MECHANISMS OF L1 MAINTENANCE IN EWE-ENGLISH CODESWITCHING

Evershed Kwasi Amuzu
University of Ghana, Legon
a_evershed@yahoo.com

In Ghana, the pervasive use of codeswitching (CS) involving each indigenous language and English, the official language and sole medium of instruction in school from primary four, has brought about intensive contact between English and each of these languages. The paper focuses on Ewe-English CS (and occasionally Akan-English CS) and demonstrates that the codeswitchers are using certain mother tongue (MT) maintenance mechanisms to preserve not only the grammar but also parts of the lexicon of their MT from interference from English. It is suggested that Ewe-English CS illustrates the kind of CS produced by bilinguals who live in speech communities alongside monolingual MT speakers (as is the case in most post-colonial settings). It is also suggested that this CS contrasts with that which is produced by second or later generation immigrants (e.g. immigrants in Europe and North America) whose MTs are becoming weaker because of their exposure to dominant host languages. The analyses provide some insights about the bilingual language competence of codeswitchers.

Au Ghana, l'utilisation fréquente de changement de code entre une langue maternelle et l'anglais comme langue officielle et seule medium d'instruction à l'école à partir de la quatrième année primaire, a apporté un contact intensif entre l'anglais et chacune de ces langues. L'article focalise sur le changement de code ewe-anglais (et parfois akan-anglais) et démontre que les utilisateurs de changement de code emploient certains mécanismes de maintien de la langue maternelle pour préserver non seulement la grammaire mais aussi des parties du lexique de leur langue maternelle dans les interférences en anglais. Dans cet article, l'on propose que le changement de code ewe-anglais illustre le genre de changement de code que produisent des locuteurs bilingues qui vivent dans un environnement où ils côtoient des locuteurs monolingues de langues maternelles (comme c'est le cas dans de nombreux contextes post-coloniaux). En outre, l'auteur propose que ce changement de code contraste avec celui qu'utilisent les immigrants de la deuxième ou de la dernière génération (tels les immigrants d'Europe et de l'Amérique du Nord) dont les langues maternelles sont devenues plus faibles à cause de leur exposition à des langues hôtes dominantes. L'analyse lève un pan de voile sur la compétence des utilisateurs de changement de code chez les sujets bilingues.

0. INTRODUCTION

The pervasive use of intra-sentential codeswitching (hereafter CS) involving English and local Ghanaian languages is just about half-a-century-old phenomenon. Forson (1979), the pioneering major work on CS in Ghana, speculates that it became a recognizable medium of expression among educated Ghanaians only after the 1940s. Specifically, according to him, the early 1950s marked a turning point in the history of the relationship between local languages and English—it was at that time that a cardinal shift in school language policy occurred—and the use of CS was an immediate by-product. What he said merits full citation here:

> Until the early 1950s, Ghanaian languages were an important part of the school curriculum, and efforts were made to translate even non-language materials such as Mathematics books into them. However, with the introduction of English as the medium of instruction in all subjects in the elementary school except Ghanaian languages, interest in the teaching, learning, and study of the local languages steadily and perceptibly waned. In elementary schools, it was, in fact, a punishable offense to be caught speaking a Ghanaian language on the school grounds. The child used English more and more in his school life, and his

> Ghanaian language at home. This situation was obviously a good recipe for codeswitching. (Forson 1979:60)

Forson reported that Akan-English bilinguals, for instance, used CS pervasively in the 1970s but still maintained full command of Akan; in fact, he claimed that educated Ghanaians in general used CS as a 'third tongue', and only in speech situations in which they considered this code desirable. However, Asilevi (1990) concluded that after the 1980s when it comes to vocabulary knowledge of their mother tongue, some Ewe-English bilinguals (mainly the youth) were already becoming 'incompetent native speakers' (p.88) because of their exposure to CS. However, others writing at about this time arrived at a different conclusion. For example, Forson (1988) maintains his thesis from his 1979 work. And Dzameshie (1994, 1996) writes glowingly about the communicative competence of Ewe-English bilinguals asserting that their CS was a 'reflection of [their] dual communicative competence…, [their] tacit knowledge of grammaticality and acceptability of utterances in the two languages' (1996:9).

A questionnaire survey I carried out in early 2002 revealed an analogous split in public opinion about what is happening to the lexicon and grammar of Ghanaian languages in the mouths of the codeswitchers. My own analysis of the situation among Ewe-English bilinguals (see Amuzu 2005a, b and c) mirrors, on the one hand, Asilevi's (1990) conclusion about their weak vocabulary knowledge of Ewe and, on the other hand, Dzameshie's conclusion about their tacit grammatical knowledge of both Ewe and English.[1]

In the following sections, I explore evidence of the grammatical resources that codeswitchers deploy when they produce bilingual (intra-sentential CS) constructions. The objective is to inform about ongoing/synchronic language contact phenomena in the Ewe-English (and occasionally Akan-English) communities in Ghana. My main conclusion is that the codeswitchers are deploying certain mother tongue maintenance mechanisms that preserve the grammar and parts of the lexicon of their mother tongue against interference from English. I will suggest that this phenomenon contrasts with what is happening with much of the CS being observed today in Europe and North America: there, studies have consistently shown that the mother tongues of codeswitching youths—intermediate- or second-generation immigrants—are rapidly converging to the dominant/host languages (see, for example, several papers in the *International Journal of Bilingualism* Volume 2, Issue 1).

1. GRAMMATICAL CONSTRAINTS IN BILINGUAL CONSTITUENTS

1.1 DISCUSSION OF THE DATA

Example (1) is an utterance by one of two sisters in their twenties who were expressing shock at the cruelty with which mob justice is being meted out to persons in urban areas who are suspected to be thieves:

[1] A detailed review of the literature and my evaluation of claims made can be found in Amuzu (2005c).

(1) **Nye hã me kpɔ nu ma teƒe nyitsɔ le Makorla. Wó lé**
1sg too 3sg see thing that place recently at Makorla. 3PL catch

BOY aɖe si fi PHONE. E- ma ko wó wu-i xó.
boy a.certain REL steal phone. 3sg-that only 3PL kill-3sg already

I also witnessed such a scene recently at Makorla (a market in Accra).
They caught <u>a boy</u> who stole <u>a phone</u>. They killed him instantly.

The second sentence highlights the intricacy of grammatical constraints in Ewe-English CS. Let us study the two transitive bilingual clauses in this sentence:

wólé <u>BOY aɖe</u> 'they caught <u>a boy</u>' (a main clause), and

si-fi <u>PHONE</u> 'who stole <u>a phone</u>' (a relative clause).

The object nouns in both clauses, namely **BOY** and **PHONE**, refer to indefinite entities, a fact made clearer in the English translations of the clauses where each object noun takes the indefiniteness marker **a**. Note, however, that in the bilingual contexts **BOY** and **PHONE** distribute differently. While **BOY** is modified by the Ewe article **aɖe** 'a certain', **PHONE** occurs alone as an object-NP. This is not accidental. The question is, 'What causes the difference in their distribution in the bilingual clauses although both would take the indefinite article 'a' in a monolingual English clause?'

One of the clues to the answer comes from insight about how indefiniteness is expressed in monolingual Ewe NPs. Ewe makes grammatical distinction between indefinite nouns that express non-specific (or generic) reference and those that express specific reference. A non-specific noun occurs without any overt marking for indefiniteness, as we find in example (2) below where **avu** 'dog', occurring as the subject-NP without an overt marking for indefiniteness, refers to a typical member of a class of entities or referents, namely dogs:

(2) **Avu ƒe nuwɔna-e nyé e-sia**
Dog poss handiwork-FOC COP 3sg-this
This is the work of <u>a dog</u>.

On the other hand, a specific-but-indefinite noun is modified by the indefiniteness marker **aɖe** 'a certain', and such an NP is interpreted as referring to a specific member of a class of entities that the speaker assumes the hearer does not know. **Avu aɖe** 'a certain dog' expresses this sense in (3):

(3) **Me-kpɔ avu aɖe le aƒe a me fia**
1sg-see dog a.certain at house DEF inside now
I have just seen <u>a dog</u> in the house [i.e. I have just seen <u>a certain dog</u> in the house].

English does not make this kind of distinction as the indefinite **a** may modify both a non-specific and a specific count noun (see Trenkic 2008). This contrast between Ewe and English is what is reflected in the fact that the two dissimilar instances of **avu** in the examples above translate into English as 'a dog'. In English, in order for a speaker to unambiguously indicate that the referent of an indefinite count noun is a specific entity, he may have to modify that noun with an adjective like 'certain', as is illustrated in the bracketed version of the translation of example (3) above.

Let us now return to the bilingual clauses in example (1). We may say that the Ewe-based distinction is applied in the distribution of the English nouns **BOY** and **PHONE** although this distinction is not made in English. We find that by occurring with **aɖe**, **BOY** makes reference to a specific-but-indefinite entity (i.e. the speaker has a particular boy in mind who she assumes her sister, the hearer, does not know). On the other hand, by occurring without an overt indefiniteness marker, **PHONE** expresses non-specific reference (i.e the speaker wants her hearer to know that a typical member of the class of entities called 'phone' was stolen). We find a similar distinction between the CS occurrences of **TEACHER** (which behaves like **BOY**) and **PARTY** (which behaves like **PHONE**) in the following example:

(4) **TEACHER aɖe FORM PARTY kpɔ-a? NEVER!**
Teacher a.certain form party before-Q Never
Has a teacher [that you know] ever formed a party? Never! (Asilevi 1990:70)

Here, the speaker challenges the hearer to name 'any' teacher (that he, the hearer, might have in mind) who has formed an organization that may generally be considered 'a (political) party'.

What the distribution of the English indefinite nouns in the bilingual clauses illustrates is their integration into Ewe-based frames in accordance with the Ewe morphosyntactic discrimination between specific and non-specific indefinite nouns. In other words, this distribution pattern highlights the codeswitchers' ability to map information about given lexemes from English onto the grammar of Ewe. This ability is reflected in several other areas of grammatical structure in Ewe-English CS. One such area, the distribution of English non-verbal predicates in Ewe-based copula constructions, is discussed in Amuzu (2005b). Another area, i.e. the distribution of English possessed nominals in Ewe-based adnominal possessive constructions, has been discussed in detail in Amuzu (2005d and forthcoming).

Further evidence of the bilingual's ability to combine information from two grammars in CS is found in the distribution of English verbs as CS items. Let us consider the distribution of the English verb **STAB** in (5):

(5) **Sydney nyɔnu aɖe STAB é-ƒe ahiavi kple BREAD KNIFE.**
Sydney woman INDEF stab 3sg-poss lover with breadknife
A Sydney woman stabbed her lover with a bread knife. (Amuzu 2005a:151)

The order of constituents in the bilingual clause in (5) mirrors **STAB**'s distribution pattern in English as represented in the English version. **STAB** is a change-of-state two-place verb that assigns thematic roles to two arguments. With the English free translation version in mind, note that **STAB** assigns the role of Agent to the subject argument (a Sydney woman) and the role of Patient to the object argument (her lover) and allows the preposition 'with' to assign the thematic role of instrumental to the optional third argument, (i.e. bread knife). We see this same pattern in the bilingual clause itself. Occurring in-between its subject (i.e Sydney **nyɔnu aɖe** 'a Sydney woman') and its object (**é-ƒe ahiavi** 'her lover'), **STAB** leaves **kple**, the Ewe counterpart of 'with', to introduce the third argument from English, **BREAD KNIFE**. This striking similarity between the distribution of **STAB** in the bilingual clause and its English version gives an erroneous impression that English exclusively constrains the structure of the bilingual clause. However, Ewe morphosyntactic procedures are very much at work in the distribution of **STAB** in (5).

The verb-slot of **STAB** in (5) is comparable to those of Ewe change-of-state verbs such as **lã** 'cut' and **ŋɔ** 'pierce' in (6) and (7):

(6) **Kofi lã te-a (kple hɛ)**
Kofi cut yam-DEF (with knife)
Kofi cut the yam (with knife). (Amuzu 1993:22)

(7) **Kofi ŋɔ bɔlu-a (kple hɛ)**
Kofi pierce ball-DEF with knife
Kofi pierced the ball with knife.

In other words, because **STAB** is a change-of-state verb, it is treated as though it is an Ewe change-of-state verb in the bilingual clause in (5). That is, the availability of Ewe change-of-state verbs like **lã** 'cut' and **ŋɔ** 'pierce' provides a syntactic model for the distribution of **STAB** as a CS verb. The significance of this point becomes clearer when we consider what happens with such English verbs in Akan-English CS.

Akan does not have change-of-state verbs that behave like the English **STAB** and the Ewe **lã** 'cut' and **ŋɔ** 'pierce' which allow a preposition to assign the thematic role of instrumental to an instrumental argument. Quarcoo (2009) notes that comparable change-of-state verbs in Akan are double object verbs whose instrumental argument is their second internal argument, as with **wɔ** 'pierce' in the following Akan version of example (5):

(8) **Sydney-nii baa bi wɔ-ɔ ne mpena sekan**
Sydney-sg Woman DET stab- PAST DET lover knife
A Sydney woman stabbed her lover with knife. (Quarcoo, 2009)

Note that **sekan** 'knife', the instrumental argument, is not introduced by any preposition. Since Akan change-of-state verbs do not require a preposition to introduce their instrumental argument, there is no syntactic model in which to accommodate an English change-of-state verb requiring a preposition to introduce an instrumental argument. Therefore, **STAB**, for instance, may not occur in Akan-English CS as it does in the Ewe-English CS example in (5) above. Example (9) below is also unacceptable even with 'with' because the preposition slot is simply not projectable from the standpoint of Akan syntax:

(9) **Sydney-nii baa bi STAB-o ne mpena *WITH BREAD KNIFE**
Sydney-sg woman DET stab - PAST DET lover
A Sydney woman stabbed her lover with bread knife.

STAB may, however, be accommodated as a single-object verb in Akan-English CS since Akan has the SVO structure to accommodate single-object verbs; in (10), the instrument used is inherent in the meaning of **STAB**, and this poses no problem from the standpoint of Akan syntax:

(10) **Sydney-nii baa bi stab-o ne mpena no**
Sydney-sg woman DET stab- PAST DET lover DET
A Sydney woman stabbed her lover. (Quarcoo, 2009)

What is evident in the distribution of **STAB** in Akan-English CS and Ewe-English CS is that the MT sets the grammatical frame into which an English verb is accommodated. Two issues have been highlighted. First, such an English verb ought to share the subcategorization features of MT verbs that occur in the type of verb-slot it fills, and second the CS verb-slot must be projectable from the standpoint of the syntax of the MT. These issues are reminiscent of what we found earlier with the distribution of English indefinite nouns in Ewe-based bilingual clauses: MT grammatical procedures are robustly upheld in CS at the same time that grammatical requirements of English lexemes are accommodated.

We now return to Ewe-English CS. Example (11) below illustrates further the fact that in Ewe-English CS English lexemes are distributed in the way in which Ewe lexemes with analogous subcategorization features are distributed. **BROWSE** is a transitive verb that occurs in (11) in an SOV clause structure following a morphosyntactic principle that applies in Ewe transitive clauses with imperfective aspects. (Note that in English, **BROWSE** would have occurred in an SVO clause as shown in the English version):

(11) **LINE-a nɔ BUSY eleabe me nɔ INTERNET BROWSE-m**
Line-DEF be busy because 1sg beNPRES -PROG
The line was busy because I was brousing the Internet.

In Ewe transitive clauses with imperfective aspects (i.e. progressive/PROG or the ingressive/INGR aspect), the object comes in-between the auxiliary verb that indicates tense (or direction) and the main verb, and the result is an SOV structure (cf. Ameka 1994 and Amuzu 1998:43-44). Accordingly, in (11), the object NP (**INTERNET**) occurs between the auxiliary verb **nɔ** 'be' and **BROWSE**, which carries the Ewe progressive morpheme –**m**.

It is significant to note, however, that it is not all English lexemes that may be integrated fully into Ewe-based frames. English attributive adjectives are examples. In English, attributive adjectives come before their head nouns but in Ewe they come after them. This means that there is no pre-head slot in the Ewe NP that matches the distributional subcategorization of English attributive adjectives. The result of this incompatibility is that they are blocked wholesale from coming before Ewe head nouns.[2] Thus, we find in the following examples that various English adjectives cannot occur before the Ewe head noun **aɖaká** 'box':

(12) **Wó á-nɔ *BIG aɖaká má me.**
3PL POT-be big box that inside
They would be in that big box.

(13) **Wó á-nɔ *NEW aɖaká má me.**
3PL POT-be new box that inside
They would be in that new box.

(14) **Wó á-nɔ *LOCKED aɖaká má me.**
3PL POT-be locked box that inside
They would be in that locked box.

[2] Some of the English adjectives, however, are allowed into the post-modifier adjective slot in the Ewe NP, a pattern we shall discuss in detail in Section 2.2 below.

Interestingly, however, English adjectives regularly find their way into Ewe-based mixed NPs without violating the post-head rule for attributive adjectives in the Ewe NP. One method is exemplified in (15). Here, the adjective **BIG** functions as a preposed modifier of an English head noun, **BOX**, thereby creating a well-formed English NP (big box). The underlined NP in (15) acquires its bilinguality from the fact that **BOX** is modified by the demonstrative **ma** 'that' which occurs as a post-posed modifier in accordance with word order in the Ewe NP (a demonstrative is a preposed modifier in the English NP):

(15) **Wó á-nɔ BIG BOX ma me.**
3PL POT-be big box that inside
They would be in <u>that big box</u> (Amuzu 1998:77)

The expression **BIG BOX** is an example of what Myers-Scotton has called *Embedded Language Island* (see Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002 and Amuzu 2005a). An embedded language island is a syntactic unit that is a well-formed expression in its language but is inserted into the syntactic structure of another language. This configuration is more clearly illustrated by the pattern in (16):

(16) **Nye YOUNGER BROTHERS-wó katã wó SHAVE-na…**
1sg younger brothers -PL all 3PL shave- HAB
<u>All my younger brothers</u>, they shave… (Amuzu 1998:72)

YOUNGER occurs as a preposed modifier of **BROTHERS** thereby creating an English NP. This NP is then embedded or integrated into a larger Ewe-based NP frame in which it is flanked on one side by **nye** (1sg person possessive) and on the other by both **wó** (PL) and **katã** 'all'. **YOUNGER** may not come before **nɔviwó** 'sibiling', the near Ewe counterpart of **BROTHERS**, because that sequence would have violated word order in the Ewe NP:

(17) **Nye *YOUNGER nɔvi -wó katã wó SHAVE-na…**
1sg younger sibiling PL all 3pl shave-HAB
All my younger brothers, they shave…

Indeed, many English NP islands containing adjectives are lexicalized phrases[3] which enter mixed NPs intact: see **ELECTRICAL FAULT** in (18a) and **EXECUTIVE MEMBER** in (18b).

(18) a. **Né ELECTRICAL FAULT aɖe vá lá…**
If electrical fault some come TP
When an electrical fault occurs…. (Asilevi 1990:48)

(18) b. **Wóawó-e nyé-na EXECUTIVE MEMBER -wó kple PATRONS-wó**
3PL -FOC be-HAB executive member -PL and patrons -PL
They normally are the executive members and patrons. (Asilevi 1990:70)

[3] I use the term 'lexicalised phrase' in the sense in which Chafe (1994: 113) used it: 'conventional collocations that are already established in the speaker's repertoire'.

Ewe-English bilinguals have an even more innovative strategy than the one shown in the examples above for overcoming the mass blocking of English attributive adjectives in CS. By the strategy, they 'smuggle' English attributive adjectives into the post-posed modifier adjective slot in the Ewe NP. The strategy, like the earlier-mentioned one, is also characterized by the use of an English NP island. This island is a unit in which the English adjective first modifies the pronoun **ONE** which it precedes and thereby forms an NP with. **ONE** is coreferential with an appositional noun which, following Ewe NP structure, occurs to its left and is modified by it. It is exemplified in the occurrence of **BEST ONE** and **BRIGHT ONE** in (20a) and (20b) respectively:

(20) a. **Gake fifia, hadziha BEST ONE a wóawó si wo le**
But now choir best one the 3PL hand 3sg be.atPRES
But now, they have <u>the best choir</u>. (Amuzu 1998:79)

(20) b. **Tsɔ akaɖi BRIGHT ONE si le CORNER kemɛ dzí...**
Take lantern bright one REL be over.there upper_surface
Bring <u>the bright lantern</u> that is in the corner over there to me.
(Amuzu 1998:80)

In (20a), **BEST** functions as preposed modifier of the pronominal form **ONE**. Because **ONE** refers back to the head-of-phrase noun, **hadziha** 'choir', **BEST** too gets to indirectly modify **hadziha**. The unit **BEST ONE** should be seen as an embedded island because it is followed by the Ewe definite article **a** 'the', which also functions as a post-posed modifier of **hadziha**. In (20b) too, **BRIGHT** modifies **ONE** and the resulting unit (**BRIGHT ONE**) functions as post-posed modifier of **akaɖi** 'lantern'. Here again, because the overall planning of the mixed NP is under the control of word/constituent order rules in the Ewe NP, **akaɖi** is further modified by an Ewe-based relative clause introduced by **si** 'which'.

The use of English adjective-**ONE** islands as post-posed modifiers of Ewe noun heads is a compromise strategy aimed at preventing the violation of the rules of both grammars. First, by modifying the English pronoun **ONE**, the English adjective retains its preposed modifier status. Second, by being part of the adjective-**ONE** NP that functions as post-posed modifier of the Ewe head noun, the English adjective does not impose its preposed modifier status on the bilingual NP structure, for that would have compromised Ewe NP grammar.

But perhaps the more significant thing about the placement of these English adjective-**ONE** islands is the fact that as elsewhere in the CS grammar such placement is guided by the distribution of a similar unit in the Ewe NP. I am talking about the placement of the Ewe adjective-**tɔ** unit, illustrated in (21).

(21) **ŋutsu lolo-tɔ a gbɔ**
man fat-ONE the return
<u>The man who is fat</u> has returned. (Amuzu 2005a:188)

Here, **lolo** 'fat' is suffixed by the pronoun **tɔ**, the Ewe equivalent of **ONE**, which is coreferential with the head-of-phrase noun, **ŋutsu** 'man'. Notice that like **BEST ONE** and **BRIGHT ONE**, **lolo tɔ** 'fat one' occurs in-between the head noun and another post-posed modifier, the Ewe definite article **a** 'the'. In other words, the English adjective-**ONE** unit is not being treated differently from the way Ewe

adjective-**tɔ** unit is treated: the latter creates the model for the CS distribution of the former.

1.2 SUMMARY AND IMPLICATIONS OF THE CS GRAMMATICAL PATTERNS

The main characteristic that we have shown so far is that Ewe plays a central role as the language of CS grammar. We saw that English lexemes occur singly in slots in Ewe-based frames where Ewe lexemes with similar subcategorisation features occur. We also saw that if there are no Ewe lexemes with the subcategorisation requirements of an English lexeme (as is the case with attributive adjectives), Ewe cannot provide a ready frame to accommodate that lexeme, and the result is that it has to occur as part of an English embedded island, in an accommodating Ewe-based frame. I summarize below evidence of these characteristics:

First, we discussed the distribution of English specific versus non-specific indefinite nouns in CS contexts. Although both types of English indefinite nouns are modified by the article 'a' in the English NP, their distribution differs in CS contexts. Following Ewe morphosyntactic procedures, a specific-but-indefinite English noun is modified by the Ewe indefinite article **ade** 'a certain' while a non-specific indefinite English noun occurs without any overt marking (see the discussion of examples 1 through to 4).

Our next set of examples concern the distribution of English verbs. The occurrence of the verb **STAB** in (5) in Ewe-English CS and in (8-10) in Akan-English CS, and that of **BROWSE** in (11) show that English verbs are given the morphosyntactic treatment reserved for Ewe verbs with similar subcategorization features. **STAB** is a change-of-state verb and accordingly distributes like an Ewe/Akan change-of-state verb, and a difference in **STAB**'s distribution in Ewe-English CS and Akan-English CS was highlighted to support this claim. **BROWSE** too occurs in an SOV structure because (i) it is a transitive verb and (ii) in Ewe transitive verbs with imperfective aspect occur in this kind of structure.

The distribution pattern of English attributive adjectives constitutes further evidence of the CS characteristics under discussion. They are barred from occurring as preposed modifiers of Ewe nouns because there is no preposed modifier slot for adjectives in the Ewe NP (i.e. there are no lexemes like them in Ewe whose preposed modifier slot may be used to accommodate them). To be used as CS forms, they have to occur as part of English NPs which are integrated, as embedded islands, in larger Ewe-based NPs.

The phenomenon outlined above may be viewed as evidence of two inter-connected CS rules, namely (i) that Ewe grammar is not to be compromised under CS and (ii) that English lexemes may only occur in slots in Ewe-based frames if they possess the subcategorization features of the Ewe morphemes which occur in those slots. I see this phenomenon as evidence of an ongoing maintenance of the Ewe grammar because it limits contact-induced grammatical interference from / convergence to English. As I have also briefly shown with Akan-English CS, it is not far fetched to generalize and say that this phenomenon is playing out in CS involving other Ghanaian languages and English (more evidence for this generalization will be discussed in later sections).

What is happening in Ghana contrasts with what is being reported about CS in Europe and Northern America. Much of the reports from there indicate that there is a prevalence of convergence of mother tongues of codeswitching youths (who are generally intermediate or second generation immigrants) to the grammars of the

dominant / host languages with which their mother tongues are in intensive CS contact. Some of such reports are Schmitt's (2000) discussion of English grammatical influence on the Russian spoken by immigrant children in America and Bolonyai's (1998, 2000) similar study of the Hungarian of immigrant youths also in America. Turkker (2000) too documents ongoing Turkish convergence to Norwegian among codeswitching intermediate and second generation Turkish immigrants in Norway.

The following is an example of convergence of Russian to English discussed in Schmitt (2000). The example was produced by a child whose L1 was Russian but who had been living in America for six years, with English becoming his more dominant language because he was 'losing Russian rapidly' (Schmitt 2000:9). Schmitt considers the distribution of the English lexeme **HEAVEN** (22i) deviant from the point of view of Russian because it is missing the Russian case marker **-e** (see 22ii), which should suffix a Russian nominal that has been en-prefixed by the locative preposition **v** 'in':

(22) i. **Nu, yest' baseball v HEAVEN?** (Child's CS)
Well is baseball in heaven

ii. **Nu, yest' baseball v HEAVEN-e?** (Standard Russian-Eng. CS)
Well is baseball in -PREP/MASC/SG
Well, is there baseball in heaven? (Schmitt 2000:23)

Schmitt explains that because of the child's waning ability in Russian in favour of English, 'the level of activation of [English] rises so that it competes with [Russian] in projecting the frame' of the bilingual PP (p.24). **HEAVEN** emerges without the **–e** postposition because it comes into the Russian grammatical structure with its English-origin subcategorisation, which includes no suffix slot for the **–e** postposition, and the resulting configuration shows no respect for Russian's morphosyntactic requirement for this postposition.

Schmitt however makes a point about the CS of adult Russians which is very important here. She notes that an adult Russian codeswitcher would not have omitted the **–e** postposition (see 22ii above):

> […] any proficient speaker of Russian would be able to select the appropriate prepositional case and mark it with affix **–e** producing the form **v HEAVEN-e** 'in heaven' which would satisfy the requirements of the MLF model. (Schmitt 2000, p.23)

In other words, the adult Russian treats **HEAVEN** in the same way that he would have treated a Russian locative nominal in such use.

A similar distinction is made between children and adult Hungarian codeswitchers by Bolonyai (1998), cited in Myers-Scotton (2001). Bolonyai attributes (23i) to "a Hungarian child whose L1 is Hungarian, but who is growing up in the United States, with English becoming her dominant language" (Myers-Scotton 2001:52). The monolingual Hungarian equivalent of the child's CS expression appears in (23ii) and the adult Hungarian-English CS version appears in (23iii):

(23) i. **játsz-ok SCHOOL-ot** (Child's CS)
play-1sg/PRES/SUB.CONJ -ACC
I'm playing school.

ii**. iskolá-s-at játsz-ok** (Standard Hungarian)

iii. **SCHOOL-os-at játsz-ok** (Adult Hungarian-English CS)
(Myers-Scotton 2001:53; Bolonyai 1998:34)

In (23i), according to Bolonyai, the child mapped the English argument structure of **SCHOOL** (=Locative) onto Hungarian instead of conceptualizing it as Actor, i.e. in terms of its Hungarian equivalent, **iskolás** ('schooler' Bolonyai 1998). The result is that in (23i), (a) verb placement is according to English, not Hungarian (see example 23ii), and (b) the Hungarian suffix for Actor –**s** is missing before the accusative marker on the codeswitched form **SCHOOL**. Note that in the adult CS version in (23iii), **SCHOOL** is duly conceptualized as Actor and carries the suffix-**s** and precedes the verb and subject in accordance with Huangarian grammar.

What is evident about adult Russian and Hungarian codeswitchers is that being first-generation immigrants and still proficient in their mother tongues they are like Ewe-English bilinguals in Ghana who are utilizing CS mechanisms that protect the grammar of their mother tongues. Unfortunately, they are unable to pass these mother-tongue maintenance mechanisms on to their children, because the children lack the level of grammatical proficiency in their mother tongues to enable them utilize such mechanisms.

Indeed, the distinction that Schmitt (2000) and Bolonyai (1998) make between the CS of first-generation immigrants and that of their children can be seen as an example of what may happen among Ghanaians living in Europe and North America. While no study has as yet been carried out among intermediate- and second-generation Ghanaian immigrants growing up in those places, some works have appeared on CS among the adults, who are first-generation immigrants. Examples include some instances of CS that I gathered on Ewe-English CS in Norway and Australia and have discussed in Amuzu (1998 and 2005a, and in this paper: see example (5) above in which the verb **STAB** is used). Dzameshie (1994 and 1996) also discussed data gathered on Ewe-English CS in America. The CS patterns observed from those data sets do not reflect any departures from the patterns being observed in Ghana: the grammar of Ewe is not being compromised in CS constituents. Guerini (2006 and forthcoming) also seems to have arrived at the same conclusion about the Akan-English CS data that she gathered from first-generation Akans living in Italy. What seems predictable from the insights emerging about CS in Europe and North America is that if younger generations of codeswitching Ghanaians residing there fail to acquire tacit knowledge of grammaticality in their mother tongues, their mother tongues will sooner than later begin to show signs of convergence to the dominant host languages they use in CS.

2. THE BILINGUAL'S LEXICONS: DISTINCTIONS BEING MADE

2.1. ENGLISH VERBS THAT MAY OCCUR AS SINGLE CS FORMS AND THOSE THAT MAY NOT

In discussing aspects of grammatical structure in Section 1.1, we encountered some English verbs, namely **FORM** (example 4), **STAB** (5), **BROWSE** (11), and **SHAVE** (16), which occurred successfully as fully-integrated singly-occurring verbs in Ewe-based bilingual clauses. The main point to be made in this section, however, is that it is not all English verbs that are acceptable as singly-occurring verbs in bilingual clauses. For instance, **GO**, **COME**, **KNOW**, **SEE**, **LOOK**, **EAT**, **WANT**, **SAY**,

TELL, **GIVE** and **BUY** cannot occur as singly-occurring verbs in Ewe-based bilingual VPs. The following clauses are unacceptable because of the English verbs:

(24) **Ama mé le suku *GO-gé o a**
Ama NEG bePRES school go -INGR NEG Q
Won't Ama go to school?

(25) **Kofi *COME-gé etsɔ**
Kofi come -INGR yesterday
Kofi will be coming tomorrow.

(26) **Nye-mé *KNOW be e- dzi vi o ɖɛ!**
1sg-NEG know COMP 2sg deliver child NEG Addr
I didn't know that you have delivered a baby. (Amuzu 1998:61)

(27) **Yi na-*SEE be papa gbɔ hã**
Go SUBJ-see COMP father return PT
Go and find out whether daddy has come back.

(28) **Me nane *LOOK-m**
1sg something look-PROG
I am watching something.

(29) **Vi-a-wó la, mɔlu ko wó *EAT-na.**
Child-DEF-PL TOP, rice only 3PL eat-HAB
His/her children, they eat only rice.

(30) **ƑFome-a a-*WANT be wó-a tsɔ nyá-a yi ɖe**
Family-DEF POT-want COMP 3PL.SUBJ take case-DEF go to
se gbɔ e
law side FOC
The family would want that the case be taken to court.

(31) **Mama-nye *SAY-na é-ƒe dɔmenyawó na-m.**
Grandma-1sg say-HAB 3sg-poss secrets to-1sg
My grandma says all her secrets to me (i.e. she tells me all her secrets).

(32) **Đe me di be ma *TELL wo hafi.**
pFOC 1sg want COMP 1sg-SUBJ tell 2sg before
I had wanted to tell you.

(33) **Né ame-áɖe á-*GIVE-m ʋuɖoga la…**
If person-INDEF POT-give-1sg lorry_fare TP
If someone can give me money for transport…

(34) **Ne e-yi asi-a me la, *BUY adzale na -m.**
When 2sg-go market-DEF inside TP, buy soap for 1sg
When you go to the market buy me some soap.

Interestingly, Forson (1979:183-184) also names **COME**, **GO**, **SEE** and **KNOW** as English verbs that may not occur singly in Akan-based bilingual VPs. One example he gives is the following:

(35) **ɔ-re- *GO fie.**
3sg-PROG-go home
He/she is going home. (Forson 1979:183)

Nyarko Ansah's (2006) following examples confirm Forson's assertion:

(36) a. **M'-a- *SEE MORE CLEARLY NOW**
1sg-Perf- see more clearly now
I see more clearly now. (Nyarko Ansah 2006)

(36) b. **M'-a- *KNOW ME LEFT AND RIGHT**
1sg-Perf-1sg know me left and right
I know my left and right. (Nyarko Ansah 2006)

In an attempt to explain why the verbs he names are blocked from entering Akan-based bilingual VPs, Forson (1979:183-184) turned to features of everyday Akan discourse. He observes that the unacceptable English verbs are all counterparts of Akan verbs that are frequently used in Akan-based discourse.[4] He therefore intimated (p.183) that if an Akan verb is 'commonly-used', then chances are that its English counterpart cannot occur as a CS form unless it occurs as part of 'some idiomatic expression (e.g., **εyε 1965 na o-GO INTO BUSINESS** [it was in 1965 that it went into business; and] … **a-COME TO THE CONSIDERATION** [it come to the consideration])'.

Forson's explanation takes care of the unacceptability of all the English verbs cited in the Ewe-English CS examples above: they are blocked because their Ewe counterparts are, arguably, high-frequency verbs in Ewe-based discourse. But attention needs to be drawn to the fact that it is NOT all English equivalents of the frequent Ewe/Akan verbs that are blocked from appearing in mixed VPs. For example, **ɖu** typically covers a wide range of meanings which in English may be expressed by **EAT**, **CHEW**, **CONSUME**, **SPEND**, **SQUANDER**, etc, depending on the context. But of these, only **EAT** (as was shown in example 29 above) may NOT occur singly in a mixed VP. English equivalents of another frequent Ewe verb, **kpɔ**, include **SEE**, **LOOK**, **WATCH**, **NOTICE**, **OBSERVE**, **FIND OUT**, **DISCOVER**, and **CONSULT**. Again, as with the equivalents of **ɖu**, some of these verbs are allowed into mixed VPs. Unlike **SEE** and **LOOK**, which as shown in (27) and (28) respectively cannot occur singly as CS verbs, **WATCH**, **NOTICE**, **OBSERVE**, **FIND OUT**, **DISCOVER**, **STARE**, and **CONSULT** may do so. In fact, both **OBSERVE** and **NOTICE** may replace **LOOK** in (28) above. The occurrence of **FIND OUT** is illustrated in:

(37) **NO, e- dze be wó a- FIND OUT FIRST**, **wó a- FIND OUT**
No 3sg settle COMP 3PL FUT find out first 3PL FUT find

[4] Forson relies on the judgements of native speakers about the frequency status of lexical items and apparently interprets the judgements as reasonable guesswork only. I share Forson's attitude because I am aware that more reliable methods of determining frequency of words in languages exist in Corpus Linguistics.

be é- li hãã.
COMP 3sg be.located too
No, they have to find out first, they have to find out whether he is around.
(Amuzu 1998:45)

Let us now turn to the equivalents of **gblɔ**, which include **SAY**, **TELL**, **INFORM** and **NARRATE**. Of these, **SAY** and **TELL** may not occur as CS forms (as is already evidenced in 32 and 33 respectively), but **INFORM** and **NARRATE** may do so as we find in the following examples:

(38) a. **W. hã nyá ko ye wo INFORM mí LAST MINUTE be ….**
W. too know PT so 3sg inform 1PL last minute COMP…
W. too knows so he informed us at last minute that… (Amuzu 1998:118)

(38) b. **Wo nɔ Agbezuge ƒe nutsinya NARRATE -m.**
3PL beNPRES Agbezugbe. poss biography narrate -PROG
Agbezuge's story was being narrated.

A scrutiny of the English equivalents of the Ewe verbs mentioned above reveals that those among them (the English equivalents) that may not occur singly as CS verbs encode the generic sense of the Ewe verb in question whereas those that may do so encode more specific or specialized shades of the meanings of that Ewe verb. Let us take equivalents of **ɖu** for example. Note that **EAT** (which may not occur singly as a CS verb) encodes the generic shade of the meaning of **ɖu** whereas **CHEW**, **CONSUME**, **DEPLETE**, **SPEND**, **SQUANDER**, etc (which may occur singly as CS verbs) encode specific/specialized shades of the meaning of **ɖu**. In fact, the distinction I am making here draws on Dixon's (1982) distinction between *nuclear* and *non-nuclear* verbs.[5] Dixon hypothesises that "verbs in any language can be divided into two groups – nuclear and non-nuclear [verbs]." He lists **TELL**, **SEE**, **GIVE**, **BURN**, **HIT**, **LAUGH** (p63) and **LOOK** (p.73) as some English nuclear verbs and illustrates the distinction with **LOOK** vs. **STARE** as follows:

> **LOOK** is a nuclear verb, whereas **STARE** is a non-nuclear verb; **STARE** could semantically be defined as, say, **LOOK HARD**…(Dixon 1982:73)

The point that has to be reiterated here is that the data discussed so far show that Ewe-English bilinguals do recognize the distinction between English generic (Dixon's nuclear) verbs and English specialized (Dixon's non-nuclear) verbs and conventionally refrain from using the former as CS verbs. In other words, we may revise Forson's (1979) explanation of the blocking of such English verbs as **EAT**, **LOOK**, **SEE**, and **GO** by stating that it is not any English counterpart of a "frequent" Ewe/Akan verb that is blocked but only those which are generic verbs.

We may illustrate this revision further with English counterparts of the Ewe verb **nya**, namely **KNOW**, **REALIZE**, and **UNDERSTAND**. Of these, **KNOW** is arguably the generic verb, and as already shown in (26) above, it is not acceptable as a CS form. But note that both **REALIZE** and **UNDERSTAND**, which are arguably more specialized siblings of **KNOW**, are acceptable in the following versions of (26):

[5] It is also inspired by Backus's (2001:141) 'specificity hypothesis' which also makes a similar distinction between 'specific' and 'general' words.

(39) a. **Nye-mé REALIZE be e- dzi vi o ɖɛ!**
1sg-NEG realize COMP 2sg deliver child NEG Addr
I didn't realize that you have delivered a baby.

(39) b. **Nye-mé UNDERSTAND be e- dzi vi o ɖɛ!**
1sg-NEG understand COMP 2sg deliver child NEG Addr
I didn't understand that you have delivered a baby.

I do not, however, intend to formulate my thesis here in absolute terms, for I am aware that there would be exceptions. Dixon (1982) tells us, for instance, that **BURN** is an English generic verb. The Ewe counterpart of this verb is **bì**, and going by the trend observed above **BURN** should not be accepted as CS verb. But it is:

(40) **Me kpɔ-m be nane BURN-m o-a**
3sg.NEG see-PROG COMP something burn -PROG NEG-Q
Can't you see that something is burning?

I cannot assume matter-of-factly that the perssimibility of **BURN** in (40) means that **bì** is not a frequent Ewe verb. What (40) points to, instead, is the fact that a more comprehensive work still needs to be done before we can formulate a clear hypothesis about the acceptability or otherwise of single English verbs in Ewe-English CS. One thing from the foregoing is sure, however: there is a verb filter aimed at blocking some English verbs from occurring as CS forms. And the question is, 'what does the existence of that filter imply?'

From Dixon's (1982) distinction between generic and specialized verbs, we can imagine that generic verbs constitute the core of a language's verbal lexicon. In this connection, then, we may say that Ewe and Akan generic verbs are not being switched by their generic English counterparts because speakers treat them as part of the core verbal lexicon of their languages. In other words, the verb filter contraining CS is ensuring the preservation of Ewe/Akan core verbal lexicon, and this filter may be regarded as a language maintenance device. However, it seems the filter is not leakage-proof in all speech communities in Ghana. Nyarko Ansah (2006) gives the following example as an acceptable Fante- (i.e. Akan-) English CS utterance.

(41) **M'a-TELL hɔn**
1sg-perf-tell 3PL
I have told them. (Nyarko Ansah, 2006)

TELL is the generic verb equivalent of the Akan verb **kà** and should be blocked if the filter rigidly applies in Fante-English CS.

It is important to recall at this point what Forson (1979:183) said, that although verbs like **GO**, **SEE**, and **KNOW** may not occur singly in CS contexts, they may do so as part of phrasal predicates or idiomatic expressions. This is what we find in the occurrence of **LOOK** in (42a):

(42) a. **Me ka ɖe e-dzi be wó a- LOOK INTO nya ma wó**
1sg sure COMP 3PL FUT- look into matter that PL
I am certain that they will look into that matter.

Here, **LOOK** is part of the expression **LOOK INTO**, which goes beyond its generic verb-of-perception meaning to mean 'to consider'; recall that **LOOK** as a singly-occurring verb was unacceptable in its generic meaning in example (28) above. Similarly, although **SEE** is unacceptable as a singly-occurring CS verb in (29) above, it is acceptable in (42b) as part of the idiomatic expression **SEE EYE TO EYE**:

(42) b. **Mawunyo kple nɔvi-a wó me SEE-na EYE TO EYE o**
M.awunyo and sibling-DEF PL NEG see -HAB eye to eye NEG
Mawunyo and his siblings don't see eye to eye.

The idiomatic expressions and phrasal predicates express specialized meanings, which is why they are acceptable CS forms.

2.2. ENGLISH ATTRIBUTIVE ADJECTIVES THAT ARE ACCEPTABLE AS CS FORMS AND THOSE THAT ARE NOT

In the later part of Section 1.1, we observed that there is mass blocking of English attributive adjectives from occurring as preposed modifiers of Ewe head nouns because there is no such slot in the Ewe NP into which to accommodate them (see examples 12-14). Indeed, there is also a blocking of the English adjectives from entering the post-posed modifier slot of Ewe attributive adjectives, as the unacceptability of the following versions of examples (12-14) attest:

(43) a. **Wó á-nɔ aɖaká *BIG ma me.**
3PL POT-be box big that inside
They would be in that big box.

(43) b. **Wó á-nɔ aɖaká *NEW ma me.**
3PL POT-be box new that inside
They would be in that new box.

(43) c. **Wó á-nɔ aɖaká *LOCKED ma me.**
3PL POT-be box locked that inside
They would be in that locked box.

As noted in Section 1.1, an English adjective may only function as a post-posed modifier of an Ewe head noun if it occurs in the adjectival postmodifier slot as part of an embedded English NP in which it modifies the English pronoun **ONE**. This is what we saw in examples (20a) and (20b) above where the ADJECTIVE+**ONE** unit functions as a post-head modifier of an Ewe noun, coming between that noun and its demonstrative determiner **ma** 'that'. This pattern is further illustrated below:

(44) a. **Wó á-nɔ aɖaká BIG ONE ma me.**
3PL POT-be box big one that inside
They would be in that big box.

(44) b. **Wó á-nɔ aɖaká NEW ONE ma me.**
3PL POT-be box new one that inside
They would be in that new box.

(44) c. **Wó á-nɔ aɖaká LOCKED ONE ma me.**
3PL POT-be box locked one that inside
They would be in <u>that locked box</u>.

There are, however, a few exceptions to the blocking of single-word English adjectivals from functioning as post-posed modifiers of Ewe nouns. Most of them are colour adjectives[6]. In (45) below, for instance, **GREEN** functions as a post-posed modifier of **ʋu** 'car' and in (46) **RED** also functions as a post-posed modifier of **awu** 'shirt'. Note that in each NP some other modifiers, from Ewe, occur in slots that conform to the order of distribution of morphemes in the Ewe NP:

(45) **Neném ʋu GREEN aɖe -wó vá yi fifilaa**
Such car green some -PL come go just.now
<u>Some green cars of that kind</u> have just passed. (Amuzu 1998:78)

(46) **Tsɔ awu RED ma ko na-WASH ná-m**
Take shirt red that only SUBJ wash for-1sg
Take <u>only the red shirt</u> and wash it for me. (Amuzu 1998:78)

But it is not all English colour terms which are acceptable as post-posed modifiers of Ewe nouns. Noun-like colour descriptors like **WINE**, **INDIGO**, and **CREAM** are not acceptable there. For example, my respondents insisted that they would not say the following versions of (46):

(47) a. **Tsɔ awu *WINE ma ko na-WASH ná-m**
Take shirt that only SUBJ for-1sg

(47) b. **Tsɔ awu *INDIGO ma ko na-WASH ná-m**

(47) c. **Tsɔ awu *CREAM ma ko na-WASH ná-m**

A handful of English non-colour adjectives too occur as post-posed modifiers of Ewe nouns. One of them is **FINE**, as used in (48):

(48) **Ameka-e nyé nyɔnuvi FINE ma le afe-a-me**
Who-FOC be girl fine that at house-the-inside
Who is <u>that fine girl</u> in the house? (Amuzu 2005a:24)

When **FINE** is construed as a physical property adjective, as is intended here, it may be understood as a synonym of such adjectives as **BEAUTIFUL**, **PRETTY** and **CUTE**. Yet, none of these adjectives may replace **FINE** as a post-posed modifier of **nyɔnuvi**:

(49) **Ameka-e nyé nyɔnuvi *BEAUTIFUL ma le afe -a -me?**
Who-FOC be girl beautiful that at house-the-inside

[6] Following Dixon (1982: 16ff) I recognize at least seven types of English adjectives: (1) colour: **RED**, **GREEN**, etc; (2) dimension: **BIG**, **SHORT**,**WIDE**, etc; (3) physical property: **HARD**, **HEAVY**, **COLD**, **SWEET**; (4) human propensity: **HONEST**,**CRUEL**, **HAPPY**, **JEALOUS**, **CULTURED**; (5) age: **OLD**, **YOUNG**, **NEW**; (6) value: **FINE**, **GOOD**, **BAD**, **EXCELLENT**, **POOR**, and (7) speed: **FAST**, **QUICK**, **SLOW**, etc.

(50) **Ameka-e nyé nyɔnuvi *PRETTY ma le aʃe- a- me?**

(51) **Ameka-e nyé nyɔnuvi *CUTE ma le aʃe -a -me?**

Another codeswitchable English adjective is **PLAIN** as it is used in (52):

(52) **E-nyé nyateʃe PLAIN be gatɔwó kplé nunɔmesitɔwó-e**
3sg-be truth plain COMP the.rich and property.owners-aFOC

FORM-na PARTY.
form -HAB party
It is the plain truth that it's the rich and wealthy who form a party.
(Asilevi 1990:70)

PLAIN as used here is a value adjective. In this use it may be seen as a synonym of such adjectives as **PURE**, **REAL**, **SIMPLE**, **BARE** and **BASIC**. But of these, only **PURE** is found to be an acceptable replacement for **PLAIN**:

(53) a. **E-nyé nyateʃe PURE be….**
3sg-be truth pure COMP

(53) b. **E-nyé nyateʃe *REAL be….**

(53) c. **E-nyé nyateʃe *SIMPLE be….**

(53) d. **E-nyé nyateʃe *BARE be….**

(53) e. **E-nyé nyateʃe *BASIC be….**

So, the question is this: 'What linguistic knowledge regulates the acceptability or otherwise of a singly-occurring English adjective in a post-head adjective slot in a mixed NP?' This is a very crucial question. And to answer it, we need to remember that it is the structural conflict between English and Ewe regarding the distribution of attributive adjectives that causes the blocking of the English adjectives as CS forms in the first place. By making exception of some of the adjectives, Ewe-English bilinguals seem to be suggesting that they are willing to perceive those adjectives as reasonably compatible with the post-head adjective slot in the Ewe NP. Our next question, then, is this: 'Why should they be willing to perceive those English adjectives as reasonably compatible with the post-head adjective slot in the Ewe NP?'

Sebba (1995, 1998) provides what I think is a reliable answer to this second question. Writing about how bilinguals 'construct' congruence across categories of their different languages, he declares that

Congruent categories are categories of the grammar which are treated as "the same" in L1 and L2 by bilinguals… [C]ongruence is not just a function of the syntax of the languages involved. The locus of congruence is the mind of the speaker, but community norms determine, by and large, the behaviour of individual speakers. (Sebba 1995: 232)

His point is that congruence of categories across bilinguals' languages is a function of their *perception* of the degree of linguistic similarities among those categories. He implies therefore that bilinguals may afford to be subjective about the nature of congruence they construct across given categories in two languages, but their

subjectivity would have to be constrained by norms or conventions in their speech community.

It may be inferred from Sebba's thesis that the Ewe-English bilinguals choose (unconsciously as it were) to be subjective about the degree of compatibility that exists between some English attributive adjectives and the post-head adjective slot in the Ewe NP so that they can use those adjectives in that slot. Also in keeping with Sebba's thesis, concerning the role of speech conventions, the bilinguals are not free to use English adjectives that are not members of the close class of 'congruent' adjectives in the said slot. They perceive those adjectives as failing to make it through the lexical filter for "compatible" adjectives (recall from Section 2.1 that the same bilinguals operate with a lexical filter for English verbs).

Evidence from the CS literature in Ghana shows that it is not only Ewe-English bilinguals who choose to 'construct' congruence between *some* English adjectives and the post-head adjective slot in their mother tongue NP. Akan- and Daŋme-English bilinguals also use some English adjectives in mixed NPs that are headed by mother tongue nouns. For instance, Mensah (1992:26) provides example (54a) in which **CRAZY** (a human propensity adjective) occurs as a post-modifier of an Akan noun, i.e. in accordance with Akan NP grammar:

(54) a. **Ne ba CRAZY bi no**
3sg child crazy some that
That stupid child of his (Akan-English CS; Mensah 1992:26)

Nartey (1982) also gives example (54b) from Daŋme -English CS in which **SLIM** (a physical property adjective) occurs as a post-modifier of **yoyo** 'girl' in accordance with Daŋme NP grammar:

(54) b. **yoyo SLIM ko**
girl slim DEF
The slim girl (Daŋme -English CS; Nartey 1982:187)

Now, because, as indicated, it is speech community conventions which determine whether speakers may use given English adjectives in mixed NPs, and since speech conventions in one community may not hold in another speech community, it happens that the English adjectives that bilinguals in one speech community accept in their CS are rejected by bilinguals in another speech community. For example, although **CRAZY** (54a) is acceptable as a CS form to Akan-English bilinguals, it is not acceptable in mixed NPs to most Ewe-English bilinguals whom I consulted:

(55) a. **E-via *CRAZY ade**
3sg-child crazy a.certain (Ewe-English CS version of 54a)

Similarly, **SLIM** (54b), the adjective that is acceptable as a CS form to Daŋme -English bilinguals, is unacceptable to most Ewe-English bilinguals I consulted:

(55) b. **nyɔnuvi *SLIM ade**
Girl slim a.certain (Ewe-English CS version of 54b)

In this section, we revisited the claim made earlier in Section 1.1 that the bilinguals refrain from using English attributive adjectives as preposed modifiers of

mother tongue nouns because they see that distribution pattern as a violation of their mother tongue NP grammars.[7] They however accept some of the English adjectives in the post-head slot of their Ewe counterparts, a pattern that preserves the integrity of their mother tongue grammars. However, as shown, many English adjectives are blocked from even this slot, a fact that will ensure that mass relexification of Ewe adjectives does not take place.

3. SIGNIFICANCE OF FINDINGS FOR CONTACT LINGUISTICS

In this paper we discussed some mechanisms of L1 maintenance in codeswitching involving English in Ghana and attempted to describe the nature of the codeswitchers' bilingual language competence. We analyzed various types of bilingual constituents involving English and Ewe (and occasionally Akan) and have demonstrated that Ewe (and Akan) bilinguals follow CS grammatical procedures that ensure that the integrity of their mother tongue grammar is protected against interference from English. We also saw evidence pointing to the fact that aspects of mother tongue lexicon (core verbs and most attributive adjectives) are protected from being relexified by their English counterparts.

The significance of what is happening in the Ewe speech community (and Ghana generally) for the study of language contact is the insights that it provides about what may be happening elsewhere in post-colonial worlds, i.e. in countries where the mother tongues of educated folks are in intensive CS contact with former colonial languages now turned official languages. In such mother tongue speech communities, codeswitchers continue to live side by side with monolingual speakers and are therefore under some form of pressure to sustain a respectable level of competence in their mother tongues even as they engage in pervasive codeswitching. To this extent, we may interpret the protection which the codeswitchers are giving their mother tongue grammars and lexicons during CS as a demonstration of their loyalty to their mother tongues. The popular perception about codeswitchers in for example Ghana, that they 'adulterate' their mother tongues, is therefore somehow unfair. In fact, their own way, the codeswitchers should be regarded as "worthy custodians" of aspects of their languages, as already explained.

What is happening in Ghana is an evidence of what Myers-Scotton (2002) posits when she sums up as follows a worldwide survey on 'Langauge Maintenance and Shift":

> Shift is slower if bilingualism comes because the group was colonized or its land annexed. Consider groups in the so-called developing world whose nations became independent in the 1950s and 1960s (e.g. in Africa and Asia or various island nations)… (p.106)

[7] The bilinguals may be resisting the temptation to simply place English adjectives in the pre-head slot in violation of word order in their mother tongue NPs. But this situation may not last forever. Colour adjectives seem to be causing havoc already. For instance, in the following example, **YELLOW** functions as a preposed modifier of **fɔkpa** 'pair of shoes' in violation of Ewe NP grammar, but many Ewe-English bilinguals I consulted confirmed that they would accept this example:

Amedahevi,	**YELLOW**	**fɔkpa**	**gã**	**aɖe**	**dó-m**	**wo-le**	**fia**
Poor_fellow	yellow	shoe	big	a.certain	wear-PROG	3sg-be	now

Poor fellow, he now wears a pair of large yellow shoes.

In fact, I believe that the slow pace at which CS-contact induced changes occur in indigenous languages in 'the so-called developing world' that Myers-Scotton refers to can be explained in terms of the kind of language maintenance mechanisms I said the codeswitchers are employing. And this, very importantly, is in contrast to what has been said about the fate of mother tongues of codeswitching immigrant youths in Europe and Northern America. As noted, Schmitt (2000) and Bolonyai (1998) discuss convergence or structural change of Russian and Hungarian to English in some immigrant children's speech and have provided evidence which imply that the children are not deploying the MT maintenance mechanisms because they lack the required level of grammatical competence in their MTs to do so. In contrast, adult Russian and Hungarian codeswitchers, who are first-generation immigrants, evidently deploy the MT maintenance mechanisms, which enable them to put grammatical interference from English in check. In this regard, as I noted earlier, the CS of the adult immigrants resembles that of Ewe-English bilinguals and I think that this has happened because, like Ewe-English bilinguals, they are still loyal to (obviously because they are still competent in) their MTs.

It is appropriate to observe too that the CS of first-generation adult Ewe-English bilinguals living in America (cf. Dzameshie 1994, 1996) and Norway and Australia (cf. Amuzu 1998, 2005a) is qualitatively the CS which is recorded in Ghana. In other words, like the adult Russian and Hungarian immigrants, first-generation Ewe-English bilinguals living abroad use the MT maintenance strategies because they are still loyal to and competent in their MT. The important question that the insight about the CS of immigrant Russian and Hungarian youths raises, for future research, is therefore as follows:

What kind of CS is being produced by Ewe-speaking youths (and Ghanaian youths generally) who live in Europe, Nothern America, Australia, or some such place?

My hypothesis is that their CS, like that of the Russian and Hungarian youths, will generally lack evidence of the kinds of MT maintenance mechanisms that I have discussed in the paper. I expect their CS (if they engage in it all) to reflect a high degree of convergence of Ewe to their host languages.

ABBREVIATIONS

aFOC	Argument Focus	INGR	Ingressive	PRES	Present Tense
Addr	Addressive	ML	Matrix Language	PT	Particle
ADJ	Adjective	MLF	Matrix Language Frame	PROG	Progressive
COMP	Complementizer	NEG	Negative	Q	Question Marker
COP	Copula	NP	Nominal Phrase	RED	Reduplicative
CS	Codeswitching	NPRES	Non-Present	REL	Relativizer
DEF	Definiteness Marker	Perf	Perfective Aspect	sg	Singular
FOC	Focus Marker	PL	Plural Marker	SUBJ	Subjunctive
FUT	Future	Poss	Possessive Linker	TP	Topic Marker
HAB	Habitual Aspect	POT	Potential	VP	Verb Phrase
INDEF	Indefiniteness Marker			1, 2, 3	First-, Second-, and Third- Persons

REFERENCES

Ameka, Felix. 1994. Ewe. In C. Goddard and A. Wiezbicka (eds.), Semantic and Lexical Universals, 57-86. Amsterdam: John Benjamins Publishing Company.

Amuzu, Evershed K. 1993. Three-Place Predicates in Ewe. M.A. Thesis, University of Ghana. Legon.

_____ 1998. Aspects of Grammatical Structure in Ewe-English Codeswitching. M. Phil. Thesis. Oslo: University of Oslo.

_____ 2005a. Ewe-English Codeswitching: A case of Composite rather than Classic Codeswitching. PhD dissertation, Australian National University, Canberra.

_____ 2005b. Revisiting the Classic Codeswitching–Composite Codeswitching Distinction: A case study of nonverbal predication in Ewe-English Codeswitching. In Australian Journal of Linguistics, Vol 23-1 (on: Language Shift, Code-mixing and Variation).

_____ 2005c. Codeswitching in Ghana – Still a ´a third tongue' of the educated? Legon Journal of the Humanities, Vol. XVI, 27-53.

_____ 2005d. The Composite Matrix Language in Mixed Possessive Constructions in Ewe-English Codeswitching". In Monash University Linguistics Papers: Language Contact, Hybrids and New Varieties: Emergent Possessive Constructions 2. 11-27.

_____ Forthcoming. Producing composite codeswitching: The role of modularity in language production. International Journal of Bilinguialism (Special Issue on Codeswitching and West Africa: Theory and Implications).

Asilevi, Francis. 1990. English-Ewe Code-mixing in Conversational Discourse: A case of English as a second language in Ghana. MA Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.

Backus, Ad. 2001.The role of semantic specificity in insertional codeswitching: Evidence from Dutch-Turkish. In Rodolfo Jacobson (ed.), Codeswitching Worldwide II, 125-154. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Bolonyai, Agnes. 1998. In-between Languages: Language shift / maintenance in childhood bilingualism. The International Journal of Bilingualism 2(1):21-43

_____ 2000. Elective affinities: Language Contact in the Abstract Lexicon and its Structural Consequences. The International Journal of Bilingualism 4(1): 81-106.

Chafe, Wallace. 1994. Discourse, Consciousness, and Time: the Flow and Displacement of Conscious Experience in Speaking and Writing. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.

Dixon, R.M.W. 1982. Where Have All the Adjectives Gone? The Hague: Mouton Publishers.

Dzameshie, Alex . 1994. Communicative Competence and Code Choice: The case of codeswitching by a bilingual family. Unpublished Paper.

_____ 1996. Toward a Global Explanation of Unmarked Codeswitching: Evidence from Ewe-English Bilingual Codeswitching. Unpublished Paper.

Essegbey, James.1999. Inherent Complement Verbs in Ewe: Towards an understanding of Argument Structure in Ewe. Ph.D Dissertation. Leiden: University of Leiden.

Forson, Barnabas. 1979. Code-switching in Akan-English Bilingualism. Ph.D Thesis. California: University of California.

_____ 1988. Code-switching, our third tongue. Universitas 10: 180-194.

Guerini, F. 2006. Language Alternation Strategies in Multilingual Settings. A case study: Ghanaian Immigrants in Northern Italy. Bern: Peter Lang.

_____ Forthcoming. ENGLISH koraa yɛde Twi MIXe! Is the variety of Akan spoken by Ghanaian immigrants in Northern Italy developing into a mixed code? International Journal of Bilinguialism (Special Issue on Codeswitching and West Africa: Theory and Implications).

Mensah, Isaac Clement. 1992. English-Fanti Code-Mixing in Conversational Discourse. M.A. Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.

Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching. Oxford: Clarendon Press.

_____ 2001. The Matrix Language Frame Model: Developments and Responses. In: Rodolfo Jacobson (ed.), Codeswitching Worldwide II, 23-58. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

_____ 2002. Contact Linguistics: Bilingual Encounters and Grammatical Outcomes. Oxford University Press.

Nartey, J. 1982. Codeswitching, Interference or Faddism? Language Use Among Educated Ghanaians. Anthropological Linguistics 24 (2): 183-192.

Nyarko Ansah, Gladys. 2006. Verbal Morphology in Code-switching. Paper presented on the 11th of April, 2006 at the Language Centre, University of Ghana.
Quarcoo, Millicent. 2009. Grammatical Constraints on Noun and Verb Phrases in Twi-English Codeswitching. MPhil Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.
Schmitt, Elena. 2000. Overt and Covert Codeswitching in Immigrant Children from Russia. The International Journal of Bilingualism 4(1): 9-28.
Sebba, Mark. 1995. Constructing Congruence: an approach to the syntax of code-switching. Network on Code-Switching and Language Contact, 229-241. Papers from the Summer School Code-Switching and Language Contact. Ljouwert/Leeuwarden: Fryske Akademy.
_____ 1998. A Congruent Approach to the Syntax of Code-switching. International Journal of Bilingualism 2: 1-20.
Trenkic, Danijela. 2008. The representation of English articles in second language grammars: Determiners or adjectives? Bilingualism: Language and Cognition 11 (1): 1-18.
Turkker, Emel. 2000. Turkish-Norwegian Codeswitching: Evidence from Intermediate and Second Generation Turkish Immigrants in Norway. Ph.D Thesis. Oslo: University of Oslo.