewa (Matiki, 2016; Nagano & Shimada, 2018). Here, we found differences in borrowability between the fields under cultural vocabulary and those which are basic across these languages in relation to how the similar aspects apply in Hehe. For instance, there are no loanwords belonging to the fields of place naming, colour, spatial relation, and the physical world all being under basic vocabulary occur, although both cultural vocabulary and basic vocabulary exist in Hehe.

This is different in Japanese Koguryo and Chichewa where loanwords belonging to these fields are present, as per Matiki (2016) and Nagano and Shimada's (2018) observations. Therefore, what is put forward in this study is that, while in a contact situation, words belonging to all semantic fields have a chance to be borrowed to facilitate communication; the borrowability of lexical items from certain semantic fields might vary from language to language. The explanation for this situation lies in differences in the culture of the speakers, their geographical location, weather condition, level of technology, and the nature of the contact.

4. Conclusion

The analysis made in this paper has provided sufficient evidence of the extent to which borrowing has influenced the lexicon of Hehe. As pointed out earlier, although information about presence of loanwords in Hehe is plenty and readily available, there was a paucity of research-based information about how lexicon in the fields of semantics has changed as a result of importation of loanwords. This paper has confirmed that the loanwords found in Hehe fall into 28 semantic fields.

The field of clothing and grooming was found to be most susceptible to borrowing while the fields of basic actions and colour are the least susceptible to borrowing. It has been established that borrowing is a function of linguistic and non-linguistic factors. The major linguistic reason for borrowing is to fill lexical and semantic gaps caused by differences in the cultures and levels of technology between the Hehe community and the communities of speakers of the source languages. Non-linguistic factors are prestige and absence of any policy or regulation that legalize the use of ECLs (including Hehe) in formal domains for more than three decades (i.e. since 1960s until 1990s).

Since massive borrowing contribute drastically for language change by leading to loss of its speakers' culture and world diverse knowledge embedded in

it, the findings are evident that if the use of ECLs' in formal domains continues to be prohibited, there will be unhealthy implications on preservation of the grammatical aspects of such languages in the future. Thus, authorities should legalize more use of ECLs. This can include making them medium of instruction in kindergarten schools along with Swahili and English; and allowing them to be taught as subjects in schools. The study appeals for further research on the influence of loanwords on the syntax of Hehe in order to enrich the existing literature.

5. Limitations of the Study

Although importation of loanwords seems to have affected the aspects all varies of Hehe (that is, Kosisamba, the Central dialect, and Kisungwa), this study focused solely on the semantic fields of the central dialect commonly known as Kihehe icha uwikalo uwa umtwaa. Hence, these findings should not be treated as covering borrowing issues of all varieties of the Hehe language

Supplementary Details

Supplementary Materials & Data Availability Statement:

We hereby admit to have no additional information in the form of figures, tables, videos, or datasets serving as supplementary files for this work.

Author Contributions:

Dr. Fahamu Kasavaga is the main author. So, he participated in the entire exercise of writing the manuscript in terms of formulating the research title, finding relevant sources, objectives, data collection process, analysing and writing. Dr. Chrispina Alphonse (senior lecturer at the university of Dodoma) is a co-author. She participated in the entire process of checking the data, analysing them and reviewing the process. Mr. Mapuga is a second co-author of this manuscript. In this manuscript he has contributed in analysing the data, editing and reviewing process.

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Institutional Review Board Statement:

Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement:

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study.



Acknowledgments:

The authors appreciate the informants of Kiponzelo, Nzihi, Ifunda, and Mibikimitali villages for their willingness to offer insights and time for this study.

Conflicts of Interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Disclosure Statement:

The authors hereby state that no AI Tool was used in writing this manuscript.

References

- Beckwith, C. (2007). *Koguryo: The language of Japan's continental Relatives: An Introduction to the Historical - comparative study of the Japanese-Koguryoic languages*. Leiden: Brill NV.
- Blommaert, J. (2013). *Ideology and Language in Tanzania*, Tilburg Papers in culture and Studies (2nd ed.). Babylon: Tilburg.
- Carling, G., Cronhamn, S., Farren, R., Aliyev, E., & Frid, J. (2019). The causality of Borrowing: Lexical Loans in Eurasia Languages. *PLOS ONE*, 14(10). Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0223588>
- Crystal, D. (2003). *The Cambridge Encyclopedia of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Der Sijs, V. (2009). Loanwords in Dutch. In M. Haspelmath, & U. Tadmor, *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook* (pp. 338-359). The Hague: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Durkin, P. (2014). *Borrowed words: A History of Loanwords in English*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Guthrie, M. (1967-71). *Comparative Bantu*. Fanbrough: Cregg International Publishers.
- Haonga, E. D. (2013). *Lahaja za Kihehe: Mtazamo wa kiisimu*, unpublished MA Dissertation. Dar es Salaam.
- Hennink, M. M. (2014). *Focus Group Discussion: Understanding Qualitative Research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kasavaga, F., & Alphonse, C. (2023). Lexical Borrowing: the Influence of Loanwords on the semantics of Kihehe. *Ghana journal of Linguistics*, 12(3), 44-64. Retrieved from <https://www.ajol.info/index.php/gjl/article/view/264877>
- Madumulla, J. S. (1995). *Proverbs and Sayings: Theory and Practice*. Dar es Salaam: Institute of Kiswahili Research.
- Matiki, A. J. (2016). Patterns of Lexical Borrowing in Chichewa. *LASU* 4, 4.



- Muzale, H. R., & Rugemalira, J. M. (2008). Research and Documentaion of the Languages of Tanzania. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 2(1), 68-108.
- Polishchuck, G. V., & Yorava, I. O. (2023). "Lexicographic Evidence of Germanic Elements in the Early 20th century English Vocabulary". *Scientific and Practical Conference (International Forum: Problems and Scientific Solutions)* (pp. 214 - 219). Riga: The Republic of Lavia. doi:http://doi.org/10.305225 / 978 - 9934 - 26-227-2-53
- Poplack, S. (1980). Sometimes I'll start a sentence in Spanish y termino en espanol: toward a topology of codeswitching. *Linguistics*, 18, 581-618.
- Tadmor, U. (2009). Loanwords in the World's Languages. In M. Haspelmath, & U. Tadmor, *Loanwords in the World Languages. A Comparative Handbook* (pp. 55-75). Berlin: De Gruyter Mouton.
- Walsh, M. T. (2004). Variability and Compounding of Affixes in Hehe Animal Names (Tanzania) . Retrieved from <http://www.academia.edu> on
- Winford, D. (2013). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Cite as: Kasavaga, F., Alphonse, C., & Mapuga, D. (2026). Borrowability of Loanwords by Semantic Fields in Tanzanian Ethnic Community Languages: Case of Hehe Language: . *International Journal of Philosophy, Linguistics, and Humanities*, 2(1), 62–74. <https://doi.org/10.70847/690088>