Sesotho Personal Names with Deictic Feature: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach

Masechaba Mahloli L Mokhathi-Mbhele [*]

National University of Lesotho, Faculty of Humanities

Abstract

This study examined how the deictic feature of the nominal group described by Systemic Functional Linguistics theory characterized independent clause in Sesotho personal names. These names were described as authentic social discourse that exchange information. Their semantics of interaction displayed speech roles such as statements, demands, commands, and questions; an additional feature not mentioned by systemic extends to exclamatives. The aim was to explore how these different deictic name choices noted with these speech roles give the name giver's evaluation of the situation (modality) and cultural context of the child's birth. This confirms that deictic names are enacted messages. They enfold the art of negotiating attitudes by awarders and this shows that modality is highly incorporated. Data was collected from national examinations pass lists, admission lists of National University of Lesotho, Telephone directories, Media and employment roll lists from Public, Private, Tertiary, Orphanage institutions. This article extends SFL-Onomastica relation and literature. Methodology used was basically of the qualitative nature since it allows the researcher to make sense of or interpret phenomena in terms of meanings that people brought to them. The study attempts to make meanings from people's view, so it is exploratory. Also, it involves aspects of in-depth human behavior and relies on reasons therein, and it does not encourage fabricated methods. This is where it displays modality and the negotiated attitudes. By so doing, it investigates the "why" and the "how" of the people's decision making.

Key words: deictic interrogatives, deictic determinatives, nominal group, specific and non-specific deictic.

INTRODUCTION

Personal names belong to the nominal group. The fundamental purpose of personal names is to make individual persons be distinctive. Some names are deictic in their form but they function as propositions that say 'something is or is not' (Eggins 1996, p.177). They enfold modality. Modality in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL) reflects how awarders evaluate the contexts in which these names were awarded and such were discussed in this article.

---

[*] **Correspondence:** Masechaba Mahloli L Mokhathi-Mbhele, Email: masmbhele@gmail.com

THE SFL DEICTIC FEATURE

Deictic feature in SFL has a character of pointing or showing deixis. It requires that the referent be identified. According to Halliday (2001, p.1125) the deictic "indicates 'which?' subset of Thing is intended". It may be specific or non-specific but the intention is to access information. Such a function is found in:

a) deictic interrogatives and
b) deictic determinatives.

The deictic interrogatives are sub-divided into interrogative demonstratives noted as 'which (ever)?'; 'what (ever)?' The interrogative possessives comprise 'who?' and 'which person's?' The deictic determinatives are marked as determinative possessives and determinative demonstratives.   The determinative possessives include first person, second person, third person regular possessives in the singular and plural as well as possession of a noun as in 'Mary's'. Determinative demonstratives are marked by 'here, this, these, that, those, the, yonder'.

DEICTIC SESOTHO NAMES

In the analysis of Sesotho personal names the deictic feature was identified and this has brought up a relationship of personal names and the SFL deictic feature – sister to epithets - in the nominal group. This is a new observation relating to SFL as well as the formalist description of personal names in particular. The first set of personal names dealt with in this article encompasses names that are expressed as interrogative possessives. The interrogative possessives seek missing information and it is identified in names such as:

1. *Mor'amang* 'whose son are you?'/ 'you are the son of who?'/ 'which man's son are you?'
2. *Ngoan'amang* 'whose child are you?'/'you are the child of who?'/ 'which man's child are you?'

These form the interrogative possessives that use 'who?' as noted by Halliday (2001, p.125). An interesting new note in these names, not mentioned by systemic theory is that the 'who?' enfolds the 'of' as part of the structure in these names to express the same message. A further new form in the same names is 'whose?' which directly inquires possessive. As noted that deictic belongs to the nominal group, Halliday (2001, p.180) notes that the logical structure of the nominal group consists of a head noun "preceded and followed by various other items all of them in some way characterizing the [head] noun in question." This is identified in names such as:

3. *Mor'amang* 'whose son are you?'/ 'you are the son of who?'
4. *Ngoan'amang* 'whose child are you?'/'you are the child of who?'

But this logical structure of the nominal group is not noted in the current description of the grammar of such structures. Their head nouns *Mora* 'son' and *Ngoana* 'child' are

followed by the other item *mang* 'who?' and the latter forms the deictic feature. Another new feature is that these names are non-finite and the non-finite structure has been confined to the verb base preceded by /ho-/ as in *ho ja* 'to eat' (Guma 1971, p.159). They form deictic demonstratives and possessives Sesotho names. In Halliday's (2001, p.241) terms non-finite refers to "a dependent clause which ...has no verb" and these names are verbless. The features marked in these deictic names with their verbless character are describing the Subject which is the head noun. This is a new venture in the application of the deictic feature. These interrogatives have been built from the interrogative adjunct *mang* as a terminal element in the clause to elicit information. In the grammar of Sesotho *mang* which means 'who?' is noted as an interrogative noun (Doke & Mofokeng 1967, p.434) and a further new interesting observation is that *Mang* 'who?' is used as a personal name. Note that as with Halliday's (2001, p.125) 'who?' the function of *mang* is exceptionally to elicit information about people not things.

Halliday (2001, p.125) notes that for 'who?' to elicit information about "'which?' a subset of Thing'", it needs to follow a possessive form – singular or plural - so as to get to the subset inquired about. This view applies to the use of *mang?* because in these examples the singular occurs as follows:

5. *Thaka ea mang* 'whose age mate?'/'age mate of who?'
mang follows *Thaka* and in
6. *Mora oa mang* 'whose son?'/'son of who?'
and *mang* follows *Mora*
and we also have
7. *Ngoana oa mang* 'whose child?'/'child of who?'
where *mang* follows *Ngoana.*

The *mang* is deictic because it requires that the referent be identified. The referents here are not physically mentioned as these structures seek or demand information. Note again that these names' structures transform to the use of the apostrophe to express the possessive feature and this occurs mainly in the spoken texts. Examples are:

8. *Thak'amang* 'whose age mate?'/'age mate of who?'   from *Thakaeamang?*
9. *Mor'amang* 'whose son?'/'son of who?'   from *Moraoamang?* and
10. *Ngoan'amang* 'whose child?'/'child of who?'   from *Ngoanaoamang?*

and these refer in daily social phatic discourse because *mang?* normally inquires information about someone. This deictic is used to build social relations though in this case the awarder displays a somewhat negative attitude that shows discontentment at the birth of this baby. This marks these names as enacted messages. The elipted *e* and *o* in *ea* and *oa* 'of' is substituted with an apostrophe in daily discourse but the original meaning is still retained. An additional interesting note is that *Thak'amang, Mor'amang* and *Ngoan'amang* have a concomitant occurrence of the determinative possession features with WH- possessive feature. The determinative possessive features are marked by the meaning embedded in the question 'whose son/child/age mate?' as noted above.

Note further that in these questions are embedded the declarative question form 'you are the son /child/age mate of whom?' and this takes a literal Sesotho translation of these names.   The part noted as 'the son/child/age mate of' or 'of whom?' are substituted by 'whose?' in the English version and Halliday and other systemics do not discuss this observation in the deictic. Thus it is noted as new. Additionally, in these deictic names the interrogative is direct and this corresponds to Halliday's (2001, p.181) view that WH- interrogative functions as a specific deictic. A further new observation is that this ellipsis even restructures some possessive names to a new form as in the example:

11. *Motho-oa-mang?* 'whose person?'
which changes to

12. *Motho-mang?* to mean 'which person?

The new form seizes to ask about possession but someone talked about. But still it inquires for a referent. Note that in the daily interaction speakers re-structure this form into:

13. Motho-mong 'what kind?'

and this form is commonly used and thought to be the only form. In *Mothomong* the awarder is actually asking sarcastically about the type or status of the third person who is the baby and this would be responded to in a deictic form as in *Ke ngoana oa ngoanana* 'It is a baby girl'. However, note that the response may recall the possessive marker *oa* 'of' in the structure. Such a name would be derived from the origin of the sex or type of baby. The alternative of this form which is *Mothomang* can be sarcastic because it can actually elicit negatively about the social position of someone. This form in actual use can be sarcastic because it actually elicits negatively about the person responsible for this third person who is the baby. There is an element of implicit ridicule in the name.

A further new note in relation to the deictic interrogative *mang?,* is that the head noun can be substituted with its own concord. Such a concord may be a duplicate of the first two or three letters of the noun and they are known as the prefix or the first letter of a 3rd person pronoun. It begins with *o* 'he/she' singular from and *ba* 'they' plural and these extend to other classifications. This feature excludes 1st person singular which takes *Ke* 'I' and plural *Re* 'we' and 2nd person singular *U* 'you' and plural *Le* 'you'. Duplication of the prefix begins with 3rd person plural. The concord may be that of a Subject (SC) or Object (OC)*.* These agree with the relevant nouns and pronouns in person and number. This causes what Halliday (2001, p.192) refers to as a sub-modification. He asserts that when a logical structure of a nominal group is 'disturbed' that causes sub-modifications. Examples are:

14. *Kemang* 'who am I?'
15 Umang? 'who are you?'

The nouns are replaced by concords but the class, number and person are retained. Another interesting observation is that these concords also take the deictic possessive marker *oa* 'of' and when *oa* follows a first person singular Subject Concord [SC] *Ke* 'I', it does not drop off or reduce elements. The form with the apostrophe does not apply and it is another new observation. Example is:

16. *Keoamang*   'whom do I belong to? or 'whose am I?'

This makes us realize that where the head of the nominal is a noun the possessive can be contracted but where the noun is substituted with a SC the full possessive concord 'of' remains unchanged. The names 14,15,16 are the awarders' wail for origin and care and these would permanently be in memory because as names they are lifetime inscription on the babies. They are in the singular form, a feature noted for the deictic. Others are expressed in plural each but still the awarder sounds hopeless and wailing in structures such as:

17. *Rebamang?* 'whose (people) are we?'/ 'to whom do we belong?'
18. *Lebamang?* 'whose (people) are you?' / 'to whom do we belong?'

The names show *ba* as an additional possessive marker in the plural but unlike *oa* it does not change form in the structures due to contraction. They still inquire information from the non-specific addressees as the prior examples did. In these names as well, the interpersonal function is dominant because there is exchange of information between the awarder and the non-specific audience that is obvious to the awarder. His/her emotions are expressed as rhetoric questions because no one is expected to answer. The emotions reflect either a worry or a concern or annoyance or their combination. The awarders affirm sub-consciously that they are not prepared to take responsibility of babies whose biological fathers are hiding. They express the modality that the babies are not theirs as modality says 'something is or is not' (Eggins, 1996, p.177) .They do so with a question form that says 'whose are you?' They ask as though they would pass the babies to the fathers if known. They may be directly asking the babies because there are no honest responses from the mothers. The awarders are denouncing the responsibilities.

Alternatively, these names were awarded because the awarders did not know how to handle the babies' traditional needs because they belong to a different ancestral lineage as this is a common practice among Africans. It is done to avoid spiritual calamities that add social problems at present and in future. The concomitance of the determinative and the interrogative possessive meanings apply to *Re/Lebamang, Keoamang* but there is ellipsis of the possessor because the possessive markers have not been spelt out in a specific way as in *Thakamang, Moramang* and *Ngoanamang.* The declarative question forms would be: 'we/you/I belong to who?' and the declarative form is marked by the use of he Subject as it is the initial element in the structure. Note that *Ke* and *oa* in *Keoamang* are direct singular forms of *Re* and *ba* in *Rebamang* thus forming a very close link of number, class and person between the Subjects *Ke* and *Re.* The message in them is identical but the Subjects and their concords are number specific. These Subjects

function as possessive deictic and it is their original form and function. In the described names interpersonal meanings are reflected because the awarders are making demands for information by being deictic interrogatively.

Another interesting new note is that though all the described names have resumed with a noun or its concord, there is another name that has, in its structure a base verb placed between the subject concord and the interrogative marker *mang?* This interrogative is also preceded by a locative circumstantial marker *ho* 'to' which is normally noted as a preposition in English. Such an example is:

19. Utlahomang 'to whom are you coming?'

This is another new observation not mentioned either by systemic or formal grammars yet it fits into the SFL framework of the deictic interrogative possessives. The name reflects deep sarcasm and repulsion of the name awarder to the counter family or in-laws and its function is to ridicule them. The reasons could differ from refusing to engage in negotiations regarding the newly born to that of refusing the return of the mother and baby to the in-laws and even more depending on the situation at hand. This confirms that personal names are enacted messages or texts described in context and as with others this is a direct interrogative. An additional adjunct to *mang?* is *eng? or 'ng?* in Sesotho structures. It functions as the interrogative demonstrative 'what (ever)?'. It is exemplified by:

20. *Ke'ng* 'what is it?' or 'what am I?'

depending on the tonemes used. The first interpretation takes HHH whereas the second takes LLH. Interpersonal function can be solicited in HHH and it is commonly used in discourse to demand information. It is normally thought to be the only interpretation. In this HHH things are not as expected about the baby and this raises concern that makes the awarder exclaim thus. On the other hand, LLH is a solliloquouy and therefore, intra-personal. LLH is used in situations that require introspection particularly when matters show a negative impact and effect on the speaker. In LLH the awarder is regretful, may be about his/her behavior that brought this baby who is probably 'unwanted' or about his/her future or failure in up-bringing of the biological mother. The name is a negative whine in both cases. The name is exclaiming about the person as in LLH or the situation at hand in HHH. However, in both cases the awarder is included in the element inquired about. So, a new observation is that tone on the same structure has the effect of displaying both the interpersonal and intra-personal meanings and the latter is new in SFL theory. Another new note about `*ng* is that in the structure:

21.*Lempatla'ng?* 'what (ever) do you want from me?'

the interrogative still seeks information but the deictic marker now follows a finite predicator *'patla'* from *batla* 'want'. The `*ng* is the WH- adjunct in search of information. It is interesting that the head noun *nna* 'me' presented as *m* in the name structure occurs with the addressee element. These are analyzed as predicative concords in the grammar of Sesotho. They can co-occur in one clause denoting the Actor *Le* 'You' and

the acted *m* 'me' respectively. The Actor is thematic because it introduces the clause and both are also directing the action expressed in the finite predicator. They display a new interdependency relation because the acted presupposes the Actor. The awarder's modality reflects annoyance which is assumed to be directed to the counter family of the baby (paternal) or in-laws. Furthermore, the same *'ng* adjunct as interrogative determiner occurs in the name:

22. Lebuaka'ng 'what are you talking about?'

in which we have the *`ng* as the WH- adjunct and it is preceded by an element *ka* that enfolds the sense of possession though this element can be relevant in various contexts. The *ka* is described in Sesotho grammar as an instrumental marker that means 'with' but a new observation from this name is that it can be used as an interrogative deictic marker 'what?'. It inquires about information by 'pointing' to what is being discussed and that is marked by *ka'ng?* 'what is it that you are talking about?' This deictic also makes use of a finite predicator *bua* 'talk'. From the structure it is expected that the speaker wants the addressee to point out the matter in question. The modality identified here is that the awarder pretends to be unaware of or not understanding what the issue is all about. He/she is being cynical because he/she does not want the counters to take the baby from him/her. It is an indirect refusal to part with the baby. This feature carries within it the use of the markers:

23. joang in
24. Lebuajoang 'what (manner) of talk is this?' and
25. life [dife] in
26.Letlakalife 'what / which (content) do you bring with you?'

Both names function in the same manner as *Lebuaka'ng.* They carry in them the same modality and function found in *Lebuaka'ng*. What differs is that *Lebuajoang* requires manner and *Letlakalife* requires content as the deictic that "indicate 'which?' subset of Thing is intended" (Halliday 2001, p.125). *Letlakalife* even uses the *ka* that is found in *Lebuaka'ng*. Another new note about *`ng* is that in the structure:

27. Lere'ng? 'what do you say/claim?'

is another interrogative determinant deictic personal name that uses the adjunct *eng* noted as *`ng* but it is coined in yet a different setup that displays a direct request using *re* 'say'.

A further interesting new observation is that the deictic with the possessive feature marked with an apostrophe as in *Mary's* is marked as a declarative and not an interrogative deictic. An example is:

28. *Mosela-oa-ntja* 'the tail of a dog/ dog's tail' *(Mosel'antja* in normal use).

An important new note to make is that the *oa* 'of' or the apostrophe form an elliptic declarative marked with the apostrophe between the head noun and the possessive concord *oa* 'of' to mark possession. It adds to the examples of the deictic determinative possessive (Halliday 2001, p.181) but it is declarative and not interrogative. This is another new observation not mentioned by the systemic theory. Possessive in Sesotho analysis is classified as part of the qualificatives which are referred to as epithet adjective by Halliday (2001, p.184).

Another interesting view deduced from this deictic name is a negative attitude generally and this is a new observation because it has not been indicated in the analysis of Sesotho. As a personal name it means 'one who is greedy'. In the grammatical analysis the negative attitude was not anticipated because the Adjective in Sesotho mainly bears an aesthetic feature but with this personal name the weight is in the negative element. Further, it is declarative and it does not inquire any information as the deictic is expected and therefore it displays the speech role of a statement. However, an interesting view here is that the name that conforms to the description of Sesotho grammar which says a possessive (concord + stem) as in:

29. *oa + ntja* 'of + the dog' resulting in 'dog's'

is also noted as determinative deictic in SFL. Such must follow the noun that they describe and in this structure they follow *mosela* 'tail'. This confirms the view by Halliday (2001, p.125) about *'s* in possessive deictic determinants. The possessive marker *oa* 'of', and the apostrophe mark the possessive directly. The referent is the tail which marks greed. The name may be given to express concern about the behavior of one of the parents or both to show their greed in having children without considering the responsibilities. In other cases it is a name given to a child born after one who passed away. Another example of the use of *'s* is noted in the name:

30. *Thaka-ea-banna* 'an age mate of men' / men's age mate.

The possessive marker *ea* functions in the same way as *oa* in *Mosela-oa-ntja* 'dog's tail' but it is made different by the class of the noun. In this name the possession marks description not a direct possession as in *Mosela-oa-ntja* 'dog's tail' but it is interesting that both have nominal referents 'dog' and 'men' respectively. It is therefore important to note that the 'of' marker which can be replaced by the *'s* for the possessive determinant can be identified with different possessive markers which are class sensitive. This name displays pride of the awarder after receiving news of a male baby because a male among Basotho is vital for agnates as the lineage will progress comfortably because of the male child. The awarder does not even look for an alternative but directly declares his position among men. He notes that he has defended his manhood as expected of men. Possibly this birth added to many others in which male children were the major specimen born hence the awarder claimed it was a month designated to men. Men could be a pun that notes male children as well as adult men who are proud of bearing male children. The referent *banna* 'men' connotatively refers to the period which marks the time of this important gesture.

These observations present that the possessive deictic WH- interrogative assumes *oa,ea,ba* [of] and *ka* [about] as the possessive markers that determine the WH-interrogative-possessive deictic in the nominal group of Sesotho clauses. These examples confirm Halliday's (2001, p.125) view that the interrogative feature uses 'whose(ever)?' in names 1,2,3,4,5,8,9, 10,17,18, and it may be coupled with 'which(ever)?' as they can bear the use of either 'whose?' or 'which' and still be relevant; 'what(ever)?' in 11,12,20,21,22,24,26,27; 'who?' in names 14.15; '(to)whom?' in names 16,19. It also uses the apostrophe to mark possession as in the names from 1 to 10 and 20 to 22 and also marks deletion as in names 28, 30 and 37. An interesting new observation here is that 'whose?' and 'whom?' can be found alternating in the same structure or clause and such is found in *Keoamang* 'to whom do I belong?' *Rebamang* 'to whom do we belong?' and *Lebamang* 'to whom do you belong?' They alternate basing themselves distinctly on number and person as 'I', 'you (singular) and 'we'. This use is new because it has not been presented in the description of person and number in Sesotho grammar.

Another new venture is that along with 'of' is the use of 'about' to mark interrogative deictic nominal structure as in *Lebuaka'ng* 'what are you talking about?' The function enfolded in the 'what?' of this name is that the awarder is possibly asking the counter family the issues they are talking about in relation to the baby's birth. It can be assumed that the baby is an out of wedlock. With the exception of *Lebuaka'ng* the names are affirmed propositions because they agree that these referents *Mosela* 'tail', *Thaka* 'agemate' are the people talked about though they are still in search of the possessor. These determinative WH- interrogative names reflect a function of initiating discourse or exchange for the awarders seek information about the babies as though it is the babies requesting response about selves. The awarders are direct with the addresses but cover them up with the discourse being directed to the babies. They are actually asking the biological mothers and this means there is a high possibility that these babies are out of wedlock children.

Besides the possessive deictic there are names that are formed using the determinative demonstratives. As noted, Halliday (2001, p.125) says determinative demonstratives are marked by 'here, this, these, that, those, the, yonder'. Examples of Sesotho names are:

31. *Keteng* LLH 'I am here' or HHL 'this is it'
32. *Kemane LHH* 'I am yonder'
33. *Semane HHH.* 'It is yonder'

Keteng is formed from a locative *teng* which means 'here'. The equivalent of 'here' from the forwarded table by Halliday is 'this'. They are equivalent deictics because as Halliday explains, deictic demonstratives are noted by reference to some kind of proximity and these demonstratives denote the same proximity of being near the speaker. *Teng* [LH] is normally classified as a locative and [HL] to mean 'so it is' in

Sesotho description but its feature of being a demonstrative with the tonemes LLH in *Keteng* 'it is so/so it is' as in this name is new in the description of Sesotho grammar. When expressed as LHL, it is used as a greeting or an indicator of pouncing on someone in a conflict context or affirmation/assurance to a doubtful victim that there is definitely security for them. The LLH use corresponds to Halliday's (2001, p.181) claim that 'here, there, yonder' function as corresponding locative adverbs to 'this, that, yon'. Examples of personal names that bear 'yon' are:

34. *Kemane* 'I am over there or yonder' and
35. *Semane* /It is over there or yonder'.

The determinative includes the demonstratives 'here', 'there', 'yonder', 'this', 'these', 'that', 'those', 'the'. However, an interesting difference in function in these determinative demonstratives is that *Kemane* is specific about the speaker's position in relation to the speaker. This is made firm by the Subject SC which is definite about the speaker. It denotes the 1st person singular as the speaker and referent. The position directed is not explicitly specific though, but it would add definite information to clarify it. On the other hand, *Semane* is not specific about the referent and position because the speaker uses non-specific Subject *Se* which may denote a person or a thing thus in need of specific context.

The awarder uses *mane* 'there' to refer to a non-specific position that would need to be probed with 'where?' to establish exactness. It presents the unmentioned Subject-noun and related information. This confirms Halliday's (2001, p.125) claim that "the subset in question is identifiable but this will not tell you how to identify it because of the non-specific character". The awarder does not tell how he/she should be identified in the context related to the baby's birth and he/she uses this non-specific element to intentionally hide the truth about his/her feelings.

Consequently, when assessing both names we find that the Subjects *Ke* and *Se* reflect what Halliday, (2001, p.181) claims as being the function of identifying a subset of a referent. In both names the modality displayed by awarders is actually certain and not only likely though their indications of where to be found in relation to the babies' births differ in the Subject. *Mane* may refer to a real proximity or intense emotions that make the awarder feel confused and unsettled. The reason may be based on Halliday's (2001, p.181) view that specific and non-specific deictic mark the experiential structure. This would, therefore, mark the experiences encountered at the birth of the child and expressed as a name. Note that tone obscures this deictic feature because it assumes LLL phonetically inscribed as [kɛma:ne] and HHH in [sɛma:ne] preferred in a personal name not LHH or HHL phonetically inscribed as [kema:ne] and [sema:ne] used as any clause. The LLL hinders identification of these names as clauses. Note that as a personal name tone change from HHL and LHH to LLL overshadows this described meaning enfolded in the name. A further interesting note not mentioned by systemic grammar is that these deictic forms take complements. We find this observation in:

36. *Keteng Metsing* 'I am here | at/in the water'.

Metsing (HHH) is the surname that makes this name read with a complement locative. It is a prepositional phrase in English. The name-surname maintains the 'something is' propositional feature. The surname clarifies the locative demonstrative 'here' with a locative complement and this confirms an observation by Makara and Mokhathi (1996, p.67) that locatives can add more meaning to each other when placed consecutively. The surname functions as what Halliday (2001, p.183) terms post-deictic subset of the class of 'thing'. Post-deictic refers to the familiarity of the 'thing' and its status in the text or its similarity/dissimilarity to some other designated subset. In this name the surname is designated to the circumstantial locatives that relate well with the demonstrative deictic 'here'. The relation is enfolded in the determinant deictic 'where?' and it inquires about a location. *Metsing* refers to a place where there is water. Though the real context is not evident the name-surname presents an affirmed proposition in structure and in meaning.

The awarder's modality or evaluation proposes that the addressed behave as though the awarder did not exist or was not aware of matters arising from the expected baby hence why he/she declares his/her presence with a possible vigorous 'I am here!'. The name-surname is emotional. The awarder may be using the aquatic context to indicate either that he/she is capable of accomplishing positive and negative things in various ways as water is used to indicate the baby's harbor during pregnancy. This is because Basotho equate a newly born baby or infant with 'water' due to infirmness in its postnatal being. He/she would be indicating that he/she is prepared to combat anything that may hinder the baby's survival.

Note again that as observed in the possessive names these demonstrative names are elliptic response moves and they confirm Halliday's (2001, p.93) view that the demonstrative deictic can highlight the ellipsis preceding discourse. *Keteng* functions as a response move because it has an indication of a response to a question such as *U hokae?* 'where are you? or *Na u teng?* 'Are you there?' *Keteng* would be an accurate and appropriate affirming response to both questions because they inquire about the whereabouts of the addressee. The awarder portrays an attitude of one who is readily available for a war. It is as though he/she will extend *Keteng* with a provocative exclamation such as *Le re'ng?* 'what do you say/claim?' as is the case in real provocation using *Keteng.* Remember that:

37. *Lere'ng?* 'what do you say/claim?'

is another interrogative determinant deictic personal name that uses the adjunct *eng* noted as *`ng* but it is coined in yet a different setup besides being a complement of *Keteng*. It demands information as well in its solitary function and it is not a possessive determinant. *Kemane* and *Semane* are ellipsed in the same manner and would be probed similarly. Ellipsis as a cohesive tie mentioned by Halliday and Hasan (1978, p. 4) makes these names semantic units, especially *Keteng* because it even declares the surname as its complement that makes the message of either pouncing or being haughty

explicit and more complete. *Keteng, Kemane* and *Semane* are elliptic declarative non-finites and this is a new discovery in relation to the grammar of Sesotho because in its description there is no mention of the declarative non-finites or the presence of ellipsis.

CONCLUSION

As noted that these deictic demonstratives and possessives in Sesotho are non-finite in Halliday's (2001, p.241) terms non-finite refers to "a dependent clause which ...has no verb" and these names are verbless. The features marked in these deictic names with their verbless character have been that of describing the Subject, a function exclusive to Adjectives, and this introduces us to other names that propel the art of describing the Subject but from other perspectives. This introduces us to the deictic in the nominal group. This new observation of the deictic in the nominal group calls for attention and therefore a new area of study to be embarked on in future. Such would require a description of the Subject from perspectives other than the verbless perspective.

REFERENCES

Doke, C.M. & S.M. Mofokeng. (1967). *Textbook of Southern Sotho Grammar.* Cape Town: Longmans Southern Africa, Pty Ltd.

Eggins, S. (1996). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics.* London: Continuum.

Guma, S.M. (1971). *An Outline Structure of Southern Sotho.* Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.

Halliday, M.A.K. (2001). *An Introduction to Functional Grammar.* London: Arnold.

Makara M. & M, Mokhathi. (1996). *Sehaeso 3.* Maseru: Longman Publishers.

Polson, E. (2000). *Qualitative Research for Dummies. Handbook of Qualitative Research.* London: Asge Publications.