

Two Ethnic Languages of the Ma'a People⁰ — A Sociolinguistic Approach —

Maya Abe

1 Introduction

This paper deals with two languages spoken by the Ma'a people¹ living in the Usambara Mountains, Tanzania. One of them has a Bantu concord system between noun classes and prefixes while also having a large number of elements which are thought to have come from several non-Bantu languages (origin unknown). It has been focused on as a unique case of language contact because it is thought to be a kind of "mixed language", and several studies on the language have been conducted to determine its sociolinguistic status. Hereafter I will call this language "Inner Kima'a". There is no detailed data on the other language which is thought to be almost the same as Kipare² (Bantu, G22, classified by

⁰ I wish to express my deepest gratitude to my language consultant, Mr. William R. Mboko (born in 1941), all other members of his family, and the respondents of the interviews. Also, my special thanks are due to the late Prof. Ruth M. Besha for her most helpful and encouraging advice on my field research in the Lushoto District. This paper is an expansion of part of an earlier study, Abe (2002). All of the data on the Ma'a people and their languages in this paper are from my field research in the Lushoto District (Jan.-Feb. 2000, Jun.-Sep. 2001) and Dar es Salaam (Jul.-Sep. 2000), Tanzania. My study on the Ma'a people and their languages has been supported by Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research on Priority Areas from the Japanese Ministry of Education, Culture, Sports, Science and Technology for the project entitled "Endangered Languages of the Pacific Rim" headed by Osahito Miyaoka.

¹ As for the appellation of the ethnic group which I will focus on in this paper, most of the previous studies said that "Ma'a" is the self-appellation and "Mbugu" is the appellation for them used only by outsiders. But the reality is more complicated, according to my own field research in summer 2001. "Ma'a" (sg. /maʔa/ pl. /vamaʔa/) is used as the self-appellation of the Ma'a people in *Kimbugu cha ndani* 'Inner Kima'a'. "Mbugu" (sg. /mbugu/ pl. /vambugu/) is the way in which they call themselves in *Kimbugu cha kawaida* 'Normal Kima'a' and how the members of other ethnic groups call them in Kiswahili and other ethnic languages. That is to say, "Mbugu" is not used as the appellation only by outsiders, but also by the Ma'a people themselves. Those who cannot understand Inner Kima'a may not use the appellation "Ma'a". Hereafter I will use the appellation "Ma'a" for the people whom I will focus on in this paper because only they use "Ma'a" as a self-appellation. See Abe (2002: 7) for further discussion about the appellation of the languages of the Ma'a people.

² See Besha (1974), etc. At this moment, this language is not included in the classification of Bantu

Guthrie 1948), which is spoken by the Pare people³ living in the Pare Mountains. Hereafter I will call this language “Normal Kima’a”.

In the previous studies on these languages, both of them have been reported to be the Ma’a people’s own languages and to be acquired as a first language (Mous 1994: 176, etc). Therefore, we may say they are ethnic languages of the Ma’a people. However, details of the situation of language use of the Ma’a people for these languages has never been described.

Therefore, in this paper I will describe the language use of the Ma’a people based on the data from my own field research in the western part of the Usambara Mountains and show the following points: these two languages are acquired as the first languages by two different groups of the Ma’a people respectively, not by the same group and yet both of the groups share the ethnic identity as “Ma’a”.

2 Background of the study

2.1 Place of residence

The Ma’a people live in several areas in the western part of the Usambara Mountains (Lushoto District), northeastern Tanzania⁴. The dominant ethnic group in the area is the Shambaa⁵ people. They speak Kishambaa (Bantu, G23, classified by Guthrie 1948) as their own ethnic language. Besides the Ma’a people and the Shambaa people, there are some Pare people that have migrated from the Pare Mountains. They speak Kipare as their own ethnic language. Although the population of the Pare people in the Usambara Mountains has never been estimated properly, it seems to be the least among these three ethnic groups.

2.2 Previous Studies⁶

The first documentation of the Ma’a people or Kima’a was done by Farler (1885). He collected 130 words of Inner Kima’a, as well as other ethnic languages of Tanzania. Johnston (1886) suggested that the vocabulary of Inner Kima’a has

languages.

³ The main place of residence of the Pare people is the Pare Mountains in Kilimanjaro Region, Tanzania. Total population of the Pare people is estimated to be 400,000 (Grimes, ed. 2002).

⁴ Abe (2002: 4-7) gives a detailed explanation of the places of residence of the Ma’a people.

⁵ The Shambaa population is estimated to be 550,000 (Grimes, ed. 2002).

⁶ See Abe (2002: 14-19) for further review of the previous studies.

non-Bantu origins while its morphology and syntax is Bantu. Furthermore, Meinhof (1906) first pointed out that the vocabulary of Inner Kima'a has a resemblance to that of Iraqw (spoken in Tanzania) which belongs to the Southern Cushitic language group. Then Inner Kima'a began to be focused on as a unique case of the studies of language contact, and several studies of Inner Kima'a were conducted to determine its linguistic or sociolinguistic status⁷. Through these descriptions, various linguists suggested different processes of language contact that Inner Kima'a had undergone⁸. Some of these linguists estimated that the lexical roots which are said to be from non-Bantu languages have a genetic relationship with Southern Cushitic languages such as Iraqw, Burunge (spoken in Tanzania) and so on⁹. These previous studies were conducted mainly to investigate how Inner Kima'a had been "created" and in which language group Inner Kima'a should be classified.

As I have already mentioned, the Ma'a people have been said to speak Normal Kima'a as well as Inner Kima'a. But Normal Kima'a had not been mentioned in the previous studies until Besha (1974) and Tucker and Bryan (1974) were published. After Besha (1974) and Tucker and Bryan (1974), several studies referred to Normal Kima'a as very close to Kipare but few studies showed the structure of Normal Kima'a systematically¹⁰.

Mous (1994) analyzes the grammar of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a respectively and comprehensively based on his own field research, and concludes that the only difference between Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a is vocabulary. According to this analysis, he advances the following opinion:

Inner Mbugu¹¹ is a lexical register that was created by speakers of Normal Mbugu¹². They did this consciously and on purpose, to set themselves apart from their Bantu neighbors. (Mous 1994 : 199)

⁷ See Green (1963), Besha (1974), Tucker and Bryan (1974) and Mous (1994).

⁸ See Goodman (1971), Thomason (1983, 1997), Brenzinger (1987), Thomason and Kaufman (1988) and so forth.

⁹ See Mous (1994), Thomason (1997), etc.

¹⁰ See Tucker and Bryan (1974) and Mous (1994).

¹¹ Ibid. Inner Kima'a.

¹² Ibid. Normal Kima'a.

He seems to imply the possibility that Inner Kima'a was created as a secret language. Moreover, Mous (2001) advances the opinion that "Inner Mbugu" is "a ethno-register" of Normal Kima'a, not a separate language.

When we try to judge whether a certain "language" is a separate "language" or not, we should not only consider and analyze the structure of a language, but also sociolinguistic elements of the language. The opinion of Mous (1994, 2001) that Inner Kima'a is a register of Normal Kima'a should be submitted with sociolinguistic evidence, for example, the situation of language use of the Ma'a people for both Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a. But he does not mention such sociolinguistic evidence nor do previous studies describe such a situation in detail. Therefore, his opinion cannot be satisfactorily substantiated. From such a review of previous studies, we should deal with the situation of language use in the Ma'a community before we discuss the structure of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a in detail.

Thus the purpose of this paper is to show the situation of language use of the Ma'a people for Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a.

3 Sociolinguistic view on Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a

As I mentioned above, in some previous studies it has been said that both Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are spoken as their own languages in a single ethnic group, Ma'a. However, I don't think it is natural that both languages serve as a symbol of ethnic identity of a single ethnic group, and are spoken in the same situation and in the same way among a single ethnic group. Therefore, in this section I will make three assumptions as to the sociolinguistic status of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a.

In the first place, I can make the following assumption from the viewpoint that a single person speaks those two languages as one's own ethnic languages:

- 1) Either Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a carries out sociolinguistically special functions in the community of the Ma'a people.

In the second place, I can make the following assumption from the viewpoint that a single person, unlike the opinions seen in the previous studies, does not speak those two languages as one's own ethnic language:

- 2) Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are spoken as their own ethnic language by different people, respectively.

Furthermore, I can make the third assumption as follows from the opinion of Mous (1994, 2001):

- 3) Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are not two separate 'languages', but two registers of a single language.

The next section will consider these three assumptions.

3.1 Sociolinguistic functions of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a

When we assume that both Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are spoken as one's own ethnic language by a single person, it is possible to think that one of them is spoken mainly in one's daily conversation and the other carries out sociolinguistically special functions in the Ma'a community. It is often the case that the languages which are said to be "created" through language contact such as Inner Kima'a carry out sociolinguistically special functions. Given this factor, I will survey the sociolinguistic situation of other languages which have a similar structure to Inner Kima'a¹³. I will use the term "the languages which have structure similar to Inner Kima'a" to refer to the language whose morphology and syntax originate in one language and whose vocabulary originates in another language. This definition is applied to the following languages: Michif, Mednyj Aleut, Eynu, Angloromani and so forth. In this section I will review the sociolinguistic situation around these languages.

3.1.1 Michif¹⁴

Michif is spoken by some Métis people living mainly in Manitoba, Saskatchewan and Alberta provinces in Canada and North Dakota, Montana and Oregon states in the United States. Michif is the language whose morphology, syntax and verbal stems originate in Cree, and whose nouns originate in French. Bakker (1994, 1997) assumes that Michif emerged as the ethnic language of the

¹³ Bakker and Mous (1994: 4-7) call the languages dealt with above "mixed languages". They define that a "mixed language has its lexicon and grammar from different sources" (Bakker and Mous 1994: 5). Furthermore, they say that "On the basis of the lexicon one would classify such languages as belonging to one language family and on the basis of the morphology, syntax and general grammatical characteristics one would classify them as belonging to another language family" (Bakker and Mous 1994: 5). Then in Bakker and Mous eds. (1994), they take Angloromani as an example of a *mixed language*. But this language should not be a good example of a *mixed language* because Angloromani is the language that was "created" by the language contact between Romani and English, both of which belong to the one language group, Indo-European.

¹⁴ The information about Michif is drawn from Bakker (1994, 1997).

Métis people who were of mixed race between French and the Cree People and desired their own identity as a new ethnicity.

3.1.2 Mednyj Aleut¹⁵

Mednyj Aleut is spoken on Copper (Mednyj) Island in Russia. It has nouns and verbal stems which are from Aleut, while it has a Russian grammatical system. Golovko (1994: 117) assumes that it was constructed by those who speak Aleut as their mother language and Russian as the second language. As for the social factor of the genesis of the language, Golovko (1994) assumes as follows:

The reason for the emergence of CIA¹⁶ was the aspiration of a group of people for a separate identity. At first, it could have been a group of 'creoles' of Attu Island, who, before or after their relocation to Mednyj (Copper) Island, wanted, for some reason, to confirm their special status. They spoke two languages, Aleut and Russian, but obviously they could not join the small group of Russians (even if they wished to), and they did not want to be included into the Aleut community which had a lower status. Their wish to mark their status against the background of the Aleut group may have made them 'invent' their own language. It may have begun as a game (cf. the code-mixing game - see below). Then it served as a kind of secret code (secret from speakers of Aleut), and later it became the native language for the next generation. (Golovko 1994: 118)

3.1.3 Eynu¹⁷

Eynu is spoken by the Eynu people in the southern part of the Uyghur Autonomous Region, China. Its phonological system, morphology and syntax originate in modern Uyghur and its vocabulary mainly originates in Persian. Hayasi et al. (1999: 23) observes that "only adult men know Eynu" and they use it "when they want outsiders not to understand their conversation". They also observe that "whenever it is unnecessary to conceal their conversation, for example at home, they always use modern Uyghur" (Hayasi et al. 1999: 23).

¹⁵ The information about Mednyj Aleut is drawn from Golovko (1994) and Fujishiro (2000).

¹⁶ Copper Island Aleut, *ibid.* Mednyj Aleut.

¹⁷ The information about Eynu is drawn from Hayasi et al. (1999) and Hayasi (2000).

Hayasi (2000) assumes that Eynu is not a separate language but a series of special vocabulary of Uyghur that is used by the Eynu people because the difference between Eynu and modern Uyghur is seen only in their vocabulary. Hayasi also states that it is used as a kind of secret language, but the reason that the Eynu people needed a secret language has remained unaccounted for.

3.1.4 Angloromani¹⁸

Angloromani is spoken by the Roma people in England. Its morphology and syntax originate in English, while its vocabulary originates in Romani. Hancock ed. (1979) assumes that Angloromani began to develop as a secret language in the sixteenth century. Kenrick (1979: 115-19) presumes that it is a register of English, then lists up seven situations that Angloromani is spoken. From the consideration of these seven situations, we can assume that Angloromani plays a role as a secret language and functions to express an ethnic identity of the Roma people.

3.1.5 Sociolinguistic functions of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a

With a review of the sociolinguistic situation of the four languages mentioned above, we can assume that those languages have the sociolinguistic functions as follows:

1. They are spoken to express "ethnic" identity of people of mixed race.
2. They are used as secret languages.

Then, I will judge whether Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a has the sociolinguistic functions mentioned above.

First, I will see whether Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a is the language for people of mixed race to express their "ethnic" identity.

The opinion that the Ma'a people are of mixed race has never been seen in previous studies nor ever been heard of in my field research in Lushoto District. Therefore, we may say that it is highly unlikely that the Ma'a people are of mixed race.

Secondly, I will see whether Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a is used as a secret language.

¹⁸ The information about Angloromani is drawn from Kenrick (1979), Hancock (1979, 1984) and Boretzky and Igla (1994).

Green (1963) states that the Ma'a people are not communicative and keep themselves apart from the Shambaa people. According to the interviews which I had with some Shambaa people, they seem to think the Ma'a people are secretive and not communicative. And some Ma'a people answered in the interview which I had that those who live in secluded places in the Usambara Mountains have a tendency to be unsocial.

We may see from these remarks that the Ma'a people are sometimes unsocial. However, as in 3. 2. 2. 3 below, the Ma'a people have contact with the Shambaa people in their daily life and usually communicate with them in Kishambaa. Also, they switch the language of conversation into Kishambaa whenever some Shambaa people join a conversation among the Ma'a people. That is to say, they never conceal the content of the conversations in front of those who are outsiders. Therefore, we can deny the possibility that the Ma'a people speak Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a as a secret language intentionally.

It follows from what has been said that neither Inner Kima'a nor Normal Kima'a carries sociolinguistically special functions in the Ma'a community and that the first assumption is not right.

3. 2 Language use of the Ma'a people

At the beginning of section 3, I listed three assumptions about sociolinguistic situations of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a. In 3.1, I considered the first assumption, but the result was not satisfactory. In this section I will consider the second assumption that Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are not spoken as one's ethnic language by a single person. I will see how the Ma'a people use Inner Kima'a, Normal Kima'a and other languages that the Ma'a people speak in their daily life. In order to see this, I will analyze the results of interviews I had on the questionnaire about language use of the Ma'a people.

3. 2. 1 Interviews on language use

A series of interviews were conducted in the city of Dar es Salaam (August 2000) and Lushoto District (July-August 2001). Respondents of the interviews were 11 Ma'a people¹⁹: one in her teens, four in their twenties, two in their

¹⁹ As shown in Table 1, M2 is a Pare. However, since his father died when he was a little child and he was born and brought up in Kinkho (see Abe 2002: 6, Map 2) which is the main place of

thirties, two in their forties and two in their seventies. In these interviews, I used a questionnaire to survey language use. See appendix for particulars about the questionnaire.

3.2.1.1 Linguistic competence

Question No.7 is a question as to the ethnicity and linguistic competence of the respondents. The results may not be objective because they are from respondents themselves. However, they will contribute toward a survey of linguistic competence of the Ma'a people.

Table 1 illustrates the ethnic group and linguistic competence of the respondents. I put the ethnicity of each respondent and one's father together because the Ma'a families are patrilineal and children inherit the ethnicity of their fathers respectively. Hereafter I will use the running number seen in Table 1 when I refer to each respondent. As for languages which each respondent can understand when heard but cannot speak, I will list each of them in parentheses²⁰. Also, in the tables below, I will abbreviate names of languages as follows: I... Inner Kima'a N...Normal Kima'a Sh...Kishambaa Sw...Kiswahili P... Kipare E...English

residence of the Ma'a people, I will include him into the scope of the analysis.

²⁰ I will regard passive speakers of a certain language as those who do not have competence in the language. Therefore, the languages which are listed in parentheses in Table 1 are the ones they do not have competence in.

Table 1 Linguistic competence

Sex	No.	age	ethnicity			Languages which respondent has competence					
			respondent (Father)	Mother	partner of respondent						
F	F1	41	Ma'a	Shambaa	Swahili	(I)	N	Sh	Sw		E
	F2	(35)	Ma'a	Ma'a	Ma'a	I	N	Sh	Sw		
	F3	19	Ma'a	Ma'a	—	(I)	N	Sh	Sw	P	
	F4	32	Ma'a	Ma'a	Ma'a	I	N	Sh	Sw	P	
	F5	27	Ma'a	Ma'a	—		N	Sh	Sw		E
M	M1	25	Ma'a	Ma'a	—	I	N	Sh	Sw	P	
	M2	27	Pare	Ma'a	—	(I)	N	Sh	Sw	P	E
	M3	71	Ma'a	Ma'a	Ma'a	I	N	Sh	Sw	P	
	M4	26	Ma'a	Zigua	—	I	N	Sh	Sw		
	M5	78	Ma'a	Ma'a	Ma'a	I	N	Sh	Sw		
	M6	40	Ma'a	Ma'a	Ma'a	I	N	Sh	Sw	P	E

First, as the table indicates, all the respondents have competence in Kiswahili. This is due to Tanzania's designation of Kiswahili as the medium of instruction in primary schools which has been successfully carried out throughout the country.

Secondly, the table indicates that all of the respondents have competence in Normal Kima'a while seven of them have competence in Inner Kima'a.

Thirdly, as for Kishambaa, all the respondents answered that they spoke the language. This result indicates that Kishambaa, the ethnic language of the Shambaa people who are dominant in the Usambara Mountains, is also dominant in terms of sociolinguistic status.

Finally, as for Kipare, six of the respondents answered that they had competence in the language. As I mentioned above, the previous studies have said that Normal Kima'a is very similar to Kipare. Some Ma'a people said that Normal Kima'a and Kipare are the same language, while others said that they are very much alike but separate languages. On the other hand, some Pare people said that they could understand what the Ma'a people said to them in Normal Kima'a. From such remarks, it is not clear whether those who said that they could speak Kipare speak it properly or not.

3.2.1.2 Language use

Questions No.10-12 are questions as to language use of the Ma'a people. No.10 is a question about language use at home. No.11 about language use in conversation with people of an other ethnicity and the influences of those present in the conversation; and No.12 is about language use in public gathering places.

• Language use at home

Table 2 illustrates language use of the Ma'a people at home.

Table 2 Language use at home

No.	age	with grand-parent(s)	with father	with mother	with sibling(s)	with partner	with child(ren)	with grand-child(ren)
F1	41	N	N	N	N	Sw	Sw	—
F2	(35)	I	I, N	I, N	N	N	N	—
F3	19	N	N	N	N	—	—	—
F4	32	I	I	I	I	I	I	—
F5	27	N	N, Sw	N, Sw	N, Sw	—	—	—
M1	25	I	I	I	I	—	—	—
M2	27	P	P	P	P	—	—	—
M3	71	I	I	I	I	I	I	—
M4	26	N	N	N	N	—	—	—
M5	78	I	I	I	I	I	I	I
M6	40	I	I	I	I	I	I	—

Table 2 indicates that with the exception of M2, respondents speak either Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a at home. M2 answered that he usually spoke Kipare at home because his ethnicity is Pare. Among those who answered that they spoke Inner Kima'a, F2 and M4 answered that they did not speak the language so often in their daily life. For this reason, it is assumed that their interlocutors cannot speak Inner Kima'a that have acquired Inner Kima'a imperfectly.

First, as for F2, she answered that her parents spoke Inner Kima'a in their daily life, and she talked with them in Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a and talked with her siblings in Normal Kima'a. From such a situation we can deduce that her competence in Inner Kima'a is not enough, that is, inheritance of Inner Kima'a in her family has begun to be abandoned from her generation.

Secondly, as for M4, he answered that both his grandparents and parents spoke Inner Kima'a in their daily life and he talked with all of them in Normal Kima'a. He helped me to collect 120 words of Inner Kima'a in summer 2000, but it was observed afterwards that a large part of them were not from Inner Kima'a but Normal Kima'a or Kishambaa. From this observation, it is likely that he has acquired Inner Kima'a imperfectly.

Those who answered that they had competence in Inner Kima'a, except F2 and M4, said that they spoke Inner Kima'a in their daily life, and talked with their children or grandchildren in Inner Kima'a. That is, they never use Normal Kima'a at home. Since they also said their children and grandchildren had competence in Inner Kima'a, we can say that Inner Kima'a has been inherited within their families.

It follows from what has been said that in some families Inner Kima'a has been inherited while in some families it no longer is. The answers to question No.8b and 9b show that parents of those who do not have competence in Inner Kima'a have competence in the language. We can say from this point that inheritance of Inner Kima'a began to be abandoned in this generation. Also, we can say that the languages of other ethnic groups such as Kishambaa are not spoken at home or in the conversation among the Ma'a people.

- Language use in conversation with members of other ethnic groups

Question No.11 is about language use in conversation with members of other ethnic groups. Table 3 illustrates which language each respondent mainly uses in conversation with Shambaa people.

Table 3

No.	Age	Sex of the interlocutor	Question No.11				
			a	b	c	d	e
F1	41	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
F2	(35)	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
F3	19	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
F4	32	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
F5	27	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
M1	25	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
M2	27	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
M3	71	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh
M4	26	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	—	—
M5	78	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh
M6	40	M	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—
		F	Sh	Sh	Sh	Sh	—

As Table 3 indicates, all the respondents switch the language of conversation into Kishambaa when they talk with Shambaa people. From this result, we can say that Kishambaa is the dominant language in the Usambara Mountains, not Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a.

Table 4 illustrates which language each respondent mainly uses in the conversation with Pare people.

Table 4

No.	Age	Sex of the interlocutor	Question No.11				
			a	b	c	d	e
F1	41	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
F2	(35)	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
F3	19	M	P	P	P	—	—
		F	P	P	P	—	—
F4	32	M	P	P	P	P	—
		F	P	P	P	P	—
F5	27	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
M1	25	M	P	P	P	—	—
		F	P	P	P	—	—
M2	27	M	P	P	P	—	—
		F	P	P	P	—	—
M3	71	M	P	P	P	P	P
		F	P	P	P	P	P
M4	26	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
M5	78	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw
M6	40	M	P	P	P	P	—
		F	P	P	P	P	—

Table 5 illustrates which language each respondent mainly uses in the conversation with those who belong to other ethnic groups besides the Shambaa and the Pare.

Table 5

No.	Age	Sex of the interlocutor	Question No.11				
			a	b	c	d	e
F1	41	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
F2	(35)	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
F3	19	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
F4	32	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
F5	27	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
M1	25	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
M2	27	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
M3	71	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw
M4	26	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	—	—
M5	78	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw
M6	40	M	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—
		F	Sw	Sw	Sw	Sw	—

As the series of tables illustrate, the Ma'a people switch the language of conversation depending on which ethnic group their interlocutors belong to. Language of conversation is not switched depending on sexuality of the interlocutors nor which generation those present in the conversations are from.

As far as I observed, their interlocutors did not switch the language of conversation into Inner Kima'a nor Normal Kima'a. This situation means neither Inner Kima'a nor Normal Kima'a is a dominant language in the Usambara Mountains.

- Language use in public gathering places

Question No.12 is about language use in public gathering places such as post offices and schools. In such places they speak Kiswahili. At the market place, they choose the language of conversation according to the ethnicity of their interlocutors.

3.2.1.3 Summary

Several observations on the results of the interviews I had with the Ma'a people have shown the following remarks:

- Normal Kima'a is acquired by all the Ma'a people, while Inner Kima'a is not.
- Acquisition and inheritance of Inner Kima'a differs between families.
- Kishambaa is the dominant language in the Usambara Mountains.
- Normal Kima'a is not used in conversation among those who have competence in Inner Kima'a.

3.2.2 Observation of daily conversations

In 3.2.1, I considered the situation of language use of the Ma'a people from the result of interviews. In this section I will consider the situation from the observation of daily conversations which had been held in a Ma'a family during 1.5 months. The family consisted of five adults (2 male [78 years old and 40 years old] and three female [70 years old, 32 years old, and 26 years old]) and four children (all of them male [10 years old, 9 years old, and two of 6 years old]). Settings of the conversations are as follows: conversations among the members of the family, with their guests, at market places (in the village and in the town), at the water place, among children, and so forth.

3.2.2.1 Conversations among the family

Conversations among the family are mainly held in Inner Kima'a. We can say that Inner Kima'a has been inherited by the children of the family because they speak Inner Kima'a in their daily life. There is no restriction on the content

of the conversations that are held in Inner Kima'a, but they sometimes apply Kiswahili loan words into the conversations in Inner Kima'a or switch the language of conversation into Kiswahili when they cannot maintain the conversation only with vocabulary of Inner Kima'a, for example, conversation about school and classes. The conversations among them are never held in Normal Kima'a, although all of them have competence in Normal Kima'a.

3.2.2.2 Conversations with other Ma'a people

The result of the observation on conversations with other members of the Ma'a people is as below.

Conversations with those who have competence in Inner Kima'a are held in Inner Kima'a and ones with those who do not are held in Normal Kima'a from the first greeting to farewell. Normal Kima'a is never used in a series of conversations in Inner Kima'a. That is to say, neither Inner Kima'a nor Normal Kima'a is a register. There is no restriction on the content of the conversations which are held either in Inner Kima'a or in Normal Kima'a, but they sometimes apply Kiswahili loanwords into the conversations in Inner Kima'a or switch the language of conversation into Kiswahili when they cannot maintain the conversation only with vocabulary of Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a, for example, conversation about school and classes.

When some Shambaa people join a conversation that is held by Ma'a people, the language of the conversation is switched into Kishambaa. When those who are neither Ma'a nor Shambaa join the conversation, the language of the conversation is switched into Kiswahili. From this situation, we may say that neither Inner Kima'a nor Normal Kima'a functions as a secret language at least in the present situation of language use of the Ma'a people. Also, Kishambaa is not used in the conversations among the Ma'a people.

Conversations in Inner Kima'a are held between man and man, woman and woman, and man and woman. Therefore, the language is independent of sexuality in terms of its use.

3.2.2.3 Conversations with members of other ethnic groups

The result of observations of conversations with the members of other ethnic groups is as below.

Conversations with the Shambaa people are mainly held in Kishambaa from the first greeting to farewell.

Ones with the Pare people are often held in Kiswahili. When the Ma'a people begin to talk to Pare people in Kipare, sometimes the language of the conversation is switched into Kipare.

Kiswahili seems to be the default language when Ma'a people talk to someone whose ethnicity is not known. It is applied to conversations in public gathering places. As for neighbors of the family, they have already been identified as to their ethnicities and linguistic competence, and have been talked to in their own language appropriately.

It is often the case that those who speak more languages switch the language of the conversations according to those who speak fewer languages when there are people from several ethnicities in one conversation.

Languages of other ethnic groups such as Kishambaa are acquired through contacts with their neighbors since their childhood. Which ethnicity is dominant among children's group determines which language is to be the dominant language of communication spoken among the group. Since the dominant ethnicity in the Usambara Mountains is the Shambaa, Ma'a children usually learn Kishambaa. Sometimes Shambaa children learn Kima'a (either Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a) when Ma'a children are dominant in the group, but those children who learned Kima'a forget the language gradually as they grow up because in the community they belong to itself, in which normally the Shambaa people are dominant, they seldom have opportunities to speak Kima'a.

3. 2. 2. 4 Summary — Language use in daily conversation

As for the current situation of language use of the Ma'a people, the result from observation of daily conversations among them can be illustrated as follows:

The Ma'a people switch their language of conversation depending on their interlocutors, that is, they talk to Ma'a people in either Inner Kima'a or Normal Kima'a, to Shambaa people in Kishambaa, and to the members of other ethnic groups in Kiswahili. They do not use the languages of other ethnic groups in conversations among only Ma'a people. Also, Normal Kima'a is not used in conversations among those who have competence in Inner Kima'a.

3.2.3 The situation of language use of the Ma'a people

As seen in the previous sections, I considered the situation of language use of the Ma'a people from the interviews with the questionnaire and observations of daily conversations. From the observations, I will summarize the situation of language use of the Ma'a people as follows:

Normal Kima'a is acquired by all of the Ma'a people, while Inner Kima'a is not acquired by everyone. Inner Kima'a is their first language for those who acquired it. Though speakers of Inner Kima'a also speak Normal Kima'a in conversations with those who do not speak Inner Kima'a, that is, native speakers of Normal Kima'a, they do not use Normal Kima'a in conversations among speakers of Inner Kima'a. This situation of language use is the same as the situation that the Ma'a never speak Kishambaa in the conversations among themselves, although all of them have competence in Kishambaa. From this point, I assume that speakers of Inner Kima'a and those of Normal Kima'a constitute two different groups which share ethnic identity as "Ma'a" and speak two different languages respectively. Speakers of Inner Kima'a also have competence in Normal Kima'a while speakers of Normal Kima'a do not have competence in Inner Kima'a. Therefore, it should be said that Normal Kima'a is the dominant language in the Ma'a community.

3.2.4 Reconsideration of Mous (1994, 2001)

As I mentioned in 2.2, Mous (1994, 2001) assumes that Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are not separate languages but two registers of one language. The main reason for his claim is due to his analysis on the structure of the two "languages" finding that the difference between them is neither morphological nor syntactic, but only lexical. In this section I will reconsider the opinion of Mous (1994, 2001) in terms of the situation of language use, not in terms of the comparison of grammatical structure of two "languages".

His claim that Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are two registers of one language is also seen in Myers-Scotton (1998) as follows:

If one maximizes the Ma'a register, one speaks *Ma'a* [Inner Mbugu²¹].
If one minimizes the Ma'a register, one speaks *Mbugu* [Normal Mbugu²²].
(Myers-Scotton 1998: 307 [p.c. with Mous])

If we suppose that Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are two registers of one language and that there is a range of Inner Kima'a used in the conversation, a conversation which includes half Inner Kima'a and half Normal Kima'a must be plausible, for example. However, in fact, as mentioned in 3.2.2, it never happens that both Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are used in one conversation among one pair of speakers.

It is hard for us to judge whether a certain "language" is a separate language or a register of some language only in terms of the grammar of the "language". Especially, when we try to judge the "language" as a register, we cannot reach the proper conclusion without consideration of how the "language" is used by its speakers. Several observations of the situation of language use of Ma'a people have shown that both Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a act as two separate languages rather than two registers of one language.

4 Conclusion

As for the situation of language use of the Ma'a people, it should be concluded as follows from what has been said above:

Inner Kima'a is not acquired by all of the Ma'a people, while Normal Kima'a is acquired by all of them. Therefore, there is no monolingual speaker of Inner Kima'a in the Ma'a community today. In some families of speakers of Inner Kima'a, Inner Kima'a is not inherited by the young generations. The language is equally acquired by both men and women.

As for the situation of the use of Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a, I will conclude as follows:

There are native speakers of each of the languages. Both Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a are used in any kind of conversation and neither of these two languages has any special function on the use of the language, such as a secret

²¹ Ibid. Inner Kima'a.

²² Ibid. Normal Kima'a.

language. Nevertheless, Normal Kima'a for speakers of Inner Kima'a has a limited domain; it is only used in the conversations with those who do not have competence in Inner Kima'a, that is, native speakers of Normal Kima'a. From this point of view, it can be said that speakers of Inner Kima'a and ones of Normal Kima'a, who share their ethnic identity as "Ma'a", belong to two different groups and each of them has their own ethnic language, that is, Inner Kima'a and Normal Kima'a respectively. Also it can be said that speakers of Normal Kima'a are the dominant group in the Ma'a community and speakers of Inner Kima'a tend to assimilate into the group of speakers of Normal Kima'a these days.

Abbreviations

sg.	singular
pl.	plural

References

- Abe, Maya. 2002. "Maa-go no shakaigengogakuteki kousatsu — Usambara ni okeru Maa-go no chousakenkyuu <in Japanese> (A sociolinguistic perspective on Kima'a : A descriptive study on Kima'a spoken in the Usambara Mountains)." Unpublished M.A. thesis. Kyoto: Kyoto University.
- Bakker, Peter. 1994. "Michif, the Cree-French mixed language of the Métis buffalo hunters in Canada." In P. Bakker and M. Mous, eds. 13-33.
- _____. 1997. *A Language of Our Own: The Genesis of Michif, the Mixed Cree-French Language of the Canadian Métis*. New York/Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous. 1994. "Introduction." In P. Bakker and M. Mous, eds. 4-7.
- Bakker, Peter and Maarten Mous, eds. 1994. *Mixed Languages*. Amsterdam: IFOTT.
- Besha, Mfumbwa Ruth. 1974. *A Socio-linguistic Description of Kimaa and Its Point of Contact with Kishambala*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Dar es Salaam: University of Dar es Salaam.

- Boretzky, Norbert and Birgit Igla. 1994. "Romani mixed dialects." In P. Bakker and M. Mous, eds. 35-68.
- Brenzinger, Matthias. 1987. *Die sprachliche und kulturelle Stellung der Mbugu (Maʼa)*. Unpublished M.A. thesis. Köln: Universität zu Köln.
- Copland, B. G. 1933-34. "A note on the origin of the Mbugu with a text." *Zeitschrift für Eingeborenen-Sprachen* 24-4: 241-44.
- Farler, (Archdeacon). 1885. "A collection of words from the Wa-Mbugu." In Shaw, Archibald Downes, ed. *A Pocket Vocabulary of the Ki-Swahili, Ki-Nyika, Ki-Taita, and Ki-Kamba Languages... Also a Brief Vocabulary of the Kibwyo Dialect*, 198-204. London: Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.
- Fujishiro, Setsu. 2000. "Aidentitii to gengohen'you — Churukuka no purosesu wo otte — <in Japanese> (Identification and language change — on Turkic Language Area in Eurasia —)". *Kyoto University Linguistic Research* 19: 95-115.
- Golovko, Evgenij V. 1994. "Copper Island Aleut." In P. Bakker and M. Mous, eds. 113-21.
- Goodman, Morris. 1971. "The strange case of Mbugu." In D. Hymes, ed. *Pidginization and Creolization of Languages*, 243-54. London: Cambridge University Press.
- Green, E. C. 1963. "The Wambugu of Usambara." *Tanganyika Notes and Records* 61: 175-88.
- Grimes, Barbara F., ed. 2002. *Ethnologue: Languages of the World* 14th ed. vol. 1. Dallas/Texas: SIL International.
- Guthrie, Malcolm. 1948. *The Classification of the Bantu Languages*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Hancock, Ian., ed. 1979. *Romani Sociolinguistics*. Hague: Mouton.
- Hancock, Ian. 1984. "Romani and Angloromani." In P. Trudgill, ed. *Language in the British Isles*, 367-83. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Hayasi, Tooru. 2000. "Chuugoku Shinkyō Uiguru-jichiku nambu de hanasareru 'Einu-go' no goi no tokuchō <in Japanese> (The characteristics of the vocabulary of Eynu spoken in the southern part of the Uyghur Autonomous Region, China)." *Proceedings of the 118th General Meeting of the Linguistic Society of Japan*. Kyoto: The Linguistic Society of Japan.
- Hayasi, Tooru, Sabit Rozi, Tahirjan Muhämmät and Wang Jianxin. 1999. *A Šäyxil Vocabulary — A Preliminary Report of Linguistic Research in Šäyxil Village, Southwestern Xinjiang* — . Kyoto: Department of Linguistics, Kyoto University.
- Johnston, Sir Harry H. 1886. *The Kilimanjaro Expedition*. London: Kegan Paul.

- Kenrick, Donald. 1979. "Romani English." In I. Hancock, ed., 111-20.
- Meinhof, Carl. 1906. "Linguistische Studien in Ostafrika, X: Mbugu." *Mitteilungen des Seminars für orientalische Sprachen* 9: 294-323.
- Mous, Maarten. 1994. "Ma'a or Mbugu." In P. Bakker and M. Mous, eds. 175-200.
- _____. 2001. "Ma'a as an ethno-register of Mbugu." In D. Nurse, ed. *Sprache und Geschichte in Afrika* 16/17: 293-320. Köln: Rüdiger Köppe Verlag.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1998. "A way to dusty death: the Matrix Language turnover hypothesis." In L. A. Grenoble and L. J. Whaley, eds. *Endangered Languages: Language Loss and Community Response*, 289-316. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey. 1983. "Genetic relationship and the case of Ma'a (Mbugu)." *Studies in African Linguistics* 14-2: 195-231.
- _____. 1997. "Ma'a (Mbugu)." In S. G. Thomason, ed. *Contact Languages: A Wider Perspective*, 469-87. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Thomason, Sarah Grey and Terrence Kaufman. 1988. *Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Tucker, A. N. and M. A. Bryan. 1974. "The Mbugu anomaly." *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 37: 188-207.

APPENDIX: Questionnaire on language use

I had interviews to survey the situation of language use of the Ma'a People with the Kiswahili version of the following questionnaire.

1. Age
2. Sex
3. Academic Background
4. Professional Background
5. Where were you born?
- 6a. Where do you live?
- b. Have you ever lived in other places? Please list them all.
- 7a. What is your ethnicity?
- b. What language do you speak? Please list them all.
- 8a. What is(was) the ethnicity of your father?
- b. What language does(did) he speak? Please list them all.
- 9a. What is(was) the ethnicity of your mother?
- b. What language does(did) she speak? Please list them all.

10. In which language do(did) you talk with the following people?
- a. with your grandparent(s)
 - b. with your father
 - c. with your mother
 - d. with your sibling(s)
 - e. with your partner
 - f. with your child(ren)
 - g. with your grandchild(ren)
11. In which language do(did) you talk with the following people?
- a. with {Shambaa/Pare/other} {man/woman}
 - b. with {Shambaa/Pare/other} {man/woman} when you are with your grandparents
 - c. with {Shambaa/Pare/other} {man/woman} when you are with your parents
 - d. with {Shambaa/Pare/other} {man/woman} when you are with your child(ren)
 - e. with {Shambaa/Pare/other} {man/woman} when you are with your grandchild(ren)
12. Which language do you speak when you are in the following places?
- a. at the market place in the town
 - b. at the market place in the village
 - c. in the church (mosque)
 - d. in the office
 - e. in the hospital
 - f. in the bank
 - g. in the post office
 - h. at the bus stop

Lugha Mbili za Wambugu

— Maoni ya Kiisimu Jamii —

Maya Abe

Muhtasari

Katika makala hii ninalenga lugha mbili zinazoongewa na Wambugu wanaoishi Wilaya ya Lushoto katika milima ya Usambara ya nchi ya Tanzania. Mojawapo ya lugha hizo inaitwa *Kimbugu cha ndani* iliyo na miundo ya upatanisho wa ngeli na viambishi awali wa kibantu huku ikiwa na nduni nyingi ambazo zinaonekana kutoka lugha kadhaa zisizo za Kibantu. Lugha hiyo Inafikiriwa kuwa aina moja ya lugha za mchanganyiko na inalengwa kama kadhia isiyo na kifani katika masomo ya migusano ya lugha. Lugha nyingine inayoitwa *Kimbugu cha kawaida* inafikiriwa kwamba inafanana sana na Kipare kinachoongewa na Wapare wanaoishi katika milima ya Pare. Lakini hakuna data za kina.

Katika makala nyingine zilizoandika kuhusu lugha hizi zinatolewa taarifa kwamba lugha hizi zote ni lugha za Wambugu wenyewe na zinarithiwa kama lugha ya kwanza. Hata hivyo, hali ya matumizi ya lugha ambazo Wambugu wanaongea hazielezwi kwa kina hata mara moja.

Kutoka uhakiki wa usuli wa uchaguzi wa Kimbugu cha ndani na cha kawaida kama huo, katika makala hii ninachanganua matumizi ya lugha ya Wambugu pamoja na matokeo ya utafiti niliofanya katika Wilaya ya Lushoto na ninahitimisha kwamba Kimbugu cha ndani na cha kawaida zinarithiwa kama lugha ya kwanza na makundi mawili tofauti, sio na kundi moja.