Substitution 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	ABSTRACT
	This study investigated how the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of substitution in comparison with English. The study also sought to find out constraints that inform the choice of substitution in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching). Findings reveal that though the two languages belong to different language families and operate on different grammatical systems, when it comes to the cohesive device of substitution, they mirror each other almost perfectly. Moreover, the study shows that the matrix language, unnaturalness, clausal boundary, phonological environment and uniformity are the constraints that inform the choice of substitution in Ewe-English codeswitching. The findings reveal that while the matrix language model is still in force, other constraints are equally relevant in bilingual constructions.

1. INTRODUCTION

This study is a sequel to Author's (2015, 2019) comparative study which brought to the fore how the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of ellipsis and conjunctions side by side English. Those studies reveal similarities and differences in the way the two languages realize cohesion by ellipsis and conjunctions. The present study's focus is the cohesive device of substitution. Using Halliday and Hassan's (1976) Cohesion in English as a theoretical framework, this study seeks to describe how substitution is realized in Ewe as well as show the differences and similarities in the way Ewe and English realize cohesion by substitution. The paper further investigates constraints that inform the choice of substitution in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching). The paper is segmented under the following sections: *research questions, literature review, methodology, discussions* and *conclusion.*

2. RESEARC HQUESTIONS

This paper seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How is cohesion realized by substitution in Ewe?

2. What are the similarities and differences, if any, in the way English and Ewe realize cohesion by substitution?

3. What constraints inform the choice of substitution in Ewe-English codeswitching?

3. LITERATURE REVIEW

3.1 Substitution

The second form of achieving grammatical cohesion from reference is substitution. As its name denotes, substitution is the replacing of one grammatical unit (or units) for another. In the words of Quirk and Greenbaum (2000: 294), "substitution is a device for abbreviating and for avoiding repetition." Substitution is therefore the replacement of one or more grammatical items by a substitute or a pro-form.

Nouns or noun phrases in English are substitutable with personal pronouns, possessive or reflexive pronouns and the indefinite pronouns 'one', 'ones', 'that' and 'those'. The following examples demonstrate these facts.

8. *Doris bought the food but she did not eat it.*

9. *There is the student's car and here are her keys.*

10. *This room is cooler than the one upstairs.*

11. *Cozy likes Shakespeare's plays but Raina prefers those of Milton's.*

In example 8, the pronouns 'she' as well as 'it' replaces 'Doris' and 'the food' respectively. These nouns are, therefore, substituted or replaced by these short and straightforward pronouns. This avoids the repetition of the nouns in question. The cohesion lies in the fact that 'she' as well as 'it' are anaphoric, they refer back to the nouns in question and bind the sentences as one. Moreover, what is replaced is retrievable from the textual world for easy understanding. In example 9, 'her', a possessive pronoun, replaces 'student'; in example 10, 'one' substitutes 'room' just as 'those' substitutes 'plays' in sentence 11. Substitution as a cohesive device avoids monotony, excessive repetition and at the same time, it holds a text together.

Verb phrases can also be replaced by the phrase 'do so' or its variants as regards tense and number. The following examples demonstrate this:

12. *Ewura Ama works hard and so does her husband*

13. *Roger promises to write to me and he did so*

14. *Do not open the next page until you are told to do so.*

In example 12, 'so does' substitutes for the verb phrase 'works hard'. 'Did so' in example 13 replaces the verb phrase 'promises to write' while 'do so' replaces 'open the next page' in example 14.

In addition, whole clauses are also substitutable by proforms as a means of holding a text together. The following examples explain this point better.

15. *Is Lydia coming to the party? I hope so.*

16. *The results show that Gabby has won the election. If so he must be very happy.*

17. *Doris said she had won a scholarship, but it did not surprise me.*

The proform 'so' in example 15 replaces a whole clause – 'Lydia is coming to the party'. The cohesion lies in the fact that repetition is avoided but a shorter form, a substitute, carries the idea across. The proform 'so' in example 17 behaves much the same way as 'so' does in example 16. In example 17, the pronoun 'it' replaces the preceding clause – *Doris said she had won a scholarship*. It is anaphoric as well as a substitution of a longer form with a shorter one.

A close look at substitution and the examples above show that reference and substitution sometimes overlap into each other as cohesive devices. Halliday and Hasan (1976:88) admit that "the classification of cohesive relations into different types should not be seen as implying a rigid division into watertight compartments". They submit that there could be instances where cohesive relations lie on the "borderline between two types and could be interpreted as one or the other". While reference marks a semantic relation, substitution marks a grammatical relation; substitution is a relation in the wording while reference concerns meaning. The following example clarifies this point better:

18. *Zidane is one of the best footballers of all time. He is of African descent.*

It is clear in example 18 that the pronoun 'he' in the second sentence above refers back to as well as substitutes for 'Zidane' in the first. This example alone shows that it is possible for the same text to display a number of cohesive relations as in the case of reference and substitution.

3.2 Codeswitching

Codeswitching has received a lot of attention from linguists over the years especially for its dynamism and prevalence as a language phenomenon. Prevalent among bilinguals, codeswitching is said to be the most creative aspect of bilingual speech and in this creativity, there is still much to be investigated and discovered (Hoffman, 1991; Crystal, 1987). Codeswitching, used sometimes interchangeably with codemixing, refers the alternate use of words, phrases and sentences from two or more distinct grammatical systems or languages (Bokamba, 1989). Muysken differentiates codeswitching from codemixing that while the latter involves mixing grammatical roots

between languages, the former, the more common, is just the alternate use of words, phrases and sentences between the languages of the bilingual.

One popular pillar in the study of bilingual constructions is Myers Scotton. Myers-Scotton (1993, 1997, 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). In that case, among Ewe-English bilinguals, Ewe is the ML while English is the EL. Moreover, according to the ML model it is Ewe that would provide all grammatical underpinning in Ewe-English Bilingual constructions. The cohesive device of substitution is classified under grammatical cohesion by Halliday and Hasan (1976), which means that substitution is a grammatical phenomenon. Many studies such as Ochoala (2006) and Amuzu (2006) have proved the linguistic power the ML has over the EL. However, Amenorvi (2019) reveals that the EL also has the capacity to control the grammar of bilingual constructions, making control of the grammar of bilingual constructions a mutual one between the ML and the EL, albeit the former has the upper hand over the latter. This study also seeks to contest the ML model as to whether other constrains would inform the choice of this grammatical phenomenon of substitution in Ewe-English codeswitching.

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 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 substitutions in Ewe as well as show the similarities and differences between English and Ewe in that regard, the native-speaker Ewe-major students are the most appropriate source of data. Each respondent submitted an essay on any given topic of personal choice. These essays were collected and the cohesive use of substitution were identified and discussed under the section *Discussions*. Besides, informal codeswitched conversations of this group were recorded, transcribed and constraints that inform substitution choice in these Ewe-English bilingual constructions were identified and 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. DISCUSSION

This section discusses the findings of the present paper side by side the research questions. The first research question seeks to find out how cohesion is realized in Ewe by means of substitution. The sub-section below answers this question.

5.1 Substitution in Ewe

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify substitution as one of the ways cohesion is realized in English. They further explain that substitution and reference overlap with each other; while substitution concerns the grammatical items that serve the cohesive tie, reference concerns itself with meaning, which is the meaning these grammatical items carry with them. In this regard, many of the examples that qualify as references are equally acceptable as substitution. As we have already seen, "substitution is a device for abbreviating and avoiding repetition" (Quirk and Greenbaun: 2000:297). In English, noun phrases are replaced by personal pronouns, possessive or reflexive pronouns and the indefinite pronouns *one, ones, that,* and *those*. Below illustrates how Ewe demonstrates substitution.

19a. Nyemeke nu hafi wò5o tome nam zi eve o.
  1PL-NEG-open mouth before 3PL-beat chic PREP-me time two NEG

(Hardly had I opened my mouth when he slapped me twice.)

Gake ema mew4 naneke o.
  but DEM NEG-do nothing NEG
  (But that is nothing.)

b. Nyemesii kp4 be `utsu a2eke 2e n4via `utsu kp4 le Ghana o.
  1PL-NEG-hear before DEM man any marry brother+DEF man before PREP G. NEG
  (I had never heard that a man married a man in Ghana)

  Gake nenemae wòle le yevuwo de.
  CONJ. same+FOC 1PL-to be PREP white-PL country
    (But that's the way it is in the western world.)

c. D4 wua ame ge2e le xexeme duk4 gbl4ewo me.
   Hunger kill-HAB man many-PREP world country poor PREP
   (Many people go hungry in the world's poor nations)

  Nusia meb4 2e ablotsi duk4wo me o.
   Thing-DEM NEG-common prep abroad country-pl prep neg
   (This is not common abroad.)

d. Nufiafia, d4w4w4 le gadzra2o5e kple x4tutu wonye d4w4na vovovowo.
    Teach+ing work+ing LOC   bank   conj. Masonry 3pl-COP work different
   (Teaching, working in the bank and masonry are different kinds of work.)

   Nufiafiae nye d4 si ses8 wu esiawo kat7 gake ga mele eme o.
   Teaching+TOP cop work DEM hard adv dem   all onj. Money neg-LOC prep neg
   (Teaching is the hardest of these all but is not lucrative.)

In Example 19a, *ema* (that) in the second sentence substitutes for *wo5o tome nam zi eve* (they slapped me twice) without which those same words may be repeated and then we will be talking about another type of cohesion, lexical cohesion, which will be discussed under that title. One thing we have realized about substitution as a cohesive tie is that long linguistic constructions can be replaced by very short ones as in the example in question.

In Example 19b, the first sentence reads, Nyemesii kp4 be `utsu a2eke 2e n4via `utsu kp4 le Ghana o (I had never heard that a man married a man in Ghana.). The following sentence goes *Gake nenemae wòle le yevuwo de* (But that's the way it is abroad). The expression *nenemae* (that is the way it is) replaces the idea of the speaker's never hearing of a man getting married to another man in Ghana. Moreover, the second person singular pronoun *wò as in wòle (it is)* also substitutes for the same happening carried in the preceding sentence. In this case, too, the words *nenemae* and *wòle* replace a whole sentence.

In Example 19c, the demonstrative pronoun   *sia*, or *esia* (this) substitutes for *d4 wua ame ge2e le xexeme duk4 gbl4ewo me (*Many people go hungry in the world's poor nations). This cohesive tie substitutes for as well as avoids the repetition of the same words as used in the preceding sentence.

In Example 19d, the first sentence mentions different types of work – *nufiafia* (teaching), *d4w4w4 le gadzra2o5e* (working in the bank) and *x4tutu* (masonry). The second sentence asserts that *nufiafia* (teaching) is more difficult than *all of these* (*esiawo kata).* We see clearly from this example that *esiawo* (these) replaces the other types of work mentioned alongside *nufiafia* (teaching), which are *d4w4w4 le gadzra2o5e* (working in the bank) and *x4tutu* (masonry). The word *kat7* (all) in addition to replacing these two other types of work in question also serve as emphasis on the difficulty of the teaching job. There is another substitution we find in the second sentence – *gake ga mele eme o* (but it is not lucrative). The Ewe third person singular pronoun *e*, as in *eme* (in), stands in place of *nufiafia*. Therefore, another way to render this is simply to repeat *nufiafia* (teaching) in this context – thus, *gake ga mele nufiafia me o.*

In Ewe, whole sentences or clauses are substitutable by the pro forms *alea* (lit. this is how) *and nenema* (lit. that is how) when they reappear in succeeding sentences and these in the context carry the same meaning of the sentence they replace. These are some examples to illustrate the above.

20a. @evi ge2e tsina va zua ametsitsi hafi nyana be
       Child many grow-HAB. come become-HAB elder before know-HAB that

   yewo dzilawo nye ame veviwo le yewo 5e agbeme.
   3PL parent-PL   COP person important-PL LOC 2PL POSS life
  (Many children grow only to learn the importance of their parents in their life)

   b. Nenema wòle le xexea 5e akpa siaa akpa.
    Same 1sg-COP COP world DEF POSS side all side
        (That is how it is all over the world.)

In Example 20 above, the first sentence – *2evi ge2e tsina va zua ametsitsi...* – is repeated in the second sentence. This time, however, it is reduced to the word *nenema*. From this type of cohesive tie where a whole clause is reduced to fewer words or a single word, economy of words is a common feature. This helps avoid repetition, which in itself is another type of cohesive tie. Another common linguistic item that is used like *nenema* in Ewe is the word *ale* or *alea*. The following are examples of how these form cohesive ties.

21a.   Ga mele agbal8 s4sr- me abe ale si wòle b4l5o5o me ene o.
       money neg-cop book learn+ing prep comp adv 2sg football prep adv neg
         (Scholarly work is not as lucrative as playing football.)

  b.   Menye alea nuwo n4 ts7 o.
       neg-cop   thing-pl cop past neg
         (That is not the way things were in the past)

22a.   Le egbe `kekewo me la,
        prep today day-pl prep det

     amewo 5e agbe le bubum to l4rif4kuwo me.
     man-pl poss life prep lose prog. prep vehicular-accidents prep
     (These days, people lose their lives from road accidents)

   b. Ale nyadz4dz4gbl4lawo gbl4e nye esi.
        how journalist-pl say+3sg cop. Dem
          (That is how journalists said it.)

In Example 21b, *alea carries* the idea in 21a and is repeated in the second sentence. The resulting cohesive tie is obvious. Formerly, scholarly work was more lucrative than playing football and that things have changed. The whole idea in sentence 21a is recaptured in 21b; 21b, therefore, re-enters the discussion and forms a tie with 21a.

In 22a, it is clear that many people lose their lives by road accidents. The word *alea* in Example 22b assumes the idea expressed in 22a and forms a cohesive tie with 22a. It therefore substitutes for the whole sentence before it.

It is evident from the above illustrations that Ewe realizes cohesion by means of substitution just as English does.

5.2 Similarities and differences
From the discussions above, it is clear that English and Ewe realize cohesion by substitution the same way. While there are certainly differences in the way the two languages operate grammatically and phonologically in that they belong to two different language families (Ewe, Kwa; English, Indo-European), in achieving cohesion by means of substitution, English and Ewe mirror each other perfectly.

5.3 Constraints that inform substitution choice
This section discusses the findings as to what constraints inform substitution choice in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching). Let us discuss the following examples from data.

23. Kofi is not serious. Megbl4 n1 be his foolishness will kill him.
                        1SG-say PREP-3SG
   (Kofi is not serious. I told him that his foolishness will kill him)

24. Those days are gone. Wovayi.
                      3PL-come-go
   (Those days are gone. They are gone.)

25. E5le pineapple gake me2ui o.
3SG-buy pineapple CONJ NEG-3SG-eat-3SG NEG
     (He bought a pineapple but did not eat it.)

26. He was killed. Wowui la! That's really cruel!
               3PL-kill-3SG INT
   (He was killed. He was killed! That's really cruel)

27. You can't post any bill there. Megaw4e o.
                      NEG-3SG-do-3SG NEG
    (You can't post any bill there. Don't do it.)

28. Keeper la dzo yi miame. That was the end of their tournament.
           POST jump go left.
  (The keeper jumped to the left. That was the end of their tournament.)

29. Learn to keep silent. Akpe 2e `uwo in all circumstances.
             AUX-help PREP body
  (Learn to keep silent. That will help you in all circumstances.)

In Example 23, we note two codeswitched sentences. The Ewe third person singular pronoun -1 in n1 as well as *his* and *him* all substitute for Kofi in the first sentence of the example. What constraints inform the choice of these substituents for Kofi? In the case of the pronoun -*1*, it is the constraint that all personal pronouns after the Ewe preposition *na* must be an Ewe one in Ewe-English bilingual constructions such as the one under consideration. The word *n1* is actually a constructed form of *na + e (for+him, her, it) = nae*, pronounced *nɛ*. It would be unacceptable to see something such as *na him* in Ewe-English codeswitching. In this instance, it is the matrix language that informs the choice of the substituent -*ɛ* in place of Kofi. For the substitutes *his* and *him*, we note that the sentence in which they appear has two main parts – the subordinate clause is fully Ewe while the main clause is fully English. The pronoun *his* in place of Kofi performs the function of premodification to the English noun *foolishness.* It is possible and acceptable for the Ewe possessive pronoun *eƒe* to replace *his.* Its absence reveals that the constraint responsible for the choice of *his* over *eƒe* is that of clausal boundary; the subordinate clause begins and ends with *be* (that) while the main clause begins with his. For the pronoun *him*, its choice is clear – the main clause is fully English. The Ewe pronoun that can substitute for *him* is e, which can change to *i* depending on the phonological environment. For example, *will kill him* would translate into Ewe thus, *awui* with *i* being the pronoun. In the phonological environment of *kill*, the pronoun will be *e*. However, it is just unnatural and unacceptable in Ewe-English codeswitching to have something like …*his foolishness will kill e*. The constraint, therefore, in the choice of the substitute for Kofi is that of unnaturalness in language use. In this case, it is the EL that has controlled the grammar of the bilingual construction in question.

Example 24 presents another interesting revelation of the choice of substitution in Ewe-English bilingual constructions. There are two full blown sentences in the example; the first in English and the second in Ewe. The Ewe pronoun *wo* (they) substitutes for *those days*. We also note that the Ewe sentence is only a repetition of the English one; the context is that of emphasis. In the light of that we can confidently conclude that in the emphasis driven repetitive use of clauses, where each is a full-blown sentence in one language, the choice of a substituent would come from the latter language. This is not the case of the power of ML over EL or vice versa. Were the example in question reversed, English would be responsible for providing the substituent. In this case, the matrix language is powerless since either language can provide the substitute in question.

In example 25, the Ewe third person pronoun *-i* replaces the English noun *pineapple*. In that example, *-i* appears in *gake meɖui o*, a subordinate clause which is fully Ewe. The constraint here is that of uniformity where attention is given to phrasal boundaries to maintain the use of one language while the other is another language. It would be unacceptable to render the phrase in concern as *me2u it o* or *has not eaten i*.

Examples 26 and 27 are similar to Example 25 and warrant similar interpretation. The Ewe pronoun *-i* replaces *he* in *wowui*, which carries the same meaning as the English sentence. The constraint at work here is also that of uniformity. The same constraint of uniformity is carried in the use of *that* to replace the two main sentences before it. *That* is preferred to its Ewe counterpart *ema* because the sentence in question is wholly English. In Example 27, the Ewe pronoun *-e* in *megawɔe o* replaces the act of posting a bill. The constraint of uniformity demands that *-e* is preferred to its English equivalent *it*.

Examples 28 and 29 also fall in the category of the constraint of uniformity in that in Example 29, the Ewe pronoun *a-* in *Akpe 2e `uwo…* replaces the entire English sentence before it, all these making the constraint of uniformity in the choice of substitutes very important in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching).

5. CONCLUSION
The present study has shown that English and Ewe, regardless of the differences in their roots, achieve cohesion by substitution the same way. Moreover, in Ewe-English bilingual constructions (codeswitching), constraints such the power of the matrix language, the embedded language as well as the constraint of uniformity inform substitution choice. The implication of this study is to trigger investigations into how other languages realize cohesion by means of substitution and other cohesive devices side by side English. Moreover, the study would trigger investigations into cohesive device choice in bilingual constructions.

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

[2] Amenorvi, C**.** (2019). A Study of Conjunctions and Codeswitching Among Some Ewe-English Coordinate Bilinguals. *International journal of linguistics, literature and translation,* 2(4) *29-37.*

[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] Bokamba, E. 1989 Are there Syntactic Constraints on Code-mixing? World Englishes Vol.8 No.3 pp. 277-292.

[5] Crystal, L. 1997. English as a Global Language. London: Cambridge University Press.

[6] Halliday M. A. K. & Hasan, R. 1976. Cohesion in English. England: Longman.

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

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

[9] 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.

[10] Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (2000). A university grammar of English. London: Longman.