International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation (IJLLT)
ISSN: 2617-0299
www.ijllt.org

A Study of Conjunctions and Codeswitching among some Ewe-English Bilinguals

Cosmas Rai Amenorvi
Department of Languages and General Studies, University of Energy and Natural Resources, Ghana
Corresponding Author: Cosmas Rai Amenorvi, E-mail: cosmas.amenorvi@uenr.edu.gh

ARTICLE INFO

Received: May 14, 2019
Accepted: June 15, 2019
Published: July 31, 2019
Volume: 2
Issue: 4
DOI: 10.32996/ijllt.2019.2.4.4

KEYWORDS

Conjunctions, cohesion, English, Ewe, comparative study, codeswitching

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this paper is to investigate how the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of conjunctions in comparison with English as well as the similarities and differences in the way the two languages realize cohesion in this regard. The findings revealed that both English and Ewe realize cohesion by conjunction almost the same way. The only major difference is that conjunctions in Ewe turn to be phrasal rather than single lexical items. Moreover, the study revealed that conjunction choice in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching) does not depend on the matrix language (Ewe) of the bilingual. Constraints such as preference for simplicity, speech speed and uniformity are responsible for conjunction choice. These findings show that the matrix language model has limitations and that the second languages of bilinguals are capable of informing the choice of some grammatical items in bilingual constructions (codeswitching).

1. INTRODUCTION

This paper describes comparatively how cohesion is realized in English and Ewe through the use of conjunctions. As a comparative study, the similarities and differences between the ways the two languages realize cohesion by means of conjunctions are identified and discussed. Bedsides, the study investigates the employment of conjunctions in Ewe-English bilingual constructions, the focus is to unearth the constraints that affect the choice of conjunctions in Ewe-English codeswitching. The study is sectioned under the following subtitles: research questions literature review, method, discussion and conclusion.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper seeks to answer the following questions:

1- How is cohesion realized in Ewe by means of conjunctions?

2- What are the similarities and differences, if any, between English and Ewe in their realization of cohesion by means of conjunctions?

3- What language informs and what constraints govern the choice of conjunctions in Ewe-English constructions?

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

Conjunctions function as a cohesive devise in a text. Unlike reference, substitution and ellipsis, conjunctions do not inform the reader or listener to supply missing information by looking for it elsewhere in the text or by filling structural slots. Conjunctions instead signal the way the writer or speaker wants the reader or hearer to relate what is about to be written or said to what has been said or written before. Halliday and Hasan (1976:226) posit:

> Conjunction is rather different in nature from the other cohesive relations, from both reference… and substitution and ellipsis… Conjunctive elements are cohesive not in themselves but indirectly, by virtue of their specific meaning; they are not devices for reaching out into the preceding (or the following) text, but they express certain meanings which presuppose the presence of other components in the discourse.

The quote above follows that conjunctions are quite different from other cohesive devices for they "are cohesive not in themselves." Their presence in a text means that some information is taken for granted; something is presupposed.

Conjunctions create cohesion by relating sentences and paragraphs to each other by using words from the class of conjunction, or numerals (Halliday & Matthiessen, 2004: Halliday, 1985). These can be causal, adversative, additive, continuatives or discourse markers. Examples of additive conjunctive elements are 'and' or 'also', 'in addition', 'furthermore', 'besides', 'similarly', 'for instance',

'by contrast' and so on. Some adversative conjunctions are 'but', 'yet', 'however', 'instead', 'on the other hand', 'nevertheless' and 'as matter of fact'. The conjunctive elements like 'so', 'consequently', 'it follows', 'for', 'because', 'under the circumstances' and the like are causal conjunctions. Some continuatives are 'now', 'of course', 'well', 'anyway', 'surely' and 'after all'. The following examples, one for each type of conjunctive element, illustrate the use of conjunction to bind a text together.

1. *He was beaten and stripped naked. Besides, he was jailed.*
2. *Do not tell them the story now. Instead, discuss with them what happened.*
3. *Larry stepped on Cozy's toes. Consequently, a fight ensued between them.*
4. *Festus could not answer that question. After all, he is but a boy.*

In example 1, above, 'besides', an addition conjunction, binds the two sentences. There is, therefore, a link connecting the first sentence to the second. The cohesion lies in this connective. The conjunctions 'instead', 'consequently' and 'after all' which are adversative, causal and continuative conjunctions in Examples 2, 3 and 4 respectively, also play the same role of binding as does the additive conjunction 'besides'.

3.1 Codeswitching

A major outcome of language contact is codeswitching. According to Hoffmann (1991), codeswitching is the most creative aspect of bilingual speech. Crystal (1997) submits that code, or language switching, occurs when an individual who is bilingual alternates between two languages in his or her speech with another bilingual person. Codeswitching can take several forms: alteration of sentences, phrases, words and even sometimes morphemes. Cook (1991) puts the extent of codeswitching in normal conversation among bilinguals into the following percentages: codeswitching comprises 84% single word switches, 10% phrase switches and 6% clause switches, culminating in codeswitching being one of the most researched fields of study as a language contact phenomenon.

Some authorities use the terms *codeswitching* and *codemixing* interchangeably while others maintain that the two terms refer to two different phenomena. Several scholars have attempted to differentiate between these terms. Among them are Bokamba (1976) and Muysken (2000). Bokamba (1976) asserts that while codeswitching concerns the alternate use of words, phrases and sentences from two distinct grammatical systems or languages, codemixing is the embedding of various linguistic units such as affixes (bound morphemes) and words (unbound morphemes) from different languages into the same structure. According to Muysken (2000), codemixing refers to all cases where lexical items and grammatical features from two languages appear in one sentence, and codeswitching refers to only code alternation. Simply put, while codeswitching refers solely to the alternation between two languages, codemixing combines the grammatical features of two or more languages in the same structure. Thus, codemixing, like codeswitching, is also one result of the contact between languages.

Most studies on codeswitching deal with intersentential and intrasentential codeswitching. Intersentential codeswitching is the type of codeswitching done across sentences while intrasentential codeswitching is that type that takes place within sentences. Some decades ago, Weinreich (1953:788) argued:

> The ideal bilingual switches from one language to another according to appropriate changes in the speech situation (interlocutors, topics etc.), but not in an unchanged situation and certainly not within a single sentence.

Many studies have proved that codeswitching (CS) can be both intersentential and intrasentential; codeswitching can take place within a sentence and between sentences. These studies render Weinreich's assertion invalid and also reveal that studies of the structure of CS constructions are relatively new since Weinreich (1968) made this statement about five decades ago. Garretts (1975), Myers-Scotton (1993), Nishimura (1997), Ochola (2006) and Romaine (1995) studied the structure of Swahili-English, Marathi-English, Japanese-English, Panjabi-English and Dholuo-English CS constructions. Most of these studies specifically touch on the grammatical as well as the lexical structure of CS constructions.

Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997 and 2002) examined Swahili-English CS corpus comprising conversations recorded in Nairobi and proposed the matrix language frame model (MLF). This model was proposed initially in 1993 and modified in 1997 and 2002. Currently, it is the most influential model used to account for intrasentential CS. This model maintains that it is one of the languages, the mother tongue in particular, of the bilingual that controls the grammar of intrasentential CS constructions. The language which provides the abstract morphosyntactic frame

and the frame itself is called the matrix language (ML) and the other participating language is called the embedded language (EL).

Myers-Scotton (2002) distinguishes two types of CS: classic codeswitching and composite codeswitching. In the former, only one of the two languages in contact accounts for the morphosyntactic structure of the bilingual clause whereas in the latter, the morphosyntactic structure is made up of the two languages in contact. The MFL model applies to classic CS and Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997 and 2002) proposed the following principles to guide it. First, it is independent or dependent clauses rather than sentences that should be the unit of analysis. Second, a bilingual CS construction may consist of three types of constituents: mixed constituents include morphemes from both matrix language and embedded language. ML islands are made of ML morphemes only and are under the control of ML grammar. They do not have any influence from the EL. EL islands are also well-formed by EL grammar but they are inserted into an ML frame. Therefore, EL islands are under the constraint of ML grammar (2002). Finally, regarding the mixed constituent, two hierarchies are proposed: first, participating languages do not have the same status. Second, the language which provides the abstract morphosyntactic frame and the frame itself is called the matrix language (ML) and the other participating language is called the embedded language (EL).

Many studies have attempted to prove or disprove Myers-Scotton's matrix language frame model (MLF). One of such studies is that of Ochola (2006). Ochola (2006) admits:

> A fascinating aspect of language contact is to consider what happens to the grammatical structure of languages when their speakers are bilingual and their speech brings two (or more) languages into contact. The goal of this article is to test the hypotheses about grammatical structure of codeswitching (CS) that are explicit or inherent in the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model of Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997; 2002), p208.

Ochola's (2006) paper was a repetition of Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997 and 2002). She conducted a study in the United States of America among undergraduate students who are Dholuo L1 speakers in which she analyzed the morphosyntactic structures in Dholuo-English CS utterances. Dholuo is a western Niletic language spoken around the shore of Lake Victoria in Kenya, Uganda and Tanzania. One of the findings of Ochola (2006) is that single occurring verbs in Dholuo-English are governed by the morphosyntactic frame of the Dholuo language. For example:

5. Ne- wa- talk gi professor moro
   PST 1PL talk with professor ADJ. another
   (We talked with another professor)

In the CS Dholuo-English construction above, the English verb 'talk' is not inflected as it is in the monolingual translation in English. Rather, 'take' is preceded by the past tense marker in Dholuo 'ne'. Based on phenomena like these, Ochola (2006) argues that it is the Dholuo language that controls the grammatical patterning of Dholuo-English CS constructions. She provides other examples to support her claim. Two are as follows:

6. Kusa è n big town.
   Kusa 3S-NONPAST BE big town
   (Kusa is a big town)

7. calculus ma – ngeny onge
   calculus that a lot that not there is
   (There is not a lot of calculus)

In example 6, 'big town' is an English noun phrase consisting of the adjective 'big' and the head noun 'town'. English grammar demands that 'big town' be preceded by the article 'a' inasmuch as the head word of the noun phrase 'town' is singular. The fact that this article is missing and this structure is still accepted as correct means that it is Dholuo that frames the utterance, not English. In Example 44, the English noun 'calculus' is followed by the Dholuo quantifying adjective 'ngeny'(a lot) introduced by 'ma' (that). In English, quantifiers precede the nouns they modify, as the translated version of example 7 shows. The quantifier 'a lot of' precedes 'calculus'. However, the Dholuo quantifier 'ngeny' (a lot) comes after 'calculus' in the CS construction. This is because in Dholuo, quantifiers come after the nouns they modify. Clearly, it is the Dholuo language that provides the grammatical structure of the Dholuo-English CS constructions. In fact, every other aspect about the Dholuo-English CS grammar tested by Ochola (2006) reveals that the Dholuo language absolutely controls the grammar of every intrasentential Dholuo-English CS constructions. These findings have validated Myers-Scotton's MFL theory and seem to confirm an observation made by Weinreich (1953:88) that "it is the conclusion of common experience, if not yet a finding of psycholinguistic research that the language which has been learned first, or the mother tongue, is in a privileged position to resist interference". The above statement, although made more than half a century ago is still true today. Many modern studies have proved so. It is this observation that triggered Myers-Scotton's MFL model in analyzing CS constructions.

There have been some studies on the contact between English and some Ghanaian languages. Amuzu's (2006) unearthed three constraints the Ewe language places on English when

the two are used in intrasentential CS constructions. Amuzu (2006:38) stated that "codeswitchers are deploying certain mother tongue language maintenance mechanisms which they have built into the principles that guide them in codeswitching". He talks about 'mother tongue language maintenance mechanisms' which control the grammar of Ewe-English codeswitching constructions. The first of the constraints identified by Amuzu (2006:38) is that "the mother tongue shall contribute all grammatically active system morphemes in a bilingual construction". Amuzu (2006) gives examples to support this claim:

8. Wo le boy ade si fi phone
   3PL catch boy a certain REL-fi phone
   (They caught a boy who stole a phone)

In the bilingual construction above, 'boy' and 'phone' are two English singular countable nouns. Singular nouns in English are normally preceded by the indefinite marker 'a'. In example 8 however, we see that the English indefinite 'a' is blocked from preceding 'boy' and 'phone'. Rather, 'boy' is postmodified by the Ewe indefinite marker 'a2e' (a certain). Since 'a2e' is a system morpheme in Ewe and the first constraint demands that the mother tongue contribute all grammatically active system morphemes in bilingual constructions, the English indefinite marker is, therefore, blocked from preceding the noun 'boy'. Below is another example:

9. Line -a nɔ busy elabe me-nɔ internet browse-m
   DEF. was because I was
   (The line was busy because I was browsing the internet.)

In example 9, it is affirmed that it is the mother tongue (MT) that controls the grammar of this bilingual construction. The noun 'line' is postmodified by the Ewe definite marker -a instead of being premodified, as it were, by the English definite article 'the'. Moreover, the verb 'browse' takes the Ewe morpheme -m, an equivalent of the English -ing. It is clear that it is the MT that has contributed all the active grammatical systems in the CS constructions above. This first constraint which points out that the MT contribute all active morphemes in Ewe-English CS constructions, is thus proved true.

The second constraint that Amuzu (2006:39) identified is that "the mother tongue shall set the order in which morphemes, constituents from both languages co-occur in a bilingual construction". When we refer to Example 45, *ade* (a certain) post-modifies 'boy' instead of premodifying it. In English, determiners and demonstratives are premodifiers. In Ewe, they are postmodifiers. Amegashie (2004), Atakpa (1993) and Obianim (1990) identify some of these demonstratives in Ewe as *a2e (certain), sia(this), siawo(these), ma(that)* and so on and assert that they always come after the nouns they modify. Here are some examples:

10. ŋutsu *ade*
    Man **a certain (a certain man)**

    ɖevi sia
    Child **this (this child)**

    Awu ma
    Shirt **that (that shirt)**

    Sukuvi siawo
    Student **these (these students)**

We can see that the indefinite marker *a2e* as well as the demonstratives *sia, ma* and *siawo* postmodifies the nouns *ŋutsu, ɖevi, awu and sukuvi* respectively. This is the grammatical constraint that the Ewe grammar imposes on English in the Ewe-English CS constructions. Moreover, Ewe-English bilinguals make specific choices that uphold the integrity of the mother tongue by refusing to let English adjectives premodify Ewe nouns in CS constructions. That will be against constraint two. In English, most adjectives are attributive; they come before the nouns they modify. A few come after the nouns they modify. Examples are *galore* and *old* as in the phrases *money galore* and *four years old* respectively. In contrast, Ewe adjectives are all in postmodification; they come after the nouns they modify. Below are some examples:

11.
suku yeye
school **new (new school)**

ɖevi nyui
child **good (good child)**

ame tsitsi
person **old (old person)**

Since adjectives postmodify nouns in Ewe, even when they are used with English nouns in CS constructions, they postmodify them rather than premodify them according to English norm. Here are examples from Amuzu (1998:79):

12.

(a) Gake fifia, **hadziha best one** a woawo si wo le.
But now, choir the 3PL hand 3sg be PRE
(But now, they have the best choir)

(b) Tsɔ akadi **bright one** si le **corner** kema dzi va na-m
Take lantern REL be over there come to- 1sg.
(Bring the bright lantern that is in the corner over there to me.) (Amuzu 1998:80)

In Example 12, 'hadziha' (choir) and 'akadi' (lantern) are the Ewe nouns used in the above CS constructions. These are both postmodified by English adjectives 'best' and 'bright' respectively. These adjectives have occurred outside their normal position in English and have behaved as though they were native to Ewe. The following Ewe-English CS construction will, therefore, be unacceptable:

13. *Woanɔ big adaka ma me.
3PL POT-be box that inside.
(They will be inside that big box)

The foregoing construction has the English adjective 'big' premodifying the Ewe noun a2aka (box). We have however seen that constraint two demands that "the mother tongue shall set the order in which morphemes, constituents from both languages co-occur in a bilingual construction". We also learn in Ewe, adjectives postmodify nouns. Taking these points into consideration helps us to see the unacceptability of the CS construction above; that is, the extent to which Ewe interferes with English in CS.

The third constraint Amuzu (2006) identified is that some English lexemes are accepted in CS forms, others are not. Some English verbs are accepted in singly-occurring forms in mixed verb phrases. Some of these verbs he identified are *go, come, know, see, look, eat, want, say, tell, give* and *buy*. The following CS constructions are therefore unacceptable:

14. *Ama me le suku **go**-ge o a?
Ama NEG. be-PRE school go ING
(Won't Ama go to school?)

*Kofi **come**-ge etsɔ
Kofi come -ING tomorrow
(Kofi is coming tomorrow)

Amuzu's findings about the third constraint are not altogether new because about three decades earlier, Forson (1979:183-184) had similar findings. He also named the above verbs as the English verbs that may not occur in Akan-based mixed verb phrases.

4. METHODOLOGY

The population of the present study was all the undergraduate students who are native speakers of Ewe and who read Ewe as a major course in the University of Cape Coast (UCC). These respondents were purposively selected for this study. Undergraduate classes in these institutions cover Levels 100 to 400. These students are selected for the reasons that they are native speakers of the Ewe language as well as students of it. Since this study seeks to describe how cohesion is realized by conjunctions in Ewe, show the similarities and differences between English and Ewe in that regard and find out the constraint that affect the choice of conjunctions in Ewe-English codeswitching, the native-speaker Ewe-major students are the most appropriate source of data for this study. Each respondent submitted an essay in Ewe on any given topic of personal choice. These essays were collected and the cohesive use of conjunctions were identified and discussed under the section *Discussions*. Besides informal Ewe-English conversations of this group were recorded, decoded and the use of conjunctions identified and are discussed. Below is the distribution of the respondents of the present study.

Table 1: Number of Respondents from UCC

SEX	L. 100	L. 200	L. 300	L. 400	TOTAL	%
MALE	15	12	13	9	49	58
FEMALE	11	9	8	7	35	42
TOTAL	26	21	21	16	84	100

5. DISCUSSIONS

Data reveals that conjunctions also serve as cohesive ties as in Ewe as they do in English. Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify four types of conjunctions in English: causal, additive, adversative and continuatives or discourse markers. Data revealed that Ewe also realizes cohesion by means of all these types of conjunctions. Let us discuss some examples.

15a. Mekpɔ wolé fiafi adɛ nyitsɔ le Gɛ.
1SG-see 3PL-catcth thief some previous day PREP Accra.
(I saw a thief caught the previous day in Accra)

Wofui, wowɔ funyafunyae eye wòyi di me.
3PL-beat-PRO 3PL-do torture+3SG CONJ. 3SG-go faint PREP

(He was beaten and tortured until he collapsed)

b. Kpeɖe esiawo ŋu la, wotso efe asibidɛwo ɖa.
CONJ DEM-PL LOC DET 3PL-cut 3SG-POSS finger-PL
(Besides, they cut off his fingers)

In example 15b, the Ewe phrase *kpe2e esiawo ŋu la* which translates into English as *besides, in addition, apart from these* and *in addition to these ones*, serves an additive conjunction. Its appearance in the text presupposes that some other information apart from the one that follows the conjunction is present. This presupposed information we retrieve from the previous sentence: the thief was beaten and tortured. However, there were more to these, *kpeɖe esiawo ŋu la* (besides), *wotso efe asibidɛwo ɖa* (they cut his fingers off). Extra information is added to the previous information and this is done by the help of the additive conjunction in question.

We have noticed from the discussion that it is possible in the case of Example 15*a* to translate the Ewe additive conjunction used there with a single English word 'besides' although phrases that express the same idea of addition can be used. In Ewe, it is impossible to use a single linguistic item as a conjunction in this case. In the Ewe construction, the word that carries the idea of addition in the phrase *kpeɖe esiawo ŋu la* is *kpeɖe*. The expression *esiawo ŋu la* which follows *kpeɖe* refers back to the ideas expressed in the previous sentence. *Kpeɖe* or sometimes *hekpeɖe* although in themselves expressed the idea of addition, they can never stand alone as *besides* can in English. *Kpeɖe* has to combine with expressions that have reference to previous information in order to be full as an additive conjunction in Ewe. What we deduce here is that Ewe can combine more than one cohesive types where one overshadows the other as in the case of Example 15a.

An example of adversative conjunction in Ewe from the data set is as follows:

16a. Past4wo w4 2e siaa 2e le nu fiam amewo 3uu 2e2i koe te wo `u.
pastor-PL do everything thing teach-prog person-PL tire only 3PL body
(Pastors had done all they could in teaching people.)

b. Gake nugbegbl8w4w4 2eko wògale dzi yim.
CONJ thing bad-do+do just 2SG-again up go-PROG
(However, badness continues to go high.)

In the Example 16b above, *gake* (however) is an adversative conjunction. It follows a statement that has a positive idea expressed in it. The presence of this conjunction *gake* (but or however) automatically shows that the information that follows *gake* is and must be in contrast with the one that precedes it. The contrast provided here in *gake* is what serves as the cohesive tie between the two conflicting ideas expressed in the text. In this example unlike the one before it, *gake* as a conjunction can be used to introduce other information unlike *kpeɖe*. However, it is acceptable to use a longer phrase, which can substitute for and be used interchangeably with *gake* but never in the case of *kpeɖe*. Here is an example to illustrate this argument.

17a. Pastɔwo wɔ ɖe siaa ɖe fia nu amewo ʋuu ɖeɖi koe te wo ŋu.
pastor-PL do everything thing teach person-PL tire only 3PL body
(Pastors have done all they can in teaching people.)

b. Togbɔ be wòle nenema hã la, nugbegblẽwɔwɔ ɖeko wògale dzi yim.
CONJ DEM 2sg-LOC same bad-do do just 2SG-again up go-PROG
(However, badness continues to go high.)

We refer to the same example in which *gake* is used. In this case, *gake* is replaced by the clause *togbɔ be wòle nenema ha la...* (even though it is that way...). The same idea of contrast is expressed in this clause as it is in the single conjunction *gake* and these two can be used interchangeably with each other. So, while the additive conjuction *kpeɖe* cannot be used alone except with other words that refer back to previous information, the adversative *gake* can be used alone as well as can be replaced by other expressions which carry the same idea of contrast.

Just like English, Ewe demonstrates causal conjunctions. The example below illustrates this.

18a. Egbe sukuvi geɖe mesrɔ̃a nu kura o.
Today student many neg-learn-HAB thing neg neg.
(Nowadays, students do not study at all.)

b. Gbevu ko wonɔa wɔwɔm le sukukpowo dzi.
Bush-dog only 3pl- do-HAB prep school-compound prep
(They only indulge in unprofitable things.)

c. Ema tae wo dometɔ geɖe mekpɔa dzidzedze le woƒe dodokpɔwo me o.
3sg-dem head-foc many neg-see-HAB comfort prep 3pl-poss exam-pl prep neg
(That is why most of them do not do well in their exams.)

In the foregoing Example 18c, *ema tae* (or *eya tae)* serves as a causal conjunction. The thoughts expressed in the previous sentences are that students do not study; they only spend their time on frivolous things. The conjunction *ema tae* (consequently or as a result) tells us, therefore, that the failure of these students is as the result of their inability to study towards examinations. The cohesion does not lie in the conjunctions *ema tae* but in the fact that its presence presupposes the presence of some other information. Thus, we cannot use any of these conjunctions alone or in isolation no more than we can tie a knot for nothing.

Ewe also realizes cohesion by continuatives or discourse markers. The following are examples from data.

19a. Dzilawo megale ɖeke tsɔm le wo viwo ƒe agbenɔnɔ me o.
Parent-PL NEG-again none take-PROG. 3PL-poss child-PL life PREP NEG
(Parents do not care about the lives of their children anymore.)

b. Le nyateƒe me la, nenema wòle le xexea ƒe akpa siaa akpa fifia.
PREP. Truth PREP DEF. that 3SG PREP world-DEF POSS side all side now
(Truly, that is how it is in every part of the world now.)

20a. Gbãla, edze be dziɖuɖua nada ga ɖe ga dzi na dɔwɔlawo.
first DET. 3SG-right government-DEF put money PREP money PREP worker-PL
(First, the government must increase the salaries of workers.)

b. Le go bubu me la, edze be dɔwɔlawo hã nawɔ dɔ sesiĕ.
prep way other-prep def 3SG-important that worker-PL also work hard
(On the other hand, it is important that workers must also work hard.)

In Example 19a, the idea of the irresponsibility of parents towards their children is raised. The succeeding sentence – 19b – confirms that idea in the continuative *le nyateƒe me la* (truly). There is therefore a cohesive tie between the previous information before and after the continuative in question. The discourse marker *le nyateƒe me la* confirms the previous information by providing a newer one that goes along with the one before it, forming a cohesive tie.

Moreover, in Example 20a, the continuative *gbã la* (first or firstly) is used. This no doubt introduces the first information. The use of *gbã la* alone indicates that more information lies ahead. The reader is in expectation of information ahead as it is expressed in the discourse marker used in 20a. Example 20b employs *le go bubu me la* (on the other hand). The appearance of this continuative alone points to the previous one in 20a – *gbã la*. It is clear that the link between these discourse markers as well as the information they carry binds the constructions together as though they were one sentence.

We have discussed how conjunctions are employed in Ewe with examples from our data set. However, the examples made use of only a few of these conjunctions. The following are some more examples of the four types of conjunctions in Ewe. Some additive conjunctions in Ewe are *hekpeɖe* or *kpeɖe* (in addition), *abe ...ene* (like or same), *hã* (also), *tsɔ kpeɖe eŋu* (to add to this), *le kpɔɖeŋu me* (for example). The following are some of the adversatives in Ewe: *gake* (but), *dzɔgbenyuitɔe la* (fortunately), *dzɔgbevɔẽtɔe la* (unfortunately), *le go bubu me la* or *le mɔ bubu ŋu la* (on the other hand). Some Ewe causals are *eya ta*, *ema tae* or *susu ma tae* (because of that), *elabe* or *elabena* (because) and *mlɔeba* (finally). These words *fifia* (now), *le nyateƒe me* (truly), *tsɔ yi edzi* (in continuation), *le go sia me* (in this regard) and *abe ale si wòle ene* (as it is) are some Ewe continuatives or discourse markers.

5.1 Similarities and Differences

Data revealed that the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of conjunctions largely the same way English does. The only observable difference in data in the way Ewe realizes cohesion by conjunctions from English is that Ewe conjunctions turn to be rather phrasal than single lexical items.

5.2 Constraints that Inform Conjunction Choice

Let us now turn our attention to the constraints that govern the choice of conjunctions in Ewe-English bilingual constructions. The following examples from data answer that question:

21. Mekpɔe etsɔ but nyemele sure be eva gba o.
1sg-see- 3SG 1SG-NEG- that 3SG-come today NEG
(I saw him yesterday but I am not not sure he has come today.)

22. Ronaldo kple Messi wole exceptional ŋutɔ, gake Ronaldo is better than Messi.
(Ronaldo CONJ Messi 3PL-LOC ADV, CONJ.)
(Ronaldo and Messi are very exceptional, but Ronaldo is better than Messi)

23. Messi is surrounded by a bunch of great players at Barca, ema tae meƒoa
SG-PRO reason-TOP NEG-play-PROG nothing PREP …. NEG
naneke le Argentina o.
(Messi is surrounded by a bunch of great plays, that is why he play nothing in Argentina)

24. Nya aɖeke mele asinye kura o. Gbã, I'm more intelligent than you.
Word some NEG-PREP POSS NEG. First, ….
(I do not have anything at to say at all. First, I'm more intelligent than you)

There is no doubt that the Ewe language is the matrix language in the above Ewe-English codeswitching. In Example 21, the conjunction employed is *but*. In that entire sentence, there are only two English words, the conjunction *but* and the adverb *sure*. The rest of the sentence is Ewe. What constraint is responsible for the choice of this English conjunction in an Ewe-English bilingual construction such as this? First, we need to know that the equivalent of *but* in Ewe can substitute perfectly for it in the construction in question. Only two expressions in Ewe can substitute for but, namely, the lexical item *gake* (but) and the phrase *togbɔ be wòle nenema hà la* (Even though that is the case). The constraint that warrants the choice of *but* over *gake and togbɔ be wòle nenema hã la* is that of preference for simplicity which is common in rapid speech. Gake is disyllabic, *togbɔ be*... is multisyllabic but *but* is monosyllabic and easily fits in as regards simplicity.

Example 22 presents a problem regarding the foregoing conclusion drawn in Example 24. This time *gake* (but), a disyllabic conjunction is preferred to *but*, a monosyllabic one. The researcher realizes that the choice of *gake* over *but* here boils down to a paralinguistic feature of emphatic speech which is naturally slower than rapid speech. The speaker of Example 22 was very emphatic in a one-word-at-a-time manner of speech. It follows, therefore, that paralinguistic constraints such speed or its absence can inform the choice of conjunction in Ewe-English codeswitching. However, Example 22 has provided answer to the question as to which language is responsible for providing conjunctions in Ewe English codeswitching. In this instance, the popular matrix language model is flouted. The answer is clear; in the choice of conjunctions in Ewe-English codeswitching, not only the matrix language does, the embedded language also does.

In Example 23, the employed conjunction is *ema tae* (as a result, consequently etc.). The choice of *ema tae* is more likely that the entire subordinate clause in which it appears is fully in Ewe. The constraint here may be a case of uniformity inasmuch as the entire clause in which the conjunction appears belongs to just one language, which is Ewe in this case.

Example 24 presents another problem, a conflict with the conclusion drawn in Example 23. It employs the Ewe conjunction *gbã* (first). Both *gbã* and *first* are monosyllabic conjunctions. Moreover, the conclusion of uniformity does not play in this regard either. Merging the two cases together, we see that it is the case of simplicity because either *gbã* or *first* can substitute for each other perfectly. As regards uniformity, that is suspended for the conclusion that any language of the Ewe-English codeswitching can supply the conjunction, not only the matrix language, which is Ewe in this case. Some studies such as Amenorvi (2015) and the present study have added to the other side of the argument that the second language of the bilinguals also have the capacity to dictate grammatical phenomena in bilingual constructions, making influence from the languages of the bilingual a mutual one.

6. CONCLUSIONS

The present study has revealed that there is hardly any difference in the way English and Ewe realize cohesion by means of conjunctions. The slight difference observed is that Ewe conjunctions are more phrasal than single lexical items. Moreover, we see that conjunction choice in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching) does not depend only on the matrix language of the bilingual. Constraints such preference for simplicity, speech speed and uniformity are responsible for conjunction choice. These findings show that the matrix language model has limitations and that the second languages of bilinguals are capable of informing the choice of some grammatical items in bilingual constructions (codeswitching).

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

Cosmas Rai Amenorvi is a lecturer of English and Academic Writing and Communication Skills at the Department of Languages and General Studies of the University of Energy and Natural Resources, Sunyani, Ghana. He has been teaching and investigating English, Linguistics, and Communication for close to a decade now. His research interests are in the areas of English Phonology, Sociolinguistics, Semantics, Literary Criticism, Discourse Analysis, and Contact Linguistics.

REFERENCES

[1] Amegashie, S. (2004). *E3egbe `4`l4a*. Aflao: Victus Printing Services.

[2] Amenorvi, C. R. (2015). Bilingualism and Interference: A Case Study of Ellipsis among Some Coordinate Bilinguals. *African Journal of Applied Research (AJAR), 2*(2).

[3] Amuzu, E. K. (2006). Language maintenance in pervasive codeswitching: insights from Ghana. *The Journal of West African Languages, Vol 33*, No. 1, 35-52.

[4] Amuzu, Evershed. (1998). Aspects of grammatical structures in Ewe-English codeswitching, MA thesis, Oslo:University of Oslo.

[5] Atakpa, F.K. (1993). *E3egbe`4`l4 `uti sewo*. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.

[6] Bokamba, E. (1976). Are there syntactic constraints on code-mixing? *World Englishes* Vol. 8 No.3, 277-292. Cambridge University Press.

Cook, V. (1991). Second language learning and language teaching. London: Edward Arnold.

[7] Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and second language acquisition*. New York: Hampshire.

[8] Cook, V. (2002). *Background to the L2 us*er. In V.J. Cook (ed.) *Portraits of the L2 User*, Clevedon, Multilingual Matters, 1-28.

[9] Crystal, L. (1997). *English as a global language*. London: Cambridge University.

[10] Forson, B. (1968). *Description of language situations classified in a corpus representing a bilingual register range* (Akan varieties of English). Unpublished M.A. Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.

[11] Garrett, M. (1975). *The analysis of sentence production.* In G. Bower (Ed), *The Psychology of Learning and Motivation*. CA: Academic Press. *grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.

[12] Halliday M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. England: Longman.

[13] Halliday, M. A. K., & Matthiessen, C. M. I. M. (2004). Clause as representation. *An introduction to functional grammar*, 168-305.

[14] Hoffman, C. (1991). *Introduction to Bilingualism.* New York: Longman.

[15] Muysken, P. (2000). Bilingual speech: a typology of code-mixing. Great Britain.

[16] Myers-Scotton, Carol. (1993 [1997]). *Duelling languages grammatical structures in codeswitching* (1997) edition with a new Afterward). Oxford: Clarendon Press.

[17] Nishimura, M. (1995). A functional analysis of Japanese/English code-switching. *Journal of pragmatics*, *23*(2), 157-181.

[18] Obianim, S. J. (1990). E3egbe `uti `unya, akpa gbat4: revised edition. Accra: Sedco Publishing Limited.

[19] Ochola, E. D.A. (2006). English words and phrases in Dholuo-English codeswitching: selected proceedings of the 36th Annual Conference on African Linguistics, University of South Carolina ed. Olaoba F. Press.

[20] Romaine, S. (1995). Bilingualism. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.

[21] Weinreich, U. (1953). Languages in contact. The Hague: Mouton.

[22] Weinreich, U. (1968). Languages in contact: findings and problems. The Hague: Mouton.

[23] Weinreich, U. (1974). Languages in contact: findings and problems. The Hague: Mouton.