

## Polarity Feature In Sesotho Personal Names: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach

ˆMasechaba ML Mokhathi-Mbhele

**ABSTRACT:-** This article presents how the functional perspective describes Sesotho names as social discourse that exchanges information. It describes the effect of linguistic polarity feature on the syntactic features and social functions in the onomastica of Basotho. The aim was to establish how polarity portrays the name awardee's evaluation (modality) of the birth situation and the cultural context basis. Data was collected from admission lists, graduation lists from different institutions, radio phone-in programmes and television shows. It is a qualitative study as it solicits interpretation of the reduplication feature from the elders, family members and on assumed context. It attempts to make meanings from the perspective of name awardees based on their experiences around the births. The contribution is that the study extends the SFL-Onomastica literature and it confirms that form-meaning description should be adhered to in linguistic analyses. It has implications for linguistics, education, anthropology and sociology.

**Keywords:-** positive and negative polarity, polarity item, affirmative, text, context, cohesion, FCI, interdependency, modality, mood.

### I. INTRODUCTION

Polarity is a concept that encompasses linguistics and other academic disciplines. In studying polarity focus is directed to "oppositeness" feature in structures of concern.

The study of polarity as a theory in linguistics emerged as a relatively new paradigm in the 1970's and only in the late 1980's and 90's did a substantial body of data including cross-linguistic studies become publicly available. In Oxford Research Encyclopedia (2019) it is asserted that in the late 1970s, William Ladusaw (building on work by Gilles Fauconnier) discovered that most English NPIs are licensed in downward entailing environments known as Fauconnier-Ladusaw hypothesis. It is claimed that this hypothesis is not a sufficient condition for all the negative items nor is it necessary for licensing especially in English.

Historically William Ladusaw (1996) delineated 3 major questions that have guided the field with the licensing question - the sensitivity question, and the status question. In another case, Israel (2004) offers a pragmatic theory of Negative Polarity Item (NPI) licensing in English distinguishing between the emphatic and attenuating NPIs and Positive Polarity Items (PPIs). Anastacia Giannakidou (2019) is more cross linguistic and that brings together scalar and referentially deficient NPIs. She also criticizes the no-variation scalar approach to polarity phenomena in natural language. Penka n Zeijlstra (2010) incorporates Giannakidou's perspective and emphasizes more syntactic aspects of licensing. Polarity phenomena in functional linguistics have been addressed in various languages including Sesotho as Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) describes polarity feature in independence clause Sesotho names and in (2019) she makes a very superficial contribution on Sesotho names as "opposites" thus listing names with direct oppositeness or contrast in meaning such as *Botsang* [bōtsaŋ] 'ask (pl)' vs *Arabang* [arabaŋ] 'answer (pl)'. In this study, focus is extended and directed to the discourse of polarity on Sesotho onomastica or personal names.

### II. DEFINITIONS OF POLARITY

Polarity, according to Schachter (1985, p.10) is a grammatical category that distinguishes affirmative and negative. In simple terms it refers to "oppositeness". Grammaarpedia (2019) notes that polarity refers to the grammatical systems associated with distinguishing between positive and negative clauses. Basic clauses in English are noted to be positive while negative clauses are explained as carrying explicit marking words such as 'not'.

Oxford Research Encyclopedia (2019) clarifies that research on polarity items has centered around the question of what creates a negative context.

### Polarity in Linguistics

In linguistics, as noted in free encyclopedia (Accessed 2019), a **polarity item** is a lexical item that can appear only in environments associated with a particular grammatical polarity – affirmative or negative. A polarity item that appears in affirmative (positive) contexts is called a **positive polarity item** (PPI), and one that appears in negative contexts is a **negative polarity item** (NPI). This, according to free encyclopedia, is to say that affirmative denotes positive form used to express the validity or truth of a basic assertion while a negative form expresses its falsity. Eggins (1996,p,177) as a systemic presents that positive and negative features are in-built in propositions for she says, “A proposition is something that can be argued in a particular way and it can be affirmed or denied.” Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) observed that polarity is evident in Sesotho names that bear the independent clause structure and they build the interpersonal function between and among families.

[oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019) clarifies that polarity items portray three prominent paradigms and such comprise negative polarity items (NPIs), positive polarity items (PPIs), and free choice items (FCIs). [oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019) explains that their common feature is that they have limited distribution as they cannot occur just anywhere, but only inside the scope of the licenser, that is, it is provided for by negation as a conducive context and a non-veridical (truthful) licenser. That the NPI's and PPI's occur in the context of the licenser reflects in various contexts and various academic areas studied and published on polarity onomastics (personal names), particularly on Sesotho names.

Basotho personal names in Mokhathi-Mbhele's (2014) view are semiotic choices that are awarded as texts (information messages) in context, and therefore function as discourse. They enfold experiences that are presented as social functions borne within the culture of Basotho hence their description in Systemic Functional Linguistics (SFL)/Grammar (SFG) framework. Martin and Rose (2007, p.3) claim that SFL bears a 'clause-text-culture' paradigm. Some of these names display the feature of “oppositeness” and all of them in context. Nonetheless, some are undisputedly direct “opposites”. In this “oppositeness” features names that reflect a positive environment and they echo the caricature of Positive Polarity Items (PPIs) and the converse which reflect a corresponding negative environment appear in the scope of negation are thus labeled Negative Polarity Items (NPI's).

In the arena of NPI's, [oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019) notes that “the distributions of NPIs and FCIs can cross-linguistically be understood in terms of general patterns”, and further explains that individual differences basically draw from and distribute the polarized lexical semantic content into polarity item paradigms. In these paradigms initially features the general patterns identified as possible lexical sources of polarity which include a dependent variable in the polarity item which characterizes NPIs and FCIs in many languages, including Greek, Mandarin, and Korean. Secondly, the polarity item may be scalar as in English, and any FCIs can be scalar, but Greek, Korean, and Mandarin NPIs are not. These NPI's need to be in the scope of a 'licenser' to create a semantic and syntactic dependency, as the polarity item must be commanded by the licenser at some syntactic level. That semantic-syntactic dependency, as stated by [oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019), is a true interface phenomenon on both semantics and syntax in Polarity. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) asserts that the context in the case of Sesotho onomastica is the 'licenser'.

Nonetheless, Oxford Research Encyclopedia (accessed 2020) notes Zwarts (1981) explanation that licensing contexts across languages include the scope of n-words and such are negative particles and negative quantifiers, the antecedent of conditionals, questions, the restrictor of universal quantifiers, non-affirmative verbs (doubt), adversative predicates (be surprised), negative conjunctions (without), comparatives (-er, more than) and superlatives (-est, most), *too*-phrases, negative predicates (unlikely), some subjunctive complements, some disjunctions, imperatives, and others (finally, only) and these are non-downward entailing environments. Some of these scopes reflect as Sesotho names as the Sesotho names *Botsang* 'ask (pl)' vs *Arabang* 'answer (pl)' are imperative opposites. As [oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019) further explains that non-veridical (truthful) polarity contexts can be negative, but also non-monotonic in modal contexts, questions, other non-assertive contexts that comprise imperatives, subjunctives, generic and habitual sentences, and disjunction, there are Sesotho names that reflect these qualities. For instance, *Buang* [buan] 'speak/talk (pl)' vs *Tholang* [tʰɔlan] '(be) quiet (pl)' mark oppositeness of habitual imperative yet they are personal names.

[Oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019) additionally claims that some NPIs and FCIs appear freely in contexts in many languages and some NPIs prefer negative contexts. These assertions basically reflect in the Sesotho names

marked with polarity because not all NPIs appear only in minimally negative contexts. A further proposal is that NPIs can be exhaustive and if not exhaustive tend to be referentially vague, which means that the speaker uses them only if he/she is unable to identify a specific referent. This is not the case in Sesotho names because as Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) asserts, Sesotho names are not arbitrary as they purposefully depict an experience.

Giannakidou (2019, p.1) claims that “polarity phenomena in natural language are pervasive and diverse” but Basotho use polarity with a positive attitude because each coinage is a reminder about a significant positive or negative incident around the baby’s birth. Kotze and Kotze (2002, p.3) claim that “words are not innocent” fortify Basotho’s engagement because personal names are ‘words’. The words are a milieu that embeds massive amounts of experiences that mark positive or negative magnitude. Constant address with the name sustains those referral experiences. Giannakidou continues to note that Polarity items are expressions of various syntactic categories such as nominal adverbials, verbs, particles and idioms, with limited distribution as they do not occur in a positive sentence in the simple, past”. Sesotho language bears examples of some of these categories as noted with the main verbs *lahla* [laʎa] ‘throw away’ which forms the name *Ntahleng* [ntaʎeŋ] ‘throw me away’ vs *thola* [tʰola] ‘pick up (as in lost and found)’ which breathes *Ntholeng* [ntʰoleŋ] ‘pick me up - lost and found’; *hloea* [hloja] which breeds *Mohlouoa* [mōʎuwa] ‘the hated one’ or *hana* [hana] ‘refuse’ that built *Mohanuoa* [mōhanuwa] ‘the refused one’. Both *Mohlouoa* [mōʎuwa] and *Mohanuoa* [mōhanuwa] are polarized with *Moratuoa* [mōratuwa] ‘the loved one’ from *rata* [rata] ‘like or love’. This distinction supports Halliday’s (2001, p.88) assertion maintained in systemic grammar that there is more than one way of getting polarity which is attained by distinction between propositions as statements and questions, that is, as information and proposals or goods and services. In systemic grammar polarity marks a direct ‘yes’ and ‘no’ and the intermediate affirmations denote modality (Halliday, 2001, p.95). Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014, p. 144) exemplifies this ‘yes’ and ‘no’ note with independent clause Sesotho names that employed the finites *hana* [hana] ‘no’ or ‘refuse’ and *lumela* [dumela] ‘yes’ or ‘agree’ in building personal names *Kehanne* [kehanné] ‘I have refused’ or ‘I said ‘no’ vs *Kelumetse* [kedumétse] ‘I have agreed’ or ‘I have said ‘yes’’. These propositions are a direct affirmation with a ‘yes’ and in their structure a direct refusal with a ‘no’ and both are statements. More polarized statements comprise *Learongoa* [learōŋwa] ‘you are being sent’ whose negative is *Halerongoe* [halerōŋwe] ‘you are/it is not sent’.

Halliday (2001, p.197) notes that finiteness unearths the interpersonal function through ‘primary tense and modality’ and this polarized name pair displays an argument between the in-laws or the sender and those sent concerning discussions around the baby’s birth using the simple present tense *-a-* which occurs immediately after the prefix *Le-* [le] ‘you (pl)’. Both the prefix and tense marker form MOOD and the finite *rongoa* the PREDICATOR. Specific expectation of the speaker or awarder is explicated by the Subject and tense marker *Le+a-* you (pl) + are... and the predicator clarifies the action to complete the Modality in the message. The negative initiates with the Negative marker *Ha* [ha] ‘do not’ thus, displaying a denied proposition. As Eggins (1996, p.178) explains Modality shows that the speaker has affirmed or denied the proposition. Simple present perfect tense also reflects primary tense in *Kelumetse* as the awarder affirmation as PPI whereas *Kehanne* in the same tense explicitly and directly displays refusal as NPI. Both display polarity with attitudes displayed by the lexical verb or predicator in structure and reference.

### III. POLARITY IN SESOTHO NAMES

Personal names among Basotho are awarded as per experiences they encounter at a baby’s birth but ancestral resemblances are a panacea. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014, p.144) initially described that Sesotho names with an independent clause function as polar adjuncts. Systemic grammar notes that polar adjuncts express meanings which are directly related to the arguable nub of the proposition. These are normally formed from declaratives whose order is Subject-Finite as in *Le-a* (subject-tense)+*rongoa* (finite) and those with a question structure are responses to polar interrogatives or questions. They respond to polar interrogatives. The structure of Polar interrogatives normally allows the Finite to precede the Subject and form Subject Finite Inversion (SFI) but Sesotho forms maintain the statement structure and employ tone to differentiate statement from question. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2019) further contributed that Sesotho names may function as *Lihanani* [dihanani] ‘opposites’ from various syntactic categories. In either description, these experiences award PPIs and NPIs and in some cases FCIs occur. The experiences may mark national incidences, historical events, social activities such as bereavements, entertainment and many more. Because of the extensively varied experiences and events Basotho coin and appropriately award a name to a baby either as PPI, NPI or FCI. Names identified in Fig. 1 display direct corresponding forms of PPI and NPI.

Fig. 1 PPI and corresponding NPI Sesotho names Observed

Positive (PPL)	Negative (NPI)
<i>Leemisa</i> [leémisa] ‘one who causes a firm stand’	<i>Leoisa</i> [lewisa] ‘one who causes a fall’
<i>Ntenya, Mafethe, Mafotha</i> [ntepa], [mafét <sup>h</sup> é], [mafōt <sup>h</sup> a] ‘fat one’	<i>Moketa</i> [mōketa] ‘thin one’
<i>Moratuoa</i> [mōratuwa] ‘loved one’	<i>Mohlouoa, Mohanuoa</i> [mōfōuwa],[ mōhanuwa] ‘the hated one’ ro ‘the refused one’
<i>Khumamang</i> [k <sup>h</sup> umamaŋ] ‘kneel down (pl)’	<i>Emang</i> [émaŋ] ‘stand’ or ‘stop (pl)’
<i>Kelumetse</i> [keduméyse] ‘I have agreed’	<i>Kehanne</i> [jehanné] ‘I have redused’
<i>Isang</i> [isaŋ] ‘take ... there (pl)’	<i>Tlisang, Khutlisang</i> [tlisaŋ],[k <sup>h</sup> utlisaŋ] ‘bring back (pl)’
<i>Nkiseng</i> [ŋkiséŋ] ‘take me there (pl)’	<i>Ntateng</i> [ntatéŋ] ‘collect me from there’
<i>Nkemeleng</i> [ŋkéméléŋ] ‘wait for me (pl)’	<i>Ntšieeng</i> [nts <sup>h</sup> ijéŋ] ‘leave me behind’
<i>Mitseng</i> [mmitséŋ] ‘call him/her (pl)’	<i>Molelekeng</i> [mōlélékéŋ] ‘chase him/her away (pl)’
<i>Mpitseng</i> [mpitséŋ] ‘call me (pl)’	<i>Ntelekeng</i> [ntélékéŋ] ‘chase me away (pl)’
<i>Utloanang</i> [utlwanaŋ] ‘acknowledge one another (pl)’	<i>Loanang</i> [lwanaŋ] ‘fight one another (pl)’
<i>Amohelang</i> [amōhélaŋ]	<i>Tsekang</i> [tsékaŋ] ‘fight over ... (pl)’
<i>Makalang</i> [makalaŋ] ‘be surprised (pl)’	<i>Semakaleng</i> [semakaléŋ] ‘don’t be surprised’
<i>Tsebang / Ntsebeng</i> [tsebaŋ] / [ntsebéŋ] ‘know this (pl)’ / ‘know me (pl)’	<i>Haketsebe</i> [haketsebe] ‘I don’t know’ <i>Haretsebe</i> [haretsebe] ‘we don’t know’
<i>Nkhetheng</i> [ŋk <sup>h</sup> ét <sup>h</sup> éŋ] ‘select/elect/choose me (pl)’	<i>Ntahleng</i> [ntaféŋ] ‘throw me away (pl)’
<i>Nkutloeleng</i> [ŋkitlwéléŋ] ‘feel for me (pl)’	<i>Ntšeheng</i> [nts <sup>h</sup> éhéŋ] ‘laugh at me (pl)’
<i>Mpheng</i> [mp <sup>h</sup> éŋ] ‘give me... (pl)’	<i>Nkoneng</i> [ŋkōnéŋ] ‘don’t give me [out of malice] (pl)’
<i>Nthekeleng</i> [nt <sup>h</sup> ékéléŋ] ‘buy me ... (pl)’	<i>Halerekoe</i> [halerékwe] ‘it is not bought’
<i>Fang</i> [faŋ] ‘give ... (pl)’	<i>Habofano</i> [habōfanwe] ‘it is not given’
<i>Nthuseng</i> [nt <sup>h</sup> uséŋ] ‘help me (pl)’	<i>Habathuse</i> [habat <sup>h</sup> use] ‘they don’t help (pl)’
<i>Nheng</i> [nnéhéŋ] ‘give me (pl)’	<i>Haboneo</i> [habōnéhwe] ‘it is not given’
<i>Learongoa</i> [learōŋwa] ‘you are being sent (pl)’	<i>Halerongoe</i> [halerōŋwe] ‘you are not being sent (pl)’
<i>Lifelile</i> [difédilé] ‘they are finished’	<i>Halifele</i> [hadiféle] ‘they do not get finished’
<i>Keteng</i> [ketéŋ] ‘I am here’	<i>Haleeo</i> [halejō] ‘you are not there (pl)’
<i>Keteng</i> [ketéŋ] ‘I am here’	<i>Keile</i> [keile] ‘I am gone’
<i>Mofuthu</i> [mōfut <sup>h</sup> u] ‘warmth’	<i>Serame</i> [seramé] ‘coldness’
<i>Botsang</i> [bōtsaŋ] ‘ask (pl)’	<i>Arabang</i> [arabaŋ] ‘answer (pl) or respond (pl)’
<i>Nepo</i> [népō] ‘correct’	<i>Fosa</i> [fōsa] ‘get it wrong’
<i>Buang</i> [buaŋ] ‘speak (pl) or talk (pl)’	<i>Tholang</i> [t <sup>h</sup> ōlaŋ] ‘keep quiet (pl)’
<i>Khumamang</i> [k <sup>h</sup> umamaŋ] ‘kneel (pl)’	<i>Emang</i> [émaŋ] ‘stand (pl)’
<i>Mpine(ng)</i> [mpin(éŋ)] ‘sing about me’(pl)’	<i>Nthole(ng)</i> [nt <sup>h</sup> ōléŋ] ‘stop talking or singing about me (pl)’
<i>Lebatla</i> [lebatla] ‘you want ... (pl)’	<i>Lehana</i> [lehana] ‘you refuse ... (pl)’
<i>Kelumetse</i> [kedumétse] ‘I have agreed’	<i>Kehanne</i> [kehanné] ‘I have refused’
<i>Seithati</i> [seuthati] ‘one who is always clean and adorable’	<i>Mahleke</i> [mafeke] ‘untidy (normally a house)’
<i>Botle/ Mantle</i> [bōtlé], [mmantlé] ‘beauty’ /’beautiful woman’	<i>Mampe</i> [mmampe] ‘ugly woman’
<i>Nkalimeng</i> [ŋkadiméŋ] ‘borrow me (pl)’	<i>Khutlisang</i> [k <sup>h</sup> utlisaŋ] ‘bring back (pl)’
<i>Mpusetseng</i> [mpusétséŋ] ‘take me back (pl) or take back for me (pl)’	<i>Ntšetseng</i> nts <sup>h</sup> étséŋ] ‘take out for me (pl) or make me stop ... permanently (pl)’
<i>Moroeroe</i> [mōrwérwé] ‘few people’	<i>Phutheho</i> [p <sup>h</sup> ut <sup>h</sup> ého] ‘congregation’ or a large group of people’
<i>Mpolokeng</i> [mpōlōkéŋ] ‘keep me safely’	<i>Ntahleng</i> [ntaféŋ] ‘throw me away’
<i>Nyolosa</i> [ŋōlōsa] ‘ascend’	<i>Theoha</i> [t <sup>h</sup> éðha] ‘come or go down’ <i>Theosa</i> [t <sup>h</sup> éðsa] ‘descend’
<i>Nkemeleng</i> [ŋkéméléŋ] ‘Wait for me’	<i>Ntšieeng</i> [nts <sup>h</sup> ijéŋ] ‘leave me behind’
<i>Hopolang</i> [hōpōlaŋ] ‘remember (pl)’	<i>Lebalang</i> [lebaŋ] ‘forget it (pl)’
<i>Ntšoereng</i> [nts <sup>h</sup> wéren] ‘touching or holding me’	<i>Ntlheleng</i> [ntlōhéleŋ] ‘leave me alone (pl)’
<i>Ntlatseng</i> [ntlatséŋ] ‘give me support (pl)’	<i>Ntsekiseng</i> [ntsékiséŋ] ‘snatch from me’ or ‘oppose me’

<i>Lumelang</i> [dumélan] ‘agree (pl)’ or ‘accept (pl)’	<i>Hanang</i> [hanan] ‘refuse (pl)’ or ‘decline (pl)’
<i>Monongoaha</i> [mōnōḡwaha] ‘this year’	<i>Ngoahola</i> [ḡwahōla] ‘last year’
<i>Ngoahola</i> [ḡwahōla] ‘last year’	<i>Isao</i> [isaḡ] ‘next year’
<i>Motšeare</i> [mōts <sup>h</sup> eare] ‘day time’	<i>Mantsiboea</i> [mantsibōja] ‘towards dusk’ <i>Bosiu</i> [bosiu] ‘night time’ <i>Shoalane</i> [šwalane] ‘nightfall’ <i>Phirima</i> [p <sup>h</sup> irima] ‘after dusk’
<i>Motholuo</i> [mōt <sup>h</sup> ōduwa] ‘lost and found child’ (actually out of wedlock)	<i>Molahluo</i> [mōlaḡuwa] ‘deserted child’
<i>Lijeng</i> [didzéḡ] ‘eat them (pl)’	<i>Sentje</i> [sentje] ‘don’t eat me’
<i>Nete</i> [nnete] ‘truth’	<i>Thetso</i> [t <sup>h</sup> etsō] ‘deceit’ <i>Mphoma</i> [mp <sup>h</sup> ōma] ‘tell me a lie’
<i>Lenepa</i> [lenəpa] ‘one who gets it right’ or ‘one who is correct’	<i>Lefosa</i> [lefōsa] ‘one who gets it wrong’ or ‘one who is wrong’
<i>Senatla</i> [senatla] ‘a giant’	<i>Moheanyane</i> [mōheanane] ‘a weakling’
<i>Letsatsi</i> [letsatsi] ‘sun’	<i>Lefifi</i> [lefifi] ‘darkness’
<i>Maapesa</i> [maapəsa] ‘one who covers’ or ‘the valuable’	<i>Mafeela</i> [mafēēla] ‘one who is laid bare’ or ‘the unimportant’
<i>Maema</i> [maéma] ‘outstanding’	<i>Malula</i> [madula] ‘one who sits’
<i>Mpheng</i> [mp <sup>h</sup> éḡ] ‘give to me (pl)’	<i>Nkoneng</i> [ḡkōnéḡ] ‘don’t give me (pl)’ <i>Ntsekiseng</i> [ntsékiséḡ] ‘snatch from me’
<i>Mpaballeng</i> [mpaballéḡ] ‘take care of me’	<i>Ntsatoleng</i> [ntsatōléḡ] ‘snap at me’
<i>Lehlohonolo</i> [leḡḡōḡōlō] ‘good luck’	<i>Malimabe</i> [madimabe] ‘ill-luck’
<i>Kebitsamang</i> ‘who do I call?’	<i>Kebotsamang</i> ‘Who do I ask?’
<i>Lerato</i> [Leratō] ‘love’	<i>Leona</i> [leḡna] ‘deep hatred’
<i>Letšoara</i> [Its <sup>h</sup> wara] ‘you touch or hold (pl)’	<i>Lesang</i> [lesan] ‘leave alone (pl)’
<i>Nkalimeng</i> [ḡkadiméḡ] ‘borrow me (pl)’	<i>Ntsekiseng</i> ‘snatch from me (pl)’
<i>Ntšoareng</i> [nts <sup>h</sup> waréḡ] ‘hold me’	<i>Ntloheleng</i> [ntlōḡḡéléḡ] ‘leave me alone’
<i>Moahi</i> [mōahi] ‘one who builds’	<i>Masenyetse</i> [maseḡétsé] ‘one who destroys’
<i>Litšoane</i> [dits <sup>h</sup> wané] ‘they should look the same’ (as a name in discourse it is [dits <sup>h</sup> wane])	<i>Liphapang</i> [dip <sup>h</sup> apan] ‘antagonism’
<i>Noosi</i> [nō:si] ‘alone’	<i>Babeli</i> [babédi] ‘two’
<i>Mofolisa</i> [mōfōdisa] ‘one who heals’	<i>Leopa</i> [leōpa] ‘the painful’
<i>Moholoholo</i> [mōḡḡōḡḡōḡ] ‘the great/older one’	<i>Monyane</i> [mōḡnane] ‘the younger one’ <i>Senyane</i> [seḡnane] ‘younger thing’ <i>Hanyane</i> [ḡanane] ‘in piece meals’
<i>Letsoha</i> [letsōḡa] ‘one who wakes up’	<i>Lala</i> [lala] ‘sleep’
<i>Tšireletso</i> [ts <sup>h</sup> irélétsō] ‘protection’	<i>Polao</i> [pōlaō] ‘murder’
<i>Letuka</i> [letuka] ‘you are burning’	<i>Letima</i> [letima] ‘you quench...’
<i>Lechesa</i> [lec <sup>h</sup> esa] ‘you burn ...’	
<i>Lenoesa</i> [lenwesa] ‘you cause to drink’	<i>Lenyora</i> [leḡōra] ‘thirst’
<i>Liholo</i> [dihōlō] ‘the big ones’	<i>Nyenyane</i> [ḡeḡnane] ‘small one’ (male) <i>Nyane</i> [ḡnane] ‘small one’ (female)
<i>Nkamoheleng</i> [ḡkamōḡḡéléḡ] ‘accept me (pl)’	<i>Ntelekeng</i> [ntélékékéḡ] ‘chase me away (pl)’
<i>Mothofoela</i> [mōt <sup>h</sup> ōfēēla] ‘just a person/nonentity’	<i>Nthofoela</i> [nt <sup>h</sup> ōfēēla] ‘just a thing’
<i>Lenea</i> [lenéa] ‘you give ...’	<i>Lenka</i> [leḡka] ‘you take ...’
<i>Lebea</i> [lebéa] ‘you put/place ...’	
<i>Liatile</i> [diatilé] ‘they have multiplied’	<i>Halieo</i> [hadijō] ‘they are not there’
<i>Paballo</i> [paballō] ‘well taken care of’	<i>Tlhoriso</i> [tl <sup>h</sup> ōrisō] ‘persecution’
<i>Lieketso</i> [diékétsō] ‘the added ones’	<i>Lefelisa</i> [lefédisa] ‘you finish off/put an end to...(pl)’
<i>Nkalimeng</i> [ḡkadiméḡ] ‘borrow me’	<i>Ntsekiseng</i> [ntsékiséḡ] ‘snatch from me’
<i>Khopotso</i> [k <sup>h</sup> ōpōtsō] ‘memory’	<i>Tebatso</i> [tebatso] ‘made to forget’
<i>Phano</i> [p <sup>h</sup> anō] ‘giving’	<i>Kamoho</i> [kamōḡō] ‘taking away from ...’
<i>Bonolo</i> [bōnōlō] ‘soft’	<i>Bothata</i> [bōt <sup>h</sup> ata] ‘hard’ or ‘difficult’

PPI's and NPI's noted in Fig. 1 display polarity in various forms:

- a) Direct opposites – *Nete* [nnete] 'truth' vs *Thetso* [t<sup>h</sup>etsɔ] 'Lie / deception',  
*Buang* [buan] 'speak (pl)' vs *Tholang* [t<sup>h</sup>ɔlan] '(be) quiet (pl)'  
*Hopolang* [hɔpɔlan] 'remember (pl)' vs *Lebalang* [lebalan] 'forget (pl)'  
*Bonolo* [bɔnɔlɔ] 'soft' or 'easy' vs *Bothata* [bɔt<sup>h</sup>ata] 'hard' or 'difficult'  
*Lehlohonolo* [leɬɔhɔnɔlɔ] 'good luck' vs *Malimabe* [madimabe] 'ill-luck'  
*Utloanang* [utlwanaŋ] 'acknowledge one another (pl)' vs  
*Loanang* [lwanaŋ] 'fight one another (pl)'  
*Nkiseng* [ŋkisɛŋ] 'take me there (pl)' vs *Ntateng* [ntatɛŋ] 'collect me from there'  
*Nkemeleng* [ŋkémélɛŋ] 'wait for me (pl)' vs *Ntšieeng* [nts<sup>h</sup>ijɛŋ] 'leave me behind'  
*Khumamang* [k<sup>h</sup>umamaŋ] 'kneel (pl)' vs *Emang* [ɛmaŋ] 'stand (pl)' or 'stop (pl)'  
*Mpitseng* [mpitsɛŋ] 'call me (pl)' vs *Ntelekeng* [ntélékɛŋ] 'chase me away (pl)'

In these direct opposites are also found 'yes' and 'no' polarity. Examples comprise *Kelumetse* [kedumɛtsɛ] 'I have agreed' or 'I said 'yes' vs *Kehanne* [kehannɛ] 'I have refused' or 'I said 'no'. The names are built from the finite predicators *lumela* [dumɛla] 'agree' or 'yes' vs *hana* [hana] 'disagree' or 'no' and are expressed as declaratives because they state information. Both further function as propositions because from Eggins' (1996, p. 171) view, proposition marks that something is or something is not. So, in *Kelumetse* [kedumɛtsɛ] the speaker (awarder) discretely agreed that 'something is' whereas with *Kehanne* [kehannɛ] the awarder declared that 'something is not'.

Note that the very imperative 'yes' – 'no' polite commands pair reflecting in *lumela* [dumɛla] 'agree' or 'yes' vs *hana* [hana] 'disagree' or 'no' serve as personal names though in the plural form thus making them be articulated as *Lumelang* [dumelan] 'agree' or 'yes' (pl) vs *Hanang* [hanaŋ] 'disagree' or 'no' (pl). The terminal *ng* denotes plurality. The various polarized texts confirm Halliday's (2001, p.88) assertion that there is more than one way of getting polarity and it is attained by distinction between propositions as statement and questions, that is, as information and proposals or goods and services. This says besides the declared structure names are questions that reflect in *Kebitsamang* [kebitsamaŋ] 'who do I call?' vs *Kebotsamang* [kebɔtsamaŋ] 'who do I ask?'

A new observation is the inclusion of the command to the statements and questions distinctions as noted in the collocating finite predicators *Khumamang* [k<sup>h</sup>umamaŋ] 'kneel down (pl)' vs *Emang* [ɛmaŋ] 'stand' or 'stop (pl)'. These may present as either direct or polite commands depending on context and these distinctions mark mood. Halliday (2001, p. 45) asserts that every clause sets for mood and modality of the awarder is tapped from the mood. Eggins (1996, p.119) explains modality as the evaluation of the speaker. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) initially observed with independent clause Sesotho names that modality is employed in the design of Sesotho names. An additional new observation is that Basotho even engage the exclamative feature to polarize personal names as in *Mothofoela* [mɔt<sup>h</sup>ɔfɛɛla] 'just a person/nonentity' vs *Nthofoela* [nt<sup>h</sup>ɔfɛɛla] 'just a thing'.

Polarity has been viewed as bearing morphology-semantic interdependency but a new observation is that Sesotho names add tone as the Phonetic element noted in the names *Taba* (LL) 'issue' or 'information' vs *Taba* (HL) 'turn grey haired' or 'soften rough smell'; and they also display homography (same spelling but different pronunciations and meanings), a Semantic feature. Additional Phonetic feature displays in question names *Kebitsamang* [kebitsamaŋ] 'who do I call?' vs *Kebotsamang* [kebɔtsamaŋ] 'who do I ask?' which are identical in all respects except with /i/ and /o/ occupying the same position in each name. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2018, p.11) quotes Fromkin and Rodman (1978, p.103) verbatim when saying, "when two different forms are identical in every way except in the same place in the string (of sounds), the two words is called a *minimal pair*" and minimal pair is another one of Phonetic features. The pair displays a new identification of an interrogative minimal pair. The declarative minimal pair is exemplified by *Lebea* 'you (pl) place or put...' and *Lenea* 'you (pl) hand over ...' and the phonemes are /b/ and /n/. Though Mokhathi-Mbhele (2018) described Sesotho names as minimal pairs, that polarized names form minimal pairs is a new observation. /i/ and /o/ cause the distinction in meaning thus they are phonemes (distinctive elements in a pair of words with identical structure except one place) and phonemes are significant and essential in forming minimal pairs. The existence of Phonetics-Morphology-Syntax-Semantics raises a new observation in Polarity in Sesotho onomastica, that being PMSS interdependency.

- b) In some cases one NPI would contrast with more than one PPI's. Examples display as:

- i) NPI vs PPIs

Verb based comprise:

*Ntelekeng* [ntélékén] ‘chase me away’ vs *Nkamoheleng* [ŋkamōhélén] ‘accept me’ or  
*Mpitseng* [mpitsén] ‘call me’;  
*Lenka* [lenka] ‘you (pl) pick or take ...’ vs *Lebea* [lebéa] ‘you (pl) place or put ...’ or  
*Lenea* [lenéa] ‘you (pl) give ...’

ii) PPI vs multiple NPIs occurs in Adverb names that include:

*Motšeara* [mōts<sup>h</sup>eara] ‘daytime’ vs *Mantsiboea* [mantsibōja] ‘very late afternoon’  
*Shoalane* [ʃwalane] ‘dusk’  
*Phirima* [p<sup>h</sup>irima] ‘twilight’  
*Bosiu* [bōsiu] / night time.

In this case, one name has taken multiple opposites which function in complementary temporal adverb relation. They are not exclusively NPIs but mark a ‘distinctively opposite’. More explicate in the finite-predicators:

*Isang* [isan] ‘take ... there (pl)’ vs *Tlisang* [tlisan], *Khutlisang* [k<sup>h</sup>utlisan] ‘bring back (pl)’

Others in Adjective based names such as:

*Liholo* [dihōlō] ‘big or great’ vs *Nyenyane* [nejane] or *Nyane* [jane] ‘small’ or ‘little’

*Moketa* [mōketa] ‘thin one’ vs *Ntenya* [nteja], *Mafethe* [mafēt<sup>h</sup>é], *Mafotha* [mafōt<sup>h</sup>a] ‘fat one’

In a similar manner, one name has taken multiple opposites which function in complementary temporal adjective relation. In nominal based names there is:

*Letsatsi* [letsatsi] ‘sun’ or ‘day’ vs *Lefifi* [lefifi] ‘darkness’ or *Pula* [pula] ‘rain’ or

*Khoeli* [k<sup>h</sup>wedi] ‘moon’ or ‘month’.

iii) In other cases different verb based NPIs are polarized with a corresponding number of PPIs, thus they form a selection table. An example is:

NPIs	PPIs
<i>Ntsekiseng</i> [ntsékisén] ‘snatch from me (pl)’	<i>Mpheng</i> [mp <sup>h</sup> én] ‘give me (pl)’
<i>Nkamoheng</i> [ŋkamōhén] ‘take away from me (pl)’	<i>Nkalimeng</i> [ŋkadimén] ‘borrow me (pl)’.

These display polarity in multiple exchange because whatever match is selected is acceptable. The multiple polarity feature complements the already known double negation noted to provide an acceptable context especially in onomastica.

From Giannekidou’s (2019, p.1) discussion, polarity is observed in verbs along with other clause elements such as nouns, adverbials, and more. As noted with *Mpheng* [mp<sup>h</sup>én] ‘give me (pl)’ and *Nkalimeng* [ŋkadimén] ‘borrow me (pl)’ as base verbs, Sesotho names further portray some verb base names that have verbal extensions. It is further observed that some FCI closely related opposites function as polite commands vs direct commands as in *Nkalimeng* [ŋkadimén] ‘**borrow** me (pl)’ vs *Mpheng* [mp<sup>h</sup>én] ‘**give** me (pl)’ instill that polarity embeds mood. They are FCI’s because the context licenses their polarized attitude. That mood is explicated supports Halliday’s (2001, p.45) view that “Every clause bears Mood” which he subdivides into the declarative, imperative, interrogative and exclamative. *Nkalimeng* [ŋkadimén] ‘**borrow** me (pl)’ vs *Mpheng* [mp<sup>h</sup>én] ‘**give** me (pl)’ display the imperative mood for they function as instructions but are scaled at different attitudinal levels. *Nkalimeng* [ŋkadimén] ‘borrow me’ is more exhortative or subjunctive and *Mpheng* [mp<sup>h</sup>én] ‘give me (pl)’ reflects coercion. These names are basically base verbs in the plural number to include the desire of awardee expressed as though it is the family’s desire or request to be given something related to the baby or the baby itself. As Martin and Rose (2007:29) claim, positive attitude “describes intense feelings and strong reaction to people and things.” The names are expressed in simple present tense and perfect tense and Sesotho grammar notes that simple present tense denotes habit whereas perfect tense expresses a completed act. Note that though modality is defined as intermediate degrees, this observation does not feature in the Sesotho names because all are definite messages from definite decisions. Note further that in these examples that the awardee expresses the name as though she/he is the one forwarding the request or order to be borrowed or given something (which could be a commodity necessary when a baby is born) and Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) notes that Eggins’ (2004, p.257) highlights this practice as a ‘tint’ initiated by Rimmon-Kenan (2013, p.118). He says a ‘tint’ occurs when the speaker puts the structure ‘in the mouth’ of the discussed as marked by the complement and Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) described Sesotho names as bearing a ‘tint’ which is marked with ‘me’ element in the name. In these names nominal complements *N-* and *M-* ‘me’ refer to the baby who is assumed to be the speaker yet the actual speaker is the awardee – parent or grandparent.

Some verb polarized names bear identical prefix in both the positive vs negative aspect. Examples are *Lifelile* [difedilél] ‘they are finished’ vs *Halifele* [hadiféle] ‘they do not get finished’ and *Liatile* [diatilél] ‘they have multiplied’ vs *Halieo* [hadijo] ‘they are not there’ and they share the Subject Concord prefix *li* [di] ‘they’. *Ha* refers to ‘do not’. In marking the actions of adding and that of bringing to an end there are *Lieketso* [diékétsō] ‘the added ones’ vs *Bafelile* [bafedilél] ‘they are finished’. *Lieketso* refers to an added child polarized

with *Bafelile* a child intended to be the last. Direct action comprise *Eketsang* [ɛkétɕaŋ] ‘add (pl)’ vs *Lefelisa* [lefɛ́dɪsa] ‘you finish off/put or bring an end to...(pl)’.

In other cases verbal radical bears verbal extensions. Guma (1971, p.159) explains that verb extensions occur between the base and the suffix. This is despite the inflection of the prefix. Guma lists nine verbal extensions that reflect after the root in the base verbs. Thus the structure would be:-(prefix+root+extension+suffix). One such verbal extension noted in polarized Sesotho names is the Causative ‘cause or help someone or something to do something’ and it manifests with the extension *-is-* [is] noted in the polarity pair.

*Leemisa* [leemisa] ‘you (pl) bring to a stand ...’ vs *Leoisa* [lewisa] vs ‘you (pl) bring to a fall ...’ pair bears the causative verb extension *-is-* which marks ‘cause to do ...’. These names stem from the verbal group as they originate from *ata* [ata] ‘multiply’, *fela* [féla] ‘get finished’, *ema* [éma] ‘stand or wait’, *oa* [wa] ‘fall’ action verbs respectively. The declarative also displays exhortation vs malice in *Leemisa* [leemisa] ‘you (pl) bring to a stand ...’ vs *Leoisa* [lewisa] vs ‘you (pl) bring to a fall ...’ and these have been built using the verbal extension *-is-*. In them is the cohesive elliptic feature that leaves the objects not mentioned but understood. 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”. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2020) says “Cohesion creates discourse”.

The passivified complete sentences as polarized names marked by *-o-* is noted the direct polarity declarative *Learongoa* [learōŋwa] ‘you are being sent’ vs *Halerongoe* [halerōŋwe] ‘you are not being sent’; The imperative is deployed as a plea in *Nkutloeleng* [ŋkutlwélén] ‘feel for me’ which polarizes with *Ntšeheng* [ntsʰéhén] ‘jeer at me’. The Subjunctive example *Hareeng* ‘harején] ‘let us go (pl) whose counter is *Khutlang* [kʰutlan] ‘come back’ or ‘return’ add to polarized verb names. Sesotho analysts observe that the subjunctive is an imperative that pleads as noted in *Hareeng*. It is invitational as it uses ‘let us ...’

Finite predicators or base verbs as other imperatives call for attention but have polarized forms as exemplified by *Makalang* ‘be surprised’ vs *Semakaleng* ‘don’t be surprised’, *Buang* speak’ or talk’ vs *Sebueng* ‘don’t speak’ or ‘don’t talk’, *Llang* [llaŋ] ‘cry (pl) vs *Selleng* [sellén] ‘don’t cry (pl)’. ‘do not’ is marked by *Se-* [se]. More finite-predicator imperative polarized verb names fan conflict versus peace keeping as displayed by *Loanang* [lwanan] ‘fight (pl)’ vs *Utloanang* [utlwanan] ‘be of same view’ or ‘strike a consensus’; *Tsekang* [tsɛkan] fight over (something) (pl)’ vs *Amohelang* [amōhélan] ‘accept (pl), *Isang* [isaŋ] ‘take there’ vs *Khutlisang* [kʰutlisaŋ] ‘bring back’..

In some polarized verb names both sides the PPIs and the NPIs bear the same prefixes as in *Lenka* vs *Lebea* ‘you (pl) take ...’ vs ‘you (pl) place or put ...’, ‘you give ...’ as well as *Lenka* [leŋka] ‘you (pl) take ...’ vs *Lebea* ‘you (pl) give ...’; *Litsoane* [ditsʰwané] ‘they should look the same’ (as a name in discourse it is [ditsʰwane] vs *Liphapang* [dipʰapan] ‘antagonism’; *Ntšoareng* [ntsʰwarén] ‘hold me’ vs *Ntloheleng* [ntlōhélen] ‘leave me alone’; *Letšoara* [ltsʰwara] ‘you touch or hold (pl)’ vs *Lesang* [lesan] ‘leave alone (pl)’, *Mantle* [mmantlé] ‘beautiful woman’ vs *Mampe* [mmampe] ‘ugly woman’. Note further, that the shared prefix may mark the state of the referent in *Moratuoa* vs *Mohlouoa* ‘loved one’ vs ‘hated one’.

An interesting observation with the verb names *Lenka* ‘you (pl) take ...’ vs *Lebea* ‘you (pl) place or put...’ is that when uttered in this consecutive order it sounds poetic as it rhymes and the rhyme breeds a social function and social functions are a crucial character in Systemic Linguistics. The rhyming in *Lenka ... Lebea ...* displays a jeer from the speaker because the interpreted meaning says the addressed are engaged in an action of taking and immediately placing what they picked. They cannot hold on to what they have picked. The rhyme reads *Lenka vs Lebea* ‘you pick up and (you) immediately place back!’ The rhyme may present as declarative because it may be sharing information or an imperative that guides in what needs to be done. This guidance is a polite command. The command addresses explicit second person plural ‘you’. These interdependent moods suggest that polarity in Sesotho can breed PPI-NPI interdependency, a new observation in the description of Sesotho onomastica.

*Lechesa* [lecʰesa] ‘you burn (pl)’ vs *Letima* [letima] ‘(as) you (pl) put out (fire)’ add to the names that share the prefix and they introduce readers to a correspondence relation of problem-solution as the message declares that the addressees ‘burn’ and ‘put out the fire’. When anything is burnt the fire shall be put out hence this possible instructive warning, *Lechesa Letima* ‘(As) you (pl) burn | you (pl) put (it) out). The warning extends in the polarized declarative *Lefosa* [lefɔsa] ‘you (pl) do the wrong’ vs *Lenepa* [lenépa] ‘you do the right’



and in full the message proposed says the addressed 'you (pl)' juggle between the wrong and the right. The conjunctions necessary (as, also) are omitted or ellipted but understood. With these conjunctions the message would read 'as you are doing the wrong you also do the right.'

Some polarized names are Person specific. 1<sup>st</sup> person (as speaker) polarity reflects in *Kelumetse* [kedumétse] 'I agreed' vs *Kehanne* [kehanné] 'I refused'. In *Nkemeleng* [ɲkémélén] 'wait for me (pl)' vs *Ntšieeng* [nts<sup>h</sup>ijén] 'leave me behind (pl)'; *Nkhopoleng* [ɲk<sup>h</sup>õpõlén] vs *Ntebaleng* [ntebalén] 'remember me (pl)' vs 'forget me (pl)'; *Mpine* [mpinɛ] vs *Nthole* [nt<sup>h</sup>õlɛ] 'sing about me' vs 'keep quiet about me' the speaker is the third person in the objective case because he/she suffers the action (verb). Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) discusses *N-* and *M-* as nominal complements as they present the subject in the object slot. The 2<sup>nd</sup> person reflects in *Buang* [buan] '(you - pl) speak (pl)' vs *Tholang* [t<sup>h</sup>õlan] '(you - pl) keep quiet'; *Botsang* [bõtsan] 'ask (pl)' vs *Arabang* [araban] 'answer (pl)', *Utloanang* [utlwanan] 'be in harmony' vs *Loanang* [lwanan] vs 'fight / be at loggerheads'. The 3<sup>rd</sup> person polarity is displayed by *Mitseng* (from *Mobitseng*) [mmitsén] 'call him/her (pl)' vs *Molelekeng* [mõlélékén] 'chase him/her away (pl)'; *Liatile* [diatilé] vs *Halieo* [hadijõ] 'they have multiplied' vs 'they are not there'. It is worthy to note importantly that different Predicative Object ConCORDS *N-* and *M-* that function as nominal complement 'me' in Sesotho language also mark polarity in the names *Mpheng* [mp<sup>h</sup>én] 'give or share with me (pl)' vs *Nkoneng* [ɲkõnén] 'do not give /share with me (pl)'.

Other Number specific distinctions are marked by different prefixes in polarized names as in *Lijeng* [ledzén] 'eat them (pl)' vs *Sentje* [sentje] 'don't eat me' (singular) articulated as [sentjé] as a name. Some varied number markers function as infixes as in *Tsebang* 'know (pl)' vs *Haketsebe* 'I don't know' (singular) and *Haretsebe* [haretsebe] 'we don't know' (plural). The NPIs are prefixed with polarity negative markers *Ha-* and *Se-* 'do not' as in *Nheng* [nnéhén] 'give to me' vs *Haboneoe* [habõnéwe] 'it is not given', *Nthuseng* [nt<sup>h</sup>usén] 'help me' vs *Habathuse* 'they don't help'. Those with corresponding plural include *Llang* [llan] 'cry (pl)' vs *Selleng* [sellén] 'don't cry (pl)'. Negative polarity markers *se-* and *ha-* confirm Zwarts (1981) explanation that licensing contexts across languages include the scope of n-words which are negative particles as the noted *Se-* [se] and *Ha-* [ha]. Based on Guma (1971), Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) asserted the *se-* and *ha-* 'don't' as markers of the negative used positively to encourage the audience which could be a worried family at the birth of the baby or negatively as a marker of being cynical as in *Haretsebe* [haretsebe] 'we don't know', the polarity of *Tsebang* [tseban] 'know (pl)'.

Some of these verbal group polarity names form clause complexes (corresponding simplexes) in the initial simplex as observed in PPI name-surname clause complex *Mpaballeng* / *Borotho* [mpaballén | bõrõthõ] 'take care for me (pl) | the bread' vs NPI *Ntsekiseng* | *Katiba* [ntsékisén | katiba] 'snatch from me (pl) | the hat'. Polarity is marked in *Mpaballeng* [mpaballén] 'take care for me (pl)' and *Ntsekiseng* [ntsékisén] 'snatch from me (pl)'. The imperative clause complexes support the observation that polarized Sesotho names with surnames as their nominal complements form independent clauses or complete messages as personal names. The interrogatives *Kebitsamang* [kebitsaman] 'I+call+who?' which as a full message reads as 'who do I call?' vs *Kebotsamang* [kebõtsaman] 'I+ask+who?' which in full is 'who do I ask?' reiterate the observation. These are new observations in Sesotho analyses.

Note that though polarized, the verb names may be used to reflect the concurrence of solution based on problem. The message is elliptic but clear to the targeted audience. A corresponding state of solution-problem order is exemplified by the polarized pairs noted as *Lenoesa* [lenwesa] 'you (pl) quench' vs *Lenyora* [lenjõra] 'thirst'. *Mofolisa* [mõfõdisa] 'one who heals' vs *Leopa* [leõpa] 'the painful' portray a health based solution-problem relation whose message is that the newly born shall heal the painful circumstances such as being childless. With the hygiene solution-problem spectrum element of *Seithati* [seithati] 'one who is always clean and adorable' vs *Mahleke* [mafeke] 'untidy (normally a house)' derivation process is embarked on. *Seithati-Mahleke* pair derives verb *rata* [rata] 'like' or 'love' to noun vs ideophone *hleke* [teke] 'mess' to noun by prefixing and this pairing description is a new observation in Sesotho analysis. The verb to noun derivation process tapers to the solution-problem correspondence that reflects in being humane in *Moahi* [mõahi] 'one who builds' vs *Masenyetse* [maseñétsé] 'one who destroys' and *Maapesa* [maapesa] 'one who covers' or 'the valuable' vs *Mafeela* [mafeéla] 'one who is laid bare' or 'the unimportant' and these display a morally directed solution-problem relation. In *Maapesa* vs *Mafeela* the verb *apesa* [apesa] 'clothe' polarizes with the conjunction *feela* [feéla] 'just anything' or 'nothing'.

The verb to noun derivation incorporates names that do not share prefix as in *Tšireletso* [ts<sup>h</sup>irélétso] 'protection' (from *sireletsa* 'protect') vs *Polao* [põlao] 'murder' (from *bolaea* 'kill') to present solution-problem relation and the message presents a principle that advocates 'protection (before, instead of, prior to, etc)

murder', normally uttered as 'prevention is better than cure'. More examples include *Paballo* [pabalɔ] 'well taken care of' vs *Tlhoriso* [tʰɔrisɔ] 'persecution', *Khopotso* kʰɔpɔtsɔ] 'reminder' vs *Tebatso* [tebatɔ] 'make to forget', *Phano* [pʰanɔ] 'giving' vs *Kamoho* [kamɔhɔ] 'snatched away', *Potso* [pɔtsɔ] 'question' vs *Karabo* [karabɔ] 'answer'. These are regarded exclusively as nouns. Added to solution-problem correspondence exists polarized nouns present conditions such as that of whether as exemplified by *Mofuthu* warmth' vs '*Serame* 'coldness', *Pula(e)* 'rain' vs *Letsatsi* 'sunshine' or *Tšeo* [tsʰeɔ] 'drizzle'. At times the day and night are polarized in *Khanya* [kʰana] 'light' vs *Lefifi* [lefifi] 'darkness' or *Lerootho* [lerɔ:tʰɔ] 'gloomy'. In the adverbs *Hae* [haé] 'home' vs *Thabeng* [tʰabén] 'on the mountain' which offer a sense of choice that accommodates 'home' vs 'on the mountain' and the choice would be given based on the discourse at hand. These pairs occur in daily discourse but taken for granted. As observed, these polarized personal names spell out as complete messages in the solution-problem correspondence and this is a new description in the analysis of Sesotho onomastica and grammar.

Personal names are generally prefixed with zero-morpheme /ø-/ regardless of origin as they are observed as nouns and these polarized names are part of this category. Zero-morpheme prefix for noun class 1a was co-opted from Meinhof's, (1977) Bantu nouns classification. Mokhathi-Mbhele (2020, p.14) simplifies Guma's (1971, p.5) input about zero morpheme by noting that Zero morpheme is noted as a prefix in Sesotho because Sesotho analysts agree that a zero morpheme "... is a type of morpheme used to refer to the significant absence of a morpheme in a given linguistic form." He clarifies that nouns of class 1a that specifically includes personal names do not have a prefix at all and are therefore, prefixed with a zero-morpheme. In his words, the zero-morpheme "... is significantly absent. It is then said to be zero and represented by the sign /ø-." Guma (1971, p.5) notes among class 1a examples, personal names, and this justifies the choice of the zero-morpheme prefix /ø-/ for these polarized personal names.

Guma (1971, p.5) continues to explain that the significance of the zero morpheme says "once upon a time it [the prefix] was there... but changes took place... and it is useful to know". In the original forms of *Paballo* and *Tlhoriso*, the ruling prefix was *Mo-* to form *mo+baballo* 'the way of taking care' vs *mo+hloriso* 'the way of persecuting'. *Tebatso* and *Khopotso* are derived from the verbal group noted as *hopola* [hɔpɔla] 'remember' vs *lebala* [lebalala] 'forget' and with the same token, *Mo-* was the original prefix to form *Mo+lebatso* made to forget' and *Mo+hopotso* 'made to remember'. A rather different polarity pair comprises a verb derived noun versus a base verb as noted in *Nepo* [nepɔ] 'correct' (from *ho nepa* 'to be correct') vs *Fosa* [fɔsa] 'get it wrong'.

In some cases with the noun polarized Sesotho names the PPIs can be in polarity relation. This is because some are polarized but remain as positive items and an example is *Moroeroe* [mɔrɔwɔrɔwɔ] 'few people' vs *Phutheho* [pʰutʰehɔ] 'congregation' or a large group of people'. Despite the size of the described group the names are bear PPI feature. However, polarity is noted in the small vs large size of the group. So, this observation proposes that in polarity, at least as noted in Sesotho names, may display simultaneity of PPI and NPI and this observation adds to the claim by Eggins (1996, p.113) that simultaneity occurs in language use.

Obsolete words magnify polarized names category. Obsolete words are never or barely incorporated in daily discourse and thought of as diminished vocabulary. They are obsolete because they function exclusively as names. Examples include *Leona* [leɔna] 'deep hatred' vs *Lerato* [leratɔ] 'love', *Moheanyane* [mɔheajane] 'tiny person' or 'weaking' vs *Senatla* [senatla] 'giant'. In the case of '*Nena* [nnena] 'one who loathes me' vs *Nthati* [ntʰati] 'one who loves me'. '*Nena* [nnena] 'one who loathes me' as a male designated name which forms another minimal pair with a female designated name '*Nana* [nnana] 'prop for *ngoanana* [ŋwanana] 'girl' (not obsolete). '*Nana* is more of baby talk meant to cuddle the addressee but it has developed to function as a personal name. These obsolete polarity pairs function as PPI's and they are actually inflammatory and fan conflict. Such names are awarded to express dissatisfaction and discomfort in in-laws' family relations. '*Nena* vs '*Nana* pair reflect that in polarity reflect sex distinctive nouns. They lead us to the gender based (but not obsolete) most explicit polarized pair in *Monnanyana* [mɔnnajana] 'tiny or small man' or 'man to be' vs *Mosalinyana* [mɔsadijana] 'tiny or small woman' or 'woman to be' used as onomastica.

Polarized Sesotho names further count as numerical numbers as in *Noosi* [nɔ:si] 'one or alone' vs *Babeli* [babédi] 'two'. *Noosi* further polarizes with *Tšelela* [tsʰelɛla] 'six', (*Ma*) *leshome* [mmalejɔmɛ] 'tenth lady'. Note further that the counting is not only numerical but it further identifies the periods of the year. These are ordinal dates and en.m.wikipedia.org (Accessed Sept 2020) notes that "An ordinal date is a calendar date typically consisting of a year and a day. e.g. '... from 1 March of the previous year ...'" These ordinal number periods that reflect as consecutive periods have been deployed as Sesotho personal names and they include

*Ngoahola* [ŋwahola] ‘last year’, *Monongoaha* [mõnõŋwaha] ‘this year’, *Isao* [isaõ] ‘next year’. In this set ‘this year’ is polarized with ‘the previous’ and ‘the next year’. These are calendar years displayed as FCI’s.

Sesotho names polarity hauls in the qualificative with the adjective design and displays size as in *Liholo* [dihõlõ] ‘the big ones’ vs *Nyenyane* [nejane] or *Nyane* [njane] ‘small one’. *Nyenyane* [nejane] vs female *Nyane* [njane] depict polarized gender based size. In discourse they are complementary to each other but they present a new observation in Sesotho analyses as polarized gender marking names. This observation contributes that there are Sesotho names that play a simultaneous double role of being polarized gender markers as well as complementary polarized size epithets. They are complementary because they are not polarized as both mark size. Allomorphic opposites cite *Moholoholo* [mõhõlõhõlõ] ‘the ancient/ancestor’ vs *Monyane* [mõjane] ‘younger one (to somebody or to the speaker)’/ *Senyane* [sejane] ‘feeble’. Some size names derived from adjectives comprise *Molelle* [mõlõllõ] ‘tally’ or ‘tall man’ (from *-lelele* [lõlõlõ] ‘tall or long’) vs *Mokhutsokane* [mõkʰutsʰwane] ‘shorty’ (from *-khutsoane* [kʰutsʰwane] ‘short or brief’). These display a rather new polarity feature of ‘multiple alternatives to one’. A further observation portrays the colour adjectives as polarized Sesotho names. Male designated colour adjectives comprise *Tsoeue* [tsʰwõu] ‘white’, *Thokoa* [tʰõkwa] ‘grey’, *Sootho* [sõ:tʰõ] ‘brown’, *Tshehla* [tsʰõla] ‘yellow’ and these are polarized against each other without a specific pattern. An interesting feature is that Mokhathi-Mbhele (2020) also describes the size adjectives as epithets because they are verbless structures. Some male designated colour names employ the suffix *-ana* which grammatically marks femininity especially in colours but these names function as family names, thus specifically identifying “fathers of the families”. Examples comprise *Tsooana* [tsʰõwana] ‘whitish’, *Tshehana* [tsʰõhana] ‘yellowish’, *Kotsoana* [kõtswana], *Tsoana* [tsʰwana] ‘darkish’. These could be referred to as neutral adjective personal names as they are not sex specific in social context.

Nonetheless, *Tsoana* [tsʰwana] ‘darkish’ is normally designated to the female colour description. Female designated colour adjective names include *Tsoani* [tsʰwani], *Khubelu* [kʰubõdu] ‘red’ as well as the borrowed one *Pinki* [pink] ‘pink’. *Tsoani* [tsʰwani] ‘darky’ may be polarized with *Tsoeute* [tsʰwõutõ] ‘whitey’. The colours are polarized as they are distinct from each other but without a specific pattern. Colour depicted as complexion when a baby is born encompasses polarized names such as *Motšõmotšõ* [mõtsʰõmõtsʰõ] ‘pitch black’ or *Tšõtsõtsõ* [tsʰõtsʰõtsʰõ] ‘pitch black’ vs *Mosoeu* [mõswõu] or *Tsoeute* [tsʰwõutõ] ‘whitey’. Nominal polarity (at times used as qualificative stem) is noted in *Senatla* [senatla] ‘giant’ vs *Moheanyane* [mõhejane] ‘tiny person’ or ‘weakling’.

The adverbial with its temporal, manner and locative tributaries also reflects in polarized Sesotho names. The temporal notes *Motšeaere* ‘daytime’ vs *Bosiu* ‘night time’; manner *Haholo* [hahõlõ] ‘a lot / too much’ vs *Hanyane* [hanejane] ‘a small amount’ or ‘little’; locative *Hae* [haõ] ‘home’ vs *Hlathe* [latʰe] ‘veld’ or *Thabeng* [tʰabõ] ‘at or on the mountain’. The locative may polarize with the enclitic verb based name-word in *Keteng* [ketõ] ‘I am here’ vs *Haleeo* [halejõ] ‘you (pl) are not there’ and this is a new observation in Sesotho onomastica description.

The manner originally used as Conjunction *feela* [fõõla] ‘just’ is repurposed into personal vs impersonal noun - *Mothofoela* [mõtʰõfõõla] ‘a nonentity’ vs *Nthofoela* [ntʰõfõõla] ‘just a thing’. On a large scale but not in all cases, these conjunction based names are sex specific as they are male and female designated respectively.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

That polarity feature encompasses Sesotho onomastica based on context and activists of this observation are the “unschooling” name-awarding personnel. Their engagement in systematic functional name awarding exercise proves their vetting of relevant contexts to display their modality favourably. Polarity interfaces phonetics-morphology-syntax-semantics (PMSS), a feature initially observed in the discourse of complete reduplication of Sesotho names because each name is a word built with others to structure the awardee’s modality or evaluation of the context at the birth of a baby. This interface is basically built on the verbal group thus it advocates the verbal group as the central or focal point in the coinage of Sesotho onomastica. The verbal group is the core of description in expressing polarity in Sesotho names because the finite predicators or verbs are derived into other syntactic categories and designated as personal names. Thus, they display a verbal-nominal reciprocation as finite predicators form nominal structures, a view initially noted by Mokhathi-Mbhele (2014) in relation to Systemic Functional Linguistics theory in describing Basotho onomastica. The major contribution is that Basotho name awarders express their attitude – positive or negative even through polarized forms and polarity is not confined to ‘yes’ and ‘no’ as claimed in systemic linguistics.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Giannakidou, Anastacia. (2019). Neg n Pos polarity Items: Variation, Licensing, ncompositionality. In *Semantics: An International handbook of natural language meaning*. (eds) Claudia Malenborn, Klaus van Heusinger, n Paul Portner, 1660-1713, Berlin, Mouton n Gruyter.
- [2]. Eggins, S. (1996). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*.
- [3]. London: Continuum Eggins, S. (2004). *An Introduction to Systemic Functional Linguistics*.
- [4]. London: Continuum Guma, S.M. (1971). *An Outline Structure of Southern Sotho*. Pietermaritzburg: Shuter and Shooter.
- [5]. 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.
- [6]. 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.
- [7]. Israel, Michael. (2004). The pragmatics of polarity. In *The handbook of pragmatics*. (eds) Kotzè, E. and D. Kotzè (2002). *Ethical ways of being*. Pretoria: Ethics Alive.
- [8]. Ladusaw, William. (1996). Negation n polarity items: In *The handbook of contemporary Semantic theory*. (ed) Shalom Lappin. Oxford: Blackwell.
- [9]. Martin, J.R. and Rose, D. (2007). *Working with discourse-meaning beyond the clause*. London: Continuum.
- [10]. Meinhof, Carl. (1977). *Ur-bantu*. Hamburg: Eckerdt & Messtorff. Mokhathi-Mbhele, M. (2014). *Independent clause Sesotho personal names as texts in contexts*. Unpublished PhD Thesis UWC, Bellville.
- [11]. Mokhathi-Mbhele, M. (2019 Nov, 13th). *Sesotho names as Opposites “Lihanani”*. NUL Research Hub.
- [12]. Mokhathi-Mbhele, MML. (2020 Feb, 17th). *Cohesion in Sesotho personal names: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach*. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Language Research (JALLR)*
- [13]. Vol. 7/1. Pp. 87-105.
- [14]. Mokhathi-Mbhele, M. (2020). *Sesotho names as Epithets: A Systemic Functional Linguistics Approach*. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies*. Vol. 8 (2); pp. 43-56.
- [15]. Penka, Doris n Heddr Zeiljstra. 2010. *Negation n polarity: An Introduction*. *Natural language and Linguistic Theory*. 28; 771-786..
- [16]. Rimmone-Kenan, S. 2013. *Narrative Fiction: Contemporary Poetics*. 2nd edition. London: Routledge.
- [17]. Zwart (1981). *Oxford Research Encyclopedia of Linguistics*. (Accessed 2020)
- [18]. Websites
- [19]. [oxfordre.com/linguistics](https://www.oxfordre.com/linguistics) (2019)
- [20]. Wikipedia, the free encyclopedia
- [21].