

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI – BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

KUMIKO MIYAZAKI & KEIKO TAKEMURA

This study examines some lexical and morphosyntactic variation found among the Swahili varieties in Zanzibar, Tanzania. It has been reported that there are three varieties in the island, and the new data collected in the villages inside the island suggest that there is a need for closer investigation and finer categorization of the Zanzibar varieties. Furthermore, there has been little discussion about the relationship between the Standard variety and other varieties or variation in the use of these varieties. In this paper, we report on the use of these Zanzibar varieties, namely, the town variety, Kiunguja-Mjini, the Northern varieties Kichaani, Kikibeni, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kinungwi and Kimatemwe, and the Southern varieties Kijambiani, Kipaje and Kimakunduchi at the level of the lexicon. In addition, we examine the varieties of the Northern province – Kichaani, Kikibeni, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kinungwi, and those of the Southern province – Kijambiani, Kipaje at the level of the grammar. In this paper, we concentrate on tense/aspect, the copula sentence, relative clause, and imperative. Among the data on these languages, we investigate, in particular, the variation among these varieties on the one hand, and the variation between these varieties and Standard Swahili on the other.

1. Introduction

This study examines some lexical and morphosyntactic variation found among the Swahili varieties in Zanzibar, Tanzania. Swahili is spoken on the Eastern African coasts and small islands, and approximately 24 varieties have been reported in the previous research (Stigand 1915, Bryan 1959, Polomé 1967, Chiraghdin & Mnyampala 1977, Mkude 1983). In the Zanzibar island of the United Republic of Tanzania, it has been reported that there are broadly three varieties, namely, the Northern, Southern, Zanzibar town varieties.

As is well-known, Swahili was standardized in 1930 under the name “Standard Swahili” (Kiswahili Sanifu) by the Interterritorial Language (Swahili) Committee set up by the British colonial government. This Standard Swahili is currently in official use in Tanzania for public education, for instance. The Zanzibar Town variety is said to be the basis for setting Standard Swahili, but in fact, the Standard variety and the Zanzibar Town variety are not identical. In addition, as mentioned above, it has been reported that there are three varieties in the island, and the new data collected in the villages inside the island suggest that there is a need for closer investigation and finer categorization of the Zanzibar varieties. Furthermore, there has been little discussion about the relationship between the Standard variety and other varieties or variation in the use of these varieties.

In this paper, we report on the use of these Zanzibar varieties, namely, the town variety, Kiunguja-Mjini, the Northern varieties Kichaani, Kikibeni, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kinungwi and Kimatemwe, and the Southern varieties Kijambiani, Kipaje and Kimakunduchi, in particular,

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

in their lexicon. In addition, we examine the varieties of the Northern province – Kichaani, Kikibeni, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kinungwi, and those of the Southern province – Kijambiani, Kipaje at the level of the grammar. In this paper, we concentrate on tense/aspect, the copula sentence, relative clause, and imperative. Among the data on these languages, we investigate, in particular, the variation among these varieties on the one hand, and the variation between these varieties and Standard Swahili on the other.

2. The lexicon

2.1 Lexical variation between Standard Swahili and Swahili dialects

First, we take a look at the variation at the level of the lexicon¹. The examples in (1) show the lexical differences between the varieties and Standard Swahili. The data show that the everyday vocabulary found in the dictionary and used on the continent is not found in any of the Zanzibar varieties, including the town variety. Example (1a) is a word for ‘tunga penetrant, jigger’. In the Standard variety, the singular form is *funza*, belonging to class 9, and the plural, the same form in class 10. In the Zanzibar varieties, the singular form is *chepu* in class 9, the plural, also *chepu* in class 10. Other consultants reported that the singular form is *chepu* in class 9, but the plural becomes *machepu* in class 6. Example (1b) denotes a tomato. In the Standard variety, the singular form is *nyanya* of class 9, and the plural is the same form, *nyanya*, in class 10. In the Zanzibar Town variety and the Chaani variety, the singular is *t’ungule* of class 9, and the plural, *t’ungule* of class 10; the /t/ is aspirated. Furthermore, in the Jambiani and Paje varieties, the singular is *tungule* of class 9, and the plural, *tungule* of class 10. And the /t/ here is not aspirated. In other words, these areal varieties make use of different vocabulary from the Standard variety. In Zanzibar island *nyanya* even denotes a different plant, namely a very bitter tomato.

(1) a. ‘tunga penetrans, jigger’

<i>funza/funza</i>	[Kiswahili Sanifu]
<i>chepu/chepu</i> or <i>chepu/machepu</i>	[Kiunguja-Mjini]
<i>kepu/kepu</i> or <i>kepu/makepu</i>	[Kichaani / Kijambiani / Kipaje]

b. ‘tomato’

<i>nyanya/nyanya</i>	[Kiswahili Sanifu]
<i>t’ungule/t’ungule</i>	[Kiunguja-Mjini / Kichaani]
<i>tungule/tungule</i>	[Kijambiani / Kipaje]

¹ The data used here are those that Takemura has collected intermittently in Zanzibar Island, Pemba Island, and Lamu Island in the Republic of Kenya since 1998, and that Miyazaki has collected intermittently in the Southern area of Zanzibar Island since 2012. Takemura has the data of 138 words, and Miyazaki collected the vocabularies of southern varieties of Zanzibar island based on Takemura’s data.

2.2 Lexical variation between the town variety and dialectal variety

The data in (2) show the differences between the town variety and the other varieties. (2a) is a word for ‘spider’; it shows that even though the vocabulary of the town variety is identical to that of Standard Swahili, in terms of noun classification, it parallels that of the other varieties. (2b), on the other hand, a word for ‘mango’, shows a different pattern of variation: while some town variety speakers may use the same form as in Standard Swahili, others may use the same singular/plural form as in the other varieties. This suggests the possibility that when the language was standardized, the vocabulary belonging to classes 9/10 has been reclassified into classes 5/6 to which ‘fruit’ (*tunda/matunda*) belongs. It also suggests that 9/10 class nouns have retained their original noun classification.

- (2) a. ‘spider’
- | | |
|------------------------|----------------------------------|
| <i>buibui/buibui</i> | [Kiswahili Sanifu] |
| <i>buibui/mabuibui</i> | [Kiunguja-Mjini] |
| <i>bui/mabui</i> | [Kichaani / Kijambiani / Kipaje] |
- b. ‘mango’
- | | |
|--------------------|----------------------------------------|
| <i>embe/maembe</i> | [Kiswahili Sanifu / Kiunguja-Mjini] |
| <i>embe/embe</i> | [Kiunguja-Mjini / Kijambiani / Kipaje] |
| <i>iembe/iembe</i> | [Kinungwi / Kimatemwe] |
| <i>yembe/yembe</i> | [Kichaani / Kikibeni] |

2.3 Lexical variation among dialectal varieties

In addition, as (3) shows, there are cases of greater variation among the varieties. Example (3) is a word for ‘butterfly’. In Standard Swahili the singular is *kipepo* of class 7, the plural is *vipepo* of class 8. This is the same in the Zanzibar town variety and Jambiani variety. But in Chaani variety, the singular is *bangawi* of class 9, and the plural is *bangawi* of class 10 or *mabangawi* of class 6. Also, in Paje variety and Makunduchi variety, the singular is *kitunguja* of class 7, and the plural is *vitunguja* of class 8. So we got different words in these varieties.

- (3) ‘butterfly’
- | | |
|--------------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------|
| <i>kipepo/vipepo</i> | [Kiswahili Sanifu / Kiunguja-Mjini / Kijambiani] |
| <i>bangawi/bangawi</i> or <i>mabangawi</i> | [Kichaani] |
| <i>kitunguja/vitunguja</i> | [Kipaje / Kimakunduchi] |

3. Grammar

In this section, we take a look at some variation at the level of grammar. In Section 3.1 we look at the variation in tense/aspect; 3.2 concerns variation in copular sentences; in 3.3 we examine the relative clause, and in 3.4, the imperative.

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

3.1 Tense/aspect

3.1.1 Present tense

Example (4a) shows the present tense in the Standard variety and the Zanzibar Town variety, (4b), in Kichaani, Kikibeni, Kinungwi, Kijambiani, and (4c) is the present tense positive sentence in Kitumbatu-Gomani. As these examples show, there are some minor differences, like the presence or absence of the subject marker, or whether the TAM morpheme is *-na-* or *-a-*. However, overall, there seem to be no major differences among these varieties in the present tense expression. We mention in passing that among the Kitumbatu-Gomani speakers, more speakers in the younger generation seem to be using the form in (4b).

(4)² ‘I study Swahili’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
ni-na-som-a *ki-swahili*
SM_{1SG}-PRS-study-FV 7-Swahili
- b. [Kichaani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kijambiani / Kipaje]
na-som-a *ki-swahili*
SM_{1SG}.PRS-study-FV 7-Swahili
- c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani]
ni-a-som-a (> nyasoma) *ki-swahili*
SM_{1SG}-PRS-study-FV 7-Swahili

3.1.2 Present tense negative

In (5a) we have the Standard variety and the Zanzibar Town variety, and in (5b), the present tense negative sentence in Kichaani, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kikibeni, Kinungwi, Kijambiani. As these examples show, the major difference is that the TAM morpheme that is absent in the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety is present in the other varieties.

(5) ‘I don’t study Swahili’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
si-som-i *ki-swahili*
NEG.SM_{1SG}-study-NEG 7-Swahili

² Abbreviations used in the gloss are as follows; 1, 2, 3...: class numbers, 1SG/PL: person + singular/plural, APPL: applicative, COP: copula, FV: final vowel, FUT: future, NEG: negative, OM: object marker, PASS: passive, PERF: perfect, PRS: present, PST: past, PRON: pronoun, REL: relative, SBJV: subjunctive.

- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kipaje / Kijambiani]
si-na-som-a *ki-swahili*
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-PRS-study-FV 7-Swahili

3.1.3 Past tense positive expression

The examples in (6a-10a) represent the past tense expression in the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety. Kichaani, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kikibeni, Kinungwi are represented in (6b-10b). Kijambiani and Kipaje have a different form of the 1st person singular subject marker, shown in (6c) and (7c). (8b-10b) represent the same form for all the varieties.

Example (6) represents the sentence, ‘I cut the meat’; (7), ‘I did (it)’; (8), ‘he/she wrote a/the letter’; (9), ‘You saw him/her’; and (10), ‘we pulled the rope’. As the data show, in (6a-10a), the past tense morpheme is *-li-*, but in (6b-10b) and also in (6c-7c), this morpheme is absent. Instead, in (6b-10b) and (6c-7c), the final vowel on the verb is copied from the final vowel of the verb root. That is, in the areal varieties, there is no past tense morphology, but instead, there is vowel copying.

W.H. Whiteley (1956) also reported that the type of past tense expression observed in (6b-10b) and (6c-7c) is also attested in the Kimtang’ata variety spoken in the coastal area between Dar es Salaam and Tanga. Given that there are different varieties with distinct characteristics inside the island, it is quite interesting that across the continent quite distant from the island, we find the same characteristics like the past tense expression.

(6) ‘I cut meat’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
ni-li-kat-a *nyama*
 SM_{1SG}-PST-cut-FV 9.meat
- b. [Kichaani / Kijambiani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
ni-kat-a *nyama*
 SM_{1SG}-cut-PST 9.meat
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
n-kat-a *nyama*
 SM_{1SG}-cut-PST 9.meat

(7) ‘I did (it)’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
ni-li-fany-a
 SM_{1SG}-PST-do-FV

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

- b. [Kichaani / Kijambiani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
ni-tend-e
SM_{1SG}-do-PST
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
n-tend-e
SM_{1SG}-do-PST
- (8) ‘She/He wrote a letter’
- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
a-li-andik-a *barua*
SM₁-PST-write-FV 9.letter
- b. [Kichaani / Kijambiani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kipaje]
ka-andik-i (> *kandiki*) *baruwa*
SM₁-write-PST 9.letter
- (9) ‘You saw her/him’
- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
u-li-mw-on-a
SM_{2SG}-PST-OM₁-see-FV
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kijambiani / Kipaje]
ku-m-on-o
SM_{2SG}-OM₁-see-PST
- (10) ‘We pulled the rope’
- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
tu-li-vut-a *kamba*
SM_{1PL}-PST-pull-FV 9.rope
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kijambiani / Kipaje]
tu-vut-u *kamba*
SM_{1PL}-pull-PST 9.rope

3.1.4 Past tense negative expression

The past tense negative expression is shown in (11-15). The examples in (11a-15a) represent the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety, (11b-15b), Kichaani, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kikibeni, Kinungwi, (11c-15c), Kijambiani and Kipaje. These show that in the (a) examples, the past tense negative morpheme is *-ku-*, while in the (b) examples, it is *-e-*. Also, as shown in (15b), there is a

phonological change in the vowel of the negative subject prefix due to this past tense negative morpheme *-e-*.

In Kijambiani and Kipaje, the past tense negative morpheme is *-li-*, as shown in the (c) examples. It is interesting to note that this parallels the past tense positive morpheme used in the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety. Furthermore, as shown in (6b-10b) and (6c-7c), in the positive form, there is vowel copying of the root vowel, whereas in the negative form, the final vowel is in the base form.

(11) ‘I didn’t cut meat’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]

si-ku-kat-a *nyama*
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-NEG.PST-cut-FV 9.meat
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]

si-e-kat-a (> *sekata*) *nyama*
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-NEG.PST-cut-PST 9.meat
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]

si-li-kat-a *nyama*
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-PST-cut-PST 9.meat

(12) ‘I didn’t do (it)’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]

si-ku-fany-a
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-NEG.PST-do-FV
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]

si-e-tend-a (> *setenda*)
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-NEG.PST-do-PST
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]

si-li-tend-a
 NEG.SM_{1SG}-PST-do-FV

(13) ‘She/He didn’t write a letter’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]

ha-ku-andik-a *barua*
 NEG.SM₁-NEG.PST-write-FV 9.letter

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
ha-e-kwandik-a (> *hekwandika*) *baruwa*
NEG.SM₁-NEG.PST-write-FV 9.letter
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
ha-li-kwandik-a *baruwa*
NEG.SM₁-PST-write-FV 9.letter

(14) ‘You didn’t see her/him’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
hu-ku-mw-on-a
NEG.SM_{2SG}-NEG.PST-OM₁-see-FV
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
hu-e-m-on-a (> *hwemona*)
NEG.SM_{2SG}-NEG.PST-OM₁-see-FV
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
hu-li-mw-on-a
NEG.SM_{2SG}-PST-OM₁-see-FV

(15) ‘We didn’t pull the rope’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
hatu-ku-vut-a *kamba*
NEG.SM_{1PL}-NEG.PST-pull-FV 9.rope
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
hatu-e-vut-a (> *hetwevuta*) *kamba*
NEG.SM_{1PL}-NEG.PST-pull-FV 9.rope
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
hatu-li-vut-a *kamba*
NEG.SM_{1PL}-PST-pull-FV 9.rope

3.1.5 Past tense positive form

We additionally note in passing that the past tense positive form shows no vowel copying in the passive, as shown in (16b-16c).

(16) ‘Ali was hit by Juma’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
Ali a-li-pig-w-a *na Juma*
Ali SM₁-PST-hit-PASS-FV by Juma

b. [Kichaani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kijambiani / Kipaje]

Ali ka-pig-w-a ni Juma
 Ali SM₁-hit-PASS-FV by Juma

c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani]

Ali ka-but-w-a ni Juma
 Ali SM₁-hit-PASS-FV by Juma

3.1.6 Present perfect tense

Turning to the examples in (17), we have the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety in (17a), and Kichaani, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kijambiani, Kikibeni, and Kinungwi in (17b). (17c) represents present perfect in Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kikibeni and Kinungwi. As shown in (17a-17b), there is variation in the form of the perfect morpheme *-me-* in the Standard variety, which presumably derived from the verb *-mala* or *-maliza* ('finish'), but grammatically there is no difference among the varieties. Furthermore, the form in (17c-17d) is identical to the past tense morpheme and is used by the older speakers of Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kikibeni, Kinungwi, and (17b) is used by younger speakers. In Kijambiani and Kipaje, as (17d) shows, a form equivalent to *-me-* is hardly used, and the past tense morpheme is used instead. In addition, (17e) shows, in Kichaani, the TAM marker *-ma-* can be used with another TAM marker *-na-*.

(17) 'I have seen her/him'

a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]

ni-me-mw-on-a
 SM_{1SG}-PERF-OM₁-see-FV

b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]

ni-ma-m-on-a
 SM_{1SG}-PERF-OM₁-see-FV

c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]

ni-m-on-o
 SM_{1SG}-OM₁-see-PST

d. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]

m-m-on-o
 SM_{1SG}-OM₁-see-PST

e. [Kichaani]

yembe zi-ma-na-az-a uz-w-a
 10.mango SM₁₀-PERF-PRS-start-FV sell-PASS-FV
 'Mangos have already been started being for sale.'

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

3.1.7 Form derived from the verb *-isha*

On the other hand, as shown in (18), the form which presumably derived from the verb *-isha* ('finish') is generally used in these varieties.

(18) 'We have finished studying'

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
tu-me-kwish-a *ku-som-a*
SM_{1PL}-PERF-finish-FV INF-study-FV
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
tu-sha-som-a
SM_{1PL}-PERF-study-FV
- c. [Kijambiani]
tu-si-som-a
SM_{1PL}-PERF-study-FV
- d. [Kipaje]
tu-isi-som-a
SM_{1PL}-PERF-study-FV

3.1.8 Future tense

In (19) we have the future tense: (19a) represents the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety; (19b), Kichaani, Kikibeni, and Kinungwi; (19c), Kitumbatu-Gomani; and (19d), Kijambiani and Kipaje. The examples show that there is no major difference between (19a-19b), but in Kitumbatu-Gomani variety in (19c), the future tense morpheme is *-na-* instead of *-ta-*. The *-ta-* form in (19b) is also used, however, among the younger generation.

(19) 'What will you tell us?'

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
u-ta-tu-ambi-a *nini?*
SM_{2SG}-FUT-OM_{1PL}-tell-FV what
- b. [Kichaani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
ku-ta-tu-ambi-ya *nini/vipi?*
SM_{2SG}-FUT-OM_{1PL}-tell-FV what/how
- c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani]
ku-na-ja-tu-ambi-ya *nini?*
SM_{2SG}-PRS-NEG.PERF-OM_{1PL}-tell-FV what

- d. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
ku-cha-tu-ambi-ya *jaje?*
 SM_{2SG-FUT-OM}_{1PL}-tell-FV what

3.2 The copular sentence

In this section we examine the variation in the expression of copular sentences.

3.2.1 Present tense indicative statement

The examples in (20) represent the present tense indicative copular statement. (20a) represents the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety; (20b), Kichaani, Kitumbatu-Gomani, Kikibeni, Kinungwi, and Kipaje; and (20c), Kijambiani. In most of these varieties, the copula *ni* is omitted.

(20) ‘I am a student’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
mimi *ni* *mw-anafunzi*
 PRON_{1SG} COP 1-student
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi / Kipaje]
miye *mw-anafuzi*
 PRON_{1SG} 1-student
- c. [Kijambiani]
mie *ni-w-a* *mw-anafunzi*
 PRON_{1SG} SM_{1SG-be}-FV 1-student

3.2.2 Past tense

In the past tense, however, the situation looks a little different. Not all the varieties have the parallel structure, and there is some variation. The Kibeni variety represented in (21b-22b) and the Chaani variety in (21d-22d) are spoken in villages that are geographically very closely located, but the forms are nonetheless quite different. In Kikibeni, though the form is different, there is the past tense morpheme, like the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety. In contrast in Kichaani, there is no past tense morpheme at all. Though it is unclear in which area the stories were recorded, among the folk tales recorded in “*Hekaya za Abunuwas na Hadithi Nyingine*” (first published in 1935, The Macmillan Press Ltd.), there were some utterances in what looked like the past tense that had the form *nalikuwa*, and this is presumably the same structure as the past tense copular sentence in Kikibeni. This same form is apparently also observed in Old Swahili. There is evidence from “*Hekaya za Abunuwas*” that the TAM morpheme *-ali-* can be productively combined with non-copular verbs. However in Kikibeni, the same form shown in (21d-22d) for Kichaani is also used, and this is rather more commonly used nowadays except among the older generation.

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

Another interesting point is that, as shown in (21c-22c) and (21d-22d), Kitumbatu-Gomani and Kinungwi on the one hand and Kijambiani on the other, which are categorized as the Northern and Southern variety respectively, show nearly identical forms. In addition, consider the relation between Kitumatu-Gomani and Kichaani. According to Chaani villagers, a great number of villagers are the offspring of those migrated from the Tumbatu island, and have the consciousness that “we speak the Tumbatu dialect”. However as far as data like those in (21c-21d) and (22c-22d) are concerned, although there is the common characteristic that the past tense morpheme is absent, the copular forms are slightly different. It seems necessary that we further investigate in detail differences like this in order to better understand the distribution of different Swahili varieties.

(21) ‘I was a student’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
ni-li-kuw-a *mw-anafunzi*
SM_{1SG}-PST-be-FV 1-student
- b. [Kikibeni]
ni-ali-kuw-a (> *nyalikuwa*) *mw-anafuzi*
SM_{1SG}-PST-be-FV 1-student
- c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kinungwi]
ni-vu *mw-anafuzi*
SM_{1SG}-be.PST 1-student
- d. [Kichaani / Kikibeni / Kijambiani / Kipaje]
ni-evu (> *nyevu*) *mw-anafuzi*
SM_{1SG}-be.PST 1-student

(22) ‘You had a cow’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
u-li-kuw-a *na* *ng’ombe*
SM_{2SG}-PST-be-FV with 9.cow
- b. [Kikibeni]
ku-ali-kuw-a (> *kwalikuwa*) *na* *ng’ombe*
SM_{2SG}-PST-be-FV with 9.cow
- c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kinungwi]
ku-vu *na* *ng’ombe*
SM_{2SG}-be.PST with 9.cow
- d. [Kichaani / Kikibeni / Kijambiani / Kipaje]
ku-evu (> *kwevu*) *na* *ng’ombe*
SM_{2SG}-be.PST with 9.cow

3.3 Relative Clause

This section briefly examines the variation in the relative clause structure. The examples in (23) represent the relative clause in the relevant varieties: (23a) represents the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety; (23b), Kichaani, Kikibeni, and Kinungwi; (23c-23d), Kitumbatu-Gomani, and (23e-23f) represent Kijambiani and Kipaje. As shown in (23b), in Kichaani, Kikibeni, and Kinungwi, there is no past tense morpheme in the relative clause. In Kitumbatu-Gomani, which is geographically close to Kichaani, the verb ‘to give’ has a different form, as shown in (23c). Kitumbatu-Gomani also makes use of the form in (23d). The form in (23d) is nearly identical to geographically distant Kijambiani and Kipaje. However, in these varieties, the form in (23d) is taken to be the older form, and speakers among the younger generation have the tendency to use the form shown in (23f).

(23) ‘the person who gave me a book’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
m-tu a-li-ye-ni-p-a ki-tabu
 1-person SM₁-PST-REL₁-OM_{1SG}-give-FV 7-book
- b. [Kichaani / Kikibeni / Kinungwi]
m-tu a-ye-ni-p-a buku
 1-person SM₁-REL₁-OM_{1SG}-give-FV 5.book
- c. [Kitumbatu-Gomani]
m-tu a-ye-ni-k-a ki-tabu
 1-person SM₁-REL₁-OM_{1SG}-give-FV 7-book
- d. [Kitumbatu-Gomani]
m-tu mw-e-ni-k-a ki-tabu
 1-person REL.SM₁-PST-OM_{1SG}-give-FV 7-book
- e. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
m-tu mw-a-n-k-a ki-tabu
 1-person REL.SM₁-PST-OM_{1SG}-give-FV 7-book
- f. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
m-tu a-li-ye-n-k-a ki-tabu
 1-person SM₁-PST-REL₁-OM_{1SG}-give-FV 7-book

3.4 Imperative

Lastly, we take a look at the imperative. Example (24a) represents the imperative to the singular interlocuter in the Standard and Zanzibar Town variety; (24b), in Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni; (24c), in Kijambiani / Kipaje, and (24d), in Kinungwi. As shown, when the object is

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI –
BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

singular, the basic final vowel is used in (24b-24d). In contrast, as shown in (25), when the object is plural, the final vowel is in the subjunctive form.

(24) ‘Make bread for me’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
ni-tengenez-e-e *mi-kate*
OM_{1SG}-make-APPL-SBJV 4-bread
- b. [Kichaani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni]
ni-tend-e-ya *mi-kate*
OM_{1SG}-make-APPL-FV 4-bread
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
n-tend-e-ya *mi-kate*
OM_{1SG}-make-APPL-FV 4-bread
- d. [Kinungwi]
ni-yund-i-ya *mi-kate*
OM_{1SG}-make-APPL-FV 4-bread

(25) ‘Make bread for us’

- a. [Standard Swahili / Kiunguja-Mjini]
tu-tengenez-e-e *mi-kate*
OM_{1PL}-make-APPL-SBJV 4-bread
- b. [Kichaani / Kijambiani / Kitumbatu-Gomani / Kikibeni]
tu-tend-el-e *mi-kate*
OM_{1PL}-make-APPL-SBJV 4-bread
- c. [Kijambiani / Kipaje]
tu-tend-e-e *mi-kate*
OM_{1PL}-make-APPL-SBJV 4-bread
- d. [Kinungwi]
tu-yund-il-e *mi-kate*
OM_{1PL}-make-APPL-SBJV 4-bread

4. Summary

To summarize, in this paper, we have examined some grammatical aspects of the areal varieties inside Zanzibar. We have seen that not only between these varieties and the Standard/Zanzibar Town varieties, but also among the varieties, there are some significant differences.

Firstly, we have shown that on the one hand, Kibumtatu-Gomani and Kijambiani, which are considered the Northern and Southern varieties respectively in previous research, nonetheless show the same characteristics in the expression of past tense marking and the past tense copular sentence. On the other hand, Kichaani and Kikibeni, which are both categorized as the Northern variety in the literature, make use of different past tense copular sentence structures.

Secondly, as the data have shown, there is also variation within a variety. This variation is due to the generational and educational differences. For example, as the data from the Jambiani variety show, there is the “Jambiani variety of the older generation” and the one of “the younger generation”, and these sub-varieties are chosen according to the interlocutor³.

Thirdly, the present perfect tense morphology has apparently derived from the same verb, but there is variation in the form. This suggests that there is variation in the way the relevant verb is grammaticalized or standardized, and the morphological alternation and the level of retention of the old form vary across the varieties.

This holds not only inside Zanzibar but also across the continent of Tanzania and other Bantu areas. For example, the past tense morpheme of ‘be’ *-evu-* and the past tense TAM morpheme *-ali-* are observed not only in Tanzania but also in other areas where other Bantu languages are spoken. *-ali-* is recognized as ‘Old Swahili’ that has come into some of the Zanzibar varieties, and so there might be a relation between Old Swahili and these Zanzibar varieties. The study of Zanzibar varieties might therefore serve as the window to understanding the process in which Old Swahili, the Northern variety and Standard Swahili, the Zanzibar Southern variety, have gone through changes or have been simplified. Furthermore, the study of linguistic phenomena common to Swahili and other Bantu languages will also help us towards a better understanding of the process of standardization and contribute towards the study of morphosyntactic development and change in Bantu languages.

Our study suggests that it is necessary to go beyond the classic, geographically based approach, and to take a step towards a more comprehensive, dynamic approach, using both qualitative and quantitative methods, to the study of variation throughout the Zanzibar island. A possible direction in future research might be to conduct a thorough comparative study of the varieties with respect to particular linguistic phenomena that takes into account Old Swahili and other Bantu languages and examine the relevant phenomena from both synchronic and

³ The choice of the varieties is also observed in other contexts: For example, a given variety may be chosen with an interlocutor whose variety is geographically close, or another variety might be used with an areally distant interlocutor. In other words, speakers use “different codes” according to their interlocutor. This kind of code choice is observed not only between two dialectal varieties, but also between a dialectal variety and Standard Swahili.

DIALECTAL VARIATION IN SWAHILI – BASED ON THE DATA COLLECTED IN ZANZIBAR

diachronic perspective. At the same time, it is perhaps also necessary to investigate any possible changes that might be taking place in the areal varieties as a result of language contact between these varieties and Standard Swahili.

Another possible research path, additionally to pure description, would be to collect more sociolinguistic data on language use and sociolinguistic status of these varieties. This would help understand what sociolinguistic conditions may play a role in the dynamics of these ‘viSwahili’.

Acknowledgements

This work is supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant number 23320086 and T16K026700 and is a product of the ILCAA joint research project “Typological Study of Microvariation in Bantu (Phase 1)” and “An Inter-disciplinary Approach to the Diversity and Dynamics of Swahili Varieties”. We would like to thank many native speakers of each variety who provided data for this article. We also give a lot of thanks to Yoneda Nobuko, Kaji Shigeki, Matthias Brenzinger, Shinagawa Daisuke and Morimoto Yukiko for very useful suggestions, and to all family members of Chaani, Jambiani, Paje and Wete for their support during our research in Unguja and Pemba Islands.

References

- Bryan, Margaret A. 1959. *The Bantu Languages of Africa*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Chiraghdin, Shihabuddin & Mathias E. Mnyampala. 1977. *Historia ya Kiswahili*. Nairobi: Oxford University Press.
- Mkude, Daniel J. 1983. Mtawanyiko wa Lahaja za Kiswahili. *Makala za Semina ya Kimataifa ya Waandishi wa Kiswahili I – Lugha ya Kiswahili*. Taasisi ya Uchunguzi wa Kiswahili (TUKI): Chuo Kikuu cha Dar es Salaam. pp. 62-83.
- Polomé, Edgar. 1967. *Swahili Language Handbook*. Washington D.C.: Center for Applied Linguistics.
- Stigand, Chauncey H. 1915. *A Grammar of Dialectic Changes in the Swahili Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Whiteley, Wilfred H. 1956. *Ki-mtang’ata: A Dialect of the Mrima Coast – Tanganyika*. East African Swahili Committee, Makerere College: Kampala.

KUMIKO MIYAZAKI & KEIKO TAKEMURA

(Unknown) 1935. *Hekaya za Abunuwas na Hadithi Nyingine*. New York: The Macmillan Press Ltd.