

Lexical Loss and Replacement in Kinga

Leonard Ngwema¹

Institute of Rural Development Planning, Tanzania

Lexical loss and replacement in Kinga are among the impacts of lexical change in language. Language contact acts as a main mediator in linguistic change. In this case, the recipient language may be affected in language systems, especially lexical loss and replacement, leading to lexical change. Kinga has been in contact with Swahili and other nearby languages for a long time. Some of the Kinga words have been lost permanently, and others have been replaced. This paper traces the way Kinga is losing some of its lexical items while others are being replaced by items from different languages, mainly from Swahili. The data analysis processes are based on a qualitative approach. This study is guided by the Cultural Transmission Theory developed by Kenny Smith in 2003. The findings of this paper reveal that Kinga has experienced lexical change because it incorporates words from other nearby languages into its lexicon. Kiswahili seems to have many words in Kinga. The study also postulates that there are changes experienced in phonology, syntax, morphology, and semantics in Kinga. Generally, the results of this paper show that many Swahili words have penetrated into Kinga in the contact situation, whereby some of Kinga's lexical items have been lost while others have been replaced. Language and culture are two things that are intertwined. Elders have to use the language according to their linguistic backgrounds, whereas the new generation learns it as it is used in the natural context. This situation makes the vitality of Kinga as one of the Ethnic Community Languages in Tanzania.

Keywords: *Lexical loss, lexical replacement, language contact, Kinga language*

Introduction

Lexical change involves the change in meaning due to replacements and word loss (Mahler, 2019). Robinson (2019) asserts that meaning can vary because of having different styles of using words in contact situations. This is the fact that when the lexical item gets replaced in Kinga, the meaning may change too. For example, the Kinga word *dema* (herd) has been replaced by the Swahili word *Tsunga* (*chunga*) (herd), but formerly the word *Tsunga* meant the type of vegetable to Kinga speakers. For Zimman (2020), lexical change can be an element of socio-political change in the use of language, and sometimes it involves the change of popular forms like verbs and nouns. In lexical change, the language loses its old usage and new usage takes place depending on the context (Holman, 2011; Grondelaers et al., 2012). In Kinga, the augment marks the new word in language. For example, the Swahili word *Jumapili* (Sunday) to *Ejumapili* (Sunday) in Kinga **E** is augment-nativising the loan word.

This paper sought to investigate the lexical change based on lexical loss and replacement in Kinga, a language spoken by the Kinga ethnic group found in Makete District, Njombe Region, Tanzania. Kinga is one of the ECLs in Tanzania that falls in the group G65 according to the New Updated Guthrie List (NUGL), a referential classification list of Bantu languages. It is located at GPS coordinates of 9° 12' 26.204" S and 34° 3' 50.911" E, latitude -9.207279 and longitude 34.064142 (Maho, 2009). According to Sanga (2018), Kinga is surrounded by different languages, which include: Magoma, Mahanji, Bena, Wanji, Nyakyusa, Pangwa English, and Swahili, whereby Swahili seems to be used more in the Kinga-speaking areas compared to other languages.

¹ **Leonard Ngwema** works as a Tutorial Assistant of the Institute of Rural Development Planning, Lake Zone Centre - Mwanza. He is a Communication skills expert with 4+ years of experience as a researcher, trainer and consultant in the field of Education, Linguistics and Communication skills.

In this paper, lexical change appears to be a concern in Kinga language because changes may be positive or negative. Kikinga has manifested itself in modifications to various ways, including morphological aspects, semantic areas lexical loss, and replacements due to several reasons, with the contact situation being the main agent. Languages have been losing their lexical items due to contact situations (Harya, 2016; Hoffmann, 2018; Njagi & Kinyua, 2016; Sutikno, 2018; Mahler, 2019; Rizka & Utara, 2016; Chatterjee, 2015; Kulwa, 2016). In contact situations, languages tend to exchange items with each other, and the superior languages enjoy imposing their items on inferior ones. Some lexical items can be lost permanently in the inferior languages, while others are replaced by items from superior languages. Kulwa (2016) defines lexical loss as the avoidance of some words and replacing them with other alternatives. According to the mentioned scholars, the effect of the lexical change is mainly manifested in the pronunciation, morphology, semantics, and sentence structure of a language. Language may have a variety of forms due to contact between speakers of different languages. For instance, in the 14th century, the English language had two words, boy and girl, which meant a male servant and a young person of either sex, respectively; but in the 15th century, the two words gained a new meaning, whereby the word girl came to mean a young female, whereas boy was used to refer to any male child as the opposite of the word girl (Giulianelli, Tredici, & Fernández, 2020). Language may change positively when it borrows words from other languages and uses other word formation processes to add to the stock of vocabulary in its corpus, but the ECLs in Tanzania are in danger due to receiving many words from Swahili. Thus, they are losing their lexical items in their lexicon (Mtallo, 2013; Kagali, 2018; Kapinga, 2018; Kulwa, 2016).

Rizka and Utara (2016) argue that lexical change is manifested in linguistic features by the influence of socio-cultural, historical, environmental, religious, and political issues. Fukushima (2019) claims that the young generation has a great impact on the ongoing changes happening in the dialectal variation of languages like the Niigata dialects of the Japanese language. The young generation has contributed to the creation of the Niigata dialect because of their way of speaking Japanese, like in the words *amai* (sweet), standard Japanese, replaced by *me* (sweet), 'Niigata dialect'. Chatterjee (2015) adds that the outcomes of language change are derived from cultural advancement and socio-cultural contact. Moreover, Hovy and Johannsen (2016) argue that language varies because there is no expectation for teenagers to speak the language the same way as pensioners. Sutikno (2018) argues that the Javanese language has been changing due to the interaction among speakers of other languages during transmigration. Such languages are Minangnese, Batakinese, Malay, and Indonesian. McFarland (2021) categorised lexical changes into several varieties of changes, such as expansive (a new word fills a gap in the lexicon), additive (new and old terms are both used), replacive (the former word disappears), loan shift (an old word's meaning changes to fill a lexical gap), loan translation (new words or phrases are translated literally), or loan blend (the term combines words or parts of words from multiple languages). Khumalo (2004) postulates that the Ndebele language has undergone significant changes resulting from the movement of Ndebele people from South Africa to Zimbabwe, where they had linguistic contact with other language groups, including the Zulus, Xhosas, Swatis, Sothos, and Afrikaners.

Furthermore, Lusekelo (2018) studied lexical borrowing across language phyla in Tanzania that it has a great impact on the changes of various languages, especially indigenous languages. In languages like Matengo, lexical items have changed in various domains, and some have been lost due to contact with Kiswahili and nearby languages (Kapinga, 2018). Also, language contact leads to the dilution of real languages to lose their originality, especially inferior languages (Bakar, 2016; Kulwa, 2016; Lusekelo, 2019). Amani (2010) proclaims that lexical loss and replacement in the Chimalaba language is the outcome of language contact through linguistic borrowing. When the word is lost and replaced by an item

from another language, it may gain a new meaning or lose it over the course of time (Feltgen, Fagard, & Nadal, 2017). Sanga (2018) postulates that the communicative domains in the Kinga speech community are dominated by the combination of Kinga and Kiswahili compared to the use of the Kinga language alone.

The use of more than one language in the same place at the same time may create variation in the host or foreign language (Thomason, 2001). It may, however, disrupt the system of a language and lead to subsequent regularisation through re-analysis (Hickey, 2010). Language contact may lead to lexical modification, loss, and replacement, like in the Kinga language. This is because Kikinga is in contact with English, Kiswahili, and other Bantu languages, such as Kimagoma, Kimahanji, Kibena, Kiwanji, and Kipangwa. In contact, language always induces loss and replacement. Kinga language, as one of the ECLs in Tanzania, may be at risk of dying because of having many replacements in its lexicon while the original ones are still existing, like what happened to Chimalaba (Amani, 2016). Thus, this paper answers the question: Has Kinga lexicon experienced lexical loss and replacement?

Theoretical Background

This paper is guided by Cultural Transmission Theory, which was developed by Kenny Smith in 2003. The central idea of this theory is that language appears to be a system of symbols used to communicate cultural ideas. The cultural evolution of linguistic form, symbolism, and compositionality is the consequence of cultural transmission. In this case, Kinga lexical change results from a broader capacity for cultural transmission rather than being Kinga language-specific. It also claims that certain language transformation features are determined by the transmission of culture from one generation to another. Kikinga is surrounded by different languages, each of which has its own cultural usage.

The theory adds that older generations may enforce the use of the original words, but peers in the same generation horizontally transmit language, such as teenagers sharing slang, making certain words popular in their speech. Language changes over time due to pressures acting on it during cultural transmission (Ritt & Gąsiorowski, 2018). Human languages are not just tools for transmitting cultural ideas; they are themselves culturally transmitted (Cornish, 2011). Cultural transmission is determined by several factors, namely: time, community advancement, increasing the number of speakers, multilingualism, the social status of the respective groups, their educational systems, technological sophistication, their transportation modes, and communication media (Cornish, 2011; Keating, 2018; Ritt and Gąsiorowski, 2018; Smith, Brighton & Kirby, 2003; Smith, 2006; and Smith, 2011). Therefore, when there is high cultural interaction, there is also a high possibility of having many new items in the indigenous language.

Literature Review

Different languages in the world have been changing enormously due to contact situations. Michael (2014) indicates how Kisagalla is losing its words to Kiswahili. It seems that many of Sagalla's original words changed to Kiswahili because the language has a strong influence over Kisagalla. For example, *ake* changed to *babu* "grandfather", *wawa* changed to *nyanya* "grandmother", *mawe/mao* changed to *mama* "mother", *khaka/mruna* *aba* changed to *mjomba/baba* *mdogo* "uncle" and *wamii* changed to *Binamu* "cousin". For Mahlangu (2016) IsiNdebele is one of the indigenous languages that are spoken in South Africa, and it has been in contact with Afrikaans and English for a long time. In this contact, IsiNdebele has been adopting lexical items from Afrikaans and English word categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs, relatives, and conjunctions. For example, *uKhresimusi* (IsiNdebele) means "Christmas" (English/Afrikaans), *utiki* (IsiNdebele) 'tickey' (English/Afrikaans), and *upeni* (IsiNdebele) means 'penny' (English/Afrikaans).

Bakar (2016) asserts that Kipemba has many new words from Swahili. Words like *ukarasa* changed to *ukurasa*, "page" *kipingili* to *kipengele* "aspect" *senema* to *sinema* "cinema" and *mepya* to *mapya* "new". It is noted that Kipemba started to change after being in contact with Kiswahili for a long time. Bernander (2012) investigated contact-induced changes in Bena (G63). The findings reveal that many Swahili loan words are integrated into the Bena language, whereby some aspects have been adapted within the linguistic framework of the Bena language. For example, *muselihaali* (Bena) is borrowed from *serikalini* (Kiswahili), 'in the government'; 'selasini' (Bena) from the word *thelathini* (Kiswahili), 'thirty'. Kapinga (2018) shows that Kiswahili is still the dominant language over Kimatengo in Mbanga District. Some of the Matengo's original words have changed, and others have been lost due to the influence of Kiswahili on Matengo speakers. For example, the word *Luhaji* has been changed to *Bakuli* "bowl", *Nhibinimundo- Binamumundu* to *Binamu* "cousin" and *Ndombu* to *Dada* "sister". Also, Kulwa (2016) postulates that different nearby languages have influenced Zinza lexical change. Kiswahili has a great influence on Zinza because it possesses national language status and therefore dominates ECLs in Tanzania. Lusekelo (2019) argues that some words from Bantu languages have been incorporated into the Datooga language. These words include: *bâanga* to *paanga* 'machete', *bâl(à)bâla* to *barabara* 'road', *bikpik* to *pikipiki* 'motorbike/scooter' and *sâbûuni* to *sabuni* 'soap'. Thus, Datooga has been receiving many words from different Bantu languages because of language contact.

Languages like Nyakyusa and Ndali in Tanzania, adopted different ways of using their words in daily basis due to contact situation. For example, they adopted modern ways of numbering and measuring things due to influence of Kiswahili or English into Nyakyusa and Ndali, for example, /mja:/ 'one hundred', /isilingi/ 'shilling' and /ilita/ 'a litre' (in Nyakyusa language) and /te:ni/ 'ten', /ikilo/ 'kilo' or 'kilogram', /ishilifulushi/ 'package/ 'bundle' in Ndali language (Mwakasege, 2021). On the other hand, Mwalongo (2017) argues that socially, Swahili speakers have had greatly influenced Bena speakers to speak more Kiswahili than Kibena. The changes in Kibena due to the influence of Kiswahili, has led to the emergence of Kimaswitule, a variety of Bena language. For example, the word *tembeli* "place for prayers" changed to *hukanisa* 'church', *upapo* replaced by *ubibi* 'grandmother', *umuhandza* has been replaced by *udada* 'sister', *mgunda* has been replaced by *hushamba* 'farm', *hukaye* has been replaced by *hunyumbani* 'home', *Yeani* has been replaced by *yenani* "who is she/her" etc.

Petzell and Marten (2016) studied linguistic variation and the dynamics of language documentation: Editing in 'pure' Kikagulu, the language spoken by the people of Morogoro Region around Gairo District in Tanzania. The results revealed how language contact has led to variant forms of Kikagulu. The contact between Kiswahili and Kikagulu is a precondition for change, shift, and endangerment. For example, the word *kamei* has changed to *halafu/harafu/ha'afu* from the word *halafu* (Kiswahili) "then", *wahokeligwa* to *wakalibishigwa* from *wakaribishwa* (Kiswahili) "welcomed", etc. This is the fact that Kagulu, like other ethnic community languages in Tanzania, is still threatened by Kiswahili.

Sanga (2018) has come up with the result that Kikinga is unsafe since the domains where Kikinga was used alone, are now used together with Kiswahili. Formerly, Kikinga was used as a language for communication in domains like religion, markets, treatment, village meetings, and traditional function domains but, presently it is not used in isolation with Kiswahili in those domains. This paper, therefore, precisely investigates lexical change in all domains in which Kikinga is used based on lexical loss and replacement.

Methodology

This paper employed qualitative approach, because of its appropriateness to collect primarily in-depth information about Kinga lexical loss and replacement by using real-life experiences

of the Kinga speakers. This paper also used descriptive research design. This was important as it helped the researcher to collect detailed data about lexical loss and replacement in the population, whose achievement greatly depends on a qualitative survey. Furthermore, the paper employed this design since it intended to describe how lexical loss and change is addressed using words, phrases, and sentences. This paper used 300 elicitation guides in order to identify the lexical items which have been lost and replaced by items from other languages. The enough list of lexical items offers best results on the lexical change of language (Lusekelo, 2013). In this paper, the Kinga Bible *Utesitamenti Umpya (Agano Jipya: Lugha ya Kikinga)* (New Testament in the Kinga language) (Wycliffe, 2019) and the Swahili English dictionary (Rechenbach et al., 1967) were used as sources of elicitation guides that were employed in the elicitation process for Kinga native speakers. Qualitatively, the paper collected data through purposive and snowball sampling techniques, and the sample size of this paper was 36 respondents, determined by the saturation point. That is, the sample size was reached when the researcher did not get any new information from the additional informants. All ethical issues were considered during data collection processes. This was to ensure the collected data are valid and reliable. The collected data were analysed through a thematic analysis approach by coding and describing coded data into different themes.

Results and Discussion

The data analysis of this paper involves the information collected from informants and different documents.

Lexical Loss in Kikinga

Kikinga as other languages, changes day to day by modifying its lexical items. Although Kikinga is developing and its speakers produce new words, there are other words which get lost. The findings show that some words in Kikinga have been lost. In the elicitation process, many lexical items were found to be lost permanently. Table 5.1 below shows some words which have lost and most of them are nouns. This means that nouns are core and basic vocabulary which are frequently used. Also, nouns occur frequently in speech, especially when naming something new or special is needed. To know this, the researcher involved 12 elders from the three wards, namely Bulongwa, Luwumbu and Ukwama, who had enough experience in Kikinga to tell if the words listed had been lost or replaced. One of the respondents answered the question asked *kwanini amamenyu agha gajagile?* 'Why have these lexical items been lost?' A man aged 60s said, *Avana va sihwitsi vajatsitswe ni hilunga visamwa gaveene* 'Youths are being attracted by globalisation and abandoning their own culture'. Table 5.1 shows the words lost permanently in Kikinga.

Table 5.1
Lexical Loss in Kikinga

S/N	Lexical item	Word class	Semantic description	Domain
1.	<i>Engimo</i>	Noun	Kinga traditional security	Home
2.	<i>Kihehe</i>	Noun	A small tree for making a sacrifice to propitiate the spirits of the dead	Home
3	<i>Kivilela</i>	Noun	Traditional drum played in burial ceremony	Home
4.	<i>Kuvata</i>	Verb	To harvest dried wheat from the farm by using sticks	Shamba
5.	<i>Lidughumetsi</i>	Noun	Traditional vegetable that is used to cure stomach	Shamba
6	<i>Lipalo</i>	Noun	Cowshed that is used to keep oxen	Home

The results in Table 5.1, lexical loss in Kikinga is a problem because the lost words are considered to be very important in the Kinga community. The influence of nearby languages

like Kiswahili led them to be abandoned. This implies that lexical loss in Kikinga is facilitated by language contact, whereby the young generation prefers foreign culture in using language. It also seems that elders have given up handling their language because they are thinking that when they die, no one will continue to keep their culture and language in general. This is confirmed by a man aged 60s when he said, *owe twiswa wetovaleha navisaaga ohuta vibuda inzovele jya veene hwahunogwa inzovele jya vaanu* 'We elders die, and the left ones do not prefer to use this language; they use foreign languages.'

Based on the arguments above, some words have been lost in Kikinga because they are not used frequently in daily communication. A word becomes lost when its concept and its role is no longer needed for the time being by the speakers. This is due to the fact that when a word is lost, its concept gets lost too. For example, *mbodamu* 'a special sitting room used for discussing family matters'; *lisonzogho* 'traditional medicine used to cure legs and swelling'; and *lidughumetsi* 'a traditional vegetable that was used as food and cure of stomach'. These words have been lost in Kikinga because of the frequent use of Swahili words. Tiwiyanti and Retnomurti (2017) argue that lexical loss can also be related to the failure of the speaker to speak a certain word in a certain language for some time.

Lexical Replacement in Kikinga

Lexical replacement mainly transpires in an inferior language context (Tiwiyanti & Retnomurti, 2017). Szymanski (2017) states that lexical replacements occur as pairs of words that occupy the same semantic space at different points in time. The rate of lexical replacement estimates the diachronic stability of word forms on the basis of how frequently a proto-language word is replaced or retained in its daughter languages (Vejdemo & Hörberg, 2016). Lexical replacement is also evident in Kikinga. Different Kinga lexical items have been replaced by other languages' lexical items. It is surprising to see Kinga lexical items being replaced while the original items are still there. Also, it seems that Kiswahili has imposed more lexical items on Kikinga than other languages. From the lexical items listed, almost all of them got replacements. The lexical replacements experienced in most of the Kinga domains of language use, such as homes, churches, marketplaces, treatment centres, traditional wedding ceremonies, and rituals.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Home Context

Kinga language has its own way of expressing concepts in the home context, as other languages do. Using language at home is divided into several sub-contexts, such as expressing family relations, home environments (surroundings), and human daily routines. There have been significant changes in Kinga in this domain because of intercultural interferences with other language speakers. This was supported by different respondents, including a woman aged 60 who provided the reason as to why original Kinga lexical items are not used in referring to home context nowadays. She said, *avana viitu vinanga inzovele jya veene ukuvigenda genda uhwa vitoola amamenyu ga Kiswahili ne nzovele ijinge vileta mu nzovele jyitu* 'Our children are ruining the language by bringing words in Kikinga from Kiswahili and other languages.' This paper identified lexical replacements in the home domain and listed them in Table 5.2 below:

Table 5.2

Kinga Lexical Replacement Expressing Home Context

S/ N	Proto-Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Jaja</i>	<i>Omujomba</i>	<i>Mjomba</i>	Kiswahili	Uncle
2.	<i>Kuhu</i>	<i>Obabu</i>	<i>Babu</i>	Kiswahili	Grandfather
3.	<i>Lwong'elo</i>	<i>Maveele</i>	<i>Mavele</i>	Wanji	Breast
4.	<i>Magasi</i>	<i>Ululenga</i>	<i>Lulenga</i>	Bena	Water

5. <i>Mbatilo</i>	<i>Ikumelo</i>	Komeo	Kiswahili	Lock
6. <i>Samsania</i>	<i>Ponania</i>	Ponania	Nyakyusa	Greetings
7. <i>Tsova</i>	Elesa	Eleza	Kiswahili	Explain
8. <i>Ukulavoha</i>	<i>Ukulyla</i>	Kolya	Nyakyusa	Eating
9. <i>Wejo</i>	Ena	Eena	Bena	Replying
10. <i>Kuvuumika</i>	<i>Kutengelela</i>	Tengelela	Wanji	Cackling

In contact situation, Kinga speakers tend to be influenced by nearby language speakers. In this case, Kikinga is swahilising the home domain lexical items by replacing them with foreign lexical items. According to Sanga (2018), currently, the situation of Kinga speakers has changed even in the older age groups of 50 years and above, which were expected to be free from the tendency of using a combination of Kikinga and Kiswahili. Kulwa (2016) asserts that Zinza speakers tend to incorporate Swahili words expressing family relations in the Zinza language due to the contact situation. For example, the Swahili word *baba* for 'father' is used in Zinza, while the proto-Zinza lexical item is *taata* for 'father' exists.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Religious Domain

Religion is a monotheistic system of beliefs and behaviours based on God's teachings. Most of Kinga speakers are Christians who believe in Jesus and are guided by the Old and New Testament teachings, which stress Jesus as a saviour. Although there are different types of religions in Tanzania, Makete is dominated by Christianity. In the course of expanding Christian services, original Kinga lexical items gradually get replaced by lexical items from other languages, including Wanji, Nyakyusa, and Kiswahili. It is certain that the Kinga people had their own worshipping style before the introduction of Christianity. They were praying to gods using proto-Kinga lexical items. Replacements started to be manifested in Kikinga when the modern ways of worshiping established. Thus, new words and worshipping style interfered with the original Kinga lexical items.

It also shows that Kiswahili has many lexical items that are used by Kinga Christians compared to other languages because Kiswahili enjoys to be national language in Tanzania and it is used all over the country. The use of Kiswahili in churches, the coming of pastors who speak only Kiswahili, and the intercommunity religious movement facilitated the influx of foreign lexical items in Kikinga. In the elicitation process many replacements are originated from Kiswahili compared to other languages as they are seen in Table 5.3:

Table 5.3
Kinga Lexical Replacement in Religious Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Ekilongotsi</i>	<i>Uwotengutsi</i>	Wotengutsi	Wanji	Introduction
2.	<i>Khyakha</i>	<i>Epasaha</i>	Pasaka	Kiswahili	Easter day
3.	<i>Kimendumendu</i>	<i>Kiigeugeu</i>	Kigeugeu	Kiswahili	Unsteady
4.	<i>Livangili</i>	<i>Ibibilia</i>	Biblia	Kiswahili	Bible
5.	<i>Lyotola</i>	<i>Lola</i>	Lola	Wanji	Look
6.	<i>Ndombeletsi</i>	<i>Mwinilisiti</i>	Mwinjlisti	Kiswahili	Priest

The data from Table 5.3 indicate that the religious domain contributes much to the lexical change in Kinga. Many original lexical items that were used in the religious domain have been replaced by lexical items from Kiswahili, English, Kiwanji, and Nyakyusa. This is due to mutual interactions of different other language speakers in Kinga areas.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Market Domain

A market is a place where people go to sell and buy goods such as clothes, food, electronics, etc. Kinga people, like other areas in Tanzania, have a special place for markets where they trade their goods. In these places, there were original Kinga lexical items used in trading activities. Kinga lexical items that were formerly used in commercial activities are now replaced by Swahili lexical items and, in a little way, by other languages. Kinga words have changed from their original to their current usage, which has led to the inexistence of many Kinga original lexical items. In marketplaces, youths are the groups that conduct market activities more than other groups. The original Kinga lexical items are replaced in the market domain because of the influence of speakers from other languages when they meet in trading activities. Kinga marketplaces involve different traders who speak different languages, like Kiswahili, Kinyakyusa, Kiwanji, etc., where Kinga speakers tend to import new lexical items into their language. Also, the attitude of the Kinga speakers to use the language has become low nowadays. According to the Swahili English dictionary (Rechenbach et al., 1967) and onsite data collection, many replacements in Kikinga have their counterparts as they are seen in Table 5.4 below:

Table 5.4
Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Market Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Amavisu</i>	<i>Indisi</i>	Ndizi	Kiswahili	Banana
2.	<i>Ghulilo</i>	<i>Illembukha</i>	Lembukha	Nyakyusa	Market
3.	<i>Khetangabilikha</i>	<i>Imboga jya asili</i>	Mboga ya asili	Kiswahili	Traditional vegetable
4.	<i>Londotsa</i>	<i>Ghutsa</i>	Gutsa	Wanji	Sell
5.	<i>Dabaga</i>	<i>Siingamba</i>	Hingamba	Bena	Sweet potatoes
6.	<i>Nsehe</i>	<i>Mpyusihi</i>	Pyurisi	Kiswahili	Peach

From the findings in Table 5.4, Kikinga is changing from its original to its current usage, which endangers the culture of language development. In marketplaces, youths are the group that conducts market activities more than other groups. The data in Table 4.6 reveal that the original Kinga lexical items are replaced in the market domain because of the influence of speakers of other languages when they meet in trading activities. Kinga marketplaces involve different traders who speak different languages, like Kiswahili, Kinyakyusa, Kiwanji, Kibena, and English, where Kinga speakers tend to import new lexical items into their language.

Apart from the markets found within Makete District, there are markets outside Makete District, where Kinga traders conduct business activities and trigger Kinga lexical change. Normally, markets found outside Makete District, traders use Kiswahili. Although Kikinga is receiving foreign lexical items, its speakers need to make some modifications to suit the Kinga lexical system; for example, *Ontsitsa lise* from the word *Mchicha lishe* (Kiswahili) 'delicious vegetable' and *Ontama* from the word *mtama* (Kiswahili) 'millet'.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Treatment Domain

Formerly, Kinga people used local medicine to cure different diseases. There are medicines in Kinga areas that are well known when they are termed using Kikinga, but unfortunately, lexical items used to name traditional herbs are now named in Kiswahili. This loses word content and important information about the particular medicine. Also, currently, traditional doctors are not accorded more status as it was previously. Some Kinga youths do not believe in local herbs, something which activates the loss of Kinga lexical items used in the treatment-related domain. Table 5.5 below shows the way Kinga treatment domain has affected by replacement:

Table 5.5
Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Treatment Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Kipata</i>	<i>Sibitali</i>	Hospitali	English via Kiswahili	Hospital
2.	<i>Ligholomoho</i>	<i>Litela/usiimbe</i>	Litela/uvimbe	Wanji/Kiswahili	Kuvimba
3.	<i>Likolakola</i>	<i>Ealovera</i>	Alovela	English	Aloe Vera
4.	<i>Lilongoti</i>	<i>Onkaratusi</i>	Mkaratusi	Kiswahili	Eucalyptus
5.	<i>Mitughuva</i>	<i>Edawa</i>	Dawa	Kiswahili	Medicines
8.	<i>Esidungu</i>	<i>Sidonge</i>	Vidonge	Kiswahili	Tablets

The words in Table 5.5 reveal that lexical items related to the treatment domain in Kikinga are replaced by lexical items from other languages. Kiswahili seems to replace many words related to treatment compared to other languages. This is due to a high level of contact between Kiswahili and Kikinga. The loss of proto-Kinga lexical items, which were used to term local medicines and ways of treating diseases, accelerated the loss of important medicines because the new generation does not know those medicines due to changes in name. For example, the word *Mitughuva* (Kinga) to *edawa* (Kiswahili)-(medicines), the name *edawa* is used to name even the hospital medicines. So, changing from *mitughuva* to *edawa*, the young generation generalises it to mean hospital medicines. Also, the introduction of new ways of treating patients facilitated the replacement of original lexical items; for example, *Ligholomoho* to *ogwausiimbe* from the word *ya uvimbe* (Kiswahili) 'tablet for swelling'. Currently the word *Ligholomoho* is not frequently used due to the introduction of hospitals and modern medicines.

In finding the reasons why Kinga speakers use many loanwords in their language, some of them said: the first respondent, "avafijana navinogwa *uhutumila imigoda* gya *hatare kwa sababu avasungu valetile esipata muhi lunga kya kyooni vakingga*" 'Kinga youths do not prefer traditional treatment because whites brought modern medicines used for treating them'. Another one said, "edini tsibeela *imigoda* gya *kyenyeji kwa sababu ohutumila emigoda igo saambi*" 'Religions prohibit the use of traditional medicines because they are against the will of God'. Kapinga (2018) asserts that there is a good number of lexical items that have changed (those under replacements) in the hospital domain as a result of the introduction of modern hospitals.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Village Meeting Domain

A village meeting refers to an assembly gathering of village members for discussing important issues about the village. In the meeting, it was normal to use the Kinga language to provide a room for all Kinga members to understand what was going on. The findings of this study showed that formerly village leaders and their village members were using original Kinga words in the meeting, but currently those original Kinga lexical items have been replaced by lexical items from other languages due to language contact.

The contact between Kikinga and other languages caused several changes in Kikinga. Kikinga has contacted many languages, but Kiswahili seems to have more items related to village meeting domains compared to items from other languages. This is because Kiswahili enjoys being a national language, and so far, it is among the two languages used as a medium for instruction in primary schools in Tanzania. Look at Table 5.6 below:

Table 5.6

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Village Meeting Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Avanzaghila</i>	<i>Avajumbe</i>	Wajumbe	Kiswahili	Committee members
2.	<i>Holeng'ana</i>	<i>Kusanyihana</i>	Kusanyika	Kiswahili	Domicile
3.	<i>Kitamo</i>	<i>tkikao</i>	kikao	Kiswahili	Short meeting
4.	<i>Leheng'ana</i>	<i>Airis</i>	airisha	Kiswahili	Postpone
5.	<i>Limenyu</i>	<i>tmada</i>	Mada	Kiswahili	Topic
8.	<i>Ontwa</i>	<i>Ontawala</i>	Mtawala	Kiswahili	Governor

The words in Table 5.6 above seem to indicate that currently, village meetings are held and conducted in Kiswahili or by mixing Kiswahili and Kikinga. Also, the coming of politicians in the Kinga areas influences Kinga speakers to use Kiswahili because they use it frequently in propagating their politics. The situation of mixing two languages in the meeting led to the replacement of Kinga lexical items because the contacted language (Kiswahili) has a stronger influence on Kinga youths than Kikinga itself.

Kulwa (2016) postulates that the speakers of the lowest educational level seem to be more familiar with types of words related to the natural environment than those with a higher educational level. This accelerates the fast catch-up of different Swahili words for the lowest education level groups when the politicians are coming in Kinga areas to propagate their political issues. According to Bakar (2016), political decisions on language use in multilingual situations may affect other languages. In the Tanzanian context, Kiswahili seems to win the game over ECLs, including Kikinga. Although Kiswahili seems to be a unifying language in Tanzania, it is important to retain ECTs because they carry different cultural values.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Traditional Function Domain

Traditions can be customs or beliefs that are transmitted from one generation to another by using language because they are thought to be useful to the current generation. In this domain, the Kinga people had their own lexical items that were used in different functions, but currently most of them have been replaced by lexical items from other languages, mainly Kiswahili. The domain was not expected to have lexical loss and replacement in Kikinga because the traditional domain maintains the originality of the language for the purpose of handling Kinga cultural values. The findings revealed that when a certain word is replaced by a word from another language, it may dilute the intended meaning. For example, the word *vunga* meant specifically to teach a mature girl, but it is currently replaced by the word *fundisa*, which has the general meaning 'teach' in Kiswahili. The lexical item *hwebuha*, which meant a woman who has undergone mental confusion and is provoking unlimited replaced by *lopoha* from the Swahili word *lopoka*, which has the general meaning of 'ranting'. Presently, Kiswahili is penetrating even in the interior parts of Makete District, where the original Kinga language is spoken. So, the number of Kinga speakers in the remote areas who speak Kiswahili is increasing day by day. This is due to the influence of Kiswahili, as the national language, over Kinga. This was supported by two respondents in the field when they said: "*Tutsige twevasee twitsova amamenyu ga hatale nuhudumisa emila, avana viitu movigeenga viletu amamenyu ga Kiswahili*" (Kinga) 'we elders remain respectful of cultural values and maintain our language, while youths bring Swahili words to Kinga as a result of moving here and there'. In this domain, several Kinga lexical items have been replaced by lexical items from other languages, Kiswahili in particular, as it is shown in Table 5.7 below:

Table 5.7

Kinga Lexical Loss and Replacement in Traditional Function Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Hwebuha</i>	<i>Lopoha</i>	Lopoka	Kiswahili	Rant
2.	<i>Johola</i>	<i>Saidila</i>	Saidia	Kiswahili	Help
3.	<i>Khevungo</i>	<i>Fuundiso</i>	Fundisho	Kiswahili	Special lesson
4.	<i>Genda</i>	<i>Lagula</i>	Lagula	Wanji	Divining
5.	<i>Lolotila</i>	<i>Esigelegele</i>	Vigelegele	Kiswahili	Cheers
6.	<i>Maghatatso</i>	<i>Omwiho</i>	Mwiko	Kiswahili	Taboo

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Farm Domain

The Kinga people cultivate different crops, such as cash crops and food crops. There are lexical items that are used in farm activities. The results of the findings revealed that the lexical items that were used previously have been replaced. This domain is affected by different languages such as Kibena, Kiwanji, Kimahanji, and Kiswahili. This is because people from different parts of the country come to invest in farming in the Kinga areas. In these investments, they employ Wanji, Kinga, Bena, and Mahanji people who can work on those farms. All of these people meet and speak the language in which they understand each other, that is, Kiswahili, mixing with their languages, and that is when they impose their words in Kikinga.

There are many lexical items that have been replaced by items from other languages in the Kinga farm domain. Most of the changed lexical items are nouns. In this scenario, Kinga lexical items related to the farm domain have been replaced mostly by items from Bena, Mahanji, and Wanji. This is the impact of language contact and lexical borrowing, which result in lexical change in Kikinga. Table 5.8 shows Kinga words which are replaced by words from nearby languages.

Table 5.8

Kinga Lexical Loss and Replacement in the Shamba Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Dekideki</i>	<i>Owolaini</i>	Ulaini	Kiswahili	Softy
2.	<i>Kilimela</i>	<i>On'gunda</i>	Ugunda	Wanji	Shamba
3.	<i>Likumbulu</i>	<i>Lighimilo</i>	Ligimilo	Bena	Hoe
4.	<i>Liposolo</i>	<i>Livonera</i>	Vonera	Mahanji	Big hoe
5.	<i>Edudu</i>	<i>Lituha</i>	Lituha	Bena	Mole
6.	<i>Nzunu</i>	<i>Soha</i>	Soha	Bena	Axe

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Wedding and Burial Domain

In this domain, Kiswahili has imposed more lexical items than any other language. The wedding and burial domains have many Swahili items replacing Kinga words, especially in the area of common nouns. Intermarriage is the main factor for lexical change in the Kinga wedding and burial domain.

Many Swahili items are imposed in Kikinga, and they replace the proto-Kinga lexical items used to represent different concepts relating to the wedding and burial domains. Unfortunately, proto-Kinga items used in the wedding and burial domains had specific concepts, but the current replacements have a general meaning, and sometimes the word replaced may have multiple meanings. One example of words which have multiple meanings after replacement is *livokusi*; before replacement, the word meant coffin, but after replacement, the word changed to *elisanduhu*, which means coffin, suitcase, or box. To

differentiate these items from the current interpretations, one has to consider the context of language use. Other words are shown in Table 5.9 below:

Table 5.9

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Wedding and Burial Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original form	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Khyuma</i>	<i>Emahali</i>	Mahali	Kiswahili	Dowry
2.	<i>Kitesu</i>	<i>Kilago</i>	Kilago	Kiswahili	Mat
3.	<i>Livokusi</i>	<i>Elisanduhu</i>	Sanduku	Kiswahili	Coffin/suitcase
4.	<i>Ng'umbung'umbu</i>	<i>Emwanandani</i>	Mwanandani	Kiswahili	Enclave in a grave
5.	<i>Onsiimba</i>	<i>Amaiti</i>	Maiti	Kiswahili	Corpse
6.	<i>Owoguli</i>	<i>Elikaburi</i>	Kaburi	Kiswahili	Tomb

Table 5.9 above shows that changes in lexical items related to wedding and burial domains lose the originality of Kinga words. In the discussion between the researcher and informants of the reasons why there is a replacement in Kinga's wedding and burial domain, one said that:

“Sisi wanawake siku hizi tunaolewa mjini na wanaume kutoka makabila mbalimbali, tukiolewa huko tunavoludi nyumbani tunakuwa na maneno ya Kiswahili mengi kulkiko ya Kikinga”.

Translated Version

'Nowadays, we Kinga women are being married by men from tribes of different language speakers; when we come back home changes happen in our language because we tend to speak more Kiswahili than Kikinga'.

Therefore, the findings above revealed that most of the replacements in the wedding and burial domains have original counterparts in Kikinga. Also, Kiswahili has a high influence over the Kinga wedding and burial domain compared to any other neighbouring language.

Kinga Lexical Replacement in the Livestock Keeping Domain

Animals are kept for meat, milk, eggs, skins, hides, commercial, manure, and domestic uses (Ministry of Livestock and Fisheries, 2022). Animals kept in the Kinga areas are cattle, goats, sheep, chickens, rabbits, guinea pigs, pigs, and bats. These animals produce products like milk, eggs, meat, fur, wool, manure and leather. In this domain, many Kinga items seem to be replaced mostly by Swahili items due to the development of animal trading activities between the Kinga people and businessmen from other parts of the country. Formerly, animal business was conducted by the Kinga people themselves, but currently the business has developed and welcomed businessmen from Mbeya, Iringa, Sumbawanga, Dodoma, and other parts of Tanzania. These people come to Makete to buy animals while speaking Kiswahili because they are not familiar with Kikinga. In speaking Kiswahili, subconsciously, Kinga speakers tend to lose their proto-Kinga items and replace them with items from Kiswahili. The data in Table 5.10 confirm this argument.

Table 5.10

Kinga Lexical Replacement in Livestock Keeping Domain

S/N	Proto Kinga lexical items	Replacement	Original forms	Source language	Gloss
1.	<i>Buhu</i>	<i>Esimbilisi</i>	Simbilisi	Kiswahili	Guinea pig
2.	<i>Dema</i>	<i>Tsunga</i>	Chunga	Kiswahili	Herd
3.	<i>Ing'enze</i>	<i>Imbeva</i>	Mbeva	Bena	Rat

4. <i>Ing'olo</i>	<i>Ikondoo</i>	Kondoo	Kiswahili	Sheep
5. <i>Isidemo</i>	<i>Emifugo</i>	Mifugo	Kiswahili	Animals
6. <i>Pongo</i>	<i>Imene idume</i>	Mene dume	Wanji and Kiswahili	Billy goat

From Table 5.10 above, lexical change in the livestock keeping domain is facilitated by the high influence of Kiswahili over Kikinga during animal business activities. According to Mwalongo (2017), native businessmen and women meet different customers from different places speaking dissimilar languages, and they must attend to them according to their languages. In this situation, lexical change becomes a phenomenon in Kikinga.

Conclusion

The results of this paper revealed that Kiswahili has penetrated into different Kinga domains. It is noted that Kikinga, like other ECLs in Tanzania, has been influenced by Kiswahili, leading to lexical loss and replacements in Kinga domains of language use. This is the initial stage for semantic and morphological interference in Kikinga. The paper also revealed that the domains like churches, marketplaces, treatment centres, homes, traditional wedding ceremonies, and rituals, as well as in the streets where Kikinga is used, have been heavily interfered with.

The findings showed that Kikinga uses many words from other languages whose similar words exist in Kikinga. Also, it was revealed that Swahili words are more common in Kikinga compared to other languages. This is due to different factors like education, language contact, and socio-political activities. In this context, the lexical change in Kikinga seems to be unavoidable though the language is maintainable. The findings pointed out that Kiswahili is one of the two languages used as a medium of instruction in primary schools in Tanzania. So, a child starts learning it in childhood. In this sense, a child grows up with Kiswahili and Kikinga. Kiswahili is the superior language in Makete; hence, many words are imposed in Kikinga by replacing them.

The paper also pointed out that Kinga speakers are using more Swahili words than they use Kinga words in Kinga areas. Some Swahili words are borrowed by Kikinga and being nativised to sound like Kinga words. Sometimes Kinga speakers do borrow words from other languages while are existing. This is the fact that Kikinga can be maintained by the willingness of Kinga speakers to prefer the use of Kikinga. Also, researchers have to do more research on other areas of the language like syntactic modification and Kinga naming systems, such as naming places, and naming cultural names for future generations.

References

Amani, H. (2016). The outcome of language contact in Chimalaba: The role of structural borrowing in language change. *Tanzania Public Service College (TPSC) Mtwara Campus*, 23, 1967–1971.

Bakar, Z. H. (2016). *Factors contributing to lexical changes in Kipemba : A case of Chake Chake District*. (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation). The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Bernander, R. (2012). *Contact induced change in Bena: A study of “ swahilization ” in a Tanzanian vernacular language*. Department of Languages and Literatures African Languages: University of Gothenburg. Gothenburg.

Chatterjee, T. (2015). Bilingualism , language contact and change : The case of Bengali and English in India. *Doctor of Philosophy: University of Michigan*, 215.

Cornish, H. (2011). Language adapts: exploring the cultural dynamics of iterated learning.

Language sciences: The University of Edinburgh. <http://hdl.handle.net/1842/5603>.

Feltgen, Q., Fagard, B., & Nadal, J. P. (2017). Frequency patterns of semantic change: Corpus-based evidence of a near-critical dynamics in language change. *Royal Society Open Science*, 4(11). <https://doi.org/10.1098/rsos.170830>

Fukushima, C. (2019). Interplay of phonological, morphological, and lexical variation: Adjectives in Japanese dialects. *Languages*, 4(2). doi.org/10.3390/languages4020031.

Giulianelli, M., Tredici, M. D., & Fernández, R. (2020). *Analysing Lexical Semantic Change with Contextualised Word Representations*. In *Proceedings of the 58th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics* (pp 3960-3973), Online. Association for Computational Linguistics. 3960–3973. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/2020.acl-main.365>.

Harya, T. D. (2016). Language change and development: Historical linguistics. *PREMISE JOURNAL*: ISSN Online: 2442-482x, ISSN Printed: 2089-3345, 5(1), 103–117. <https://doi.org/10.24127/pj.v5i1.418>.

Hickey, R. (2010). Language contact: Reconsideration and Reassessment. *Handbook of language contact*, (1978), 1–28. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781444318159.ch>.

Hoffmann, S. (2018). Lexical change: *English language*, 225–237. https://doi.org/10.1057/978-1-137-57185-4_14.

Hovy, D., & Johannsen, A. (2016). Exploring language variation across Europe: A web-based tool for computational sociolinguistics. *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Language Resources and Evaluation, LREC 2016*, 2986–2989.

Kagali, V. (2018). *Towards the assessment of the status of Ekiehe language*. (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation). The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Kapinga, V. S. (2018). *An assessment of lexical change in Matengo*: (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation). The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Keating, E. (2018). Linguistic anthropology: language and culture. *Anthropology, University of Texas at Austin, USA*, 217–240. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315 227283-9>.

Khan, F. N., Begum, M., & Imad, M. (2019). Relationship between students' home environment and their academic achievement at secondary school level. *Pakistan Journal of Distance and Online Learning*, 5(2), 223–234.

Khumalo, L. (2004). Language contact and lexical change: A lexicographical terminographical interface in Zimbabwean Ndebele. *Lexikos*, 14. <https://doi.org/10.4314/lex.v14i1.51413>.

Kinyua, N. J. (2016). Lexical borrowing and semantic change: A case of English and Gikuyu contact. *Master of Arts in Linguistics: The University of Nairobi*.

Kulwa, B. (2016). *Assessment of Zinza language lexical change: A case of Kome Island Sengerema District*. (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation). The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Lusekelo, A. (2013). *Swahili loanwords and their semantic nativisations into African languages*. HURIA Journal of The Open University of Tanzania. Vol. 14.

Lusekelo, A. (2018). Lexical borrowing in Africa with special attention to outcomes of languages in contacts in Tanzania. *Mgbakoigba: Journal of African Studies*, 7(2), 1–22.

Lusekelo, A. (2019). Adaptation of Sukuma loanwords in the Western dialects of Datooga (Taturu) and its dialectological implications. *Ethnologia Actualis*, 19(1), 54–89. <https://doi.org/10.2478/eas-2019-0010>.

Mahlangu, K. S. (2016). Language contact and linguistic change: The case of Afrikaans and English influence on isiNdebele. *South African Journal of African Languages*, 36(1), 25–

31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02572117.2016.1186892>.

Mahler, H. (2019). Lexical emergence on Reddit: An analysis of lexical change on the “Front Page of the internet.” *Lexis*, (16), 0–20. <https://doi.org/10.4000/lexis.4917>.

Maho, J. F. (2009). NUGL Online. *The Online Version of the New Updated Guthrie List*, 7–124. Retrieved from <http://goto.glocalnet.net/mahopapers/nuglonline>.

McFarland, J. R. (2021). Sinophone Southeast Asia. In *Sinophone Southeast Asia*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004473263>.

Michael, I. K. (2014). *Lexical change : A case study of Kisagalla losing its words to Kiswahili. (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation)*. University of Nairobi. Nairobi.

Mtallo, G. R. (2013). *The source of language variation among Chagga people. (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation)*. The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Mwakasege, A. M. (2021). *Adaptation mecanisms of loan words in Nyakyusa and Ndali language (Unpublished PhD in linguistics)*. The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Mwalongo, L. J. (2017). Social factors influencing language change: A case of Kibena to Kimaswitule in Njombe district, Tanzania. *European Journal of Foreign Language Teaching*, 2 (2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.496189>.

Njagi, B., & Kinyua, J. (2016). *Lexical borrowing and semantic change: A case of English and Gĩkũyũ contact. Master of arts in linguistics*: The University of Nairobi.

Petzell, M., & Marten, L. (2016). *Linguistic variation and the dynamics of language documentation: Editing in “pure” Kagulu*. Special Publication No. 10 (2016): African language documentation: new data, methods and approaches, ed. Mandana Seyfeddinipur, pp. 105–129. <http://hdl.handle.net/10125/24651>.

Ritt, N. & Gąsiorowski, P. (2018). The cultural evolution of language: Models and methods. *A thematic session at the 48th Poznań linguistic meeting (PLM2018), Abstract*, 1–2. Retrieved from <https://psyarxiv.com/qxykg>.

Rizka, B., & Utara, S. (2016). *Lexical change with reference to social contact*. Vol. 10, No. 1, 1–8. DOI : <https://doi.org/10.24036/ld.v10i1.6296>.

Sanga, E. (2018). *Assessment of language endangerment in the Kinga speech community: Makete district Tanzania. (Unpublished M.A Linguistics Dissertation)*. The University of Dodoma. Dodoma.

Smith, K., Brighton, H. & Kirby, S. (2003). Complex systems in language evolution: The cultural emergence of compositional structure. *Advances in Complex Systems*, 6 (4), 537–558. <http://sites.google.com/site/drkennysmithsmithcomplex.pdf>.

Smith, K. (2006). Cultural Evolution of Language. *University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK*, 315–322. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B0-08-044854-2/04742-8>.

Smith, K. (2011). Learning bias, cultural evolution of language, and the biological evolution of the language faculty. *Human Biology*, 83(2). <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.3378/027.083.0207>.

Sutikno, W. (2018). Lexical change causes of Javanese language in Deli Serdang Regency. *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan Bahasa Dan Sastra*, 3(1), 286–296. <https://doi.org/10.32696/ojs.v3i1.88>.

Szymanski, T. (2017). Temporal word analogies: Identifying lexical replacement with diachronic word embeddings. *ACL 2017 - 55th Annual Meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics, Proceedings of the Conference (Long Papers)*, 2, 448–453. <https://doi.org/10.18653/v1/P17-2071>.

Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. 22 George Square, Edinburgh:

Edinburgh University press Ltd. <https://doi:10.1016/B0-08-043076-7/03032-1>.

Tiwiyanti, L., & Retnomurti, A. B. (2017). Loss and gain in translation of culture-specific items in Ahmad Tohari's *Lintang Kemukus*: A semantic study. *Lingua Cultura*, 11(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.21512/lc.v11i1.1820>.

Vejdemo, S., & Hörberg, T. (2016). Semantic factors predict the rate of lexical replacement of content words. *PLoS ONE*, 11(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0147924>.