Outcomes of the Contact between Luganda and English Pragmatic Markers

Sarah Nakijoba[1*], Deo Kawalya[1]
1. Makerere University
** kalyangon10@gmail.com*
https://dx.doi.org/10.4314/jh.v32i1.2

Abstract
Cross-linguistic studies on language contact have established that when pragmatic marker (PM) systems are in contact, three outcomes may occur: (i) the PM sets of the languages in contact may coexist, (ii) the PMs in contact may acquire differentiated meanings, and (iii) PMs from one language may be replaced wholly or partially by markers of another language. Using Luganda-English bilingual data of 190,580 words, this paper examines the contact between Luganda and English PMs to establish whether the outcomes reported in cross-linguistic studies are evident in the data at hand or not and whether there are any other observable outcomes peculiar to the Luganda-English data. The findings point to the coexistence between Luganda and English PMs and the partial replacement of some Luganda PMs by English functional equivalents. However, there was no evidence to support the outcome of the acquisition of differentiated meaning. In addition, the data points to the possibility of a new contact outcome, which we describe as calquing/loan translating. The analysis is informed by cross-linguistic findings and Blakemore's relevance-theoretic notion of procedural encoding.

Keywords
pragmatic markers,
Luganda,
calquing,
loan translation,
procedural encoding

1. Introduction[1]

From a relevance-theoretic perspective, pragmatic markers (PMs) are linguistic expressions such as *therefore, but,* and *however*, which facilitate interaction

1 The paper is based on a doctoral dissertation submitted by Sarah Nakijoba to Stellenbosh University titled Pragmatic markers in L1 Luganda-L2 English bilingual spoken discourse: A relevance-theoretic approach in 2018

by providing clues to the hearer (or reader), which constrain the inferential process of utterance interpretation (Blakemore, 2002). Following this definition, the implicative PM *so,* in the introspective utterance (1), encodes a logical cause-effect relation, in which the conclusion *She was active the whole day* is premised on the proposition *Divine slept well.*

(1) Divine slept well; **so**, she was active the whole day.

Blakemore (2002) argues that PMs contribute to the relevance of the host utterance in two ways. First, they guide the hearer towards the intended contextual/cognitive effects in the form of contextual implication (conclusions for the communicated propositions, e.g., *so, therefore*), presupposition strengthening (evidence or justification for the communicated assumptions, e.g., *in addition, more so*) and presupposition cancelling (contradicting the communicated assumptions, e.g., *but, however).* Second, PMs reduce the overall processing effort required to interpret segments conjoined by a PM. By the second function, it is assumed that if utterance (1) were presented as *Divine slept well. She was active the whole day,* without the PM *so,* it would be propositional as long as it is processed in the right context. However, a proposition not coordinated with an explicit PM will be open to interpretation and would require extra mental processing effort on the side of the hearer/reader. E.g., the openness of *Divine slept well. She was active the whole day* encourages several interpretations including the bracketed interpretations presented in (2) and (3).

(2) Divine slept well; **after all**, she was active the whole day. (evidence)

(3) Divine slept well; **because** she was active the whole day. (causal justification)

Before the 1980s, PMs were a less popular field of inquiry, partly because they were treated primarily as pragmatic and non-truth-conditional (Traugott, 1995). However, over the past three decades, PMs have developed into a fascinating area of investigation in the field of pragmatics, and are described as "a growth industry in linguistics" (Fraser, 1999, p. 932). Despite this, results from these studies are not inclusive. First, due to the Anglo-centric nature of pragmatic research, most

of the findings focus on English PMs and those of a few other Indo-European languages (see Andersen, 2001, p. 17). Second, many studies on PMs have focused on resolving controversies related to their definition as a unified functional category, delimiting their functional spectrum, defining their diagnostic properties and the explicit procedural (and conceptual) roles they play, among others (see Aijmer, 2013; Fraser, 1999, 2006; Wilson, 2016). Third, scholarly attention is geared towards understanding PMs that occur singly and primarily in monolingual discourse (see Andersen, 2001; Fraser, 2015).

In addition, studies on language contact have paid less attention to studying the borrowability and code-switchability of PMs, and yet PMs (being semantically autonomous and grammatically self-contained) are ranked high on the borrowability hierarchy (see Matras, 2000). The few studies that examine PMs in bilingual data have focused on their procedural functions in indigenous languages (Torres, 2006), the way PMs in contact situations are used across generations (Torres & Potowski, 2008), the frequency and functionality of foreign PMs in bilingual discourses (Hlavac, 2006), and others have focussed on resolving terminological controversies regarding bilingual PMs (González, 2004), among others.

While we recognise the successes achieved in PM studies, several grey areas in the PM domain must be explored to comprehensively understand PMs, particularly bilingual ones. This paper aims to analyse the outcomes of the contact between PM systems of languages which are genetically unrelated and compare them with the established findings in the different studied bilingual data sets. The provision of more cross-linguistic data, especially of genetically dissimilar languages, is justifiably relevant in consolidating or nullifying the fundamental assumptions regarding the 'universalities' of PM systems in contact and provides a platform for retelling a story about PMs in contact.

This paper is divided into six sections. The following section describes the contact between Luganda and English; Section 3 addresses the methodological issues; Section 4 discusses the outcomes of contact between PM systems across

different language pairs; Section 5 discusses the study's findings; and Section 6 concludes.

2. On Luganda and the contact with English

Luganda is the most widely spoken, written and studied among the 40-odd indigenous languages of Uganda (David et al., 2023). As the de facto *lingua franca*, the language is not only used natively in the Buganda region but also in the cosmopolitan spaces in Uganda, with about 6,563,450 L1 speakers and about 1,500,000 L2 speakers out of the estimated Ugandan population of 40 million (David et al., 2023). On the other hand, English is the primary official language in Uganda and a medium of instruction from elementary to tertiary level (Isingoma, 2014; Nakayiza, 2012; Ssentanda, 2014). Although it is reported that there is a new generation of L1 speakers of English in Uganda (Bayiga, 2016, p. 31), English is primarily spoken as an L2 language, with an estimated 2,500,000 speakers (David et al., 2023). Much as Luganda has more speakers in Uganda, compared to English, the hegemony of English as a world language gives it a superior status. It remains a highly regarded language in post-colonial Uganda, associated with elitism and intellectualism.

English and Luganda have been in contact since the arrival of English missionaries and the advent of British colonial rule in Uganda in the 1890s (Ladefoged, Glick, & Clive, 1972). At the time of colonialism, Standard British English was used. Still, as time went by, this variety was affected by contact with the indigenous languages of Uganda, and, as Tukwasibwe (2014, p. 32) observes, it lost its 'standard flavour'. Studies on non-native varieties of English recognise that English is spoken in Uganda as an independent indigenised variety (Fisher, 2000, p. 39, 61) and is described variously as Ugandan English, Lugandan English, or Uglish. Incidentally, this variety features in the bilingual data used in this study because that is what Ugandans use both in the formal and informal domains. However, The constitution of Ugandan recognises English as Uganda's primary official language, and it is silent about such scholarly descriptive labels. It is assumed that a Standard British variety, which the colonial masters used, is expected to be used especially

in the formal domains. In this paper, however, the generic term 'English' is used in reference to Ugandan English, a non-native variety of L2 English spoken in Uganda. For a general description of the features of Ugandan English, see Fisher (2000b), Isingoma (2013, 2014), Ssempuuma (2013) and Meierkord & Isingoma (2022).

The contact between Luganda and English has resulted in reciprocated influence, as evidenced by the speech behaviours of L1 Luganda and L2 English. As bilingual speakers of L1 Luganda and L2 English, we have observed that spoken conversations involving Luganda and English are characterised by spontaneous code-switching (CS) at different levels, including inter-morpheme, inter-lexical, inter-sentential, etc. Studies have shown that functional words such as PMs are easily code-switchable, partly because of their semantic autonomy and peripheral grammatical role in utterances (Matras, 2000). This makes it easy for bilingual speakers to accept and transport them 'wholly' from the replica to the receptor language (see Andersen, 2014). Mougeon & Beniak (1986), cited in Torres & Potowski (2008, p. 264), explain that PMs are introduced into the receptor language as switches by most bilingual speakers and the less proficient speakers may pick them up and sometimes use them differently from the way proficient bilinguals use them.

The motivations for CS, in general, are varied, including the need to fill a lexical gap, CS for euphemistic effects, CS for identification purposes, CS for originality purposes, CS for expressive purposes, where the donor language may contain a more accurate term (Gardner-Chloros, 2010; Gumperz, 1982), and so on. Note that the motivation for switching between Luganda and English PMs has nothing to do with filling a lexical gap, given that the two languages in contact have fully fledged PM systems. We attribute this behaviour to factors related to the speaker's need to be more expressive and as a strategy to enhance communication. In RT terms, CS in PMs can be interpreted as a product of the speaker's effort to maximise relevance. The assumption is that a speaker operating in bilingual mode has access to both the Luganda and English PM systems, and because such

a speaker desires to communicate to their audience most effectively, he/she will be motivated to choose PM forms which are optimal in communicating the intended meaning, forms which are more accessible to them, and forms which require less production effort.

3. Methodological considerations

The analysis in this paper is based on data from bilingual conversations of 190,580 words, which were obtained from interviews and group discussions with 41 bilingual speakers of L1 Luganda and L2 English in 2015. The interviews and group discussions were based on casual topics, such as childhood experiences and other memorable moments in life in the domain of play, school life, etc. All conversations were audio-recorded and transcribed verbatim.

Using Atlas.ti. tool, all the PMs were queried and assembled according to (i) their structural manifestation (e.g., as single monolingual PM occurrences, as monolingual PM co-occurrences, or as bilingual PM occurrences); (ii) their operation status (e.g., as switches, borrowings) and; (iii) their contextual procedural functions. Bilingual utterances that illustrate the outcomes of contact between Luganda and English were selected, and all the Luganda constituents in these utterances were glossed.

The selection of PM occurrences for analysis was based on the criterion of quality (PMs that belong to salient categories with definable procedural functions), precision (PMs occurring in clear contexts) and quantity (PMs appearing at least three times from different speakers).

The existing cross-linguistic findings inform the qualitative analysis of the outcomes exhibited in the contact between Luganda and English. In addition, we evoke Blakemore's (2002) notion of procedural encoding to explain the inferential routes that hearers use to compute the relational meaning between propositions coordinated by PMs in bilingual utterances. The notion of procedural encoding is based on Sperber and Wilson's (1995) Relevance theory. All ethical considerations

regarding data collection and management were observed, including seeking consent from participants, anonymity in data codes, etc.

4. Cross-linguistic outcomes of the contact between pragmatic marker systems

Cross-linguistic research established that when languages are in contact and their PM systems are available to speakers, three outcomes may occur: the two PM sets may coexist, they may acquire differentiated meanings, or PMs from one language may be replaced wholly or partially (see Brody, 1987; Goss & Salmons, 2000; Fuller, 2001; Hlavac, 2006; Torres & Potowski, 2008). Coexistence occurs when two languages are in contact and the speaker operating in bilingual mode can access the two PM systems in question. This manifests when a speaker employs two procedurally identical PMs in the same environment. For instance, Brody (1987) analyses bilingual data of Spanish and Tojolba'l (a Mayan language) and establishes the coexistence of the Spanish PM *entonces* and a Tojolba'l PM, *ti* as illustrated in (4).

(4) Entonces ti wa yajni jawli

Entonces	**ti**	wa	yajni	jaw1i
Then	then	but	now	when that term
'And that's how it was.'			Brody (1987, p. 512)	

The glosses show that both *entonces* and *ti* are procedurally identical and translated as the results signalling *then*. In this bilingual language pair, it is reported that Spanish is the more prestigious language and it supplies the PM switch to Tojolba'l, the less prestigious language. As we show later, coexistence is discussed in Goss & Salmons (2000) as a step towards language substitution (or replacement).

The second reported outcome of the contact between PM systems results in the acquisition of differentiated meaning. This occurs when the coexisting PMs begin to function in complementary distribution (Fuller, 2001), where the two PMs may assume different procedural functions (Solomon, 1995). For example, in a

study of Italian-French bilingual data, Serra (1998) established that the Italian-French bilingual migrant speakers have developed an argumentative system which is not identical to Italian or French. Serra studied the French counter-argumentative PM *mais* (but) and provided evidence that it is used differently by Italian workers in French-speaking Switzerland. Her conclusion points to the possibility of the development of a mixed code, which is not equivalent to the two source languages, Italian or French.

Similarly, it is observed in Solomon (1995) that the contact between Spanish and Yucatec (another Maya language), which has existed for over five hundred years, has resulted in the borrowing of the Spanish results signalling PM *entonces* (Lit. *then, so*), one of the highly borrowable PMs in Spanish. She argues that *entonces* (then), if used as a loanword, does not have a wide range of uses compared to its use in monolingual discourses. In her conclusion, Solomon (1995) observes that the acquisition of differentiated meaning is common in contexts of stable bilingualism. In another study of Italian-French bilingual data, Serra (1998) established that the Italian-French bilingual migrant speakers have developed an argumentative system which is not identical to Italian or French. She studied the French counter-argumentative PM *mais* (but) and provided evidence that it is used differently by Italian workers in French-speaking Switzerland. Her conclusion points to the possibility of developing a mixed code, which is not equivalent to the two source languages, Italian or French.

Lastly, the outcome of replacement occurs when the native PM system ceases to exist, being substituted by the foreign pragmatic marking system. In their diachronic study of PMs in contact, Goss & Salmons (2000) studied German dialects spoken in the U.S.A. using two literary pieces. They established that German particles had been replaced by English particles such as *well, you know*. They observe that replacement is a gradual process that started with the exclusive use of German modal particles and other PMs imported from Europe. This was followed by emblematic code-switching where the English PMs, such as *well, so, you know*, were introduced into German. This led to the coexistence of both systems,

where the borrowed English PMs became dominant and, eventually, the German particles started to die out. They report that it is evident from the current speech of a German-English bilingual that the English PMs have lost their status as switches and are part of the German grammar. In other words, the German native PMs have died, being substituted by the PMs in the English system.

Replacement in PM systems can be complete or partial. As the terms suggest, complete replacement occurs when the 'foreign' PMs have substituted the native PMs. For instance, in the case of Goss & Salmons' (2000) report above, we see English PMs completely replacing German PMs. On the other hand, partial replacement occurs in situations of PMs' coexistence but where the PMs of one language are more frequently used than the others. Partial replacement is reported in Hlavac's (2006) study of Croatian-English bilingual speeches in Australia, where the English PMs such as *yeah* (*da*), *so* (*te*) and *you know* (*znate*), have partially replaced the Croatian counterparts, in brackets. Hlavac's statistics show that while Croatian and English PMs are used, English PMs are more susceptible to use because they are polyfunctional. He cites the English PM, *yeah*, to appear five and a half times more frequently than *da*, the Croatian counterpart. Hlavac (2006) accounts for a relationship between replacement and the multifunctionality of the replaced markers and observes that English PMs, which are more multifunctional, seem to be replacing the Croatian PMs with fewer functions. Similar observations regarding polyfunctionality are cited in a Shona-English corpus (see Myers-Scotton 2006, p. 216), where the English PMs *because* and *but* have partially replaced the Shona PMs. English PMs are frequently used in place of the Shona PM equivalents *nokuti* and *asi*, respectively, moreover even in monolingual Shona discourse.

In this study, we sought to establish whether or not the Luganda-English bilingual data share these cross-linguistic outcomes of contact. For consistency in terminology usage, we adopt Goss & Salmons' (2000) nomenclature in defining terms of coexistence and replacement.

5. Outcomes of the contact between Luganda and English pragmatic markers

This section presents data which illustrates the outcomes of contact between Luganda and English PMs. In summary, the data attest to the outcome of coexistence and partial replacement, and there was no evidence of the outcome of the acquisition of differentiated meaning. We further present evidence of the possibility of a new contact outcome, which we describe as calquing/loan translating. These outcomes are discussed in extenso below.

5.1 Coexistence between Luganda and English PMs

In the Luganda–English bilingual data, coexistence manifests when a Luganda PM co-occurs with a procedurally identical English PM. For instance, in (5), the Luganda speculative PM *oba* (maybe) occurs in the same environment with a procedurally identical English PM *maybe*.

(5) I think it's about six or seven miles ***oba*** **maybe** six … (LoM10)
I think it's about six or seven miles oba maybe six
I think it's about six or seven miles perhaps maybe six
'I think it's about maybe six or seven miles, maybe (perhaps) maybe six'

In this utterance, the speaker speculates the distance from his home and his workplace using two procedurally identical PMs, the Luganda *oba* (perhaps) and the English *maybe*. The coexistence here is similar to what we saw in the Spanish–Tojolba'l example (see utterance (4) above) where the Spanish *entonces* co-occurs with the Tojolba'l *ti*. However, unlike in the Spanish–Tojolba'l case where the more prestigious language (Spanish) supplies the PM switch, in example (5), the more prestigious language (English) receives a PM switch.

From the discussion on the contact between Luganda and English in Section 2, we noted that both Luganda and English are prestigious languages, although English is more prestigious. For this matter, the two languages borrow from each other in a more or less symbiotic way. However, there are more instances of

Luganda PMs occurring in English utterances than the opposite. For example, utterance (6) illustrates an English PM occurring as the embedded element in the Luganda matrix language.

(6)… n*g'alumye amannyo*. **So** *kati, n'ayita baganda be abalala*…(NoMS10).

nga	a-lum-ye	a-ma-nnyo	so	kati	ne
while	SM_1-bite-PFV	IV-NP_6-tooth	so	then	and
a-yit-a	ba-ganda	be	a-ba-lala		
SM_1-call-FV	NP_2-sibling	$POSS_2$	IV-PP_2-other		

'…He was biting his teeth {convulsing}. **And so** he (his son) called his other siblings… {to take the patient to hospital}'

In this utterance, the speaker describes a scenario in which her grandfather convulsed using two sequential encoding PMs, the English *so* and the Luganda *kati* (then). The two PMs encode procedures which result in the processing of the event of a son calling his siblings to have happened after the event of the convulsing of his father. If Utterance (6) were to be produced with one of the PMs, either so or *kati*, the representational meaning encoded by the utterance would be the same, for both *so* and *kati* are identical in terms of procedural values.

The question of what motivates speakers to use two procedurally identical PMs in the same environment where one PM would suffice is crucial here. Given that each of the operating languages has a fully developed PM system, the speech behaviour demonstrated in (5) and (6) is not motivated by the speaker's need to fill a lexical gap but by factors external to it. Using bilingual data of Spanish and Tojolba'l, Brody (1987) explains that such coexistence may reflect the speaker's balance between purism attitudes (the speaker's need to maintain the unmarked code status quo) and the sociocultural reality that Spanish is prestigious. The plausible RT-based account for the employment of procedural doublets could be explained in terms of the speaker's need to maximise relevance. Note that the processing (and production) of identical PM pairs requires more effort, which effort is not compensated for in terms of extra cognitive effects derived. We

argue, in line with Brody's (1987) observation, that double PM production can be interpreted as a strategy to enhance communication and reinforce solidarity.

Other examples of coexistence exhibited in the data include PM pairs such as '*and era'* (and also), '*kati then*' (Now then) and *so kaakati* (so now). *Kaakati* is a *kati* variant discussed in (6) above.

5.2 Replacement

As mentioned, longer contact between PMs can result in their replacement, where the native PM system may cease to exist and the foreign pragmatic marking system is substituted. The replacement can be partial or complete. Bringing the Luganda-English data into perspective, the manifestation of certain PMs attests to the possibility of partial replacement of some Luganda PMs by some English markers. For instance, the behaviour of the English *so* occurring as a single switch and its frequent manifestation in bilingual PM co-occurrences points to a possibility of its partial replacement of the Luganda functional PM counterparts such as *kati* (now/then) and *kale* (then/now). Like the English *yeah*, which is reported to be outcompeting the Croatian *da* due to its polyfunctionality (see Hlavac's (2006) study of Croatian-English data), the English *so* can be interpreted to compete with the Luganda PM counterparts such as *kati* and *kale*. Interestingly, the English *so* has been cited in speeches of Luganda monolingual speakers but signalling procedures which the Luganda *kale* or *kati* would encode in monolingual contexts.

5.3 Calquing of bilingual pragmatic markers

The label calquing is drawn from Haugen's (1953, p. 390) conceptualisation of calquing in the domain of language contact. Calquing is construed as a subtype of borrowing which involves native morpheme substitution in the structure of the borrowed item. The data exhibit instances of direct or literal translation of the Luganda functional equivalents into English, and vice versa. Like in lexical translation where the meaning of a word is relayed using another code, the PMs in the bilingual data exhibit a related quality. There are six forms of calques exhibited in the data, namely: (i) calques involving single Luganda or English PMs; (ii) calques

in correlating bilingual PM pairs; (iii) partial calques of a PM pair; (iv) complete calques of a PM pair; (v) partial calques of PM clusters; (iv) total calques of PM clusters. These are discussed in extenso below.

5.3.1 Calques involving single PMs

Calquing in single PMs is evident where a Luganda PM may be loan-translated into English and vice versa. In utterance (7) the speaker employs a calqued English PM *so* to narrate her regrettable experience of leaving her home before she had accomplished her domestic chores and yet she did not have a house helper.

(7) I didn't want to come, *nga bw'omanyi awaka nga tolina muntu* so *teebeereza buli kimu nga nkiresse awo*…(HoK11).

nga	bwe	o-manyi		a-wa-ka	nga	te-o-lin-a	
as	how	SM_{2SG}-know		IV-NP_{16}-home	when	NEG-SM_{2SG}-have-FV	
mu-ntu		so		teebeerez-a	buli	ki-mu	nga
NP_1-person		now		imagine-FV	every	NP_7-one_thing	while
n-ki-resse				a-wo			
SM_{1SG}-OM_7-leave.PFV				IV-$PP_{16.}$DEMb			

'I didn't want to come, as you know, a home without someone (a nanny). **Now imagine/consider that** I left everything {housework} undone'.

We argue that *so* is a calque of a Luganda interpersonal PM *kale* (now) because the relationship between the proposition of not having a helper and the proposition of leaving the domestic chores unattended cannot be accessible if the PM *so* is interpreted as a switch. Rather, this relationship is clearly evident if the propositions are processed along the *kale* inferential route. According to Fraser's (1996) taxonomy of PMs, *kale* (which would translate as 'now') would be categorised as a parallel marker signalling focus or refocus on the proposition it prefaces. *Kale* and *so* do not procedurally resemble; in this context, *kale* serves rhetorical-related functions, which functions are not shared by the English so. In Luganda the attention-drawing form *teebereza* (you imagine) commonly collocates

with *kale* or *kati* PMs (*kale teebereza* or *kati tebeereza*). In both cases, what is encoded are procedures that result in interpreting the segment prefaced by *kale teebereza* as expressing feelings related to regret and disappointment, and in this case, caused by her unaccomplished domestic chores. The rhetorical pragmatic nuances embedded in *kale teebereza* are intended to draw the speaker's hearers closer to her situation and sympathise with her.

We, therefore, argue that *so* is a calque because the procedural nuances the speaker intended to encode in utterance (7) cannot be retrieved if *so* were to be interpreted as a code-switched English PM in co-occurrence with *teebereeza*. An interpretation which maintains *so* as a code-switched implicative marker is possible but it would require a comma intonation, which is not provided in this case. Similarly, an interpretation of utterance (7) where *so* is construed as a native contrastive Luganda *so* will not be possible because the proposition prefaced by *so teebereza* bears no contrastive interpretation. Like the English PM *so, kale* is a highly multifunctional PM, and it is often difficult to bring it to consciousness or describe.

Another Luganda form which often collocates with *teebeereza* is *naawe* (you also). *Naawe teebereza* and *kale teebereza* in general encode similar rhetorical procedures. Both of them are addressee-centred markers, signalling procedures related to solidarity or familiarity. However, speaker intuition indicates that *naawe* would be a less relevant translation of *so* in the context of utterance (7) compared to *kale*. *Naawe* as a refocus PM in this context should not be confused with the persuasive, negotiation *naawe!* (please) or the pronominal *naawe* (you too) whose role is not pragmatic but grammatical.

5.3.2 Calquing in correlating pragmatic markers

Just like correlating conjunctions, PMs will occur in correlating pairs to signal unified procedures. In English, correlating pairs include, *no sooner/than*, *neither/nor*, *not only/but also*, *whether/or,* etc. In Luganda, correlating pairs include *oba/oba* (either/or), *bwe/ne* (when/then) etc. The data exhibit instances where the English

correlating pair *either/or* is partially calqued to manifest in two forms: 'either…*oba*' and as '*oba* …or' as illustrated in utterances (8) and (9), respectively. The PM pair *either/or* is used in affirmative constructions to encode procedures which signal choices between possibilities and in this context the causal possibility.

(8) …*muzeeyi*; **either** *yalina emputtu oba yalina obusoberwa*… (KoM10)

muzeeyi	either	y-a-lin-a	e-mputtu	oba
father	either	SM_1-PST-have-FV	IV-NP_9.defiance	or

a-a-lin-a	o-bu-soberwa
SM_1-PST-have-FV	IV-NP_{14}-confusion

'(My) father, was **either** big headed or he was in dilemma…'

(9) …they had an accident …I think *n'afuna oba* internal bleeding *or* something… (AoS6)

ne	a-fun-a	oba	internal bleeding or something
and	SM_1-get-FV	perhaps	internal bleeding or something

'… they had an accident …I think and he had either internal bleeding or something'

Utterance (8) is set in a context where the speaker's father had to make risky decisions during the war. The speaker uses an English-Luganda correlating pair *either…oba* to describe the cause of his father's character in decision-making with two possibilities; the possibility that he was *big headed* (strong-hearted) and the possibility that he acted hastily out of confusion. Similarly, in utterance (9), the speaker employs a bilingual pair *oba…or* to explain the cause of her father's death, as an event caused by one of the possibilities; the possibility that he had internal bleeding or the possibility that he died due to other accident-related causes.

Looking closely at the structural manifestation of the two bilingual correlating PMs, one would qualify them as cases of codeswitching (CS), given that CS is one of the outcomes of language contact. The claim would hold because what is happening relates to the definition of CS as the "juxtaposition

within the same speech exchange of passages of speech belonging to two different grammatical systems or subsystems" (see Gumperz, 1982, p. 59). The gradient and fuzzy nature of the continuum on which language contact outcomes range sometimes makes it difficult to define or delineate them clearly. We concur with Nivens' (2002) observation that defining concepts involving interaction between two or more languages will remain difficult as long as linguists across disciplines fail to define language explicitly.

The procedural value of the English form *either/or,* and the partially translated forms *either/oba* or *oba/or* is not significantly different. Thus, the speaker's employment of *either/oba* or *oba/or* could be explained in terms of the generic factors that trigger CS in PMs, including speaker preference and aim to communicate as relevantly as possible. Other than *either…oba* and *oba…either*, there are no other code-switched occurrences of calqued correlating pairs that were attested in our data.

5.3.3 Partial calquing of a PM pair

Partial calquing of a PM pair describes patterns in which one of the PMs in co-occurrences may be calqued. This contact outcome should not be confused with calquing in correlating pairs discussed in 5.3.2. In partial calquing, the PMs involved do not correlate grammatically but they co-occur as bilingual PMs as we see in utterance (10) below.

(10) *Nafunanga emitwalo ng'esatu buli mwezi nga zinnyambako. Kati* **because**
I was on the payroll, it was easier for me to connect to a secondary school (LoM 60).

n-a-fun-a-nga		e-mi-twalo		nga	e-satu
SM_{1SG}-PST-earn-FV-PROG		IV-NP_4-ten_thousand		about	PP_4-three
buli	mw-ezi	nga	zi-n-yamb-a-ko		**kati**
every	NP_3-month	as	SM_{10}-OM_{1SG}-help-FV=LOC_{17}		now

because I was on payroll, …
because I was on the payroll

I used to earn about thirty thousand every month which would facilitate part of my welfare. **And because** I was on the payroll, it was easier for me to connect to a secondary school (for bigger opportunities)'.

Utterance (10) above is set in a context where the speaker was explaining his financial constraints of surviving on minimal monthly earnings and explaining how he managed to manoeuvre and connect to bigger studying opportunities. To encode an epistemic reason for the existence of the state of affairs described, the speaker employs a causal bilingual PM '*kati because* (Lit. now because). The *kati because* can be interpreted as a partial calque of the Luganda monolingual PM co-occurrence *kati olwokubanga* (and because) or a partial calque of the English monolingual PM pair *and because*. In Luganda causality is encoded mainly by the Luganda basic form, *kubanga*, a form which is claimed to manifest in (10) causally related forms: *kuba, lwakuba* and *lwakubanga* (because), *kulwokuba* and *kulwokubanga* (for the reason that), *olwokubanga* and *olwokuba*(because of/since/for the fact that) and the two infrequent pairs *okuba/okubanga*, and *bba/bbanga*, all translatable roughly as *because* (see Nakijoba (2019)).

Interpreted in isolation, the Luganda *olwokuba/olwokubanga* is inherently a causal marker and the cognitive effects associated with it would be of presupposition strengthening. That is, the *olwokuba*(*nga*) clause provides evidence which justifies why the speaker was able to connect to greater opportunities. On the other hand, *kati* is used as a transition device to mark serialised textual relations between the foregoing and the upcoming discourse. This means that *kati* cannot encode causal procedures in isolation as *because/olwokubanga* does. However, when *kati* combines with a causal *lwakuba*(*nga*), what is signalled is a stronger epistemic force, which interpretively resembles a force encoded by the causal expression *for the reason that*.

If we went by an interpretation in which *kati because* is treated as partial calque of the English PM pair *and because*, which in Luganda would be *kati olwokuba*(*nga*), the contextual procedural function of the cardinal connective *and* would be to signal transition, a function similar to what *kati* signals. However, a

deeper scrutiny of the procedural roles of the three forms, *kati because*, *and because* and *kati olwokuba*(*nga*) shows that the three forms encode different causal forces. Intuitively, *kati olwokuba*(*nga*) seems to be the strongest because its intonation is emphatic, followed by *kati because* and lastly *and because*.

Other examples of partial calques attested in the data include *era still* (and still), *era actually* (and actually), *era of course* (and of course), *of course olwokuba* (of course, for the reason that), *naye still* (but still).

5.3.4 Total calquing of a PM pair

Unlike in partial calques where one of the PMs is loan translated, the data exhibit PM pairs which are completely calqued. For example, the use of an ill-formed PM pair *then after* in utterance (11). This utterance is set in a context when the speaker was asked to remove her dress as a requirement to attend a physical education lesson. Unfortunately, she had forgotten to wear her nickers that day and the teacher asked her to dress up immediately.

(11) I removed my dress… *ne nsigala nga ndi* naked…**Then after** *ne baŋŋamba ne nnyambala ka* dress *kange* (BoI 19)

I removed my dress ne n-sigal-a nga n-di naked
I removed my dress and SM_{1SG}-remain-FV while SM_{1SG}-be naked

then after ne ba-n-gamb-a ne n-yambal-a
then after and SM_{2}-OM_{1SG}-tell-FV and SM_{1SG}-wear-FV

ka dress ka-nge
NP_{12} dress PP_{12}-$POSS_{1SG}$

'I removed my dress, and I remained naked…**thereafter** they told me to wear my little dress.'

In this utterance, the speaker employs an ill-formed PM pair *then after* to encode temporal/sequential relations between the coordinated segments. What is calqued is the Luganda PM pair, *kati oluvannyuma* (Lit. then, after (that)), a form whose temporal procedures interpretively resemble what is encoded by the

English form *then afterwards*, *thereafter* or *then after that*. *Kati oluwannyuma* is a common sequential/temporal PM pair employed in narratives to introduce a transition from one scene/event to another. In this case, the event of the speaker removing her dress was followed by the event of becoming naked and finally the event of dressing up again. This style of serialising events is described in Segan, Duchan & Scott (1991) and Labov & Waletzky (1967), (cited in Torres (2002, p. 68)) as typical to oral narratives, characterised by additivity (each new clause encodes new information) and temporality (sequential ordering of events).

Other than interpreting *then after* as a calque, it can also be construed as usage within Ugandan English (UgE), a non-native variety of L2 English spoken in Uganda. UgE has both 'crude' and 'formal' expressions. *Then after* is a widespread 'formal' expression and we can argue that its status in UgE usage is established. For that matter, the form is less stigmatised. In the entire studied data, then after occurs four times in three forms produced by different speakers: *then after*, *then after that* and *and then after*.

Other forms of calques traceable from the data include, the English PM pair *fortunately still* which is a loan translation of the Luganda *era eky'omukisa* and *so since then*, translated from *kati okuva olwo*.

5.3.5 Partial calquing in pragmatic marker clusters

Before we delve into the calquing of PM clusters, we need to describe briefly Luganda PM combinations. Languages vary with the number of PMs permissible in a PM combination/cluster. Whereas English permits a maximum of two PMs (Fraser, 2015), Luganda monolingual PMs can pair and cluster, taking up to four PMs in sequences, e.g., *naye nga ate era* (Lit. Even though, but also). However, the longest PM clusters in the data have three PMs. When Luganda gets in contact with English, this serialised combinability feature is passed on.

Note that the behaviour of the partially calqued PM clusters is not significantly different from calquing involving PM pairs. What differentiates them is the number of PMs involved, in which case, calquing in PM clusters involves

more than two PMs in co-occurrence. For instance, the cluster, *naye since then*, as it features in utterance (12).

(12) …*abaana ne batulika ne baseka. Naye* **since then**, *natandika okwebuuza lwaki* … (LoM155)

a-ba-ana	ne	ba-tulik-a	o-ku-sek-a	naye	since	then
IV-NP$_2$-child	and	SM$_2$-burst-FV	IV-NP$_{15}$-laugh-FV	but	since	then

n-a-tandik-a	o-kw-ee-buuz-a	lwaki
SM$_1$SG-PST-start-FV	IV-NP$_{15}$-REFL-ask-FV	why

'And children broke into laughter. **And since then**, I started to ask myself why {certain sounds are silent}'

In this utterance, the speaker explained how he got embarrassed during an English reading lesson when he attempted to read the word *sign* wrongly as /sigini/ and his classmates laughed at him. The segment, *natandika okwebuuza lwaki* (I started to ask myself why) prefaced by the partially calqued PM cluster *naye since then* signals the speaker's quest and resolution to discover the secret of silent sounds in English. We argue that the bilingual PM cluster *naye since then* is a partial calque of the Luganda monolingual PM pair *naye okuva olwo* (Lit. but since that time), which is used to preface such resolution actions. In English, to encode such procedural meaning requires a PM pair such as *since then*, or *since that time*. Note that *naye okuva olwo* is a PM pair comprising *naye* (and) and *okuva olwo* (since that time). The Luganda form *okuva olwo* is a compound conjunction and cannot be decomposed into *okuva* and *olwo*. However, the two forms *okuva* and *olwo* exist as independent lexical items to mean *from* and *then* respectively. We discuss *naye okuva olwo* as a PM cluster because *okuva olwo* is construed as a direct translation of the English compound conjunction *since then* into the Luganda (since-*okuva*, then-*olwo*). While the cognitive effects derived from processing *naye okuva olwo* and *naye since then* are not significantly different, native intuition reveals that the Luganda cluster is more relevant in communicating the quest nuances embedded in the narrative.

Other occurrences of partial translation/calque in PM clusters in the data include, *kati since then*, (Lit. and since then) and *but era still* (Lit. But even then).

5.3.6 Total calquing of a PM cluster

Total calquing of PM clusters occurs when the entire Luganda PM cluster is loan translated into English. In utterance (13), the speaker narrates his experience as a student when the head teacher introduced compulsory evening classes.

(13) *Omusajja yaleeta* policy *nti* senior four *bajja kusiibangayo* for revision and discussion. **But because again** of my problems, *saasobola*. (LoM40)

o-mu-sajja	y-a-leet-a	policy	nti	senior	four
IV-NP_1-man	SM_1-PST-bring-FV	policy	that	senior	four
ba-jj-a	ku-siib-a-nga=yo		for revision		and
SM_2-will-FV	NP_{15}-spend_a_day-FV-PROG=LOC_{23}		for revision		and

discussion but because again of my problemssi-a-sobol-a

discussion but because again of my problemsNEG.SM_{1SG}-PST-be_able-FV

'The man (head teacher) introduced a policy where all senior four (students) had to spend the whole day (at school) doing revision and discussions. **But (again) because** of my problems, I was unable'.

To explain why it was challenging to attend the afternoon sessions, the speaker employs a construction that is headed by an ill-formed English PM cluster *but because again*. Procedurally, the PM cluster *but because again* provides an inferential route to the epistemic justification of the speaker's failure to attend evening sessions and contrasts it with its urgency. We argue that *but because again* is a loan translation of the Luganda PM cluster *naye era olwa* (Lit: but, again, for the reason that). Note that the ordering of PMs in the calqued form *but because again* is different from the ordering of the Luganda native form *naye era olwa* (but again for the reason that).

Our educated guess on what motivates the speaker to employ *but because again* as a 'better' alternative can be explained in terms of acceptability constraints

in PM combinations (Fraser, 2015). Like in CS where the bilingual constituents are systematically organised and guided by rules and principles, calquing is seemingly constrained, making it possible for a speaker to identify a more natural form from the ill-formed calque alternatives. Relatedly, Myers-Scotton (1993) observes that speakers who engage in unmarked CS are often unaware that they are using a mixed code because they usually start their conversations in their indigenous languages (usually the matrix language). As they engage more, they perceive their conversation to be typically in those languages. On the other hand, Bullock & Toribio (2009) allude that the production of stigmatised ill-formed PM clusters such as *but because again* may speak to the levels of bilingualism of the speakers for the degree of proficiency of the bilingual speaker correlates with the type of CS engaged in and a measure of one's bilinguality.

Following the tenets of Myer-Scotton's Matrix Frame model (1995), it is probable that in constructing the ill-formed PM cluster, Luganda having been the Matrix language supplied the 'syntactic frame' of the cluster and English supplied the switch. This possibility is further consolidated by clusters such as *but I think again* whose Luganda counterpart is *naye era ndowooza* (I also want to think). (lit. *Naye* (but) *ndowooza* (I think) *era* (also)'.

6. Conclusion

In this paper, we have discussed the outcomes of the contact between Luganda and English PMs and demonstrated how these outcomes compare with other scholarly findings. Three outcomes are attested: coexistence, partial replacement and calquing but, there was no evidence of PMs having acquired differentiated meanings. There is evidence for reciprocated switching between Luganda and English PMs but there is no precise evidence to illustrate that Luganda PMs compete or threaten to compete with English PMs.

Although PM calques are evident both in English and Luganda PMs, more Luganda PMs are loan translated into English because (i) Luganda is the most frequent unmarked code of the PM-hosting utterances, (ii) English is more

prestigious than Luganda in which case speakers prefer to associate with it, (iii) mother tongue influence, and (iv) the speaker's low level of balanced bilingualism. Considering the competitive behaviour of certain English PMs such as *so*, which appears in many illustrations of partial replacement, we make educated predictions that in the far future, the affected Luganda PMs *kale* and *kati* may be entirely replaced by the English markers.

The results in this paper need to be interpreted with some limitations. First, the findings are based on limited oral data of only 190,580 words. Such a small data size would not provide a complete picture of the manifestation of the coexistence of Luganda-English PMs. Second, some PMs were notoriously difficult to translate or describe without loss. Third, the criterion for differentiating between PMs in coexistence and PMs in partial replacement is not precise, for, coexistence has been analysed as a step towards language replacement (Goss & Salmons (2000, p. 469).

We argue for further investigations in PMs in contact. This discussion has only focused on the contact between two PM systems. There is a need to investigate what happens when more than two PM systems get in contact, establishing which PMs (monolingual or bilingual) can co-occur, what constraints may bind co-occurrence, whether the co-occurring PMs are procedurally and structurally compositional.

Abbreviations

CS – code-switching, DEMb – proximal demonstrative, FV – final vowel, IV – initial vowel, L1 – first language, L2 – second language, LOCx - locative of class x, NEG – negative, NPx – nominal prefix of class x, OMx – object marker of class x, PFV – perfective, PL – plural, POSSx – possessive of class x, PM(s) – pragmatic marker(s), PPx – pronominal prefix of class x, PROG – progressive, PST – past, REFL – reflexive, SG – singular, SMx – subject marker of class x

Acknowledgements

First, Gerda Henkel Foundation for funding doctoral studies of the first author under the Partnership for Africa's Next Generation of Academics (PANGeA) programme (2015/2018). Second, the Carnegie Corporation of New York for funding the African Humanities Program (AHP) fellowship (2021-2022) of the first author. We also thank three anonymous reviewers for their invaluable comments and guidance.

Declaration of conflict of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest to disclose.

References

Aijmer, K. (2013). *Understanding pragmatic markers: A variational pragmatic approach*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Andersen, G. (2001). *Pragmatic markers of sociolinguistic variation: A Relevance-theoretic approach to the language of adolescents*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Andersen, G. (2014). Pragmatic borrowing. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 67, 17–33.

Bayiga, F.T. (2016). Profiles of multilingualism in Kampala: An analysis of language biographies and linguistic repertoires of university students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stellenbosch University.

Blakemore, D. (2002). *Relevance and linguistic meaning: The semantics and pragmatics of discourse markers*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Brody, J. (1987). Linguistic particles borrowed from Spanish as discourse markers in Mayan languages. *Anthropological Linguistics*. 29(4), 507–521.

Bullock, B.E. & Toribio, A.J. (2009). Themes in the study of code-switching. In B.E. Bullock & A.J. Toribio (eds.). *The Cambridge Handbook of linguistic code-switching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. p. 1–17.

David, E.M, Simons, G.F. & Fennig, C.D. (eds.). (2023). *Ethnologue: Languages of the world*. Twenty-sixth edition. Dallas, Texas: SIL International.

Fisher, A. (2000a). Assessing the state of Ugandan English. *English today*. 16(1), 57–61.

Fisher, A. (2000b). English for Uganda in the next millennium. The grammar of the noun phrase and article in Ugandan English. *The Uganda Journal*. 46, 39–48.

Fraser, B. (1996). Pragmatic markers. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 6(2), 1–27.

Fraser, B. (1999). What are discourse markers? *Journal of Pragmatics*. 31, 931–952.

Fraser, B. (2006). On the conceptual-procedural distinction. *Style*. 40(1–2), 24–32.

Fraser, B. (2015). The combining of discourse markers - A beginning. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 86, 48–53.

Fuller, J.M. (2001). The principle of pragmatic detachability in borrowing: English-origin discourse markers in Pennsylvania German. *Linguistics*. 39(2), 351–369.

Gardner-Chloros, P. (2010). Contact and code switching. In R. Hickey (ed.). *The handbook of language contact.*Oxford: Blackwell Publishers. 188–207.

González, M. (2004). *Pragmatic markers in the oral narrative: The case of English and Catalan*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Goss, E.L. & Salmons, J.C. (2000). The evolution of a bilingual discourse marking system: Modal particles and English markers in German-American dialects. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. 4(4), 469–484.

Gumperz, J. (1982). *Discourse strategies*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Haugen, E. (1953). *The Norwegian language in America: A study in bilingual behaviour*. 2nd ed. Pennsylvania/Philadelphia: The University of Pennsylvania Press.

Hlavac, J. (2006). Bilingual discourse markers: Evidence from Croatian-English code-switching. *Journal of Pragmatics*. 38(11), 1870–1900.

Isingoma, B. (2013). Innovative pragmatic codes in Ugandan English: A Relevance-theoretic account. *Argumentum*. 9, 19–31.

Isingoma, B. (2014). Lexical and grammatical features of Ugandan *English*. *English* Today. 30(2), 51–56.

Ladefoged, P., Glick, R. & Clive, C. (1972). *Languages in Uganda*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Matras, Y. (2000). Fusion and the cognitive basis for bilingual discourse markers. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. 4(4), 505–528.

Meierkord, C. and Isingoma, B. (2022). Between first language influence, exonormative orientation and migration: Future time expressions in post-protectorate Ugandan English. *English World-Wide*, 43(2), 220-248.

Myers-Scotton, C. (1993). *Social motivations for code switching: Evidence from Africa*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

Myers-Scotton, C. (2006). *Multiple voices: An introduction to bilingualism*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Nakayiza, J. (2013). The sociolinguistics of multilingualism in Uganda; A case study of the official and non-official language policy, planning and management of Luruuri-Lunyara and Luganda. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. The University of London.

Nakijoba S. (2019). Manifestation of kubanga causal connectives in English-Luganda bilingual discourse. *Stellenbosch Papers in Linguistics Plus*. 58, 155–175.

Serra, C. O. (1998). Discourse connectives in bilingual conversation: the case of an emerging Italian-French mixed code. In Peter Auer (ed.). *Code-Switching in Conversation: Language, Interaction and Identity*. New York: Routledge. 101–122.

Solomon, J. (1995). Local and global functions of a borrowed native pair of discourse markers in a Yucatan Mayan narrative. In J. Ahlers (Ed.), Proceedings of the 21st annual meeting of the Berkeley linguistic society, Feb. 17–20. General session and parasession on historical issues in sociolinguistics (287–298). Berkeley: The University of California Press.

Sperber, D. & Wilson, D. (1995). *Relevance: Communication and cognition*. 2nd ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

Ssempuuma, J. (2013). Ugandan English. In B. Kortmann & L.H. Kerstin (eds.) *The Mouton World Atlas of Variation in English (WAVE)*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 475–482.

Ssentanda, M.E. (2014). Mother tongue education and transition to English medium education in Uganda: Teachers' perspectives and practices versus language policy and curriculum. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Stellenbosch University.

Torres, L. (2002). Bilingual discourse markers in Puerto Rican Spanish. *Language in Society*. 31, 65–83.

Torres, L. (2006). Bilingual discourse markers in indigenous languages. *International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism*. 9(5), 615–624.

Torres, L. & Potowski, K. (2008). A comparative study of bilingual discourse markers in Chicago Mexican, Puerto Rican and Mexican Spanish. *International Journal of Bilingualism*. 12(4), 263–279.

Traugott, E.C. (1995). The role of the development of discourse markers in a theory of grammaticalisation. In ICHL XII, *Manchester 1995*. 1–23. Conference presentation

Tukwasibwe, C. (2014). The influence of indigenous languages on Ugandan English as used in the media. Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Rhodes University.

Wilson, D. (2016). Reassessing the conceptual-procedural distinction. *Lingua*. 175–176, 5–19.