English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit are Entirely Arabic- *Free Good Lovely Comely Merry Beautiful Girls Marry Noble Villains in Engagement and Wedding Rings Ceremoniously*: A Radical Linguistic Theory Approach

Zaidan Ali Jassem

Department of English Language and Translation,
Qassim University, KSA

Abstract

This paper aims to show that English is an Arabic dialect and so are German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and all Indo-European languages by examining the above title sentence from a radical linguistic (or lexical root) theory perspective. The data comprises all the words and/or lexical and grammatical morphemes of **Free good lovely comely beautiful merry** <u>**girls**</u> <u>**marry**</u> **noble** <u>**villains**</u> **in engagement and wedding rings ceremoniously** *with the underlined words being the core of the sentence. The results indicate without a single shred of doubt that all such words have true Arabic cognates with the same or similar forms and meanings, whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of linguistic change, especially lexical, semantic, or morphological shift. Therefore, the results support the adequacy of the radical linguistic theory according to which, unlike the Family Tree Model or Comparative Method, Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit not only belong to the same language family, renamed Eurabian or Urban family, but also are dialects of the same language, with Arabic being their origin all because only it shares the whole cognates with them all and because it has a huge phonetic, morphological, grammatical, and lexical repertoire and variety. On a more general level, they also entail that there is a radical language from which all human languages stemmed and which has been preserved almost intact in Arabic, thus being the most conservative and productive language.*

Keywords: Marital words, Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, historical linguistics, radical linguistic (lexical root) theory, language relationships

1. Introduction

Jassem (2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015a-h, 2016a-e) has demonstrated in fifty studies so far that Arabic, English, German, French, and the so-called Indo-European languages in general are genetically related very closely phonetically, morphologically, grammatically, and semantically or lexically so much so that that they can all be considered dialects of the same language. More precisely, the Arabic origins or cognates of their words were successfully traced

in twenty nine lexical studies in key semantic fields like numerals, religious, love, democratic, military, legal, urban, and fashion terms (Jassem 2012a-d, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015a-h, 2016b); in three morphological studies on inflectional and derivational markers (Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b); in ten grammatical papers like pronouns, verb 'to be', wh-questions, case, the definite article (Jassem 2012c-e, 2013l, 2014c, 2015d, 2016de); and in one phonetic study about the English, German, French, Latin, and Greek cognates of Arabic back consonants (Jassem 2013c). Furthermore, the theory was extended in another five even wider studies to the examination of the Arabic origins of pronouns in Chinese (Jassem 2014h) and Basque and Finnish (Jassem 2014i), demonstratives (Jassem 2015h), negation (Jassem 2015j), and plurality (Jassem 2016a) in eleven major (and minor) language families in the last three especially, which are spoken by 95% of the total world population. Finally, two papers applied the approach to translation studies (Jassem 2014e, 2015b).

The above fifty studies have initially employed the lexical root theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g, 2015a-h) and subsequently its slightly revised and extended version, called radical linguistic theory (Jassem 2014 h-k, 2015a-j, 2016a-e), both deriving their name originally from the use of lexical (consonantal) roots or radicals in retracing genetic relationships between words in world languages. The theory first arose as a rejection of the Family Tree Model or Comparative Method in historical linguistics for classifying Arabic as a member of a different language family than English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and the so-called Indo-European languages (Bergs and Brinton 2012; Algeo 2010; Crystal 2010: 302; Yule 2014; Campbell 2004: 190-191; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 61-94). In all the above fifty studies, the tightly-knit genetic relationship between Arabic and such languages was, on the contrary, categorically established phonetically, morphologically, grammatically, and semantically or lexically so much so that they can be really considered dialects of the same language, where Arabic was found to be their source or parent language for several reasons (Jassem (2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015a-g). In other words, Arabic, English, German, and French words of all types and sorts, for example, were shown to be true cognates with similar or identical forms and meanings, whose apparent differences are due to natural and plausible causes and diverse routes of linguistic change. This entails that all such languages developed, in fact must have developed, from a prehistoric single, perfect, suddenly-emerged Radical Language from which all human languages emanated in the first place, and which could never have died out but rather has fully, though variably, survived into today's languages, to which they can all be traced, with Arabic in particular being the closest or most conservative and productive descendant. To adequately depict the close genetic linkage between Indo-European and Arabian languages in general, a new larger language family grouping has been proposed, called *Eurabian* or *Urban* (Jassem 2015c: 41; 2015d).

This paper carries on the quest by investigating the Arabic origins and/or source cognates of a short, full, advanced text with different types of words, *marital terms* in the main, in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and the so-called Indo-European languages.

The remainder of the paper has four sections: (ii) research methods, (iii) results, (iv) discussion, and (v) conclusion.

2. Research Methods

2.1 The Data

The data consists of a short, full, advanced text- *Free good lovely comely merry beautiful girls marry noble villains in engagement and wedding rings ceremoniously*, with key *marital terms* in English and their cognates in German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Indo-European languages as well as Arabic, now all generally called *Eurabian* or *Urban*. Text and word selection has been based on the author's knowledge of their frequency and use in today's fully natural English, German, and French conversations and/or texts as well as English dictionaries. For ease of reference, the data will be arranged alphabetically with brief linguistic comments in the next Results section (3). For the sake of brevity, however, one can alternatively go to **Girls Marry Villains** in that order, a text I first tested in 2015 on Professor Emeritus Patrick Bennet of the University of Wisconsin at Madison.

As for etymological data, all references to English and Indo-European languages are for Harper (2016) despite, like all other similar dictionaries upon which it was based, its severe shortcomings owing to the seemingly illogical, uncertain, or unknown derivations or meanings of many words such as *girl, good, noble*, and so on which make more sense if derived straight from Arabic as shall be seen in sections (3 & 4) below. Therefore, it, along with similar dictionaries, has to be used with extreme care and discretion.

Concerning Arabic data, the meanings are for Ibn Manzoor (2013) in the main, Ibn Seedah (1996: 5/110-115), Altha3alibi (2011: 206-14), Albabidi (2011), e-dictionaries like *mu3jam alama3ani* (2016), and the author's knowledge and use of Shami (Syrian) Arabic as a native speaker. All the genetic linkages between Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and so on are exclusively mine, unless otherwise stated.

In transcribing the data, normal Romanized spelling is used for all languages for practical purposes. Nonetheless, certain symbols were used for unique Arabic sounds: namely, /2 & 3/ for the voiceless and voiced pharyngeal fricatives respectively, /kh & gh/ for the voiceless and voiced velar fricatives each, /q/ for the voiceless uvular stop, /'/ for the glottal stop, and capital letters for the emphatic counterparts of plain consonants /T (t), D (d), Dh (dh), & S (s)/ (Jassem 2013c). Long vowels in Arabic are usually doubled- i.e., /aa, ee, & oo/.

2.2 Data Analysis

2.2.1   Theoretical Framework: Radical Linguistic Theory

Data analysis shall utilize the Radical Linguistic Theory (Jassem 2014h-l, 2015a-j, 2016a-e), a slightly revised and more generalized version of the original Lexical Root Theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g). For the sake of brevity and economy, the inquisitive reader is referred to any earlier work for a fuller account of principles and procedures (e.g., Jassem 2015a-c, 2014a, 2013a, 2012a-b, 2016d).

In short, however, the main principle of the theory states that Arabic is not only related to Indo-European languages but also is their immediate ancestor or origin all. In practice, the most appropriate procedure for genetically relating English and Arabic words to each other can be summed up as follows:

(i)   select a word (in any given semantic field), e.g., *marry, girl* ;

(ii)   identify the source, daughter, or sister language meaning (e.g., English or Latin) on the basis of especially word history or etymology. It is essential to start with meanings, not sounds or sound laws as the former are more stable and change a lot less than the latter which do so extensively and drastically; for example, all the sounds of a given word might change beyond recognition while meanings in a rather limited way; so the meaning first will often lead one to the correct cognate naturally whereas the sounds first will get one lost definitely;

(iii)   search for the word with the equivalent meaning and form in the target, parent, or reference language (e.g., Arabic), looking for cognates: i.e., sister words with the same or similar forms and meanings;

(iv)   explain the differences, if any, in both form and meaning between the cognates lexicologically, phonetically, morphologically, and semantically as indicated. As a matter of fact, finding the right cognate on the basis of its meaning first often leads one to the resultant changes automatically; and

(v)   finally, formulate phonological, morphological, grammatical, and semantic rules after sufficient data has been amassed and analyzed.

That is the whole story simply, briefly, and truly. No fuss, no mess. For example, consider *girl, marry, noble, free*, or any word in Section 3 below.

2.2.2 Statistical Analysis

The percentage formula will be used for calculating the ratio of cognate words or shared vocabulary (Cowley 1997: 173, 182), which has been fully described in earlier papers (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k).

4. Results

The results will primarily focus on the Arabic lexical (consonantal) radicals or roots of English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit   words and the changes that occurred to them. The exact quality of the vowel is, therefore, of generally secondary importance for having little or no semantic impact on the final output whatsoever (Jassem 2012-2016).

And via Old English *and/ond* 'thereupon, next, over there', Old High German *enti*, German *und*, Latin *ante* 'before, near, opposite', Greek *anti (anta, anten)* 'opposite, before, over against', from Arabic *3inda* 'there, at, next to, near, with' via /3/-loss; or *3ada* 'except' via lexical divergence and turning /3/ into /n/.

Engage *(engagement, engaged, disengagement; wed, wedding)* is two parts, which came via Old French *en gage* 'under pledge', from (i) *en* 'in', from Arabic *3an* 'on, from' via lexical shift and /3/-loss, and (ii) *gage* 'pledge', from Old English *weddian* 'lit., promise; to pledge oneself to, vow, marry, betroth', Modern English *wed*, Gothic *ga-wadjon* 'betroth', from Proto-Germanic **wadi*, **wadiare* (v) 'pledge' (cognate with Latin *vas, vadis* (gen.) 'bail, security') through the evolution of /w (& d)/ to /g & (g)/, from Arabic *wa3d* 'pledge, promise, date', *waa3ad* 'to date' via /3/-loss or mutation into /g/ into which /d/ assimilated or merged. Formulaically, Arabic *(3an) wa3d* ↔ Germanic *wadi* (English *wed)* ↔ French *en gage* 'under pledge', ↔ English *engage* 'under pledge'. It has to noted that in my dialect *widd-i (bidd-i)* 'want-I = I want' and *waa3ad* 'to date' are often used in love affairs- i.e., 'I want to marry or love her'. See **wed**.

As to **–ment** 'nominal suffix', it came via Old French, from a combination of two or three Arabic affixes *m, n, & t* 'inflectional and derivational affixes' via morphological shift (see Jassem 2013a). That is, it eventually stemmed from either (i) Arabic *-nt* in which /m/ split from /n/ as in Arabic *wardanat* (n) 'flowering', from *wardan* (v) 'to flower', from *ward* (pl. n) 'flower(s)' or (ii) from Arabic *m---nt* as in   *muwardi̲n̲a̲t̲* (adj.) 'flowering, flowered' via reordering.

Free *(freedom, friend, Friday)* via Old English *freo, freogan* (v) 'free, exempt from; noble, joyful', German *frei* (Old High German *vri*), from Arabic *faraj, afraja* (v) 'to set free; to be happy; to recover, be healthy; a proper name', turning /j/ into /ee/ (as in Kuwaiti and UAE Arabic *farai*); and/or Arabic *fari2* 'joyful' via /2/-loss, though less likely.

As to the nominal suffix *–dom*, it derives straight from a combination of the two Arabic suffixes *-t* 'fem. suf.' and *-n* 'nom. suf.' (i.e., *-tun*) as in *farjatun, faraj* (v) 'freedom, opening' in which /t & n/ became /d & n/. Thus, according to this analysis, English *-dom* and *–tion* are conditioned variants of the same derivational Arabic morpheme *–tun* 'derivational and inflectional suffix' (see Jassem 2012f, 2013a, 2015d, 2016a).

As for **friend** *(befriend, friendship)*, it came via Old English *freond* 'friend', present participle of *freogan* 'to love, to favour' and German *Freund*, from the same Arabic root for **free** above- i.e., from Arabic (i) *farajun* 'free, happy; a proper name' via reordering and replacing /j/ by /d/ or (ii) *far2aan(at), fari2a* (v) 'happy; proper name' via lexical shift and turning /2/ into /g (Ø)/; otherwise, from Arabic *rafeeq(un), rufqaan* (pl.) 'friend, gentle, kind; a proper name', *raafaq* (v) 'to befriend', *rafaqa* (v) 'to be kind, gentle' via reordering and turning /q/ into /d/.

Regarding **Friday** (German *Freitag*)**,** it consists of (i) *free* above, from Arabic *far2a(t), fari2a* (v) 'happiness; a fair' via /2/-loss or *furja(t), faraja* (v), *tafarraja* (v.) 'fair, show, watching; happiness; something beautiful; a gap' via reordering and turning /q/ into /d/; and (ii) *day*, from Old English *dæg* 'day, lifetime', German *Tag*, from Arabic *ghad* 'tomorrow' via lexical shift, reversal, and turning /gh/ into /g/ and later loss or from Arabic *Du2a* 'forenoon' via lexical shift and passing /D & 2/ into /d & g (Ø)/.

What about the formally similar but semantically different f**or** *(fore-)*? It came via Old English *fer* 'for, before, on account of', German *für*, Latin *per/pro* 'before, for, on behalf of', *porro* 'for', Russian *pere* 'through', ultimately from Arabic *fee* 'in, with, to, because' or *fa* 'because; so' via /r/-insertion (see Jassem 2014c).

Comely *(uncomely, becoming)* probably via Old English *cymlic* 'lovely, splendid, finely made', from *cyme* 'exquisite, glorious, delicate', from West Germanic **kumi-* 'delicate, feeble', (Old High German *chumo* 'with difficulty', German *kaum* 'hardly, scarcely'), or perhaps from Middle English *bicumelic* 'suitable, exquisite; lit., becomely', straight from Arabic *jameel* 'beautiful' where /j/ became /k/ or *qaiyem* 'valuable, precious' where /q/ passed into /k/.

What about **come** *(came, coming, becoming)*? Its different senses came direct from Arabic (i) *kaam* 'to make love' or *kaana3* 'make love' via /3/-loss, (ii) *qaam* 'of penis, to erect; come, move', and/or (iii) *qawam, qaweem* (adj.) 'to suit, straighten'.

As to German *kaum*, it is from Arabic *qallama* 'hardly, scarcely' in which /q/ became /k/ and /l & m/ merged.

Beautiful *(beauty, beauteous)* via Old French *biauté* 'beauty, beautiful person', earlier *beltet*, from Latin *bellitas* 'handsomeness', from *bellus* 'pretty, handsome, charming', perhaps from PIE **dw-en-elo-*, diminutive of **deu-* 'do; show favour, revere', direct from Arabic *baiDa', bayaaD* (n) 'white; beautiful' in which /D/ became /l/, a common sound change in Arabic (Jassem 1987: Ch. 5); *balal, ballat* 'goodness; health; youthfulness' via lexical shift; or *bahi(at)* 'beautiful' via /h/-elision.

Thus PIE *deu-* can't be a cognate at all which is rather taken direct from Arabic *'adda* 'to do, perform'. PIE *deu-* means 'shine, light' as well, leading to such cognates as *divine, Diana, Deus, Zeus, theo-*. Again it comes from Arabic *Daw', Dia'* 'light, shine' in which /D & '/ became /d & Ø/ (Jassem 2014e).

As to the adjectival suffix *–ful* 'full of, having', it came from Old English *–full, -ful*, from *full* (adj.) 'containing all; filled; perfect, entire', German *voll*, from PIE *pele-* 'to fill', straight from Arabic *mil'* (n) 'fullness', *malee'* (adj.) 'full', *mala'* (v) 'to fill' in which /m/ became /f/.

Girl *(girly, girlish, girlie, girlhood, girlfriend, gal)* has two parts, the second of which is *–l*, a diminutive suffix. It came from Old English *gyrle* 'child of either sex; young person', which is of unknown or objectionable origin, or perhaps from an unrecorded Old English **gyrele*, from Proto-Germanic **gurwilon-*, diminutive of **gurwjoz* (Low German *gare* 'boy, girl', Norwegian dialectal *gorre*, Swedish dialectal *gurre* 'small child', from PIE **ghwrgh-*, also found in Greek *parthenos* 'virgin'), direct from Arabic *ghirra(t)* 'young girl', *ghirr* (m.) 'young boy', passing /gh/ into /g/. (Cf. Arabic *ghirl* 'uncircumcised child' via lexical shift.)

The diminutive suffix *–l(e)* in *girl, gyrle* is obtained direct from Arabic *al* 'the' via morphological shift. That is, *girl* is Arabic *alghir* via reordering. The Arabic origins of the word and its parts thus resolve all the guesswork and uncertainty in English and Indo-European languages.

As to the plural marker *–s*, it developed from Arabic *–t* 'plural marker' with which it varies in certain contexts in Arabic and English and Germanic languages as well as Indo-European languages such as *democrat, democracy; Henrietta, princess; married, marries, marital, maritus* (see Jassem 2012f, 2013a, 2016a). So one can say in general that every English and Indo-European inflectional and derivational *–s* (or *–d*) is originally *–t*, eventually from Arabic *–t*.

The adjectival suffixes *–y/-ie* in *girly, girlie* came straight from Arabic *–i/-ee* 'a derivational and inflectional suffix' as in *3arab* v. *3arabi* 'Arabic', *adab* 'literature' v. *adabi* 'literary'.

Similarly, the adjectival suffix *–ish* came from Old English *-isc* 'of the country of', from Proto-Germanic **-iska* (with cognates in Swedish and Danish *–sk*, German *-isch*, Greek *-iskos*, borrowed into French *–esque* and Spanish *–esco*), ultimately from a combination of Arabic *–i/-ee* to which *-j* was added and turned into /sh/ as in *3arabi* v. *3arabij* 'Arabic', *adabi* v. *adabij* 'literary'. See *–age* in *marriage* below.

What about **gray** which is formally similar to but semantically different from **girl**? Again this comes straight from Arabic *'aghar* 'gray, white' of the same Arabic root for it where /gh/ became /g/.

Good *(goodness, God)* via Old English *god* 'excellent, fine; desirable; complete; effective; virtuous', probably originally 'have the right or desirable quality', from Proto-Germanic **godaz* 'fitting, suitable' (as in German *gut* 'good', from PIE root **ghedh-* 'to unite, suitable' (Russian *godnyi* 'suitable', Old English *gadrian* 'to gather'), direct from Arabic *jaiyed, jood* (n) 'good, fine, generous', turning /j/ into /g/.

In *(in-, en-)* via Old English *in* 'in, into, on, upon, at, among, about, during', *inne* (adv.) 'inside, within', German/Latin *in*, and Greek *en* from Arabic *3an* 'about, on' via /3/-loss (see Jassem 2014a).

As a negative prefix, it, along with *un-* and *no*, can all be considered variants, which ultimately derive straight from Arabic *in/an* 'no, not' (Jassem 2013b).

But what about the formally similar but semantically different **on**? It came via Old English *an/on* 'in, on, into', German *an*, Greek *ana*, Latin *an-*, from Arabic *3an* 'on, about' via /3/-loss. That is Arabic *3an* split into or produced two words in English.

Love *(lovely)* via Old English *lufu, lufian* (v) 'love' and German *lieben* 'love' from Arabic *lahaf* 'love, strong desire' via /h/-loss; *labab, 'alabba* (v), *laabba(t)* (adj./n) 'to love, to live/stay; to leave' where /b/ became /v/; *labba, lablab* 'of animals, to lick and fondle with lips; to sympathize with' (cf. **live, leave, elope**) (see Jassem 2013q, 2015i).

As to the adjectival and adverbial suffix *–ly*, it comes from Middle English, from Old English *–lic* (adj. suf.) and *-lice* (adv. suf.) 'having qualities of, fitting', from Proto-Germanic **-liko-* (Old Frisian *–lik(e)*, Old Saxon *–liko*, German *–lich*), related to **likom* 'appearance, form', (Old English *lich* 'corpse, body'), from Arabic *shakl* 'shape', *shakli* (adj.) via lexical or grammatical shift, reversal, and merging /sh & k/ into /s/ and later loss (Jassem 2013a, 2014c).

Merry *(merriment, mirth, Merry Christmas)* via Old English *myrge* 'pleasing, agreeable, sweet, pleasant', Middle Dutch *mergelijc* 'joyful', from Proto-Germanic **myrgijaz*, which probably means 'short-lasting' as in Old High German *murg* 'short', from PIE **merghu-* 'short', straight from Arabic *mara2, mari2* (adj.) 'merry, happy' via /2/-loss.

Marry *(marriage, marital, matrimony, matron; mother)* via Latin *maritus* 'husband', *mari* 'woman', *maritare* (v) 'to marry', from Arabic *mar'a(t)* (pronounced *mara* in the vernacular*)* 'woman, wife' via lexical shift (Jassem 2013k). The same applies to English ***mother***, German *Mutter*, Latin *mater*, Italian *matre*, Spanish *madre*, French *mère*, Greek *meter*, Sanskrit *matar*, to which reordering, turning /t/ into /dh (d)/, and semantic shift applied.

In European languages like French and German, similar forms or words are used which suffered different sound and semantic changes or shifts. German *Frau* 'woman; wife', French *mère* 'mother', and Spanish *mujera* 'woman' all descend directly from Arabic *mar'a(t)* by substituting /f/ for /m/ in German. Furthermore, French *mari* 'husband' is from Arabic *mar', imri'* 'man' via lexical shift (see Jassem 2016d). Even the definite articles in all these languages which usually accompany nouns have identical Arabic parent cognates (see Jassem 2016d).

As to the suffixes of the derived forms or words, they all have identical Arabic cognates. In *marital*, the first –*t* is from Arabic –*t* 'fem. suf.' while the second –*al* from Arabic *al* 'the' via morphological shift (Jassem 2016d). That is, *marital* is Arabic *almar'at* to which reordering and morphological and semantic shift applied.

In *marriage*, the suffix –*age* is from Arabic –*ee* 'a derivational and inflectional suffix' to which -*j* was added as was common in some olden Arabic dialects in which –*ee*-final words attached –*j* as in *3arabi* v. *3arabij* 'Arabic', *hanee* v. *haneej* 'happy', *adabi* v. *adabij* 'literary'. In some modern Arabic accents like Kuwaiti and UAE Arabic, /j/ is replaced by /ee (y)/ such as *jamal* v. *yamal* 'camel' and *faraj* v. *farai* 'free, happy; a proper name'.

The suffixes in *matri<u>mony</u>* and *mat<u>ron</u>* can be considered variants, both of which came directly from Arabic –*un* 'inflectional and derivational suffix' which split into /m & n/ in –*mony* coupled with morphological shift (Jassem 2012f, 2013b, 2016a). That is, *matron* is Arabic *mar'atun* 'a woman (nom. indef.)' via reordering and lexical shift.

What about *mare, mere, more, mar, marine, mayor (emperor), mirror, merry, myrrh, moor, admire* which share /m & r/ with *marry*? All have identical Arabic cognates, which are the same or similar in form and meaning. More precisely, **mare** comes from Arabic *muhra(t)* 'mare' via /h/-loss; **mayor** & **emperor** *(empire, imperial, imperative)* from Arabic *'ameer* 'emir, prince, ruler' via /b/-insertion; **mar** & **myrrh** from Arabic *murr* 'bitter; embitter'; **marine** from Arabic *marr(in)* 'sea, rain'; **mirror & admire** from Arabic *mir'a(t)* 'mirror' for the former and *tamarra* (v) 'to look in a mirror; to admire' for the latter, from the root *ra'a* (v) 'to see', where /t/ became /d/ besides reordering; **mere** & **more** from Arabic *marra(t)* 'once' and its irregular plural *miraar* 'many times'; **moor** from Arabic *mar3a* 'grazing ground' or *maraa2* 'animals' den; water area; washing' via /3/-loss and turning /b/ into /m/.

On a more general plane, all English and Indo-European marriage-related terms have true Arabic cognates such as *sex, bigamy,* and *divorce* (Jassem 2013k, 2013q). For example,

Divorce *(divorcee; verge, diverge, divergence, diverse, convergence; fork, bifurcation)* came via Old French *divorce*, from Latin *divortium* 'separation, dissolution of marriage', from *divertere* (v) 'to separate, leave one's husband, turn aside', from (i) *dis-* 'aside', and *de-*

'from', and (ii) *vertere* 'turn', direct from Arabic *tafreeq* (n) 'separation, divorce', from *tafarraq* (v), from *faraq* (v) 'to divide, split, separate; to fork'; /q/ became /k/ (Jassem 2013c). All other italicized, bracketed words come from the same root *faraq*. For example, *bifurcation* derives straight from Arabic *mufaraqatun* 'separation', from *faraq* (v) in which /m/ became /b/. As to *verge* and related derivatives *diverge, divergence, convergence, diverse*, they developed from the same Arabic root or from the formally and semantically similar *furja(t)* 'a gap', from *faraj, tafraj, infaraj* 'to split'.

Sex *(sexuality, sect, sectarian, section, insect, dissection)* via Latin *sexus* 'male/female', from *secare* (v) 'divide, cut', *seco* 'half', from Arabic *shaqqa* 'cut' where /sh & q/ became /s & k/. The derivatives *sect, section, insect, dissection, sectarian* come from similar Arabic derivatives, which are *shiqqat* 'section' for *sect*, *shiqqatun* 'section' for *section*, *inshaqqat* 'to be divided' for *insect*, and *tashaqquqatun* for   *dissection* in all of which /sh, q, & t/ became /s, k, & d/ (Jassem 2013m, 2013q).

As to affixes, all derive straight from Arabic as seen in the above cognates. That is, the English suffix *–t (-ty)* is from Arabic *–t*; *in-* from Arabic *in-*; *–tion* from Arabic *–tun (-t + -n)*; the prefix *dis- (de-)* from Arabic *ta-*; and the suffix *–al* from Arabic *al* 'the' via morphological shift (Jassem 2012f, 2013a, 2016a, 2016d).

Bigamy *(bigamous, polygamy, monogamy)* via Old French, from Church Latin *bigamia*, from Latin *bigamus* 'twice married', from (i) *bi-* 'double', from Arabic *bi-* 'by, in, with' via lexical shift and (ii) Greek *gamos* 'marrying', from Arabic *jimaa3* 'marriage, intercourse; lit., gathering, joining' via /3/-loss and replacing /j/ by /g/; or *kaama3* 'make love', *kim3/kamee3* (n) 'husband' via /3/-loss and /k/-replacement by /g/.

Noble *(nobility; know)* via Old French, from Latin *nobilis* 'well-known, excellent, high-born, superior', earlier **gnobilis* 'lit., knowable', from *gnoscere* 'to come to know', from PIE root **gno-* 'to know', from Arabic *'aiqan* 'to know', turning /q/ into /g/. However, this derivation is both illogical and inaccurate as it comes instead straight from Arabic *nabeel* 'noble, respectable, intelligent' (Jassem 2013p).

Ring *(ringlet, earring)* via Old English and Old High German *hring* (German *Ring*) 'small circlet for wearing on the finger; anything circular', *hringan* (v) 'sound a bell', from Proto-Germanic **khrengan*, from PIE root **(s)kregh*, from *(s)ker-* 'to turn, bend' (Latin *curvus* 'bent, curved', *crispus* 'curly', and perhaps Greek *kirkos* 'ring', *koronos* 'curved'), direct from Arabic *qarn* 'a horn or horn-shaped object' or *naqar* 'to beat, knock' via reordering and turning /q/ into /g/. That is, its two meanings stemmed from two formally similar but semantically different Arabic words, a process that explains widespread polysemy in English, German, French, Latin, and Indo-European languages.

Villain *(villainy, village, villa)* via Old French *vilain* 'farmer, commoner', from Latin *villanus* 'farmhand', from *villa* 'country house, farm', direct from Arabic *falla2(in)* 'farmer', *fala2* (v) 'to farm' via /2/-loss and lexical shift (Jassem 2015i). That is, *villain* is two parts, both of which come straight from Arabic (i) *falla2* 'farmer' and (ii) *–in (-un, -an)* 'derivational and inflectional suffix': in this case, 'a farmer (sing. indef.)' (Jassem 2012f, 2016a). The same applies to *villa, Ville, & village* (see Jassem 2015i).

Its current meaning 'criminal' involves lexical shift. **Criminal** *(crime, criminology, discrimination)* itself, which came via Middle French, from Latin *criminalis* 'pertaining to crime', from *crimen* (genitive *criminis*) 'crime; charge', perhaps from *cernere* 'to decide, sift', derives straight from Arabic *jurm, jarima(t)* 'crime', *jaarim(in), mujrim(in)* (adj.) 'criminal', *aljaarimin* 'the criminal' via reordering and turning /j/ into /k/. (Jassem 2015g).

Wed *(wedding)* via Old English *weddian* 'to pledge oneself to, vow, marry, betroth', Gothic *ga-wadjon* 'betroth', Proto-Germanic **wadi*, (cf. Latin *vas, vadis* (gen.) 'bail, security'), from Arabic *wa3d* 'promise, pledge, date', *waa3ad* 'to date someone or a woman' via /3/-loss; or *wiT'* 'making love, marriage' where /T & '/ were replaced by /d & Ø/. See **engage**.

As to the suffix *–ing* 'inflectional and derivational suffix', it came from Old English present participle suffix *–ende*, from PIE **-nt-* (with cognates in German *-end*, Sanskrit *-ant*, Latin *–ans, -ens*, Greek *-on*), from Arabic *–nat (-n + -t)* as in *waladanat* 'boyishness', from *waldan* 'to act as a boy or child', from *walad* 'boy, child' in which /t/ became /d/ and later /g/ (Jassem 2013a).

Ceremony *(ceremonial, ceremoniously)* via Old French *ceremonie*, from Latin *ceremonia*, from *coerimonia* 'holiness, sacredness; awe; sacred ceremony', straight from Arabic *karam(an), ikraam(an)* (spoken Arabic *kurmaan*) 'of guests and VIPs, in honour of', *karma(t)* 'dinner party, banquet', *karaama(t)* 'dignity', from *karram, akram* (v) 'to honour, to be kind or generous, to dignify or revere', turning /k/ into /s/ (Jassem 2015e).

All its suffixes have true Arabic cognates. The suffix *–ly* has already been dealt with in **lovely** above. The adjectival suffix *–ious (-ose* as in *glucose)* 'having, full of, doing' came from Old French *–ous, -eux*, from Latin *–osus*, from Arabic *–at* 'inflectional and derivational affix' in which /t/ evolved into /s/ as in *saleem* 'safe (m)', *saleemat* 'safe (f.)', *salamat* (n) 'safety'. See *–s* in **girls** above.

In short, the total number of *marital and related terms* in this study amounted to 16, all of which have true Arabic cognates: i.e., 100%. One can actually reduce the 16-word-long long text to *Girls marry villains* which is Arabic *gharra mara falla2in* 'lit., girl wife farmer = A girl marries a villain'. This is purely and simply Arabic of one type or another, taking natural linguistic change into account.

4. Discussion

In this discussion, the relevance of the results and their implications to two issues will be tackled: (i) the radical linguistic theory and (ii) English and Indo-European etymological dictionaries and lexicographical works.

First, the radical linguistic theory. The title text *Free good lovely comely beautiful merry girls marry noble villains in engagement and wedding rings ceremoniously* clearly shows that all its words and word-parts in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and all Indo-European languages are true cognates for having identical or similar forms and meanings, whose differences, however, are all due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of phonetic, morphological, grammatical, and semantic change. The percentage of shared *words* between Arabic and English, German, French, or Latin, for example, amounted to 100%, which indicates that they are members or dialects of the same language, for which, according to Cowley's (1997: 172-173) 100-word list-based classification, a 60-80% ratio is usually set.

Thus, the results fully agree with the findings of previous studies (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015a-j, 2016a-d) in which English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Arabic were all found to be not only members of the same family but also rather dialects of the same language. More precisely, they lend further support to the radical linguistic (or lexical root) theory on all theoretical and analytical grounds. Theoretically, the main principle which states that Arabic, English, German, French, and the so-called Indo-European languages are not only genetically related but also are dialects of the same language is, therefore, verifiably sound and empirically true. This being so, a larger language family grouping has been proposed and termed *Eurabian* or *Urban* as a blend of Indo-European and Arabian languages (Jassem 2015c: 41, 2015d).

Moreover, the results entail that all the above languages must have descended from an earlier, perfect, suddenly-emerged language, called *radical (world) language* from which all human languages initially came and which has variably survived into today's languages, though getting simpler and simpler over time. In other words, the radical language could never have died out beyond recognition. With proper methodology, it can be easily recovered as shown here (cf. Campbell 2004: 360). As this work demonstrated, it seems that its closest or most conservative and productive descendant is Arabic for having retained almost all its features (Jassem 2014h-k, 2015a-d). In fact, all Indo-European languages can be safely said to have descended directly from Arabic for reasons outlined earlier (Jassem 2015a-b, 2015d: 131-132; 2014a-b, 2014e).

Thus, on a more general level, one can state that reconstructing a first old world language, a proto-language, is needless; rather that proto-language, called radical language here, is still very much alive, having variably survived into today's languages, with Arabic being its closest descendant as the above data clearly shows (for detail, see Jassem 2014h: 254-256, 2014i: 116-117; 2014k, 2015a-b). So instead of reconstructing hypothetical, fictitious languages, the quest

should be concerned with relating those languages to it as shown here (cf. Campbell 2004: 360). Indeed, why go for an imaginary, fairy-tale language when the real one is already there and preserved almost intact?

Because the relationships amongst such languages are self-evident and because linguists deal with language first and foremost, the exact time and place of the split-up between Arabic and the so-called Indo-European languages is immaterial here (for details, see Jassem 2015e-f). On the basis of linguistic evidence, all that can be said here is that such languages and their speakers spread or migrated northwards, westwards, and eastwards from this part of the world. Recent genetic evidence in Italian and German universities points to that too (for a survey, see Jassem 2015e-f; Karls 2014).

Now, let's turn to the analytical level. The results above clearly indicated that the procedures of the theory operated neatly and smoothly on all plains. Phonetically, the entire changes were natural and plausible, cyclic and multi-directional, including processes like substitution, deletion, reversal, merger, split, reordering, reduction, and so on. The results are replete with examples which need not be repeated here.

Morphologically, all affixes of all types, whether inflectional or derivational, have true Arabic cognates as well (for detail, see Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b, 2013l, 2015d, 2016a).

Semantically, almost all types of lexical relations were attested. Lexical or semantic stability was attested in *free, good, girl, merry, noble,* and *ring* which preserved their basic meanings in English and Arabic. Lexical convergence occurred in the data due to formal and semantic similarity between Arabic words, on the one hand, and their English, German, French, Latin, and Greek cognates, on the other. In fact, all the words for which more than one likely cognate was provided are a case in point such as English *free, in, and*, and *wed*, which might derive from two or more formally and semantically similar Arabic words (see 3 above). Although only one cognate might be the ultimate source in the end, no need is presently felt to specify which one it might be; the reader may judge. Likewise, Lexical divergence might have affected *and* which could have developed from Arabic *3ada* 'except' (see 3 above). Lexical multiplicity (polysemy), an extremely common feature of Arabic lexicography (e.g., Ibn Manzour 2013), affected *ring* in English which derives from two formally similar but semantically different Arabic words- i.e., *qarn* and *naqar* via reordering and turning /q/ into /g/ (see 3 above); *come* is another example. Lexical shift occurred in English *wed* and *engage*, moving from Arabic *wa3d* 'promise' to their current meaning 'marriage' in English, German, and French. Also *marry* 'originally, woman' moved from such a meaning to 'taking a wife' in English, French, Latin, and many other languages; *mother* had the same story, which moved from Arabic *mar'at* 'woman' to 'mum'; *villain* shifted from 'farmer' in Arabic, Latin, and French to 'criminal' in English and French. Lexical split affected Arabic *mar'a(t)/imra'a(t)* and *mar'/imri'* from which came, e.g., English *marry, marriage, marital, mother, matron, matrimony;* German *Frau;* French

mer, mari, marriage, and so on. Lexical change could have affected *villain* 'originally, farmer' which means 'criminal' today. Finally, lexical variability was observed in the data, whether at the level of the different forms of the same word within the same language such as English *marry, marital, mother* or across the languages like English *marry*, German *Frau*, and Arabic *mar'a(t)* 'woman' (see 3 above). Arabic, in particular, abounds with linguistic variability of all types such as *mar'a(t), imra'a(t)* 'woman'*; imri', mar'* 'man' (see 3 above).

Now, we turn to problems and issues of methodology in English and Indo-European dictionaries, especially the etymological ones. It can be safely said that, although tracing the Arabic origins of English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Indo-European words cannot actually be carried out without consulting their etymologies and origins such as Harper (2016) and his sources, yet they are fraught with countless, fundamental problems and drawbacks of different types. There are too many cases whose origins are not only admittedly uncertain or unknown but also are factually implausible, erroneous, and complicated with unnecessarily lengthy derivations and sub-derivations. Stopping at or erecting Latin and/or Greek as a barrier between Arabic and such languages is the source of all problems from which all evils bounced. These will be handled in more detail below.

The first major drawback relates to the nature of cognates. Since a cognate is defined as a word in two or more languages with the same or similar form and meaning such as English *father* and *mother* and German *Vater* and *Mutter*, a great many such cognates, one can instantly observe, do not stand the test at all where they do not relate to each other in either form or meaning or both. For instance, English *girl* and Greek *parthenos* 'virgin', English *villa, villain* and Latin *vicus*, English *ring* and PIE *sker-* (Latin *curvus*, *crispus*, Greek *kirkos*), English *free* and *friend*, English *beautiful*, Latin *bellus*, and PIE **dw-en-elo- (*deu)* 'to do' cannot be cognates by form and meaning at all; they are rather semantic or lexical equivalents just like any other words in different languages like English *pen* and Arabic *qalam* 'pen' or Latin *calamum* 'pen' (see 3 above).

The second concerns illogical cognates such as English *comely* and German *kaum* 'hardly', English *good* and Old English *gadrian* 'to gather' and PIE **ghedh-* 'to unite', English *criminal* and Latin *cernere* 'to decide, sift'. How comes that such terms are cognates? No way. These are false cognates.

The third relates to unnecessarily lengthy derivation and sub-derivation with two or more parts as in *noble* (2 parts), *divorce,* and *ring*. Take *ring*, for instance, which is derived via a long process from PIE **(s)ker-* 'cut', which is implausible, semantically-speaking. Its Arabic cognates *qarn* 'horn; a circular-shaped object' or *naqar* 'to knock, beat, sound' are direct and self-evident as each agrees with it formally and semantically: i.e., a true cognate.

The fourth is uncertain, unknown, or possible derivations like *girl* for which three or four objectionable or uncertain derivations are given, some of which do not make sense, formally and

semantically speaking. Instead, deriving it from Arabic *alghirr* 'the young person' preserves both its form and meaning (see 3 above). *Comely, merry, criminal,* and *beautiful* are other instances. Therefore, in all such cases, a direct derivation from Arabic is not only shorter but also more logical, which, at the same time, retains both the form and meaning of cognate words.

The fifth issue concerns *proto-language*, in this case proto-Germanic or proto-Indo-European (PIE). These hypothetical languages are mythical, fictitious or superstitious without any linguistic status whatsoever, which constitute a spurious barrier between such languages and their immediate Arabic neighbour. Linking them to Arabic is not only a natural, geographical choice but also a linguistically logical, true, and substantive one. The data at hand speaks better than words. Therefore, reconstructing PIE, for example, is futile, meaningless, and a waste of time and effort (see above).

The sixth issue concerns polysemy or multiple senses and meanings of English words which seem to be quite unrelated to one another in which English and European dictionaries abound as in *free* in this paper above. Such meanings developed from formally similar but semantically different Arabic cognates as has been stated earlier.

Finally, there is the inexplicable, total avoidance of Arabic despite the clear and obvious relationships linguistically and geographically. As has already been seen in the results, all such *words* have Arabic cognates as has been the case in all previous (50) studies, in fact. Why this has been so needs a separate treatise, indeed. One only has to recall, though, that modern European civilization and culture inherited Arabic science and culture in full through contact in Western Europe, especially Spain, France, and Italy.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main findings can be summed up as follows:

i) The 16 words and their parts in *Free good lovely comely merry beautiful girls marry noble villains in engagement and wedding rings ceremoniously* in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit are true cognates, whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of linguistic change.

ii) The radical linguistic (or lexical root) theory has been adequate for genetically relating *words* in the above languages to one another, according to which they are all dialects of the same language, comprising one larger language family grouping that may be called *Eurabian* or *Urban*. In addition, these languages descended from a prehistoric, perfect Radical (Root) Language, from which all human languages came and which, furthermore, has variably survived into today's languages. As Arabic is phonetically, morphologically, and lexically the most complex of all, it can be safely said that it has inherited almost all that Radical Language features, thus being the most conservative of all.

On the analytical level, the main phonetic changes included substitution, reversal, reordering, deletion, split, and merger; morphologically, all affixes had true Arabic cognates; lexically, the recurrent patterns were stability, convergence, multiplicity, shift, split, and variability.

iii)   Finally, further research is needed into all language levels, especially lexis (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015a-h, 2016b-d); also similar research in other world languages or their families is called for (Jassem 2014h-i, 2015h-i, 2016a). Moreover, the application of such findings to language teaching, lexicology and lexicography, translation (Jassem 2014d, 2015a), cultural (including historical, social, religious) awareness, understanding, and heritage is badly needed to promote cross-cultural cooperation and understanding.

Acknowledgements

References

Albabidi, Ahmad Mustafa Aldimashqi. (2011). *Mu3jam asma' alashia' (allaTa'if fi allughat)*. Ed. Awad, Ahmad Abd-ul-tawab. Cairo: Dar AlfaDeelat. Retrieved http://www.waqfeya.com (May 1, 2016).

Algeo, J. (2010). *The origins and development of the English language*. (6th edn.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

Altha3aalibi, Abu ManSoor. (2011). Fiqhu allughat wa asraar al3arabiyyat. *Ed. by Alayoobi, Dr. Yaseen. Beirut and Saida: Al-Maktabat Al-3aSriyyat.*

Bergs, Alexander and Brinton, Laurel (eds). (2012). *Handbook of English historical linguistics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Campbell, L. (2006). *Historical linguistics: An introduction.* (2nd edn). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

Celce-Murcia, M. et al. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide*. (2nd edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Crowley, T. (1997). *An Introduction to historical linguistics*. (3rd edn). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. (3rd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Harper, Douglas. (2015). *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved http://www.etymonline.com (May 5, 2016).

Ibn Manzoor, Abi Alfadl Almisri. (2013). *Lisan al3arab*. Beirut: Dar Sadir. Retrieved http://www.lisan.com (May 5, 2016).

Ibn Seedah, Ali bin Ismail. (1996). *AlmukhaSSaS*. Beirut: Daar I2ya Alturath Al3arabi and Muassasat Altareekh al3arabi.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1987). *Phonological variation and change in immigrant speech: A sociolinguistic study of a 1967 Arab-Israeli war immigrant speech community in Damascus, Syria*. PhD Thesis, Durham University, UK. Retrieved http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1682/1/1682.pdf (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1993). *Dirasa fi 3ilmi allugha al-ijtima3i: Bahth lughawi Sauti ijtima3i fi allahajat al3arabia alshamia muqaranatan ma3a alingleeziyya wa ghairiha*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara. Retrieved http://www.academia.edu (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1994a). *Impact of the Arab-Israeli wars on language and social change in the Arab world: The case of Syrian Arabic*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1994b). *Lectures in English and Arabic sociolinguistics, 2 Vols*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012a). The Arabic origins of numeral words in English and European languages. *International Journal of Linguistics 4 (3)*, 225-41. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.1276 (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012b). The Arabic origins of common religious terms in English: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature 1 (6)*, 59-71. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.59 (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012c). The Arabic origins of English pronouns: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Linguistics 4 (4)*, 83-103. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.227 (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012d). The Arabic origins of determiners in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 12 (11)*, 323-359. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012e). The Arabic Origins of Verb "To Be" in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature 1 (7)*, 185-196. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.185 (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012f). The Arabic origins of number and gender markers in English, German, French, and Latin: a lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 12 (12)*, 89-119. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013a). The Arabic origins of derivational morphemes in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (1)*, 48-72. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013b). The Arabic origins of negative particles in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (1)*, 234-48. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013c). The English, German, and French cognates of Arabic back consonants: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (2)*: 108-128. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013d). The Arabic origins of "water and sea" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (2)*: 126-151. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013e). The Arabic origins of "air and fire" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (3)*: 631-651. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013f). The Arabic origins of "celestial and terrestrial" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (2)*: 323-345. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013g). The Arabic origins of "animal" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (4)*: 68-106. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013h). The Arabic origins of "body part" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Current Applied Linguistics and English Literature (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.bretj.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013i). The Arabic origins of "speech and writing" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (5)*: 108-159. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013j). The Arabic origins of "time words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (6)*: 274-97. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013k). The Arabic origins of "family words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (3)*: 261-77. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013l). al'uSool al3arabiat lilDamaa'ir alshakSiat fi alingleeziat, walfiransiat, walalmaniat (The Arabic origins of "personal pronouns" in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach (In Arabic). *Almu'tamar aldawli althamin, tajdeed alkhiTaab al3arabi, jaami3at imam bonjul, Indonesia 28-31 August 2013* (8th International Conference of Arabic Speech Renewal, Imam Bonjul University, Indonesia, 28-31 August 2013). Retrieved URL: http://www.academia.edu (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013m). The Arabic origins of "cutting and breaking words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (2)*: 155-68. Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013n). The Arabic origins of "movement and action words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (3):* 187-202. Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013o). The Arabic origins of "perceptual and sensual words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (4): 212-24.* Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013p). The Arabic origins of "cognitive and mental words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (4)*: 65-83. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013q). The Arabic origins of "love and sexual words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 1 (4)*: 97-114. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014a). The Arabic origins of "wining and dining words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 1 (4)*: 146-74. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014b). The Arabic origins of "question and auxiliary words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014c). The Arabic origins of "prepositions and conjunctions" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.jsel.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014d). Translating cultural universals radically: A lexical root theory approach for translating English, French, and German cultural terms into Arabic. In الترجمة وإشكالات المثاقفة: بحوث ومشاركات المؤتمر (*Proceedings of the International Conference on Translation and the Problematics of Cross-Cultural Understanding, the Forum for Arab and International Relations*, Doha, Qatar 26-27 February 2014: 643-695, 505-60).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014e). The Arabic origins of "divine and theological terms" in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 14 (3)*: 155-195. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014f). The Arabic origins of "proper names" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of ELT and Poetry 2 (2)*: 201-22. Retrieved URL: http://www.journalofelt.in (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014g). The Arabic origins of "mathematical and computational terms" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal on Studies in English and Literature 2 (5)*: 21-40. Retrieved URL: http://www.arcjournals.org/ijsell (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014h). The Arabic origins of "Mandarin Chinese Pronouns": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 3 (3)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014i). The Arabic origins of "Finnish and Basque Pronouns": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English language and literature 2 (1): 109-20*. Retrieved URL: http://www.jellonline.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014j). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "colour and artistic terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English language, literature, and Translation 1 (1): 1-14*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijels.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014k). I buy, Ich kaufe, & J'achéte as Arabic Dialectal Variants: A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of language and linguistics 2 (5): 317-27*. Retrieved URL: http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/ijll. Doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20140205.15 (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015a). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "life and death terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 4/1:* 322-345. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015b). Towards a radical translation theory for names: A comparative historical linguistics approach. *International Journal of English and Education 4/1:* 298-321. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015c). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "medical terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English Language and Literature 2/1:* 18-47. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015d). The Arabic origins or cognates of English and Indo-European "case markings and word order": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Language in India 15/3:* 104-40. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015e). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "democratic terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English Language and Literature 2/2:* 111-139. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015f). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "military terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Language in India 15/5:* 105-139. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015g). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "legal terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation 1/1:* 10-29. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015h). allugha alarabia wa allugha al3alamia aljadhria alwaritha al2afiDha: asmaa' alishara fi lughat al3alam qadiman wa2adithan min manDhoor 3ilm allugha aljadhri (In Arabic, Arabic as *the* conservative radical world language: A radical linguistic theory approach to demonstratives in old and modern world languages). *Proceedings of almultaqa al3ilmi al3aalami altaasi3 lilughati alarabia wa-l-mu'tamar alkhamis li-itti2ad mu3allimi allugha alarabia,* Mawlana Malik Ibrahim Islamic University, Malang, Eastern Java, Indonesia, August 27-29, 2015.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015i). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "urban terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *English Review: Journal of English Education* 3/2: 146-166. Retrieved URL: http://www.journal.uniku.ac.in/index.php/ERJEE (May 5, 2016)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015j). Negation in world languages: A radical linguistic theory approach. *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature* 2/4: 1-17. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (May 5, 2016)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016a). The Arabic origins of "plural markers" in world languages: A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education* 5/1:

193-223. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (May 5, 2016). (Also in *Indonesian EFL Journal 1 (2):* 144-163, 2015.)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016b). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "floral terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal on Studies in English and Literature 4 (2)*: 81-99. Retrieved URL: http://www.arcjournals.org/ijsell (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016c). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "fashion and modeling terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal on Studies in English and Literature 4 (6)*: 40-60. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0405007 (May 5, 2016).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016d). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "definite articles": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Review: Journal of English Education 4/1*. Retrieved URL: http://www.journal.uniku.ac.ind/index.php/ERJEE (June 5, 2016)

Karls, Eberhard. (2014). Genetic Makeup of Europeans. Retrieved URL: http://www.uni-tuebingen.de/ en/news (May 5, 2016).

Mu3jam alama3ani (2016). Retrieved URL: http://www.almaany.com (May 5, 2016).

Pyles, T. and J. Algeo. (1993). *The origins and development of the English language.* (4th edn)*.* San Diego: HBJ.

Roach, P. (2008). *English phonetics and phonology: A practical course*. (4th edn). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Yule, G. (2014). *The study of language*. (5th ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.