

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications



Adaptation of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

AMANI LUSEKELO

Dar es Salaam University College of Education,
University of Dar es Salaam, Tanzania
alusekelo@duce.ac.tz

ABSTRACT

The exchange of linguistic materials between languages which come into contact is indeed reciprocal. The previous accounts of the outcome of contact between Datooga and Sukuma was skewed towards impact of Datooga on Sukuma. Based on ethnolinguistic vitality approach, the Datooga tend to reveal solidarity-related social identity by acquiring their language as a mother tongue. They also reveal prestige-related social identity by acquiring Sukuma language which is the prestigious lingua franca of the Itumba area in Igunga District. Moreover, the Datooga envisaged mechanisms to either isolate out-group members using their ethnonyms. Based on a list of 250 loanwords, this paper highlights the substitutive borrowing of kinship terms and additive borrowing of agricultural terms. The Sukuma loanwords penetrate into the Datooga lexicon.

KEY WORDS: language contact, lexical borrowing, Nilotic Datooga, Sukuma Bantu, Tanzania

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapion of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Introduction¹

The Datooga pastoral community of Tanzania occupy a large area of central and northern Tanzania. Rottland divided the Datooga into the western dialects (Bianjida, Buradiga and Rotigenga) and eastern dialects (Bajuta, Barbaiga, Gisamjanga and Isimijega) (ROTTLAND 1983:216). Each of the two groups comes into contact with different ethnic groups in Tanzania. The western dialects are collectively called Taturu by non-Datooga communities (MHAJIDA 2019:173) and the name Taturu appears in the *Atlas of the Languages of Tanzania* (LOT² 2009:2). The non-Datooga people refer to the eastern communities as Mang'ati, but particularly the speakers of the Barbaiga dialect (KILMA 1970; MHAJIDA 2019). Thus, the intent of this article is to look at the outcome of contact between Bantu speaking communities and Datooga dialects in Mara, Singida and Tabora regions of Tanzania.

The outcome of language contact is reciprocal in that speakers of both languages which come into contact tend to exchange linguistic materials, primarily loanwords and sound systems, in both directions, i.e. donor community to recipient society and the vice versa is also true. This is confirmed by research in which larger communities surround smaller ones, e.g. in north-eastern Tanzania (NURSE 2000). The reciprocal exchange of linguistic materials is also confirmed in other communities in various countries (cf. HASPELMATH – TADMOR 2009; MATRAS 2009; THOMASON – KAUFMAN 1988). However, studies reported by ITANDALA (1980) and BATIBO – ROTLAND (2001) are inadequate because they discuss the impact of the Nilotic Datooga to the Sukuma Bantu. This paper, therefore, addresses the reverse in that it accounts for the penetration of the Sukuma loanwords into Datooga lexicon.

The choice of the impact of Sukuma on Datooga is purposeful because the Datooga people have many neighbouring communities. As stated above, the speakers of the dialects of Datooga, who are scattered in central and northern Tanzania, come into contact with many other communities. Based on the map published by Kiessling, Mous and Nurse, eleven different communities live close to the Datooga in just the Tanzanian Rift Valley area:

¹ Part of the linguistic material reported in this article was collected under the auspices of the collaborative research between the University of Dar es Salaam (Tanzania) and University of Hamburg (Germany). Acknowledgement is hereby addressed to the Federal Government of Germany for funding the project called DALGOM (Datooga Lexico-Grammar of Motion in Dialectological Perspective).

² The abbreviation LOT is a shorthand for Language of Tanzania Project at the University of Dar es Salaam.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Alaagwa, Gorowaa, Hadza, Iraqw, Maasai, Nyamwezi, Nyiramba, Nyisanzu, Rangi, Sandawe, and Sukuma (KIESSLING – MOUS – NURSE 2008:187). Consequently, an exchange of linguistic materials between Datooga and Sukuma is given by BATIBO – ROTLAND (2001), Datooga and Iraqw is reported in MOUS–QORRO (2009), and influence of Datooga on Hadzabe by LUSEKELO (2013a, 2015). The reverse, i.e. impact of other languages into Datooga, is inadequately covered, as it appears in passing in MITCHELL (2015a) who highlighted the penetration of Kiswahili words into the lexicon of Datooga.

The contact between the speakers of Datooga and Sukuma in Tabora and Shinyanga areas of Tanzania probably began around the 1700s. Based on Itandal, they might had been in contact for about 300 year now because the Datooga “gradually moved southwards would appear that they were in the vicinity of the Ruvana by 1600, but they do not seem to have had any notable contact with the Babinza or the other Wasukuma until the 1700s” (ITANDALA 1980:2). Mhajida accepted the narration that “the first group of Datoga migrants headed west and settled around Nzega, southwest of the Serengeti” (MHAJIDA 2019:56). Therefore, the exchange of the lexical words discussed in this paper is assumed to have taken place for about 300 years now.

The impact of the Sukuma language on Datooga cannot be underestimated because of the differences in socio-cultural and economic activities. On the one hand, the Datooga had been full-time nomadic pastoralists (ITANDALA 1980). On the other hand, between the 1700s and 1800s, the Sukuma people practised solely agriculture (ITANDALA 1980). However, recently some Datooga people had taken up agriculture, though they still keep livestock (CEPPI – NIELSEN 2014; MHAJIDA 2019). Given this difference, exchange of linguistic materials between Datooga and Sukuma is necessary in order to fill a lexical gap in the target language. Contributors in the volume of lexical borrowing by HASPELMATH – TADMOR (2009) highlighted that most lexical gaps involve words or items alien or foreign to the target languages. In this regard, agricultural activities and words involving farming turn alien to Datooga hence could be borrowed.

The influence of Bantu on Datooga is not a new phenomenon. Ehret presented the linguistic evidence of the contact of the groups speaking Nilotic, Cushitic and Bantu languages in East Africa. For instance, *mageemoojig* ‘iron hoe’ [<*magembe* ‘iron hoes’] and *maargweeg* ‘millet beer’ [<*maalua* ‘local brew’] represent some Bantu loanwords which were incorporated in Datooga lexicon (EHRET 1971:162). Both words bear origin in the agricultural community.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapition of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Thus, investigation of the loanwords of Sukuma origin in the lexicon of Datooga turns to be a welcome contribution to make in order to understand the grammar of Datooga.

The linguistic evidence given in EHRET (1971) and BATIBO – ROTTLAND (2001) seem to suggest least impact of Sukuma to Datooga. However, Nurse highlighted correctly that in any situation of language contact, the number of speakers counts a lot (NURSE 2000). In fact, the speakers of majority languages tend to influence greatly the speakers of minority languages. The speakers of Sukuma outnumber, by far, the speakers of Datooga. Muzale and Rugemalira provide these statistics: Sukuma speakers in Tanzania: 5194553 and speakers of Datooga and Taturu: 161,449 (MUZALE – RUGEMALIRA 2008:79-80). In this regards, the Sukuma people are likely to impact greatly the Datooga.

The habitations of the Datooga people

The Datooga speaking people inhabit almost six regions of central and northern Tanzania today, namely Arusha (Karatu District), Manyara (Babati, Hanang and Mbulu Districts), Mara (Bunda and Serengeti Districts), Simiyu (Itilima, Maswa and Meatu Districts), Singida (Itigi, Iramba, Manyoni, and Mkalama Districts), and Tabora (Igunga District). The majority of the speakers are found in Hanang (KILMA 1970; ROTTLAND 1983; BLYSTAD 2000, 2005; LOT 2009), which was a district established purposefully for the settlement of the Datooga in the late 1980s (MHAJIDA 2019:179). Of these six regions, Simiyu and Tabora are primarily the hinterlands of Sukuma people as well (ITANDALA 1980; BATIBO – ROTTLAND 2001; MHAJIDA 2019).

The Datooga speaking people are divided into at least seven (language) dialects. Based on Rottland, now we can project the habitations of the dialects as follows: Bajuta, Gisamjanga and Isimijega dialects (Karatu, Mbulu and Mkalama Districts), Barbaiga dialect (Hanang and Mbulu Districts), Buradiga dialect (Igunga, Iramba, Itilima, Meatu, and Maswa Districts), Rotigenga dialect (Bunda and Serengeti Districts), and Bianjida dialect (Itigi and Manyoni Districts) (ROTTLAND 1983:216). The *Atlas of the Languages of Tanzania* provides estimates of the speakers of Datooga into two groups, namely Datooga: 138,777 and Taturu: 22,672 (LOT 2009:2). Table 1 provides the distribution of these speakers. These communities

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

are located in almost in the Rift Valley area of Tanzania, as provided by KIESSLING – MOUS – NURSE (2008).

Regions	Districts	Number of Speakers	Additional Information
Arusha	Karatu	8,806 (Datooga)	---
Manyara	Babati	6,869 (Datooga)	---
	Mbulu	7,639 (Datooga)	---
	Hanang	88,982 (Datooga)	plus 3,946 (Taturu)
Mara	Bunda	2,397 (Taturu)	---
	Serengeti	1,261 (Taturu)	---
Shinyanga	Meatu	2,492 (Taturu)	---
Singida	Itigi	2,199 (Datooga)	plus 5,252 (Taturu)
Tabora	Igunga	1,745 (Taturu)	---

Figure 1: *The distribution of the speakers of Datooga (LOT 2009:2; 2002 census)*

The dispersal of the Datooga hinterlands invites contact with several speaker communities. Kiessling, Mous and Nurse present fourteen speaker communities in the Rift Valley area of Tanzania: Alaagwa, Burunge, Datooga, Gorowaa, Hadzabe, Iraqw, Maasai, Mbugwe, Nyamwezi, Nyaturu, Nyiramba, Nyisanzu, Rangi, and Sukuma (KIESSLING – MOUS – NURSE 2008:188). In the margins of the Rift Valley area, the Datooga (Taturu) people come into contact with the Nyamwezi and Sukuma, who are genetically affiliated communities (ITANDALA 1980; MASELE 2001). Therefore, the focus of this paper is on the outcome of the Datooga–Sukuma contact.

The outcome of the contact between these communities is reported, though in passing. Ehret presents the Datooga loanwords in Nyaturu Bantu (1) and Bantu loans in Datooga grammar in (2). The attestation of the Datooga loanwords in Nyaturu and Bantu loans in Datooga is an evidence which substantiates the contact of these communities.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

(1) NYATURU WORDS	DATOOGA STEMS
<i>digida</i> ‘donkey’	<i>digeed</i> ‘donkey’
<i>lughumida</i> ‘hide finger ring’	<i>luugmeed</i> ‘hide finger ring’
<i>muli</i> ‘dark red cow’	<i>mur</i> ‘brown cow’
<i>senuku</i> ‘dark cow’	<i>saenaeku</i> ‘dark’
<i>siuli</i> ‘white cow’	<i>siiwoold</i> ‘eland’
(2) DATOOGA WORDS	BANTU STEMS
buulaaliid ‘bed’	laala ‘to sleep’
maadiingood ‘large wooden spoon’	matinko ‘wooden spoon’
maadaenjaend ‘dried meat’	tanda ‘to spread out’
mageemoojig ‘iron hoe’	magembe ‘iron hoe’
maargweeg ‘millet beer’	maalua ‘local brew’

(EHRET 1971:150, 162).

The outcome of the contact with other ethnic community languages (shorthand: ECLs) in the Datooga habitation is reported. For instance, in Hanang and Mbulu districts, the Datooga come into contact with the Iraqw and Hadzabe (KIESSLING – MOUS – NURSE 2008; LUSEKELO 2015). An exchange of linguistic materials between Iraqw and Datooga is reported by MOUS – QORRO (2009). The examples in (3) illustrate this point. Apart from Kiswahili, Mous and Qorro insisted, there are numerous Datooga borrowings in Iraqw in the area of cattle colours, cattle names, and cattle diseases (MOUS – QORRO 2009). This phenomenon was also reported by Batibo and Rottland for Datooga loans in Sukuma.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapition of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

(3) IRAQW WORDS

areer 'red (as cow colour)'*gidabá* 'because'*gwanda* 'ram'*iidígw* 'news'*muur* 'brownish'*nawéet* 'name for cow born on the road'

DATOOGA STEMS

areera 'red'*aba gidæeba* 'because'*lagweenda* 'ram'*iidiga* 'news'*muru* 'brown cow'*naweeda* 'road'

(MOUS – QORRO 2009:111-113).

The linguistic situation of Tanzania allows many languages to co-exist and the official languages to dominate ECLs. The impact of Kiswahili on Chingoni (MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015), Iraqw (MOUS – QORRO 2009), and Kisafwa (MSANJILA 2004) provide enough evidence to highlight the power of Kiswahili over ECLs. Baldi gives evidence to substantiate the impact of Arabic loans in Kiswahili which penetrated into East African languages, including Nilo-Saharan ones such as Acooli (Uganda), Dholuo (Kenya and Tanzania), Ma'di (Uganda and Sudan), and Pokoot (Kenya and Uganda) (BALDI 2011, 2012). In fact, Datooga is not unique in this regard. In line with a specialised study of avoidance register amongst the Datooga women, Mitchel lists some Kiswahili loans in Datooga (4)

(4) DATOOGA WORDS

bâanga 'machete'*bâl(à)bála* 'road'*bikipik* 'motorbike, scooter'*sàbúuni* 'soap'*sàmàháan* 'sorry'

KISWAHILI STEMS

paanga 'machete'*barabara* 'road'*pikipiki* 'motorbike, scooter'*sabuni* 'soap'*samahani* 'sorry'

(MITCHEL (2015a:208).

Now we return back to the Datooga–Sukuma contact situation in Tanzania. Based on Table 1 above, the contact between Datooga and Sukuma occurred in Shinyanga (now Simiyu) and Tabora regions as from the 1850s. It involved the Taturu, as they are called by non-Datooga

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapion of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

speaking communities (KILMA 1970; MHAJIDA 2019:56-57). The primary data presented and discussed in subsequent sections come primarily from Igunga District, which is the home of the Buradiga dialect in Wembere plains (BIHARIOVÁ 2016; MHAJIDA 2019).

The Taturu people (Buradiga and Bianjida dialects) had been in contact with the Sukuma people in other regions of Tanzania as well. Mhajida reported the tension between the Sukuma and Datooga people in Shinyanga, Singida and Tabora regions in the 1980s (MHAJIDA 2019). Therefore, other linguistic materials reported herein were gathered from native speakers of Bianjida and Rotigenga dialects of Datooga.

The collection of the linguistic material

Three main strategies to obtain data were involved in this research. The first strategy involved a survey of the state of multilingualism as evidenced by the school children in Datooga villages. The target villages are situated in Singida and Tabora regions of Tanzania. The survey questionnaires were administered by teachers to 50 students of five secondary schools (Table 2).

Region	District	Name of School	Respondents		Total
			Male	Female	
Singida	Itigi	Ipande	4	7	11
		Doroto	6	6	12
		Sanjaranda	12	10	22
Tabora	Igunga	Itumba	5	0	5
Total			27	23	50

Figure 2: Research sites: Secondary schools in Datooga villages (My Field Data, 2018)

The questionnaire intended to gather information about the language of the school and home environment. Tanzania permits Kiswahili and English as the official languages of schools. However, in rural schools the use of mother tongue in the school environment is reported by MSANJILA (2003). Therefore, the questionnaire intended to gather some information of language use in schools.

The questionnaire also intended to gather information about the language use in the villages. Students were asked to mention the languages predominantly used at home by siblings and

DOI: 10.2478/eas-2019-0010 © University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. All rights reserved.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

parents/guardians. These items of the questionnaire aimed to gather information about the dominant languages in the villages. Msanjila reported that even in villages which are prescribed to maintain the indigenous culture, the influence of superior languages such as Kiswahili cannot be ignored (MSANJILA 2004:170). Given the superiority of Sukuma in terms of number of speakers, investigation of the language use in Datooga villages was executed in Singida and Tabora.

The survey method was supplemented by the observation of language use in Chagana village. During fieldwork, the engagement with the local community was made possible mainly during the village gatherings called gerigwegira in Datooga and involvement in the day-to-day village activities in Chagana. Based on Msanjila, this kind of observation in the home environment helps to obtain the clear picture of language use in villages (MSANJILA 2004).

The second strategy concerned a word list (of 250 entries) which was supplied to native speakers of the Datooga dialects (Table 3). In order to obtain a good list of loanwords, Haspelmath and Tadmor envisaged the best strategy of semantic fields (HASPELMATH–TADMOR 2009). Since the Sukuma were full-time agriculturalists and the Datooga are nomadic pastoralists, the lexical entries of the word list involved such semantic fields as agriculture (e.g. potatoes, maize, rice, farm, millet, etc.) and food and drinks and household utensils (beans, cooked rice, cup, chair, local brew, plate etc.). Since these are culture-oriented words (THOMASON – KAUFMAN 1988; MATRAS 2009), the assumption here is that additive borrowing from Sukuma to Datooga will manifest in these cultural lexical entries. The results are indeed revealing.

Dialect	Region	District	Ward	Village	Population	Informants
Rotigeenga	Mara	Bunda	Hunyari	Maliwanda	14,569	2
Bianjida	Singida	Itigi	Sanjaranda	Sanjaranda	8,828	2
Buradiga	Tabora	Igunga	Itumba	Chagana	20,464	4

Figure 3: Research sites in the Datooga villages in Tanzania (My Field Data 2018).

In the studies of lexical borrowing in Africa (e.g. MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015; MATIKI 2016; LUSEKELO 2017a), these semantic fields have been found to contain most loans: the

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

modern world (motorcar, bicycle, school, nurse, train etc.), the house (door, roof, window, bed, chair etc.), the cognition (write, read, book, notebook, teacher, office etc.). These words were included in the list in order to figure out loans in Datooga. In fact, the Sukuma and Datooga had had different cultures, therefore, an exchange of cultural matters related to housing and households is expected (ITANDALA 1980).

Another target of loanwords involved the semantic fields of kinship terms (sibling, father, mother, wife, sister etc.) and the physical landforms (hills, mountains, rivers, ponds, valleys, lakes etc.). Thomason with Kaufman, and Matras highlighted correctly that kinship terms and lexical entries for the physical world are not borrowed easily because they are not cultural terms (THOMASON – KAUFMAN 1988; MATRAS 2009). When borrowing of these terms occurs, usually substitutive borrowing emerges, as had been the case of Chingoni (MAPUNDA–ROSENDAL 2015) and Hadzabe and Maasai (LUSEKELO 2017b). The results in Datooga do reveal.

The lexical entries presented in this paper were collected from three villages. At a single village and one time, at least two informants were engaged in the elicitation of the lexical entries (Table 3). In Sanjaranda Ward, many of the words come from one person because the other informant provided few entries. In Itumba area, almost four informants were engaged because much time was spent in the village.

The locations and demographics of the research sites are offered in Table 2 (URT³ 2013). Two of these research sites are located in rural areas, while one is at least close to town centre. Sanjaranda Ward is located some 7 kilometres west of Itigi Small Township, which had been a hinterland of the Datooga (MHAJIDA 2019:106). Notice also that less Bianjida is spoken in this originally Datooga village because the Gogo, Nyaturu and Sukuma occupied the village (MHAJIDA 2019:106, 2015). During fieldwork, it was found that the village is predominated by Nyaturu speakers and people of Datooga descent are multilingual in Nyaturu, Kiswahili and less Bianjida dialect.

Another village is called Maliwanda and it is located in Hunyari Ward. The Datooga people in this village were expelled out of the Serengeti, either by the Maasai since the 1850s and/or by the colonial government project which established the Serengeti National Park in 1951 (MHAJIDA 2019:14-16). Consequently, they settled in the villages along the fringes of the Serengeti National Park. Maliwanda is a typical rural village located about 18 kilometres

³ This is a shorthand for **United Republic of Tanzania**.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

north of the capital of the Bunda District. The village is predominantly occupied by Sukuma and Ikizu speakers. Consequently, Rotigenga speakers are multilingual in Sukuma, Ikizu and Datooga.

The main research site is Chagana village which is situated some 37 kilometres south of the capital of Igunga District. Generally, the village is located in the Wembere Plains, which Mhajida suggested to be the main hinterland of the Datooga in Singida and Tabora regions (MHAJIDA 2019:38). Bihariová, as well as field encounters, revealed that Chagana is a typical Datooga village (BIHARIOVÁ 2016:95). Sukuma and Nyiramba are other important languages spoken in the village. The Buradiga speakers speak Sukuma as well.

The third strategy involved the collection of data from secondary sources. As far as Datooga is concerned, two important resources with linguistic materials were consulted as sources of secondary data. The kinship terms in Datooga, mainly the Gisamjanga and Barbaiga dialects were collected and presented by Mitchell based on data collected in Mbulu District (MITCHELL 2015b, 2017). Klima and Blastad highlighted that the Gisamjanga and Barbaiga communities inhabit primarily this area (KLIMA 1970; BLASTAD 2000, 2005). Since the data in her study would comprise kinship terms as attested amongst the Gisamjanga and Barbaiga in Yaeda valley and Haydom areas of Mbulu District, the comparison with the data collected from Buradiga, Bianjida and Rotigenga dialects was carried out.

The secondary data came also from narrative texts of the Gisamjanga variety of Datooga collected by Paul Berger in between 1935 and 1936, which have been converted into electronic format by Kiesslering (cf. KIESSLING 2001). Moreover, Rottland collected the lexicon of Datooga and compiled a manuscript of the Datooga-English and English-Datooga dictionary (cf. BATIBO – ROTTLAND 2001). Both researchers provide very good sources of the data for the current paper.

The state of multilingualism in Datooga villages

Ethnolinguistic vitality theory as the base of the current analysis

The case of multilingualism in this paper is approached using the ethnolinguistic vitality theory, which is rooted within the social identity theory (LIUA – GIJSENA – TSAIB 2013:427). The main assumption is that in-group members will maintain some group traits which recognise them as in-groups. Thus, the Datooga children may maintain some traits, in

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

our case language-oriented features, which will eventually help to isolate the Sukuma. Likewise, the Sukuma will regard themselves as a group different from the Datooga.

The ethnolinguistic vitality theory assumes that there is an asymmetric linguistic relationship between the minority and majority speaker groups in a given area. Batibo offers a Tanzanian scenario in which Kiswahili is the group of the majority and a prestigious language while Sukuma is a minority group (BATIBO 2015:83). Msanjila and Ehala discussed the utilisation of the ethnolinguistic vitality theory to determine some intergroup relations (MSANJILA 2004; EHALA 2010). The theory assumes that the sustainability of a small language does not necessarily depend on the size of the community but also the sustainability depends on the temperament and attitudes of the speaker community.

Karan highlighted important points related to ethnolinguistic vitality theory. The social identity motivates people's desire to be identified with a group or individual in three strands: (i) prestige-related social identity motivations involve people who choose to use or acquire a language variety in order to associate themselves with a prestige group, which normally uses that language variety;

(ii) solidarity-related social identity motivations concern people who choose to use or acquire a language variety in order to create and/or maintain a solidarity bond with an individual, group, culture or subculture;

and (iii) distance-related social identity motivations happens when people choose to use or acquire a language variety in order to create or maintain a distance between themselves and an individual, group, culture or subculture (KARAN 2011:141).

Nonetheless, the use of the theory does not offer straightforward answers to sociolinguistic questions of language use. This happens because attitudes of people might differ due to the status they maintain at a given point in time. For instance, Ehala highlighted that there are cases in which "both the minority and majority agree that the majority vitality is higher, but the minority group perceives the vitality difference between groups to be less than the majority does." Therefore, the attitude differs from one group to the other. In addition, there are cases in which "the minority perceives the vitality difference between its own group and the dominant outgroup to be larger than perceived by the dominant majority" (EHALA (2010:205).

Given this backdrop, the ethnolinguistic vitality theory fits to examine language use in Tanzania because the situation of language use in rural areas of Tanzania reveals the presence of Kiswahili, the national language and ECLs such as Alaagwa, Datooga, Hadzabe, Iraqw, Kisafwa, Nyamwezi, Sukuma etc. We can situate the phenomenon using Msanjila and Ström

DOI: 10.2478/eas-2019-0010 © University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. All rights reserved.

who reported on the language uses in various domains in rural areas of Ituha (Mbeya Region) and Rufiji District (Coast Region) in Tanzania, respectively (MSANJILA 2004; STRÖM 2009).

In Rufiji District bilingualism is commonplace because both Kiswahili and Ndengeleko co-exist, though with Kiswahili enjoying being a privileged official language. Ström concludes that Kiswahili impacted Ndengeleko, which had co-existed in this area for some 200 years. Today, “there is no reason to believe that they couldn’t do so in the future. But the situation in favor of Kiswahili has changed dramatically since independence in the 1960s, leaving hardly any space for L1” (STRÖM 2009:241).

Msanjila reported that in the village of Ituha, language use reveals presence of Kisafwa and Kiswahili, hence inhabitants of Ituha village are bilingual. However, language use varies between people of different age. The grandparents and middle-aged parents use predominantly Kisafwa when they interact amongst themselves but they use both Kisafwa and Kiswahili when they interact with young people. The opposite is true because more young people dominantly use Kiswahili at home than middle-aged parents and grandparents (MSANJILA 2004:165).

The situation in Mbeya and Coast Regions exhibit the state of bilingualism due to language contact. It is known that the outcome of the contact between speakers of different languages is development of bilingual children (BAKER 1996; MATRAS 2009). The situation in Datooga villages, however, is different from that of Mbeya and Coast Regions. In the Rift Valley area of Tanzania, a convergence of many ECLs is apparently attested. Findings in next section will display that what happens to the Datooga children in rural areas of Tanzania is that they acquire two languages in the neighbourhood and later learn Kiswahili. At first, they become bilingual in either Datooga and Sukuma or Datooga and Iraqw or Datooga and Nyaturu, depending on their area of residence. Then they learn Kiswahili either in school or meeting centres.

It is obvious now that apart from the ECLs in the neighbourhood of the Datooga villages, Kiswahili comes to play as well. This phenomenon is reported in almost all studies of language contact and lexical borrowing in Tanzania (cf. LUSEKELO 2016; MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015; MOUS – QORRO 2009, among others). Also, code-switching between ECLs and Kiswahili is reported in rural areas of Tanzania, e.g. Ngoni and Kiswahili in Ruvuma Region (ROSENDAL – MAPUNDA 2017) and Pare and Kiswahili in Kilimanjaro Region (SEBONDE 2012). In these studies, the domination of Kiswahili is observed in areas

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

of modern world, agriculture, housing, cognition etc. in fact, Datooga is not unique in this regard (cf. MITCHELL 2015a).

Multilingualism in Datooga villages in north-western Tanzania

Observations at Itumba ward found that the Datooga identify themselves as a unitary group with distinct socio-cultural settings with the Sukuma of Igunga. Within the ethnolinguistic vitality theory, the Datooga people insist to maintain their ethnic identity as a group. The historian Mhajida and anthropologist Bihariová confirm the sole identity of the Datooga (MHAJIDA 2019; BIHARIOVÁ 2016).

This identity happens amidst the presence of several ethnic groups in the area. As highlighted in the foregoing discussion, Kiessling, Mous and Nurse presented correctly that the Rift Valley area of Tanzania is a zone of convergence of all language families of Africa. Specifically, they exhibited the presence of Sukuma and Nyamwezi in the neighbourhood of the Datooga (KIESSLING – MOUS – NURSE 2008). Other researchers found that in Igunga District, the Datooga live adjacent to Sukuma and Nyiramba (BIHARIOVÁ 2015, 2016; MHAJIDA 2019).

The presence of many languages in a small area is further confirmed by estimates by Lot who shows that the Datooga communities live adjacent to Gogo and Nyaturu (Singida Region), Ikizu (Mara Region), and Nyamwezi and Sukuma (Tabora Region) (Table 4).

Region	District	Ward	L ₁	L ₂	L ₃	L ₄
Mara	Bunda	Hunyari	Ikizu	Sukuma	Rotigenga	Kiswahili
Singida	Itigi	Sanjaranda	Nyaturu	Gogo	Bianjida	Kiswahili
Tabora	Igunga	Itumba	Sukuma	Nyamwezi	Buradiga	Kiswahili

Figure 4: Languages spoken in the selected research sites (LOT 2009).

The state of multilingualism in Datooga villages is evident in the areas mentioned within the *Atlas of the Languages of Tanzania* (LOT 2009). Almost a four-tier of languages is

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

apparently revealed in each administrative ward (Table 4). For instance, the atlas shows that Sukuma and Nyamwezi are dominantly first languages at Itumba ward. Then Kiswahili turns to be the fourth language in the area.

An important observation from the state of multilingualism above is that Datooga turns to be the first language at Itumba ward in almost all Datooga families. Both parents and children communicate in Datooga within Chagana village. The lingua franca of the area is typically Sukuma rather than Kiswahili. However, Kiswahili is also used in the communication with people who neither speak Sukuma nor Datooga. Irrespective of the presence of Kiswahili and Sukuma, Datooga people are very proud of the culture and their language and pass it very proudly to young generations. This tendency conforms the Karan's type of social identity called solidarity-related social identity motivations in which the Datooga people choose to acquire their language for identifications to the in-group members (KARAN 2011).

The mastery of Sukuma amongst both young, middle-aged and aged persons is a sign of the importance of the language which is used as a lingua franca in the area. This is in line with Karan's state of prestige-related social identity motivations in which the Datooga people choose to acquire Sukuma in order to associate themselves with a prestige group of the Wasukuma (KARAN 2011).

With regard to multilingualism of school children, the four-tier of language in the *Atlas of the Languages of Tanzania* was not fully confirmed by investigations in the field (LOT 2009). In fact, a three-tier phenomenon appeared to be commonplace (Table 5). This survey was conducted in secondary schools to reveal the pattern of language use by students. The obvious information is that most children are bilingual in Datooga dialect and Nyaturu, Sukuma, Gogo or Iraqw. Kiswahili is the third language commanded by secondary school pupils. Table 4 gives the summary.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapition of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Region	District	Schools	L ₁	L ₂	L ₃
Singida	Itigi	Doroto	Taturu	Gogo	Kiswahili
		Ipande	Taturu	Gogo	Kiswahili
		Sanjaranda	Taturu	Nyaturu	Kiswahili
Tabora	Igunga	Itumba	Taturu	Sukuma	Kiswahili

Figure 5: Multilingualism of secondary school pupils in Datooga villages (My Field Data 2018).

Within the realm of ethnolinguistic vitality theory, all the children identified Taturu (Datooga) as their mother tongue. This means that they assign solidarity to their ethnic identity. Nonetheless, most of the students acquired Sukuma, Gogo or Nyaturu as another language. Generally, this means that Gogo, Nyaturu and Sukuma remain important languages in the area and the Datooga wish to associate with this prestigious language.

Further evidence come from ethnographic encounters in Datooga villages. It is apparently true that Datooga speakers are multilingual, speaking their mother tongue and another language. In Itumba, for instance, most Datooga speakers command fully Sukuma, which is the main language of communication in the area. Nonetheless, they have linguistic mechanisms to identify out-groups. The ethnonyms are one of the mechanisms. Table 6 presents names of other ethnic groups as are referred to by the Datooga.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Ethnic groups	Bianjira	Buradiga	Rotigenga
Hadzabe	matindiga	hagiriiga	hagiriiga
Maasai	rubageigi	rabegiiga	rabeeghiigha
Nyamwezi	mkonongojeega	matakamajiiga	matakama
Nyaturu	mainetika	maineta	maineeta
Sukuma	masukumaa	masukumajeega	galiiti
Iraqw	mamburu	qayiwuuriga	---
Nyiramba	raimbera	ireimbira	raembira
Ikizu	---	---	gjiirigeu

Figure 6: Names of neighbouring ethnic groups in the research sites (*My Field Data 2018*).

Some observations could be made based on data in Table 6. The first observation is that the contact situation is apparently attested only for the Ikizu people who are identified by the Rotigenga speakers in Mara Region. Since this is several kilometres away, the Bianjida and Buradiga could not establish a name for the Ikizu.

The second observation concerns some of these ethnonyms which bear connotations. For instance, the name Rabeghiigha means enemy, fighter or warrior, which is similar to the Maasai label for the Datooga, i.e. Mang'ati 'enemy' (BLYSTAD 2005; BIHARIOVÁ 2016). Mhajida assigns the label Mangati/Mang'ati to being the real enemy of the Maasai. However, it became obvious that the Datooga appear to have coined a name with similar connotations for the Maasai (MHAJIDA 2019:63).

Similar connotative ethnonyms manifest for the Hadzabe. In the field, it was observed that the Datooga coined the name Hagiriiga which means a hunter or a person in the wilderness (< *tarebiita* = wilderness, forest). The Nilotic Maasai coined the name Tindiga for the Hadzabe whose connotation is poor person (people without cattle), who dwell in water sources.

The third observation concerns other names of the ethnic groups. Their names emanate from their area of residence, e.g. Matakama has reference to the southerners. Also, the names Raembira and Mainetika have reference to sections of the ethnic groups Nyiramba and

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapitton of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Nyaturu respectively. These are the neighbours of the Datooga in Tanzania who are identified as out-group members to Datooga.

The presence of Kiswahili in the village centres cannot be ruled out. Our ethnographic observations at Sanjaranda in Itigi District and Itumba in Igunga District revealed that most inhabitants of these villages converse in Kiswahili apart from their mother tongues. This is apparently common because these villages are composed of people from different ethnic groups. However, the mastery of Kiswahili is limited. Bihariová found that only 5 % of the Buradiga Datooga speak Kiswahili (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:32).

Nonetheless, the participation of the Datooga of Singida and Tabora in school curriculum is still low. Bihariová found that “Datoga rarely sent children to schools and were sceptical of education from the beginning.” The impact of education system in Tanzania, which supports the promotion of Kiswahili, has yet impacted the Datooga. Thus, Sukuma still remains the lingua franca in Wembere plains (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:32).

The penetration of the Sukuma loanwords into Datooga lexicon

Incorporation of kinship terms: A case of substitutive borrowing

Two issues are worth mentioning in this introductory note. The first issue is the fact that kinship terms are treated as being pervasive in each language and they formulate a relatively stable category of the lexicon (BORGES 2013). Kinship terms rank very low on the scale of borrowability according to semantic domain (HASPELMATH – TADMOR 2009). However, Borges found that Suriname had demonstrated “kinship terms have undergone, and continue to undergo, changes in both form and meaning.” This is the outcome of the contact situation in which “Sranan and Dutch have both contributed material to the shared structure of kinship terms in the Surinamese linguistic area” (BORGES (2013:24).

Haspelmath argues correctly that borrowing of the kinship terms would require prolonged contact between languages to the extent that the native lexicon of the target languages get replaced by terms from the donor language hence substitutive borrowing (HASPELMATH 2009). This is the case of Suriname which had been in contact with Sranan and Dutch for more than two hundred years (BORGES 2013:5).

Itandala suggests that earlier contacts between the Datooga and Sukuma occurred some three hundred years ago (ITANDALA 1980). Also, the historical sources have shown that the intense contact of the Datooga and Sukuma occurred from the 1850s (MHAJIDA 2019:56-

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

58). Thus, these communities had been in profound contact for more than one hundred and fifty years now. Probably such a long period of time is necessary to influence exchange of kinship terms between these communities.

The second issue concerns language shift as related to kinship terms. Batibo highlighted the situation in which speakers of minority language tend to shift to the dominant language (BATIBO 2005). In the same vein, Batibo argues correctly that when words of important domains are being replaced by terms from areally dominant language that becomes a case of language shift (BATIBO 2005). Borges highlights that semantic shift of the kinship terms occurs sometimes, as had been the case of the Suriname language (BORGES 2013).

Now this scenario has implications to Datooga–Sukuma contact situation. Batibo provides that “the only major areally dominant language is Kisukuma, which is spoken in the northern part of the country by more than 12.5% of the population” (BATIBO 2005:83). This entails that Datooga becomes a minority language. However, we demonstrated in section 4 that the Datooga maintains their culture and language and they are proudly passing the language and culture to the new generation. Nonetheless, the penetration of Sukuma kinship terms into the lexicon of Datooga is an important subject matter of discussion.

The *Taturu*, the northern dialects of the Datooga, incorporated some kinship terms from Bantu languages, mainly *Nyaturu*, *Sukuma* and *Nyamwezi*. We offer data in Table 7 (for *Buradiga* and *Rotigenga*) and then discuss this as a case of substitutive borrowing leading to language shift. The benchmark kinship terms of *Barbayiga* dialect come from Mitchel (2015b).

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Kinship	Buradiga	Rotigenga	Barbayiga
father's father	ghembagweenda	ghuuku	qéambábàabà
father's mother	qambaabwa	ukuuku	qámabàaba
father's sister	seengi	qambwaabwa	qámabàabà
father's sister's son	jefta seengi	ribiga iija	òorjéedá bwàabà
mother's brother	mami	mwamwáy	máamày
mother's father	qemba qeamata	ghuuku	qéambíiyá
sister's child	mami	jefta ee balegii	jééptá húda
husband's brother	maramunajeenda	mulamu	síiyéeda
wife's sister	ghényáwa	mulamu	qényáwa
son-in-law	mkwilima, gigwejucheenda	mkwelima jendeeyu, ngweenga	síiyéedá húda
daughter-in-law	ng'wiinga jendenyu	ngweenga jeendeyu	gátmóodá bálêanda
brother's wife	bwamuku	mulamwa jendeyu	gátmòoda
parent of son-in-law	qeera ghwejuu	mkwelima jendeyu	bàadii

Figure 7: Loanwords for kinship terms of Datooga (My Field Data 2018).

Two general observations are worth mentioning here. The first general observation to make out of the data in Table 7 concerns the sources of the kinship terms. Since the Barbayiga remains the most dominant and more conservative dialect (ROTTLAND 1983), we provide kinship terms from Mitchell, who collected data amongst the Barbaiga and Gisamjanga communities in Mbulu District of Tanzania (MITCHELL 2015b, 2017). This is the benchmark for the northern dialects of Datooga.

Another general observation concerns similarities between Nyamwezi, Nyaturu, Nyiramba and Sukuma kinship terms. As shown in Table 8, similar kinship terms are pervasive across Bantu speaking communities in Africa (cf. KUPER 1979; PRINSLOO 2014). Thus, on convenient grounds, we use the Sukuma kinship terms. These loanwords are in a series of four kin terms as discussed below.

First, the term *ghuuku* 'father's father' and *ukuuku* 'father's mother' in Rotigenga differ significantly from the Buradiga and Barbaiga kin term. These are loanwords from Sukuma because the Bantu languages Sepedi, Setswana and Isizulu, which are inhabit areas located

thousands of kilometres from Sukumaland, make use of the kinship terms *gogo* ‘grandmother’ and *koko* ‘grandfather’ (KUPER 1979:375).

Second, another common Sukuma term is *seengi* ‘father’s sister, aunt’ which is attested in Buradiga and Rotigenga. The Barbaiga uses the term *qámábàbà* ‘father’s sister’. Similarly, the term *mami* ‘uncle, mother’s brother’ is robust in Buradiga. The benchmark dialect has the kin term *máamày* ‘uncle’. In southern Bantu languages, the term *malume* or *umaluma* ‘mother’s brother’ is common (KUPER 1979:374; PRINSLOO 2014:275-279). Moreover, the expression *jefta seengi* ‘aunt’s children’ is commonplace in Igunga District of Tanzania.

Third, it was observed that the Bantu terms *malamujeenda* and *mulamu* ‘wife’s /husband’s brother’ penetrated into the lexicon of the Buradiga and Rotigenga. The benchmark dialect (Barbaiga) adopted the terms *síyéeda* ‘husband’s brother’ and *qényáwa* ‘wife’s sister’. The term *malamu* ‘wife’s /husband’s brother’ is used in many Bantu languages.

Last, the kin term for son-in-law or daughter-in-law is borrowed as *mkwelima* in Taturu dialect. In Kiswahili, the term *mkwe* ‘son-in-law’ is used. In Shona, the kinship terms *mukuwasha* or *mukwambo* ‘son-in-law’ and *murora* ‘daughter-in-law’ are commonplace (MASHIRI 2004). The kinship term *síyéedá húda* ‘son-in-law’ is attested in Barbaiga. Similarly, the Bantu loan *ngweenga* ‘daughter-in-law’ replaces *gátmóodá báléanda* ‘daughter-in-law’ which is attested in Barbaiga.

Now we return to issues related to language shift based on the cases of substitutive borrowing discussed above. These series of four loans cannot support language shift rather semantic shift as discussed by BORGES (2013). Batibo states that “the nationally dominant and the major areally dominant languages are the most devastating in causing language shift and death because of their power, charm and extent. They can easily penetrate into the primary domains” (BATIBO 2005:23). This phenomenon is not realised in Igunga District because the Datooga still maintain their language and culture in Wembere plains. The penetration of foreign words is not detrimental to the language. However, Nyaturu had already engulfed Bianjida because language use in Sanjaranda village is purely dominated by Nyaturu rather than Datooga.

The culture of the Bianjida speakers changed. For instance, based on data collected from Sanjaranda village, Ceppi and Nielsen reported that “the Wataturu have taken up agriculture the past 25 years, and cultivate intercropped maize, beans and pumpkin (90% of the respondents), with sunflower (50% of the respondents) and sorghum (33% of the respondents) as monoculture” (CEPPI – NIELSEN 2014:279). This means that the penetration of agriculture and new culture engulfed the community. The language shift is

apparently observed in the area, as discussed in previous section. Specifically, the school children speak Nyaturu or Gogo in Itigi area (cf. MHAJIDA 2019).

The case in Wembere plain is different. The Buradiga maintain their culture and full-time pastoralism. Thus, in the case of the Datooga dialect spoken in Igunga District of Tanzania, language shift has not occurred. Some of the kinship terms were borrowed from Sukuma/Nyamwezi which is the areally dominant language in Tabora. However, the children acquire Sukuma/Nyamwezi for communication purposes but they still maintain their culture and language (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:33).

As far as kinship terms are concerned, further analysis of the state of multilingualism can be provided based on marked bilingualism model. In this model, we can view substitutive borrowing within the process-based perspective (BATIBO 2005:89). Language shift can only take place when there is a state of bilingualism. In fact, all around Chagana and Sanjaranda villages, speakers of Datooga are bilingual as they speak Sukuma and/or Nyaturu. In fact, Sukuma and Nyaturu are predominant languages. However, the shift occurred in Sanjaranda but not in Chagana.

Batibo highlighted that in order for the speakers of one language to be attracted to another, there must be significant differences of prestige and status between the two languages (BATIBO 2005:89). As stated above both Sukuma in Igunga and Nyaturu in Itigi are prestigious and dominant languages. However, the shift is felt in Itigi were the Datooga have taken up farming and lost most of their cattle (MHAJIDA 2019). In Chagana, farming is practised by a few Datooga people but pastoralism is maintained fully (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:34). As a result, language shift has not occurred.

Furthermore, Batibo highlights that the rate of language shift depends to a large degree on the amount of pressure from the dominant language on the one hand, and the degree of resistance from the minority language on the other (BATIBO 2005:89). With regard to the Datooga community at large, this is not fully achieved because the Datooga people cling to their culture. Datooga is still maintained in their homesteads in Tabora.

Adaptation of crops and farming practices: The case of additive borrowing

The Datooga of Mara, Singida and Tabora have taken up agriculture, though with variations. In both Maliwanda and Sanjaranda villages, the Datooga have become sedentary agro-pastoralists (CEPPI – NIELSEN 2014; MHAJIDA 2019). In Wembere plains, farming is

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

limited while pastoralism is robust (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:34). This has implications to the foreign terms which fill a gap because traditionally the Datooga were full-time pastoralists.

Now the discussion hereunder is guided by additive borrowing. This is examined using a single semantic field of agriculture and vegetation suggested in contemporary studies (cf. HASPELMATH 2009; MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015; MATIKI 2016). However, the main attention is paid to the agriculture because farming is a new activity amongst the Datooga speakers.

Most of the New World crops came from Americas (BLENCH 2006) and India (Asia) (BOSTOEN 2007). The names of these crops spread through Tanzanian languages through Kiswahili (LUSEKELO 2016). Baldi discusses penetration of other Arabic words into East African languages, including the Nilo-Saharan language of Dholuo (spoken in Tanzania and Kenya) (BALDI 2011, 2012).

From the field, we gathered data related to crops. Findings in the Datooga dialects revealed the penetration of Sukuma/Nyaturu names into Datooga. This is a very important observation because the Sukuma and Nyaturu people are agro-pastoralists. Kiswahili terms are also attested in the data. Table 8 gives an inventory of the names of crops amongst the Waturu (the northern Datooga).

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Word	Bianjira	Buradiga	Rotigeenga
Sukuma/Nyaturu loans			
maize	mambukira	mambugiira	membugiira
millet	bwoga	bwoga	bwoga mwanang'
red millet	bwogariri	bwogariri	bwogariri
finger millet	bwoga	bwoga	mahimbiga
bulrush millet	mbiriigi	gibiriiga	mahimbiiga
potatoes	kandoljeega	gasisa	gasiisa
sugarcane	mshariijanda	maguba	maguuwa
peanut	karangaa	gisigisika	gàranga
beans	maharaje	murumburi	mahàragi
rice	bwoginyega	mchele, ghughudiga	mcheli
rice farm	minyandi booginyegi	rabasijeenda, rabasuuka	mariminyenda mchele
Swahili loans			
cassava	mihog	mihog	mwaliwa
pepper	pirpíl	geetangw'ani	gabwalara
pawpaw	papai	paipai	mapápàyí
pineapple	mananaas	nanasi	nanasi
mangoes	nyembe	munyembe	minyembi
tomatoes	manyanya	shebudiga	uchanyanya

Figure 8: Names of crops in Datooga dialects⁴ (My Field Data 2018).

⁴ Based on Table 8 above, loans related to the names of crops in Datooga penetrated through Kiswahili, as it is the case in other languages in East Africa (BALDI 2011, 2012; LUSEKELO 2016). Two loans bear scientific names: *mananasi* [<Greek: *ananas*] 'pineapple' and *mapápàyí* [<Spanish: *papaya*] 'pawpaw'.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

The additive loanwords in Table 8 split twice: some come from Sukuma/Nyaturu, while others come from Kiswahili. The first set involves most crops grown in Singida and Tabora. For example, the Wembere plains are well-known for rice and maize cultivation (MHAJIDA 2019:169). Four observations can be made from the first dataset.

First and foremost, the word *bwoga* has reference to all cereal crops of millet and rice across Datooga dialects. The Datooga people labelled all cereals as *bwoga*, which is one of the testimonies that they have taken up farming recently. A special case is for the cereal maize which is labelled *mambugiira* across dialects.

Secondly, the Rotigenga speakers have borrowed the word *mahimbiga* for finger and bulrush millet. The word appears to have come from mahemba, an Ikizu (Bantu) word for maize. Lusekelo found that *-hemba/-pemba* ‘maize’ is common for Bantu languages around Lake Victoria and Mount Kilimanjaro areas, while the rest of the dialects adopted *bwogariri* for finger millet (LUSEKELO 2016).

Thirdly, exchange of crop-related materials is attested for the word *-ndolo* (*kandoljeega*) ‘potatoes’. With regard to foreign tubers, this name is attested across Bantu languages (BOSTOEN 2007; LUSEKELO 2016:54). It is spread across African languages south of the Sahara desert (BLENCH 2006). For example, in central Tanzania, *-ndolo* ‘potatoes’ is used by the Gogo speakers.

Furthermore, Sukuma and Nyaturu names manifest in Rotigenga and Bianjida. For instance, the word *maguuwa* ‘sugarcane’ comes from Bantu. Likewise, the word *mwaliwa* ‘cassava’ is used by the Rotigenga speakers. Lusekelo found the word *malibu* ‘cassava’ across Lake Victoria Bantu. Therefore, the speakers of northern Datooga dialects borrowed the word from Bantu speakers (LUSEKELO 2016).

Looking at the morphology of these loans, we would conclude that these ones had undergone nativisation: *mahimbiga* ‘finger/bulrush millet’ and *kandoljeega* ‘potatoes’. These words bear the Datooga element *-ga*, which was assumed to be marking number (plural) (CREIDER – ROTTLAND 1997:78) or some specificity within the noun (KIESSLING 2001:351). Thus, since the element *-ga* manifested in the loanwords, then this substantiates that the words have become Datooga now.

Kiswahili words appear to be penetrating into Datooga recently. Technically, their incorporation does not show full-picture. The words *mihog* ‘cassava’ [from Kiswahili: *mihogo*] and *pirpīl* ‘pepper’ [from Kiswahili: *pilipili*] had been nativised by the deletion of

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

the final vowel. Creider with Rottland, and Kiessling reported the presence of the short final vowel in Datooga. Therefore, the Kiswahili loanwords obtain this sound as well (CREIDER – ROTTLAND 1997:74; KIESSLING 2001:350).

The other names also had been nativised partially. This is confirmed, for instance, by *nanasi* ‘pineapple’ [from Kiswahili: *nanasi*] and *uchanyanya* ‘tomatoes’ [from Kiswahili: *nyanya*]. The latter example, however, appear to have adopted the name from the Ikizu people who calls *uchanyanya* ‘tomatoes’. The Kiswahili words, therefore, penetrated through Ikizu into Datooga dialect.

Now that we know most loans in the western Datooga dialects come from Sukuma, we would like to examine the borrowed elements in the semantic field of the modern world, as suggested by HASPELMATH – TADMOR (2009). Studies in Tanzania revealed that the languages borrow mainly from Kiswahili (cf. LUSEKELO 2017b; MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015; MOUS – QORRO 2009).

Integration of terms for modern world: Another case of additive borrowing

With regard to the semantic field of modern world, a number of foreign words had been elicited across western Datooga dialects. Some variations are provided in Table 9. Notice also that some other worlds involve modern houses, modern clothing, cognition and modern food and drinks.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Words	Bianjira	Buradiga	Rotigenga	Kiswahili
motorcar	mutukjanda	mutuk	motoka	motokaa, gari
brick	matofalijanda	matafarajiiga	tofali	tofali
road	balbaljanda	balabala	ipàlàpàla	barabara
market	sokoo	munati	muteela	soko
floor market	mnadijanda	munati	muteela	mnada
motorcycle	pikpik	pikpik	pikpik	pikipiki
iron sheet	baati	mabatajeega	ipaati	bati
bucket	ndoojanda	ndobujanda	ndobu	ndoo
coat	kotijanda	gwanda	ikoti	koti
shirt	gwandijanda	gwandajenda	ishaati	shati
school	shule	shulejeega	shuli	shule
money	pesajanda	dabita, lapiya	helajiiga	pesa, hela
pupil	jepta shule	jefta shule	---	mwanafunzi
tin	debjaanda	debejeega	itepi	debe
cup	kikombejande	chombu	gharinyeenda	kikombe
nurse	neesi	nesajenda	nesi	nesi, muuguzi
doctor	maninyandi	daktari	daktari	daktari, mganga
notebook	daftarijanda	wewenda	wewiiga	daftari
book	kitabujanda	wewenda	gitabuura	kitabu
toilet	chorooni	chorooni	choloni	choo
table	meza	mezajenda	meza	meza
spoon	kijikojanda	gijikojenda	gíchiku	kijiko
plate	sahanijanda	sahanajeenda	sahani	sahani
central pole	mughamba	mughamba	---	nguzo

Figure 9: Loans for the modern world, housing and food and drinks⁵ (My Field Data 2018).

Some observational points are outlined from the data in Table 9. We begin with the fact that the data shows that Kiswahili loans are robust in Datooga. We conclude that some terms

DOI: 10.2478/eas-2019-0010 © University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. All rights reserved.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

associated with the semantic fields of the modern world, modern houses, and modern food and drinks come from Kiswahili. This is a typical case of recent additive borrowing because very few Datooga people speak Kiswahili (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:32) to have helped to carry the loans into their language.

Another observation is that modern clothing integrates words from Bantu. The traditional dressing of the Datooga is hang'da 'a wrap or sheet'. Any foreign dress (gown, skirt, shirt, short, trouser etc.) may be used for official (government or church) gatherings. The term gwandajeega 'dress, shirt' is borrowed from Bantu communities. The essence of gwanda is varied across Bantu, as illustrated by data in (5) elicited from Bantu speakers. Nonetheless, each of the equivalent given is associated with dresses.

(5)	BANTU	WORD	GLOSS
	Ngoni	ligwanda	'shirt'
	Chasu	ibwanda	'shirt'
	Chasu	igwanda	'uniform'
	Sukuma	gwanda	'gown'
	Kibena	iligwanda	'shirt, gown'
	Kihehe	ligwanda	'shirt, gown'
	Kurya	gwanda	'heavy dress'
	Gogo	ligwanda	'military uniform'
	Giha	gwanda	'Rwandese local garment'
	Kiswahili	gwanda	'army uniform'

(My Field Data 2018)

The Sukuma and Nyamwezi people of north-western Tanzania use the word gwanda for gown and dress. It is plausible to argue that even for modern dresses, the Datooga borrowed the words from Sukuma people.

Further evidence of the penetration of the Sukuma words into western dialects of Datooga is revealed in the word for the central pole of a house. The Buradiga-Datooga borrowed the

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

word *mughamba* ‘pole’ from Bantu languages. It is incorporated as *mghembajeenda gogwinda* ‘the central pole of the *tembe* house’. Lusekelo exhibited the term *mughamba* ‘central pillar’ being common for the Bantu languages of Tanzania. Traditionally, huts of the Datooga were covered by animal skins. The adaptation of *tembe* houses attracted incorporation of terms used by Bantu speakers (LUSEKELO 2017a:22).

Moreover, the expression of the cardinal terms are specified in Datooga. The Buradiga have incorporated the Bantu terms *sígúma* ‘north’ and *rákáma* ‘south’. This is confirmed by Lusekelo who found that these terms are common in languages of central Tanzania, mainly Gogo, Nyamwezi, Nyaturu, Nyiramba, and Sukuma. Therefore, this is a kind of additive borrowing from Sukuma (LUSEKELO 2018:67).

Furthermore, Bruckhaus did not report of any of these terms in Barbaiga and Gisamjanga dialects of Datooga (BRUCKHAUS 2015) but Mietzner with Pasch found the terms *suqumeera* expresses ‘north’ and *taqameera* ‘south’ [i.e. *rákáma* ‘south’ and *sígúma* ‘north’] in Nilotic Datooga and Maasai of Tanzania (MIETZNER – PASCH 2007). The presence of these terms in western dialects of Datooga and in Maasai substantiates an exchange of cardinal terms occurred between Bantu and Nilotic languages.

The word *lapiya* ‘money’ comes from the word Rupee, which penetrated into the interior of Tanzania. Lusekel listed these words from *amahéra/empiya* in Runyambo, *jiyera* in Ruuri and *pesa/sendi* in Gogo for money. The Runyambo case is an example of an interior Bantu language which incorporated the word *empiya* ‘Rupee, money’. The other words are similar to the Datooga word *pesajaanda* ‘money’ which comes from the Kiswahili word *pesa* ‘money’ (LUSEKELO 2013b:156).

The last point is associated with modern education. The formal education system has not penetrated deeper into the Datooga community (BIHARIOVÁ 2015:32). Given this backdrop, the word *wewenda* ‘paper, book, notebook, newspaper’ is adjusted from the native word for the *dermis*, i.e. the inner (whitish) layer of a skin of an animal. This is semantic broadening of the word to cover the concept of the white paper. In the previous study of incorporation of Bantu loans, adjustment of the meaning of the indigene words is reported for the names of crops (LUSEKELO 2016) and names of medicine-man (LUSEKELO 2013b). However, the case of *wewenda* is associated with semantic broadening in which it

retained its origin meaning of *dermis*, and acquired a new meaning of ‘paper, book, notebook, newspaper’.

Conclusion

The foregoing discussion in this article hinged on the penetration of Sukuma words into the western dialects of Datooga. It presented the essence of multilingualism in Singida and Tabora regions. The article intended to establish language shift from Datooga to Sukuma using the guidelines in the marked bilingualism model and the ethnolinguistic vitality theory, as presented in BATIBO (2005). As shown in the discussion, the Buradiga people have no signs of language shift though they borrow words from Sukuma and speak Sukuma as a second language. Therefore, the marked bilingualism model, which pre-emptly that bilingual speakers will shift from their mother tongue towards an areally dominant and prestigious language, has not been satisfied in Igunga District of Tabora Region. However, the Bianjida people have given up Datooga language in favour of Nyaturu and Gogo. Probably this is an outcome of sedentarisation of the pastoral Datooga during *ujamaa* (socialism) era, as discussed by MHAJIDA (2019). The Datooga have become agro-pastoralists in Igunga District of Singida Region (CEPPI – NIELSEN 2014) and have shifted to Nyaturu and Gogo.

Another subject matter which is discussed in this article concerns Bloomfield’s theory of language change (BLOOMFIELD 1933). The main premise in this theory is that speakers of one language may change the lexicon of their language by importing new terms from another language. These new terms will either substitute indigene terms and/or add to the existing lexicons to fill in lexical gaps. Mapunda with Rosendal presented cases of language change associated with additive and substitutive borrowing in Chingoni (MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015), while Lusekelo presented additive and substitutive borrowing in languages of Tanzania like Hadzabe, Maasai, Ruhaya etc. (LUSEKELO 2017a, 2017b). This article concluded from the data obtained from kinship terms, modern world, and modern housing as found in western dialects of Datooga.

With regard to kinship terms, some Sukuma words penetrated into Datooga and replaced indigene ones, at least in the communication in Chagana village of Igunga District: ghuuku ‘grandparent’ [replaced: *qéambábàabà*], mami ‘uncle’ [substituted: *máamày*], seengi ‘aunt’ [substituted: *qámàaba*] and mkwelima ‘son-in-law’ [replaced: *gátmòoda*]. This is a testimony that Sukuma people had had a strong impact on Datooga people to the extent that

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapition of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

substitutive borrowing occurred. Borges insisted that kinship terms are relatively stable (BORGES 2013:24) but in Datooga, these terms have been penetrated with Sukuma ones.

As regards to additive borrowing, Sukuma words penetrated into the semantic fields of agriculture in which names of crops, which are foreign to Datooga, had been incorporated. This is a commonplace phenomenon, as discussed in HASPELMATH – TADMOR (2009) and MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL (2015). Thus, the situation in Datooga is not unique because additive borrowing is common across languages of the world.

The smaller amount of nativised Kiswahili terms is a phenomenon worth mentioning here. Most studies of borrowing in Tanzania have highlighted the penetration of Kiswahili words into interior languages of Tanzania (cf. LUSEKELO 2013b, 2016, 2017b; MAPUNDA – ROSENDAL 2015; MOUS – QORRO 2009, among others). The mastery of Kiswahili by the Datooga is very low, as had been highlighted by BIHARIOVÁ (2015). Thus, Sukuma will continue to be the lingua franca of the Datooga villages in Igunga District. The potential consequence will be the penetration of more Sukuma words into Datooga.

The foregoing discussion has historical implications as well. It is obvious that animal-related Datooga words were incorporated into Hadzabe (LUSEKELO 2015), Iraqw (MOUS – QORRO 2009), Nyaturu (EHRET 1970), and Sukuma (ROTTLAND – BATIBO 2001). This is apparently motivated by the dominance of pastoralism by the Datooga. However, the sedentarisation of the Datooga had allowed the Sukuma to pass many agriculture-oriented words into Datooga. Thus, the suggestion by ROTTLAND – BATIBO (2001) is now reversed in the sense that both Sukuma and Datooga influence one another. The direction of impact is not only from Datooga to Sukuma but also from Sukuma to Datooga.

The remaining part which requires an explanation concerns the dialectological implications of the language contact in Datooga speaking areas. The eastern dialects of Datooga, who formulate the majority of the speakers (KLIMA 1970; BLYSTAD 2000; LOT 2009), are in constant contact with the Afro-asiatic Alagwa, Burunge, Gorowaa, and Iraqw speaking people (KIESSLING – MOUS – NURSE 2008; LUSEKELO 2013a, 2015). The penetration of Datooga words into Iraqw is reported by MOUS – QORRO (2009). Since the Iraqw are agro-pastoralists, there is a need to investigate the penetration of the Iraqw words into Datooga. Consequently, a clear picture of the exchange of the linguistic materials between

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

the Nilotic Datooga, Afro-asiatic Iraqw, and Sukuma Bantu will depend on such future research work.

Bibliography

BAKER, Collins (1996): *Foundations of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

BALDI, Sergio (2011): Swahili: A Donor Language. In *Lingua Posnaniensis* LIII (1), pp. 7-24.

BALDI, Sergio (2012): Arabic Loans in East African Languages through Swahili: A Survey. In *Folia Orientalia* 49, pp. 37-52.

BATIBO, Herman M. (2005): *Language Decline and Death in Africa: Causes, Consequences and Challenges*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters.

BATIBO, Herman (2015): The Prevalence of Cultural Diversity in a Multilingual Situation: The Case of Age and Gender Dimensions in the Shisukuma and Kiswahili Greeting Rituals. In *Journal of Multicultural Discourses* 10 (1), pp. 100-111.

BATIBO, Herman M. – ROTTLAND, Franz (2001): The Adoption of Datooga Loanwords in Sukuma and its Historical Implications. In *SUGIA* 16/17, pp. 23-24.

BIHARIOVÁ, Emília (2015): 'We Don't Need No Education': A Case Study about Pastoral Datoga Girls in Tanzania. In *Ethnologia Actualis* 15 (2), pp. 30-45.

BIHARIOVÁ, Emília (2016): Avoiding Christianity – a Weapon in Education 'Savage' Pastoralists: A Case Study of Nilotic Buradiga in Tanzania. In *Asia & African Studies* 25 (1), pp. 85-105.

BLENCH, Roger (2006): *Archaeology, Language, and the African Past*. Lanham, MD: Altamira Press.

BLOOMFIELD, Leonard (1933): *Language*. London: Allen and Unwin.

BLYSTAD, Astrid (2000): *Prekarious Procreation: Datoga Pastoralists at the Late 20th Century*. Doctoral thesis, Bergen: Bergen University.

BLYSTAD, Astrid (2005): Fertile Mortal Links: Reconsidering Barabaig Violence. In Vigdis Broch-Due (ed.): *Violence and Belonging: The Quest for Identity in Post-colonial Africa*. London: Routledge, pp. 112-130.

BORGES, Robert (2013): Linguistic Archaeology, Kinship Terms, and Language Contact in Suriname. In *Anthropological Linguistics* 55 (1), pp. 1-35.

DOI: 10.2478/eas-2019-0010 © University of SS. Cyril and Methodius in Trnava. All rights reserved.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

BOSTOEN, Koen (2007): Bantu Plant Names as Indicators of Linguistic Stratigraphy in the Western Province of Zambia. In Doris L. Payne, Jaime Peña (eds.): *Selected Proceedings of the 37th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, pp. 16-29.

BRUCKHAUS, Stefan (2015): Locational Nouns in Datooga (Southern Nilotic, Tanzania). In Angelika Mietzner, Anne Storch (eds.): *Nilo-Saharan: Models and Descriptions*. Cologne: Koepppe Verlag, pp. 73-92.

CEPPI, Silvia L. – NIELSEN, Martin R. (2014): A Comparative Study on Bush-meat Consumption Patterns in Ten Tribes in Tanzania. In *Tropical Conservation Science* 7 (2), pp. 272-287.

CREIDLER, Chet – ROTLAND, Franz (1997): Noun Classification in Southern Nilotic: Datooga. In *Afrika und Ubersee* 80, pp.71-93.

EHALA, Martin (2010): Ethnolinguistic Vitality and Intergroup Processes. In *Multilingua* 29, pp. 203-221.

EHRET, Christopher (1971): *Southern Nilotic History: Linguistic Approaches to the Study of the Past*. Evanston, Illinois: Northwestern University Press.

ITANDALA, Buluba (1980): Nilotic Impact on the Babinza of Usukuma. In *Transafrican Journal of History* 9 (1/2), pp. 1-17.

HASPELMATH, Martin (2009): Lexical Borrowing: Concepts and Issues. In Martin Haspelmath, Uri Tadmor (eds.): *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 35-54.

HASPELMATH, Martin – TADMOR, Uri (2009): The Loanword Typology Project and the World Loanword Database. In Martin Haspelmath, Uri Tadmor (eds.): *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 1-34.

KARAN, Mark E. (2011): Understanding and Forecasting Ethnolinguistic Vitality. In *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development* 32 (2), pp. 137-149.

KIESSLING, Roland (2001): Number Marking in Datooga Nouns. In Rainer Vossen, Angelika Mietzner, Antje Meissner (eds.): *Mehr als nur Worte: Afrikanistische Beiträge zum 65 - Geburtstag von Franz Rottland*. Cologne: Köppe. pp. 349-366.

KIESSLING, Roland – MOUS, Maarten – NURSE, Derek (2008): The Tanzanian Rift Valley Area. In Bernd Heine, Derek Nurse (eds.): *A Linguistic Geography of Africa*. London: Cambridge University Press. pp. 186-227.

KLIMA, George J. (1970): *The Barabaig: East African Cattle-herders*. Illinois: Waveland Press Inc.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapition of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

KUPER, Adam (1979): Zulu Kinship Terminology over a Century. In *Journal of Anthropological Research* 35 (3), pp. 373-386.

LIUA, Yu-Chang – GIJSENA, Johan – TSAIB, Chung-Yin (2013): An Empirical Evaluation of Ethnolinguistic Vitality and Language Loss: The Case of Southern Min in Taiwan. In *Folia Linguistica* 47 (2), pp. 425-447.

LOT (LANGUAGE OF TANZANIA PROJECT) (2009): *Atlasi ya lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2013a): Language Contact in Lake Eyasi Area in North-western Tanzania. In *Journal of Historical Society of Nigeria* 22, pp. 137-157.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2013b): Swahili Loanwords Nativisations in the Languages of Tanzania. In *Huria Journal of the Open University of Tanzania* 14, pp. 151-162.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2015): The Consequences of the Contacts Between Bantu and Non-Bantu Languages around Lake Eyasi in Northern Tanzania. In *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language* 3 (1), pp. 62-75.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2016): The Spread of Kiswahili Lexis into the Interior Bantu: The Case of Names of New World Cereals and Tubers in Tanzanian Bantu. In *Kioo cha Lugha* 14, pp. 50-73.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2017a): Additive and Substitutive Borrowing against Semantic Broadening and Narrowing in the Names of Architectural Structures in Tanzanian Bantu Languages. In *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities* 18 (1), pp. 19-45.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2017b): Education-induced Borrowing in Tanzania: Penetration of Swahili Nouns into Maa (Maasai) and Hadzane (Hadzabe). In *Language Matters* 38 (1), pp. 1-26.

LUSEKELO, Amani (2018): Terms for Cardinal Directions in Eastern Bantu Languages. In *Journal of Humanities*, 26, pp. 49-70.

MAPUNDA, Gastor – ROSENDAL, Tove (2015): Borrowing in Tanzanian Ngoni Lexicon: Some Semantic Trends in a Language Contact Situation. In *Language Matters: Studies in the Languages of Africa* 46 (2), pp. 180-194.

MASHIRI, Pedzisai (2004): A Sociolinguistic Interpretation of the Social Meanings of Kinship Terms in Shona Urban Interactions. In *Southern African Linguistics and Applied Language Studies* 22 (1-2), pp. 27-42.

MATIKI, Alfred J. (2016): Patterns of Lexical Borrowing in Chichewa. In *Journal of the Linguistics Association of SADC Universities* 4 (4), pp. 79-93.

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asapition of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

- MATRAS, Yaron (2009): *Language Contact*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- MHAJIDA, Samwel S. (2019): *The Collapse of a Pastoral Economy: The Datooga of Central and Northern Tanzania from the 1830s to the 2000s*. Göttingen: Göttingen University Press.
- MIETZNER, Angelika, PASCH, Helma (2007): Expressions of Cardinal Directions in Nilotic and in Ubangian Languages. In *Skase Journal of Theoretical Linguistics* 4 (3), pp. 17-31.
- MITCHELL, Alice (2015a): Words That Smell Like Father-in-law: A Linguistic Description of the Datooga Avoidance Register. In *Anthropological Linguistics* 57 (2), pp. 195-217.
- MITCHELL, Alice (2015b): Linguistic Avoidance and Social Relations in Datooga. Doctoral thesis, Buffalo: University of Buffalo.
- MITCHELL, Alice (2017): The Pragmatics of a Kinship Term: The Meaning and Use of *Íiyá* 'Mother' in Datooga (Nilotic). In Raija Kramer, Roland Kiessling (eds.): *Mechthildian Approaches to Afrikanistik: Advances in Language Based Research on Africa: Festschrift für Mechthild Reh*. Cologne: Rüdiger Köppe. pp. 287-301.
- MOUS, Maarten – QORRO, Martha (2009): Loanwords in Iraqw, a Cushitic Language of Tanzania. In Martin Haspelmath, Uri Tadmor (eds.): *Loanwords in the World's Languages: A Comparative Handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. pp. 103-123.
- MSANJILA, Yohana P. (2003): Kushuka kwa hadhi ya lugha za jamii nchini Tanzania. In *Nordic Journal of African Studies* 12 (3), pp. 296-309.
- MSANJILA, Yohana P. (2004): The Future of the Kisafwa Language: A Case Study of Ithaha Village in Tanzania. In *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 68, pp. 161-171.
- MUZALE, Henry R.T. – RUGEMALIRA, Josephat M. (2008): Researching and Documenting the Languages of Tanzania. In *Language Documentation & Conservation* 2 (1), pp. 68-108.
- NURSE, Derek (2000): *Inheritance, Contact, and Change in Two East African Languages* (Language Contact in Africa 4). Cologne: Ruediger Koepppe Verlag.
- PRINSLOO, Danie J. (2014). Lexicographic Treatment of Kinship Terms in an English/Sepedi-Setswana-Sesotho Dictionary with an Amalgamated Lemmalist. In *Lexikos* 24, pp. 272-290.
- ROSENDAL, Tove, - MAPUNDA, Gastor (2017): Contact-induced Language Alternation in Tanzanian Ngoni: An Empirical Study of Frequency and Patterns. In *International Journal of Multilingualism* 14 (4), pp. 463-477.
- ROTTLAND, Franz (1983): Southern Nilotic (with an Outline of Datooga). In Lionel

AMANI LUSEKELO

Asaption of Sukuma Loanwords in the Western Dialects of Datooga (*Taturu*) and its Dialectological Implications

Bender (ed.): *Nilo-Saharan Language Studies*. Michigan: African Studies Center. pp. 208-38.

SEBONDE, Rafiki. Y. (2012): Code Switching and Social Stratification in Rural Chasu Community. In *Language Matters*, 43 (1), pp. 80-86.

STRÖM, Eva-Marie (2009): The Situation of Ndengeleko: A Coastal Tanzanian Language (P10). In Masangu Matondo, Fiona McLaughlin, Eric Potsdam (eds.): *Selected Proceedings of the 38th Annual Conference on African Linguistics*. Somerville: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. pp. 229-241.

THOMASON, Sarah – KAUFMAN, Thomas (1988): *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics*. University of California Press.

URT (UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA) (2013): *2012 Population and Housing Census: Population Distribution by Administrative Areas*. Dar es Salaam: National Bureau of Statistics.

Amani Lusekelo is a Senior Lecturer specialising in African languages at Dar es Salaam University College of Education, a Constituent College of the University of Dar es Salaam in Tanzania (East Africa). His research focuses on the ethnolinguistic and cultural matters related to contacts of societies in African settings. He publishes on themes related to the outcome of the contact of African languages, transformation of the naming systems in Africa, and general linguistics. Apart from the citations used in the article, he is the author of "African Linguistics in Eastern Africa" In H. Ekkhehard Wolff (ed.) *A History of African Linguistics* (Cambridge University Press, United Kingdom, forthcoming), "An Account of Intercultural Contact in Nyakyusa Personal Names" (African Study Monographs, Japan, 2018), "The Hadzabe Society of Tanzania: Contacts, Sociolinguistics and Onomastics" (John Archers Publishers, Nigeria, 2015), and "Linguistic Morphology: A Student Guide" (E&D Vision Publishing Limited, Tanzania, 2014). He conducts research in Tanzania. He participated in short-term teaching at the universities of Botswana (Africa), Gothenburg in Sweden and Saints Cyril and Methodius in Trnava (Slovakia).

