

The Syntax of Adverbials in Ewe-English Codeswitching

Evershed Kwasi Amuzu

*Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana, Legon
a_evershed@yahoo.com; ekamuzu@ug.edu.gh*

This paper discusses adverbial switches (single-word adverbs, adverb phrases, temporal noun phrases, prepositional phrases, and adverb clauses) in bilingual clauses in Ewe-English codeswitching, spoken in Ghana. The data analysed come mainly from two databases created in 1996 and 2002 respectively. It is found that while English adverbials occur in Ewe-based clauses, Ewe adverbials do not occur in English-based clauses. Furthermore, it is found that the English adverbials are allowed only in the four positions in which Ewe adverbials may occur. They do not occur in clause-medial adverb positions (e.g. the position in-between the subject-NP and the VP and in the VP-internal position) that are found in the English clause structure but not in the Ewe clause structure. The main significance of these findings is that although adverbial switches constitute an amorphous syntactic and semantic category, their distribution is consistent with principles outlined in Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model that have been found attested in the distribution of English nouns, verbs, and adjectives in Ewe-English codeswitching (cf. Amuzu 1998, 2005a, 2014a, 2014b, 2015) and in codeswitching elsewhere in West Africa (Amuzu 2005b[2010], 2013a, Quarcoo 2009, Vanderpuije 2011, and Bolaji et al 2014). Also, the findings support other scholars' studies of adverbial switches (e.g. Treffers-Daller 1994 and Hebblethwaite 2010) with respect to which of the languages in codeswitching contact may serve as the source of adverbial switches in bilingual clauses: the source is consistently the more socially dominant language, the embedded language from the perspective of the Matrix Language Frame model, in this case English.

Keywords: *adverbs, adverbials, codeswitching, sociolinguistics, bilingualism, language contact, Matrix Language Frame model, Ewe*

***Journal of Cognitive Science* 17-1: 133-165, 2016**

Date submitted: 10/07/15 Date reviewed: 02/03/16

Date confirmed for publication: 03/24/16

©2016 Institute for Cognitive Science, Seoul National University

1. Introduction

Few studies have been devoted to scrutinizing the behaviour of adverbials (including adverbs, adverb phrases, temporal noun phrases, prepositional phrases and adverb clauses) in bilingual constructions because attention tended to revolve around the distribution of nouns and verbs, and, to some extent, adjectives. Research on Ewe-English codeswitching aptly illustrates this situation: although several works on Ewe-English codeswitching have appeared,¹ it is only in Amuzu (1998) that a four-page attention was paid to this subject (see p. 115-118). Indeed, Amuzu (2005b: 246 [2010: 182]) strongly recommended further study into this aspect of Ewe-English codeswitching.²

In spite of this lack of attention to the study of codeswitching involving adverbials, the few works which have dealt with the phenomenon show that they occur frequently, sometimes even more frequently than, for example, verbs and adjectives. Treffers-Daller (1994) is one of the earliest studies that have paid considerable attention to discussing the behaviour of adverbials (specifically single-word adverbs) in bilingual grammar. The data she analysed were gathered in Brussels on Dutch-French and French-Dutch codeswitching. Treffers-Daller sorted 3,988 French single-word switches into different syntactic categories and ranked them by frequency and reports that adverbs placed third in the frequency ranking (p.99). Nouns, she finds, were the most frequent, with 58.4% of the total 3,988 single-word switches, followed by interjections (12%). The adverbs scored 9.7% for their

¹ They include Amuzu's work on the grammar of codeswitching (e.g. 1998, 2005a, 2005b[2010], 2013a, 2013b, 2014a, 2014b, 2015) and his work on the sociopragmatics of the phenomenon (2012 and 2014c). They also include Asilevi (1990), the pioneering work on Ewe-English codeswitching that deals with both grammatical and sociolinguistic aspects of the phenomenon, Dzameshie (1994, 1996) on codeswitching as evidence of bilinguals' communicative competence, Nortsu-Kotoe (1999) on codeswitching in advertisements, Amekor (2009) and Ezuh (2009, 2014) on codeswitching in the classroom, and Yevudey (2009) on codeswitching in radio talk shows.

² The Amuzu (1998) paper indeed provides theoretical inspiration for the current work because even though rather brief in terms of analysis of data, it outlines the attractiveness of Myers-Scotton's (1995) proposal for explaining adverbial switching. As will be made clear, the current paper adopts that proposal in its detailed discussion of data.

third position ahead of adjectives (9.0%), verbs (8.9%), conjunctions (0.8%), prepositions (0.1%), and pronouns (0.02%). Other elements including quantifiers and particles take up the remaining 0.5%. In an earlier study, Yoon (1992, p.438) arrived at a similar picture, with adverbs constituting 7% of all single-word switches in her Korean-English data.

It is not clear why adverbial switches, even single-word adverbs, have not received much scholarly attention worldwide despite the fact that they occur so frequently as codeswitches. The reason, perhaps, has to do with the fact that they constitute an amorphous category in terms of *function* (they could be adjuncts, disjuncts or conjuncts), *distribution* (they could occur clause-initially, in some languages clause-medially, and clause-finally) and the *linguistic expression* used to encode them (as noted they could be adverbs, adverb phrases, temporal noun phrases, prepositional phrases or adverb clauses).

The dearth of scholarly interest notwithstanding, there are certain findings that seem to recur in the few works that have appeared. One is that there is lack of asymmetry between the languages in codeswitching contact when it comes to which of them may serve as the source of adverbial switches; one of the languages normally supplies all or the majority of the adverbial switches. For example, Treffers-Daller (1994) finds in her Dutch-French codeswitching data that whereas 388 French adverbs occur in Dutch-based clauses, not a single Dutch adverb occurred as a codeswitch in a French-based clause. Treffers-Daller identifies social structure as the source of this asymmetrical influence, indicating that “French has been the upper language and Brussels Dutch the lower language for generations of Brusselers” (Treffers-Daller 1994: 106). A similar situation is reported for Miami Haitian Creole-English codeswitching. According to Hebblethwaite (2010: 409), his data “show that one language, Haitian Creole, asymmetrically supplies the grammatical frame while the other language, English, asymmetrically supplies mixed lexical categories like adverbs”. However, Hebblethwaite (2010) notes that the Haitian situation is slightly different from the Brussels situation in the sense that not all codeswitched adverbials come from one source. There are also “[t]races of code-switching with an English frame and Haitian Creole lexical categories” (pp. 409). He observes, however, that Treffers-Daller’s sociolinguistic explanation for the preference of French

adverbs in codeswitching in Brussels also explains why English “dominates” as the source of the adverb switches in Miami Haitian Creole–English codeswitching; in this speech community in Miami, English is the language of higher social status.

As will become evident in the current study, codeswitched adverbs (and all the other kinds of adverbials) found in the Ewe-English codeswitching corpora consistently come from English, and Treffers-Daller’s explanation again applies because as the official language and sole language of education from primary school class four in Ghana, English is indisputably the language of highest prestige for Ghanaians.

Another common finding about the behavior of adverbials relates to their distribution. This finding is succinctly captured by Hebblethwaite (2010), regarding Miami Haitian Creole–English codeswitching. He observes that “they [the English adverbs] most commonly target discourse-prominent positions in, first, the left-periphery and, second, a right-adjunction position whereas they are rarer in the IP- or VP-internal positions” (pp. 425).³ That is to say that the English adverbs occur mostly in clause-initial position and, also, in clause-final position but hardly in clause-medial positions. Indeed, a recent study (Flamenbaum 2014) concerned with the discourse-pragmatics of codeswitching has shown that the clause-initial position in particular is preferred for codeswitched adverbials because this position allows speakers to signal their communicative intentions rather early. In that study of Akan-English codeswitching in talk-radio, Flamenbaum observes several instances in which a speaker would employ the strategy by which he “metalinguistically frames” his utterance with an English adverbial element at the outset so that he can orient his addressees to his stance on the argument he is about to make. Below are some of the examples Flamenbaum (2014) cites; they come from different speakers at different stages in the same radio programme:

- (1a) **Obviously** aban bīaa nni hō a ɔbetumi a **maintain nine million cedis a ton.** **Obviously** there is no government that can maintain [a subsidy of] **nine million cedis a ton.**⁷ [that is, per ton of cocoa].

³ The IP-internal (i.e. Inflection Phrase-internal) position is in-between the subject-NP and the VP.

noted, calls “IP- or VP-internal positions”, in Haitian Creole clauses. He notes that the preference for the clause-initial and final positions “suggests accessibility of the peripheries outside of argument structure” (pp. 425).

Although, as mentioned above (but see section 4 below), English adverb(ials) occur mainly in clause-initial and final positions in Ewe-based clauses in Ewe-English codeswitching, I will hesitate to adopt Hebblethwaite’s explanation for the patterns. His explanation seems to be too category-specific and thus suggests that there is something peculiar about the behavior of adverbs which needs to be given some idiosyncratic theoretical explanation. He appeals to the peripherality (and, by default, accessibility) of clause-initial and final positions as the primary reason why the English adverbials predominantly occur in those positions. If this argument holds, then it raises questions about how English verbs, for instance, get to occur (frequently) in Haitian-based VPs that are by no means peripheral.

I will argue in this paper that there is no need to treat the distribution of adverbial switches as something that deserves some unique explanation. Instead, I will argue that the insertion of English adverbials into slots in Ewe-based clauses follows the very principles that underpin the insertion of English nouns, verbs, and adjectives into slots in Ewe-based clauses. This theoretical orientation, which I considered in Amuzu (1998: 115-118), stems from the tenets of the Matrix Language Frame model (Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002), a model found manifested in Ewe-English codeswitching and in codeswitching in West Africa generally (cf. 2005b[2010], 2005a, 2013a, 2014a, 2014b and 2015).

In what follows, I first discuss my methods of data collection (section 2). I then (in section 3) discuss the Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model drawing on findings discussed in some of my previous works on Ewe-English codeswitching. In section 4, I turn to the syntax of English adverbials in Ewe-English codeswitching. It is here I describe the positions in Ewe-based clauses where English adverbial switches tend to occur. Section 5 is devoted to analyzing the English adverbials in terms of their semantic functions, i.e. in terms of which ones are adverbial complements and which are adverbial adjuncts or disjuncts or conjuncts. Some concluding remarks are made in section 6.

2. Methods of data collection

Unless otherwise acknowledged, examples of codeswitching that are analysed in the paper come from two sets of data I collected over time using slightly different methods. Examples from the two databases are used with one goal: to exhibit evidence of the phenomenon across time. Many of the examples to be cited have already appeared in other papers by me in which the objects of attention were rarely the English adverbials we will be discussing. The same thing applies to examples cited in works on Ewe-English codeswitching by others; as already noted, it is only in Amuzu 1998 that a four-page discussion is made of adverbial switching in Ewe-English codeswitching.

The first database, created in 1996, was first utilized in Amuzu (1998). It contained extracts from naturally-occurring conversations documented through surreptitious taping, i.e. tape-recordings that were made while interlocutors were unaware that their conversations were being recorded. In choosing this method of data collection, I followed the example of three Ghanaian codeswitching researchers—Forson (1979), Nartey (1982), and Asilevi (1990)—who saw in it the obvious gain of securing natural utterances. A tape-recorder would be concealed in a pocket, a bag or anywhere nearby while a conversation transpired. Even at moments when most of the interlocutors already knew that they probably were being tape-recorded—as was the case with recordings other than the very first involving members of my family at home in Accra, great care was taken not to let them know when exactly the recorder was on or off. The method helped in securing naturally-occurring conversations that exhibit characteristics of Ewe-English bilinguals' language use in informal in-group contexts. Conscious of ethical problems with this method, I always informed interlocutors after each recording session and duly sought their approval for my use of their utterances for the specific purpose of sociolinguistic research. A few did refuse to let me use specific utterances, and sometimes whole conversations, when they learned about what I did. I always respected the wishes of those people and never used any such rejected portions of the recordings.

The second database was created in 2002. It was used in Amuzu

(2005b[2010]) and in several publications afterward. The method may be described as semi-formal or experimental. Tape-recordings were made during interviews designed to verify a by then familiar assumption that bilinguals in Ghana who use codeswitching involving English hardly used it with members of their out-group, i.e. Ghanaians who speak very little or no English (cf. Forson 1979). Each of fifteen interviewees had at least high school education, was therefore bilingual in Ewe and English, and was aged between 18 and 50. Two interviewers alternated. One was a well-known Ewe-medium talk show host and the other was a renowned Ewe poet and orator. The peculiarity of the context created for the exchanges was the directive that everyone was to stick to unilingual Ewe. In each interview session four people were present and participating. The main interaction was between the interviewer and interviewee. I was there as well and sometimes entered into the conversation. Crucially, the fourth person was a member of the out-group, an elderly Ewe man or woman (dubbed in Amuzu 2005b[2010] as ‘collaborator’) who spoke little or no English. The presence of the collaborator was intended to ensure compliance with the Ewe-only language policy for the exchanges. Each interviewee was to try to ‘educate’ the collaborator on topics that ranged from domestic affairs, types of marriage ceremony and their socio-economic implications on modern marriages, national issues (mainly current affairs), and the relevance of science and technology in our life. The interviewer guided the discussions with questions and even rebuttals. I sometimes assisted him in this.

3. The matrix language frame model

3.1 Key tenets and principles

The theoretical framework to be used in analyzing data is Myers-Scotton’s Matrix Language Frame (MLF) model. A central assumption of the model, expressed in one of its sub-models, the 4-M model, is that there are four types of morphemes in human language (cf. Myers-Scotton 2002: 72). They are:

1. **content morphemes:** nouns, verbs, adjectives, and some prepositions.

2. **early system morphemes:** grammatical elements that have conceptual affinity with their content morpheme heads, e.g. verb satellites (e.g. *into* in *look into* meaning ‘to consider’), noun plural markers, demonstratives, intensifiers.
3. **late bridge system morphemes:** elements that provide grammatical links between two units, e.g. copulas and possessive linkers.
4. **late outsider system morphemes:** critical grammatical or functional elements, e.g. tense, modal, and aspect (TMA) markers, agreement inflections, and case markers.

From the perspective of the model, there are differences in how morphemes from these categories behave in intra-clausal codeswitching. Two basic factors determine whether a morpheme may appear in a bilingual clause or not: (i) the language it comes from and (ii) the category of morphemes it belongs to. Briefly put, any morpheme from the matrix language (a matrix language / ML is the source of grammatical frame for all bilingual clauses) may appear in a bilingual clause. In contrast, morphemes from the other language in codeswitching contact, called the embedded language / EL, may not occur with the same degree of freedom. Among EL morphemes, only the content morphemes may occur singly in bilingual clauses. EL early system morphemes may also occur only if they accompany EL content-morpheme heads. One principle of the MLF model, known as the System Morpheme Principle (SMP), ensures that only the ML may supply late bridge system morphemes and late outsider system morphemes for participation in bilingual clauses. The SMP states:

In ML + EL constituents, all system morphemes which have grammatical relations external to their head constituent (i.e., which participate in the sentence’s thematic role grid) will come from the ML (Myers-Scotton 1993: 82).

In Ewe-English codeswitching, Ewe basically functions like the ML (I said ‘basically’ because there is more to this point, see, e.g., Amuzu 2005b[2010]) while English functions as the EL. This means that in Ewe-English codeswitching, while there are no restrictions on the occurrences of Ewe morphemes across all categories in bilingual clauses, only English content morphemes and their accompanying early system morphemes may occur in

those clauses because the SMP is expected to routinely block English late bridge and late outsider system morphemes from occurring.

How does the MLF model perceive adverbs? Initially, i.e. in her (1993) book (see pp. 129), Myers-Scotton categorized adverbs as system morphemes with the explanation that they “pick out individuals across variables”. A motivation for her analysis was the nature of the Swahili-English codeswitching data on which she based much of the discussion in that book. After having convincingly demonstrated that Swahili is the ML and English the EL in codeswitching involving this language pair, she found that curiously there were no instances of singly-occurring English / EL adverbs in Swahili-based clauses. She found only 20 instances of multi-word English adverbials in the bilingual clauses. However, reports from later works by others, e.g. Treffers-Daller (1994), were to show that in codeswitching involving some other language pairs EL adverbs do occur frequently as codeswitches. This new knowledge obviously informed the revision in Myers-Scotton 1995: 240ff)⁴ and in her 2002 book (see e.g. pp. 70) in which she makes it clear that there are indeed two broad sub-categories of adverbs, namely (i) adverbs of intensity and negation (e.g. *VERY* and *NEVER*, respectively), which are characterized as system morphemes, i.e., that they quantify (=restrict) the otherwise broad senses of adjectives and adverbs of the other group, and (ii) adverbs derived from adjectives (e.g. *CLEVERLY*), and, of course, other lexical adverbs (e.g. time adverbs like *YESTERDAY* and *SOON*), which form the majority and have thematic relations with their verbs.⁵ The model predicts that while Embedded Language (here English) lexical adverbs may occur as singly-occurring codeswitches (of course under specifiable conditions guided by the Morpheme Order Principle, discussed below) in slots in ML-based

⁴ See figure 11.2, Myers-Scotton (1995: 242).

⁵ The idea that verbs and their adverb have a thematic relation is emphasized also in Eckardt’s (1998) work. Eckardt (1998: 34), cited in Hebblethwaite (2010: 413), stated that “Verbs and their adverbial events have *THEMATIC* relation, for example, SPATIAL (inside), TEMPORAL (yesterday), BENEFICIENT (for Susan), INSTRUMENTAL (with a knife), VOLITIONAL (shyly/carefully/reluctantly), and so forth”. As Hebblethwaite (2010: 413) points out, like all system morphemes, system morpheme adverbs constitute a closed class of morphemes whereas

order (reflecting surface relations) will be that of the ML (Myers-Scotton 1993: 82).

Simply put, this means that singly-occurring content morphemes from an EL are expected to occur in ML-based clauses following the order in which similar ML morphemes occur in monolingual ML clauses.

However, outcomes in codeswitching worldwide have shown that notably different sets of considerations inform and define the application of the SMP and MOP by codeswitchers. In Amuzu (2014a: 256-263), I outlined the existence of at least three types of intra-clausal codeswitching from the perspective of the MLF model: classic codeswitching, composite-1 codeswitching, and composite-2 codeswitching.

In classic codeswitching the ML and EL play asymmetrical roles. The ML does not only control the nature and operation of SMP and MOP, it also compels EL content morphemes to only occur in slots projected by their equivalents in the ML with which they, crucially, are congruent (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002). In composite-1 codeswitching (Myers-Scotton 2002),⁶ the two languages are said to “split” roles as ML, to the extent that they may be seen to have comparable levels of contribution to the nature of application of the SMP and MOP. In composite-2 codeswitching, the relationship between the languages in contact is best described as complementary. While the EL provides the subcategorization information needed for the realization of its content morphemes in grammatical contexts, the ML strictly defines the SMP and MOP that are deployed for the realization of the EL content morphemes in what are ultimately ML-based grammatical contexts. It is expected for an EL content morpheme in composite-2 codeswitching to retain its EL-origin grammatical requirements when it is realized in an ML-based clause, specifically in a slot in which ML content morphemes with similar grammatical requirements may occur. Ewe-English codeswitching is an example of composite-2 codeswitching, as I demonstrate in the next subsection with examples I

⁶ In fact, Myers-Scotton (2002) simply called it composite codeswitching. However, I have to rename it composite-1 codeswitching in Amuzu (2014a) so that I can draw attention to the differences between this type of codeswitching and what I call in that study composite-2 codeswitching.

cited in earlier works.

3.2 Relevant insights about Ewe-English codeswitching

In this subsection, I use some examples of noun and verb switches to highlight some key composite-2 codeswitching characteristics of Ewe-English codeswitching; for more comprehensive discussions, see Amuzu (2005b[2010], 2005a, 2013a, 2014a, 2014b, and 2015). The primary objective of this summary is to demonstrate the fact that the principles that govern the distribution of English nouns and verbs, for example, are the very principles that also govern the distribution of English adverb switches that will be discussed in sections 4 and 5. I commence with the distribution of English nouns.

In line with composite-2 codeswitching, it is expected for an English noun to retain its English-origin grammatical requirements when it is realized in an Ewe-based clause, specifically in a slot in which Ewe nouns with analogous grammatical requirements also occur. This is illustrated in the following example discussed in Amuzu (2013a: 77-82) in which two nouns, *STUDENT* and *DICTIONARY*, occur:

- (3) Wo do student ade be wo-a- fle dictionary na
 3PL send student INDEF COMP 3sg-POT-buy dictionary for
secretary-a
 secretary-DEF

‘They sent a student (with the instruction) that he buys a dictionary for the secretary.’ [‘A student was sent to buy a dictionary for the secretary’] (Amuzu 2013a: 77)

Each of the English nouns refers to an indefinite entity, a fact expressed similarly in the English translation in which both nouns take the indefiniteness article *A*. Note, however, that in the bilingual clause itself *STUDENT* and *DICTIONARY* distribute differently. While *STUDENT* is modified by the Ewe indefiniteness marker *ade* ‘a certain’, *DICTIONARY* occurs alone as NP. To account for this distributional difference, we need to consider how indefiniteness is expressed in monolingual Ewe NPs. Ewe makes a grammatical distinction between indefinite nouns that express non-specific (or generic) reference and those that express specific (or non-

generic) reference (Amuzu, 2009: 223). A non-specific noun occurs without any overt marking for indefiniteness, as we find in example (4a) below where *avu* ‘dog’, occurring as the subject-NP without an overt marking for indefiniteness, refers generally to *a typical member of a class of entities or referents*, namely dogs:

- (4a) Avu fe nuwɔna-e nyé e-sia
 Dog poss handiwork-FOC COP 3sg-this
 ‘This is the work of a dog.’ (Amuzu 2009: 223; Amuzu 2013a: 78)

On the other hand, a specific-but-indefinite noun is modified by the indefiniteness marker *adɛ* ‘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 adɛ* ‘a certain dog’ expresses this sense in (4b):

- (4b) Me-kpɔ avu adɛ le afe a me fia
 1sg-see dog a certain at house DEF inside now
 ‘I have just seen a dog in the house [i.e. I have just seen a (certain) dog in the house].’ (Amuzu 2009: 223; 2013a: 78)

English does not make this kind of distinction because the indefinite *A* may modify specific as well as non-specific indefinite count nouns (cf. Trenkic 2008) as is demonstrated in the underlined parts of the English translation versions of (4a) and (4b) above.

Thus, in example (3) above, *STUDENT* and *DICTIONARY* respectively come into codeswitching with their semantic and morphosyntactic requirements, notably the requirement to be marked as indefinite nouns. However, *STUDENT* occurs with *adɛ* because it makes reference to a specific-but-indefinite entity/individual while *DICTIONARY* occurs without an overt indefiniteness marker to express non-specific reference. Crucially, the SMP and MOP are activated to ensure that the placement of this English noun obeys the relevant Ewe morphosyntactic rules for the distribution of nouns with such grammatical requirements.

Similar distribution patterns may be demonstrated with English verbs in Ewe-based clauses. For example, Amuzu (2014a) finds that English ditransitive verb switches occur in only bilingual SVOiOd (subject—verb—indirect object—direct object) clauses, i.e. in clauses in which the

‘The woman lends money to her child.’ (Amuzu 2010: 172)

- (5g) Nyɔnu-a **lend**-na ga *(to) vi-a
 Woman-DEF lend-HAB money DAT child-DEF
 ‘The woman lends money to her child.’ (Amuzu 2010: 171)

The blocking of the incompatible SVOdOi structure in Ewe-English codeswitching highlights the fact that an English verb may not project a slot in an Ewe-based construction that does not comply strictly with Ewe-controlled SMP and MOP specifications. The sticking points are the following: (i) Ewe cannot supply its dative preposition for use in this structure type (see 5f) because it would contravene monolingual Ewe grammatical rules, and (ii) English, as the embedded language, cannot supply its version of the preposition (see 5g) because it is a case-marking preposition, which being a late system morpheme must come from a matrix language.

4. Positions in which English adverbials occur in bilingual clauses

I will begin by stating that I have not found any instances of Ewe adverbial switches in English-based clauses in my two databases. I have also scrutinized all other available works on Ewe-English codeswitching in the hope of finding such instances in the examples cited in them, but I have not found any. However, despite the situation in the data and in the literature, I can state that there is at least one type of manner adverbs from Ghanaian languages, idiophones, that are used occasionally by some Ghanaians, including Ewe speakers, in their English sentences. One such idiophone is *gidigidi* (an imitation of the sound of the footsteps of stampeding large animals) in example (6a). Another one is *wamwamwam*⁷ in (6b), which is an imitation of the sound one might make when, like a glutton, one repeatedly gulps down large quantities of (softened) food.

- (6a) The soldiers came, and *gidigidi* they attempted to whisk our brother away.
 ‘The soldiers came, and, in much show of brutish force amidst a lot of noise, they attempted to whisk our brother away.
- (6b) They are *chopping*⁸ our money *wamwamwam*.

‘They are embezzling our money with abundant impunity.’

These idiophones may have come from Ewe, Ga, or Akan.

We now return to the pattern found in the data and in the literature, i.e. to the situation where only one language, English, tends to contribute adverbial switches. This pattern is reminiscent of what Treffers-Daller (1994) reports for Dutch-French codeswitching in Brussels in which only French adverbs occur as codeswitches. I believe that Treffers-Daller’s (1994: 106) explanation for the pattern in her data holds for the Ewe-English case: the dearth of Ewe adverbial switches has to do directly with its lower social status compared with English, the official language of Ghana and therefore the language of highest social status in the country. I will return to the theoretical implication of this phenomenon in the concluding section (i.e. from the perspective of the Matrix Language Frame model).

Because of the absence of Ewe adverb switches in English-based clauses, this section is devoted to describing the positions (i.e. the morphosyntactic contexts) in Ewe-based clauses where English adverbials typically occur. The discussion continues into section 5 where we analyse the English adverbials in terms of their semantic functions; i.e., in terms of which ones are adverbial complements and which are adverbial adjuncts or disjuncts or conjuncts.

We start with single-word English adverbs. English single-word adverbs are seen regularly in slots marked with ‘ap’ (adverbial phrase) in Table 1 below, an adaptation of Duthie’s (1996: 35) table. Duthie labels the verb slot as 0 to signal that the verb is the nucleus of the clause. The adverbials occur in slots -6, -4, +4 and +7.

The adverbial position -6 (highlighted in example 7a) and the position -4 (highlighted in 7b) are clause-initial positions whereas the positions +4 (highlighted in 7c) and position +7 (highlighted in 7d) are typically clause-

⁷ In fact, this word has become popular in Ghanaian political discourse in which it depicts the impunity with which politicians embezzle public funds. But it is probably more accurate to say that this and other idiophones belong to Ghanaian (and West African) Pidgin English(es) and that those who would use them in their English are in fact regular users of the pidgin. However, this assertion needs empirical investigation.

⁸ Ghanaian Pidgin English word for ‘eating, consuming’.

Table 1. The Ewe clause structure:*

-				0	+					
-6 (-5)	-4 -3	-2	-1	0	+2	+4	+5	+6	+7	
Topic	Focus	Subject	O, S/I	Predicator	Object	Adjunct	bé + Object Clause	O	ap	
np ap	np ap	NP		VP	np np	ap ap ap				
(l)á	-ɖe -(y)e		mé ná né					-ò		

*Abbreviations: np/NP (noun phrase), VP (verb phrase), ap (adverbial phrase), O (negation), S (subjunctive), I (imperative particle).

final positions.

- (7a) *egbe*₋₆ (l)á₋₅, mí₋₂ m₋₁[-á-te ŋu á-yi]₁ Kumasi₊₂ o₊₆
 today TP, 1PL NEG POT-can POT-go Kumasi NEG
 ‘today, we will not be able to go to Kumasi.’
- (7b) *egbe*₋₄ (y)e₋₃, mí₋₂ m₋₁[-á-te ŋu á-yi]₁ Kumasi₊₂ o₊₆
 today FOC, 1PL NEG POT-can POT-go Kumasi NEG
 ‘it is today that we will not be able to go to Kumasi.’
- (7c) *egbe*₋₆ (l)á₋₅, mí₋₂ m₋₁[-á-te ŋu á-yi]₁ Kumasi₊₂ *kaba*₊₄ o₊₆
 today TP 1PL NEG POT-can POT-go Kumasi early NEG
 ‘today, we will not be able to go to Kumasi early.’
- (7d) *egbe*₋₆ (l)á₋₅, mí₋₂ m₋₁[-á-te ŋu á-yi]₁ Kumasi₊₂ *kaba*₊₄ o₊₆ *nyatefe*₋₇
 today TP, 1PL NEG POT-can POT-go Kumasi early NEG truly/in fact
 ‘today, we will not be able to go to Kumasi early, in fact.’

Observe in (7a) that the adverb in -4 is topic-marked by the topic marker **(l)á**, which occurs in the -5 slot. Similarly, note in (7b) that the adverb is focus-marked by the marker **(y)e**, which occurs in -3 slot.⁹ Both the topicalized and focused adverbial positions may be filled in the same clause, as shown in (7e):

- (7e) *le nyatefe me*₋₆ (l)á₋₅ *egbe*₋₄ (y)e₋₃, mí₋₂ m₋₁[-á-te ŋu á-yi]₁ Kumasi₊₂ *kaba*₊₄ o₊₆
 at truth inside TP today FOC 1PL NEG POT-can POT-go Kumasi early NEG
 ‘In fact, it is today that we will not be able to go to Kumasi early.’

As shown in the table, there is no VP-internal adverbial position in the Ewe clause, neither is there an adverb position in-between the subject-NP and the VP, i.e. IP-internal adverb position. However, in some sentences, e.g. (7f) below, the +4 slot is actually a clause-medial position, because it is followed by an object clause (bé vu gbɔ-na ‘that a vehicle is approaching’) in +5:

- (7f) nye me kpɔ *kaba*₊₄ [be vu gbɔna]₊₅ ɔ₊₆.
 1sg NEG see early COMP vehicle approach-HAB NEG
 ‘I did not notice quickly enough that a vehicle is approaching’.

From what is discussed in section 3.2 above, it is to be expected that English adverbials will only be able to occur in the four positions identified in the Ewe clause structure; i.e., they are expected in the four slots but not in such slots as the VP-internal and IP-internal ones which are not found in the Ewe clause structure. In what follows, I demonstrate that these predictions are what indeed obtain in Ewe-English codeswitching.

We find, for example, no instance of an English adverb codeswitch in a clause-medial position between the subject-NP and the VP (i.e. IP-internal position) in the data. For instance, note that the adverb *FINALLY* is not acceptable in-between the subject-NP *mi* (1PL) and the bracketed VP in (8a) despite the fact that it (i.e. *FINALLY*) is acceptable in an analogous position in the monolingual English version. Similarly, in (8b) although *FINALLY* may occur clause-medially between an auxiliary verb and the main verb in the monolingual English translation (i.e. in VP-internal position), it is not acceptable in such a position as a codeswitch in the Ewe-based clause.

- (8a) *Clause-medial, between subject-NP and VP¹⁰:* Mi **finally* [te ɲu ɖo-na] ‘We *finally* [could converse] like siblings.’
 dze abe nɔviwo ene. like siblings.’
- (8b) *Clause-medial, inside the VP, i.e. between pre-verb and main verb:* Mi [te ɲu **finally* ɖo-na] ‘We [could *finally* converse] like siblings.’
 dze abe nɔviwo ene. like siblings.’

In contrast, as expected, an English adverb may occur in one of the four adverb positions in Table 1 above provided the slot corresponds to its

⁹ These particles are late system morphemes.

on **trek** in (the) **north** (of Ghana) and when he came and went (to) **home**(town) during **old-lady**'s illness too, **could you believe it** that Uncle could **list** the **days** on which I didn't sleep at home? (Asilevi 1990:106; bracketed numbering and translation added)

This example is interesting because it captures a case of adverb doubling in the -6 slot: the English scalar adverb *EVEN* is partnered in that slot by its Ewe equivalent *kura* before the topic marker comes in the -5 slot. The motivation for this adverb doubling, which is reminiscent of reduplication in Ewe, seems to be the speaker's desire to emphasize how much he did not expect the event he is about to describe in the rest of [Sent 3].

Multiword English adverbials also occur in the first three adverb slots shown in Table 1. *IN FACT* in [Sent 1] in example (10) above is an instance of multiword adverb placement in the -6 slot. Other examples appear in (11)-(13) below. In (11) the adverb phrase *VERY SOON* occurs in the -6 slot and in (12a) the temporal noun phrase *THE FOLLOWING SUNDAY* also occurs there. A prepositional phrase, *BY TOMORROW*, also occurs in that slot in (12b) while the examples in (13) contain cases of adverb clause switches in the -6 slot, i.e. *ALTHOUGH I AM NOBODY* and *BECAUSE SHE DOESN'T REALLY LOVE HIM*.

- (11) *Adverb phrase* **Very soon**-a mie wò ordain-gé 'Very soon, we shall ordain them
in -6 slot: as a pastor (Amuzu, 2014a: 278) as pastors.'
- (12a) *Temporal noun phrase* **The following Sunday** woaḍe 'On the following Sunday
in -6 slot: wò afia church-a they will introduce them to [the congregation at] the church.
- (12b) *Prepositional phrase* **By tomorrow** la, amɔ ma 'By tomorrow, that dough is
in -6 slot: nɔnɔ-ge fermented akpa ná going to be too fermented for consumption.
slot: ɖuɖu. (Amuzu, 2010: 86)
- (13a) *Adverb clause* **Although I am nobody** la, me 'Although I am nobody, I want
in -6 slot: dzi be vinyewo na de suku to my children to school to any level they want.
slot: any level they want.
- (13b) *Adverb clause* **Because she doesn't really** 'Because she doesn't love him,
in -6 slot: love him, e-ɖui lolui hafi a-be she fleeced him before announcing
slot: ye gbee. that she has divorced him.

Similar multiword English adverbials may also occur in the focused -4 slot in clause-initial position. For instance, in (14) the temporal noun phrase *SOMEWHERE IN NOVEMBER* occurs in that slot (note the presence

of the focus marker *-e* in the -3 slot) and in (15) the prepositional phrase ***AFTER THIS PROGRAMME*** also occurs there:

- (14) *Temporal noun* ***Somewhere in November***-e 'It is ***somewhere*** in November
phrase in -4 wo ***celebrate***-na Hogbetsotso. that they celebrate Hogbetsotso.'
slot:
- (15) *Prepositional* ***After this programme***-e 'It is ***after this programme*** that
Phrase in -4 film-a gome dze-ge. the firm will begin.
slot:

The placement of English prepositional phrase adverbials in the post-VP +4 slot is illustrated above in examples (11) and (13). ***AS A PASTOR*** occurs in the +4 slot in (11) and ***TO ANY LEVEL THEY WANT*** occurs there in (13). Example (16) below illustrates the placement of a temporal nominal, ***ALL OF A SUDDEN***, in-between *kpɔ* 'see' and its clausal object, ***be nyɔnu-a vu ŋku*** 'that the woman has opened (her) eyes' (in +5 slot):

- (16) esi mi nɔ gbe-a do-m ɖa la, [me kpɔ ***all of a sudden*** be
 when IPL beNPRES prayer-DEF grow-PROG PT TP 1sg see all of a sudden COMP
 nyɔnu-a vu ŋku].
 woman-DEF open eye
 'while we were busily praying, [I saw ***all of a sudden*** that the woman opened (her) eyes].'

The final example in this subsection illustrates the fact that more than one English adverbials may occur in the +4 slot as is provided for in the Ewe clause, a distribution pattern that is also permissible in English. Two adverbials, ***FIRMLY*** and ***ON THE MAP OF WORLD SOCCER*** occur in that slot in (17) below:

- (17) Fifia ya la, Blackstars place mi ***firmly on the map of world soccer***.
 Now EMPH TP, Blackstars place IPL
 'now the Blackstars has placed us firmly on the map of world soccer.'

We shall discuss the kind of adverbs that occur in the +7 slot in the next section (specifically, see the discussion of example 25a below).

5. Semantic functions of English adverbial switches

There are at least four semantic types of adverbials, namely adverbial complements, adverbial adjuncts, disjunct, and conjuncts. Each of these is

attested in the codeswitching data.

5.1 Adverbial complements

An adverbial complement is an adverbial element that is obligatorily subcategorized for by a verb such that an ungrammatical sentence results if it is removed. Enkvist (1976: 54), cited in Johansson and Lysvåg (1987: 230), explains why this is so when he observes that an adverbial complement is “obligatorily tied to the verb in the Predicator in much the same way as the obligatory Object of a two-place verb”.

Caused motion verbs are typical examples of verbs which require an obligatory adverbial complement. In (17) above, the verb *PLACE* takes an Object, *mi* (1PL), in the +2 slot and an obligatory adverbial complement (*ON THE MAP OF WORLD SOCCER*) in the +4 slot in the Ewe-based clause structure captured in Table 1 in section 4. I argue that the permissibility of the codeswitching pattern in (17) derives from the syntactic model in Ewe which is illustrated in verbs like *da* ‘to put, place’ and *zyio* ‘to lean’, which are illustrated in (18). Note that the adverbial complements in the +4 slot may not be omitted:

(18a) Kofi da atukpa *(de kplɔ-a dzi)
 K. put bottle ALL table-DEF TOP
 ‘Kofi put a bottle on the table.’

(18b) Kofi zyio trakpui-a *(de gli ŋu)
 K. lean ladder-DEF ALL wall side
 ‘Kofi leaned the ladder against a wall.’

In other words, the obligatory adverbial complement *ON THE MAP OF WORLD SOCCER* in (17) above would not have been accepted as a codeswitch in the bilingual clause if its slot were not projectable in keeping with Ewe morphosyntactic procedures backed by the MOP.

5.2 Adverbial adjuncts

Unlike adverbial complements, adverbial adjuncts are optional or structurally dispensable elements of the clause or sentence. The adverbial

adjunct may be an adverb, a prepositional phrase, a temporal noun phrase, a verb phrase, or an entire clause/sentence. The adverbial adjunct establishes the circumstances in which the action, process or state that the verb expresses takes place. In other words, adjuncts, also called circumstantial adverbials, “typically specify the when, where, how, and why of the actions, processes and states” expressed in the verb (Johansson and Lysvåg 1987: 91). As codeswitches, English adjuncts occur in the topic slot in the Ewe clause structure (i.e. in the -6 slot in Table 1) and in two other adverbial positions, the -4 and +4 slots. In fact, several of the English adverbials (single-word or multiword) that were discussed in section 4 above are examples of adverbial adjuncts. Below are collations of adjuncts already discussed in section 4. I highlight the positions in which the adjuncts appeared.

• **adjuncts in the -6 slot:**

- ‘when’ (or temporal) adjuncts: **finally** (8c), **very soon** (11), **the following Sunday** (12a), **by tomorrow** (12b)
- ‘why’ (or reason) adjunct: **because she doesn’t really love him** (13b)

• **adjuncts in the -4 slot:**

- ‘when’ adjuncts: **immediately** (9a), **somewhere in November** (14), **after this programme** (15)
- ‘how’ adjunct: **seriously** (9b)

• **adjuncts in the +4 slot:**

- ‘how’ adjunct: **matter-of-factly** (9c), **firmly** (17)
- ‘when’ adjunct: **all of a sudden** (16)
- ‘where’ adjunct: **to any level they want** (13a)

Several other kinds of adjuncts were spotted in the Ewe-English data. They include clauses that are adjuncts of purpose (e.g. ***bé TO CURB THOSE THINGS*** in 18 below),¹¹ concession (e.g. ***ALTHOUGH I AM NOBODY*** in 13a above), and condition (e.g. ***IF HE CARES ABOUT YOUR CHILDREN*** in 19 below).¹² And in (20), a prepositional phrase, ***FOR LUNCH***, also occurs as the purpose adjunct in the +4 slot:

- (18) *Adjunct in* *bé to curb those things*-a me ‘[In order] to curb those things, I am
 -6 slot: ICT fiam ɖeviwo. teaching the kids ICT.’

- (19) *Adjunct in* má nɔ nu má-wo wɔ-m **if he** ‘He wouldn’t be doing those things if
 +4 slot: **cares about your children** o. he cares about your children.
- (20) *Adjunct in* Egbe me ‘**broke**’¹³ ta rice-water ‘As for today, I have no money, so I’ll
 +4 slot: ko no-ge ma la **for lunch.** drink rice-water **for lunch.**’
 (Asilevi, 1990: 22)

There is the tendency for some Ewe-English bilinguals to bleach derived English single-word manner adverbs of the adverbial suffix *-LY* when they use such adverbs clause-finally in the +4 slot. This is illustrated in the realization of *FREE* in (21a) and of *CLEAN* in (21b); the meanings of these adverbs also seem to have changed somewhat, as I try to depict in the brackets against the English versions:

- (21a) ate ɲu a-rape wò **free**¹⁴ ‘He can rape you “**freely**” [i.e. scot-free].’
 (21b) Le **two hundred meters final**-a la, ‘In the two hundred meters finals,
 Chubby ɔe wo **beat** Pele **clean!** (Asilevi Chubby beat Pele “**clean**” [i.e. fairly and
 1990: 26) indisputably].

Another tendency, already observed in Akan-English codeswitching by Nuworsu (2014), see example (1e) above, is for predicative single-word English adjectives to be converted to manner adverbs that are then reduplicated, in this case in the +4 slot. This is illustrated in the following examples in (22). In (22a), the reduplication of *FUNNY* expresses the intensity of the state encoded in the adverb. A similar reading applies to the use of the adjective turned adverb, *PLAIN*, in (22b):

- (22a) xɔ-ya me ɖeɖe-m **funny funny funny.** ‘‘This room is smelling in **a very funny way.**’
 (22b) e-nya se-m a? Ma gblɔ-e na wo **plain** ‘Do you hear? Let me say tell you **very**
plain... (Asilevi 1990: 55) **plainly**...’

¹¹ The clause has been introduced by the Ewe complementizer *bé* ‘that’.

¹² Note that *IF HE CARES ABOUT YOUR CHILDREN* duly occurs in its +4 slot because it is followed in +6 slot (see Table 1) by the second of the bipartite negation morphemes, *me...o*; the first of those morphemes, *me*, is fused with two other morphemes, *é* (3sg) and the potential marker *a*, resulting in the portmanteau morph *má*.

¹³ “**Broke**” is a Ghanaian Pidgin English word which means ‘to run out of money’.

¹⁴ I suspect that this use of *FREE* relates to a popular Ghanaian English expression, *FREE OF CHARGE*, that is used to describe an action for which the doer will unjustly suffer no adverse consequences.

Underived manner adverbs, e.g. *WELL*, may also be reduplicated for a similar intensification effect:

- (23) **Guy** ma a-te ŋu a-**dance** a-**entertain** ‘That guy can dance and entertain
ame-wo well well well. (Amuzu 2013b: 25). people very well.’

5.3 Disjuncts

Like adverbial adjuncts, adverbial disjuncts express information that is not considered essential to the sentence it appears in; thus, they may also be dropped without making the sentence ungrammatical. But unlike adjuncts, they convey the mood, attitude or sentiments that a speaker has toward the propositional content of his/her sentence. Also, they are more loosely connected to the clause than adjuncts are.

The examples in (24) below contain cases of clause-initial English disjuncts in the -6 slot, where they are marked optionally by the topic marker (*l*)*a* from the -5 slot. In (24a), note that *LEFT TO ME ALONE* defines the speaker’s attitude to his statement, and *TO BE FRANK WITH YOU* (24b) and *UNFORTUNATELY* (24c) functions similarly:

- (24a) left to me alone-a, ma ga va afiya azo o. ‘Left to me alone, you will not come here again.’
(24b) to be frank with you, nye me le ready ‘To be frank with you, I am not yet ready for marriage.’
na sɔdɛdɛ haɛ o.
(24c) Unfortunately, me va ŋlɔ **discussion** ma ‘Unfortunately, I forget that **discussion** be **altogether**.’

Two examples of English disjuncts have already been presented in section 4 above, in example (10). They are *IN FACT* and *EVEN*, which also occur in the topic slot, i.e. the -6 slot.

There is a marked distinction between clause-final adjuncts and clause-final disjuncts. Disjuncts do not occur in the +4 slot. Rather, they occur peripherally outside the clause structure, in +7 slot (for a monolingual Ewe illustration, see 7d above). For example, the Ewe clause-final particle *o* (the second part of the bipartite negation morphemes *me...o*) cannot come after the disjunct *OBVIOUSLY* (see the unacceptability of 25b); however, *OBVIOUSLY* is acceptable as sentence-final element when it

without (*I*)a but (*I*)a is present in (26b). Note that each of the English conjuncts may be replaced by their Ewe counterpart expressions, which means that the conjunct slot is projectable in the Ewe clause structure.

- (26a) **But, but**, se ɖa lo, viɖe ka kpɔm ne le tso **But, but**, listen, what profit are you
 teacher ɖɔ ya me fia-a? deriving from this ‘**teacher job**’ [i.e.
 teaching career].’
- NB: ***Gake, gake***, se ɖa lo...
- (26b) **Because of that** la, ma gblɔ be ɖe viwo **Because of that**, I would say that the
 dze agbagba. kids have done very well.’
- NB: ***de ema*** ta la, ma gblɔ be...
- (26c) **Government** ya le **very irresponsible**. This **government** is **very irresponsible**.
For example, wo me te ŋu **job create-m** **For example**, they are unable to **create**
 ná mí **unemployed youth**-wo o. **jobs** for us **unemployed youth**.’
- NB: ***Le kpɔdenu me***, wo me te ŋu...

The utterance in (26a) was made during a heated debate between two teachers concerning their remuneration. The conjunct **BUT** signals the speaker’s intension to contradict the point made by the interlocutor; in fact, the repetition was intended to wrestle the turn from the interlocutor, who had been speaking loudly for quite a long time. The conjunct **BECAUSE OF THAT** signals that the speaker is about to state the result of something that was mentioned earlier in the conversation. Lastly, the use of **FOR EXAMPLE** alerts the listener that an illustration is about to be given of what was stated in the previous sentence.

6. Concluding remarks

Few studies have been devoted to scrutinizing the behaviour of adverbials in bilingual constructions, and we have noted that the dearth of such studies is likely due to the fact that adverbials constitute an amorphous category in terms of *function* (they could be adjuncts, disjuncts or conjuncts), *distribution* (they could occur clause-initially, in some languages clause-medially, and cause-finally) and the *linguistic expression* used to encode them (as noted they could be adverbs, adverb phrases, temporal noun phrases, prepositional phrases or adverb clauses). The paper aimed to provoke a discussion of this subject matter.

It set out to describe and explain patterns in which adverbials (i.e. single-

word adverbs, adverb phrases, temporal noun phrases, prepositional phrases, and adverb clauses) distribute in bilingual clauses in Ewe-English codeswitching, spoken in Ghana. It finds that while English adverbials occur in Ewe-based clauses, Ewe adverbials do not occur in English-based clauses.¹⁵ This state of affairs is parallel to Treffers-Daller's (1994) study in which French adverbs were shown to occur in Dutch-based clauses while it is never the case that a Dutch adverb occurs in a French clause; a similar though not perfectly identical situation is reported by Hebblethwaite's (2010) study of Haitian-English in Miami. The interesting point of this cross-linguistic pattern is that the source of adverbial switches is (and I agree with Treffers-Daller, 1994) the socially more dominant / prestigious of the two languages in contact.

The second major point relates closely to the first one in that it concerns the fact that the socially more dominant language that is the constant source of adverb switches is restricted to playing a less dominant role when it comes to defining the morphosyntactic character of the bilingual clauses in which its adverbs occur.

In other words, it was found that the English adverbials only occur in four adverb positions in Ewe-based clauses where equivalent Ewe adverbials may occur, i.e. in the -6 and -4 clause-initial adverb positions and in the +4 clause-final (and sometimes clause-medial) position as well as in the peripheral +7 slot. The English adverbs do not occur in clause-medial adverb positions found in English clauses but not in Ewe clauses (i.e. the clause medial position between the subject-NP, i.e. the IP-internal position, and the VP-internal position, i.e. the position in-between a pre-verb and a main verb). What these findings ultimately mean is that although adverbial switches constitute an amorphous syntactic and semantic category, their distribution is consistent with principles outlined in Myers-Scotton's Matrix Language Frame model that have also been found attested in the distribution of English nouns, verbs, and adjectives in Ewe-English codeswitching by Amuzu (2005a, 2014a, 2014b, 2015) and in codeswitching elsewhere in West Africa by Amuzu (2005b[2010], 2013a), in Akan-English codeswitching by Quarcoo (2009), in Ga-English codeswitching by

¹⁵ However, hypothetically, as indicated earlier in the examples in (6a) and (6b), some

Vanderpuije (2011), and in Yoruba-English codeswitching by Bolaji et al (2014) among others.

List of Grammatical Abbreviations

ALL = Allative preposition	HAB = Habitual	PROSP = Prospective
COMP = Complementizer	NDEF = Indefiniteness	NPRES = non-Present tense
COP = copula	NEG = Negative	sg = Singular
DAT = Dative preposition	NP = Nominal Phrase Plural	TP = Topic Marker
DEF = Definiteness	PL = Possessive	1, 2, 3 = First-, Second-, and Third-Persons.
EMPH = Emphasis	poss = Linker Potential Aspect	(*X) = Unacceptable if X included
FOC = Focus	POT = Present tense	
	PRES =	

References

- Amekor, Collins Kwabla, 2009. *Codeswitching as a Medium of Instruction in Selected Schools in the Volta Region*. M.Phil Thesis. English Department, University of Ghana.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 1998. *Aspects of Grammatical Structure in Ewe-English*

idiophones from Ewe may surface as manner adverbs in the English speech of some bilinguals. I should add here that Ewe nouns (and their counterparts from other Ghanaian languages) occasionally get used in English-based clauses, i.e. in clauses in which English functions as the matrix language. Most of those nouns relate to socio-culturally unique items for which there are hardly words in English, e.g. royal titles and names of some local dishes. One scholar who has investigated this kind of language alternation is Kari Dako (e.g. 2001 and 2002). It is revealing that her source of data for those studies was not conversational discourse but rather English medium national newspapers; the phenomenon of spoken English-based codeswitching is, at least for now, rare. No work has so far appeared that shows the use of adjectives and verbs from Ghanaian languages in English-based clauses. This situation is not surprising because the matrix language is normally the socially less dominant language (cf. Myers-Scotton 1993, 2002).

- Codeswitching*. M. Phil. Thesis, University of Oslo.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2005a. Revisiting the Classic Codeswitching – Composite Codeswitching Distinction: A Case Study of Nonverbal Predication in Ewe-English Codeswitching. *Australian Journal of Linguistics* 25(1). 127-151.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2005b. *Ewe-English Codeswitching: A Composite rather than Classic Codeswitching*. PhD. Dissertation, Australian National University.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2009. Double Plurality in Codeswitching. *Legon Journal of the Humanities*. 20: 151-180.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2010. *Composite Codeswitching in West Africa: The Case of Ewe-English Codeswitching*. Saarbrücken: Lambert Academic Publishing.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2013a. A cross-linguistic study of double plurality in bilingual code-switching in West Africa. *Journal of West African Languages*. Volume XL, No. 2: 73-100.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2013b. Bilingual serial verb constructions: A comparative study of Ewe-English and Ewe-French codeswitching. *Lingua* 137, 19-37.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2014a. A comparative study of bilingual verb phrases in Ewe-English and Gengbe-French codeswitching. *Journal of Language Contact*. 7(2): 250-287.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2014b. Producing composite codeswitching: the role of the modularity of language production. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(4): 384-407.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2014c. Is codeswitching in Ghana still the ‘third tongue’ of the educated? In Kwesi Yankah, Kofi Saah and Nana Aba Amfo ed. *A Legon Reader in Ghanaian linguistics*. pp.162-177. Oxfordshire: Ayebia Clarke publishing Limited.
- Amuzu, Evershed Kwasi. 2015. Combining the Markedness Model and the Matrix Language Frame Model in analyzing bilingual speech. In Gerald Stell and Kofi Yakpo (eds.) *Code-switching between structural and sociolinguistic perspectives*. Berlin: D Gruyter. Pp. 85-116.
- Asilevi, Francis. 1990. *English-Ewe Code-mixing in Conversational Discourse: A case of English as a second language in Ghana*. MA Thesis. Accra: University of Ghana.
- Bolaji, Ezekiel Tunde, Omowunmi Mopelola Adebajo and Rifqat Opeyemi Sanni. 2014. ‘Patterns of Codeswitching in Mixed Yoruba-English Interrogative Sentences.’ *Journal of Cognitive Science*, 15(2): 149-286.
- Dako, Kari. 2002. ‘Code-switching and lexical borrowing: which is what in Ghanaian English?’ *English Today*, 18(3): 48-54
- Dako, Kari. 2001. ‘Ghanaianisms: towards a semantic and a formal classification’. *English World Wide*, 22(2): 23-53.

- Duthie, A. 1996. *Introducing Ewe Linguistic Patterns*. Accra: Ghana Universities Press.
- Dzameshie, Alex, 1994. Communicative competence and code choice: The case of codeswitching by a bilingual family. Unpublished manuscript.
- Dzameshie, Alex, 1996. Toward a global explanation of unmarked codeswitching: Evidence from Ewe-English bilingual codeswitching. Unpublished manuscript.
- Ezuh, Sampson Kobla, 2009. *Investigating the effect of using code switching in instruction on the performance of students of Senior High Schools in the Volta and Central Regions*. M.A. Teaching English as a Second Language. Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana, Legon.
- Ezuh, Sampson. 2014. *Teaching English through codeswitching to adult beginner learners*. MPhil. Thesis. Linguistics Department, University of Ghana.
- Eckardt, R. 1998. *Adverbs, events and other things*. Tübingen: Max Niemeyer.
- Enkvist, N.E. 1976. Notes on valency, semantic scope and thematic perspective as parameters of adverbial placement in English. In N.E. Enkvist & V. Kononen (eds.) *Reports on Text Linguistics: Approaches to Word Order*. Åbo, pp. 51-73.
- Flamenbaum, Rachel. 2014. The pragmatics of codeswitching on Ghanaian talk-radio. *International Journal of Bilingualism*, 18(4): 346-362.
- Forson, Barnabas. 1979. *Code-switching in Akan-English Bilingualism*. Ph.D Thesis. California: University of California.
- Hebblethwaite, Benjamin. 2010. Adverb code-switching among Miami's Haitian Creole-English second generation. *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition*. 13 (4): 409-428.
- Johansson, S., & Lysvåg, P. 1987. *Understanding English grammar, Part II: A closer view*. Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1993. *Duelling Languages: Grammatical Structure in Codeswitching*. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 1995. A lexically-based model of codeswitching. In Milroy L and Muysken P. (eds.). *One speaker, two languages: Cross-linguistic perspectives on codeswitching*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 233-256.
- Myers-Scotton, Carol. 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.
- Nortsu-Kotoe, Peter, K. 1999. *A linguistic analysis of Ewe Adverts*. BA Long Essay. Accra: University of Ghana.
- Nuworsu, Anastasia. 2014. *Adverbials in Akan-English codeswitching*. An MPhil. Sociolinguistics term paper.
- Quarcoo, Millicent. 2009. *Grammatical Constraints on Noun and Verb Phrases in*

- Twi-English Codeswitching*. MPhil Thesis, University of Ghana, Legon.
- Treffers-Daller, J. 1994. *Mixing two languages: French–Dutch contact in a comparative perspective*. New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Trenkic, Danijela. 2008. The representation of English articles in second language grammars: Determiners or adjectives? *Bilingualism: Language and Cognition* 11(1): 1-18.
- Vanderpuije, Joana Adua, 2011. *Ga-English codeswitching in television and radio advertisements*. MPhil. Thesis, Department of Linguistics, University of Ghana, Legon.
- Yevudey, Elvis, 2009. *Ewe-English codeswitching on radio*. BA Long Essay, Linguistics Department, University of Ghana, Legon.
- Yoon, K. 1992. New perspective on intrasentential codeswitching: A study of Korean–English switching. *Applied Psycholinguistics*, 13(4): 433–449.

