The Dependent Clause in Ghanaian English Pidgin

John Franklin WIREDU
Department of English, University of Ghana, Legon

Abstract

Increasing use of Pidgin in Ghana has inevitably drawn attention to this variety of language – especially, since its use is believed to have a direct negative effect on people's competent use of the English Language in school. As a result, people believe that its pervasive use by the youth in Ghana has implications for education in the country. This negative perception stems from the conviction that pidgin is linguistically deficient because

    a)   it is a reduced language, when compared to its superstrate language(s)

    b)   it is spoken by people in the lower class of society

Not surprisingly, therefore, there are those voices in the educational sector who often suggest that pidgin use in school campuses should be stamped out.

This strong condemnation of pidgin use has aroused our interest in this study of pidgins. We consider a pidgin as a contact language, closely related to whatever language(s) serve(s) as its superstrate(s). As a contact language, then, it deserves research interest.

The overall aim in this study, accordingly, is to examine the grammar of Ghanaian English Pidgin. Specifically, we are interested in the grammar of the dependent clause in a variety of pidgin. And the data we are using is derived from recorded conversations that Osei-Tutu (2009) used in his work on Ghanaian Student Pidgin.

Our assumption throughout this work is that the fact that pidgin is viewed as 'a reduced language' does not mean that it is linguistically deficient and unstructured. We believe that it has structure and, accordingly, can be studied, like any other contact language.

LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ART-DEF	Definite Article
ART-INDEF	Indefinite Article
AUX-PROG	Auxiliary (Progressive Aspect)
COMP	Complementizer (that)
COP-EQ	Copular (Equative) Verb
COP-LOC	Copular (Locative) Verb
EMP	Emphasizer Particle
MOD-FUT	Modal Auxiliary (Future)
MOD-OBL	Modal Auxiliary (Obligation)
MOD-POSS	Modal Auxiliary (Possibility)
NEG	Negator
PART	Particle
1 PL-POSS	1st Person Plural Possessive Determiner
3 SG-POSS	3rd Person Singular Possessive Determiner
3 PL-PRO	3rd Person Plural Pronoun
3 SG-PRO/OBJ	3rd Person Singular Objective Pronoun
3 SG-PRO/SBJ	3rd Person Singular Subjective Pronoun
SUB-COND	Subordinator (Conditional)
SUB-TEMP	Subordinator (Temporal)

THE DEPENDENT CLAUSE IN GHANAIAN ENGLISH PIDGIN

1. Introduction

Given the increasingly globalizing trends in human mobility, the world has become a common ground for people of different languages and cultures to meet and interact. Significantly for linguistics, the issue of language contact arises, since, in most cases, individuals in such interactions do not share a common language. When languages thus come into contact, according to Sebba (1997), the situation provides the environment for the processes of pidginization and creolization. Other sociolinguistic processes that can occur in such a situation are borrowing, code-switching, language convergence, and language mixing.

It is important to note that pidginization (and, eventually, creolization) may more easily occur because, unlike the other sociolinguistic processes, it does not involve any high degree of bilingualism in the languages of contact. This is because, in such situations, the two groups of people who interact do not need to know each other's language. They do not have the opportunity or the desire to learn the other group's language. But each has a native command of at least one of the languages in contact.

A pidgin results from such contact because language learning has taken place, even if imperfectly. It results from the need to bridge the communicative gap which arises as a result of the lack of a common, understood language. So, pidginization results as a strategy adopted to make communication possible between the two groups who have a need to communicate with each other. Indeed, it is generally accepted that pidgins emerge in multilingual communities which have restricted social and linguistic interaction. As a result of this need to interact, members of the communities are 'forced' to improvise a language that will facilitate interaction among them. This leads to the use of a pidgin.

Unfortunately, pidgins have generally been stigmatized. According to Siegel (1999), there is a subjective rejection of this variety of language. And there are reasons assigned for this stigmatization. Firstly, most pidgin languages are not official languages in the societies in which they are spoken. Therefore, they are not recognized as suitable to be used in schools as languages of instruction. (Craig, 2008).

Secondly, pidgins are traditionally considered to be low-class varieties of a standard language (Eades, 1999). Of course, there is a basis for the low regard we give to pidgins. In the past, they were associated with plantation workers, enslaved labour, misunderstood cultures which were clearly different from European cultures, household staff who performed menial jobs for their superior European masters, etc. Because these classes of people were considered socially inferior, the pidgins they spoke were considered as a reflection of their inability to speak the European languages of their masters. (Todd, 1974). As a confirmation of this view, one recalls the unfortunate remark made by Herbert Macauley (a Nigerian political activist in the 1930s) when he described Nigerian pidgin as "the inferior language of the half-caste." (Omolewa, 1975).

Also, because of the economy of form and structure of pidgins, they are considered to be linguistically and cognitively deficient. They are regarded as inferior, non-systematic, broken or bastardized versions of some standard superstrate languages, whose words and structures, for the most part, were 'borrowed' from some other languages to fill a linguistic need. Therefore, pidgins were assumed to be deformed, defective varieties of these other languages. (Holm, 2000).

In Ghana, for instance, the pidgin spoken was for a long time referred to as *broken English,* because it was considered to be a corrupt, inferior version of English. Thus, in many schools, it was viewed as 'uneducated speech' and efforts were made to discourage its use because of its perceived adverse effects on pupils' proficiency in English. (Hyde, 1991).

In spite of these negative perceptions, however, current research into pidgins considers them as contact languages, closely related to their respective constituent source languages (Mufwene, 2001). This change in attitude is reflected in the definitions in current literature:

- *a pidgin is defined as a marginal language which arises to fulfil certain restricted communication needs among people who have no common language.* (Todd, 1974: 1)
- *a pidgin represents a language which has been stripped of everything but the bare essentials necessary for communication. There are few, if any stylistic options. The emphasis is on the referential or communicative rather than the expressive function of language.* (Romaine, 1988: 24)
- *a simplified language used for restricted communicative purposes by people who normally have no language in common.* (Ahulu, 1995: 31)
- *pidgin languages represent speech- forms which do not have native speakers, and are, therefore, primarily used as a means of communication among people who do not share a common language* (Muysken and Smith, 1995: 3).
- *a pidgin is a reduced language that results from extended contact between groups of people with no other language in common; it evolves when they need some means of verbal communication. . .* (Holm, 2000: 5)

It is evident from these definitions that a pidgin should be considered a contact language. And, therefore, as a contact language, it has the following features:

a) it has emerged in situations in which people from different linguistic backgrounds need to talk to each other
b) it has developed in social contexts where the members do not know each other's language
c) its lexicon and grammatical structures show evidence that it is a mixed language. In other words, the grammar of the pidgin does not come from one language. Instead, it is a kind of cross-language compromise of the grammars of the languages in contact

According to Thomason (2007), the following implications arise from the above characteristics:

a) a pidgin is nobody's mother-tongue and, therefore, is spoken as a second language
b) a pidgin is used typically for limited intergroup communication
c) a pidgin has fewer linguistic processes (for example, minimal lexical stock, lack of elaborated morphological structures, limited syntactic patterns, etc.) because of its restricted communicative functions

In this study, then, we will consider pidgins as worthy of linguistic study because they have linguistic

systems which are quite different from those of the languages from which they are derived. They cannot be considered as dialects of their parent languages. Rather, they are new languages generated in situations of language contact. This point is buttressed by Sebba (1997), who argues that, in many instances, pidgins are not mutually intelligible with their source languages.

Accordingly, we believe that linguistic processes in pidgins are not haphazard. They are systematic, conventional and rule-governed (Rickford and McWhorter, 1997). This is what has informed this study of a grammar of a pidgin variety in West Africa.

The main objective is to examine an area of grammar in the pidgin used by a section of students in Ghana. Specifically, we are interested in the grammar of the dependent clause. The data we are using is derived from the recorded conversations that Osei-Tutu (2009) used in his work on Ghanaian Pidgin.

2. The Complex Sentence

In grammatical analysis, the dependent clause is found in the complex and compound-complex sentences. In the pidgin data we are analyzing, however, there is no single instance of a compound-complex sentence. All the dependent clauses occur in complex sentences, their patterns of which we analyze as follows.

To begin with, there are three main structural types of the complex sentence in this pidgin, based on the combinatory arrangements of the constituent clauses within each sentence. That is, we have identified the subtypes based on the various ways by which the dependent and independent clauses in each complex are organized. We have the following configurations in this pidgin variety:

2.1. Internal Structural Types

	Structural Types of the Complex Sentence	Frequency	Percentage
A	sentences with only one rankshifted dependent clause	117	50.87
B	sentences with multiple rankshifted clauses only	36	15.65
C	sentences with only one non-rankshifted clause	45	19.57
D	sentences with multiple non-rankshifted clauses only	05	2.17
E	sentences with one rankshifted and one non-rankshifted clause	22	9.57
F	sentences with multiple rankshifted and non-rankshifted clauses	05	2.17
	TOTAL	230	100

Table 1: Structural Types of the Complex Sentence

Listed below are some of the examples of complex sentences which display the above dependent clause combinations:

1. a sentence in which there is only one rankshifted clause

a)

She	say	*e*	*go*	*come*
She	say	she	MOD-FUT	come
[She	said	she	would	come]

b)

You	know	*sey*	*the girl*	*be*	*your*	*paddy*	*im*	*girl*
You	know	COMP	the girl	COP-EQ	your	friend	3SG-POSS	girl

[You know that the girl is your friend's girlfriend]

2. a sentence in which there are only multiple rankshifted clauses:

a)

So woman	*wey*	*you*	*dey*	*feel*	*deɛ,*	e		no	be
So woman	COMP	you	AUX-PROG	like	EMP	3SG-PRO/SBJ		NEG	COP-EQ

[As for the woman whom you like,

sey	*you*	*for*	*make*	*im*	*head*	*jom*	*am*
COMP	you	MOD-OBL	make	3SG-POSS	head	sweet	3SG-PRO/OBJ

you should not pamper her]

b)

The	boys-boys	*wey*	*dem*	*dey*	*church*	*no*	de	flow	me
The	boys-PL	COMP	3PL-PRO	COP-LOC	church	ART-DET	AUX-PROG	tell	me

[Those boys in the church told me

sey	im	mummy	say	e	dey	respect	me	paa
COMP	3SG-POSS	mother	say	she	AUX-PROG	respect	me	very much

[that her mother says she respects me a lot]

3. a sentence in which only one non-rankshifted clause occurs:
   a)

Then	we	dey	bash	ball	wey	the	chick	enter	the	yard
Then	we	AUX-PROG	play	football	COMP	the	girl	enter	the	yard

[Then we were playing football when the girl came around]

   b.)

Because	Jubilee	dem	dey	give	4	oha,	4	oha,	sɔɔ	you	go	see
Because	Jubilee	3PL-PRO	AUX-PROG	give	4	hundred,	4	hundred	only	you	MOD-FUT	see

[Because Jubilee (Hall) assigns rooms to Level 400 (students), you will see only Level 400 students]

4. a sentence in which only multiple non-rankshifted clauses occur:
   a)

Because	the	way	e	dey,	if	I	start	small	nɔ,	e
Because	the	way	3SGPRO/SBJ	COP-LOC	if	I	start	a little	EMP	3SGPRO/SBJ

[As things stand now, if I start now, she

go	fit	start	de	fall	for	me
MOD-FUT	can	start	AUX-PROG	fall	for	me

may become interested in me]

   b)

Wey	we	be	paddies	o,	and	the	way	wanna	body	check,
COMP	we	COP-EQ	friends	PART	and	the	way	wanna	body	close

[Considering how close we are,

if	girlie	go	destroy	wanna	body,	e	no	fresh.
if	girl	MOD-FUT	destroy	1PL-POSS	body,	3SGPRO/SBJ	NEG	be-good

it will not be good to allow a girl to come between us]

5. a sentence in which one non-rankshifted clause and one rankshifted clause occur:

   a)

We	no	shɛda	chat	kyɛ	nɔɔ,	then	she	say	she	wan	tell	me	something
We	NEG	actually	chat	long	SUB-TEM	then	she	say	she	wan	tell	me	something

[We had not chatted for long, when she said she had something to tell me.

   b)

You	plus	am	for	dey	some	relationship
You	and	3SGPRO	MOD-OBL	COP-EQ	some	relationship

[You and she must be in some relationship

before	e	go	know	sey	this	guy	be	correct	guy
before	3SGPRO	MOD-FUT	know	COMP	this	guy	COP-EQ	correct	guy

before she can know you are the right person]

6. a sentence in which we have a combination of one or more non-rankshifted clauses plus one or more rankshifted clauses
   a.)

As	*we*	*de*	*talk*	*a,*	e	check	*like*	*I*	*see*
As	we	AUX-PROG	talk	SUB-TEMP	*3SGPRO*	*seem*	*COMP*	I	see

[As we continued to chat, I realized

what	*e*	*wan*	*talk*	*me*
what	3SGPRO	want	talk	1SGPRO

what she wanted to tell me]

b.)

Dem	know	*sey*	*e*	*no*	*be*	*your*	*woman,*
3PLPRO	know	COMP	3SGPRO	NEG	COP-EQ	your	woman,

[They know that she is not the only woman in your life

because	*dem*	*know*	*sey*	*you*	*get*	*chao*	*women*
because	3PLPRO	know	COMP	you	have	many	women

because you have a lot of girlfriends]

To sum up, we note that we have the following types of complex sentences:

a	Sentences with only rankshifted dependent clauses	153	66.52
b	Sentences with only non-rankshifted dependent clauses	50	21. 74
c	Sentences with a mixture of rankshifted and non-rankshifted clauses	27	11. 74
	TOTAL	230	100. 00

Table 2: Types of Complex Sentence

Based on this information, we can make the following observations:

i. There is preference for sentences with rankshifted dependent clauses (66.52%), rather than those with non-rankshifted clauses (21. 74%). This means that where a complex sentence occurs in this variety of Pidgin, it is more likely to be of the form:

a)

You	see	*sey*	*im*	*plus*	*the*	*girlie*	*de*	*go*
You	see	COMP	3SGPRO	and	the	girl	AUX-PROG	go

[You will see that he and the girl will just walk

the	room	inside
the	room	inside

into the room]

rather than

b)

You	*fit*	*dey*	*there*	*noo,*	dem	go	come	the
You	MOD-POSS	be-LOC	there	SUB-TEMP,	3PLPRO	MOD-FUT	come	the

[You will be in the room when they will walk in

room	inside
room	inside]

ii. In addition, even though there appears to be some overwhelming preference for rankshifted clauses, we see that, in most cases, they select sentences with only one rankshifted clause. This we see in the respective figures in the table below:

a	Sentences with only one rankshifted clause	117	76.47
b	Sentences with multiple rankshifted clauses only	36	23. 53
	TOTAL	153	100.00

Table 3: Frequency of Sentences with one-Rankshifted Clauses

iii. Indeed, this preference for one-clause dependent forms occurs even with non-rankshifted one-clause forms. That is, even in sentences with only non-rankshifted clauses, we note that those sentences with only one non-rankshifted clauses dominate, as the figures below show:

a	Sentences with only one non-rankshifted clause	45	90.00
b	Sentences with multiple non-rankshifted clauses only	05	10.00
	TOTAL	50	100.00

Table 4: Frequency of Sentences with one-non-rankshifted Clause

The obvious conclusion we can draw from all this is that, even though rankshifts occur frequently in this variety of Pidgin, there are efforts to keep the complex sentence uncomplicated. Instead of multiple dependent clauses in a single sentence, there is the choice of sentences with a single rankshifted clause or one with a single non-rankshifted clause. In other words, there is a preference for simpler internal structures within a sentence.

2.2. Types of Dependent Clause

Like other varieties of language, Ghanaian English Pidgin has different types of dependent clauses. In the data we are analyzing, we find their frequencies of occurrence as follows:

Types of Dependent Clauses

Type	Frequency	Percentage
Nominal Clause	189	54.94
Adverbial Clause	110	31.98
Relative Clause	45	13.08
TOTAL	344	100.00

Table 5: Types of Dependent Clauses

2.2.1. The Nominal Clause

The following examples illustrate the environments within which we find nominal clauses in this form of pidgin.

a)

So	my	mind	be	*sey*	*this*	*girl*	*go*	*look*	*sharp*	*give*	*me*
So	my	mind	COP-EQ	COMP	this	girl	MOD-FUT	appear	favour	for	me

[So I thought this girl would accept my proposal if I asked]

b)

She	say	*e*	*de*	*chock*	*for*	*Sarbah (Hall)*
She	say	3SGPRO	AUX-PROG	wait	at	Sarbah (Hall)

[She said she was waiting in Sarbah (Hall)]

c)

E	check	*like*	*I*	*know*	*am*	*well*	*well*
It	seem	COMP	I	know	3SGPRO	ADV-INT	well

[It seems I know her very well]

d)

Some	time	bi	e	de	biz	me	*how*	*e*	*de*	*like*
Some	time	ART-INDEF	3SGPRO	AUX-PROG	biz	me	how	e	de	like

[Sometimes she kept asking how she looked]

e)

I	biz	am	*sey*	*so*	*what*	*be*	*im*	*mind*	*now*
I	ask	3SGPRO	COMP	so	what	COP-EQ	3SGPOSS	mind	now

[I asked her what her decision was]

From these examples above, we can deduce the environments for the occurrence of the nominal clause as follows:

1. *sey* + **a finite clause**

    In such a structure, *sey* serves as the nominal complementizer in the dependent clause.

    There are two possible options here:

    a) where the complementizer actually occurs in the clause

I	no	fit	talk	*sey*	*she*	*no*	*fine*
I	NEG	can	talk	COMP	she	NEG	fine

    [I have to admit that she is beautiful]

Then	I	tell	am	*sey*	*I*	*be*	*Michael*
Then	I	tell	3SGPRO	COMP	I	COP-EQ	Michael

    [Then I told her that I am Michael]

    b) where the complementizer is optional in the clause

She	go	flow	me	*make*	*I*	*come*	*chop*	*some*
She	MOD-FUT	tell	me	let	I	come	eat	QUANT-PRO

    [She will call me to come and eat]

    c)

E	say	*we*	*mo*	*be*	*friends*
3SGPRO	say	we	MOD-OBL	COP-EQ	friends

[She said we should be friends]

2. *like* + **a finite clause**

In such environments, the COMP *like* serves as the complementizer in the dependent clause. It has an obligatory presence in the clause.

    a)

E	check	*like*	*we*	*paddy*	*wanna*	*body*	*fine*
It	seem	COMP	we	friends	1PLPOSS	body	fine

[We seem to like each other]

    b)

E	be	*like*	*I*	*de*	*slack*
It	COP-EQ	COMP	I	AUX-PROG	slack

[It seems I am letting the chance slip by]

3. *WH* + **a finite clause**

This is an interrogative clause. There are two possible options here:

i.   where there is the presence of the complementizer *sey* preceding the WH-word:

    a)

Sometime	she	go	biz	me	*sey*	*why*	*I*	*no*	*bell*	*am*
Sometimes	she	AUX-PROG	ask	me	COMP	why	I	NEG	call	3SGPRO

[Sometimes she will call me to find out why I haven't called her]

    b)

My	paddies	de	wonder	*sey*	*who*	*be*	*my*	*true*	*paddy*
My	friends	AUX-PROG	wonder	COMP	who	COP-EQ	my	true	friend

[My friends often wonder who my true friend is]

ii. where the clause occurs without any preceding complementizer:

    a)

Dem	no	shɛda	know	*where*	*dem*	*de*	*go*	*sef*
3PLPRO	NEG	actually	know	where	3PLPRO	AUX-PROG	go	even

[They don't know where they are even going]

    b)

You	for	know	*how*	*you*	*go*	*treat*	*woman*
You	MOD-OBL	know	how	you	MOD-FUT	treat	woman

[You should know how to handle ladies]

These types of dependent nominal clauses exemplified above occur in the following frequencies:

Distribution of Nominal Clause Types
1. *sey* + **a finite clause**

i	where *sey* actually occurs in the clause	113	59.79
ii	where *sey* is omitted in the clause	26	13.76

2. *like* + **a finite clause**

where the complementizer *like* occurs in the clause	21	11.11

3. **WH** + **a finite clause**

i	where the clause occurs with the complementizer *sey*	09	4.76
ii	where the clause occurs with no complementizer	20	10.58
	TOTAL	189	100.00

The major conclusions one can draw from the above figures are:
  a)   There are two complementizers in this variety of pidgin - *sey* and *like*
  b)   The more commonly used complementizer is *sey,* which occurs in the following environments:
      i.   It may or may not occur in a non-interrogative nominal clause
      ii.   it may or may not occur in an interrogative nominal clause
  c)   The complementizer *like* has a less frequent occurrence and, in contrast to *sey*, must appear in the clause.

2.2.1.1. Grammatical Context of the Nominal Clause

These nominal clause types serve as complements of mainly particular verbs and a few adjectives. They never occur as complements to nouns. Accordingly, we can set up sub-classes of these nominal clauses based on which verbs and/or adjectives can allow the nominal clause as complement. In connection with this, then, there are six such sub-types:

1.   Verbs which can allow the occurrence of the structure *sey* + nominal clause.
     The following list consists of verbs which can be followed by this clause type:

be	hope	see
*bell	know	suspect
*biz	like	*talk
figure	love	*tell
*flow	make	think
gather	regret	wonder

(Verbs which are marked with the sign * can take a noun object before the nominal clause itself).

2.   Verbs which allow the omission of the complementizer *sey* in the nominal clause:
         be
         flow
         know
         mean
         say

This means that the verbs above may or may not allow the COMP *sey* in the structure of the sentence.

3.   Verbs which take the *WH*-nominal clause.

These are verbs which can allow the occurrence of the *WH*-nominal clause as complement. The verbs are listed as follows:

         be
         biz
         dey
         know
         see

These WH- clauses usually start with the following interrogators – *what, where, why, how* .

4.   Verbs which take the *like*-nominal clause as complement are:
         be
         check

5.   Verbs which take *sey* followed by the WH-nominal clause. In other words, we have a structure like: V + *sey* + WH-nominal clause
         biz
         wonder

6.   The following adjectives allow *sey* + nominal clause complements

high	sure
sorry	true

Before concluding the discussion on the nominal clause, it is important to mention that their syntactic occurrence is relatively limited, compared to the superstrate English Language. In Ghanaian English Pidgin, the nominal clause can occur in the following syntactic environments only:

i. as direct object of a verb
ii. as qualifier in an Adjectival Group

but the nominal clause never occurs
iii. at Subject position
iv. as qualifier in the Nominal Group
v. as completive element in a Prepositional Group

2.2.2. The Adverbial Clause

We find the following types of Adverbial Clauses and their relative distribution in the data as follows:

Types	Frequency	Percentage
Clause of Time	50	45.46
Clause of Condition	28	25.46
Clause of Reason	20	18.18
Clause of Manner	08	7.27
Clause of Purpose	02	1.82
Clause of Place	02	1.82
TOTAL	110	100.00

Table 7: Types of the Adverbial Clause

From this table, it is clear that, in this variety of pidgin, only three types of the Adverbial Clause are of significance – clauses of time, condition, and reason. So, while not ignoring the other three 'minor' types (clauses of manner, purpose and place), we will concentrate mainly on the clauses with a more prevailing presence in the language.

1. Clause of Time

This type of clause is realized through the use of two different sets of subordinators:
i. There are those subordinators which occur at clause-initial position in the clause:
a)

Wey	*we*	*go*	*programme,*	e	go	like	zook-zook	me
SUB-TEMP	we	go	programme,	3SGPL	MOD-FUT	like	caress	me

[When we are at a programme, she will caress me]
b)

I	go	programme	some	time	bi,	wey	I	cross	this	girl
I	go	programme	some	time	ART-INDEF,	SUB-TEMP	I	met	this	girl

[I was at one programme, when I came across this girl]

_as_

a)

As	*I*	*pop*	*the*	*girl*	*that*	*day,*	then	my	interest	dey
As	I	look (at)	the	girl	that	day,	then	my	interest	be-LOC

[As I looked at the girl that day, I developed interest in her]

b)

As	*we*	*write*	*the*	*exam*	*finish,*	we	vacate	go	home
As	we	write	the	exam	finish,	we	vacate	go	home

[When we finished writing our exams, we went home]

Sometimes, this subordinator may be used together with an Akan correlative time subordinator – *no,* which occurs at clause-final position. This forms some sort of correlative subordination with the English subordinator *as*:

As	*I*	*de*	*wan*	*bed*	*no,*	then	some	number	bi	flash
As	I	AUX-PROG	want	sleep	SUB,	then	some	number	ART-INDEF	flash

[As I got ready to sleep, a number kept flashing on my phone]

before

	de	weigh	the	two	of	us	*before*	*you*	*go*	*select*	*one?*
You											
You	AUX-PROG	weigh	the	two	of	us	before	you	MOD-FUT	select	one?

[Are you assessing the two of us before you select one of us?]

after

After	I	chop	the	chow	finish,	I	leave	house	go	campus
After	I	eat	the	food	finish,	I	leave	house	go	campus

[After eating, I left the house for the Campus]

    ii.   There are those time subordinators which occur at clause-final position. They optionally occur with some other subordinators (such as *when* and *as*) in a correlative relationship. This means that they may occur with the above subordinators or they may occur alone:

***n*ɔɔ**

a)

I	*catch*	*school*	*n* ɔɔ	I	rush	go	meet	my	supervisor
I	reach	school	SUB-TIME	I	rush	go	meet	my	supervisor

[As soon as I reached school, I went to see my supervisor]

b)

I	*make*	*some*	*small*	*move*	*n*ɔɔ,	dem	vex
I	make	some	small	move	SUB-TEMP	3PLPRO	(become) angry

[Whenever I take any action, they become angry]

a

a)

I	*come*	*a,*	I	go	come	in	there
I	come	SUB-TEMP	I	MOD-FUT	come	3SGPOSS	place

[When I come, I will come to her place]

b)

I	sure	*sey*	*she*	*finish*	*talk*	*a,*	she	go	bell	me
I	be- sure	COMP	she	finish	talk	SUB-COND,	she	MOD-FUT	call	me

[I am sure that when she finishes talking, she will call me]

It is possible to list below the relative distribution of the above time subordinators as they occur in the data:

Types	Frequency	Percentage
wey	18	36.00
a	11	22.00
as…*(no)*	09	18.00
n ɔɔ	08	16.00
after	02	4.00
before	02	4.00
TOTAL	50	100.00

Table 8: Types of Time Adverbial Subordinators

We will conclude this discussion of time adverbial clauses by remarking as follows:
    i.   Compared to the superstrate English in Ghana, this pidgin variety has fewer time subordinators. As the data has shown, there are only six types; and even then, only four of them are more frequently used – *wey, as, a, n* .
    ii.   Many other subordinators (which occur very frequently in the superstrate English) do not occur in this pidgin. For example, we do not have the following time subordinators being used – *when, until, since, immediately, as soon as, while,* etc. They are all 'missing 'in this pidgin.

2. Clause of Condition

This type of clause is realized through the following forms:

if

a)

If	*me*	*plus*	*am*	*dey*	*some*	*cool*	*place,*	*then*	*fine*
If	*I*	*and*	*3SGPRO*	*COP-LOC*	*some*	*quiet*	*place,*	*then*	*fine*

[If the two of us are in a quiet place, then it's fine]

b)

If	*I*	*be*	*serious*	*de*	*do*	*something*	*I*	*be*	*serious*
If	*I*	*COP-EQ*	*serious*	*AUX-PROG*	*do*	*something*	*I*	*COP-EQ*	*serious*

[If I am serious about something, I deal with it seriously]

In some instances, just as in the time subordination discussed above, there are some Akan focus markers are placed at clause-final positions to form correlative subordination. These are found in the list below:

if. . . a

a)

E	*talk*	*sey*	*if*	*I*	*be*	*im*	*boy*	*a,*	*e*	*go*	*bore*	*paa*
3SGPRO	*talk*	*COMP*	*if*	*I*	*COP-LOC*	*3SGPOSS*	*boy*	*SUB-COND*	*3SGPRO*	*MOD-FUT*	*angry*	*very*

[She said that if I were her boyfriend, she would be very angry]

b)

If	*the*	*move*	*pae*	*a,*	*we*	*go*	*fit*	*run*	*wanna*	*body*	*fine*
If	the	move	succeed	SUB-COND,	we	MOD-FUT	can	manage	1PLPOSS	body	fine

[If it works out, we can start a relationship]

if . . . deε

a)

So	*if*	*this*	*one*	*no*	*work*	*deε,*	*I*	*go*	*just*	*chock*
So	if	this	one	NEG	work	EMP,	I	MOD-FUT	just	wait

[If this one doesn't work out, I will just wait]

b)

If	I	wan	run	am	deε,	im	mummy	no	be	problem
If	I	want	woo	3SG-PRO	EMP,	3SGPOSS	mother	NEG	COP-EQ	problem

If I want to woo her, her mother will not pose a problem

The relative distribution of these conditional types is as follows:

Subordinators	Frequency	Percentage
if	12	42.86
if … *a*	09	32.14
if … *deε*	07	25.00
TOTAL	28	100.00

Table 9: Types of Subordinators of Condition

We will remark that there is only one type of conditional clause used in this pidgin – what Quirk et al (1985) identify as Type 1 clause of condition. The others - Types 2 and 3 - do not occur at all. This is not surprising because several studies on pidgins elsewhere have noted that mood, tense and aspectual considerations do not matter in pidgin (see Muhlhausler, 1997; Romain, 2000; Bakker, 2008)

3. Clause of Reason

There are only two subordinators which occur in this type of clause:

because	08	66.67
sake of	04	33.33
TOTAL	12	100.00

Table 10: Types of Subordinators of Reason

We have the following examples:

a)

But	more	times	I	no	de	bell	am
But	more	times	I	NEG	AUX-PROG	call	3SGPRO

[But most often I don't call her,

because	*I*	*know*	*sey*	*the*	*interest*	*no*	*dey*
because	I	know	COMP	the	interest	NEG	COP-LOC

because I know I am not interested in her]

b)

Sake of	*the*	*girl*	*shun*	*that*	*my*	*paddy*	*no,*	boys-boys	bore	am
Because (of)	the	girl	shun	that	my	friend	ART-DEF,	boys-PL	angry	3SGPRO

[Since the girl broke up with my friend, all the other boys are angry with her]

2.2.3. The Relative Clause

This clause occurs quite often in this pidgin. There is only one subordinator – *wey:*

a)

One	lady	bi	dey	inside	*wey*	*I*	*know*	*am*
One	lady	ART-INDEF	COP-LOC	inside	COMP	I	know	3SGPRO

[There is one lady whom I know]

b)

Girls	de	jealous	other	girls	paddies	*wey*	*dem*
Girls	COP-EQ	jealous	other	girls	friends	COMP	3PLPRO

[Girls are jealous of those girls whose

see	*sey*	*dem*	*boys*	*de*	*fine*	*give*	*dem*
see	COMP	3PLPRO	boys	AUX-PROG	fine	for	3PLPRO

boys are handsome]

It is important to mention that there are instances when the relative clause subordinator may be omitted, as follows:

a)

You	see	the	yawa	*the*	*girl*	*de*	*flow*	*me?*
You	see	the	nonsense	the	girl	AUX-PROG	tell	me?

[Do you notice the nonsense the girl is telling me?]

b)

I	see	sey	the	voice	de	jay	that	girl
I	see	COMP	the	voice	AUX-PROG	resemble	that	girl

[I realized that the voice resembled that girl

c)

I	*de*	*talk*	*plus*	*am*	*that*	*gbeketii*	*no*
I	AUX-PROG	talk	with	3SGPPRO	that	night	ART-DEF

I spoke to that night]

We will end this section by remarking that many studies on pidgin use have perceived pidgins as reduced languages because their syntactic structures are considered less complex than the structures of the languages they are in contact with. And that this overall simplicity found in pidgins is a general design feature. From the discussion above, there appears to be a basis for this view of .

3. Conclusion

We will conclude this study by recalling the words of Todd (1974: 10):

> In creoles and pidgins, one finds not a reduced, or partial, or corrupt
> form of the grammar of English, but a new system related to the
> contact languages but possessing unique features.

This study has revealed that not only is the dependent clause a reflection of the imbibed features of the two languages in contact, but also it reflects a restructuring of the dependent clauses in both languages.

Thus, we consider it inappropriate to regard pidgin as an ungrammatical version of the English in use in Ghana. Pidgin definitely is not, as we have demonstrated in this study. It has norms; it has rules; it has systems. This is why it is a variety that has to be learnt.

This pidgin variety has arisen because English has come in contact with some other language. As a result, the pidgin has developed a grammar which is structurally different. Its grammar is not merely a simplified English grammar. It is a grammar resulting from two (or more) grammars of the contact languages.

Thomason and Kaufman (1988) have pointed out that pidgins are lingua francas which have developed to meet particular functional needs of the users. They are needed to bridge a communication gap. The grammars of pidgins, as they are, are able to perform these functions. Thus, the lack of complexity implies that pidgins have restricted social and communicative roles for their users. The 'simplicity' of pidgins has arisen because of its limited linguistic functionality – a pidgin is simple because its function is simple.

In the study of pidgins, there is the need to correct the often-held belief that a pidgin is a bastardized, corrupt and defective version of a natural language. It is through linguistic research aimed at describing the structure of pidgins that language scholars can shape opinions about them. It is in recognition of this responsibility that this study has been undertaken.

The major assumption, throughout the work, is that a pidgin is an inevitable consequence of social contacts between peoples from different linguistic backgrounds. Therefore, there is the need for a comprehensive examination of its structural features. It is our hope that linguists in Ghana will take up this challenge.

REFERENCES

Ahulu, Samuel (1995). Hybridized English in Ghana. *English Today: The International Review of the English Lnguage.* 11.4: 31 – 36.

Bakker, Peter (2008). Pidgins Versus Creoles and Pidgin Creoles. In Kouwenberg, Silvia and Singler, John (eds). *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies.* West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell. pp. 130 – 157.

Craig, Dennis (2008). Pidgins, Creoles and Education. In Kouwenberg, Silva and Singler, John (eds). *The Handbook of Pidgin and Creole Studies*. West Sussex: Wiley-Blackwell. pp. 593 – 614.

Eades, Diana (1999). News from Da Pidgin Coup in Hawai'i. *Pidgins and Creoles in Education Newsletter.* 10: 5 – 7.

Holms, John (2000). *An Introduction to Pidgins and Creoles*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Hyde, Faustina (1991). 'Harvard' and the Dilemma of the English Teacher: A Case for Pidgin English. In Quarcoo, Emmanuel (ed). *Proceedings of the Ghana English Studies Association Conference.* University of Ghana, Legon.

Mufwene, Salikoko (2001). *The Ecology of Language Evolution*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Muhlhausler, Peter (1997). *Pidgin and Creole Linguistics*. London: University of Westminster Press.

Muysken, Pieter and Smith, Norval (1995) The Study of Pidgin and Creole Languages. In Arends, Jacques; Muysken, Peter and Smith, Norval (eds). *Pidgins and Creoles*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: John Benjamins.

Omolewa, M. (1975). The English Language in Colonial Nigeria, 1862 – 1960: A Study of the Major Factors which Promoted the English Language. *Journal of Nigerian English Studies Association.* 7: 103 – 117.

Osei-Tutu, Kwaku (2009). *Exploring Meaning in Student Pidgin*. M. Phil Thesis. University of Ghana, Legon

Quirk, Randolph; Greenbaum, Sidney; Leech, Geoffrey and Svartvik, Jan (1985). *A Comprehensive Grammar of the English Language*. London: Longman.

Rickford, John and McWhorter, (1997). Language Contact and Language Generation: Pidginas and Creoles. In Coulman, Florian (ed). *The Handbook of Sociolinguistics*. Oxford: Blackwell. pp. 238 – 256.

Romaine, Suzanne (1988). *Pidgin and Creole Languages*. London: Longman.

Sebba, Mark (1977). *Contact Languages*. London: Macmillan.

Siegel, Jeff (1999). Stigmatized and Standardized Varieties in the Classroom: Interference or Separation? *TESOL Quarterly* 33: 701 – 728.

Thomason, Sarah (2007). *Language Contact*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Thomason, Sarah and Kaufman, T (1988). *Language Contact, Creolization and Genetic Linguistics.*Berkeley: University of California Press.

Todd, Loreto (1974). *Pidgins and Creoles.* London: Routledge and Kegan Paul.