

Languages in Contact and Interference: A Case of Reference among Some Coordinate 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: September 24, 2019

Accepted: October 27, 2019

Published: November 30, 2019

Volume: 1

Issue: 6

KEYWORDS

Reference; coordinate bilinguals; interference; cohesion; languages in contact; logophoric pronouns; bilingualism.

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how the Ewe language realizes cohesion by reference in comparison with English. The study also sought to find out the extent to which English interferes with Ewe in the use of reference among coordinate Ewe-English bilinguals, specifically Ghanaian undergraduate students reading Ewe as a major course of study. The findings reveal that both English and Ewe realize cohesion almost the same way by means of reference. The study further reveals that English, the second language of the respondents, had significant influence on Ewe, their first language, while Ewe had no significant influence on their English. The findings disprove the popular view in contact linguistics that only first languages have the capacity to interfere with second languages in the use of language among bilinguals. They indicate that the otherwise is also true and it is only that too much attention has been given to the former phenomenon to the neglect of the latter.

1. INTRODUCTION

The present paper is the forth in the series of Amenorvi's (2015, 2019, 2019) papers which revealed how the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of ellipsis, substitution and conjunctions side by side English as well as successfully contested the popular view in contact linguistics that only first languages have the capacity to interfere with second languages of the bilingual. These papers proved that interference between the languages of the bilingual is a mutual phenomenon between the languages with varying degrees and that second languages also influence first languages. They focused on Ewe-English coordinate bilinguals and findings revealed that the interference was mutual and that English, though the second language of the bilinguals, equally influenced Ewe, the bilinguals' first language. Zooming in on the cohesive device of reference, the present paper's focus, therefore, is to investigate the influence of English, the bilinguals in question's second language, on Ewe, their second language, not vice versa which is an already established popular view in contact linguistics.

1.1 Coordinate bilingualism

One of the first type of bilingualism identified by Weinreich (1953), one of the earliest scholars in bilingualism, is coordinate bilingualism. A coordinate bilingual is one who has acquired two languages in two separate contexts and the words are stored separately. In this type of bilingualism, the person learns the languages in different environments. Halliday et al (1970) consider that this person is not necessarily an ambilingual (an individual with native competency in two languages). This bilingual possesses very high levels of proficiency in both languages in the written and oral modes. He is, however, not a native speaker of two languages. An instance of this type of bilingualism is seen in a Ghanaian child learning English at school with an already developed first language (L1). Sey (1973) also classifies Ghanaian university students who can use English and their Ghanaian language with almost equal competence as coordinate bilinguals.

2. TYPES OF LANGUAGE CONTACT PHENOMENON

An increasing body of works such as Cook (1992, 2002), Grosjean (1989), Haugen (1953, 1956), Kecskes and Papp (2000) and Weinreich (1974) shows that the coexistence of two languages in an individual is a complex phenomenon. Bilinguals do not use language the way monolinguals do. The bilingual's use of language, as pointed

out by Mackey (1962) and Wei (2002), involves such factors as degree (the proficiency level of the language that an individual has), function (for what an individual uses his languages, the roles his languages played in his total pattern of behavior), alternation (the extent to which one alternates between one's languages, how one changes from one language to another, and under what conditions) and interference (how well the bilingual keeps his languages apart, the extent to which he fuses them, how one of his languages influences the use of another).

2.1 Borrowing

Contact between languages can result in a variety of linguistic outcomes. One of the most researched areas in the field of languages in contact concerns the status of foreign lexical elements that appear in everyday discourse of bilinguals. This linguistic phenomenon is termed *borrowing*. Borrowing, according to Heath (1994:55), "involves mixing the systems themselves because an item is borrowed from one language to become part of the other language..." The borrowing of words happens because of the contact between languages and the 'source languages' of these words can be traced by people. Heath (1994), for instance, provides some examples of borrowed words into English as *karaoke*, *paella*, *schnapps*, *sputnik* and *fait accompli* from Japanese, Spanish, German, Russian and French respectively. Pereira (1977) identified three hundred (300) English loan words in Brazilian Portuguese. Socanac (1996) pointed to more than one thousand five hundred (1500) English words in Italian. Paradis and Lancharite (1997) also identified about 545 French words in Fula. Poplack and Meechan (1998:127) assert that borrowing is a common language contact phenomenon and that "major-class content words such as nouns, verbs, and adjectives are the most likely to be borrowed". Some examples of borrowed words into English are as follows: *courage*, *adventure*, *fruit*, *count*, *clergy*, *jury*, *state*, *question* and *pilgrimage* from French; *agile*, *abdomen*, *anatomy*, *area*, *capsule*, *compensate*, *insane*, *habitual* and *vindicate* from Latin and *anonymous*, *pneumonia*, *climax*, *skeleton*, *autograph*, *tragedy* and *atmosphere* from Greek. These are just a few examples of borrowed words we find in the English language. One way that languages, therefore, increase their vocabulary stock is by means of borrowing.

2.2 Pidgins and Creoles

Pidgins and creoles may also result when languages meet. Bynon (1977:256) writes that "pidgins and creoles could be described as the contact languages par excellence, for it is to contact that they are presumed to have their very existence". Pidgin is a simplified language that develops as a means of communication between two or more groups of speakers that do not have one common language. It is not a native language of any speaker of the speech communities involved. However, it is possible for a pidgin to acquire native speakers. A pidgin that has acquired native speakers is called a creole language, and the process whereby a pidgin turns into a creole is called creolization (Hudson 1980). Pidgins become creoles when generations whose parents speak pidgins to each other pass them on to their children as their first languages (L1s). Creoles can then replace the existing mix of languages to become the native language of a community. Examples of creole languages are Krio in Sierra Leone and Tok Pisin in Papua New Guinea.

2.3 Codeswitching and Codemixing

Another outcome of language contact is codeswitching. According to Hoffmann (1991), codeswitching is the most creative aspect of bilingual speech. Crystal (1987) 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. Codeswitching is prevalent among bilinguals. 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. Codeswitching is one of the most researched fields of study as a language contact phenomenon and for its prevalence.

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 (1989) 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.

2.4 Interference

Interference is also one outcome of the contact between languages. Interference is the transference of elements of one language to another at various levels, namely phonological, grammatical, lexical and orthographical (Berthold, Mangubhai & Batorowicz, 1997). Berthold et al (1997) define phonological interference as items including accent such as stress, rhyme, intonation and speech sounds from the first language (L1) influencing those of the second language (L2). As pointed out in Amenorvi (2015), when the first language influences the second in terms of word order, use of pronouns and determiners, tense and mood and so on, we are talking about grammatical interference. Interference at the lexical level provides for the borrowing of words from one language to another and modifying them to sound and function naturally in another language.

Studies in contact linguistics have shown that when two languages come in contact, they interfere with each other phonologically, grammatically and lexically. However, the popular view in contact linguistics is that only first languages have the capacity to interfere with second languages of the bilingual (Akande and Akinwale 2006, Cook 1993, Crystal 1997 etc.). This paper seeks to contest this popular view by ascertaining that the otherwise is also possible thereby making interference a mutual phenomenon between the languages of the bilingual. By focusing on the use of reference as a cohesive device, which is a grammatical phenomenon, the present study aims to describe how reference is realized in Ewe and investigate the extent to which English interferes with Ewe in the use of reference among Ewe-English coordinate (university undergraduate) bilinguals.

3. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This paper seeks to answer the following questions:

1. How is cohesion realized by reference in Ewe?
2. How does English interfere with Ewe in the Ewe-English coordinate bilingual's use of reference?

4. LITERATURE REVIEW

4.1 Reference in English

The first type of cohesive device identified by Halliday and Hasan (1976) is reference. The term 'reference' is traditionally used in semantics to mark the relationship that exists between a word and what it represents in the real world. Halliday and Hasan (1976) however do not use this term as the semanticist does. In their model of cohesion, the term reference is used in a more restricted way to denote a direct relationship between words and extra-linguistic objects. Reference is limited here to the relationship of identity that exists between two linguistic expressions. They further explained reference thus:

What characterizes this particular type of cohesion...is the specific nature of the information that is signaled for retrieval. In the case of reference, the information to be retrieved is the referential meaning, the identity of a particular thing or class of things that is being referred to; and the cohesion lies in continuity if of reference, whereby the thing enters into the discourse a second time (p31).

Reference simply has to do with bringing back or pointing to information that has gone before the existing discourse inasmuch as that information contributes to the understanding of the text as a unified whole.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify three areas that reference can be realized in English: personals, demonstratives and comparatives. Some personal references are *I, me, you, we, us, he, him, she, her, they, them, it* and *one*. The words *this, these, that, those here, there, then* and *the* are some demonstrative references. For comparative reference, we have *same, identical, equal, additional, different, else*, comparative adjectives such as *similar, same, different* and so on. Below are examples of each of the three types of references:

1- *Mrs. Thatcher has resigned. She announced her decision this morning.*

2- *Is it not marvelous to have a method of struggle where it is possible to stand up against the unjust system, fight it with all your might, never accept it and yet not stoop to violence and hatred in the process? This is what we have.*

3- *One of life's best philosophies is the golden rule. Another is to freely forgive others.*

In example 1, the pronoun ‘she’, a personal reference, refers back to ‘Mrs. Thatcher’ within the textual world. We see that reference, as used here, exists in the textual rather than the semantic sense where the reader or listener has to retrieve the identity of what is discussed by referring to another expression in the immediate context. The resulting cohesion, therefore, lies in the transfer or continuity of reference since the point in question re-enters into the discourse. The demonstrative pronoun ‘this’ in example 2, refers back to the question that precedes it. In that case, *this* can only be interpreted as referring to the ‘the method of struggle’ mentioned earlier. The cohesion in example 2 lies in the fact that the demonstrative *this* binds the two sentences together. In example 3, the comparative *another* refers back to *philosophies* and as a consequence binds the text together.

According to Halliday and Hasan (1976), reference is further divided into two: exophora (situational) and endophora (contextual). Exophora or exophoric reference is the type of reference that relates to something outside a text in question. There are times when the meaning of a text is not explicit from the text itself, but is obvious to those in a particular situation. Let us look at an example.

4- *Nobody believed his story. For everybody knows he is a liar.*

Readers outside this environment cannot refer to ‘he’ but the listeners involved are aware of ‘him’ and can find texture in these sentences.

The other type of reference in a text is endophora. Endophoric reference is textual in that what is discussed is retrievable from the text, not outside it. Halliday and Hasan (1976) give an example to explain endophora:

5- *Wash and core six cooking apples. Put them into a fireproof dish.*

The cohesion of example 5 lies in the pronoun ‘them’ in the second sentence for it refers back to ‘apples’ in the first sentence. This type of reference is an endophoric one inasmuch as what it points to is within the text. Everyone else will understand these sentences as far as what ‘them’ refers to is retrievable from the sentences, not anywhere else.

Further, there are two types of endophoric references: anaphora and cataphora. Anaphoric reference is a type of reference that looks back to a preceding text. In the example 3 above, ‘them’ refers back to the preceding sentence to retrieve its meaning. It is easy for the reader to figure out that ‘them’ refers back to ‘apples’, not anything else; this reference is an anaphoric one. Unlike anaphoric reference, cataphoric reference points to a following text, not a preceding one. Quirk and Greenbaum (2000) provide examples of what a cataphoric reference looks like:

6- *It never should have happened. She went out and left the baby unattended.*

7- *Here is the news. A diplomat was kidnapped last night in London.*

In example 6, what ‘it’ stands for is clarified in the following sentence. The referent of ‘it’ is retrieved from the following sentence. The cohesion here lies in the continuity of ideas between the first and second sentences. In example 7, there is anticipation of what news there is. The second sentence provides the news – “A diplomat was kidnapped last night in London.” In this example too, the reference is cataphoric. Therefore, while both cataphoric and anaphoric references are endophoric, anaphoric refers to a preceding text and cataphoric to a following text.

5. METHOD

All the 219 undergraduate students who were Ewe major students from the University of Education, Winneba (UEW) were selected for this study. The purposive random sampling technique was employed in selecting these respondents who were all Ewe major students from the University of Education, Winneba. Moreover, UEW was chosen as the site for this study because the University offers courses in both English and Ewe. These students reading Ewe are the best sample for this study inasmuch as their proficiency in Ewe and English qualify them as coordinate bilinguals. Each respondent submitted an essay in Ewe on any topic of his or her choice. Each of these essays was analysed focusing on the use of reference and checking English influence in the way reference was used in Ewe. Table 1 below shows the distribution of respondents from UEW.

Table 1: Respondents from UEW

| SEX | L. 100 | L. 200 | L. 300 | L. 400 | TOTAL | % |
|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|-------|--------|
| MALE | 51 | 43 | 24 | 36 | 154 | 70.32% |
| FEMALE | 10 | 16 | 19 | 20 | 65 | 29.68% |
| TOTAL | 61 | 59 | 43 | 56 | 219 | 100% |

6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This section presents the analysis of data by answering the questions as to how reference is realised in Ewe and how English interferes with Ewe in the use of reference among the coordinate bilinguals in question.

6.1 Reference in Ewe

Analysis of data reveals that just as in English, cohesion is realized in Ewe is by means of reference. The following examples authenticate this conclusion.

8a. Enye nyatefe be nyɔnuwo sɔ gbɔ wu ɲutsuwo le Ghana.
 3SG-COP truth that woman-PL more than man-PL LOC
 (It is true that women outnumber men in Ghana)

b. Togbɔ be wòle nenema hã la, wometea ɲu wɔa dɔ sesẽ aɖeke o.
 though PREP 3SG-COP same 3PL-NEG-HAB can do work hard NEG.
 (Though this is true, they do not do any hard work.)

In Example 8b, the Ewe third person singular *wò* (*it, she* or *he* depending on the context) in *wòle...* refers back to sentence 8a. In that case, sentence 8a re-enters the discussion. The only change we see of it is that it has been reduced to a single pronoun *wò*. This is clearly shown in the English translation as *that* just as *it* in translation *b* refers to the whole of sentence *a*, so does *wò* in sentence *b* refer to the whole of sentence *a*.

Another referential link that serves a cohesive purpose in the foregoing examples is the Ewe third person plural pronoun *wo* (they) in the clause *wometea ɲu...* (they can't...). The *e* (it) and *wo* (they) bind the two sentences together and serve the cohesive purpose of reference.

Reference, as a cohesive device, can either be anaphoric or cataphoric. It is anaphoric when the reference points to a preceding item and cataphoric when the reference points to a succeeding item. These are some examples from data showing both types of references.

9a. Dunyahehe menye ɖevi fe nya kura o.
 politics NEG.COP child POSS word NEG.NEG
 (Politics is not a child's play)

Tsitsiawo kple akɔtanɔamesitɔwo fe nyae wònye.
 elderly.PL CONJ chest.owner.PL POSS word.FOC 3SG COP
 (It is the elderly and the courageous who indulge in politics.)

b. Dzilawo kpea fu geɖe ɖe wo viwo ta le ɖeviawo fe sukudenyawo,
 parent-PL suffer-HAB many PREP POSS-child-PL PREP PREP child-DEF-PL POSS school-go- words,

nuɖɔnyawo kple kɔdzidenyawo me.
 thing-eat-words CONJ hospital-go-words POST.
 (Parents suffer for their children's education, nutrition and health)

Nu siawo wɔwɔ menye fefenya kura o.
 thing DEM-PL do-do NEG-COP play-word NEG NEG
 (Fulfilling these roles is not easy at all)

In Example 9a, the sentence *Dunyahehe menye ɖevi fe nya kura o* (Politics is not a child's play), clearly points to the succeeding sentence to provide the answer as to who should indulge in politics. The answer comes swiftly in the following sentence – *Tsitsiawo kple akɔtanɔamesitɔwo fe nyae wɔnye* (It is the elderly and the courageous who indulge in it).

The first sentence in Example 9a clearly points to the following one for a meaningful cohesive tie. This type of reference is anaphoric.

A reference can also be cataphoric when a cohesive tie links with a linguistic item or items in a preceding sentence. The preceding items of reference do not need to come immediately before a succeeding sentence to be accepted as cataphoric. As long as a link is made, a cohesive tie is established however near or far off the linguistic items that mark the tie are, the reference is still cataphoric. Example 9b illustrates how a cataphoric reference looks like in Ewe. The example has two sentences. The first part reads: *Dzilawo kpea fu geɖe ɖe woviwo ta le ɖeviawo fe sukudenyawo, nuɖɔnyawo kple kɔdzidenyawo me* (Parents suffer for their children's education, nutrition and health). The second sentence goes, *Nu siawo wɔwɔ menye fefenya kura o* (Fulfilling these roles is not easy at all). The first sentence lists some of the roles parents play – *sukudenyawo* (education), *nuɖɔnyawo* (nutrition), and *kɔdzidenyawo* (health). The second sentence restates these roles in the pro-form *nu siawo* (these things). In this case, *nu siawo* refers back to the different roles parents perform in the lives of their children. This is a cataphoric reference.

Halliday and Hasan (1976) identify three ways in which reference can be realized in English: through the use of demonstratives, personal pronouns and comparatives. Data revealed that reference is realized in like manner in Ewe. The following examples explain this conclusion:

10. Afɔkuwo dzɔna le miafe mɔwo dzi zi geɖe.
 Accidents happen-HAB. PREP. We-POSS road-PL POST time several
 (Accidents happen on our roads many times.)

11. Esiawo menyea vukulawo fe vodada xe siaa xi o.
 These NEG-COP-HAB driver-PL POSS. Fault always NEG.
 (Drivers are not always to blame for these accidents.)

In Example 11, a demonstrative pronoun *esiawo* (these) has a direct link with *afɔkuwo* (accidents) in the preceding sentence (Example 10). In addition to serving as a cohesive device, *esiawo* also helps in avoiding monotony. Here is another example:

12. Sukudede hi a ɣutɔ le ame fe agbe me. Ema nye nyatefe matrɔmatrɔ.
 Education need ADV PREP person POS life PREP. DEM COP truth undeniable
 (Education is very important in a person's life. That is an undeniable truth.)

In Example 12, the Ewe demonstrative pronoun *ema* (that) refers back to the statement before it – *sukudede hi a ɣutɔ le ame fe agbe me* (education is very important in a person's life). These examples show that Ewe also realizes cohesion by means of demonstratives just as English does.

Reference exhibits itself by the use of personal pronouns too in Ewe.

Below are examples of the realization of reference by personal pronouns from the data:

13a. Sukudelawo kple dɔwɔlawo katā lé nɔfe vevi aɔe na dukɔ sia.
 student- PL CONJ worker-PL all work-HAB place important PREP nation DEM
 (Workers and students have an important place in the country.)

b. Wofe veviedodo nu wɛe be dzidzedze kpɔkpɔ le dukɔa me.
 3PL-POSS hard work thing do+PRO comfort seeing PREP nation-DEF POST
 (Their hard work brings comfort to the people in the country.)

In Example 13a, *sukudelawo* (students) and *dɔwɔlawo* (workers) are replaced by the personal pronoun *wo* (they) in 13b. The personal pronoun *wo*, therefore, refers back to these two groups of people. Here is another example of the use of personal pronouns in Ewe:

14a. Nye kple nɔvinye ye wodzi de Keta.
 1SG CONJ brother-mine FOC 3PL-bear PREP Keta
 (My brother and I were born at Keta.)

b. Afi mae mɪtsi hede suku le.
 There+FOC 2PL-grow VERBID+attend school POST LOC.
 (That was where we grew up and attended school.)

In Example 14b, the personal pronoun *mí* in *mɪtsi* refers back to *nye* (*I*) and *nɔvinye* (*my brother*) in 14a. It is clear by these examples that just as personal pronouns perform cohesive ties in English, they do the same in Ewe. These are some common Ewe personals derived from the data: *nye / me* (*I*), *wɔ* (*you singular*), *mi* or *miawo* (*you plural*), *mí* or *miawo* (*we*), *wo* (*they*), *e* or *eya* (*he, she, it*).

The Ewe language, just as English does, also realizes cohesion by means of demonstrative references. Here are some examples:

15a. Nkronful nye du sue le Ghana fe Xedzefe Nutoa me
 cop town small prep poss east region prep
 (Nkronful is a small town in the Eastern Region of Ghana)

Afi mae wodzi Nkrumah le.
 there-foc 3pl-bear POST LOC.
 (That is where Nkrumah was born)

b. Edze be ame tsitsi de siaa de nabu edokui, awɔ nu si dze.
 3sg-right person-old all respect 3sg-self FUT-do thing dem right
 (It is good for all elderly ones to respect themselves and do what is right)

Kpɔɔɔɔ nyuiwoe emawo nye na deviwɔ.
 example good-pl-foc dem cop prep child-pl
 (Those are good examples for children)

The second sentence of Example 15a uses the demonstrative *afi mae* (there) to refer back to *Nkronful* in the first sentence. In Example 15b, sentence one mentions self-respect as well as doing what is right as qualities elderly ones must portray. The second sentence refers to these qualities by the use of the demonstrative *emawo* (those). *Emawo*, therefore, refers back to the earlier information and serves as a cohesive tie between the two pieces of information.

Other examples of demonstratives in Ewe derived from data are *esia* (this), *esiawo* (these), *ema* (that), *ekeme* (that one), *afi sia* (here), *fifia* (now), *ɔe ma ɔi* (then) and *ɔe aɔewo ɔi* (sometimes).

Besides demonstratives, comparatives also serve as cohesive ties in Ewe just as they do in English. Below are some examples.

16a. Ghana fe koko xɔ asi wu esiwo le xexea katā me.
 Ghana POSS cocoa get market ADV DEM PREP world+DEF all POST
 (Ghana's cocoa is the most expensive in the world)

Gake, mesɔgbɔ abe Cote D'Ivoire tɔ ene o.
 CONJ NEG-plenty ADV POSS ADV NEG
 (But it is not as much as that of Cote D'Ivoire.)

b. Ghana xɔ ɖokuisinɔɔ do ŋɔ na Afrika dukɔwo kata.
 G. get independence ahead ADV country-PL all
 (Ghana had independence ahead of all African countries)

Afrika dukɔ bubuawo ya dze ɖokuisinɔɔ xɔxɔ gɔme le ɛɔɖɛwo me.
 A. country other-PL start independence gain+ing prep PREP -PL POST
 (Other African countries started having their independence in the 1960s.)

In Example 16a, the sentence *Ghana fe koko ...* says that Ghana's cocoa is the most expensive in the world. In the following sentence, the comparative *abe ... ene* (like or same) places Ghana's cocoa side by side that of Cote D'Ivoire in terms of quantity. The use of the comparative *abe... ene* refers to an earlier information without which the comparison here will be void. This is a comparative reference in that a comparison is used as a cohesive tie that refers back to preceding information. Example 16b shows another type of comparative reference in Ewe. The sentence *Ghana xɔ ɖokuisinɔɔ...* tells of Ghana's having independence ahead of other African countries. The following sentence *Afrika dukɔ bubuawo...* says that other African nations had their independence in the 1960s. The Ewe comparative *bubuawo* (others) refers to these African countries that had their independence after Ghana. Moreover, it is a comparative tie between the two sentences. It is impossible and unacceptable to use the comparative *bubuawo* in Ewe so as it is when we use *others* in English without any prior information. The comparative *bubuawo* therefore refers back to the first sentence *Ghana xɔ ɖokuisinɔɔ...*

It is clear that the Ewe language realizes cohesion by means of reference just as English does. There are some differences though, and these differences are discussed under *English Interference on Ewe*.

6.2 English Interference on Ewe

The influence of English on Ewe showed particularly in the use of Ewe personal pronouns. To understand this interference, we need some background knowledge on the grammaticality of Ewe personal pronouns. Some languages have distinct set of pronouns called logophors which are employed in the third person context where the speaker is not involved in the reportage (Hagege 1975). Some scholars such as Reuland (2006) and Clements (1975) have identified Ewe as one language that possesses logophoric pronouns. Clements (1975) outlines three distinct properties of logophors as follows:

- a. logophoric pronouns are discourse-bound: they may only occur in a context in which the perspective of an individual other than the speaker's is being reported.
- b. the antecedent of the logophoric pronoun must not occur in the same clause in which the indirect speech is introduced.
- c. the antecedent specifies which individual's (or individuals') perspective is being reported.

It follows therefore that two distinct pronouns could form a cohesive tie of reference in Ewe while referring to one and the same person or thing. The relationship between these pronouns is not the same as one espoused in the relationship between the English pronoun *he* and *his*, for example, where the former is a third person pronoun while the latter is a third person possessive pronoun. The relationship that exists between a logophor and its antecedent is that both belong to the same category of pronouns but cannot interchange positions. The logophoric pronoun cannot be used at the first subject position. Let us look at some examples from the data to clarify the points above.

17a. Kpovito la gblɔ be yɛnɔ tefe si wowu adzodala la le.
 police DEF. say DEM. 3SG place. DEM. 3PL-kill robber DEF. POST.
 (The police said he was at the place where the robber had been killed.)

b. Nu sia do dziku na Kɔbla eye eɖɔe be yemayi azadufe o.

thing DEM. cause anger PREP. CONJ. 3SG-decide DEM. 3SG-NEG-go festival NEG
(This angered K. and he decided not to go to the festival.)

18a. Woḍu nu eye wokpɔ gbɔ be wowɔ nu sia nu nyuie.
3PL-eat thing CONJ. 3PL-see DEM 3PL thing all thing ADV.
(They ate and made sure they did everything well.)

b. Milɔ be mi koe ayi ahakpe ameaowo
1PL-agree 1PL only go meet person-PL
(We agreed that only we would go to meet the people.)

In Example 17a, the logophor *ye* (he/she) as in *yenɔ ...* refers back to *kpovitɔ* (police). This is acceptable grammatically in Ewe. Still, when we substitute *kpovitɔ* with the personal *e* (he/she), the sentence would still be acceptable and the personal *ye* would therefore refer to *e* in that case. Let us note that while both *e* and *ye* are both equivalent to the English *he/she*; *ye* is a logophor while *e* is not. *Ye* is a logophoric pronoun whose antecedent is *e*, both referring to the same referent.

Data revealed that some respondents have ignored the Ewe logophoric pronouns and resorted to using the first initial ones that can appear at subject position. The researcher believes that this must be due to interference from English since English has only one type of personal pronouns that function as subjects. The respondents, because of the influence from English, are therefore simply dropping what English does not have and making Ewe look like English in the use of personal pronouns. Example 17b explains this point better.

In Example 17b, the personal *e* as in *edɔe* refers to the subject of the construction *Kɔbla*. The personal *e* is wrongly used in this construction making the sentence in which it appears ungrammatical and thus unacceptable in Ewe. The sentence rightly reads thus:

Nu sia do dziku na Kɔbla eye wɔḍɔe be yemayi azaḍufe o.

In the acceptable version of the sentence above, the right logophor *wɔḍ* is used and it refers to *Kɔbla*. The logophor *wɔḍ* is also a third person singular personal just as *e* is. Both are subjective personals; the latter appears at the initial part of a sentence while the former does not. The personal *wɔḍ* also normally appears after the *be clause* (that clause) in Ewe. Examples are as follows:

Kofi be yeaḍu nu.

Kuma melɔ be yeayi kuatefe o.

It is clear from the examples that while Ewe employs the singular third personals *e*, *wɔḍ* and *ye* in the subjective form, English only employs *he*, *she* or *it*, depending on the context. While Ewe uses *wo*, *woawo* and *yewo* as plurals, English employs only *they* for the same purpose.

From the foregoing, we can deduce that the difference in the use of personal pronouns in English and Ewe is the cause of the unacceptable Ewe sentences produced by respondents as those of English. When we translate the ungrammatical Ewe sentence into English, it reads:

This angered Kɔbla and he decided he would not go to the festival.

In the foregoing English sentence, the pronoun *he* appears twice, both referring to *Kɔbla*. It is clear that the reason why Example 17b from our data is rendered the way it is, is that the respondent was unconsciously making Ewe personals behave and look like English ones. The obvious reason why the respondent chose the Ewe personal *e* throughout is that in English, only *he* fits that position and is used throughout without changing its form unlike in Ewe. The personals *ye* and *wo* cannot be used at the initial position in Ewe (Atakpa 1993). In English, however, the personals *he*, *she*, *it* and their plural forms can occur at any part of the sentence. Because of this difference in English and Ewe in their employment of personal pronouns, respondents fell victim to the interference from English and used Ewe personals as though they were those of English. Since the personal *e* comes handy and is without much restriction as *ye* and *wo*, it becomes the obvious choice and is used throughout just as *he* is used in English.

In Example 18a, the Ewe third person plural personal *wo* appears twice. In its second appearance, *wo* should have been *yewo* inasmuch as it comes after the Ewe *be clause* (that clause). After the Ewe *be clauses*, most Ewe personal pronouns change their forms to logophoric ones. Let us look at the following sentences to illustrate this point before we proceed.

- 19a. Egbe be yemele tsi le ge o.
3sg-refuse dem 3sg-neg- water bathe neg
(He refused to take his bath.)
- b. Wolɔ be yewoakpe de devia ŋu.
3pl-agree dem-help child-foc body
(They agreed to help the child.)

The Ewe *be clause* (*that clause*), as we have argued, carries logophoric pronouns other than the initial ones even though the latter refers to the former and both form a cohesive tie. In English, however, this is not so. We see from the first sentence above that in the *that clause* is another *he* besides the initial one, both forming a cohesive tie. In the Ewe sentence, however, we see two different personal pronoun pronouns – *e* as in *egbe* and *ye* as in *yemele* – both referring to the same thing and forming a tie. It is unacceptable to repeat the *e* in its second appearance just as it is unacceptable to bring *ye* to the position of *e* and vice versa. Either way is unacceptable.

In Example 19b, we see two different personals, *wo* as in *wolɔ* and *yewo* as in *yewoakpe*, both forming a tie, the second referring to the first. The English translation, however, maintains the plural English pronoun *they*. Just as *ye* cannot replace *e* and vice versa in the first sentence, so can *wo* not replace *yewo* and vice versa in sentence two. This is how some personal pronouns work in the Ewe language.

Now back to the sentence before the above illustrations. In Example 18, the third person Ewe personal *wo* appears twice, which must not be so. In its second appearance, *wo* should have been *yewo* for it comes after the Ewe *be clause*. Why has this respondent chosen *wo* again instead of *yewo*? The answer comes readily in the fact that English would employ the same personal pronoun were this sentence in English. This sentence can be rendered in English thus:

They ate and (they) made sure that everything went on smoothly.

In the above English translation, the personal pronoun *they* appears twice. The latter, however, can be deleted and the sentence would still be acceptable though. Since English employs the same personal pronouns in many positions, the respondents employ Ewe personal pronouns as though they were those of English, a clear interference from English.

Finally, Example 19b employs the first person plural personal *mí* two times. The latter should have been *míawo*. This sentence too has fallen victim to interference from English. There is one thing that is common from the influence of English on Ewe in the analysis of data; all these influences so far result in unacceptable constructions in Ewe. These unacceptable Ewe sentences are modified in the way English employs personal pronouns. Indeed, scholars like Cook (1993), Robins (1989) and Weinreich (1953) assert that contact between languages have several effects, one of which is that the second language of the bilingual begins to be modified phonetically, grammatically and lexically in the direction of the first. This phenomenon under discussion confirms their stand. The only significant difference here is that this time, it is the second language interfering with the first one, a proof that their stand is true and the opposite is equally true.

6.3 Comments from Respondents

After the analysis of data and the findings of this study, the researcher wanted to find out the reactions of the respondents of the study towards the findings. This was done to ascertain whether or not these respondents would agree that they had been influenced by English in the use reference in the essays they wrote for the study. We have already discussed how the influence of English on Ewe resulted in unacceptable Ewe constructions. The researcher gathered all these constructions and mixed them with other constructions that were acceptable and showed them to some randomly chosen respondents. Their reactions are summed up in the words of one Level Four Hundred student:

Some of us think in English even when we are writing in Ewe. I think this is so because even though we read Ewe as one of our major courses, we only use it when we are in Ewe classes. Every other time, it is English all way. Why wouldn't we write Ewe as though we were writing English?

We can see from the outcome of the reactions of respondents as well as the comment above that English truly is the source of the interference on Ewe. The Level Four Hundred student submitted that the interference might be because students use Ewe scarcely in comparison with English in their academic assignments. It is true that students always use English in their assignments and examinations. They only use Ewe or other Ghanaian languages when that is one of their major courses and they write assignments and examinations on them. It is reasonable to conclude that since English is used as the major medium of communication in teaching and learning, it must have a strong influence on the scarcely used Ewe or other Ghanaian languages. The quote above points to English as the source of the interference in the respondents' use of reference in the essays in Ewe.

7. CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATION

The present study has shown that the Ewe language realizes cohesion by reference largely the same way English does. It has further confirmed that second languages of the bilingual are also capable of interfering with the first as it is demonstrated in the case of the Ewe-English coordinate bilinguals of this study. Interference between languages of the bilingual is, therefore, not a one-sided phenomenon but a mutual one. The implication of this study is that the popular theory as propounded by Weinreich (1953) that only first languages of the bilingual have the capacity to influence or interfere with their second languages and not vice versa, is rejected by findings of modern studies such as the present one.

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] Akande, A. T. and Akinwale, T. O. (2006). *A Case Study of the Pronunciation of /θ/ and /ð/ Sounds by Some Yoruba Speakers of English*. Ed. A. J. Matiki: Marang Vol. 16, pp. 23-34.
- [2] Amenorvi, C. R. (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] Amenorvi, C. R. (2019). Substitution and Codeswitching among Some Ewe-English Bilinguals. *Journal Humanities and Social Science Studies*, 1(5), 53-59.
- [4] Amenorvi, C. R. (2015). *Bilingualism and Interference: A Case Study of Ellipsis among Some Coordinate Bilinguals*. *African Journal of Applied Research (AJAR)*, 2(2).
- [5] Atakpa, F.K. (1993). *E3egbe`4`l4 ~uti Sewo*. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.
- [6] Bada, E. (2001). *Native Language Influence on the Production of English Sounds by Some Japanese Learners*. *The Reading Matrix Vol. 1 No. 2 pp.1-15*.
- [7] Berthold, M., Mangubhai, F., & Batorowicz, K. (1997). *Bilingualism & multiculturalism: study book*. Distance Education Centre, University of Southern Queensland: Toowoomba, QLD. Anthropology, 13,367-384.
- [8] Bhela, B. (1999). *Native language interference in learning a second language: exploratory case studies of native language interference with target language usage*. *International Education Journal Vol. 1 No. 1 pp.22-31*.
- [9] Bokamba, E. (1989). *Are there Syntactic Constraints on Code-mixing?* *World Englishes Vol.8 No.3 pp. 277-292*.
- [10] Bynon, T. (1977). *Historical Linguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [11] Clements, George N. (1975), "The Logophoric Pronoun in Ewe: Its Role in Discourse", *Journal of West African Languages*, 2: 141–177
- [12] Cook, V. (1993). *Linguistics and Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Hampshire.
- [13] Crystal, L. (1997). *English as a Global Language*. London: Cambridge University Press.

- [14] Grosjean, F. (1989). Neurolinguists, beware! The bilingual is not two monolinguals in one person. *Brain and Language*, 36, 3-15.
- [15] Hagège, Claude (1974), "Les pronoms logophoriques", *Bulletin de la Société de Linguistique de Paris*, 69: 287-310
- [16] Halliday M. A. K. & Hasan, R. (1976). *Cohesion in English*. England: Longman.
- [17] Halliday M.A.K. & Matthiessen C.M.I.M. (2004). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [18] Halliday, M.A.K. (1985). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar*. London: Edward Arnold.
- [19] Halliday, M.A.K., McKintosh, A., Strevens, P. (1970). "The users and uses of language" in Readings of the Sociology of Language, ed. J.A. Fishman. The Hague: Mouton.
- [20] Haugen, E. (1950a): *The Analysis of Linguistic Borrowing*. *Language*, 26:210-231
- [21] Haugen, E. (1950b): Problems of Bilingualism, *Lingual*, 2: 271-290.
- [22] Heath, S. B. (1983). *Ways with words: Language, life and work in communities and classrooms*. London: Cambridge University Press.
- [23] Hoffman, C. (1991). *Introduction to Bilingualism*. New York: Longman.
- [24] Hudson, R. A. (1980). *Sociolinguistics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- [25] Kecskes, I. & T. Papp. (2000). *Metaphorical competence in trilingual language production*. In Cenoz, J. and U. Jessner (eds.) 2000. *Acquisition of English as a third language*. Clevedon: Multilingual Matters, 99-120.
- [26] Mackey, W.F. (1969). How can bilingualism be described and measured? In L.G. Muysken, P. 2000. *Bilingual Speech: A Typology of Code-mixing*. Great Britain: Cambridge University Press.
- [27] Paradis, C. and LaCharité, D. (1997). Preservation and Minimality in Loanword Adaptation. *Journal of Linguistics* 33: 379-430.
- [28] Pereira, V. R. A. (1977). Adaptações fonológicas dos empréstimos ingleses. *Letras de Hoje* 27, 53-71.
- [29] Poplack, S. & Meechan, M. (1998). Introduction: *How Languages Fit Together in Codemixing*. *International Journal of Bilingualism: Instant loans, easy conditions: the product of bilingual borrowing*, ed. by S. Poplack and M. Meechan, 127-138, London: Kingston Press.
- [30] Poplack, S. 2000. *Sometimes I'll Start a Sentence in Spanish* termino en español. *Linguistics Publication Inc* 18:581-618.
- [31] Quirk, R. & Greenbaum, S. (2000). *A university grammar of English*. London: Longman.
- Reuland, Eric (2006), "Chapter 38. Logophoricity", in M. Everaert, H. van Riemsdijk, [The Blackwell Companion to Syntax](#), Blackwell Publishing Ltd., pp. 1-20, [ISBN 9781405114851](#), retrieved 2014-10-28
- [32] Robins, R. H. (1989). *General Linguistics*. 4th ed. England: Longman.
- [33] Sey, K. 1973. *Ghanaian English: An Exploratory Study*. London: Macmillan.
- [34] Thomason, S. G. (2001). *Language Contact*. Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- [35] Wei, L. (2002). The Bilingual Mental Lexicon and Speech Production Process. *Brain and Language* 81:691-707.
- [36] Weinreich, U. (1953). *Languages in Contact*. The Hague: Mouton.
- [37] Weinreich, U. (1974). *Languages in Contact: Findings and Problems*. The Hague: Mouton.