Linguistic outcomes of interactions of Hadzabe and Sukuma in north-western Tanzania[1]

Amani Lusekelo

Senior Lecturer
Department of Languages and Literature
Dar es Salaam University College of Education
University of Dar es Salaam
alusekelo@duce.ac.tz

Micky Mgeja

Assistant Lecturer
Department of Languages and Literature
Dar es Salaam University College of Education
University of Dar es Salaam
mgejamicky@gmail.com

Abstract

This paper articulates the outcomes of the contacts of the Hadzabe speaking people with Sukuma people in Maswa district (now Meatu district) in northern Tanzania. It is reported that the Hadzabe in western Tanzania differ from eastern Hadzabe in material culture (Woodburn 1970) and adaptation of kinship terms (Miller 2016). However, linguistic adaptation of names of plants and crops have not been discussed in the literature. Findings from Sungu village in Meatu district reveal significant influence of Sukuma over Hadzabe lexicon of plants and crops. It is understandable that the Sukuma farmers introduced farming amongst the Hadzabe foragers. But is unclear as to why the Hadzabe should have borrowed names of wild plants, which they have depended throughout their existence (Marlowe 2010). It is argued in this paper that strong communities, such as the Sukuma, tend to influence the deeper lexicon of the smaller communities like Hadzabe.

Keywords: Contacts, Dunduiya Hadzabe, Language, Sukuma Bantu, Tanzania

[1] We are grateful to Hadzabe people who participated in this research, specifically our main informants in Sungu village of Meatu district, namely Samsoni Gango Salehe and Katalina Mayayi. This research was supported by the University of Dar es Salaam Competitive Research Fund (2020 Cycle).

1. Introduction

The purpose of this paper is two-fold. On the one hand, investigation of the Hadzabe society is skewed towards eastern settlements in Mangola (or Mang'ola in Swahili) (Karatu district) and Yaeda Chini (Mbulu district) in northern Tanzania (see Blurton-Jones et al. 1992; Edenmyr 2007; Lusekelo 2014, 2015a, b, 2017a, b; Marlowe 2002, 2005, 2010; Sands et al. 1996; Woodburn 1958, 1970, among others). The presence of the settlement of the Hadzabe in Dunduiya (western) area at Kimali village (in the then Maswa district, now Meatu district) had been reported by Woodburn (1958). However, sociolinguistic research amongst the Dunduiya Hadzabe is not reported in the literature. As a result, interactions of Hadzabe with the Sukuma, the main ethnic group in the area (LoT 2009; Marlowe 2010; Woodburn 1970), is not given an upper-hand in the literature, except mentioned in passing in Blurton-Jones (2016), Gunderson (2010) and Rockel (2000). Even the prominent anthropologist Woodburn (1970: 11) articulates that "my description refers only to the Eastern Hadza and does not necessarily apply to the Western Hadza of Sukumaland whose equipment and way of life differ from those of the Eastern Hadza in a number of respects." The absence of the research reports from Western (Dunduiya) Hadzabe is the lacuna that the current contribution aims to fill.

On the other hand, in the literature for Khoisan languages, borrowing appears to have influence (Sands 2001). But outcomes of interactions of the Hadzabe and Sukuma is a concern of linguists which have not yet been reported in important linguistic resources for Hadzabe such as Edenmyr (2004) and Sands et al. (1996). Therefore, additional motivation for this contribution arises from the gap in the earlier linguistic studies on Hadzabe. Previously, Edenmyr (2007) discusses the penetration of Isanzu and Swahili nouns in Hadzabe, while Miller (2016) displays the outcome of the contact between Nilotic, Bantu and Hadzabe on kinship terms. In both works, the influence of Sukuma is discussed in passing. Lusekelo (2019) discusses the penetration of names of cereals and tubers in Hadzabe, as well as other non-Bantu languages spoken in Tanzania. But he does not indicate the influence of Sukuma in Meatu district. In general, in all earlier research reports,

outcomes of the contacts between Sukuma and Hadzabe is not given an upper-hand. Names of crops and plants, which have not yet been presented, calls for the current contribution.

After this introduction, the paper is organised in this manner. The section discusses the socio-economic and political organisation of the Sukuma people in north-western Tanzania, mainly during colonial period (1990s-1950s). The section also presents facts about the Sukuma society after independence, mainly between 1960s and 1980s. This is the period when the Sukuma people expanded into Hadzabe-land. In the next section, the paper presents the history of six decades of the Dunduiya dialect of Hadzabe from the 1960s through 2020s. Then it presents the development of the farming skills amongst the hunter-gatherers in Sukumaland. The influence of the Sukuma people on the farming practises of the Hadzabe is also presented. Sedentary settlement is confirmed by the presentation of foreign names in Hadzabe. These names are discussed further in the section for names of structures of architecture. To confirm continued engagement with foraging, the paper turns to the topic of plant names in the next section. In it, further penetration of Sukuma names into the lexicon of Hadzabe is revealed. The last section is the conclusion.

2. Sukuma villages in Tanzania: Socio-economics and political status

Sukuma people established their settlements and became strong ethnic group in major part of north-western Tanzania. According to LoT (2009), Sukuma people occupy many regions, but abundantly Shinyanga (over 2 million), Mwanza (about 2 million), Tabora (above half a million), Kagera (201,244), Mara (67,711) and Singida (60,374). Their population is increasingly expanding, as it was reported to be 4 to 5 million in 1980s (Abrahams 1989) and almost between 6 and 8 in 2000s (LoT 2009; Mesaki 2009).

Sukuma people were organized in chiefdoms controlled by *batemi* 'chiefs'. Chiefdoms were organised in terms of clans. Chiefs controlled peace, law and

order. Also, chiefs controlled material production, which was profound in the traditional institution of communal reciprocal working groups (Mesaki 2009). Chieftainship was undertaken through succession. Abrahams (1989: 358) found that "Nyamwezi and Sukuma have lived under a succession of regimes during the last 200 and more years." The chiefdoms became important tool for strengthening of the Sukuma community as a cultural identity in north-western Tanzania.

Sukuma people practised subsistence farming with the slash-and-burn shifting cultivation (Little 1991) and adopted large-scale animal husbandry, perhaps from Nilotic Datooga and Maasai (Itandala 1980; Batibo and Rottland 2001). Mesaki (2009: 74) reports that "at the beginning of German colonial rule (1890-1919), the Sukuma had already started agricultural intensification in response to population pressure." Little (1991: 378) found that "certain crops were the domain of women, others of men." Women's food crops were sweet potatoes, sesame, peanuts, beans, maize, green grams, cowpeas, and bambara nuts. Men's food crops were millet, cassava, and sorghum. Latter cotton was introduced by the colonial government. Little (1991) found that both sexes collaborated in its production as it was a mandatory crop. Also, rice has become an important crop in Sukuma-land (Little 1991; Mesaki 2009). Since these crops are grown by the Sukuma people, the lexicon of Sukuma language must contain their names.

Animal keeping have become an important occupation of the Sukuma people. The accumulation of cattle wealth was enabled by strengthening of agro-pastoralism through cooperation in defence of animal raiding by Datooga and Maasai (Itandala 1980). Collaboration strengthened the expansion and solidification of the chiefdoms in the Sukuma community (Itandala 1980).

During (long-distance) caravan trade, both Nyamwezi and Sukuma people were engaged first as porters and later as traders. Rockel (1997) argues that crops were carried by porters, who were mainly of Nyamwezi and Sukuma people, from the coast into the interior of Tanganyika. Also, the Nyamwezi and Sukuma participated in the salt caravan trade from Lake Eyasi (Blurton-Jones 2016; Miller

2016; Rockel 2000). As a result, the strong Sukuma culture is likely to have engulfed more areas in north-western Tanzania.

During caravan trade dominated by Nyamwezi and Sukuma, salt from Lake Eyasi, the homeland of the Hadzabe people, was a very important commodity. Rockel (2000: 756) reports that in Tanzania, "Nyamwezi and Sukuma women in the eighteenth and early nineteenth centuries also took part in local and regional trade. Sukuma salt caravans to Lake Eyasi, for instance, consisted largely of unmarried young women." Interactions between the Sukuma and Hadzabe was inevitable in the western part of the salt lake (Blurton-Jones 2016). This is confirmed even in the legendary songs of caravan traders of the Sukuma people which contains names of Tindiga (Hadzabe) and Ndorobo (Akie) (Gunderson 2010).

Today the Sukuma settled in villages principally established for the Hadzabe. For instance, Woodburn (1958) mentions the presence of Hadzabe at Kimali, which is now a rural administrative ward in Meatu district. In the 1970s, the Hadzabe were placed in settlement at Paji village; and later in 1980s at Iramba Ndogo village (Lusekelo 2015; Marlowe 2010; Woodburn 2016). In our fieldwork in March and April 2020, we found that both villages of Paji and Iramba Ndogo have been occupied fully by agro-pastoral Sukuma.

Our informants state that Sungu village was established in the 1990s, specifically a village centre was opened in 1998. Sungu village is part of Mwangudo Administrative Ward of Meatu district. In the 2012 census, Mwangudo ward constituted of a population of 12,270 people (URT 2013: 215). It becomes plausible to argue that Mwangudo ward have become Sukuma-land because the Hadzabe account only for 529 people (LoT 2009: 102). Also, the Sukuma people dominate all important village centres at Iramba Ndogo, Mibuyuni, Paji and Sungu. Their homesteads are typical *bomas* of extended families (Image 1). They opened many farms, growing mainly cotton, maize, peanuts, sorghum, sweat potatoes, and sunflowers. In addition, they keep large numbers of cattle, which are grazed in the neighbourhoods of the Sungu village.



Image 1: Sukuma homesteads, farm-yards and grasslands in Sungu village (April 2020).

3. Western Hadzabe (Dunduiya dialect)

The presence of the Hadzabe at Kilima (which is located in Meatu district today) had been reported by Woodburn (1958). Based on the historical narrations, the Hadzabe appears to be the earliest people to settle in Sukuma-land. Batibo and Rottland (2001) state that the Sukuma had been in contact with the Hadzabe perhaps in Maswa district. They argue that legendary information indicates that the Khoisan-speaking people who were hunter-gatherers had been the first people to inhabit the Sukuma-land. Based on the settlements of Bantu people, this may have happened some 500 years ago (Batibo and Rottland 2001; Kiessling et al. 2008; Lusekelo 2015a). However, the Hadzabe are characteristically migrating hunter-gatherers who change camps in shorter periods of time (Blurton-Jones 2016; Kaare 1989; Marlowe 2010; Woodburn 1970). This may entail that by then the Hadzabe may have opted to dwell deeper into the inner wild forests and bush land around Lake Eyasi, which is located in the eastern part of Sukuma-land.

Maswa district was part of the Western Province which was established by the German Colonial Administration between 1922 and 1926. Hadzabe people lived in the eastern parts of the district, in the fringes of Lake Eyasi. When Shinyanga region was established in 1963 by the Independent Government of Tanganyika, settlements of the Hadzabe remained in Maswa district. In 2012, Simiyu region was established. Meatu district in Simiyu region became the home-land of the Hadzabe. In both Shinyanga and Simiyu regions, the Sukuma people predominate the rest of the ethnic groups. For instance, LoT (2009: 102) reports of more than 2 million Sukuma people in Shinyanga region but only 529 Hadzabe people. Our informants mention that Mwanhuzi, Paji and Iramba Ndogo are primarily earlier settlements of the Hadzabe. In the literature, Paji and Iramba Ndogo have been documented as the homes of the Dunduiya Hadzabe (Blurton-Jones 2016; Marlowe 2010). Recently, we found that only a couple of typical families of Dunduiya Hadzabe settled at Sungu village in Mwangudo ward and Shushuni and Mbushi villages in Mbushi ward of Meatu district. Many households claim descent to Hadzabe and Sukuma due to intermarriages.

The demography of the Dunduiya dialect of Hadzabe was estimated to be between 200 and 300 people. This is confirmed by two sources. On the one hand, based on actual census conducted in June 1985 by Blurton Jones et al. (1992: 165), "there are apparently some 200-300 Western Hadzabe." On the other hand, Marlowe (2010: 13) articulates that "there about 250 Hadzabe in each of the four areas." This number appear to have been maintained but speaking of Hadzabe have dwindled. Our estimates in Sungu village found a total of 40 households, which would constitute 200 people. However, we have been able to identify and visit 13 households of Hadzabe people. The 13 households visited constitute a demography with an average of five people each; hence making a total of less than Hadzabe 100 people in Sungu village.

Our informants report that Sungu village was formerly established in the late 1990s. However, Hadzabe families migrated from Paji and Iramba Ndogo to Sungu village in the 1980s. Now Sungu village have become predominantly Sukuma-land. For instance, the village administration reports of 92 households in

Ng'wanyanga cell in Sungu village. Of these households, only 40 households constitute members of Hadzabe descent, while the 52 households are of Sukuma descent. Nonetheless, the number of Hadzabe households reported is different from the 13 typical Hadzabe households identified in this cell of the village. The implication is that even Ng'wanyanga cell has turned into Sukuma village; rather than being a Hadzabe-land, as mentioned in the literature by Blurton-Jones (2016), Lusekelo (2015b), Marlowe (2010).

The claim that Sungu village has become Sukuma-land is based on a typical sociolinguistic factor. Marlowe (2010) argues correctly that the main inclusion criterion in the Hadzabe group is by speaking Hadzane, the language of the Hadzabe people. Sociolinguistic evidence does not support the claim that Sungu village is Hadzabe-land. Only people aged above 30 and with Hadzabe descent command fully the language, together with Sukuma and Swahili. A few members of the 13 households visited who are aged between 20 and 30 speak Hadzane, together with Sukuma and Swahili. All children between age 2 and 18 do not speak Hadzane but Sukuma. As a result, the lingua franca of Sungu village is Sukuma. This qualifies the village to be a typical Sukuma-land.

The material culture of the Hadzabe households in Sungu village differ significantly from those of Domanga and Mongo wa Mono in Mbulu district as observed by Woodburn (1970) and Lusekelo (2015b). First of all, the structures of their houses is a typical *tembe* (Image 2), which is common amongst sedentary communities in central and north-western Tanzania (Lusekelo 2017b). The properties of Hadzabe camps described in previous works does not feature in Sungu village; rather the Sukuma homesteads described in the literature (Lusekelo 2017b) appear to manifest in Sungu village.



Image 2: Hadzabe household in Sungu village (April 2020)

Another major concern is the introduction of crop cultivation and animal husbandry, which is a typical economic structure of the Sukuma people (Itandala 1980; Batibo and Rottland 2001). All the 13 households visited in Sungu village own a small piece of cultivated land in which crops discussed in the next section are grown. Also, few fowls and cattle are owned by some Hadzabe households. It is obvious now that in the western parts of Lake Eyasi the Sukuma speaking people encroached the Hadzabe-land (Lusekelo 2015b). A number of Sukuma families opened up cotton farms in the Western area (Blurton-Jones 2016). Also, Sukuma people kept large flocks of cattle which were grazed in the hunting and gathering grounds of the foragers. Farming is not reported in Sungu village alone. Blurton Jones (1992: 164) suggest that the Hadzabe become non-foragers because "125 people living at Munguli and Mwangeza, most involved in both farming and foraging." Non-commercial hunting (subsistence foraging) is strictly forbidden in Sungu village which is surrounded by Ngorongoro Conservation Area, Maswa Game Reserve and Mwiba Wildlife Reserve (under Mwiba Holdings Limited).

With regards to continued foraging skills, two important points must be educed here. One, the Dunduiya Hadzabe are involved in hunting and gathering for tourism purposes as organized by Mwiba Wildlife Reserve at regular intervals.

Two, many members of western Hadzabe community maintain close ties with the Domanga, Mang'ola, Mongo wa Mono and Munguli Hadzabe lands. Hunting and gathering skills are practised in these eastern communities. Both practises help to maintain the foraging skills, which are now experienced more by adults in Sungu village.

4. Development of small-scale farming by Hadzabe people

One of the strategies used to explore the development of farming in an African society is the integration of terms related to crops[2]. While Mous and Rottland (2001) argue that borrowed terms from neighbouring languages and Kiswahili which reveal general meaning usually will refer to new loans, Lusekelo (2013, 2016) argues that integration of names of crops from Kiswahili will usually undergo morpho-semantic changes. Based on data in table 1, this section discusses five issues related to the integration of names of crops from the agro-pastoral Sukuma into hunter-gatherers Hadzabe.

Crop names (with Swahili names)	**Hadzabe**	**Sukuma**
farm <Swahili: *shamba*>	*mgundako*	*ngundaa*
rice farm <Swahili: *shamba la mpunga*>	*mgundako*	*mbuuɣa*
hoe <Swahili: *jembe*>	*igembe*	*magembe*
sweet potatoes <Swahili: *viazi vitamu*>	*khándolopiʔi*	*mandolo*
tobacco <Swahili: *tumbaku*>	*túmbátʰe*	*itumbati*
bullrush millet <Swahili: *uwele*>	*uweleya*	*ßußele*
finger millet <Swahili: *ulezi*>	*bukímbeya*	*ßulezi*
sorghum <Swahili: *mtama*>	*póyopeʔe*	*ußusiɣa*
cotton <Swahili: *pamba*>	*bulubaa*	*ßulußa*
beans <Swahili: *maharage*>	*maharagipiʔi*	*amaharage*
pumpkin <Swahili: *maboga*>	*matangapiʔi*	*muungʰu*

[2] This report is based on research conducted in Meatu district at Sungu village. Further research on crop names is going on in Karatu district at Mangola village, Mkalama district at Munguli village and Mbulu district at Yaeda Chini village. These villages constitute slightly different economic activities which might reveal another pattern of crop names.

Table 1: Names of crops grown in western parts of Lake Eyasi

The first issue concerns two key terms reveal that penetration of agricultural skills is from Sukuma to Hadzabe. Firstly, the name of a farm-land is borrowed from the Sukuma term: *mgundako*. Secondly, the name of the main farming tool is borrowed from Sukuma: *igembe*. Both names are essential in the identification of the crop cultivation activity.

The second issue concerns the importance of sweet potatoes and tobacco amongst the Hadzabe is presented in previous studies (see Blurton-Jones 2016; Lusekelo 2019; Marlowe 2010, among others). Hadzabe borrowed the term *khándolo* 'sweet potatoes' and *túmbát^{h}e* 'tobacco' from Sukuma. The former turns common amongst the Hadzabe because it is a domesticated tuber and the Hadzabe had practised collection of wild tubers ever since (Marlowe 2010; Woodburn 1970). As shown in image 3, *khándolo* 'sweet potatoes' is an important staple food in Sungu village. The latter is also central for the recreation of the Hadzabe who practised pipe-smoking using both stone and wood pipes (Petersen 2012; Woodburn 1970).



Image 3: Small *khándolo* 'sweet potatoes' farm in Sungu village (March 2020)

The third issue revolves around the introduction of indigenous crops grown by the Sukuma. Four indigenous crops have been adopted differently as follows: (i) *uweleya* 'bullrush millet' is similar to Swahili; (ii) *bukímbeya* 'finger millet' is adopted from the name *bugimbi* 'alcohol/local brew' made from finger millet'; (iii) as discussed in the last paragraph of this section, *póyope?e* 'sorghum' does not show morpho-phonological features to confirm its source; (iv) (*ma)tangapi?i* 'pumpkins' is a general term which has reference to cucumber <Swahili: *matango*> and nightshade <Swahili: *ndulele*, *tunguja*>.

The other issue concerns new crops. Cotton is an important cash crop in Meatu district, as it is true in many other Sukuma districts in Tanzania (Little 1991; Mesaki 2009). The name *bulubaa* 'cotton' is adopted from Sukuma. Beans is not preferred by the Hadzabe. Also, beans does not flourish in Sungu village of Meatu district. As a result, Swahili term *maharagipi?i* 'beans' appears to have come into Hadzabe recently.

Lastly, data confirms that transfer of linguistic materials is obviously from Sukuma to Hadzabe. The Hadzabe assign the gender-number suffixes *-(a)ko* (singular/feminine), *-(a)ya* (singular/masculine) and - *pi?i* (neuter/plural). This phenomenon is different from the Sukuma nominal system which employ prefixes to mark number (Katamba 2003).

The foregoing discussion affirms that farmers of Sukuma descent influenced foragers of Hadzabe descent to take up farming. This is confirmed by the common names of crops in its lexicon. Also, observations in Sungu village confirmed that at least each family opened up a farm around its homestead, growing sweet potatoes, pumpkins, sorghum, green vegetables, and sunflowers. As a result, their settlements in Sungu village appear to have become sedentary, as discussed in the subsequent section.

However, further research is required in order to compare the nativisation of foreign names of crops because Lusekelo (2014, 2015b, 2019) attested the names *wali* 'rice', *háguko* 'maize' and *mindiko* 'maize' in Hadzabe. A comparative

research across dialects remains an essential component of knowledge creation for the transformation of Hadzabe culture.

5. Names of structures in Dunduiya Hadzabe

The Hadzabe maintained nomadic hunting by settling in seasonal camps (Marlowe 2010; Petersen 2012; Woodburn 1970). Their interactions with the Sukuma influenced the Hadzabe to adopt sedentary settlements, at least in Sungu village. Perhaps linguistic materials given is table 2 will help us have a better understanding of this claim.

Names of architectural structures	**Hadzabe**	**Sukuma**
a Hadzabe camp <Swahili: *kambi*>	*/'ets'a* or *hets'aako*	*nh'umba*
house <Swahili: *nyumba*>	*hets'aako* or */'ets'a*	*nh'umba*
village <Swahili: *kijiji*>	*majengowaa*	*nzengo*
deserted homestead <Swahili: *mahame*>	*ithongo* or *ʔithongo*	*itongoo*
fireplace (outside) <Swahili: *moto*>	*kit^{h}inde*	*shikome*
lamp <Swahili: *taa*>	*talaa*	*tala*
veranda <Swahili: *kibaraza*>	*hulandaa*	---
place outside a house <Swahili: *baraza*>	*ʔiyanzako*	---
roof <Swahili: *paa*>	*gampaa*	---

Table 2: Names of crops grown in western parts of Lake Eyasi

Table 2 shows that the Hadzabe camps are traditionally called *hets'aako* or */'ets'a*. These terms are also used to refer to houses or homesteads. The Bantu names *nyumba* (Swahili) and *nh'umba* (Sukuma) have not been integrated in Dunduiya Hadzabe. The presence of these indigenous nouns is a testimony that they did not borrow a term to represent its traditional settlements. Nonetheless, the name of a sedentary village or settlement is borrowed as *majengowaa* <in plural: *majengopeʔe*>. This resembles the Sukuma name *nzengo*. Likewise, deserted homesteads is referred as *ithongo* or *ʔithongo* <in plural: *ʔithungubiʔi*>. Presence of these terms point out that Hadzabe adopted sedentary settlement is recent years.

The morphologies of the loans indicate the transfer from Sukuma to Hadzabe. The integration of the names *majengowaa* vs. *majengope?e* 'village(s) and *ithongo* vs. *ithungubi?i* 'deserted homestead(s) is through attachment of the suffixes *-bi?i* (feminine/plural) and *-pe?e* (masculine/plural). These are typical Hadzabe gender-number markers. The source words of *nzengo* 'village' and *itongoo* 'deserted homestead' do not bear the gender-number markers.

Apart from the usual fireplace, usually houses in sedentary settlements are illuminated by lamps (lights). The traditional fireplace is called *kit^{h}inde* <in plural: *kit^{h}inde?i*>. The modern lamp is called *talaa* in Hadzabe, which resembles the Sukuma name *tala* 'lamp'. Both terms concern the important of light in sedentary households.

The name of the veranda is *hulandaa* in Hadzabe. Based on Rottland (1983), this is a typical Datooga name. Lusekelo (2015a) discusses the impact of Datooga on smaller communities of Isanzu and Hadzabe in Mbulu district. The borrowing of the notion *hulandaa* 'veranda' is another testimony to this claim. This name co-occurs with the name *?iyanzako* 'sitting place outside a camp'.

The name *gampaa* 'roof' is similar to the Swahili term *paa*. Thus Hadzabe might have borrowed it from Bantu languages.

The introduction of the Bantu names surrounding the semantics of the households is a good indicator that nomadic lifestyle had been the core of the Hadzabe culture even in Sungu village. However, traditional homelands of the Hadzabe in Sungu (as well as Mang'ola and Munguli) have been replaced by sedentary settlements. Such sedentary settlements had been influenced by foreigners, especially the Sukuma people in north-western Tanzania.

6. On shared names of plants in Hadzabe and Sukuma

Both Hadzabe and Sukuma communities share names of wild plants[3]. This is a major sign of prolonged language contact in that the Hadzabe language of Khoisan (Isolate) affiliation shares cognate names with Sukuma language of Niger-Congo (Bantu) affiliation. This kind of exchange of plant names require some form of prolonged contact that may yield borrowing across language phylum (Haspelmath 2009).

The image 4 (left-hand) exhibits currant plant (*Rhus natalensis*) with similar names in both languages. In Hadzabe, it is named *túnguluwa* (in plural: *tungulupiʔi*), while in Sukuma it is *ntunguru* (in our data) or *mhunguru* (FAO 1993: 78). Image 4 (right-hand) displays a shrub named *Strychnos innocua* (monkey orange). It is called *mondowaa* (in plural: *mondopiʔi*) in Hadzabe. In Sukuma language, its name is *móóndó* (in plural: *mimóóndó*). In Nyamwezi, it is called *mumundu* (FAO 1993: 79).



Image 4: *Rhus natalensis* (currant plant) and *Strychnos innocua* (monkey orange).

[3] As stated in the preceding footnote, continued research in other Hadzabe villages might reveal differences in plant names. This assumption is based on the environmental differences between Mangola (Karatu district), Sponga (Mbulu district) and Tlh'iika (Mkalama district).

The false marula tree is called *sawaa* (in plural: *sawapiʔi*) in Hadzabe and *sayu* (in plural: *misayu*) in Sukuma (Image 5 (left-hand). To confirm the pervasiveness of the term across Sukuma dialects, FAO (1993: 72) lists the terms *nsayu* and *msayu* 'false marula tree' in the language. Image 5 (right-hand) shows *mokangaako* (plural: *mokangapiʔi*) in Hadzabe *mugunga* in Sukuma language.





Image 5: *Lannea sp.* (false marula tree) and *Acacia tortilis* (umbrella thorn).

Moreover, plant is *ningiweeya* (plural: *ningiwepiʔi*) tree in Hadzabe is called *ningiwe* in Sukuma language. The wild plant bears similar name in both Hadzabe and Sukuma: *nangaléako* (in plural: *nangalipiʔi*) in Hadzabe and *nàngàlé* (in plural: *minàngàlé*).

Furthermore, data shows the plant-name *ungumaako* (in plural: *ungumapiʔi*) in Hadzabe and *ngúmo* tree in Sukuma. Lastly, data displays the name *mbótólowaa* <plural: *mbótólopiʔi*) in Hadzabe. In Sukuma language, the tree is called *mbotolo* (plural: *mambotolo*).

The morphological properties of nouns in the two languages help to decipher the donor language. Hadzabe indicates both gender and number in suffixes (Edenmyr 2004; Miller 2013, 2016), while Sukuma behaves like other Bantu languages in that number is marked in nominal prefixes (Katamba 2003). Table 3 presents the morphologies of the eight names presented in this section.

Hadzabe		**Sukuma**		**Botanical name**
Singular	Plural	Singular	Plural	
mbótólowaa	*mbótólopiʔi*	*mbotolo*	*mambotolo*	---
mokangaako	*mokangapiʔi*	*mugunga*	*migunga*	Acacia tortilis
mondowaa	*mondopiʔi*	*móóndó*	*mimóóndó*	Strychnos innocua
nangaléako	*nangalipiʔi*	*nàngàlé*	*minàngàlé*	---
ningiweeya	*ningiwepiʔi*	*ningiwe*	*miningiwe*	---
túnguluya	*tungulupiʔi*	*ntunguru*	*mitunguru*	Rhus natalensis
sawaa	*sawapiʔi*	*sayu*	*misayu*	Lannea sp.
ungumaako	*ungumapiʔi*	*ngúmo*	*mangúmo*	---

Table 3: Plant names in Hadzabe and Sukuma

Based on morphologies, these names originate from Sukuma. Masculine gender-number in Hadzabe is indicated by *-wa(a)*/*-ya(a)*, while feminine gender-number is marked by suffix *-ako*/*-ko*. The plural forms manifest with the suffix *-piʔi*. Almost all nouns in table 2 exhibit this phenomena, i.e. constitute the gender-and-number suffixes *-wa(a)*/*-ya(a)* (masculine/singular), *-ako*/*-ko* (feminine/singular), and *-piʔi* (feminine/plural). In Sukuma, the nominal prefixes *m-*/*na-*/*ni-*/*n-* indicate singularity, while plurals are marked by prefix *ma-*/*mi-*. The nouns with this morphology appears to have come from Sukuma, except *sayu* (Lannea sp.), which does not begin with nominal prefix in singular. Since the morphologies of the nouns in table 2 are typically Bantu in nature, it becomes plausible that these plant names have been borrowed from Sukuma to Hadzabe, as is the case of several borrowed names for other artefacts (Lusekelo 2017a, b). The plant name *sayu* (Lannea sp.) appears to have not originated from Sukuma because it does not reveal the morphology of Bantu nouns.

At this juncture one wonders as to why the Hadzabe should have adopted the names of plants from Sukuma. In the literature, it is stated that Lake Eyasi is the traditional land of the Hadzabe who practised hunting wild animals and birds and collecting wild tubers, berries and leaves (Marlowe 2002, 2010; Petersen 2012; Woodburn 1970). It is plausible to argue that plants did bear Hadzabe names

which had been replaced by the Sukuma names. It is also plausible to assume that the lexicon of Hadzabe might have constituted names of each plant. But the influence of the Sukuma culture enabled the Hadzabe to drop the indigenous names.

But the suggestion that the Hadzabe dropped indigenous names of some plants cannot be assumed to be water-tight because the Hadzabe are good at adopting foreign names (Lusekelo 2014, 2015b) and using other names for other purposes (Blench 2013). Also, the Hadzabe tend to maintain many names of some important animals, as illustrated by Blench (2013; Miller 2013): *hantaʔe* (masculine) vs. *hantaʔi* (feminine) vs. *dóŋoko* (general/common) 'zebra', *hawaʔe* (masculine) vs. *hawaʔi* (feminine) vs. *ts'ókwanako* (general/common) 'giraffe', and *tehlehеʔe* (masculine) vs. *tehlehеʔi* (feminine) vs. *nák'ómáko* (general/common) 'buffalo'. Apart from a series of these names, foreign names are also used, for instance, Bantu name *mwanda* 'old male zebra', *k^{h}upe* (from Bantu) 'hunting name for giraffe', and *náti* 'donkey' (Miller 2013). Therefore, further research on plant names across other dialects of Hadzabe (i.e. Mangolanebe [Karatu district], Tl'iikanebe [Mkalama district] and Siponganebe [Mbulu district]) is required in order to compare the names across dialects. Also, further research in Meatu district is required in order to determine how much amount of knowledge of indigenous names of plants is lost amongst the Dunduiya Hadzabe.

7. Conclusion

The purpose of writing this paper was to articulate two issues: one, expansion of our knowledge about language contact in western Tanzania where Dunduiya Hadzabe had been interacting with the Sukuma since caravan salt trade; two, incorporation of the linguistic influence of Sukuma on Hadzabe, which is not reported in previous studies (see Edenmyr 2007; Lusekelo 2019). Both objectives of the paper have been achieved.

The material culture of the western (Dunduiya) Hadzabe differs from those of eastern dialects, namely Mangola in Karatu district, and Siponga in Mbulu district and Tl'iikanebe in Mkalama district. Woodburn (1970) noticed this

difference. In our data from Sungu village, names of crops have been adopted from Sukuma. Also, names of households have been adopted from Sukuma. This is an obvious phenomenon of additive borrowing in which concepts which were not available in the nomadic Hadzabe foragers are borrowed from the adjacent community of sedentary Sukuma farmers.

Names of wild plants are shared amongst the Hadzabe and Sukuma. This appears to be a case of substitutive borrowing in that names of wild plants must have been available in the lexicon of Hadzabe because they depended on wild plants as sources of tubers, berries, medicine and leaves. Traditionally, earth materials of this nature should contain names in a language of people inhabiting the area (Haspelmath 2009). It is unfortunate that the Sukuma people have influenced Dunduiya Hadzabe even for the names of some important plants in Meatu district.

The incorporation of Sukuma names of wild plants requires further research across dialects of Hadzabe. This is because it is unclear as to why the Hadzabe should have borrowed names of wild plants while they have depended throughout their existence. Perhaps there exist many names of the same wild plants across dialects. This is a common phenomenon in Hadzabe who appear to maintain many names for wild animals (Blench 2013).

References

Abrahams, R. 1989. Law and order and the state in the Nyamwezi and Sukuma area of Tanzania. *Journal of the International African Institute* 59(3): 356-370.

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

Blench, R. 2013. Linguistic aspects of Hadza interactions with animals. In A. Witzlack and M. Erneszt (eds.). *Khoisan languages and linguistics: Proceedings of the 3rd international symposium.* Cologne: Ruediger Koeppe Verlag, pp. 101-110.

Blurton-Jones, N. 2016. *Demography and evolutionary ecology of Hadza hunter-gatherers*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Blurton-Jones, N. G., L. C. Smith, J. F. O'Connell, K. Hawkes, and C. L. Kamuzora (1992). Demography of the Hadza, an increasing and high density population of savanna foragers. *American Journal of Physical Anthropology* 89: 159-181.

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

Edenmyr, N. 2007. Bantu loans in Hadza. Paper presented at *Bantu languages: Analysis, description and theory,* Gothenburg University, Sweden, October 4-6, 2007.

FAO. 1993. *Indigenous multipurpose trees of uses and economic benefits for people*. Rome: FAO Working Paper FO:Misc/93/9.

Gunderson, F. D. 2010. *Sukuma labor songs from western Tanzania: We never sleep, we dream of farming*. Leiden: Brill.

Haspelmath, M. 2009. Lexical borrowing: Concepts and issues. In M. Haspelmath and U. Tadmor (eds.). *Loanwords in the world's languages: A comparative handbook*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, pp. 35-54.

Itandala, B. 1980. Nilotic impact on the Babinza of Usukuma. *Transafrican Journal of History* 9(1/2): 1-17.

Kaare, B. T. M. 1989. The Hadzabe and Tanzanian state: Problems of transformation in a hunting-gathering community. MA dissertation, University of Dar es Salaam.

Katamba, F. 2003. Bantu nominal morphology. In D. Nurse and G. Philippson (eds.). *The Bantu languages*. London: Routledge, pp. 103-120.

Kiessling, R., M. Maarten, and D. Nurse. 2008. The Tanzanian rift valley area. In: B. Heine and D. Nurse (eds.). *A linguistic geography of Africa*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 186-227.

Little, M. 1991. Colonial policy and subsistence in Tanganyika 1925-1945. *Geographical Review* 81(4): 375-388.

LoT. 2009. *Atlasi ya lugha za Tanzania*. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

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 N. Ostler and P. Heinrich (eds.). *FEL XVIII Okinawa:*

Indigenous languages – Value to the community. Bath: Foundation for Endangered Languages, pp. 88-92.

Lusekelo, A. 2015a. The consequences of the contacts between Bantu and non-Bantu languages around Lake Eyasi in northern Tanzania. *International Journal of Society, Culture & Language* 3(1): 62-75.

Lusekelo, A. 2015b. *The Hadzabe society of Tanzania: Contacts, sociolinguistics and onomastics*. Ibadan: John Archers.

Lusekelo, A. 2016. The spread of Kiswahili lexis into the interior Bantu: The case of names of New World cereals and tubers in Tanzanian Bantu. *Kioo cha Lugha* 14: 50-73.

Lusekelo, A. 2017a. Education-induced borrowing in Tanzania: Penetration of Swahili nouns into Maa (Maasai) and Hadzane (Hadzabe). *Language Matters* 48 (1): 3-26.

Lusekelo, A. 2017b. Additive and substitutive borrowing against semantic broadening and narrowing in the names of architectural structures in Tanzanian Bantu languages. *Unizik Journal of Arts and Humanities* 18(1): 19-45.

Lusekelo, A. 2019. The incorporation of the Kiswahili names of cereals and tubers in the non-Bantu languages in Tanzania. *Utafiti Journal of African Perspectives* 14(2): 295-314.

Marlowe, F. 2002. Why the Hadza are still hunter-gatherers. In K. Sue (ed.). *Ethnicity, hunter-gatherers and the "other": Association or assimilation in Africa.* Washington D.C.: Smithsonian Institution Press, pp. 247-275.

Marlowe, F. W. 2005. Who tends Hadza children? In S. B. Hewlett and M. E. Lamb (eds.). *Hunter-gather childhoods: Evolutionary, developmental and cultural perspective*. New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction, pp. 177-190.

Marlowe, F. W. 2010. *The Hadza hunter-gatherers of Tanzania*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Mesaki, S. 2009. The tragedy of ageing: Witch killings and poor governance among the Sukuma. In L. Haram and C. B. Yamba (eds.). *Dealing with uncertainty in contemporary African lives*. Stockholm: Nordiska Afrikainstitutet, pp. 72-90.

Miller, K. (with B. Sands and B. Gudo) 2013. *Hadza dictionary*. Mang'ola, Tanzania. Manuscript (electronic).

Miller, K. 2016. Hadza kinship terms. In S. Shenah and M. Brenzinger (eds.). *Khoisan languages and linguistics: Proceedings of the 5th international symposium*, July 13-17, 2014. Cologne: Ruediger Koeppe Verlag, 277-333.

Mous M. and Rottland, F. 2001. Datooga and Iraqw: A comparison of subsistence vocabulary. In D. Ibriszimow, R. Leger, and U. Seibert (eds.). *Von Aegypten zum Tschadsee – eine linguistische Reise durch Afrika. Festschrift fuer Herrrmann Jungraithmayr zum 65. Geburtstag*. Wuerzburg: Deutsche Morgenlaendische Gesellschaft, pp. 377-400.

Petersen, D. 2012. (with R. Baalow and J. Cox). *Hadzabe by the light of a million fires.* Dar es Salaam: Mkuki na Nyota Publishers.

Rockel, S. J. (997. *Caravan porters of the Nyika: Labour, culture, and society in nineteenth century Tanzania*. Doctoral thesis, University of Toronto.

Rockel, S. J. 2000. Enterprising partners: Caravan women in nineteenth century Tanzania. *Canadian Journal of African Studies* 34(3): 748-778.

Sands, B. 2001. Borrowing and diffusion as a source of lexical similarities in Khoesan. *Cornell Working Papers in Linguistics* 18: 200-224.

Sands, B., I. Maddieson and P. Ladefoged. 1996. The phonetic structures of Hadza. *Studies in African Linguistics* 25: 171-204.

Woodburn, J. 1958. The Hadza: First impression. Paper prepared for *East African Institute Social Sciences,* Kampala (Makerere) Conference, June, 1-10, 1958.

Woodburn, J. 1970. *Hunters and gatherers: The material culture of nomadic Hadza.* London: The Trustees of the British Museum.