(1) Retroflexion in Somali Bantu Kizigua: Language Shift and a Contact-Induced Explanation to What Looks Like an Internally Motivated Sound Change
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(2) The problem
As discussed by Thomason and Kaufman (1988):
• Traditional bias among historical linguists against claims of change induced by language shift
Logical reason for bias:
• A completed shift means the language disappears
• Loss of key evidence about the structure of the language
• Hard to prove unless language continues to be spoken elsewhere and/or written documentation available
Yet, it may have happened more often historically than has been described.
So, important to examine cases in which there is sufficient evidence

(3) Presentation Focus
• Case study of shift-induced sound change
  o Both sociohistorical and linguistic evidence available
• Data
  o Target Language: Somali Bantu Kizigua (SBK, Bantu G-Zone)
  o Substratum Language: Chimwiini (Bantu G-Zone)

(4) Presentation Goals
• To show how the outcome of this case is an internally motivated pattern that is actually contact-induced
  o Change: alveolar NC > retroflex NC
• To show that genetic relatedness (Epps et al 2013, Law 2013) combined with the specific socio-historical circumstances made this possible
  o Both Chimwiini and Kizigua are Bantu G-Zone
  o History of migration (Tanzania → Somalia → US) and language shift (Other Bantu → Chimwiini → Kizigua)

(5) Criteria needed to prove interference through shift (Thomason & Kaufman 1988)
(i) An identifiable substratum language whose speakers shifted to the target language
• Chimwiini
(ii) Information about its structure
• Chimwiini has had retroflex NC for past several centuries (Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993)
(iii) Information about the target language before the shift
• Tanzanian Kizigua lacks retroflex NC (Last 1885, Kisbey 1897, Kisbey 1906)
• No evidence for development of retroflex NC in early 21st Century Tanzanian Kizigua (Mochiwa 2008)
(6) Notes on NC (Nasal + Consonant) Clusters
• Genetic feature found across Bantu languages
• Status controversial among Bantuists (see Hyman 2003)
  o Is it a single unit, two segments, a mora?
• Commonly transcribed as two segments
  o As in this presentation
  o But in Kizigua, behaves diachronically as a single unit

(7) nt > nʈ in Inherited Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanzanian Kizigua (Kisbey 1906, Mochiwa 2008)</th>
<th>Somali Bantu Kizigua (Consultant Work)</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mntu</td>
<td>mŋtu</td>
<td>‘person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntundo</td>
<td>nʈondo</td>
<td>‘star’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntambo</td>
<td>(mwe) nʈambo</td>
<td>‘traveler’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntembo</td>
<td>nʈembo</td>
<td>‘elephant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>banti</td>
<td>bantɨ</td>
<td>‘door’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntangulu</td>
<td>nʈangulu</td>
<td>‘basket’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(8) nd > nɖ in Inherited Vocabulary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tanzanian Kizigua (Kisbey 1906, Mochiwa 2008)</th>
<th>Somali Bantu Kizigua (Consultant Work)</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ndevu</td>
<td>ndɛvu</td>
<td>‘beard’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vundi</td>
<td>vunde</td>
<td>‘cloud’*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nkonde</td>
<td>hondɛ / qondɛ</td>
<td>‘cultivated field’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tunda</td>
<td>tundɛ</td>
<td>‘fruit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kindedi</td>
<td>cindɛdi</td>
<td>‘correct’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kudanta</td>
<td>kudanʈo</td>
<td>‘to lie, to deceive’*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nkande</td>
<td>hanɖɛ / qandɛ</td>
<td>‘food’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Typo in LSA abstract: SBK form for ‘cloud’ has retroflex, but different vowels not typos

(9) Noun Class Prefix Alternation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SBK</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>mŋtu m-tuhu</td>
<td>‘other person’ (Noun Class 1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wanʈu wa-tuhu</td>
<td>‘other people’ (Noun Class 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cinʈu ci-tuhu</td>
<td>‘other thing’ (Noun Class 7)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vinʈu vi-tuhu</td>
<td>‘other things’ (Noun Class 8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mbwa N-tuhu/ -&gt; [mbwa nʈuhu]</td>
<td>‘other dog’ (Noun Class 9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>/mbwa N-tuhu/ -&gt; [mbwa nʈuhu]</td>
<td>‘other dogs’ (Noun Class 10)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
  - Inherited alternation from TK (Kisbey 1897, Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993), but t → tʰ / n _
  - Similar alternation in Northern Swahili dialects (Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993)

---

1 Kisbey (1906) includes 3,500 words and is the most comprehensive source of vocabulary available on Tanzanian Kizigua.
2 Consultant work began as part of a 4-month long Field Methods course and was subsequently supplemented with work with additional speakers in the Pittsburgh Somali Bantu community resulting in a lexicon of approximately 700 words.
**History of the Zigua (Eno and Eno 2007)**

- 1840’s: Famine and drought in (present-day) NE Tanzania
- Arab-Omani exploitation of many Bantu groups
- East African Slave Trade brought Zigua to coastal city of Brava
- 1865-1890: > 20,000 slaves escape and settle in a region called Gosha (now Southern Somalia)

**The Importance of Gosha**

- Described as a “republic of free ex-slaves” (Declich 1995:96)
- Zigua leadership crucial (although also non-Zigua leaders)
- Isolated the Zigua from Somali invaders, making it possible for Kizigua to be maintained for 100+ years (Crevatin 1993)
- Created environment for Non-Zigua to learn Kizigua

**Two Major Groups in Contact in Gosha**

1. Zigua
2. Mixed Group of
   - Indigenous Groups
     - Bantu: Bajuni, Pokomo
     - Cushitic: Oromo, Boni, Somali
   - Other fugitive slaves
     - All Bantu: Yao, Makua, Ngindo, Nyasa

**Sociolinguistic Division in Gosha in Early Years (Menkhaus 2003)**

- The Zigua
  - All adults
    - Explains why Kizigua language maintained after 100+ years
    - Very strong loyalty to ancestral language/culture
  - Other Bantu Slave Groups
    - Included some children
      - More likely able to acquire other languages
      - Did not pass their heritage languages to subsequent generations
- In the port of Brava (aka Barawa, Mwiini), (Henderson 2010)
  1. Chimwiini (dialect of Northern Swahili, see Nurse & Hinnebusch 1993) – regional lingua franca
  2. Af-Maay (Cushitic)
  3. Tunni Dialect of Somali (Cushitic)

**Subsequent Generations in Gosha region**

- The Zigua
  - Continued speaking Kizigua up to the present
- Other Bantu Groups
  - Initially spoke Chimwiini, Af-Maay, Tunni Somali
  - Today speak Af-Maay and Somali
- Intermarriage between two groups
  - Some Kizigua speakers today trace ancestry to more than one group
Would have facilitated transfer of features from Chimwiini to Kizigua

(15)

**Shift-Induced Interference Between Genetically Related Languages**

(16)

**How /nt/ and /nd/ may have spread from Chimwiini to SBK**

- **The Zigua**
  - All adults spoke Kizigua
  - Spoke Kizigua
  - Spoke Kizigua with both parents Zigua
  - 1 Zigua parent acquired Kizigua with Chimwiini substrate features

- **Other Bantu Groups**
  - Some children acquired Chimwiini and Maay
  - L1: Chimwiini & Maay
  - L2: Kizigua (with Chimwiini phonology)
  - Spoke Maay only
  - Intermarriage

...
(17) Two Mechanisms for Contact-Induced Change
Following Thomason & Kaufman (1988)
- Borrowing
  - L1 speakers of a language influencing direction of change
- Shift-Induced Interference
  - L2 speakers of a language influencing development of language by introducing L1 features into the L2

(18) NC Cluster Correspondences

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TK</th>
<th>Chimwiini</th>
<th>SBK</th>
<th>Gloss</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>nkonde</td>
<td>honde</td>
<td>honde / qonde</td>
<td>‘cultivated field’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-nkundu</td>
<td>-hundu</td>
<td>-hundu</td>
<td>‘red’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nkondo</td>
<td>nkondo</td>
<td>qondo</td>
<td>‘war’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kenda</td>
<td>kenda</td>
<td>cenda</td>
<td>‘nine’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>matunda</td>
<td>matundaqa</td>
<td>matunda</td>
<td>‘fruit’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kintu</td>
<td>cinfu</td>
<td>cinfu</td>
<td>‘thing’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mntu</td>
<td>mntu</td>
<td>mntu</td>
<td>‘person’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntembo</td>
<td>(te:mbo)</td>
<td>ntembo</td>
<td>‘palm wine’, ‘elephant’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ntendo</td>
<td>(no:ta)</td>
<td>ntendo</td>
<td>‘star’</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vundi</td>
<td>(iwi:ngu)</td>
<td>vunde</td>
<td>‘cloud’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(19) Borrowing Scenario
- If all words with retroflex stops borrowed from Chimwiini
  - Why would some words with retroflexion in SBK lack cognates in Chimwiini?
  - Lexical diffusion?
  - Possible, but we also have socio-historical evidence for shift

(20) Shift scenario
- Chimwiini L1 speakers learned Kizigua as an L2 thereby introducing Chimwiini substrate features into Kizigua
- No need to explain lack of corresponding cognates with retroflexion in Chimwiini
  - Interlingual Identification (Weinreich 1953)
    - Kizigua [nt] and [nd] substituted as [nʈ] and [nɖ]

(21) The Importance of Similarity in Contact
- Interlingual Substitution in L2 Acquisition of a Genetically Related Languages
  - L2 speakers able to exploit sound correspondences between L1 and L2
  - Ex: /nt/ in Kizigua pronounced as /nʈ/ among L1 Chimwiini speakers
    - nt > nʈ and nd > nɖ
    - Exceptionless
    - Affects all environments
    - Affects basic environments
- Neogrammarian Sound Change
  - nt > nʈ and nd > nɖ
  - Exceptionless

---

3 The Chimwiini data comes from combining Nurse and Hinnebusch (1993) and (Kisseberth and Abasheikh 2004). Original transcriptions have been converted to IPA.
Affects all environments  
Affects native vocabulary  
• SIMILAR STRUCTURAL OUTCOMES

(22) Conclusion  
• This presentation  
  – Showed a sound change with consistent diachronic correspondences restricted to inherited vocabulary  
  – Presented socio-historical evidence for shift  
  – Presented comparative linguistic data  
  – Presented two possibilities (borrowing and shift)  
  – Showed how shift can result in an outcome identical to what would be expected of an internally-motivated sound change  
• Raises questions: Are there other similar examples of shift? Or is the case of Somali Bantu Kizigua a unique one?

(23) Acknowledgements  
Funding: U. of Pittsburgh Dietrich School of Arts and Sciences, US Dept of Education Foreign Language Area Studies Fellowship Program  
The Spring 2012 Field Methods class at the University of Pittsburgh  
Faculty Advisors: David Mortensen, Scott Kiesling, Claude Mauk, Shelome Gooden,  
Conversations with: Dave Odden, Larry Hyman  
Somali Bantu Community Organization of Pittsburgh

(24) References  
Last, Joseph Thomas. 1885. Polyglotta Africana orientalis: or a comparative collection of two hundred and fifty words and sentences in forty-eight languages and dialects spoken south of the Equator and additional words in nineteen languages. Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge.  
