

TIPOLOGY OF LINGUISTIC BORROWING IN THE WOLOF LANGUAGE

Alioune Badara Thiam

Gaston Berger University, GERAHA, Saint-Louis

ABSTRACT

This paper offers the results of a typological analysis of loanwords in the Wolof language following the methodology applied by Haspelmath & Tadmor in their Loanword Typology Project (LWT). On the basis of a representative sample of the world's languages these authors compiled the *World Loanword Database* (WOLD) and carried out a comparative analysis of the loanword profile of 41 languages focusing on 1460 lexical meanings grouped into 24 semantic fields. Since the Wolof language was not included in their typological analysis as a recipient language, the following text is meant as a further contribution to the LWT project. On the whole, the Wolof language conforms to the general principles established by Haspelmath and Tadmor, although some minor departures are also observed.

KEYWORDS: Linguistic borrowing, loanwords typology, Wolof language.

TIPOLOGÍA DE LOS PRÉSTAMOS LINGÜÍSTICOS EN LA LENGUA WOLOF

RESUMEN

Este artículo ofrece los resultados de un análisis tipológico de los préstamos en la lengua wolof, siguiendo la metodología aplicada por Haspelmath y Tadmor en su proyecto llamado Loanword Typology (LWT). Basándose en un corpus representativo de las lenguas del mundo, estos autores desarrollaron una base de datos denominada *World Loanword Database* (WOLD) y llevaron a cabo un análisis comparativo de una muestra de 41 lenguas, basado en una lista fija de 1460 significados léxicos repartidos en 24 campos semánticos. Al constatar que el wolof no está incluido en su análisis tipológico como lengua receptora, el presente artículo pretende ser una contribución al proyecto LWT. En conjunto global, la lengua wolof confirma los principios generales establecidos por Haspelmath y Tadmor, aunque se observan algunas discrepancias menores.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Préstamos lingüísticos, tipología lingüística, lengua Wolof.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.25145/j.recaesin.2020.80.08>

REVISTA CANARIA DE ESTUDIOS INGLESES, 80; April 2020, pp. 145-159; ISSN: e-2530-8335



1. INTRODUCTION

Wolof, the majority ethnic group and language in Senegal, has been lexically enriched, as a result of its many historical contacts with other local and foreign languages. Indeed, as of the 11th century, between 1061 and 1062, the Almoravids started the first jihad (holy war) among the sub-Saharan populations that subjugated Islam. Then came the European Colonizers, especially France, from the 15th century through the triangular trade and evangelization. Due to colonization, this prolonged contact with the local populations that cohabit in a multilingual situation, has had very significant sociolinguistic and cultural repercussions throughout the country. Consider that Senegal has an ethnolinguistic diversity reflected in the presence of almost 40 languages in correspondence to as many ethnic groups. This phenomenon of contact, which has been produced and reflected above all on the linguistic level, has got an impact on local languages, especially Wolof, which has seen its lexical heritage enriched by multiple borrowings.

But why is there a need to import words from other languages if each language has “unlimited” lexical innovation mechanisms and techniques incorporated into its own system, enabling them to name any abstract or physical novelty, foreign or local, that they discover?

To such a question, Martin Haspelmath & Uri Tadmor tried to answer, applying an extensive approach based on “the classical methods of linguistic typology on performance”, following these steps:

- Choosing a sample of 41 languages representative of the world’s linguistic diversity;
- Collecting the types of borrowings found in these languages, based on a fixed list of 1,460 lexical meanings spread over 24 semantic fields;
- Attempting to draw provisional general conclusions about the languages of the sample.

The results obtained were used to formulate the following three hypotheses which should serve as general principles of “universal” validity for all languages:

1. Names are easier to import than verbs.
2. There is less likelihood of borrowing with terms referring to body parts.
3. Terms designating new artifacts are more prone to borrowing.

This work based on a thorough analysis of a corpus consisting of more than 3,500 borrowings, aims at verifying the relevance for Wolof (a language not included in Haspelmath & Tadmor’s sample as a recipient language) of the general principles applicable to the lexical borrowings resulting from the LWT (Loanword Typology) project. The corpus was collected from a variety of sources. These are first of all lexicological ones such as the Wolof-French and French-Wolof dictionary by Jean Léopold Diouf and Mamadou Cissé’s French-Wolof dictionary. In addition, we also draw items from the books by Faidherbe and



Dumont. To complete Arabic borrowings, the Koranic text was the main source of more than 170 borrowings. Some borrowings from English were taken from the Wolof-English dictionary of the American Peace Corps of The Gambia and the Gambian Wolof-English dictionary by David Percy Gamble. With regard to local languages, the fieldwork has been completed with other empirical sources, in particular radio and television programs, sitcoms in wolof, daily conversations, etc. All the sources have been reinforced by my status as a native speaker of Wolof in addition to a good knowledge of French, English and Arabic, *i.e.* languages which provide most of the loans in Wolof.

However, before drawing the conclusions we have reached, it is necessary to carry out a contrasting analysis of LWT and Wolof loanwords, with the aim of establishing a comparison between both studies. Indeed, after an extensive analysis of the processes of linguistic change by contact with languages, the authors of the LWT came up with conclusive results that we compared to those obtained with Wolof in order to corroborate or refute the hypotheses made by the project.

2. LWT VS WOLOF LANGUAGE BORROWINGS

Starting from the fact that the “borrowing phenomenon is universal”, since all languages of the world borrow words from other languages, Tadmor (55) asked the following question: what makes languages prone to borrowing? His research led him to note the existence of 4 levels of language performance: very high (more than 50% of total loanwords), high (between 25 and 50%), medium (between 10 and 25%) and low (less than 10%).

Table 1 shows the level of performance of each of the 41 LWT languages from highest to lowest.

Tadmor advances two main reasons to explain this difference in levels of performance between the different languages of the project. The first reason is of chronological nature: the more a language has a very long written history, the more contacts it has throughout its history, the more prone it is to borrowings; whereas the new languages, due to a lack of written tradition, need even more time to be able to take a large number of borrowings. That is to say, when a language is little studied little will be known about its history and therefore about its loanwords. As shown in table 1, the language with the highest degree in loans turns out to be Selice Romani. This minority language is actually a dialect spoken by some 1,350 speakers in a village in southern Slovakia, which for over 8 centuries has lived under the linguistic dominance of other more powerful languages such as Slovak or Hungarian that most speakers have a good command of, especially the young population. This sociolinguistic situation is favorable to the incorporation of many borrowings in the case of the Romani that lives a constant linguistic pressure on the part of the dominant languages. On the other hand, languages with a lesser degree of performance, such as Mandarin Chinese, spoken by almost a billion speakers, mostly monolingual, and whose command of other languages has been exerted for thousands of years, have almost no need to import words from other languages.



TABLE 1: LEVEL OF PERFORMANCE OF THE 41 LWT LANGUAGES (TADMOR 56-57)

BORROWING TYPE	LANGUAGES	Nº OF WORDS	Nº OF LOANWORDS	% OF LOANWORDS
Very high borrowers	Selice Romani	1431	898	62.7%
	Tarifiyt Berber	1526	789	51.7%
High borrowers	Gurindji	842	384	45.6%
	Romanian	2137	894	41.8%
	English	1504	617	41.0%
	Saramaccan	1089	417	38.3%
	Ceq Wong	862	319	37.0%
	Japanese	1975	689	34.9%
	Indonesian	1942	660	34.0%
	Bezhta	1344	427	31.8%
	Kildin Saami	1336	408	30.5%
	ImbaburaQuechua	1158	350	30.2%
	Archi	1112	328	29.5%
	Sakha	1411	409	29.0%
	Vietnamese	1477	415	28.1%
	Swahili	1610	447	27.8%
	Yaqui	1379	366	26.5%
	Thai	2063	539	26.1%
	Taquia	1123	291	25.9%
Average borrowers	Lower Sorbian	1671	374	22.4%
	Hausa	1452	323	22.2%
	Mapudungun	1236	274	22.2%
	White Hmong	1290	273	21.2%
	Kanuri	1427	283	19.8%
	Dutch	1513	289	19.1%
	Malagasi	1526	267	17.5%
	Zinacantán Tzotzil	1217	195	16.0%
	Wichí	1187	188	15.8%
	Q'eqchi'	1774	266	15.0%
	Iraqw	1117	162	14.5%
	Kali'na	1110	156	14.0%
	Hawaiian	1245	169	13.6%
	Oroqen	1138	137	12.0%
	Hup	993	114	11.5%
	Gawwada	982	111	11.3%
	Seychelles Creole	1879	201	10.7%
Otomi	2158	231	10.7%	



Low borrowers	Ket	1030	100	9.7%
	Manange	1009	84	8.3%
	Old High German	1203	70	5.8%
	Mandarin Chinese	2042	25	1.2%

Table 2 highlights the main sociolinguistic circumstances that explain the difference in performance between Mandarin Chinese and Selice Romani.

TABLE 2: SOCIOLINGUISTIC CIRCUMSTANCES CONDITIONING BORROWING (TADMOR 58)	
SELICE ROMANI	MANDARIN CHINESE
Universal multilingualism	Almost no bilingualism
Minority language	Majority language
Sociopolitically marginalized	Sociopolitically dominant
Relatively short history	Relatively long history
Prolonged absence of homeland	Prolonged presence in homeland
Tolerance with respect to Purism	Purism
Not standardized	Highly standardized
Well-studied contact language	Little studied contact language
Well-known donor languages	Some little-known donor languages

If we apply to Wolof the sociolinguistic characteristics of the LWT to measure its borrowing rate, we realize from the outset that Wolof is found between Selice Romani and Mandarin Chinese, as it shares 5 out of the 9 characteristics with both, as shown in table 3 below.

TABLE 3: SOCIOLINGUISTIC CIRCUMSTANCES CONDITIONING BORROWING IN WOLOF (NON-RELEVANT FEATURES FOR WOLOF LANGUAGE HAVE BEEN CROSSED OUT)	
SELICE ROMANI	MANDARIN CHINESE
Universal multilingualism	Almost no bilingualism
Minority language	Majority language
Sociopolitically marginalized	Sociopolitically dominant
Relatively short history	Relatively long history
Prolonged absence of homeland	Prolonged presence in homeland
Permissivity with respect to the Purism	Purism
Not standardized	Highly standardized
Well-studied contact language	Little studied contact language
Well-known donor languages	Some little-known donor languages



Based on the main characteristics of Wolof, we find out that this language does not meet the criteria of Level 1 (very high, *i.e.* Selice Romani) or Level 4 (low, *i.e.* Mandarin Chinese). As these two levels are excluded, it remains to classify Wolof language between level 2 (high) and level 3 (medium). Level 2 is also ruled out if we consider the percentage of borrowing that characterizes languages belonging to this level (25% and 50%).

As a result, Wolof, which totals 21.1% (see table 11 below) in terms of borrowing ranks at the average level 3. However, it is important to highlight the concepts of *donor language* and *standardized language*.

In fact, as far as Wolof is concerned, donor foreign languages are clearly identified. But when it comes to local languages, the problem lies in the difficulty of knowing which language has lent/borrowed to/from the other, as the languages in question have always shared the same geographical territory, and this context has favoured intense intercultural exchanges for centuries to the extent that is virtually impossible to detect the source of borrowing. This situation is mainly due to the lack of written documents narrating the history of languages in Senegal's sociolinguistic landscape. As far as the standardization of the Wolof language is concerned, several official decrees regulate it from 1971 to 2005. The decrees are related to transcription, spelling and separation of words. They also pursue the objective of codifying not only the Wolof language but also the other local languages claiming the same status as the Wolof. It is worth emphasizing that a great majority of the Senegalese population can neither read nor write in Wolof: more than 87%¹ of Wolof speakers can neither read nor write in this language. As 54%² of the population is educated in French, written communications are mostly done in either French or in Arabic. The latter plays a religious role in the country where the population is predominantly Muslim at 95%³. From a glottopolitical point of view, national languages still play a very marginal role. Their role is essentially limited to the literacy of rural people so that they can read and write in their mother tongue. French is still the only official language in the country, even though the expansion and visibility of Wolof are undeniable.

¹ On the literacy level of the Senegalese population in local languages, *cf.* Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat, de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage ['General Census of Population and Housing'].

² Source: Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat, de l'Agriculture et de l'Elevage.

³ *Cf.* Triaud.



3. CONTRASTIVE ANALYSIS OF LWT AND WOLOF BORROWING ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC WORD CLASS

3.1. CONTENT WORDS VS FUNCTION WORDS

Analyzing the cases of borrowings encountered in the project's languages, Tadmor retains 5 different categories: nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs and function words that he gathers into 2 main classes, namely, content words and function words. According to the results obtained, only three languages –White Hmong (with 22.4% of function words against 21.1% of lexical words), Hup (16.6% against 11.1%) and Wich (15.5% against 21.5%)– do not confirm the hypothesis that languages adopt more content words than function words.

CATEGORY	Nº OF WORDS	LOANWORDS	% OF LOANWORDS
Content words	53 446	13 446	25.2%
Function words	4071	492	12.1%
Total	57 517	13 938	24.2%

With regard to Wolof, given the low number of registered function words (32) in relation to the total number of borrowings in our corpus (3629), representing a percentage of only 1.9%, it is clear that Wolof speakers have not taken many function words from languages in contact. This may be due to the marginal bilingualism of Wolof speakers. The observations of language practices in Senegal show us that the majority of speakers having Wolof as their mother tongue do not practice another local language.

SEMANTIC WORD CLASS	Nº OF LOANWORDS	% OF LOANWORDS
Content words	3597	99.1%
Function words	32	0.9%
Total	3629	100%

3.2. NOUNS VS VERBS

In the following tables 6 and 7, the results obtained by Tadmor concerning the behavior of the borrowings with respect to the semantic word class, will give us the key to test our first hypothesis. According to the author (Table 6), the number of nouns doubles the number of verbs, *i.e.* 31% versus 14% because “things and concepts are easily adopted across culture” (61).



SEMANTIC WORD CLASS	Nº OF WORDS	LOANWORDS	% OF LOANWORDS
Nouns	34 355	10 712	31.2%
Adjectives and adverbs	5284	803	15.2%
Verbs	13 808	1932	14.0%
Total of content words	53 446	13 446	25.2%

Comparing these data with those of Wolof, we can confirm this first hypothesis of the present study, as the percentage of names is almost triple than that of verbs. Consider Table 7 which distributes borrowings according to the different semantic categories.

SEMANTIC WORD CLASS	Nº OF LOANWORDS	% OF LOANWORDS
Nouns	2492	65.4%
Verbs	819	22.6%
Adjectives	278	7.9%
Adverbs	117	3.2%
Function words	32	0.9%
Total	3629	100%

Table 8, which we discuss below, presents the percentages of nouns and verbs that each language contributed to the LWT project. With the exception of Gurindji (with 48.8% of nouns versus 49.7% of verbs) and Saramacan (with 44% of verbs versus 37.1% of nouns), in all the other languages of the project nouns outnumber verbs. In the case of Saramacan, the result is due to “the partial relexification of Saramaccan by Portuguese” (Tadmor 63). This general preference can be explained by the fact “the more isolating the recipient language, the less morphosyntactic adaptation is necessary for borrowing verbs as such; conversely, the more synthetic language, the more adaptation is required. It is much easier to borrow than it is to synthesize languages” (Tadmor 63). Yet, according to Tadmor quoting Kossmann, this phenomenon does not always depend on linguistic factors, but rather on social reasons. The example of Mandarin Chinese, which despite being a highly insulating language has no verbal borrowing in the LWT corpus, and the case of Berber which has adopted several verbs as a substantially synthetic language –because of the strong influence of Arab language for centuries, tend to corroborate this linguistic fact.



TABLE 8: LOAN NOUNS AND LOAN VERBS BY PROJECT LANGUAGE (TADMOR 62)

LANGUAGES	% OF LOAN NOUNS	% OF LOAN VERBS	LOAN NOUN TO LOAN VERB RATIO
Zinacatán Tzotzil	24.1%	0.6%	37.5
Takia	37.7%	3.2%	11.8
Iraqw	23.6%	2.1%	11.3
Wichí	23.1%	2.7%	8.4
Otomi	17.0%	2.2%	7.6
Bezhta	44.4%	6.0%	7.5
Oroqen	18.6%	2.8%	6.7
Kali'na	21.1%	3.6%	5.8
Old High German	9.0%	1.7%	5.4
Q'eqchi'	23.0%	4.8%	4.8
Hausa	31.2%	7.0%	4.4
Hawaiian	19.3%	5.1%	3.8
Manange	12.3%	3.3%	3.7
Yaqui	37.3%	10.1%	3.7
Gawwada	16.9%	4.6%	3.6
Archi	40.6%	11.7%	3.5
Dutch	26.3%	7.5%	3.5
Seychelles Creole	14.6%	4.1%	3.5
Ket	13.6%	4.0%	3.4
Lower Sorbian	30.7%	9.0%	3.4
Malagasi	23.9%	7.0%	3.4
Mapudungun	31.3%	10.1%	3.1
Sakha	40.0%	12.8%	3.1
Kanuri	26.7%	8.7%	3.0
Imbura Quechua	43.1%	15.5%	2.8
Indonesian	43.7%	17.2%	2.5
Japanese	43.2%	19.9%	2.2
Swahili	34.3%	16.0%	2.1
Kildin Saami	38.0%	19.1%	2.0
Thai	32.3%	16.3%	2.0
Hup	13.8%	8.3%	1.7
Selice Romani	75.6%	45.1%	1.7
Romanian	50.2%	32.1%	1.6
English	48.0%	34.1%	1.4
Tarifyt Berber	56.1%	44.1%	1.3



Ceq Wong	41.6%	32.1%	1.3
Vietnamese	31.3%	25.0%	1.3
White Hmong	21.5%	18.8%	1.1
Gurindji	48.8%	49.7%	1.0
Saramaccan	37.1%	44.0%	0.8
Mandarin Chinese	1.9%	0.0%	-
Total	31.2%	14.0%	2.2

If we take the data of each donor language in the case of Wolof, we also find that none of them gave more verbs or other categories of words than nouns (Table 9), which confirms again our hypothesis 1.

TABLE 9: WOLOF BORROWING CONTENT WORDS VS FUNCTION WORDS BY DONOR LANGUAGES

	FRENCH	ARABIC	ENGLISH	SPANISH	PORTUGUESE	NETHERLAND	PULAR	MANDINKA	SERER	C.C	TOTAL LOAN-WORDS	NO LOANWORDS
Nouns	44.9	16.3	1.8	-	0.9	0.1	0.6	0.6	0.1	-	65.4	34.6
Verbs	17.5	5.3	0.4	0.1	-	-	-	0.2	-	-	22.6	77.4
Adjectives	7.5	2.0	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	7.9	92.1
Adverbs	3.2	3.1	-	-	0.0	-	0.0	-	-	-	3.2	96.8
Function words	1.9	-	-	0.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	1.9	98.1
Total	15.0	5.3	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	0.0	21.1	78.9

4. ANALYSIS OF LWT AND WOLOF LOANS ACCORDING TO SEMANTIC FIELDS

The analysis of the distribution of the borrowings based on semantic fields with regard to Tadmor's criteria shows that the most prolific semantic fields in borrowings are 'religion' (41.2%), 'clothing' (38.6%) and 'housing' (37.2%). Intercultural influences are the main reason these authors put forward to explain such a reality. In the case of 'religions and beliefs' as a semantic field, they explain that the two great revealed religions, *i.e.* Christianity and Islam, have been adopted during their worldwide spread by people belonging to thousands of languages, and those populations consequently, have adopted the terminologies accompanying the two belief systems.

As for the semantic field of 'clothing', colonization and the impact of globalization have contributed a great deal to the adoption of a large number of words



related to fashion that only developed countries knew before. It is the same with 'housing'. The explanation can be found in the switch from rural / rustic housing to global modern standards. The latter has had undoubtedly lexical consequences with exponential development of this sector throughout the world.

Addressing the issue of semantic fields which are least subject to borrowing such as 'body', 'kinship', 'spatial relations' and 'sense perceptions', representing only between 10-15%, Tadmor notes that the universality of the concepts implies that languages do not really feel the need to import them. Table 10 summarizes the results obtained.

SEMANTIC FIELDS	% OF LOANWORDS
Religion and belief	41.2%
Clothing and grooming	38.6%
The house	37.2%
Law	34.3%
Social and political relations	31.0%
Agriculture and vegetation	30.0%
Food and drink	29.3%
Warfare and hunting	27.9%
Possession	27.1%
Animals	25.5%
Cognition	24.2%
Basic actions and technology	23.8%
Time	23.2%
Speech and language	22.3%
Quantity	20.5%
Emotions and values	19.9%
The physical world	19.8%
Motion	17.3%
Kinship	15.0%
The body	14.2%
Spatial relations	14.0%
Sense perception	11.0%
Total	24.2%

The comparison of semantic fields with the degree of loan functionality offers disparate results between the LWT project and Wolof. Indeed, with the exception of 'religion' and 'clothing', the semantic field most inclined to borrowing is 'time', by the large number of words that especially French (18.6%) and Arabic (10.6%) gave



to the Wolof language. In the case of French, it is mainly young people and adults educated in this language, who use the terms relating to time such as the days of the week, the calendar months, the years (Arabic version is used by the elderly and the illiterate in French), the four seasons of the year (that the majority of Wolof speakers do not even know in Wolof) and several adverbs of time. Moreover, politics occupies such an important place in Senegalese social life that 'political and social relations' (23.7%) gave more loans to the Wolof language than 'housing' (21.8%) and 'animals' (8.2%), for example.

The semantic field of 'animals' serves as a pretext for analyzing fields less inclined to borrowing. Indeed, according to Tadmor's results, apart from function words and semantic fields such as 'spatial relations' and 'perception of the senses', the semantic field of the 'body' (object of the second hypothesis), remains in general the field most reluctant to loans. However, in the case of Wolof, it is the semantic field of 'animals' with only 8.2% of borrowings which constitutes the field which gives the least borrowings to the Wolof language, compared to the 11.0% belonging to the semantic field of the 'body'. If this is so it is because, apart from animals living outside the Senegalese ecosystem, (almost) all other animals have their names or doublets in Wolof. Therefore, we can say that the second hypothesis is not confirmed, since the semantic field of the 'body' with 11.0% of the borrowings, gave the Wolof language a percentage higher than that of the 'animals' which remains at 8.2%.

As for the third hypothesis stating that the terms referring to novelties (objects and new creations) are more inclined to be borrowed, it also remains confirmed, insofar as the semantic field of the 'modern world' with a percentage of 92.9% represents the field that produces the most borrowings among the 24 analyzed semantic fields. These new objects, in fact, represent totally unknown concepts in traditional Wolof, and their integration, in most cases, was carried out with a more or less important phonological adaptation and without any semantic or morphosyntactic change.

TABLE 11: WOLOF BORROWINGS BY SEMANTIC FIELD AND DONOR

SEMANTIC FIELDS	FRENCH	ARABIC	ENGLISH	SPANISH	PORTUGUESE	NETHERLANDS	PULAR	MANDINKA	SERER	TOTAL	NO LOANWORDS
Modern world	92.6	-	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	2.9	7.1
Religion and belief	10.9	35.8	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	0.8	47.6	52.4
Clothing and grooming	24.0	6.4	1.1	-	-	1.7	1.0	-	-	34.2	65.8
Time	10.6	18.6	1.3	-	-	-	0.5	-	-	31.0	69.0
Food and drink	16.7	10.7	1.2	-	-	-	0.7	0.1	-	29.4	70.6
Social and political relations	19.7	3.6	0.4	-	-	-	-	-	-	23.7	76.3

Possession	18.8	2.7	0.4	-	-	-	-	0.0	-	21.9	78.1
The house	16.7	4.0	0.3	-	0.6	-	-	0.2	-	21.8	78.2
Cognition	18.1	2.7	0.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	21.3	78.7
Basic actions and technology	12.5	5.3	1.6	-	0.5	-	-	0.0	-	19.9	79.1
Quantity	12.3	2.1	1.1	-	1.2	2.1	0.8	0.0	-	19.6	80.4
Motion	14.4	2.7	1.1	-	-	-	-	0.1	-	18.3	81.7
Emotions and values	9.8	6.2	0.3	1.0	-	-	-	0.0	-	17.3	82.7
Kinship	10.0	5.5	0.3	-	0.2	-	-	0.1	0.2	16.3	83.7
The physical world	11.9	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	15.9	84.1
Law	8.7	6.0	0.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.9	85.1
Speech and language	10.3	1.4	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	12.0	88.0
The body	6.3	1.3	1.1	-	2.3	-	-	-	-	11.0	89.0
Warfare and hunting	8.7	-	0.3	-	-	-	-	-	-	9.0	91.0
Agriculture and vegetation	6.2	2.0	0.1	-	-	-	0.6	-	-	8.9	91.1
Animals	4.2	4.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.2	91.8
Sense perception	5.6	2.4	0.1	-	-	-	-	-	-	8.1	91.8
Spatial relations	2.3	0.7	1.5	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.5	95.5
Function words	1.8	-	-	-	0.1	-	-	-	-	1.9	98.1
TOTAL	15.0	5.3	0.5	0.0	0.2	0.0	0.1	0.0	0.0	21.1	78.9

To the central question of why there is the need to import words from other languages if each language has in its own system mechanisms and “unlimited” techniques of lexical combination that allow it to name any novelty, be it abstract or physical, foreign or local, which were the findings? the answer must be understood in a double reading of the data that our analysis has revealed.

1. On the one hand, languages borrow words from other languages to fill a linguistic gap because of the rapid evolution of society, with the creation of new concepts related to new technologies. As far as Wolof is concerned, it is the semantic field of ‘modern world’ which gives most of the present borrowings with words such as *partaaze*, *bëez*, *ójo*, *buwaat wokaal*, *konekte*, *cate*, etc. Indeed, the Wolof speaker has integrated in his lexicon 92.9% of the borrowings of this semantic field.
2. On the other hand, the semantic domains of ‘food and drink’, ‘clothing’, ‘home’ and ‘religion and beliefs’ have enriched the Wolof lexicon not only linguistically but also culturally. In the area of ‘food and drink’, for example, borrowing (especially from French) has brought a new way of eating (*furset*,



palaat, soos, buwaason, etc.); ‘clothing,’ a new way of dressing (*pàntaloy, west, kostim, sipp*, etc.); ‘housing,’ a new way of life (*taabal, fótóoy, làmp, miir, etaas*, etc.); and ‘religion and beliefs,’ a new way of believing (*julli, jullite, nodd, naafila, xëdd*, etc.).

5. CONCLUSION

After having compared the results obtained by the authors of the LWT project with those of the Wolof language, in order to verify the relevance, for Wolof, of the general principles of applicability of the resulting loans, we were able to verify the three research hypotheses, drawing the following conclusions:

- In both studies, names are easier to import than verbs: hypothesis confirmed.
- In both studies, the terms that designate ‘novelties’ (objects and new creations) are more inclined to borrowings: hypothesis confirmed.
- In the case of the LWT, the semantic field of the ‘body’ is the one that is the least inclined to borrow, while in the case of Wolof, it is that of ‘animals’: unconfirmed hypothesis.

Thus, the Wolof language vis-à-vis its borrowings does not differ from the languages studied by Haspelmath & Tadmor, thus reflecting the same universal typological model.

Reviews sent to author: 15 January 2020

Revised paper accepted for publication: 28 January 2020



WORKS CITED

- CISSÉ, Mamadou. *Dictionnaire Français-Wolof*. L'Asiathèque–Maison des langues du monde: Paris, 2004.
- Diccionarios y léxicos. <http://www.arabdickt.com/ردق/ينابسا-يبرع/>.
- DIOUF, Jean-Léopold. *Dictionnaire Wolof-Français et Français-Qolof*. Karthala: Paris, 2003.
- FAIDHERBE, Louis Léon César. *Langues Sénégalaises: Wolof, Arabe-bassania, Soninké, Sérère, Notions Grammaticales, Vocabulaires et Phrases*. E. Leroux: Paris, 1887.
- DUMONT, Pierre. *Le Français et Langues Africaines au Sénégal*. Karthala: Paris, 1983.
- GAMBLE, David Percy. *Gambian Wolof-English Dictionary*. Gambian Studies: Brisbane, California, 1991.
- HASPELMATH, Martin & TADMOR, Uri. *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Mouton Gruyter: Berlin / New York, 2009. 1-75.
- Recensement Général de la Population et de l'Habitat, de l'Agriculture et de l'Élevage (RGPHAE 2013) <http://www.ansd.sn/ressources/RGPHAE-2013/ressources/doc/pdf/3.pdf>.
- TADMOR, Uri, 2009. "Loanwords in the World's languages: Findings and Results." *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Ed. Martin Haspelmath and Turi Tadmor. Mouton Gruyter: Berlin / New York, 2009. 55-75.
- THIAM, Alioune Badara. *Los préstamos lingüísticos en la lengua wolof: estudio tipológico*. Tesis doctoral, ULL, La Laguna, España, 2016.
- TRIAUD, J.L. "Senegal." *Encyclopaedia of Islam*. Ed. P. Bearman, Th. Bianquis, C.E. Bosworth, E. van Donzel and W.P. Heinrichs. Consulted online on 30th October 2019. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1163>.



