



**International
Journal of Society, Culture & Language
IJSCL**

Journal homepage: www.ij scl.net
ISSN 2323-2210 (online)

The Consequences of the Contacts between Bantu and Non-Bantu Languages around Lake Eyasi in Northern Tanzania

Amani Lusekelo^{1a}

ARTICLE HISTORY:

Received July 2014
Received in revised form October 2014
Accepted October 2014
Available online October 2014

KEYWORDS:

Language contact
Historical linguistics
Non-Bantu
Bantu
Northern Tanzania

Abstract

In rural Tanzania, recent major influences happen between Kiswahili and English to ethnic languages rather than ethnic languages, which had been in contact for so long, influencing each other. In this work, I report the results of investigation of lexical changes in indigenous languages that aimed at examining how ethnic communities and their languages, namely Cushitic Iraqw, Nilotic Datooga, Nyilamba Bantu, Isanzu Bantu, Sukuma Bantu, and (Isolate) Hadzabe, have influenced one another due to contact in Yaeda Chini, Mang'ola, and Endamaghang wards (i.e., Lake Eyasi area). Though they have been in contact for many decades, this study found that ethnic languages in the area have been affected mainly by Kiswahili. It was revealed that loanwords of this official language tend to outnumber loanwords in each language which come from other ethnic languages. It is supported that, in terms of cultural superiority to date, Iraqw and Datooga are far ahead because Iraqw and Datooga languages tend to influence Nyisanzu, Nyilamba, and Hadzabe languages in Lake Eyasi area.

© 2014 IJSCL. All rights reserved.

¹ Assistant Professor, Email: alusekelo@duce.ac.tz

Tel: +255-754-670 715

^a Dar es Salaam University College of Education, Tanzania

1. Introduction

In the contemporary context of rural areas of East Africa, it is known that contacts and influences happen between one indigenous ethnic language and another rather than ex-colonial languages affecting African languages. Brenzinger (2007, p. 191) have succinctly articulated this situation: “dramatic changes in East African history have been triggered by the arrival of waves of immigrants. For the last 5,000 years or so, various Nilotic, Cushitic, and Bantu speaking populations spread, after arriving in East Africa”. In Tanzania, for instance, influx of Afro-Asiatic people (e.g., Iraqw), Nilotic speakers (e.g., Datooga), and Bantu communities (e.g., Isanzu, Nyilamba) engulfed the native hunter-gatherer communities (e.g., Hadzabe) (cf. Madsen, 2000; Marlowe, 2002; Ndagala, 1991). Through scrutiny of vocabularies in individual languages, as well as place names in these communities, this article investigates sociolinguistic changes that might be happening due to contacts of speakers of ethnic languages (Hadzabe, Datooga, Iraqw, Sukuma, and Nyilamba) and national languages Kiswahili and English.

It is argued that languages of wider communications tend to affect languages of smaller communities. For instance, Thomason (2001) argues that, in contact situations numbers of members of the speaker community count. Thus, “if one of two groups in contact is much larger than the other, the smaller group’s language is more likely to acquire features from the larger group’s language than if the two groups are roughly equal in size” (Thomason, 2001, p. 66). In line with Tanzanian contexts, Nurse (2000, p. 260) appears to be convinced that “target languages are spoken by smaller communities” while “the communities speaking donor languages are larger”, e.g., Digo: 120,000 and Kiswahili: millions against Daiso: 10,000; Datooga: 60,000 against Sonjo: 20,000; and Pare (Chasu): 300,000 and Shambala: 400,000 against Ma’a: 20,000. It is important, therefore, to examine how major languages of Tanzania, namely English and Kiswahili (Batibo, 1992, 1995) tend to influence languages spoken by few people in Tanzania (Muzale & Rugemalira, 2008; Petzell, 2012), namely, for this article, Hadzabe, Sukuma,

Iraqw, Datooga, Isanzu, and Nyilamba. The effects due to contacts between these smaller languages are also examined herein.

In Section 2, this article deals with borrowed toponyms and anthroponyms which tend to convey historical lessons which exist in words (Evans, 2010). The historical implication on place and personal names as a result of the contacts between ethnic languages in Tanzania is given in existing literature. For instance, Kisyombe (2013) argues that the place names in Iringa municipality relate to a number of historical lessons associated with chiefdom and Germans invasion amongst the Hehe people of Tanzania. For the case of Rift Valley area, Batibo and Rottland (2001) show that Datooga speaking people came into Sukuma speaking areas thus, Sukuma-Datooga contacts had been established. The linguistic impact of Datooga into Sukuma is well signaled by the Datooga names of villages settled by Sukuma people, namely *Selelya*, *Sayu Sayu*, *Gabu*, etc. and adaptation of Datooga names by some Sukuma people, e.g., *Sita*, *Magina*, *Shigilu*, *Masuka*, etc. (Batibo & Rottland, 2001, p. 13). Lusekelo (2014) argues that a number of foreign personal names in Hadzabe come from Kiswahili and English.

The foregoing discussion about names associated with contacts calls for further investigation of the place names amongst the communities around Lake Eyasi (mainly in Yaeda Chini, Mang’ola, and Endamaghang areas). I argue in this article that a number of foreign place and personal names in communities such as Hadzabe indicate existence of influences between these societies.

It is argued by Hock and Joseph (1996) that the grammar of any language does not stay intact because languages grow as they are dynamic in nature given that, specifically, speakers of such languages are dynamic. They pointed succinctly out that “a very common result of linguistic contact is lexical borrowing, the adoption of individual words or even of large sets of vocabulary items from another language or dialect” (Hock & Joseph, 1996, p. 241). The addition of new words means addition of new culture in the target language. Lusekelo and Kapufi (2014) argue that words carry cultural issues in them which are articulated by the speaker community. Since it

is established that change of the lexicon of the language is a result of speakers of such language having contact with speakers of other languages (see also Thomason, 2001), various studies in Tanzania (cf. Batibo & Rottland, 2001; Lusekelo, 2013; Schadeberg, 2009; Shembuli, 2010; Swilla, 2000, among others) have shown that the share that borrowing brings about into the target languages cannot be underestimated because it transports with it some morphological (as well as phonological) inputs none existent in the target language. The present sociolinguistic contribution wants to investigate the use of the foreign words in conversations of young speakers. This goal is reached by examining various loanwords from young native speakers of Hadzabe, Iraqw, and Nyilamba, as presented in Section 3.

In the literature, it seems that the influences appear to come from each ethnic community to the other, though some communities heavily influence other societies. For example, Datooga loanwords appear plentiful in Iraqw and Sukuma (Batibo & Rottland, 2001; Mous & Qorro, 2009). Data offered in this article show the convergence of the Nilotic Datooga, Isolate Hadzabe, Sukuma Bantu, Nyisanzu Bantu, Nyilamba Bantu, and Cushitic Iraqw. In this line, Kiessling, Mous, and Nurse (2008) pointed out that:

The Rift Valley area of central and northern Tanzania is of considerable interest for the study of language contact, since it is unique in being the only area in Africa where members of all four language families are, and have been, in contact for a long time, having had linguistic interaction of various intensity at various points in time. (p. 186)

Therefore, the intention of the present article is to examine how these ethnic communities and their languages, namely Iraqw, Datooga, Isanzu, Nyilamba, and Hadzabe, have influenced one another at the face of contact, as well as how Kiswahili and English brought loanwords into these languages. Section 4 is set aside to discuss the historical implications associated with the contacts between ethnic communities around Lake Eyasi (i.e., Mang'ola, Yaeda Chini, and Endamaghang wards). Such a discussion is expanded further to include superior communities in the area (Section 5).

This article establishes that there are apparent sociolinguistic facts related to place names, personal names, and the direction of the influence of major communities on smaller communities which are associated with contacts between different communities speaking diverse languages. It also shows that there is need to examine the vocabularies of individual languages because they help to decipher the historical backgrounds as well as new historical contacts between communities speaking different languages. This happens because the shared lexicons, toponyms and anthroponyms help to show the trend of influence between ethnic communities and the level of contacts between communities speaking such languages.

2. Contacts around Lake Eyasi: Issues of *Toponyms* and *Anthroponyms*

It is argued that onomastics helps to decipher anthropological, sociological, and historical facts because “geographically, toponyms are unique among the words of a language in being tied to particular locations, enabling us to map the spread of languages on the ground” (Evans, 2010, p. 112). Thus, this section is set aside to describe the patterns of place names and personal names which have been borrowed between communities settled around Lake Eyasi in Karatu district (Arusha region) and Mbulu district (Manyara region) of Tanzania. The report given here is a result of the research visits to the area under the auspices of *Endangered Languages Fund* (ELF) and *African Humanities Program* (AHP).

The research materials reported herein were collected in 2013 and 2014 around Lake Eyasi area inhabited by various people speaking different languages from four phylum (Blench, 2006; Dimmendaal, 2008): Niger-Congo phyla (Bantu languages) (e.g., Isanzu, Nyilamba, Sukuma), Afro-Asiatic phyla (Cushitic languages) (e.g., Iraqw), Khoisan/Isolate group (Hadzabe) and Nilotic languages Datooga and Maasai (see also Kiessling et al., 2008).

Based on my observations in Yaeda Chini ward (Mbulu district), located at the mid of Savannah dry-land, I found that the area is bordered by a large dry-lake valley (occupied mainly by Datooga people - *Mbugani*), bush-land (savannah forest) (occupied mainly by

Hadzabe - *Mwituni*) and scattered homesteads at the heart of the villages (mixed cultures: mostly Nyisanzu Bantu and Iraqw Cushites – *Yaeda Chini*). There are various Hadzabe houses (called camps in the literature (Madsen, 2000; Marlowe, 2002, 2010)) which are made of grass and trees (bush) and *Datooga* homesteads (Young, 2008) and *mixed cultures* houses are made of bricks, trees, grass, and corrugated iron sheets.

The findings indicate that Mang'ola and Endamaghang wards in Karatu district comprise of mixed settlements. My observations found that most of the settled population comprise mainly the Cushitic Iraqw who practises agro-pastoralism. The Nilotic Datooga had established settlements over a vast area of the district and practise pastoralism. Bantu speaking communities (mainly Sukuma, Nyaturu, and Nyilamba) who cultivate crops and keep animals have settled in the area. The hunter-gatherers community of Hadzabe occupy the outskirts and interior lands of the area.

The consequences of the contacts between these communities seem to suggest borrowings of personal names. As shown in the examples in Table 1, Hadzabe speakers use Iraqw, Isanzu, and Sukuma personal names. Some of the personal names are typical Kiswahili. This indicates that, there had been continued contacts between the ethnic communities and Kiswahili speakers that resulted into communities borrowing personal names from one another. Such a process falls under the borrowing of lexical categories, which Hock and Joseph (1996) argue that it adds words (add new concepts and cultural items (Lusekelo & Kapufi, 2014) into a target language.

Table 1
Hadzabe~Isanzu~Iraqw~Sukuma~Kiswahili
Toponyms

Anthroponyms in Hadzabe families	Source language
<i>Samiti</i>	Iraqw
<i>Bura</i>	Iraqw
<i>Madulu</i>	Sukuma
<i>Ngemelo</i>	Sukuma
<i>Nyaguga</i>	Isanzu
<i>Safari</i>	Kiswahili
<i>Athumani</i>	Kiswahili

Another kind of borrowing involves place names which Evans (2010) argues that they can be easily identified and show the contact zones. In the context of Tanzania, Batibo and Rottland (2001) argue that place names show contact zones between Datooga and Sukuma in north-west parts of the country. Data from Mang'ola and Endamaghang wards reveal that a number of toponyms in the Hadzabe camps are loanwords from other communities. Table 2 below presents some names of camps identified by Hadzabe speakers in the area.

Table 2
Toponyms of Hadzabe Camps

Hadzabe camps	Source languages
<i>Kipindupindu</i>	Kiswahili
<i>Safari</i>	
<i>Msafiri</i>	
<i>Madulu</i>	Sukuma
<i>Bakulu</i>	

One important point to notice here is that these Hadzabe camps are seasonal. Marlowe (2010) found that the Hadzabe change camps regularly throughout the year. The names in Table 2 above are for semi-sedentary Hadzabe homesteads in Mang'ola area. Findings show that many of the toponyms are Kiswahili and Sukuma by origin.

3. English and Kiswahili Influences

This section is envisaged to offer analysis of some new and current data gathered, for this article, from young native speakers at Dar es Salaam University College of Education. It articulates the various lexical items borrowed from Kiswahili and English into target languages in this area (Hadzabe, Nyilamba, and Iraqw).

One of the most carefully researched areas in the entire field of languages in contact concerns the status of foreign lexical elements that appear in the everyday discourse of bilinguals (Sankoff, 2001). The study of contacts of languages is also conducted in Tanzania in which most people are bilingual, at least in ethnic community languages and Kiswahili (cf. Batibo, 1995; Kiessling et al., 2008; Mous & Qorro, 2009; Petzell, 2012). Table 3 offers examples from Tanzanian young speakers of Nyilamba Bantu and

Cushitic Iraqw. The Hadzabe data come from Yaeda Chini area.

Table 3

Lexical Items for Selected Loanwords in Hadzabe, Iraqw, and Nyilamba

English	hospital	nurse	doctor	school	book	church	priest, padre
Kiswahili	<i>hospitali</i>	<i>nesi, muuguzi</i>	<i>mganga, daktari, tabibu</i>	<i>shule, skuli</i>	<i>kitabu</i>	<i>kanisa</i>	<i>mchungaji, kasisi</i>
Hadzabe	<i>sipitaliko</i>	---	---	---	<i>kitabuko</i>	<i>kaanisa</i>	<i>padriamo</i>
Iraqw	<i>siptaali</i>	<i>nesi, yaaya</i>	<i>qwaslaramo, daktaari</i>	<i>shuule</i>	<i>kitaabu</i>	<i>kaniisa</i>	<i>patri, kahamusmo</i>
Nyilamba	<i>usipitali</i>	<i>onesi</i>	<i>muganga, dakitali</i>	<i>ishuule</i>	<i>ikitabu</i>	<i>ikanisa</i>	<i>upadili</i>

Sources: TUKI (2001) (Kiswahili), Mous & Qorro (2009) and Mous, Qorro, & Kiessling (2002) (Iraqw), my field data (Hadzabe), and survey from undergraduate students (Nyilamba and Iraqw).

A number of lexical items are borrowed in languages of this area. Table 3 above shows the loanwords in the Nyilamba Bantu, Isolate Hadzabe, and the Cushitic Iraqw. For instance, in Hadzabe, the words *kitabuko* ‘book’ and *sipitaliko* ‘hospital’ are loanwords from Kiswahili. These loanwords have been nativised by the attachment of the suffix *-ko*. Edenmyr (2004) pointed out that the suffix *-ko* is gender marker in Hadzabe which indicates feminine in singular nominal expressions.

These words appear as *kitaabu* ‘book’ and *siptaali* ‘hospital’ in Iraqw whose nativisations process involves, among others, vowel shortening and lengthening in nouns. Mous and Qorro (2009) argue that Iraqw nouns appear with short vowel in the first syllable and long vowel in the second syllable. It seems vowel alteration is a common process which affects Kiswahili loans. Nurse and Spear (1985) suggest that accepted loan words are determined by correlating them with sound changes in the target language.

The Kiswahili words *hospitali* and *kitabu* were borrowed from English *hospital* and Arabic *kitab*. In this line, it is claimed that “the most obvious level at which borrowing takes place is that of vocabulary, or “loan “words”. Swahili today absorbs loan words from English and in turn exerts an enormous influence on the vocabularies of other languages in East Africa” (Nurse & Spear, 1985, p. 14). This indicates that Kiswahili is the major source language in Yaeda Chini, Endamaghang and Mang’ola areas.

The word for *church* is *kaanisa* in Hadzabe and *kaniisa* for Iraqw. Likewise, loanwords for *padre* are *padriamo* in Hadzabe and *patri* in Iraqw. The words *padriamo* and *patri* seem to be borrowed from English (perhaps through Kiswahili), a second official language in the country (Batibo, 1995). The nativisations process involves suffixation by *-mo* in Hadzabe and devoicing [d/>/t] in Iraqw. Mous and Qorro (2009) report that some voiced sounds in Kiswahili tend to be devoiced in Iraqw. (See detailed analysis of the phonological and morphological processes attested in Iraqw in Mous and Qorro, 2009 and Burunge in Kiessling, 2001).

Perhaps contact between Iraqw and Hadzabe is common in Yaeda Chini ward because of the borrowing of the suffix *-mo* in Hadzabe. Mous and Qorro (2009) report that *-mo* is a singular suffix common for human referents in Iraqw, e.g., *qwaslaramo* ‘doctor’ and *kahamusmo* ‘priest/padre’. In Hadzabe words, the suffix *-mo* indicates plurality or togetherness; hence it is used for nominal expressions which designate mass entities.

Moreover, both Bantu and non-Bantu languages have borrowed from Kiswahili and English. Data in Table 3 above show that while the non-Bantu languages borrowed Kiswahili words, e.g., for *church*, Iraqw: *kanisa*, Bantu languages such as Nyilamba borrowed *ikanisa*. Non-Bantu languages have also maintained their native words for *priest/padre*: Iraqw: *kahamusmo*, while Nyilamba has taken *upadili* ‘padre’ from English.

Furthermore, both non-Bantu and Bantu languages of Tanzania have borrowed English loanwords, e.g., Cushitic Iraqw uses *siptaali* and *usipitali* for Nyilamba. The non-Bantu languages also borrow from the Bantu language Kiswahili. Iraqw, Cushitic language, utilizes the word *kaniisa* ‘church’ from Kiswahili. This shows that evangelization had been through Kiswahili language in the area, which is dominated by Lutheran church (see also Madsen, 2000).

Some non-Bantu languages have borrowed the English and Kiswahili words while others use native words, e.g., *doctor*, Iraqw: *qwaslaramo*; *school*, Iraqw: *shule*; for other words: *write*, *teacher*, *book*, Iraqw: *goi*, *kitaabu*.

The findings provided in this section match, to a lesser extent, to the fact that there had been earlier contacts between speakers of Coastal Kiswahili Bantu and English and speakers of non-Bantu languages (i.e., Maasai, Hadzabe, Iraqw, Sandawe, Datooga, and Luo) in the country, which is reported in various sources. For example, Nurse and Spear (1985) say:

Though at least three small Southern Cushitic groups have survived into this century by hunting in marginal lands, Southern Cushitic farmers and herders began to be displaced and absorbed by incoming Bantu-speakers over two thousand years ago. All have subsequently disappeared as distinct people, but they have left traces of their former existence in the large number of loan words absorbed into the Bantu languages during the period of interaction and assimilation in which Bantu-speakers came to predominate throughout eastern and southern Africa. (p. 36)

In addition, I point out that loanwords such as *kaniisa* (Iraqw) and *kaanisa* (Hadzabe) ‘church’ and *patri* (Iraqw), *upadili* (Nyilamba) and *padriamo* (Hadzabe) are associated with Christianity. Lusekelo (2013) argues that religious terms are apparent in Bantu languages of Tanzania because services are conducted in Kiswahili. This is the true picture in the continent because, on Christianity in Volta Delta in Ghana, it is said “church services are conducted mostly in Ewe including announcements, and Ewe hymn

books and Bible are used” (Ameka, 2007, p. 120).

One of the implications of the loanwords in a language is indication of the contacts between communities and suggestion towards superior communities (Batibo & Rottland, 2001; Nurse, 2000; Thomason, 2001). A number of loanwords discussed in Sections 2 and 3 above reveal fascinating historical ideas which are discussed in the next section.

4. Sociolinguistic and Historical Implications of the Loanwords

This section discusses the sociolinguistic, historical, and anthropological issues which emanate from the contacts of the people from different ethnic community languages. I discuss the observations from the findings in Section 4.1 and then present some facts from Rift Valley area in Section 4.2.

4.1. Observations from Findings around Lake Eyasi Area

In this subsection, I discuss four observations deduced from the data. The first observation surrounds the number of speakers of these ethnic community languages because Nurse (2000) and Thomason (2001) insist that number counts a lot in the influence between languages in contacts.

Based on 1995-1996 anthropological investigation, Marlowe (2004, 2010) reports that the Hadzabe are mobile, hence they contact the pastoral communities of the Datooga, Isanzu pastoral-farmers, and Iraqw (Madsen, 2000). My informants at Yaeda Chini reported that Datooga (typical pastoral community) and Hadzabe (hunters and gatherers) people outnumber the rest of the inhabitants in the village, or even in Yaeda Chini area (Yaeda valley). The other communities mentioned include: Iraqw (Wambulu), Nyisanzu, and Sukuma (semi-pastoral and agricultural communities). My informants at Mang’ola and Endamaghang wards say Iraqw and Datooga have the majority people in the area. Other ethnic community languages spoken in the area include Hadzabe, Nyaturu, Nyiramba, and Waswahili.

From the observation above, it becomes obvious that the major groups of Iraqw and Datooga are likely to influence other languages such as Hadzabe, Nyilamba, and Nyisanzu. Findings show that a number of lexical words entered into Hadzabe from these languages. Batibo and Rottland (2001) point out that Datooga words entered Sukuma lexicon, and Kiessling (2001) also shows that loanwords from Bantu penetrated into Cushitic languages.

The second observation revolves around the power of Kiswahili in Tanzania. Marlowe (2002) found that the Hadzabe, except children and elders, speak Kiswahili as their second language. He claims that Kiswahili has replaced Isanzu as a second language. My findings show that all Hadzabe, including children who are able to speak, do speak Kiswahili as a second language. I conducted interviews in Kiswahili, with children, elders, and teenagers. Kiswahili is also spoken when the Hadzabe pupils at Endamagha and Yaeda Chini primary schools converse with Isanzu (Bantu), Iraqw (Wambulu) (Cushitic), and Datooga (Nilotic). Kiswahili is heard all around the centres of Yaeda village and Mang'ola township.

On language situation in Yaeda Chini (rural) ward, Kiswahili is frequently used at the two village centers, namely Yaeda Chini and Domanga. Both Datooga and Hadzabe homesteads are dominated by the use of their language. Hadzabe is used in Mongo wa Mono and Domanga villages (though interviews were conducted in Kiswahili and almost everybody speaks Kiswahili in Yaeda valley). This means some people in the area command Kiswahili and Hadzabe while others command Kiswahili and Datooga.

The language situation in Mang'ola and Endamaghang is a little bit different. First, these wards are inhabited by numerous ethnic groups: Datooga, Iraqw, Hadzabe, Nyilamba, Nyaturu, Sukuma, etc. This situation warrants Kiswahili to be used for communications between people from different ethnic backgrounds. Second, the education centres in these areas put Kiswahili into the fore-front in communication because it is the medium of instruction. Observations in schools at Yaeda Chini and Endamaghang found that many

children come from different ethnic groups. Therefore, Kiswahili is the medium of communication in both formal (classrooms) and informal (outside classrooms) settings.

The third observation surrounds changes associated with contacts between communities. Mankind is known for adjusting to changes (Marlowe, 2010), in most cases, towards western civilization and development (Madsen, 2000; Matunhu, 2011). Marlowe (2002) suggests that the Hadzabe have had contact with non-foragers (Isanzu, Nyilamba, Datooga, Iraqw) at least for the past century and yet they have persisted as foragers. My research findings (through observations) point out that the Hadzabe at Yaeda and Domanga villages have become partly very small farmers (gardeners), growing maize and sorghum, and keep fowls. However, these villages are established homes of the sedentary communities, namely Iraqw (Wambulu), Nyisanzu, and some Sukuma. In Mang'ola and Endamaghang wards, the Hadzabe had been settled in some vicinity, at least in areas where they can be traced. Some of these people keep dogs as well. This seems to be a result of contacts with non-foragers. This is supported by Madsen (2000, p. 14) who says "in recent years, Hadzabe diversify their income by limited gardening, small scale agriculture and trade with neighbors".

The last observation is about another significant trait of the Rift Valley area which is intermarriage. Marlowe (2002, 2004) mentions that the Isanzu men marry Hadzabe women and not the other way round. Contrary to this, I found that intermarriages in the research area are numerous between Iraqw and Datooga, Isanzu and Hadzabe, Isanzu and Datooga, Hadzabe and Sukuma, Iraqw and Sukuma, etc. Also, I found that Hadzabe men marry Isanzu women and vice versa. This has implications on learning their spouses' languages. Most of the children in such families are bilingual in Kiswahili and Hadzabe and/or Isanzu or Iraqw or Datooga and Kiswahili, etc. As apparently found in Yaeda Chini, Mag'ola and Endamaghang wards, Thomason (2001) said intermarriage is one of the parameters which leads to language contact.

The issue of intermarriage and language change is not unique to Lake Eyasi area. In West Africa, Ameka (2007, p. 120) found that “while Likpes marry from outside their ethnolinguistic group, the spouses do not necessarily learn Likpe since they can communicate in one of the ‘big’ languages: Ewe, Akan, or English”. This is truer in the context of Kiswahili in Lake Eyasi area because most of the children in Yaeda Chini and Endamaghang primary schools who come from families with parents from different ethnic communities tend to speak Kiswahili and/or the big language of the area, mainly Iraqw.

4.2. Historical Lessons from Language Contact in the Rift Valley Area

The question of contacts has roots in the distance between the communities in contact. It is shown that the massive linguistic encroachment happens when a language is surrounded by other languages. As a result, speakers become bilingual and/or turn to a superior language. For the case of Ma’a, for instance, Thomason (2001, p. 199) shows that “Ma’a people are, or were, an ethnic group quite distinct from their Bantu-speaking neighbors, whose languages, Shambaa (or Shambala) and Pare (Chasu), are also spoken by all the Ma’a people”. Nurse (2000) found that Shambala and Chasu speakers surrounded the Ma’a and influenced the language heavily.

Given the scenario above, Hadzabe speakers [who are only between 1,000-1,500 (Marlowe, 2010; Peterson, 2012)] seem to fall into the same situation because they are surrounded by large ethnic communities around Lake Eyasi, namely Iraqw (602,661), Nyilamba (385,824), Datooga (138,777), and Isanzu (25,978) (Muzale & Rugemalira, 2008). For the case of rural areas such as Yaeda Chini and Endamaghang wards, the situation is further tense because only fractions of Hadzabe (perhaps 500+/- people) inhabit these areas. The number of Isanzu, Datooga and Iraqw speakers is far ahead of the Hadzabe in two wards where research had been conducted. The statistics show that Yaeda Chini ward has 5,420 inhabitants and Endamaghang ward has a population of 16,267 people (URT, 2013). This entails that about 15,000 non-Hadzabe come into close contacts with about 500+/-

Hadzabe in the area. The direction of the consequence of such contacts appears to be obvious: the Hadzabe borrows toponyms and anthroponyms from non-Hadzabe languages.

The place names in Sukuma (Batibo & Rottland, 2001), the loanwords in Burunge (Kiessling, 2001) and toponyms and anthroponyms in Hadzabe are all good signs for the contacts between these ethnic communities in the country. Several of the loanwords in these languages come from the national language Kiswahili, which is an indication that contacts Kiswahili is a lingua franca used for communication in Lake Eyasi area.

The various loanwords in Hadzabe do not seem to properly indicate the earlier contacts because Sukuma, Nyisanzu, and Iraqw toponyms and anthroponyms are apparent in the language. However, the actual dates of the contacts seem to be very long because Kiessling et al. (2008) state that there had been continued contacts in the Tanzanian Rift Valley. These contacts resulted into unstable power relations, “in which the directions of influence changed over time and probably without ever having had one dominant language for the whole area over an extensive period of time” (Kiessling et al., 2008, p. 187). This contention shows that there had been prolonged contacts between speakers of the languages in the Rift Valley. Kiessling et al. (2008) further argue:

The ancestors of the Hadza[be] and Sandawe, the earliest linguistically recognizable groups, have probably been present for at least several millennia; the ancestors of the Southern Cushites (Iraqw) entering some 3,000 years ago, followed by the Bantu (Isanzu) approximately 2,000 years ago, the Southern Nilotes (Datooga) being late-comers having arrived in the area 500 to 1,000 years ago. (p. 187)

Another significant point to note here is that Tanzania experienced the domination of English and Kiswahili over the smaller communities in the interior of Tanzania (Batibo, 1992, 1995). It seems this had not been the case in the Rift Valley area in that influences of Datooga into Sukuma and Rangi into Burunge have been reported to occur

earlier (Batibo & Rottland, 2001; Kiessling, 2001). However, Kiswahili left contemporary footmarks into the lexicons of most languages in the Rift Valley area. Kiessling et al. (2008, p. 189) state that “[Ki]swahili, which has this role now, was a very late newcomer; for example, Iraqw oral tradition claims that there was only one interpreter for [Ki]swahili during the German administration”.

Data presented and discussed in previous sections of this article substantiate that Kiswahili is a major donor language in the area. Also, most loans from English seem to have come into ethnic languages through the national language Kiswahili.

Due to prolonged language contacts, some linguistic evidence of the diffusion of cultures related to pastoralism and hunting appear to be available in the literature. The influence is mainly from Iraqw and Datooga cultures into Hadzabe and Bantu cultures (Batibo & Rottland, 2001; Kiessling et al., 2008; Mous & Qorro, 2009). Table 4 presents some of the loanwords which are indicative of cultural diffusion, i.e., *yaqamba-nzagamba* (Iraqw-Nyisanzu-Sukuma) *gwanda-lagweenda* (Iraqw-Datooga), and *masomba-nsumba* (Iraqw and Nyisanzu).

Table 4

Similar Lexical Tokens as a Result of Culture Diffusion in the Rift Valley Area

	Iraqw	Datooga	Hadzabe	Sukuma	Isanzu
bull	<i>yaqamba</i>	<i>jurukta</i>	<i>atchekako</i>	<i>nzayamba</i>	<i>nzagamba</i>
ram	<i>gwanda</i>	<i>lagweenda</i>	---	<i>n'holo</i>	---
boys	<i>masomba</i>	<i>balanda murjew</i>	<i>wa'a</i>	<i>βayanda</i>	<i>nsumba</i>
milk	<i>maso'oo</i>	<i>merejāanda</i>	<i>ilibáko</i>	<i>maβele</i>	---
millet	<i>basooroo</i>	---	<i>póyoko, gadida</i>	<i>βusiya</i>	---
maize	<i>buri</i>	---	<i>hagúko, usutuko</i>	<i>mandeye</i>	---

Sources: Kiessling et al. (2008); Mous et al. (2002); Tomikawa (1978); my survey (field notes).

The literature shows that speakers of Datooga and Iraqw languages seem to be superior to people from Bantu communities (Batibo & Rottland, 2001; Mous & Qorro, 2009; Snyder, 2005). In the following section; therefore, I describe the superiority of two speaker communities, namely Datooga and Iraqw, in the Lake Eyasi area.

5. Current Superiority of Iraqw and Datooga Communities in Lake Eyasi Area

In sociolinguistic situations involving languages contacts, one important point to notice is that speakers of minority languages shift to the cultures of the people speaking superior languages (Hock & Joseph, 1996; Nurse, 2000; Thomason, 2001). For the Rift Valley area, it seems communities, namely the pastoral Datooga and agro-pastoral Iraqw had been powerful in the area though “power relations were not stable over time; for example, the scales of power between the Iraqw and the Datooga shifted several times”

(Kiessling et al., 2008, p. 189). It is the assumption of this article that Hadzabe and Isanzu speakers might be, to a lesser extent, turning to Datooga and Iraqw cultures due to the size of the speakers.

As explained in the literature, speakers of Datooga and Iraqw languages seem to be superior to people from Bantu communities. For instance, it is claimed that Datooga speaking people came into Sukuma speaking areas and settled around 1600-1700 in Tanzania (Batibo & Rottland, 2001). Thus, Sukuma-Datooga contacts had been established for a long period of time, about 200-300 years. The linguistic impact of Datooga into Sukuma is well signaled by the Datooga names of villages settled by Sukuma people (Batibo & Rottland, 2001).

In this section, I discuss the power relations of the communities available in the research areas, i.e., Mang'ola, Yaeda Chini, and Endamaghang wards. Observations indicate that the pastoral Datooga and agro-pastoral

Iraqw are superior communities around Yaeda Chini area. However, Nyisanzu society is also powerful in the area. For the case of Endamaghang and Mang'ola, Datooga and Iraqw seem to surpass Hadzabe, Nyilamba, and Sukuma.

5.1. Iraqw and Their Neighbors

The Iraqw people inhabit Hanang, Mbulu, and Karatu districts in northern Tanzania. Their population stands at about 602,661 (Muzale & Rugemalira, 2008). Ehret (1980) argues that Iraqw came recently into Lake Eyasi area. The neighbors of the Iraqw people include Datooga and Maasai (pastoralists), Hadzabe (hunter-gatherers), as well as Nyisanzu and Nyilamba (agriculturalists).

Snyder (2005) and Mous and Qorro (2009) describe the power relations of Iraqw and their pastoral neighbors Datooga and Maasai. Snyder (2005, p. 25) argues that "Iraqw had established control over the former Datoga area of Dongobesh". Iraqw societies pushed into Maasai land because Snyder (2005, p. 26) says "Maasai lost control over land from Karatu north to Mbulumbulu in the 1930s and 1940s". This entails that the Iraqw people have control of much of the land in Karatu and Mbulu districts of Tanzania.

Mous and Qorro (2009) offer the best discussion of the contact situations for Iraqw community in which Kiswahili has become the main donor language followed by Datooga. They categorically point out that current contact situations are between Iraqw, Kiswahili, and Datooga, as they succinctly argue that "[Ki]swahili [...] is a second language for the vast majority of Iraqw speakers. [Ki]swahili is used in dealings with the administration, in school, and in writing" (Mous & Qorro, 2009, p. 103).

Since Iraqw is used in all other domains, and occasionally in formal domains as well, then it is the dominant language in the area. For example, it is said that Protestant churches use Iraqw more than Catholic churches (Mous & Qorro, 2009). Thus, it seems that Iraqw is a superior language which currently dominates Datooga. To substantiate this claim, they show that "an important number of Datooga have become Iraqw when they opted for a more sedentary farming lifestyle and gave up their

Southern Nilotic language in the process. Iraqw is a dominant regional language" (Mous & Qorro, 2009, p. 103).

A similar situation which involves domination of one ethnic language in religious domains is also reported in other areas in the continent. Ameka (2007, p. 119), for instance, reports that "the contact between the Likpe and Ewe has been on-going for centuries, and since Ewe is the dominant lingua franca in the Likpe area, almost all Likpe are bilingual in Likpe and Ewe".

The power relations in the Rift Valley area; nonetheless, have shifted and some communities have assumed superiority (Kiessling et al., 2008). This is true for Iraqw and Datooga. For instance, Mous and Qorro (2009) point out that:

More people shift from Datooga to Iraqw than the other way around. The influence of Datooga on Iraqw is from an earlier period when the Datooga were military and culturally dominant. Before the Iraqw settled in the area where they are now, they were already in contact with Datooga. In earlier times Datooga was the prestige language for Iraqw speakers. (p. 107)

Currently, therefore, in the Rift Valley area, Iraqw influences other languages.

On issues of culture and persistence of indigenous knowledge and language, Mous and Qorro (2009, p. 108) argue that "Iraqw is a strong language in a relatively conservative, traditional cultural context. Iraqw flourishes primarily in the rural area of Mbulu district and neighbouring districts". In this context Iraqw culture is strong and the Iraqw language is highly valued by its speakers. One of the parameters to examine the superiority of language is on attitude of speakers. Batibo (2005, p. 31) argue that "as long as speakers see some social status or socio-economic value in their languages, they will certainly wish to maintain them". It is established that Iraqw is superior because even "the attitude of speakers is that for many modern concepts Iraqw words are used" (Mous & Qorro, 2009, p. 108). This does not rule out the availability of loanwords in Iraqw: "constituting 86 percent (Kiswahili

loanwords) and 9 percent (Datooga loanwords)” (Mous & Qorro, 2009, p. 108).

One of the ways to see how one culture of a given speech community influences another is to examine the way new concepts are adapted in the target language (Hock & Joseph, 1996; Lusekelo, 2013; Schadeberg, 2009; Thomason, 2001). In the case of Iraqw, it is established that “most loans are, not surprisingly, additive (insertions) for modern concepts and mostly from [Ki]swahili. In all semantic fields, [Ki]swahili is the number one donor language, except for the domain of domestic animals, which has more loans from Datooga” (Mous & Qorro, 2009, p. 111). This entails that cultural issues available in Kiswahili speaking community tend to influx Iraqw culture.

5.2. Datooga and Their Neighbors

The various communities of Datooga inhabit mainly Mbulu, Karatu, and Hannang districts of northern Tanzania. Their population is estimated to be 138,771 (Muzale & Rugemalira, 2008). Their neighboring ethnic societies include Hadzabe, Iraqw, Maasai, Sukuma, Nyisanzu, and Nyilamba.

Datooga are pastoral society, keeping cattles, sheep, goats, and fowls (Young, 2008) and have “only taken up agriculture in recent years” (Ndagala, 1991, p. 73). Almost 70 percent of the Datooga speakers inhabit Mbulu district (Ndagala, 1991) where it is estimated to have arrived around 1950s (Young, 2008). Traditionally, they lived in isolated pastureland but “the expansion into the new areas by both occupational groups gradually reduced the spatial distance between the Datooga and their neighbours” (Young, 2008, p. 75). Their relationships in Mbulu district had been with Iraqw and they peacefully adopt each others’ rituals and inter-marry (Young, 2008).

In recent years (in 1960s and 1980s) there occurred conflicts and wars between the agro-pastoral communities of the Sukuma and Nyilamba against the pastoral communities of the Datooga. This caused displacements of the Datooga speakers (Ndagala, 1991; Young, 2008), as it had been the case in some communities in Volta Basin in West Africa, e.g., Likpe speakers (Ameka, 2007). As a result, the entire sub-groups of the Datooga

were united and consolidated their unity (Ndagala, 1991). As a result, as it is the assumption of this article, the influences of the other communities into Datooga were blocked but the influence of the national language Kiswahili might have persisted.

Contemporary studies show that pasture land declined and Datooga communities settle in dry and unproductive areas around Lake Eyasi. Also, they have undergone intermarriages and shifted to sedentary farmers. For instance, Young (2008, pp. 101-102) argues that “the differences in estimated Datooga population sizes are primarily related to [...] intermarriage with other local groups associated with assimilation into Swahili culture”. Also, after villagization in the 1970s, Datooga people experienced an influx of Iraqw farmers into Lake Eyasi area (Young, 2008).

On influence of Datooga on other languages, let us take an example of the work by Batibo and Rottland (2001) about adaptation of Datooga loanwords in Sukuma. This study describes the nature of the contact between the languages presented in this work because such a context determines the level of impact associated with contacts. Datooga (Nilotic language of Tanzania) speaking people came into Sukuma (Bantu language) speaking areas and settled around 1600-1700 in Tanzania. Thus, Sukuma-Datooga contacts had been established for a long period of time, about 200-300 years. The linguistic impact of Datooga into Sukuma is well signaled by the Datooga names of villages settled by Sukuma people, e.g., *Selelya*, *Sayu Sayu*, *Gabu*, etc. and adaptation of Datooga names by some Sukuma people, e.g., *Sita*, *Magina*, *Shigilu*, *Masuka*, etc. (Batibo & Rottland, 2001, p 13). This informs us that not only do contacts between people speaking two languages need to take place for a reasonably longer period of time so that languages influence each other but also Datooga culture seems to be superior here.

6. Concluding Remarks

This article articulated the consequences of the continued contacts between various languages in the Lake Eyasi area, focusing on Yaeda Chini, Endamaghang, and Mang’ola wards.

The main ethnic communities discussed herein are Datooga, Hadzabe, Iraqw, Nyisanzu, and Nyilamba. Sociolinguistic data presented indicate that toponyms and anthroponyms in the area show borrowing between ethnic languages. This signals that there had been long contacts between these communities in northern Tanzania.

Contemporary sociolinguistic data point towards the domination of Kiswahili as a donor language in the area. This of course is a result of Kiswahili being used as the medium of instruction in primary schools. Also, for children from families with parents from different ethnic groups, Kiswahili becomes their mother tongue. This language pattern is apparent in the country (cf. Batibo, 1992, 1995, 2005). Although it is argued that rural areas in East Africa demonstrate language contacts between ethnic languages (Brenzinger, 2007), it is established in this article that in rural Tanzania, contacts and influences happen between Kiswahili and indigenous languages such as Iraqw, Hadzabe, Datooga, and Nyilamba rather than these native languages influencing massively other ethnic languages.

On issues of cultural changes at the face of massive contacts of indigenous languages, the discussion herein pointed out that some communities have gained power in the recent years. For Lake Eyasi area (Mang'ola, Endamaghang and Yaeda Chini wards), the Datooga and Iraqw communities are superior. Their superiority, in my opinion, vests on their number, i.e., being many counts a lot in contact situations (Nurse, 2000; Thomason, 2001). Other superior communities are the Nyisanzu, Nyilamba, and Sukuma whose population is larger than Hadzabe. The second reason for the superiority of the communities to date seems to be economic powers. While the Datooga are rich in livestock, Iraqw have farms and keep animals. Their conservative livelihoods help to maintain their culture (cf. Snyder, 2005).

References

Ameka, F. K. (2007). Grammars in contact in the Volta Basin (West Africa): On contact-induced grammatical change in Likpe. In A. Y. Aikhenvald & R. M. W.

Dixon (Eds.), *Grammars in contact: A cross-linguistic typology* (pp. 114-142). London: Oxford University Press.

Batibo, H. M. (1992). The fate of ethnic languages in Tanzania. In M. Brenzinger (Ed.), *Language death: Factual and theoretical explorations, with special reference to East Africa* (pp. 85-98). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Batibo, H. M. (1995). The growth of Kiswahili as a language of education and administration in Tanzania. In M. Putz (Ed.), *Linguistic inequality in Africa: Perspectives on the Namibian experience* (pp. 57-80). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Batibo, H. M. (2005). *Language decline and death in Africa: Causes, consequences and challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Batibo, H. M., & Rottland, F. (2001). The adoption of Datooga loanwords in Sukuma and its historical implications. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika*, 16(17), 9-50.

Blench, R. (2006). *Archaeology, language, and the African past*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

Brenzinger, M. (2007). Language endangerment in southern and eastern Africa. In M. Brenzinger (Ed.), *Language diversity endangered* (pp. 179-204). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Dimmendaal, G. J. (2008). Language ecology and linguistic diversity on the African continent. *Language and Linguistics Compass*, 2(5), 840-858.

Edenmyr, N. (2004). The semantics of Hadza gender assignment: A few notes from the field. *Africa & Asia*, 4, 3-19.

Ehret, C. (1980). The Nilotic languages of Tanzania. In E. C. Polomé & C. P. Hill (Eds.), *Languages of Tanzania* (pp. 68-78). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Evans, N. (2010). *Dying words: Endangered languages and what they have to tell us*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Hock, H. H., & Joseph, B. D. (1996). *Language history, language change, and language relationship: An introduction to historical and comparative linguistics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Kiessling, R. (2001). The integration of Bantu loans into Burunge (Southern Cushitic). *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika*, 16(17), 213-238.

- Kiessling, R., Mous, M., & Nurse, D. (2008). The Tanzanian Rift Valley area. In: B. Heine & D. Nurse (Eds.), *A Linguistic geography of Africa* (pp. 186-227). London: Cambridge University Press.
- Kisyombe, J. G. (2013). *The sociolinguistics of place names in Tanzania: The case of analysis of naming streets in Iringa Municipality*. Unpublished MA dissertation, Ruaha University College, Tanzania.
- Lusekelo, A. (2013). Swahili loanwords nativisations in the languages of Tanzania. *HURIA Journal of the Open University of Tanzania*, 14, 151-162.
- Lusekelo, A. (2014). The encroachment of the personal names and naming system of the Hadzabe. In Ostler, N. & Heinrich, P. (Eds.), *FEL XVIII Okinawa: Indigenous languages - Value to the community* (pp. 88-92). Bath: Foundation for Endangered Languages.
- Lusekelo, A., & Kapufi, D. I. (2014). An analysis of metaphoric use of names of body parts in the Bantu language Kifipa. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language*, 2(1), 106-118.
- Madsen, A. (2000). *The Hadzabe of Tanzania: Land and human rights for a hunter-gatherer community*. Copenhagen: IWGIA document no. 98.
- Marlowe, F. W. (2002). Why the Hadza are still hunter-gatherers. In S. Kent, (Ed.), *Ethnicity, hunter-gatherers and the "other": Association or assimilation in Africa* (pp. 247-275). Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press.
- Marlowe, F. W. (2004). Mate preferences among Hadza hunter-gatherers. *Human nature*, 15(4), 365-376.
- Marlowe, F. W. (2010). *The Hadza: Hunter-gatherers of Tanzania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Matunhu, J. (2011). A critique of modernization and dependency theories in Africa: Critical assessment. *African Journal of History and Culture*, 3(5), 65-72.
- Mous, M., & Qorro, M. (2009). Loanwords in Iraqw, a Cushitic Language of Tanzania. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook* (pp. 103-123). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Mous, M., Qorro, M., & Kiessling, R. (2002). *Iraqw-English dictionary: With an English and a thesaurus index*. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Muzale H. R. T., & Rugemalira, J. M. (2008). Researching and documenting the languages of Tanzania. *Language Documentation & Conservation*, 2(1), 68-108.
- Ndagala, D. K. (1991). The unmarking of the Datoga: Decreasing resources and increasing conflict in rural Tanzania. *Nomadic Peoples*, 28, 71-82.
- Nurse, D. (2000). *Inheritance, contact, and change in two East African languages* (Language Contact in Africa 4). Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Nurse, D., & Spear, T. T. (1985). *The Swahili: Reconstructing the history and language of an African society, 800-1500*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Peterson, D. (2012). *Hadzabe: In the light of a million fires*. Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.
- Petzell, M. (2012). The linguistic situation in Tanzania. *Moderna Språk*, 1, 136-144.
- Sankoff, G. (2001). Linguistic outcomes of language contact. In P. Trudgill, J. K. Chambers, & N. Schilling-Estes (Eds.), *Handbook of sociolinguistics* (pp. 638-668). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Schadeberg, T. C. (2009). Loanwords in Swahili. In M. Haspelmath & U. Tadmor (Eds.), *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook* (pp. 78-102). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Shembuli, M. M. S. (2010). Mabadiliko ya kifonolojia na kimofolojia wakati wa utohoaji maneno ya Kiarabu katika Swahili: Mifano kutoka Kamusi ya Swahili Sanifu (TUKI 2004). *KISWAHILI: Journal of the Institute of Swahili Studies*, 73, 45-57.
- Snyder, K. A. (2005). *The Iraqw of Tanzania: Negotiating rural development*. New York: Westview Press.
- Swilla, I. N. (2000). Borrowing in Chindali. In K. Kahigi, Y. Kihore & M. Mous (Eds.), *Languages of Tanzania* (pp. 297-307). Leiden: Research for Asian, African and Amerindian Studies.
- Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language contact: An introduction*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Tomikawa, M. (1978). Family and daily life: An ethnography of the Datoga pastoralists

- in Mangola. *Family Ethnological Studies*, 1, 1-36
- TUKI (Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili) (2001). *Kamusi ya Swahili-Kiingereza*. Dar es Salaam: Institute of Swahili Research.
- URT (United Republic of Tanzania). (2013). *2012 Population and housing census: Population distribution by administrative areas*. Dar es Salaam/Zanzibar: National Bureau of Statistics and Office of Chief Government Statistician.
- Young, A. G. (2008). *Young child health among Eyasi Datoga: Socio-economic marginalization, local biology, and infant resilience within the mother-infant dyad*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, the University of Arizona, USA.