

# THE USE OF DITRANSITIVE CONSTRUCTIONS AMONG L1 LUGBARATI SPEAKERS OF ENGLISH IN UGANDA: A PRELIMINARY STUDY

Peace Yikiru<sup>1</sup>, Bebwa Isingoma<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Department of Languages and Literature (English Language and Linguistics section)  
at Gulu University, Uganda

**Abstract:** *One of the important features of structural nativization of L2 varieties of English is how their grammar converges with and/or diverges from their parent variety, usually, British English. Building on Isingoma (2016, 2021a), this study is set out to augment discourse on verb complementational profile in Ugandan English, focusing on ditransitive constructions. Using naturalistic data from semi-structured interviews involving 50 participants from L1 Lugbarati (a Central Sudanic language) speakers of English, the study shows that the Prepositional Phrase Construction (PPC) involving goal verbs is preferred over the Double Object Construction (DOC) configuration. Moreover, our data did not have a single incidence of benefactive DOCs. Substrate influence from Lugbarati, among others, appears to be a contributing factor, given that DOCs are rare in this language, as they are constrained by the semantic criterion of ‘prior possession’ of the theme/ patient by the recipient/ beneficiary referent. The findings thus show that Isingoma’s (2016) monolithic generalizations about this phenomenon are debatable, as he indicates that the DOC is overwhelmingly acceptable with goal verbs in Ugandan English and that the particularities observed in ditransitive constructions in the variety are influenced by Bantu languages (where the DOC is the norm). Likewise, the assertion that Ugandans ubiquitously use the non-canonical PPC configuration for benefactive verbs (Isingoma, 2016) does not hold for L1 Lugbarati speakers of English, as the configuration was manifestly sporadic in our data, as opposed to the canonical PPC. The current study thus underscores the fact that there is substantial interspeaker variability in Ugandan English along ethno-linguistic lines (cf. Isingoma & Meierkord, 2022).*

**Keywords:** English, Uganda, ditransitive, Lugbarati, substrate influence

**About the author:** Peace Yikiru is an Assistant Lecturer at the Department of Languages and Literature at Gulu University (Uganda). She is a trained teacher of English and Literature in English. Her research interests are in the fields of sociolinguistics, syntax and corpus linguistics.

e-mail: peaceyikiru@gmail.com

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3303-8841>

**About the author:** Bebwa Isingoma earned his PhD in English Linguistics in 2013 at the University of Agder (Norway) after completing his MPhil at the Norwegian University of Science and Technology. He is an EU Marie S. Curie fellow (Freiburg Institute for Advanced Studies, Germany, 2018/19) and a fellow of the African Humanities Program (Rhodes University, South Africa, 2015). His research interests include (variational) sociolinguistics, English syntax, cognitive pragmatics and Bantu linguistics. He is currently a Senior Lecturer in English Language & Linguistics at Gulu University (Uganda).

e-mail: b.isingoma@gu.ac.ug

ORCID iD: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1203-5951>

isibebwa@yahoo.co.uk

Copyright © 2023 Peace Yikiru, Bebwa Isingoma

**Article history:** Received: 16 February 2023; Reviewed: 3 April 2023; Revised: 4 April 2023; Accepted: 5 April 2023; Published: 28 April 2023



This open access article is published and distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

**Citation (APA):** Yikiru, P., & Isingoma, B. (2023). The use of ditransitive constructions among L1 Lugbarati speakers of English in Uganda: A preliminary study. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*, 11(1), 33-48. <http://doi.org/10.46687/FNIV9282>.

## Introduction: ditransitive constructions in L1 and L2 Englishes

The study aims at examining how speakers of Lugbarati (a Central Sudanic language) use ditransitive constructions in English. Various studies have analyzed ditransitive constructions in English, right from the 1970s to date (e.g. Green, 1974; Oehrle, 1976; Gropen et al., 1989; Pinker, 1989; Harley, 2002; Krifka, 2004; Bresnan & Nikitina, 2009; Beavers, 2011; Beavers & Koontz-Garboden, 2017; Isingoma, 2018, Hlaváčková & Brůhová, 2022, among others). All these studies are concerned with what takes place in L1 (first language) English. Studies that have examined L2 Englishes include Nyaggah (1990), Kuha, (1997), Mukherjee and Hoffmann (2006), Hoffmann and Mukherjee (2007), Koch and Bernaisch (2013), Bernaisch et al. (2014), Isingoma (2016), Röthlisberger, Grafmiller and Szmrecsanyi (2017), Proroković and Malenica (2023), among others. Of these, only Nyaggah (1990), Kuha, (1997) and Isingoma (2016) examine the phenomenon in African Englishes, with Isingoma (2016) investigating how Ugandans use ditransitive constructions from a World Englishes perspective.

Ditransitive constructions have two formal varieties, i.e. the Double Object Construction (DOC), as in (1a) and the Prepositional Phrase Construction (PPC), as in (1b).

- (1) (a) I gave John a book.  
 (b) I gave a book to John.

In (1a), the postverbal arguments are linearized contiguously (DOC), while in (1b), there is an oblique argument, introduced by a preposition (PPC). While some of the verbs are goal verbs, as in (1), others are benefactive verbs ((2a) & (2b)). The ditransitive verbs belonging to these two broad semantic categories have been mapped into specific semantic classes, which show whether there is alternation between the DOC and the PPC or not (see Pinker, 1989; Isingoma, 2018):

- (2) (a) I baked John a cake. (DOC)  
 (b) I baked a cake for John. (PPC)

While the goal verb *give*, which belongs to class of ‘verbs of giving’, together with *pass, hand, sell, pay, lend, loan, serve, feed, rent...*, alternates between the DOC and the PPC, as shown in (1), the goal verb *push*, which belongs to the class of ‘verbs of continuous causation of accompanied motion in some manner’, together with *carry, pull, tow...*, is said to preclude the alternation, i.e. it occurs in the PPC only (Pinker, 1989; Beavers, 2011; Isingoma, 2018, among others). Moreover, even though ‘verbs of giving’ are said to allow the alternation between the two linear orders, the goal ‘verb of giving’ *donate* does not allow that alternation due to some etymological, semantic and phonological

constraints (Pinker, 1989; Isingoma, 2018). Similarly, while the benefactive ‘verb of creation’ *bake* allows the alternation, together with a set of other ‘verbs of creation’, i.e. *bake, make, build, cook, sew, pour, wash, iron*, the verb *create* does not allow that alternation; it only occurs in the PPC. Many counterexamples have been observed, though, since native speakers sometimes use the precluded linear order of given verbs (see, e.g. Fellbaum, 2005; Bresnan & Nikitina, 2009; Isingoma, 2018) due to not only pragmatic reasons (Krifka, 2004; Bresnan & Nikitina, 2009) but also due to analogy and diachronic factors (Isingoma, 2018).

In L2 (second language) Englishes, there have been reports on using non-ditransitive verbs as goal ditransitive verbs in Indian English, involving verbs such as *inform, remind, advise, confer, notify*, etc. (Mukherjee & Hoffmann, 2006), while Nyaggah (1990) and Kuha (1997) show the use of the non-canonical configuration of benefactive verbs in a sentence like *Buy for me that book* (Nyaggah, 1990, p.60) in Kenyan English. Isingoma (2016) expatiates on the overwhelming acceptance of goal DOCs in Ugandan English and the rejection of some benefactive DOCs such as *I poured him some tea* in preference to the PPC, but in its non-canonical ordering. It should be noted that the non-canonical ordering, which is used in Ugandan and Kenyan Englishes, is also possible in standard British/American English when there is a heavy NP shift, e.g. *Carl August invited Goethe to Weimar, and in 1792 bought for him a house on the Frauenplan, a small plaza near the Marktplatz* (COCA).<sup>1</sup> Besides, this structure is also often possible when the patient (which comes after the beneficiary in the non-canonical PPC ordering) requires ‘end-focus’, but end-focus on the patient is also achievable in the DOC, unless the speaker needs to convey a ‘deputative’ reading of the benefactive construction (Isingoma, 2016).<sup>2</sup> However, for verbs such as *organize* and *create*, which do not allow the DOC (cf. Levin, 1993), the non-canonical PPC is used in standard British/American English to achieve this pragmatic purpose.

Isingoma (2016) accounts for the rejection of many benefactive DOCs and a preference for their PPC counterparts in Ugandan English in terms of L1 substrate influence from Bantu languages. However, we are aware that (Ugandan) Bantu languages do not have benefactive prepositions and code all benefactive constructions by means of the DOC (Isingoma, 2021b; Kroeger, 2004). While Isingoma (2016) has also shown that the dispreference of benefactive DOCs is also due to the fact that benefactive verbs are inherently monotransitive verbs that are only used ditransitively, there is a need to enrich this, given that recent studies have shown that Ugandan English is not influenced by Bantu

1. COCA = Corpus of Contemporary American English

2. ‘Deputative benefaction’ means that the subject referent performs the action encoded by the ditransitive verb so that the beneficiary does not have to; this reading is only available in the PPC configuration (Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997).

languages alone, contra Fisher (2000) and Isingoma (2016).<sup>3</sup> In fact, Isingoma and Meierkord (2022) and Meierkord and Isingoma (2022) have argued that speakers of different Ugandan languages may present different features in their respective Englishes. Moreover, there is also a need to augment Isingoma's (2016) study not only in terms of using a different ethnolinguistic group, but also with respect to methodology, i.e. by using naturally occurring data, as opposed to acceptability tests that he used, although he also used examples from Ugandan newspapers, but whose ethnolinguistic association could not be established. Thus, the current study is set out to investigate how L1 speakers of Lugbarati use ditransitive constructions in their L2 English and how their L1 contributes to the particularities observed.

### **An overview of ditransitive constructions in Lugbarati**

Lugbarati is a Central Sudanic language spoken in Uganda, South Sudan and the Democratic Republic of the Congo. It is one of the overly understudied African languages, with only two grammar primers, written by missionaries in the 1960s, i.e. Crazzolaro (1960) and Barr (1965), while Andersen (1986, 1994) examines some phonological features of the language, and there are also a few bilingual dictionaries (e.g. Ongua, 1999). There are almost no known syntactic analyses of ditransitive constructions available, save for some mention in, e.g. Crazzolaro (1960, p.24), who indicates that the adposition *-ni* (a particle) and *dri* are used to introduce the indirect object. However, Yikiru and Isingoma (2023) have prepared a more or less comprehensive manuscript on this subject, from which the following account is derived.

Lugbarati has both the DOC and the PPC involving both goal verbs and benefactive verbs, as shown in (3) and (4) from Yikiru and Isingoma (2023, p.1f):

#### (3) *Goal verbs*

- (a) Ma     ma     ezo                     ma     mawua fe. (DOC)  
       I     my     girlfriend     her     flower             give  
       'I give my girlfriend her flowers.'
- (b) Ma     mawua fe     ma     ezo-ni. (PPC)  
       I     flower             give     my     girlfriend-to.  
       'I give flowers to my girlfriend.'

---

3. See also Nyaggah (1990) and Kuha (1997), who attribute the occurrence of structures like *Buy for me that book* in Kenyan English to Kiswahili and Kikuyu, which are also Bantu languages.

(4) *Benefactive verbs*

(a) Meri a'di ima ati ma eribi. (DOC)

Mary cooked her father his vegetables

'Mary cooked her father his vegetables.'

(b) Ma enya a'di 'ba aku-a 'diyi-ni. (PPC)

I food cook people home-at them-for.

'I cook food for them.'

As can be seen, both the DOC and the PPC are available in Lugbarati, and the PPC requires the use of the adposition particle *-ni*, which is translatable as *to* or *for* in English and is attached to the recipient/beneficiary argument. Crucially, for a ditransitive verb to occur in the DOC in Lugbarati, there must be prior possession of the theme/patient referent by the recipient/beneficiary referent. Thus, Yikiru and Isingoma (2023, p.5) note that the following sentence (5) is illicit in Lugbarati:

(5) \*Ma ma ezo mawua fe. (DOC)

I my girlfriend flower give

'I give my girlfriend flowers.'

The sentence is illicit because there is no possessive marker indicating that *mawua* 'flower' belonged to the recipient *ezo* 'girlfriend' prior to the subject referent giving it to her. This semantic restriction clearly means that there are very few DOCs in Lugbarati. For that matter, Yikiru and Isingoma (2023) state that Lugbarati is a PPC-dominant language. This is not an isolated case for a language to have one configuration of ditransitive constructions dominating the other configuration, as, for example, Isingoma (2021b, p.1) indicates that while Rutooro has both the DOC and the PPC, it is a DOC-dominant language, since PPCs can only occur with verbs that obey the 'locomotional constraint'. This requires "the governing verb in the Rutooro PPC to encode a change in the physical location of an entity as well as a directional meaning" (Isingoma, 2021b, p.1). Hence, languages display different structures and this fact, in language contact situations, may affect how speakers of L2 varieties of English use ditransitive constructions, as this study will reveal.

## Methodology

We used semi-structured interviews, which we recorded, in order to obtain sentences containing ditransitive constructions in L2 English by L1 Lugbarati speakers, and this tool enabled us to compile a corpus for our study. The semi-structured interviews aimed at obtaining naturally occurring data, so that

information could be derived on the use of ditransitive constructions in L2 English and this was achieved through free interaction amongst 50 respondents. The questions that we asked the participants were designed in such a way that would require the participants to use a number of ditransitive verbs. The 50 respondents were divided into 10 groups, where each group was composed of five participants. Each interview conducted had an average duration of 10 minutes. All the participants were acrolectal speakers of English, having completed at least 13 years of English education (cf. Greenbaum & Nelson, 1996).

We transcribed each interview and obtained around 610 words per transcript. As a result, the total number of words for our corpus was about 6,100 words. This small corpus was then searched manually for all occurrences of ditransitive constructions, and thirteen ditransitive verbs were recorded, i.e. *give, donate, serve, rent, pay, send, write, ask, leave, prepare, build, buy* and *cook*, and these were used in 88 sentences.

## Results and discussion

Results from the corpus data indicate that there were occurrences of ditransitive constructions in the corpus. Both the DOC and the PPC are attested, albeit at varying degrees, while some ditransitive verbs did not occur at all. Following the tradition in corpus linguistics (see, e.g. Esimaje, Gut & Antia, 2019), our corpus of 6100 words can be normalized in comparable terms with other corpora, using the formula  $N = n (106)/C$ , where  $N$  is the normalized frequency;  $n$  is the observed frequency and  $C$  is the corpus size.<sup>4</sup> Hence, the following computation shows normalized frequencies per one million words:

*Table 1.*

*Normalized Frequency of the occurrence of ditransitive verbs*

<b>Verb type</b>	<b>Attestation/Normalized Frequency (1million words)</b>
Ditransitive	13(2131.14)

The above indicates that for every one million words, there would be an occurrence of 2,131.14 ditransitive verbs. This is significant enough even though not all ditransitive verbs were used in the corpus. The actual attestation of ditransitive constructions in the two configurations can be visualized in Table 2:<sup>5</sup>

4. See *Comparing Frequencies for Corpora of Different Sizes* at [https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/courses/ling/corpus/blue/105\\_3.htm](https://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fss/courses/ling/corpus/blue/105_3.htm).

5. Note that there were no instantiations of the non-canonical DOC in our data, which is reported to occur in some varieties of British English (Hughes & Trudgill, 1979; Isingoma, 2022).

Table 2.  
Ditransitive constructions in the corpus

Verb	Frequency of goal verbs			Frequency of benefactive verbs		
	Canonical PPC	Non-Canonical PPC	DOC	DOC	Canonical PPC	Non-canonical PPC
give	6	2	15			
donate	8	-	-			
serve	-	-	1			
rent	-	-	-	-	-	1
pay	1	-	-			
send	4	-	-			
write	8	-	-	-	-	-
ask	-	-	4			
leave	6	-	-	-	3	-
prepare				-	5	-
build				-	4	-
buy				-	7	1
cook				-	12	-
Total	33	2	20	00	31	2
Total goal vs. benefactive constructions	55 (goal)			33 (benefactive)		

Although the exact purpose of the table was not to draw a comparison between goal verbs and benefactive verbs, these two main semantic classes of verbs cannot be overlooked. This is because goal verbs had generally a higher frequency of use than the benefactive verbs (but we are also aware of the fact that there are more goal verbs than benefactive verbs that are used in both configurations). Under goal verbs, the class of verbs that appeared in the data were ‘verbs of giving’<sup>6</sup>, in which the verbs *give* and *donate* appeared 23 and eight times, respectively, while the verbs *serve*, *rent*, *pay* all appeared once.<sup>7</sup> These were followed by ‘verbs of sending’, in which only the verb *send* was used and it appeared four

6. For the nomenclature used here in this semantic mapping, see, e.g. Pinker (1989), Beavers (2011), Isingoma (2018), among others.

7. Note that *rent* was used in the corpus benefactively, since it has both goal and benefactive uses, as in (i) and (ii) below. It was used in the PPC in its non-canonical configuration:

- (i) I rented a house to him. (goal use)
- (ii) I rented a house for him. (benefactive use)

Another verb in our data which has both goal and benefactive uses is *leave*, while *write*, which is also a goal and benefactive verb, was only used with goal semantics in the data.

times. This was then followed by ‘verbs of transfer of a message’, specifically, *ask* and *write*, which appeared four and eight times, respectively. The last verb group noted here were ‘verbs of future having’, where only *leave* was used and it appeared six times, as a goal verb. To contrast these with benefactive verbs, under ‘verbs of creation’, three verbs, i.e. *build*, *cook*, and *prepare* were used, and these appeared four, 12, and five times, respectively. As for ‘verbs of obtaining’, only the verb *buy* was used and this appeared eight times, with one sentence appearing in the non-canonical pattern and the others in the canonical pattern. Note also that the verb *leave* was also used benefactively in three sentences.

Although the verb *give* was used in the DOC 15 times, the data generally shows the non-frequent use of the DOC across verb groups. In the entire corpus (6,100 words), the DOC was only used with three verbs, specifically with the verbs *give* and *serve* (both ‘verbs of giving’) and *ask* (a verb of transfer of a message), and these were used 15 times, once and four times, respectively. This gives us only 20 occurrences of DOCs, as opposed to 68 occurrences of the PPC.<sup>8</sup> Crucially, no DOC at all was used with benefactive verbs. In order to statistically prove the prevalence of the PPC over the DOC in both goal and benefactive verbs, we subjected the data to a statistical significance test. Following the value  $p \leq 0.05$  and confidence interval of 95%, the One-Sample T Test shows that the variation between the PPC and the DOC for goal verbs was statistically significant:  $p = 0.020$ , while the occurrence of the DOC for goal verbs was not statistically significant:  $p = 0.225$ . And the proportion of DOCs in benefactive constructions was not statistically significant:  $p = 0.167$ . This pattern of use could partly be attributed to substrate influence from the participants’ L1, i.e. Lugbarati, bearing in mind that multilingual speakers can combine linguistic features from the multilingual repertoire at their disposal (Syvertsen, 2022; Jaspers & Madsen, 2019). As already indicated above, while there are instances of the DOC in Lugbarati, the pattern of use is very much different from that of English, in that, instead of the DOC simply expressing a ‘caused possession’ of an entity (cf. Pinker, 1989; Beavers, 2011), there has to be prior possession of that entity by the recipient or the beneficiary referent in Lugbarati. Thus, there are very few occurrences of the DOC in Lugbarati. This may imply that the disparities in the nature of the DOC in the two languages could be the reason for its low incidence of occurrence among L1 Lugbarati speakers of English as an L2. While Isingoma (2016) points out the preference of the PPC over the DOC

---

8. It is not clear to us why *give* has more occurrences in the DOC than it has in the PPC, even though we are aware that, in British English, *give* appears more in the DOC than in the PPC (Hoffmann & Mukherjee, 2007, p.12). Perhaps, this is one of the manifestations of exonormative orientation (i.e. a superstrate input from British English – the parent variety), which has been said to characterize Ugandan English, as a variety that involves the nexus between nativization (where substrate influence plays an important role) with some aspects of endonormative stabilization (total acceptance of local forms) and exonormative orientation (Isingoma & Meierkord, 2019; 2022).



in his data with respect to Ugandan English, this only concerns benefactive constructions. According to Isingoma (2016), Ugandans overwhelmingly accept the DOC for goal verbs. But we see here that in actual usage, the DOC has generally a lower frequency of occurrence even for goal verbs among L1 Lugbarati speakers of English. Although Isingoma's (2016) revelation on the dispreference of benefactive DOCs is attested in the current study, our findings in fact not only show this dispreference, but also the total absence of benefactive DOCs in our data. By contrast, Isingoma's (2016, p.213) findings indicate that some benefactive verbs (e.g. *buy, fetch*) were fully accepted in the DOC and they were also attested in newspapers.

Besides substrate influence, another very important reason could just be a matter of preference of the PPC over the DOC by the participants. This is supported by earlier findings showing that L2 learners of English prefer the PPC to the DOC, with the assumption that the former is less engaging cognitively (Jäschke, 2016, following Chang, 2004). In a similar vein, it has been argued that the PPC is acquired before the DOC by second language learners of English (Hawkins, 1987; Jäschke, 2016). Although the scope and nature of the current study did not allow us to take a psycholinguistic approach in order to find out which configuration was acquired first by our participants or even to have engagements with participants on reasons for their preference of the PPC over the DOC, it is possible that L1 Lugbarati speakers of English as a second language could simply have opted for the "cognitively less complex" configuration (cf. Jäschke, 2016, p.13), i.e. the PPC. We are also aware that there are other factors that can lead to the choice of one configuration over the other, especially language-internal factors such as information structure, pronominalization, etc. All these might have had an impact and can constitute a good area for further research involving the same population. However, we are also aware that studies in world Englishes (e.g. Kachru, 1985; Schneider, 2007; Mesthrie & Bhatt, 2008; Isingoma & Meierkord, 2022, among others) indicate that the role of substrate influence in shaping L2 varieties of English has been proven as an important contributing factor to various facets of structural nativization. Thus, we could, for now, content ourselves with the fact that substrate influence could be one of the multifactorial predictors in the use of ditransitive constructions among L2 speakers of English.

Furthermore, there was the use of the verb *give* in the PPC with the benefactive preposition *for*, moreover, in the non-canonical form (6), yet the context of the discourse points to a goal meaning. Although this incidence is not significant in statistical terms, the fact that such sentences could appear in acrolectal discourse is a striking realization:

- (6) (a) Someone gives for me a flower.
- (b) They can give for me things.

While this could be attributed to other factors, there is a dimension that can link this occurrence with what takes place in Lugbarati. As indicated earlier, the adposition *-ni* in Lugbarati is polysemous, in that it is used to mean *to* or *for*. English *to* is used with goal verbs, while *for* is typically used with benefactive verbs. For an L2 speaker of English, it is possible to mix the two prepositions, when no formal distinction exists between the allative adposition and the benefactive adposition in an L1 such as Lugbarati. Schmied (2004) has argued that the polysemous nature of adpositions in African languages usually results in interference in how Africans speak English as an L2 – something that has been attested in several studies in this respect (e.g. Jibril, 1991; Isingoma & Meierkord, 2022).

Our data in Table 2 also shows the occurrence of the verbs *buy* and *rent* in the non-canonical configuration of the PPC. While there were only two sentences in the non-canonical PPC involving these verbs (7), it is worthwhile to make mention of what this may entail.

(7)(a) I have to rent for them the accommodation.

(b) My elder sister buys for me clothes on Christmas.

In the first place, since the discourse context here does not involve what has been called ‘deputative benefaction’ (cf. Van Valin & LaPolla, 1997), i.e. where the subject referent does something so that the beneficiary referent does not have to, and given that both *buy* and *rent* allow the DOC (unlike verbs such as *create* and *organize*), our findings here are in line with Isingoma (2016) in relation to the fact that these non-canonical constructions, which are not pragmatically conditioned, indeed occur in Ugandan English. However, our findings also depart from Isingoma (2016), in that while Isingoma (2016) indicates that there is ubiquitous use of the non-canonical configuration with benefactive verbs in Ugandan English, our data only shows this occurrence sporadically, as out of the 33 occurrences of benefactive constructions, only two were non-canonical. While we acknowledge the fact that we had a small corpus, the ubiquity in usage Isingoma (2016) emphasizes should have manifested itself here to a considerable extent. Perhaps, the prevalence of the non-canonical configuration is pronounced among L1 speakers of Bantu languages (cf. Isingoma, 2016, Nyaggah, 1990, Kuha, 1997), i.e. languages which do not have benefactive adpositions, while for speakers of languages with benefactive adpositions (e.g. Lugbarati), the occurrence is limited, since there is similarity between L1 English and such languages. If we take this reasoning to be correct, then the sporadic occurrence of the non-canonical benefactive PPC could be accounted for in terms of Meierkord’s (2012) Interactions-across-Englishes model. In this model, Meierkord (2012) posits that as there exist many varieties of English in a given country, these varieties not only interact with each other but they may also influence each other. Isingoma and Meierkord (2022) have provided

some evidence to that effect with respect to the use of the preposition *from* to encode stative location in Ugandan English (e.g. *I ate from a restaurant.*) as a feature that could have originated from Acholi (a Nilotic language spoken in the northern part of Uganda), where an equivalent preposition which canonically has ablative semantics is also used to encode stative location. The use of *from* to encode stative location is, however, widespread in Ugandan English and ethnolinguistic groups without such substrate influence also use it, though at a lower rate than L1 Acholi speakers of English. Hence, we could state that while the use of the non-canonical PPC is ubiquitous among L1 Bantu speakers of English (cf. Isingoma, 2016, Nyaggah, 1990, Kuha, 1997), non-Bantu speakers such as L1 Lugbarati speakers of English also show this feature to a small extent due to interactions across Englishes in the sense of Meierkord (2012), as has already been proven by Isingoma and Meierkord (2022) with respect to other features in Ugandan English. But, perhaps, the use of a bigger corpus involving L1 Lugbarati speakers of English in the future could allow us to come up with a clearer picture of this phenomenon.

## Conclusion

This study has highlighted how L1 Lugbarati speakers use ditransitive constructions in their L2 English. We have seen the prevalence of the PPC configuration in our data, and this being the dominant configuration in Lugbarati, it points to the possible role of substrate influence in the use of ditransitive constructions among L1 Lugbarati speakers of English. The study has also shown that, in contradistinction to Isingoma (2016), the non-canonical PPC is not as pervasive as reported in Isingoma (2016) and this supports the idea that Ugandan English is not solely influenced by Bantu languages, contra Isingoma (2013, 2016) and Fisher (2000). Rather, this study supports Isingoma and Meierkord's (2022) study, among other studies, in which the idea of ethnolinguistic varieties of English within Ugandan English is floated. However, this state of affairs does not rule out the fact that these ethnolinguistic varieties may influence each other to some degree in consonance with the reasoning behind Meierkord's (2012) Interactions-across-Englishes model. Given the findings in this study, it might be right to reiterate Hoffmann and Mukherjee's (2007, p.5) enunciation to the effect that "the concept of verb complementational profile is a useful framework for comparative studies of varieties of English." While our aim in this study was not to explicitly compare varieties of English per se, this was achieved implicitly, since any features of New Englishes are naturally compared with the superstrate variety, in our case, British English, in terms of divergences from or convergences with the latter. In addition, our analysis has also highlighted intra-national variability within Ugandan English, given the departures of our findings from those provided by Isingoma (2016). However, given the small size of our corpus, as well as the scope of our study, our findings in the study

will need to be strengthened by further studies in which larger corpora and a multifactorial approach are used. Indeed, the current study is just exploratory and has thus raised important questions, thereby setting the scene for further studies on this syntactic phenomenon in an L2 variety of English.

## References

- Andersen, T. (1986). Tone splitting and vowel quality: Evidence from Lugbara. *Studies in African Linguistics*, 17(1), 55-68. <https://doi.org/10.32473/sal.v17i1.107492>.
- Andersen, T. (1994). Consonantal tones in Lugbara. *Acta Linguistica Hafniensa*, 27, 25-50. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03740463.1994.10420392>.
- Barr, L. I. (1965). *A Course in Lugbara*. Nairobi, Kampala, Dar es Salaam: East African Literature Bureau.
- Beavers, J. (2011). An aspectual analysis of ditransitive verbs of caused possession in English. *Journal of Semantics*, 28, 1-54. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jos/ffq014>.
- Beavers, J., & Koontz-Garboden, A. (2017). The semantic contribution of idiosyncratic roots in ditransitive verbs. In A. Kaplan, C. Brendel, A. Kaplan, A. Kaplan, M. McCarvel, J. Pynes & E. Rubin (Eds.), *Proceedings of the 34th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics* (pp. 70-80). Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project, 70-80.
- Bernaisch, T., Gries, T.S., & Mukherjee, J. (2014). The dative alternation in South Asian English(es): Modelling predictors and predicting prototypes. *English World-Wide*, 35(1), 7-31. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.35.1.02ber>.
- Bresnan, J., & Nikitina, T. (2009). The gradience of the dative Alternation. In L. Uyechi & L. H. Wee (Eds.), *Reality Explanation and Discovery: Pattern Interaction in Language and Life* (pp 161-184). Stanford: CSLI.
- Chang, L. H. (2004). Discourse effects on EFL learners' production of dative constructions. *Journal of National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences*, 33, 145-170.
- Corpora: Coca*. English. (n.d.). Retrieved April 21, 2023, from <https://www.english-corpora.org/coca/>.
- Crazzolara, J. P. (1960). *A Study of the Logbara (Ma'di) Language*. London: Oxford University Press.
- Esimaje, U. A., Gut, U., & Antia, E. B. (Eds.). (2019). *Corpus Linguistics and African Englishes: [Studies in corpus linguistics]*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.88>.
- Fellbaum, D. C. (2005). Examining the constraints on the benefactive alternation by using the World-Wide Web as a corpus. In M. Reis & S. Kesper

- (Eds.), *Linguistic Evidence: Empirical, Theoretical, and Computational Perspectives* (pp. 209-240). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110197549.209>.
- Fisher, A. E. C. (2000). Assessing the state of Ugandan English. *English Today*, 16, 57-61. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0266078400011470>.
- Green, M. G. (1974). *Semantics and syntactic regularity*. London: Indiana University Press.
- Greenbaum, S., & Nelson, G. (1996). The International Corpus of English (ICE) Project. *World Englishes*, 15, 3-15. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-971X.1996.tb00088.x>.
- Gropen, J., Pinker, S., Hollander, M., Goldberg, R., & Wilson, R. (1989). The learnability and acquisition of the dative alternation in English. *Language*, 65(2), 203-257. <https://doi.org/10.2307/415332>.
- Harley, H. (2002). Possession and the double object construction. In P. Pica (Ed.), *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 2, 26-68. <https://doi.org/10.1075/livy.2.04har>.
- Hawkins, R. (1987). Markedness and the acquisition of the English dative alternation by L2 speakers. *Second Language Research*, 3(1), 21-55. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026765838700300104>.
- Hlaváčková, V., & Brůhová, G. (2022). The development of and factors influencing double object construction preference of the ditransitive verbs envy and forgive. *Linguistica Pragensia*, 32(2), 198-213. <https://doi.org/10.14712/18059635.2022.2.2>.
- Hoffmann, S., & Mukherjee, J. (2007). Ditransitive verbs in Indian English and British English: A corpus linguistic study. *Arbeiten aus Anglistik und Amerikanistik*, 32, 5-24.
- Hughes, A., & Trudgill, P. (1979). *English accents and dialects: An introduction to social and regional varieties of British English*. London: Edward Arnold.
- Isingoma, B. (2013). Innovative pragmatic codes in Ugandan English: A relevance-theoretic account. *Argumentum*, 9, 19-31.
- Isingoma, B. (2016). The use of ditransitive constructions in Ugandan English. In C. Meierkord, B. Isingoma & S. Namyalo (Eds.), *Ugandan English. Its sociolinguistics, structure and uses in a globalising post-protectorate* (pp. 201-226). Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/veaw.g59.09isi>.
- Isingoma, B. (2018). Accounting for variability in the linearization of ditransitive constructions in English among native speakers. *Argumentum*, 14, 383-399.
- Isingoma, B. (2021a). Implicit arguments in Ugandan English. *English Studies at NBU*, 7(2), 147-166. <https://doi.org/10.33919/esnbu.21.2.2>.
- Isingoma, B. (2021b). Structural properties of Rutooro ditransitive constructions: A lexical functional grammar analysis. *Linguistica Atlantica*, 39(1), 1-21.

- Isingoma, B. (2022). Revisiting constraints on postverbal argument coding and linearization in English goal ditransitive constructions. *Studies in Linguistics, Culture, and FLT*, 10(2), 7-16. <https://doi.org/10.46687/GFSC7527>.
- Isingoma, B., & Meierkord, C. (2019). Capturing the lexicon of Ugandan English: ICE-Uganda, its limitations and effective complements. In A. U. Esimaje, U. Gut & B. E. Antia (eds.), *Corpus Linguistics and African Englishes* (pp. 294-328). Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.88.13isi>.
- Isingoma, B., & Meierkord, C. (2022). Between exonormative traditions and local acceptance: A corpus-linguistic study of modals of obligation and spatial prepositions in spoken Ugandan English. *Open Linguistics*, 8, 87-107. <https://doi.org/10.1515/opli-2022-0185>.
- Jäschke, K. (2016). The dative alternation in English as a second language. Düsseldorf Heinrich-Heine-Universität doctoral dissertation. Retrieved October 18, 2022 from <https://d-nb.info/1135382433/34>.
- Jaspers, J., & Madsen, L. M. (2019). Fixity and fluidity in sociolinguistic theory and practice. In J. Jaspers & L.M. Madsen (eds.), *Critical Perspectives on Linguistic Fixity and Fluidity* (pp. 1-26). Abingdon: Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429469312-1>.
- Jibril, M. (1991). The sociolinguistics of prepositional usage in Nigerian English. In J. Cheshire (Ed.), *English around the world: Sociolinguistic perspectives*, (pp. 519-537). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511611889.036>.
- Kachru, B. (1985). Standards, codification and sociolinguistic realism: The English language in the outer circle'. In R. Quirk & H. G. Widdowson (Eds.), *English in the world. Teaching and learning the language and literatures* (pp. 11-30), Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Koch, C., & Bernaisch, T. (2013). Verb complementation in South Asian English(es): The range and frequency of “new” ditransitives. *Language and Computers*, 77(1): 69-89. [https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401209403\\_006](https://doi.org/10.1163/9789401209403_006).
- Krifka, M. (2004). Semantic and pragmatic conditions for the dative alternation. *Korean Journal of English Language & Linguistics*, 4, 1-32.
- Kroeger, R. P. (2004). *Analyzing Syntax: A Lexical-Functional Approach*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511801693>.
- Kuha, M. (1997). Competing motivations for NP order in Kenyan English. *World Englishes*, 17(1), 61-70. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-971X.00082>.
- Levin, B. (1993). *English verb classes and alternations: A preliminary investigation*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.
- Meierkord, C. (2012). *Interactions across Englishes: Linguistic choices in local and international contact situations*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139026703>.

- Meierkord, C., & 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. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.21014.mei>.
- Mesthrie, R., & Bhatt, R. M. (2008). *World Englishes: The Study of New Linguistic Varieties*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511791321>.
- Mukherjee, J. (2009). The lexicogrammar of present-day Indian English: A corpus-based perspective on structural nativisation. In U. Römer & S. Rainer (Eds), *Exploring the Lexis-Grammar Interface* (pp.117-137). Amsterdam: Benjamins. <https://doi.org/10.1075/scl.35.9muk>.
- Mukherjee, J., & Hoffmann, S. (2006). Describing verb-complementational profiles of New Englishes: A pilot study of Indian English. *English World-Wide*, 27(2), 147-173. <https://doi.org/10.1075/eww.27.2.03muk>.
- Nyaggah, L. B. (1990). Cross-linguistic influence in Kenyan English: The impact of Swahili and Kikuyu on syntax. PhD dissertation, UCLA.
- Oehrle, R. T. (1976). The Grammatical status of the English dative alternation. PhD Dissertation. MIT.
- Ongua, I. P. (1999). *A Simplified Lugbara-English Dictionary*. Kampala: Fountain Publishers.
- Pinker, S. (1989). *Learnability and cognition*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Proroković, J., & Malenica, F. (2023). Language corpora and first language acquisition – A case study of the ditransitive construction. *Applied Corpus Linguistics*, 100041. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.acorp.2023.100041>.
- Röthlisberger, M., Grafmiller, J., & Szmrecsanyi, B. (2017). Cognitive indigenization effects in the English dative alternation. *Cognitive Linguistics*, 28(4), 673-710. <https://doi.org/10.1515/cog-2016-0051>.
- Schmied, J. (2004). East African English (Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania): Morphology and syntax. In B. Kortmann & E. W. Schneider (Eds.), *A Handbook of Varieties of English, Volume II: Morphology and Syntax* (pp. 929-947). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Schneider, W. E. (2007). *Postcolonial English: Varieties around the World*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511618901>.
- Syvertsen, I. (2022). Syllable structures in English speech produced by multilingual speakers with histories of mobility. In M. Monsen & G. B. Steien (Eds.), *Language Learning and Forced Migration* (pp. 101-121). Bristol: Multilingual Matters. <https://doi.org/10.21832/9781800412262-010>.
- Van Valin, D. R., & LaPolla, J. R. (1997). *Syntax: Structure, meaning, and function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139166799>.

Yikiru, P., & Isingoma, B. (2023). Ditransitive constructions in Lugbarati: A preliminary study: ms. Gulu University.

## Appendix 1.

*Table 3.  
Statistical significance of goal verbs using the One-Sample T Test*

One-Sample Test						
	Test Value = 0.05					
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Identification	6.434	12	.000	6.95000	4.5966	9.3034
Frequency of PPC in goal verbs	2.688	12	.020	2.64231	.5003	4.7843
Frequency of DOC in goal verbs	1.279	12	.225	1.48846	-1.0469	4.0238

*Table 4.  
Statistical significance of benefactive verbs in the DOC  
using the One Sample T Test*

One-Sample Test						
	Test Value = 0.05					
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Identification	6.434	12	.000	6.95000	4.5966	9.3034
Frequency of DOC in benefactive verbs	1.471	12	.167	2.33462	-1.1240	5.7932