

## Cohesion in Sesotho Personal Names

Masechaba Mahloli L Mokhathi-Mbhele \*

Faculty of Humanities, National University of Lesotho, Lesotho

### Abstract

This paper sought to describe cohesion in Sesotho personal names as social discourse and their description is directed mostly to their relevance based on Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory. The study is qualitative and it drew data from national examinations pass lists, admissions, employment roll lists from public, private, tertiary and orphanage institutions, telephone directories, interviews with owners, parents, senior citizens to demonstrate the interface of systemic theory and naming in socio-cultural contexts. The study establishes Sesotho names as semantic units that function as semiotic choices in the exchange of information with features of various moods proposed by Halliday (2001, p.45). The names display the cohesive ties and the awardee's evaluation a feature that Eggins (1996) refers as modality. This is appraisal of the context, a skill to be redirected to the development of various linguistic and social avenues and serve as the main framework for language and linguistic analyses syllabi. Reciprocation and the sub-modification features taken for granted by formalist analysts of the logical structures of the nominal and verbal groups reflect. The study has implications for studies in language and culture, linguistics, social and cultural studies, education and development generally.

**Keywords:** cohesive ties, ellipsis, reference, substitution, reduplication

### INTRODUCTION

This paper presents that cohesion is found in personal names and specifically in Sesotho names. Personal names are expressed as purposeful structures. Discussion will only be confined to displaying the concept of cohesion as a semantic feature in language based on Sesotho personal names. Such names will be expressed as either single names (first names or surnames) and as rhyming Name-Surname or Surname-Name forms.

### Cohesion

Cohesion produces unity of elements that make up a structure. Halliday and Hasan (1978:1) claim that completeness of meaning is attained through cohesion. They explain that this cohesion produces a 'unified whole' in a structure and it is the speakers who decide, on hearing or reading a structure, "whether it forms a whole or is just a collection of unrelated sentences". This means it thus creates discourse. That feature of a structure being a 'unified whole' is capacitated by cohesion that result in complete meaningful messages. This capacity creates discourse because the harbored completeness of meaning in those personal names can be cohesively comprehended (unified meaning)

and therefore can be described or interpreted as complete discourse. This cohesion is the cement of the elements of any structure for they become adhesive to each other and thus make a structure become a 'unified whole'.

When used in any form of discourse it produces unity in all structures. Halliday and Hasan (1978:1) clarify that if what is heard or read forms a unified whole then that structure is noted as a text and in a text there is cohesion because of that unified wholeness. Formation of a text is a fundamental need in discourse to make it related, sensible and meaningful. The presented personal names have displayed instances of a single cohesion and according to Halliday and Hasan (1987:2) a single instance of cohesion is a term for one occurrence of a pair of cohesively related items. They call this single instance a COHESIVE TIE.

Halliday and Hasan (1987:1) further claim that "we know, as a general rule, whether any specimen of our own language constitutes a text or not" and this view has supported my intent of describing cohesion in Sesotho personal names because cohesion makes a structure a 'unified whole' and in personal names as texts it creates and displays that 'unified whole' feature interpretable in context. It is this cohesion that allows personal names to reflect unified wholistic messages that build interpersonal meaning. The context may be known or assumed based on the culture of the Basotho as awarders of the discussed names. Through the cohesion in the names purposeful meaning in context is deduced.

Cohesion is enfolded in every area of language to deliver complete and meaningful messages. This cohesion cements the elements of any structure for they become adhesive to each other and thus make a structure become a 'unified whole'. Their claim continues that speakers can decide, on hearing or reading a structure, "whether it forms a whole or is just a collection of unrelated sentences". They note that if what is heard or read forms a 'unified whole' then that is noted as a text and in a text, there is cohesion because of that unified wholeness.

As Halliday and Hasan (1978:2) explain, there are certain linguistic features in a text which can be identified as contributing to the total unity of that text. In their view a text would be written or spoken, prose or verse, dialogue or monologue, a single proverb or a play, a momentary cry for help or an all day discussion. Formation of a text is a fundamental need to make discourse meaningful and because Sesotho names are texts, they bear cohesion that allows personal names to reflect messages expressed with distinct interpretation of a 'unified whole' and present interpersonal meaning interpretable using Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) theory. The awarders cohesively build and cement the elements of a name structure and present the names as the interpretable 'unified whole' to present their experiences regarding the newly born baby as a name is awarded just after birth. That element of being 'interpretable' indicates that there is a semantic element enfolded in the target structure.

## CONCEPT OF COHESION AS BEING A SEMANTIC UNIT.

Halliday and Hasan (1987:4) claim that the concept of cohesion is basically a semantic one and there are features that make this semantic feature of cohesion distinctive in language use. They explain that cohesion is a semantic concept because:

- a) cohesion has that semantic relation between an element in the text and some other element that is crucial to its interpretation. This other element must be found in the text to show the relationship of the presupposing and the presupposed and such could be:

*Kenangbohle* [k'énaŋ bɔ́lé] 'come one come all'

The action *kenang* [k'énaŋ] 'come in' (pl) is an action that presupposes someone to act favourably to the invitation and that presupposed someone is *bohle* [bɔ́lé] 'all/everyone'. Cohesion is made evident by the fact that this is an invitation to the presupposed human being invited. The name belongs the verbal group and is an imperative mood. *Kenang* 'come in (pl) functions as a finite-predicator that denotes action and it is followed by a nominal complement *bohle* 'all'.

*Bohle* is human specific. A new linguistic observation made is that this name bears 'double standards' of polarity because it can be positive and negative in context. Positively it is used to welcome everybody and anybody who has been invited to an occasion. Negative connotation is that it is an insult that denotes the referent as one who has more than one sexual partner. Actually, it insults the referent as a 'whore'. *Kenang* 'come in (pl)' collocates very well with *bohle* 'all / everyone' because it invites humans who can possibly afford the invitation. Another new presentation about this cohesion in Sesotho names is that it declares the mood it carries. The name displays an imperative mood but this is another new observation which has not been forwarded in prior descriptions of Sesotho names. Indication of mood and cohesion in the description of Sesotho names has not been presented either in formalist or systemic linguistics. Furthermore,

- b) cohesion refers to relations of meaning that exist within a text and that define it as a text. As Halliday and Hasan (1987:2) explain, there are certain linguistic features in a text which can be identified as contributing to the total unity of that text. It has been noted earlier that a text would be spatial or temporal, prose or stanza, dialogue or monologue, proverbial or a play, an interjection for help or an going discussion. Examples pertaining to these features include:

- the proverb clip:

*Kelebone* [kelebɔ́ne] 'Oh my!'

from the proverb *Ka le bona la moepa moholo monyolosa thaba* 'I am faced with a mammoth case' when used contextually. According to Halliday and Hasan (1987, p.1) a text may be a proverb. The name *Kelebone* is the perfect tense form of the initial part *Ka le bona* of the proverb. *Ka le bona* has undergone a tense effect from simple present to perfect tense *Kelebone*. *e* attached terminally to the finite predicator *bone* [bɔ́ne] is the marker of the perfect tense in Sesotho and it has variants that grammarians of Sesotho

present in their various discussions. When retreating to the original structure *Ka le bona* there is a cohesion of the speaker *Ka* 'I' and the action *bona* 'see' and the represented event noted as *le* 'it' which is understood in context. That *le* is not pleasant in any way or condition. Therefore, when a Mosotho says *Ka le bona* the meaning is 'Oh my!' This meaning does not change despite the reflection of the perfect tense it is transferred to. Another example reflects:

➤ monologue found in:

*Keasobaka* 'I'm going to stir it up!'

This name is an ill-intention of the awarder in relation to matters around the newly born and they are not positive. It arises from intra-communication of the speaker. The *-o-* refers to the ill-intention which becomes conspicuous in the surname *Moerane* 'confusion' because the name in full as NS is *Kesaobaka Moerane* 'I'm going to stir it up | confusion'. The awarder stirs up this idea and intent in self and no one is aware of this intention. It is designed as a monologue as the awarder quietly plans this move in his or her heart. What is interesting and an issue for further research is the awareness of the awarders to collocate the first and second name so well yet this is an act performed in the field of naming. With dialogue we may refer to:

*Keteng Metsing* 'I am there / in water'

where there is a claim by the speaker that draws the attention of listeners or even observers that he or she is present and specifically at a specific location and that being 'at the place with water'. The NS expresses haughtiness in the speaker that says if the counters thought they could or had won, they should think again. The cohesion noted here is that the speaker announces his or her presence using *teng* 'present/ there' which denote the locative or uses the choice 'have arrived' to mark time at a specific place *Metsing* 'at the place with water'. *Teng* locative always presupposes a place that may be specified or be understood (unless when derived as conjunctive) and in this case *Metsing* is specified as the presupposed place. There is cohesion in this NS because as locative markers are interdependent and they also collocate. As noted earlier that in lexicogrammar principle general meanings are guided through grammar this name-surname is meaningful and guided through grammar as an independent clause that is cohesively built by relating the surname to the first name. They strengthen this principle by saying that "meanings are expressed through the grammar and the more specific meanings through the vocabulary" (Halliday and Hasan 1987, p.5).

In the case of an SN structure we may have:

*Kemong Semakale* 'I am alone | don't be surprised'.

The surname-name (SN) above is grammatically expressed and that choice of words is specific hence why the claimed cohesion. Note again that this pair is reversible as well and functions of the reversed form hold onto the roles initially discussed. Such is:

*Semakale Kemong* 'don't be surprised | I am alone'.

The choice of sounds and their order which marks a phonological system and their inscription or orthographic presentation makes a vivid presentation of the intended semantic feature. Both cases reflect the declarative mood as they just report.

Another mood newly observed include exclamations that reflect a momentary cry and such include:

*A!*[a] *Ai!*[aji\ or *Au!*[au] or *Bo!* [bɔ[ or *Na!*[na] or *Chehe!*[ch<sup>h</sup>éhé]

These names reflect the feature of exclamatives. They have been awarded as personal names and they reflect as interjective or vocative expressions. The interjective feature in the description of Sesotho is noted by grammarians such as Doke and Mofokeng (1967:432), Guma (1971:265). Note that Halliday (2001:95) refers to interjective texts in SFL as minor clauses because he asserts that they cannot be analyzed into clause structures (cf. 'grammatically isolated' feature) but can function to fulfill complete meaningful messages as clauses.

They are minor clauses because they cannot be analyzed into MOOD-RESIDUE structure when described using Systemic Functional Linguistic (SFL) theory. In these names, the exclamative mood reflects. However, they reflect features that both SFL and formalist descriptions note as either awe or wonder or surprise. Sesotho grammarians even note that they denote wonder and surprise and I add that they also denote concern. *Na* 'really?' or 'really!' or 'is it true?' or 'does it mean that...?' is noted by Doke and Mofokeng (1967, p. 434) as the interrogative adverb. These names are monosyllabic interjections as termed by Doke and Mofokeng (1967:365). Guma (1971:265) shares Doke and Mofokeng's sentiment that interjectives are grammatically isolated in any given construction and are never concordially related to other words in the sentence and this reflects in these minor clause names. Interjectives though they are, they actualize Halliday's (2001, p.95) contention that interjectives can function to fulfill complete meaningful messages.

However, ironically and despite this shared sentiment, Doke and Mofokeng (1965:265) note that "Interjectives may, of themselves, constitute complete 'sentences'..." and it has been deduced that this completeness marks that feature of a 'unified whole'. It is presented, therefore, that if these interjectives "of themselves constitute complete 'sentences' this means that they enfold cohesion in them for 'complete sentences' display cohesive completeness in structure and meaning.

Doke and Mofokeng (1965:265) further strengthen the effect of cohesion in interjectives by asserting that "In view of their highly emotional character their tones are significant in relation to the sentences in which they function...". This assertion indicates that there is an intimate interrelationship between these name interjectives and the 'untold' sentences which complete the messages initiated with these name interjectives. As noted, their emotional character presents a clear indication of the cohesive contents in the name. It is worthy to note that whenever interjectives are used in Sesotho they introduce the sentence that will follow and the two interdependently display a complete meaning.

The interjective presupposes meaningful content from the 'untold' contextual content. Whether the co-text is available or not the interjective alone contains a clear meaning. This new observation introduces to linguists that the Sesotho interjectives bear cohesion on their own. It is deduced from their wording which enfolds the emotional effect that the names present. That element of a 'unified whole' or completeness is borne by sentences they relate with hence why they reflect this cohesion. They presuppose messages that agree with their denotation or connotation. A further note is that Guma (1971:247) explains that interjectives are "Expressive of wonder, surprise, sorrow, annoyance, contempt" and this explanation allows a linguist to argue that these features cannot be established and dichotomized unless there is cohesion in the structures that bear the meaning intended, in this case by the awarder. For instance, we have:

*A* [a] indicating either surprise or loss of hope or wonder;

*Ai!* or *Ayi!* [ai] indicating sorrow (pain) or annoyance;

*Au!* [au] indicating annoyance or surprise (awe);

*Bo!* [bɔ] which could be a clip of a full name or the cry of a dog / puppy'

*Na!* [na] indicating wonder, surprise;

*Chehe!* [čɛhɛ] indicating a feeling of contempt (caused by others).

These features displayed by just one emotionally expressed word that says "of themselves constitute complete sentences". Their full meaning is dependent on the 'unvoiced' but 'understood' sentences.

When denoted as personal names Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014, p.274) explains that interjectives verify information resourced from different situations. She supports her view with a claim by Doke and Mofokeng (1967:434) who define *na?* as an interrogative Adverb that 'checks the reliability' of the message given. It is interesting that even as a personal name it maintains this role although it is not evident what it maintains without context. They claim further that among other forms, it commonly follows the time circumstantial *Neng* 'when?' and manner circumstantial *Joang* 'how?' and the locative circumstantial *kae?* 'where?' in a clause.

Circumstantial normally 'adds information' to the verb or qualificative or another circumstantial with which they are used. Guma (1971:213), Makara and Mokhathi (1993) and Doke and Mofokeng (1967:317) note the Circumstantial as Adverbs. In SFL Circumstantial elements are adjuncts. According to Eggins (1996, p.165) "Adjuncts are clause elements which contribute some additional (but not essential) information to the clause." The observation that the Circumstantial is the Adverb is fortified by Eggins (1996, p.166) when she explains that "Circumstantial adjuncts are usually expressed by ... adverb of time, manner and place". It is the understood meaning enfolds in *A*, *AI*, *AU*, *Bo*, *Na* and *Chehe* as persons' names that presents their cohesive feature as the meaning is deduced despite lack of visible spatial medium because they display "unified whole" messages.

Cohesion exists even in the minor clauses such as these momentary cries. Their awarding is indicative that the awarder was not sure of something – either that the mother’s pregnancy was doubted or the maternal parents were wondering if their daughter’s marriage would actually be for permanence. It is interpreted as a concern of the maternal parents. It could also be that there was conflict between the in-laws and the awarder’s side was proudly emotionally announcing in a ‘wonder question’ form, full of pride, one that quietly asks whether the paternal family feels it can pose the anticipated challenge (obvious to the awarder) to the maternal family concerning the newly born. It displays a tug of war in this sense.

Another new observation related to Sesotho names is that cohesion reflects on Sesotho names as clause complexes. A clause complex, in Eggins (2004, p.254) words, refers to “The grammar of logical meaning.” Eggins (2004, p.257) also notes that a clause complex may reflect in more than two simplexes. The logical feature reflects in these simplex names because based on Eggins (2004, p.254) note, two clauses, which are *Nkhetheleng* and *Lenka* from:

*Nkhetheleng Lenka* ‘choose for me | as you take’

are linked together in a systematic and meaningful way that says *Lenka* can be planned, decided upon and even be fulfilled. That way makes them a name and a surname that present a meaningful message because when choosing is done, eventually, something will be taken. Therefore, the awarder says as choices are made by the audience, some must be done on his or her behalf. Cohesion is enfolded in a morpheme *ha* omitted intentionally between *Nkhetheleng* ‘choose for me’ and *Lenka* (as you) ‘take for yourselves’. *ha* has been omitted and it directs us to ellipsis as one of the cohesive ties to be discussed later. In full the message says:

*Nkhetheleng (ha) Lenka* ‘choose for me (as) you take for yourselves’.

The plural markers *ng* and *Le* in the name-surname respectively breathe that cohesion of the message being interpersonal and specifically to more than one addressee. The awarder is at the mercy of his or her audience who seem to take the upper hand in whatever were the choices concerning the baby or any occasion around the event. Furthermore,

- c) cohesion occurs where there is interpretation of interdependency of elements in a structure. This is where one element presupposes the other for effective decoding. The effective decoding can take place if the second element takes recourse to the first element; that is, a light has been shed that the subject did something. This was evident on *Kesaobaka Moerane* above where *-o-* presupposed *Moerane* ‘confusion’. In the case of:

*Bare’ng Batho* (NS) ‘They say what / People?’

the first */Ba/* ‘they’ as a concord presupposes */Batho/* ‘people’ which is specified as the presupposed noun. Without the specification of *Batho* ‘people’ the initial *Ba* of the alpha clause would never be explicit because that initial *ba* could refer to any human based

species. In this way *Batho* can be a full redirection to *Ba*. This *Ba* is human specific. A further presentation of interdependency of elements in a structure is identified in the name-surname (NS) occurrence of *Bare'ng* 'what do they say' as a first name and its surname *Batho* 'people' and it is a new observation because cohesion in name-surname structure has not been presented earlier.

The complete message in this structure is 'What do they say // people?' which is actually 'What do people say?' The NS message is that of a "unified whole". This name displays that a clause complex personal name bears cohesion even if it is taken for granted as just a name. This name reflects that the awarder is aware that there is cheap gossip among the community they reside with and the question asked with this clause complex is 'rhetoric' as it does not require an answer. A further new observation in the description of cohesive clause complexes is to note a new observation that reflects Eggins' (2004, p.265) view that some texts are "reversible" with or without duplication of meanings. This name is reversible as:

*Batho Bare'ng* 'what do people say?'; A further reversible cohesive example is the declarative SN:

*Likotsi Likhabiso* 'They are dangerous | decorations' to NS

*Likhabiso Likotsi* 'decorations are | dangerous'

and it maintains the same meaning in this juxtaposed word order. In SN *Likotsi Likhabiso* the initial *Li* of the Surname presupposes *Likhabiso* and this cohesion reflects in that the infused Subjects presented as concord *Li* recurs in both names that form SN with a complete message. As Eggins (2004, p.254) proposes the two elements can exchange positions but still maintain the original structure and meaning. This name bears an interrogative mood either way. There are other reversible cohesive clause complex names which reflect as declaratives but that bear different meanings when reversed as in:

*Liile Lekena* 'they left or moved out | as you came in'

*Lekena Liile* 'you walk in | just as they left'

*Lebusa Letlatsa* 'you rule | as deputies'

*Letlatsa lebusa* 'you support | if you rule'

*Leuna Lechesa* 'you earn | (as) you are motivated'

*Lechesa Leuna* which means 'you burn | (as) you earn'

Other names reflect the imperative but which are not reversible as in:

*Lebohang Lethibelane* 'give thanks | (and) stop each other'

*Nkhetheleleng Lenka* 'choose for me (as) you take (something)'

*Arabang Lenyatsa* 'respond | with a refusal or (as) you refuse'.



- d) cohesion is expressed through strata organization of language. In Halliday and Hasan's (1987, p.6) view, language can be explained in a multiple coding system comprising three levels of coding or strata. Such are the semantic (meanings), the lexico-grammatical (wording – choice of words and grammatical structures) and the phonological-orthographic (sounding and writing). In lexico-grammar principle general meanings are guided through grammar and specific meanings through vocabulary choice. This is where grammatical cohesion and lexical cohesion occur. These are evident in Name-Surname (NS) clause complexes such as:

*Mpheng Molapo* 'give me (pl) | a river'

*Kopang Khotso* 'ask for | peace'

*Loela Hoanela* 'fight | to cover all'

*Lebotsamang / Kolobe* 'who do you ask | pig?'

These complexes form that "unified whole" messages and are therefore, cohesive. Other forms have a clause complex feature but are a single entry and such include:

*Abuaareng* 'what did he/she speak and say?'

This name bears an interrogative mood. Interdependency cohesion reflects in the concords *A* and the third *a*. Both denote the same referent who is the third person singular and as it is known the third person is normally out of sight. Speakers of Sesotho use /*a*/ in the Subject position, to refer to someone known but not necessary to mention by name or any other clear denotation. The *a* functions as a Subject in both positions in this name to build the cohesion of the message required. Guma (1971, p. 165-166) explains that in Sesotho description *a* is a conjugational morpheme that "indicates (indicative) mood, tense as well as semantic concepts... Each tense has principal and participial forms". In this name the initial and third /*a*/ function as principal forms that refer to the third person singular. The prior set is composed of the initial three imperatives ending with *a*, interrogative. In this name the awarder sounds livid though the actual cause is not specified. The cause, however, has to do with the newly born baby and circumstances around it. The /*a*/ actually substitute the third person singular. This view leads us to the point that:

- e) cohesion is expressed in different ties. These include reference, substitution, ellipsis and conjunction and repetition. Some, such as ellipsis, reference (interdependency) have been addressed. However, they are explained and exemplified as follows:

- i) elliptical form as in:

*Lephethasang* 'for what do you fulfill...?'

The surname presupposes that as it is an action or verb, there is an actor who engaged in the action *phetha* [p<sup>h</sup>ét<sup>h</sup>a] 'fulfill'. This presupposed actor *Le* 'you (pl)' is the pronoun of

the first person plural *lona* [lōna] and both cohere elliptically. *Lona* is human specific. The cohesion in this name is elliptical but it enfolds the understanding that completes the message by giving the full contents of what the presupposed actor said. There is cohesion between the actor and the action as they interact about the unspecified *sang* [saŋ] 'of what?'. The full form of *sang* [saŋ] is *sa eng*. That unspecified element forms an ellipsis of what the presupposed said. This name displays an interrogative mood with a WH- adjunct '*ng* [ŋ] which is a short form of '*eng?* [eŋ] 'what?'. This structure is built on a finite-predicator *phetha* 'fulfill', An alternative structure can be built on a non-finite and an example of an interrogative was identified in:

*Bathobakae* 'people are where?' which is normally uttered as 'where are people?'

In this case *ba* serves as cohesion tie that is specified by its reference to *Batho* 'people'. *ba* agrees with the main noun *Batho* 'people' in number and person. Its use gives the structure the essence of "unified whole" and completeness of meaning. A different mood displayed is the declarative which is exemplified in the name:

(*Se*) *Chaba-se-oele* 'the nation is depleted'

The position of *Sechaba* and *batho* is initial but a new note is that this position makes them serve as head nouns and their function is to introduce or project the discourse. This reflects that nominal group uses the noun as Subject. Cohesion is identified in *se* of *Chabaseoele* as it duplicates the omitted or ellipsed initial morpheme of the Subject *Sechaba* 'nation'. It is a structure normally found in spoken language. Cohesion of the structure is marked by the *se* within the name. It duplicates the ellipsed *Se* which must occur as an initial morpheme so that the structure presents as (*Se*)*Chabaseoele*. The noun *sechaba* acceptably functions as a clipped form of *chaba* in the Sesotho language. The awardee coins this name to display a concern about depleted nation. The name's origin may be a capture of difficult issues noted in the history of a nation.

An interesting observation between these names is that there is a relation of events that cohere because the first may be a claim that results in the second name? Such a relation could be possible in a family where children may be in the same family. A joint message that says (*Se*)*Chabaseoele*, *Bathobakae*? 'the nation has depleted, where are people?' This is acceptable cohesive discourse in Sesotho. These are a declarative followed by an interrogative. They display a function of concern. The declarative used confirms that 'something is' and it is therefore positive.

Besides these affirming cohesive declarative complexes we have those that deny that 'something is'. In the Sesotho names the denial is mainly presented by 'do not' in various tenses. The 'do not' or 'don't' use as initial and mid elements *Ha* and *Se*. Such include declaratives as in:

*Ha + rea ipha Marumo* 'we did not give ourselves | spears',

*Habathuse* 'they do not help' ie 'they are useless' LHHH,

*Haseletho* 'there is nothing wrong' ie 'there is no reason' or 'it is nothing' LHHH;

Imperatives include:

*Sethōle* 'don't be quiet' ie 'say something'LHH,

In *Haseletho* an interesting new observation is that there is a co-occurrence of the negative markers *Ha* and *se* which are normally used as one marker that says 'something is not'. As a paired element it still denoted that 'something is not'. Eggins (1996, p.178) explains that "when we exchange information, we are arguing about whether something IS or IS NOT" and this name doubles the markers that say 'something IS NOT'. The combination of *Ha* and *se* makes audience wonder whether the intensity of the negation is magnified.

The magnitude may be clarified by Mbhele 's (2017) explanation that *Haseletho* is normally uttered when the speaker hides something that is 'sacred' but painful to him or her and it needs to be handled with care. The speaker normally has lost hope for any solution regarding the problem faced. Mbhele continues that it is wise not to force the speaker, who is the name awarder in this case, to disclose that sacred issue unless the speaker is ready. This sensitive issue reflects a pain that can destroy the life of the 'victim speaker' and even cause psychological breakdown if coercion is used to disclose its contents. The expression may, at times be uttered with a stern face, rough tone, a shaky, screechy, voice and even be accompanied and completed by tears. That cohesion is embedded in the intentionally ellipsed information. Another example of negation in declarative mood is found in the clause complex name:

*Se + lemeng Habahaba* 'don't plough | a vast place' LLHH | LLHL

This name reflects as a clause complex formed from a name-surname and both display a complete message. *Selemeng* [selemen] 'don't plough' is an imperative used as a personal name that has the phonemic pattern [selemén] but as a clause it has [selemen]. Ellipsis is established in this name because what needs not be ploughed is not specified and therefore ellipsed. This imperative mood with a negative polarity feature is also noted in another cohesive tie known as reference because what is not supposed to be ploughed is eventually specified as *Habahaba* [habahaba] 'vast space'. The tonemes used are evidence that Sesotho is a tone language. Guma (1971, p.26) explains that "a tone language is one that makes a particular use of pitch as an element of speech". He specifically notes that "Southern Sotho is a tonal language" (Guma, 1971, p.26).

Halliday and Hasan (1987, p.4) explains that reference denotes that an element used in a structure would refer to another that was used in a prior position and the latter may be of a different form. This is why in the name-surname:

*Halieo Lipholo* 'they are not there / bulls'

the presupposed /li/ concord in *Halieo* presupposes *Lipholo* 'bulls' which is used as a surname. In the same token, *li* in *Halieo* is specified in *Lipholo* which is the surname. This says the first name *li* 'they' introduces a noun *Lipholo* 'bulls' to follow. The speakers of Sesotho draw a "unified whole" from the articulation of the first name *Halieo* because the negative-concord-enclitic 'eo' form a complete message, that is, they reflect as "unified

whole". The pattern is that of negative marker-concord order. To confirm that the name is a complete cohesive structure, if used in dialogue the other speaker may only use the WH- interrogative probe about the ellipsed content represented by *li*.

Guma (1971, p.208) explains that *eo* is used "to predicate the unavailability of something and it is the "negative of *teng* 'available / present'. He explains that *eo* enclitic as a negative expression of *teng* is "an alternative idiomatic way of expressing the negative" and the translation of the name conforms the absence of the noun presented as *li* 'they' which is specified later as 'bulls'. The concord and the negative enclitic tie cohesively. The negative marker presented reflects as *Se* and *Ha* and both occur initially as in *Selemeng* 'don't plough', *Senkhane* [senk<sup>h</sup>ane] 'don't deny me' and in the middle as in *Haseletho* 'there is problem' or 'there is nothing (bothering)'. That *se* denotes a condition or situation where something occurs(ed) and when expressed as *Hase* enfolds danger in the situation because it covers and hides the real truth. In this case *se* is even blended with *Ha* 'not' to mark negative form.

Furthermore, we have examples that use the concord to refer to the noun (bolded) presented initially in a name structure but presenting the negative marker as the mid-man ending in a passive form finite-predicator and such has the examples:

***Lirahalibonoe*** 'enemies are invisible' (enemies are not easy to detect)

***Mothohaalahloe*** 'a person should never be disposed off.

The pattern is that of "noun-negative marker-concord-finite" order. In *Lirahalibonoe* there is an explicit reference of the subject concord *li* of the subject noun *Lira* and Sesotho grammarians have noted that in a Sesotho structure the concord resembles the prefix of the noun it refers to and that prefix is the shadow of the noun referred to. With *Mothohaalahloe* the subject concord *mo-* refers to the noun *motho* and they co-occur in the same structure used as a personal name. That concomitant co-occurrence is a new observation in the description of Sesotho names using SFL theory. The negative markers *Se* as in *Senkatake* 'don't stamp on me' and *Ha* in *Halerokoe* 'it cannot be bought', as observed, occurs initially as well as a 'mid-man' in Sesotho names. These add to the given examples above.

***Tabalingata*** 'there is too much (unanticipated) information' reflects as noun-concord order. In these names *Tabalingata* there is a concomitant co-existence of ellipsis and reference because *taba* 'news / information' is a clipped form of *litaba* and the subject concord *li* is repeated prior to the epithet adjective *ngata*. It was ellipsed before the noun *litaba* in the name structure.

i) lexical repetition form > *Hatahata* 'make a light step'.

➤ *Halahala*

➤ *Nthontho*

➤ *Tlaitlai*

With reduplication found in names such as *Hatahata* Halliday and Hasan (1987:281) explain that "it is not the repetition of the word that has cohesive effect but only its

repetition accompanied by an anaphoric reference (the second pointing back to the first element)". The repetition is sourced from verbs as in *Hatahata* 'make a light step' which says 'take a light step'; from exclamations as in *Halahala* whose origin may be the exclamation 'halala'; repeating a noun to show appreciation, from ideophones as in *Tlaitlai* 'a light touch of fire on something being grilled'. Guma (1971, p.226) defines an ideophone as "the special part of speech resembling to a certain extent, in function, the adverb", It is descriptive on function.

Reduplication in *Tlaitlai* refers to the repetitive way an action takes place. It also marks size as refers to a very superficial way of treading as reflected in *Hatahata*. They explain this as just the reiteration of a lexical item in a context of grammatical cohesion. Halliday and Hasan (1987, p.282) further claim that repetition is the kind of cohesion that "is simply a matter of reference" that is a lexical reiteration and this view is well displayed in *Hata + Hata, Hala +Hala; etc. Nthontho* (literally) 'thing-thing' or dainty thing' is a patting expression that reflects a special appreciation from the awardee about the newly born baby. The presence of the baby cannot be equated with anything. It is an aesthetic name. The first 'thing' cohesively ties in reduplication with the second 'thing'.

Cohesion is even evident in a clause complex name set of three elements which are names and surname of the same person as in:

*Refuoe Moramang Hape* 'we have been given // whose son // again?'

This cohesive expression presents the order of NSN and it is an interrogative. The meanings are dependent on each other because they form a continuing discourse. Halliday (2001:193) and Eggins (2004:257) refer to such a structure as univariate because the clauses occur, one after the other. The continuity is pressurized by unexpressed but a possible probe that requires answers provided by *Moramang* and *Hape*. Such a probe is 'what?'

This name can be reversed as well to read as:

*Hape Refuoe Moramang?* 'whose son have we been given again?'

It is worthy to explain that though the complete interpretations seem to be built from incomplete forms in the English version, the individual Sesotho clauses are complete as they are because they can be interpreted fully from the sentential make and contexts of culture. For instance, *Hape* and *Refuoe* could individually be response moves whereas *Moramang* would be an initiating move that seeks information. These reflect Eggins' (2004:258) words that "A clause complex is composed of one clause after another after another after another clause".

Let us note that the ability to compose one clause after another indicates 'recurrence' (in Halliday's (2001:193) words) of the same feature in a clause complex and this strengthens the view that Sesotho names form clause complexes. A further interesting note with these names that have a 'recurrence' feature is that they display various patterns and this is a new observation in the analysis of Sesotho. *Refuoe Moramang Hape* comprises NSN whereas *Hape Refuoe Moramang?* displays NNS pattern. It is further

interesting that the NSN pattern names generally show their reversed new structure as NNS. Examples are:

NSN pattern

*Refumane Mahloko 'Motseng* 'We received // pain situations or death reports //ask him/her.

*Refuoe Moramang Hape* 'we have been given // whose son // again?'

NNS pattern

*'Motseng Refimane Mahloko* 'ask him/her // we found // painful situations or death reports'.

*Hape Refuoe Moramang?* 'whose son have we been given again?'

NNS pattern

*Keneiloe Karabo Molise* "I have been given // an answer // herder or shepherd

SNN pattern

31. *Molise Keneiloe Karabo* 'herder or shepherd // I have been given // an answer'.

In some cases the SNN pattern occurs but it is not reversible. Examples include:

SNN pattern

*Letima Mokone Lerato* 'you refuse // the one from foreign land // love';  
*Lekena Keneiloe Thakabanna* 'you enter // (after) I have been given // men's size.'

The bracketed word is implicit but it exists as part of the clause to make it complete. Eggins (2004:257) further says this feature 'colorfully' deduces various pair patterns which bear more than one element in their structure. This view is substantiated by the fact that the NSN pattern, for example, has been reversed into NNS and NNS has been reversed into SNN. It is worth noting another new observation from this occurrence. The simplexes used form parataxis. In SFL parataxis encapsulates simplexes that bear individual completeness of structure and meaning.

Added to these cohesive devices is a tie noted as:

## ii) Conjunction

Conjunction is basically a linguistic element that joins two lexical or sentential entities. It may occur initially or be a mid-element in a structure. According to Eggins (2004:264) parataxis is commonly signaled by an accompanying linking word or conjunction in spontaneous speech. Eggins (1996:169) agrees with Sesotho Academy (1983 and 1985) that a conjunction occurs between words and sentences and Eggins specifically notes that the clause elements as a conjunctive adjunct and from the collected names we have direct examples of complex name clauses linked by conjunction *le* in NS pattern. They are:

*Mpolokeng Lenkoe* 'keep me | **with** a leopard';

*Lieketseng Lematla* 'add to them | **with** more strength'.

According to Eggins (2004:264) parataxis is commonly signaled by an accompanying linking word or conjunction in spontaneous speech. Eggins (1996:169) says it occurs between the clause elements as a conjunctive adjunct and from the collected names we have direct examples of complex name clauses linked by conjunction *le* in NS pattern. They are:

*Mpolokeng Lenkoe* 'keep me | **with** a leopard';

*Lieketseng Lematla* 'add to them | **with** more strength'.

The choice to the link of clauses as paratactic clause complexes creates a closer logico-semantic bond between them than the clause simplex option. The bond may be identified in clauses that have a paratactic relation because such clauses may be linked to each other by adjacency. In these names such adjacency is noted because the name is adjacent to the surname. The adjacency here is strengthened with the conjunction that begins the surname. An interesting note here is that these names are not paratactic but hypotactic and this adds as new information that the 'linking' process that encompasses the taxis system. A further new note to add is that the finite-predicators *boloka* 'keep / protect' and *eketsa* 'add' are the determining elements in building clause complexes in Sesotho names.

An interesting note to make here is that the conjunctive feature is not easily recognized in these names because change of tone from the original structure has had an effect on the conjunctions of these clause complexes. They change from H to L with NS pattern as name clauses. That is, as a normal clause we have:

*Mpolokeng | Lenkoe* is LHHHH // HHH whereas as a name clause it becomes LHHHH // LLL.

*Lieketseng | Lematla* HHHHH // HHH changes to LHHHH // LLL.

It should be noted that this interesting observation newly captured refutes the Eggins' 2004, p.259) claim that 'only' clause complexes create a closer logico-semantic bond between them than the clause simplex option. This is because some simplex form Sesotho personal names use this conjunctive feature found in parataxis. An example is:

*Resetselemang Maimane* 'with whom are we left.

In the example *Resetselemang* two parties are involved. There is *Re* 'we' who is the narrator and wailer and the unknown but wanted person represented by *mang* which means 'who?' These participants are 'linked' in the structure by the conjunction *le* which refers to 'with' or 'and'. The conjunction makes the finite-predicator *Resetse* 'we stay behind' and the WH- interrogative adjunct *mang* 'who?' employ the conjunction *le* 'with' to form "a unified whole structure". More examples include:

*Kenalemang?* 'with whom am I?

*Ketlalemang?* 'with whom do I come?'

The finite predicator *tla* can form a pattern of declarative conjunctive names thus:

**infused Subject + verb + conjunction + Complement.** Examples are:

*Motlalentoa* 'one who comes with or brings war'

*Motlalekhomo* 'one who comes with or brings a cow'

*Motlalekhotso* 'one who comes with or brings peace'

*Motlalepula* 'one who comes with or brings rain'

*Motlalekhosi* 'one who comes with or brings a chief'

*Motlalepuso* 'one who comes with or brings government'

*Motlaletsona* 'one who comes with or brings them'.

These are awarded to denote the wish of personhood which Guma (2001, p.1) and Mohome (1972, p.1) agree about this personhood as existing among Basotho. They agree that the desired personhood can be voiced by the design of the structures of personal names. The interrogative mood form is also exemplified with:

*Motlalemang* 'with whom do/did you come?'

An additional new observation concerning the *le* conjunction in the pair names is that it perpetuates a logical relationship between clauses with taxis. Though it occurs as mid-man in this set it also occurs in an initial position to project a clause. The name:

*Lenna* 'me too'

has been captured as an example that begins with the conjunctive *le*. It functions as a first name. This is an interesting observation that gives the conjunctive *le* a thematic position of a clause yet the meaning enfolded indicates a combination of this pronoun complement to an initiating but unvoiced text. It is a response move. The observation reflects Eggins (1996, p.178) claim that Conjunctive adjuncts may occur at any position in a clause. In *Lenna* the meaning embedded is that of resemblance. The speaker resembles the first unmentioned or covert speaker regarding whatever action is the matter. In the Sesotho language, this lexicon is understood in dialogue thus it is elliptical.

In a dialogue *Lenna* indicates an agreement to something formatively mentioned. The initiating move clause is understood and meaningful to the addressed. This arouses interest to unearth what was said before this ellipsis which completes an unheard and unknown message. The paratactic conjunctions, as explained by Eggins (2004, p.264) "express the logical relationship between two clauses of equal structural status" and *Lenna* is assumed to be a response tactic based on an ellipsed tactic projector. This is despite the fact that that initiating part implied in this name, is known, probably to the narrator or the name awarder alone. We note to this point that the name clauses analyzed use *le* as the main paratactic conjunction which, as argued, also applies to the simplex forms. Therefore, it may be said that the conjunction *le* as a projecting element reflects cohesion of the ellipsed structure and the pronoun complement *nna*. Other conjunctions do not apply.

The ellipsis identified in *Lenna* triggers another interesting issue that arises from Eggins (2004, p.265) claim that in a paratactic sequence "the Subject can be ellipted in the second clause because readers know how to infer that second Subject based on the initial one."



This applies to *Lenna* because it sounds as though it is a second clause following the unexpressed part. Thus, the initial message can be inferred as being of an enticing message that attracted the respondent to include self and thus use the response as a responding move.

*Lenna* would be expected to follow the initial clause but it has been placed in the position of the initiating move. It could be suspected that its birth occurred in the middle of an exchange in a happening in the family and the response was carried on as a personal name. Its position as an initiating move is not anticipated in reality. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014, p.209) portrays that these roles performed by *le* as a cohesive tie is a description of the 'Linking' feature in paratactic Sesotho names. An additional example uses mid-conjunction *le* to connect the understood Subject and the terminal pronoun *nna* 'I' to declare that:

*Onalenna* 'He/She is with me' HHHHL;

In this name *O-* 'He or She' is an infused Subject known as a concord in the grammar of Sesotho. A new observation is that this name is built from pronouns as Subject *O-* and Complement *nna*. Cohesion is noted in the association marker *na le* 'am with' to connect the Subject *O-* and the Complement *nna* 'me/I'. The name is a thanksgiving for the baby born of a woman who was critically ill. The awarder was literally praying silently for a breakthrough in baby delivery. When there was no loss of life the awarder was excited that *onalenna* 'God is with me'.

Another cohesive tie reflects as:

iii) Substitution

Sesotho names have different forms that substitute the Subject noun in a proposition but maintain the functions of the Subject. These substitutes function as pronouns would do but they are class, person and number specific. The first way is that the predicative concords, singular and plural, may directly precede the Finite-predicator. An example is the imperative:

*Mponeng* 'look at me'

which in full is *bonang nna* 'look at me'. *M-* refers to *nna* and it has moved from being the terminal marker to initiate the structure. Thus *M-* has substituted the pronoun speaker *nna* with the predicative concord *M-*.

The concords employed to build cohesive structures form both the simplexes and clause complex patterns that end with complements or adjuncts. In the clause complexes they present the MOOD with Subject Concord (SC) + Finite-Predicator + nominal complement in the simple present tense as in:

*Le+ tšabisa Lerotholi* 'you are ashamed to bring out | the drop'

*Li +abeloa Matlama* 'they are set aside | for the ones who tie'

*Mo + bontše Limakatso* 'show him/her | wonders'.

In these clause complex names *Le*, *Li*, *Mo* are markers that bring cohesion to the finite-predicators and their complements. They have substituted the unspecified referents. *Li* and *Mo* are third person plural and singular markers respectively and *Le* is a second person plural marker. *Le+tšabisa Lerotholi* and *Li +abeloa Matlama* are reports but *Mo+bontše Limakatso*, is a command. Note that this set has one Subject concord.

In other cases, the same concord occurs in both simplexes. With interrogatives we have:

*Le+botsamang Lethola* 'who do you ask | yet you are quiet?' LHHHH | HHH

A different set is where the concord occurs in one of the verbal form simplexes within a complex as the bolded part shows in these imperatives:

*Arabang Lenyatsa* 'respond |with a dispute (pl)' HHHL | HHH.

In this clause complex name there is cohesion of number because **ng** of the first name and **Le** of the surname mark the plural.

Note that the exclamative reflects substitute in one interrogative simplex when coupled with the imperative as in:

*Ke+itseng Mosala* 'what did I say | remainder!' from *Ke + rileng*.

This declarative-exclamative-interrogative serves as a response move based on an expression voiced earlier. The name extends to an observation made earlier that the awarder is sharing the sentiment of the first speaker. However, the awarder in this case is excited about the confirmation of what his or her earlier claim.

## CONCLUSION

Personal names, as portrayed, display various forms of cohesion as they build discourse because the unified whole feature is a quality found in texts and texts must be cohesive in order to form acceptable discourse. The paramount cohesive feature is ellipsis, followed by substitution because most data comprises names that use nominal and predicative concords as MOOD Subjects. Polarity also enfolds cohesion as it is understood in context when used. These features occur in single names as well as clause complex names and in all sets – single or complex - reigns the mood system. These are new observations not mentioned earlier. The concept has been applied in other fields but personal names and in this way, it has opened way to a new field of onomastica. It is interesting to realize that through personal naming "unschooled" clientele have mastered the nomenclature of cohesion in onomastica based on the cultural practices and expectations. This confirms that language and culture are inseparable.

## REFERENCES

- Doke, C.M. and S.M. Mofokeng. (1967). *Textbook of Southern Sotho grammar*. Cape Town: Longmans Southern Africa, Pty Ltd.
- Eggs, S. (1996). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Continuum

- Eggins, S. (2004). *An introduction to systemic functional linguistics*. London: Continuum
- Guma, S.M. (1971). *An outline structure of Southern Sotho*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- Guma, S. M. (2001). The cultural meaning of names among Basotho of Southern Africa: A historical and linguistic analysis. *Nordic Journal of African Studies*. Vol. 10(3): 265-279
- Halliday, M.A.K. (2001). *An introduction to functional grammar*. London: Arnold
- Halliday, M.A.K. and R. Hasan. (1978). *Cohesion in English*. Essex: Longman.
- Makara M. and M, Mokhathi. (1993). *Sehaeso 1*. Maseru: Longman Publishers.
- Mbhele, H.M. (2017). Counselling in denial context. *Church service*. Christian Revival Fellowship Church.
- Mokhathi-Mbhele, MML. (2014). Independent clause Sesotho personal names as texts in contexts. Unpublished PhD Thesis. UWC. South Africa.
- Mohome, P.M. (1972). Naming in Sesotho: Its socio-cultural and linguistic basis. *Tsoelopele*. Vol 20:3.
- Rimmone-Kenan, S. (2003). *Narrative fiction: contemporary poetics*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- Sampson-Akpan, E. and M. Mokhathi-Mbhele. (2002). *African names in African culture*. (Unpublished) ALASA Conference Paper, KZN.