

## **A Study of Loanwords in Tiv Domains of Communication**

**Cletus Tyongi Bem<sup>1</sup>, Ishima JLJ<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Languages and Linguistics,  
Rev. Fr. Moses Orshio Adasu University, Markurdi,  
Benue State, Nigeria

### **Corresponding author**

Cletus Tyongi Bem

Email: tyongibem1993@gmail.com

Phone: +2347086282695

### **Abstract**

Despite the growing presence of loanwords in the Tiv language, the phenomenon remains understudied. Existing literature on Tiv linguistics has largely focused on phonology, morphology, and general grammatical structure, with little systematic attention given to lexical borrowing. This study examines loanwords in Tiv domains of communication. The study aims to identify the loanwords borrowed into the Tiv language and analyses the domains in which they are borrowed. Specifically, the study identified the loanwords that have been borrowed into Tiv communication, analyses the different domains in which the Tiv people have borrowed loanwords, examine the grammatical classes of the borrowed words in Tiv communication. The study adopts the Language Contact Theory, developed by Uriel Weinreich in 1953, which explains that language contact is a central force of linguistic change, leading to the transfer of vocabulary and other linguistic features between languages. This study is library-based research. The data are gathered primarily from secondary sources, including published and unpublished works, academic journals, and online publications on the Tiv language. Additionally, the researchers' intuitive knowledge as a native Tiv speakers was instrumental in data collection and validation. Findings reveal that Tiv has integrated a significant number of loanwords from other languages, particularly in domains such as agriculture, food, and household tools. These borrowings are shown to be concentrated in areas where new concepts or items have been introduced through cultural contact. The study concludes that lexical borrowing is a common and natural process that enriches Tiv by providing the linguistic resources needed to name new realities. The study recommends the systematic documentation of Tiv loanwords through written records and digital archives. This will preserve the borrowed lexicon and provide a resource for linguistic research and cultural education.

**Keywords: Loanwords, Tiv, Domains, Communication, cultural contact, cultural education.**

## Introduction

Lexical borrowing is one of the most notable consequences of language contact and interaction. It refers to the adoption of words from one language into another to meet communicative, cultural, or social needs. Myers-Scotton (2017) considers borrowing as the incorporation of foreign lexical items into the recipient language in order to bridge lexical or cultural gaps in communication. This view explains that borrowing serves as a means of expanding the linguistic repertoire of a speech community. Matras (2020) posits that borrowing is a cross-linguistic transfer of vocabulary motivated by interaction, social need, and identity negotiation. This means that borrowing is not a haphazard act but a systematic process through which languages adapt to new realities.

Languages generally borrow because they come into contact with new ideas,

practices, and concepts for which they lack native vocabulary, and this is also the case of Tiv. Haspelmath (2020) asserts that borrowing arises mainly from cultural and technological diffusion, where new realities demand new terms that are more efficiently adopted from donor languages. This view explains that borrowing is often a response to necessity rather than choice. Likewise, Aikhenvald (2018) avers that languages borrow to remain flexible and relevant in a changing sociolinguistic environment. This view explains that Tiv, through its constant interaction with English, Hausa, and other Nigerian languages, borrows extensively to capture new social, cultural, and technological realities.

In the case of Tiv communication, borrowing has become evident across several domains where foreign influence has been most pronounced. Thomason (2018) avers that borrowed words tend to cluster in areas

such as governance, religion, technology, and education, where languages face new lexical demands. This view explains that Tiv, like many African languages, adopts words in key domains of social interaction. Winford (2017) posits that lexical borrowing is a pragmatic strategy that ensures clarity and effective communication in multilingual settings. This quote supports the idea that Tiv speakers borrow words from other languages not merely by accident, but as a deliberate communicative strategy to achieve clarity and effectiveness in domains such as agriculture, food items, home tools, and kitchen tools, where indigenous vocabulary may be insufficient. This borrowing not only fills lexical gaps but also serves to integrate the Tiv people into broader socio-cultural and technological networks, while still maintaining their distinct linguistic identity. It is against this background that this study seeks to examine the domains of lexical borrowing in Tiv.

The term “Tiv” refers to both an ethnic group and a language, encompassing their ancestral heritage as well. Hembe (2005) confirms that the word ‘Tiv’ refers to the people, their language as well as their progenitor, highlighting its significance. Linguistically, Tiv belongs to the Bantu language family. Abraham (1940) notes that “the Tiv are an originally Bantu tribe” supported by Hembe (2005), who emphasizes the strong linguistic affinities between Tiv and the Bantu Nyanza, indicating a historical connection. Therefore, Tiv’s status as a prolific borrower makes it an essential subject for the study of lexical borrowing.

Lexical borrowing is a common linguistic phenomenon through which languages adopt words from other languages, often as a result of cultural contact, modernization, religious influence, or the need to express new realities for which no indigenous equivalent exists. The Tiv

language, spoken predominantly in Benue State and parts of Nasarawa, Taraba, and Plateau States in Nigeria, has not been immune to this process. As Tiv speakers continue to interact with speakers of English, Hausa, and other Nigerian languages, foreign words have steadily penetrated various domains of everyday communication.

Despite the growing presence of loanwords in the Tiv language, the phenomenon remains understudied. Existing literature on Tiv linguistics has largely focused on phonology, morphology, and general grammatical structure, with little systematic attention given to lexical borrowing. The few studies that acknowledge borrowed words in Tiv tend to treat the subject superficially, offering only general observations without conducting a domain-specific analysis. As a result, there is currently fewer documentation of the specific domains in which borrowing occurs, the source languages from which words are

drawn, the phonological and morphological adaptations these words undergo upon integration, and the communicative functions they serve within the Tiv speech community.

This gap is particularly significant because loanwords do not occur randomly - they cluster in specific domains of human activity where cultural contact is most intense or where indigenous vocabulary is perceived as inadequate. In the Tiv context, domains such as agriculture, food items, home tools, and kitchen utensils represent areas of daily life where borrowing is likely to be extensive, yet these remain largely unexplored in the existing literature. Without a study of these domains, it is difficult to fully understand the nature, extent, and direction of lexical change in the Tiv language. It is against this background that this study seeks to conduct a detailed investigation into loanwords in selected domains of Tiv communication, specifically agriculture, food items, home tools, and kitchen tools.

The aim of this study is to examine the domains of lexical borrowing in Tiv communication. To achieve this aim, the study will pursue the following objectives which are to: identify the loanwords that have been borrowed into Tiv communication. Analyse the different domains in which the Tiv people have borrowed loanwords and examine the grammatical classes of the borrowed words in Tiv communication

Borrowing is widely recognised as one of the most prominent consequences of language contact, providing speakers with new lexical resources. Sankoff (2017) defines borrowing as the adoption of linguistic material from one language into another, where the borrowed items become part of the regular vocabulary of the recipient language. This view explains that once a word is borrowed, it loses its status as foreign and functions as if it were native. Clyne (2016) asserts that borrowing is an adaptive mechanism that enables languages to cope

with new cultural, social, and technological demands. This view explains that borrowing ensures that a language remains relevant in changing environments. Matras (2020) describes borrowing as a core process of linguistic interaction, reflecting the ongoing exchange between speech communities. This view explains that borrowing is not isolated but part of a broader system of cultural and linguistic exchange.

In addition to enriching vocabulary, borrowing reveals important insights into the relationship between language, society, and identity. Hock and Joseph (2019) argue that borrowing serves both communicative and symbolic functions, allowing languages to extend their range of expression while signaling social alignment. This view explains that languages not only borrow for practical communication but also to show connections with other communities. Hickey (2020) posits that the intensity and direction of borrowing are determined by patterns of

dominance, prestige, and bilingualism. This view explains that power relations and social hierarchies strongly influence what words are borrowed and retained. According to Trudgill (2017), borrowing is an unavoidable result of sustained multilingual contact, occurring whenever communities maintain close interaction. This view explains that as long as languages coexist in close proximity, borrowing will continue as a natural outcome of contact.

One of the most common reasons languages borrow is to fill lexical gaps created by new concepts, inventions, or cultural imports. Yule (2020) avers that communities resort to borrowing when local vocabulary cannot capture newly introduced cultural or technological items. This view explains that borrowing becomes necessary when speakers face unfamiliar realities that require immediate naming. Aikhenvald (2018) asserts that languages extend their vocabulary through borrowing whenever

fresh semantic domains demand immediate naming. This explains that rather than coining new words, speakers prefer the ready-made forms from other languages. Romaine (2017) posits that borrowing is a linguistic shortcut to ensure effective communication in the face of novelty. This view explains that novelty and efficiency remain central to why borrowing occurs.

Another strong motivation for borrowing is intensive contact, prestige, and modernization. Wardhaugh and Fuller (2021) aver that borrowing is proportional to the closeness of social ties, trade networks, and bilingual practices. This reveals that frequent interaction between groups accelerates word exchange. Holmes (2019) asserts that languages inevitably borrow where sustained multilingualism exists, especially in contexts of migration and trade. This unveils that social interaction becomes a fertile ground for loanwords. Fishman (2018) posits that borrowing is often motivated by the symbolic

value of words associated with authority, education, or progress. This explains that speakers also adopt prestigious or modern terms to signal belonging to higher social and cultural domains.

### **Empirical Review**

Adeyemi and Fashola (2017) examine lexical borrowing in the Yoruba language, with specific focus on English loanwords across the domains of religion, education, and technology among Yoruba speakers in Lagos State, Nigeria. The primary objective of the study is to identify and categorise borrowed lexical items and to analyse the phonological processes through which English words are adapted into the Yoruba sound system. The study adopts a descriptive qualitative design, with the population comprising native Yoruba speakers selected through purposive sampling to include individuals with varying degrees of exposure to English. Data were

collected through structured interviews, participant observation, and the analysis of Yoruba radio broadcasts and print materials. The findings reveal that English loanwords are most prominent in technological and religious domains, and that borrowed words undergo significant phonological modification, particularly vowel insertion and tone assignment, to conform to Yoruba's phonological structure. The study concludes that lexical borrowing has become an indispensable mechanism for vocabulary expansion in Yoruba, particularly in domains where indigenous terms are insufficient to capture modern realities.

The study by Adeyemi and Fashola is related to the current study in that both investigate lexical borrowing as a linguistic strategy used by indigenous Nigerian languages to fill vocabulary gaps created by modernisation and cross-cultural contact. Both studies also recognise that loanwords are concentrated in specific domains of

communication rather than occurring randomly across the language. Despite this shared concern, the two studies differ in several important respects. Adeyemi and Fashola focus on Yoruba, a Kwa language with a well-documented literary and linguistic tradition, whereas the current study examines Tiv, a Bantoid language that remains comparatively understudied. Furthermore, the Yoruba study places its analytical emphasis on phonological adaptation processes such as vowel insertion and tone assignment, while the current study is primarily concerned with mapping loanwords across specific everyday domains of Tiv communication, namely agriculture, food items, home tools, and kitchen tools, thereby adopting a domain-centred rather than process-centred orientation.

Abdullahi and Musa (2019) investigate lexical borrowing in the Hausa language, with particular focus on English loanwords in the domains of education,

technology, and governance. The study aims to document the borrowed lexical items, examine the strategies of phonological assimilation employed, and assess the communicative functions these loanwords serve among Hausa speakers in Kano State, Nigeria. A descriptive research design was adopted, with the population comprising educated and semi-educated Hausa speakers selected through purposive sampling to ensure familiarity with English-influenced vocabulary. Data were gathered through oral interviews, participant observation, and the analysis of Hausa print media. The findings indicate that English loanwords are pervasive in formal and semi-formal domains of Hausa communication, with speakers adapting foreign words through vowel insertion, consonant substitution, and syllable restructuring to conform to Hausa phonological norms. The study concludes that while loanwords enhance the expressive capacity of Hausa in modern communicative

contexts, the degree of phonological modification varies depending on the speaker's level of education and degree of bilingualism.

The study by Abdullahi and Musa is related to the current study in that both are situated within the Nigerian linguistic context and examine how indigenous languages absorb foreign vocabulary to meet the communicative demands of a multilingual society. Both studies further recognize that lexical borrowing is a systematic and rule-governed process, with borrowed words undergoing structural modification to fit the phonological and grammatical patterns of the host language. However, the two studies differ in focus and analytical emphasis. Abdullahi and Musa concentrate on Hausa, one of Nigeria's most widely spoken and well-researched languages, with a strong written literary tradition that provides an abundant data source for linguistic analysis. The current study, by contrast, focuses on

Tiv, a language with comparatively limited documentation in the area of lexical borrowing. Additionally, while Abdullahi and Musa prioritize the phonological assimilation strategies through which English words are integrated into Hausa, the current study shifts focus toward identifying the specific everyday domains — agriculture, food items, home tools, and kitchen tools — in which borrowing is most active in Tiv communication, offering a domain-specific contribution that distinguishes it from adaptation-focused studies.

### **Methodology**

This study is a library-based research project in which all data are lexical in nature, consisting of loanwords obtained exclusively from secondary sources, including published academic journals, textbooks, dissertations, dictionaries, and online repositories such as Google Scholar and JSTOR. Loanwords across the selected domains of agriculture, food items, home tools, and kitchen tools

were systematically identified by reviewing relevant literature and cross-referencing findings against established linguistic records on the Tiv lexicon. Additionally, the intuitive knowledge of one of the researchers as a native Tiv speaker served as a complementary validation tool to assess the naturalness of identified loanwords, confirm their phonological forms, and flag items that appeared inconsistent with authentic Tiv usage. Where discrepancies arose, the researchers engaged in collaborative deliberation to ensure the final dataset reflects both scholarly documentation and genuine linguistic practice within the Tiv speech community. The study adopts Uriel Weinreich’s Language Contact Theory as its

analytical framework. Published in the mid-20th century, a major tenet of this theory is that language contact is a primary driver of linguistic change. It posits that when speakers of different languages interact, features such as vocabulary, phonology, and grammatical structures can be transferred. The intensity of this interaction determines the degree of influence, which can range from the casual borrowing of single words to profound structural changes. This theory provides a suitable model for analysing the phenomenon of lexical borrowing in Tiv.

**Data Presentation and Analysis**

This section presents and analyses the data. For clarity, the analysis immediately follows each data table

**Table 1: Hausa Loanwords for Agriculture**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss     | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 1   | Abya        | Abya         | Small hoe | Noun              |
| 2   | Ikyaa       | Ikyaa        | Hoe       | Noun              |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 1 presents Hausa loanwords in Tiv related to agriculture. The words *abya*

and *ikyaa* are borrowed directly from Hausa with little or no phonological or

morphological modification. This indicates that Tiv speakers found these words easily adaptable due to shared sound systems and similar agricultural practices. The loanwords

fit naturally into Tiv’s phonological structure, which prefers open syllables, and they are now fully integrated as common nouns used in daily speech.

**Tbale 2: Hausa Loanwords for Food Items**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss     | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|-----------|-------------------|
| 3   | Albasa      | Alabusa      | Onion     | Noun              |
| 4   | Lemun       | Alum         | Orange    | Noun              |
| 5   | Ayaba       | Ayaba        | Banana    | Noun              |
| 6   | Shinkafa    | Chinkafa     | Rice      | Noun              |
| 7   | Kunu        | Kamu         | Pap       | Noun              |
| 8   | Kaun        | Kawan        | Potash    | Noun              |
| 9   | Akara       | Kweesi       | Bean cake | Noun              |
| 10  | Garinrogo   | Logo         | Cassava   | Noun              |

Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025

Table 2 displays Hausa loanwords in Tiv that refer to various food items. These borrowings show minor phonological adjustments, such as vowel insertion and sound substitution, to suit Tiv pronunciation patterns. For instance, *albasa* → *alabusa* adds a vowel to maintain open syllables, and

*shinkafa* → *chinkafa* changes /sh/ to /ch/ to match Tiv sounds. Words like *kunu* → *kamu* reflect vowel harmony. Overall, these words are semantically retained but phonetically modified, showing that Tiv adapts Hausa words slightly for ease of articulation while keeping their meanings intact.

**Table 3: Hausa Loanwords for Home Tools**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss            | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|------------------|-------------------|
| 11  | Agogo       | Agogo        | Wristwatch/Clock | Noun              |
| 12  | Akwati      | Akwati       | Box              | Noun              |
| 13  | Butu        | Butu         | Mat              | Noun              |

|    |         |         |          |      |
|----|---------|---------|----------|------|
| 14 | Chancha | Chancha | Broom    | Noun |
| 15 | Katifa  | Katifa  | Mattress | Noun |
| 16 | Kujera  | Kujila  | Stool    | Noun |
| 17 | Kugi    | Kula    | Hook     | Noun |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 3 shows Hausa loanwords in Tiv that relate to home tools and household objects. Most of these borrowings, such as *agogo* (clock), *akwati* (box), and *katifa* (mattress), retain their original Hausa form without much change. However, there are few cases of phonological substitution, such

as *kujera* → *kujila* and *kugi* → *kula*, where /r/ is replaced by /l/, which is common in Tiv phonology. The limited changes demonstrate that these words are long-established in Tiv and phonologically compatible with native sounds.

**Table 4: Hausa Loanwords (Kitchen Tools)**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss   | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|---------|-------------------|
| 18  | Ashana      | Ashanu       | Matches | Noun              |
| 19  | Cokali      | Chokeli      | Spoon   | Noun              |
| 20  | Raliya      | Lalia        | Filter  | Noun              |
| 21  | Falanti     | Pelengi      | Tray    | Noun              |
| 22  | Tasa        | Tesa         | Dish    | Noun              |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 4 presents Hausa loanwords for kitchen tools in Tiv. Here, the borrowed words undergo noticeable but simple phonological modifications. *Cokali* → *chokeli* substitutes /c/ with /ch/ and adds a vowel /e/ to fit Tiv’s syllable pattern. *Falang* → *pelengi* shows /f/ changing to /p/, while

*tasa* → *tesa* reflects vowel harmony. These changes reveal how Tiv speakers adjust Hausa words slightly to follow Tiv sound rules while maintaining original meanings. The words have become part of everyday Tiv vocabulary used in domestic cooking contexts.

**Table 5: English Loanwords for Agriculture**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss       | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|-------------|-------------------|
| 22  | Grader      | Gerada       | Grader      | Noun              |
| 23  | Digger      | Ijiga        | Digger      | Noun              |
| 24  | Shovel      | Shebul       | Shovel      | Noun              |
| 25  | Tractor     | Turokoto     | Tractor     | Noun              |
| 26  | Wheelbarrow | Wilbaro      | Wheelbarrow | Noun              |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 5 contains English agricultural loanwords in Tiv. These words show extensive phonological adaptation due to the structural differences between English and Tiv. For example, *grader* → *gerada* and *digger* → *ijiga* include vowel insertion to avoid consonant clusters. *Tractor* → *turokoto* is completely restructured through vowel

addition and syllable expansion, showing Tiv’s preference for open CV syllables. *Shovel* → *shebul* replaces /v/ with /b/, a sound more common in Tiv. These adaptations illustrate how Tiv remodels English words to fit its sound system and pronunciation norms.

**Table 6: English Loanwords for Kitchen Tools**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss   | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|---------|-------------------|
| 27  | Kitchen     | Kichin       | Kitchen | Noun              |
| 28  | Cup         | Koopu        | Cup     | Noun              |
| 29  | Rubber      | Roba         | Rubber  | Noun              |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 6 shows English kitchen-related loanwords in Tiv. The adaptations here mostly involve vowel lengthening and syllable simplification. *Cup* → *koopu* adds an extra vowel to produce an open syllable, while *rubber* → *roba* drops the final

consonant and introduces /a/ for smooth articulation. *Kitchen* → *kichin* remains largely unchanged because its structure already aligns with Tivphonotactics. These words are now commonly used in Tiv homes

and have been phonologically adjusted for natural use.

**Table 7: English Loanwords (Food Items)**

| No. | Source Word   | Tiv Loanword | Gloss          | Grammatical Class |
|-----|---------------|--------------|----------------|-------------------|
| 30  | Bread         | Beledi       | Bread          | Noun              |
| 31  | Guava         | Gwava        | Guava          | Noun              |
| 32  | Maggi (Brand) | Magi         | Seasoning cube | Noun              |
| 33  | Mango         | Mango        | Mango          | Noun              |
| 34  | Sugar         | Shuga        | Sugar          | Noun              |
| 35  | Tomato        | Tomato       | Tomato         | Noun              |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 7 presents English food-related loanwords in Tiv. Most words have been slightly modified to suit Tiv pronunciation. For instance, *bread* → *beledi* shows syllable expansion and vowel insertion, while *sugar* → *shuga* and *guava* → *gwava* demonstrate open-syllable endings typical of Tiv. *Maggi*

is borrowed directly as a brand name but functions generically in Tiv. These changes reflect phonological accommodation rather than semantic alteration, showing how Tiv speakers adapt English food terms to their native sound structure.

**Table 8: English Loanwords (Home Tools)**

| No. | Source Word | Tiv Loanword | Gloss      | Grammatical Class |
|-----|-------------|--------------|------------|-------------------|
| 36  | Bucket      | Bokoti       | Bucket     | Noun              |
| 37  | Fridge      | Firiji       | Fridge     | Noun              |
| 38  | Radio       | Ledio        | Radio      | Noun              |
| 39  | Pillow      | Pilo         | Pillow     | Noun              |
| 40  | Table       | Tebul        | Table      | Noun              |
| 41  | Television  | Televishen   | Television | Noun              |
| 43  | Torch       | Tochi        | Flashlight | Noun              |

**Source: Secondary sources and researcher’s intuitive knowledge, 2025**

Table 8 includes English loanwords for home tools and appliances in Tiv. These

borrowings show strong phonological adaptation processes. *Bucket* → *bokoti* and

*fridge* → *firiji* insert vowels to eliminate consonant clusters, while *radio* → *ledio* substitutes /r/ with /l/, aligning with Tiv phonology. *Torch* → *tochi* and *table* → *tebul* also show vowel addition to achieve open syllables. All words retain their English meanings but are fully nativized in form and pronunciation, illustrating Tiv's ability to modify and internalize English vocabulary into everyday speech.

### **Discussion of Findings**

The first objective sought to identify the lexicon that have been borrowed into Tiv communication. The findings clearly show a significant number of loanwords have been integrated into the Tiv language. The research identified loanwords from sources such as Hausa, English. The tables reveal a particularly strong influence from Hausa and English, with numerous examples like *Alabusa* (onion) and *Ayaba* (banana) from Hausa and *Beledi* (bread) and *Magi* (Magi) from English. This confirms that Tiv has

actively borrowed words to fill lexical gaps, especially for items and concepts introduced through contact with other cultures. This finding is directly supported by Haugen (1950), by stating that borrowing is a common and natural process when different cultures interact.

The second objective of the study sought to analyse the different domains in which the Tiv people have borrowed loanwords. The study reveals that borrowing is not random but occurs in specific, identifiable domains. For instance, the domain of Food and Kitchen Items shows extensive borrowing for new food products, with words like *chinkafa* (rice) and *alum* (orange) from Hausa, and *Tomato* and *Shuga* from English. Similarly, the domain of Agriculture reflects the adoption of new technology, with loanwords such as *Turokoto* (tractor) and *Shebul* (shovel). The same trend is evident in the domain of Home and Household Items, where terms such as *Firiji*

(fridge) and *Televishen* (television) are used to denote modern products. This concentration of loanwords in specific areas underscores that borrowing is driven by cultural contact and the need to name new concepts and technologies. Gillespie (2006), notes that languages often borrow words for new or "foreign" concepts, with domains like technology, food, and modern domestic life being particularly fertile ground for lexical borrowing.

The third objective of this study was to examine the grammatical classes of the borrowed words in Tiv communication. The findings from the data reveal that almost all the loanwords borrowed from both Hausa and English belong to the **noun class**. These nouns represent names of tangible objects, materials, and food items that have become part of Tiv speakers' daily life. For instance, Hausa words such as *chinkafa* (rice), *alabusa* (onion), *katifa* (mattress), and *agogo*(clock) function as nouns that name concrete objects.

Similarly, English loanwords like *firiji* (fridge), *tebul* (table), *tochi* (torch), and *turokoto* (tractor) also fall within the same grammatical category. The dominance of nouns among the borrowed words suggests that the primary motivation for borrowing is **lexical expansion**, the need to name new objects, tools, or concepts introduced through interaction with other cultures.

### Conclusion

This study concludes that the Tiv language has borrowed a significant number of loanwords from other languages. These loanwords are concentrated in specific domains of communication, such as agriculture, food, and household items. The findings explain that these borrowing process is a natural consequence of cultural interaction and has a profound impact on the language's vocabulary and overall structure.

**References**

- Abraham, R. C. (1940). *A Dictionary of the Tiv Language*. Government of Nigeria.
- Aikhenvald, A. (2018). *Language Contact and Change*. Oxford University Press.
- Aor, T. (2020). *Phonological Effects and Functions of English Loanwords on Tiv Grammar*.
- Clyne, M. (2016). *Dynamics of Language Contact: English and Immigrant Languages*. Cambridge University Press.
- Craig, R. (2019). *Theories of Communication: An Introduction*. Routledge.
- Fishman, J. A. (2018). *Language and Ethnicity in Minority Sociolinguistic Perspective*. Multilingual Matters.
- Fiske, J. (2016). *Introduction to Communication Studies*. Routledge.
- Foss, S. (2018). *Rhetorical Criticism: Exploration and Practice*. Waveland Press.
- Gillespie, A. (2006). *The Social Psychology of Communication*. Oxford University Press.
- Hall, S. (2021). *Representation: Cultural Representations and Signifying Practices*. Routledge.
- Haspelmath, M. (2020). *The Linguistic Typology of Loanwords*. Language Science Press.
- Haugen, E. (1950). *The Norwegian Language in America: A Study in Bilingual Behavior*. Indiana University Press.
- Hembe, A. A. (2005). *Tiv Language and Culture: A Historical Perspective*.
- Hickey, R. (2020). *The Handbook of Language Contact*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Hock, H. H., & Joseph, B. D. (2019). *Language History, Language*

- Change, and Language Relationship.*  
Mouton de Gruyter.
- Holmes, J. (2019). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. Pearson.
- Iornenge, I., & Okechukwu, O. (2017). "English and Hausa Loan Words in Tiv." *Ansu Journal of Language and Literary Studies*, 1(1), 1-10.
- Matras, Y. (2020). *Language Contact*. Cambridge University Press.
- McQuail, D. (2017). *McQuail's Mass Communication Theory*. Sage Publications.
- Myers-Scotton, C. (2017). *Multiple Voices: An Introduction to Bilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Romaine, S. (2017). *Bilingualism*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Sankoff, G. (2017). *Linguistic Variation and Change*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Thomason, S. (2018). *Linguistic Borrowing*. Oxford University Press.
- Trudgill, P. (2017). *Sociolinguistics: An Introduction to Language and Society*. Penguin Books.
- Wardhaugh, R., & Fuller, J. M. (2021). *An Introduction to Sociolinguistics*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. Mouton.
- Winford, D. (2017). *An Introduction to Contact Linguistics*. Blackwell Publishing.
- Yule, G. (2020). *The Study of Language*. Cambridge University Press.