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Abstract: This paper aims to extend and test the application of the lexical root or radical linguistic theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-l), an innovation or a new model in comparative historical linguistics, to translation studies. More precisely, it examines translating proper (personal and place) names from English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and/or Indo-European languages into Arabic from a lexical root (or radical linguistic) theory perspective. As Arabic was found, according to it, to be their main origin, the paper argues, therefore, for using cognates (words with similar or identical forms and meanings or simply sister words) in translating amongst such languages. The data consists of certain select common personal names like Amanda, Andrew, Antony, Augustine, Bert, Black, Charles, Christine, Elizabeth, Hegel, George, Goethe, Jacob, Jack, James, John (Jane, Ivan), King, Matthew, Michael, Monica, Paul, Peter, Queene, Ralph, Simon, Theodore, William, Zeus. The results indicate that all such names have true Arabic cognates whose differences are due to phonetic, morphological, and semantic changes over time. Thus transliterating, the method usually followed here, should be abandoned in this respect. In conclusion, the paper proves the adequacy and applicability of the lexical root theory to the translation of names by using cognates, which can be generalized to all other areas of translation studies.

1. Introduction

Language is essentially a naming device, a tool or mechanism for naming persons, things, objects, and ideas of all kinds (cf. Jassem 2014d). All words do that without exception, indeed. Proper names, in particular, are words that name, indicate, or refer to persons and places such as Charles, John, Mark, Augustine, Ali, Ahmad, London, Washington, Damascus, and so on; besides, they all have meanings such as Paul 'small, little'. Moreover, most names are universal or cross-cultural in the sense that a good number of them occur in the same or similar forms and meanings across different languages and cultures like Paul (Paulus, Pablo, Pavlo), Charles (Carlus, Karl), Augustine (Augustus), Ahmad (Ahmed, Ahmet, Amado), Muhammad (Mohammed, Mammado, Mo).

Can names be translated? In translation theory and practice (for a survey, see Baker 2009; Baker and Saldanha 2008; Munday 2008; Venuti 2004; Jassem 2014e, 2010), names are not usually translated; rather they are transliterated, for example, Paul يول, which is simply written.
down in a different script. An exception to that is Jassem (2014e) in which it was shown that, as Arabic, English, German, French, and the Indo-European languages have been found to be dialects of the same language which stem in the end from Arabic (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-j), personal names, like all other words, can be translated because they have meanings which do have Arabic cognates, sister words with the same or similar forms and meanings. It comes as no surprise that it is in full agreement with Jassem (2014f) which traced the Arabic origins of around 190 Indo-European proper names. So if that is the case, how can names be translated?

Names can be translated radically, the end result of which may be termed radical translation. So what is radical translation indeed? It means the use of lexical roots in translating words, which is founded on the radical linguistic or lexical root theory. So what is the radical linguistic theory? It is a slightly revised version (Jassem h-j) of the lexical root theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-l), both of which originally derive their name from the use of lexical (consonantal) roots or radicals in retracing genetic relationships between words in world languages. It first emerged as a rejection of the Comparative (Historical Linguistics) Method or Family Tree Model for classifying Arabic as a member of a different language family from English, German, French, and the so-called Indo-European languages in general (Bergs and Brinton 2012; Algeo 2010; Crystal 2010: 302; Yule 2006; Campbell 2004: 190-191; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 61-94). In all his thirty-five studies, Jassem (2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-l) clearly demonstrated, on the contrary, that Arabic is genetically and inextricably related to such languages phonetically, morphologically, grammatically, and semantically or lexically so much so that they can be really considered dialects of the same language, with Arabic being the source or parent language. The theory has last been extended to investigating the relationship between pronouns in Arabic and Chinese (Jassem 2014h) and Basque and Finnish (Jassem 2014i).

On the phonetic plane, Jassem (2013c) outlined the English, German, French, Latin, and Greek cognates of Arabic back consonants: viz., the glottals, pharyngeals, uvulars, and velars; needless to say, the phonetic analysis recurred in all his studies. Morphologically, three studies established the Arabic origins of English, German, French, Latin, and Greek inflectional 'plural and gender' markers (Jassem 2012f), derivational morphemes (Jassem 2013a), and negative particles (Jassem 2013b). Grammatically, eight papers described the Arabic origins of English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit personal pronouns (Jassem 2012c, 2013l), determiners (Jassem 2012d), verb 'to be' (Jassem 2012e), question and modal words (Jassem 2014b), and prepositions and conjunctions (Jassem 2014c). In addition, two papers examined the Arabic origins of pronouns in Chinese (Jassem 2014h) and Basque and Finnish (Jassem 2014i), which belong to traditionally different language families- i.e., non-Indo-European.

Lexically, twenty two studies successfully traced the Arabic origins of English, German, French, Latin, Greek and Sanskrit words in key semantic fields- namely, numeral words (Jassem
2012a), common religious terms (Jassem 2012b), water and sea terms (Jassem 2013d), air and fire terms (Jassem 2013e), celestial and terrestrial terms (Jassem 2013f), animal terms (Jassem 2013g), body part terms (Jassem 2013h), speech and writing terms (Jassem 2013i), time words (Jassem 2013j), family words (Jassem 2013k), cutting and breaking words (Jassem 2013m), movement and action words (Jassem 2013n), perceptual and sensual words (Jassem 2013o), cognitive and mental words (Jassem 2013p), love and sexual words (Jassem 2013q), winning and dining words (Jassem 2014a), divine and theological terms (Jassem 2014d), proper names (Jassem 2014f), mathematical and computational terms (2014g), colour and artistic terms (Jassem 2014j), buying and selling terms (Jassem 2014k), and life and death terms (Jassem 2014l). In a nutshell, all such studies made it totally clear that Arabic, English, German, and French words, for example, are true and real cognates with similar or identical forms and meanings, whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and diverse routes of linguistic change.

Finally, on the applied linguistics level, Jassem (2014e) extended this approach to the field of translation studies, showing how cultural universals like religious terms and numeral words can be translated radically (i.e., by using cognates) from such languages into Arabic and vice versa. That is, cognates (sister, mother, or parent words) are used to show that the translated words are genetically related in having the same or similar forms and meanings. It is offered as an alternative to equivalence theory in which words are translated by giving their meanings in the target language. For instance, *pie* is rendered in equivalence translation as *faTeera(t)* into Arabic while in radical (cognate-based) translation as *kubba(t), kabaab* (pl.) *ﻛﺒﺔ، ﻹﺑﺎب* because it came from Latin *pica* to which linguistic changes like reversal and /k/-deletion applied (see Jassem 2014a, 2014d). All words are like that such as *Hallelujah*: in normal or equivalent translation, it yields *اﺣﻤﺪوا اﻟﺮب* 'praise the Lord'; in radical translation it produces and/or derives from Arabic *Allaha la ilaaha illah (la ilaaha illa Allah)* via reversal and reduction or merger (see Jassem 2014a, 2014d). There is an extremely and incredibly huge difference between the two renderings. In short, equivalence relates words through meanings as unrelated entities while radical translation relates them as cognates through form and meaning. In short, radical translation uses the lexical roots of words which determine not only their form and meaning but also their common cultural history, heritage, and genealogy.

This paper extends the application of the theory further to the examination of the translation of select personal names in English, German, French, and Indo-European languages into Arabic by using cognates. That is because all such languages have already been proven to have come from an earlier perfect, sudden Radical Language from which all human languages emanated in the first place, to which they can be traced, and which has survived into different forms in today's languages, with Arabic being the closest descendant (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-l). The remainder of the paper is organized into four sections: (ii) research methods, (iii) results, (iv) discussion, and (v) conclusion.
2. Research Methods

2.1 The Data

The data consists of a select sample of highly frequent proper (personal and place) names that are common to English, German, French, Arabic, and all the so-called Indo-European languages like Amanda, Andrew, Antony, Augustine, Bert, Black, Charles, Christine, Elizabeth, Hegel, George, Goethe, Jacob, Jack, James, John (Jane, Ivan, Yvonne), King, Matthew, Michael, Monica, Paul, Peter, Queene, Ralph, Simon, Theodore, William, Zeus. Their selection has been based on the author's knowledge of their frequency and use as well as English dictionaries.

As for etymological data for English and Indo-European languages, all references are for Harper (2014); for Arabic, the meanings are for Ibn Manzoor (2013) in the main and Ibn Seedah (1996).

In transcribing the data, normal Romanized spelling is used for all languages for practical purposes. Nonetheless, certain symbols were used for unique Arabic sounds, including /2 & 3/ for the voiceless and voiced pharyngeal fricatives respectively, /kh & gh/ for the voiceless and voiced velar fricatives each, capital letters for the emphatic counterparts of plain consonants /t, d, dh, & s/, and // for the glottal stop (Jassem 2013c).

The above names usually occur in today's fully natural English, German, and French speech as the following exemplary conversation shows.

Augustine: What's your name, sir?

John: My name is Mr. John Charleston. Call me Charles, please.

Every word in the above fully natural English text has a true Arabic cognate as will be shown in the analysis below. In other words, it is as much English as it is Arabic. To facilitate reference, they will be arranged alphabetically together with brief linguistic comments in (3.) below.

2.2 Data Analysis

2.2.1 Theoretical Framework: The Radical Linguistic Theory

The theoretical framework for data analysis will be the Radical Linguistic Theory (Jassem 2014h-j), a slightly revised and more generalized version of the original Lexical Root Theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g). Both were so called because of employing the lexical (consonantal) roots or radicals in examining genetic relationships between Arabic, English, German, French, and Indo-European words. Hence the name. For example, observation derives from serve (or simply srv) (see Jassem 2013o) and description (subscription, prescription, inscription) from scribe (scrb) (see Jassem 2013i, 2014e). The main reason for that
is because the consonantal root carries and determines the basic meaning of the word irrespective of its affixation and vowels such as \textit{observation} (srv) as the underlined affixes clearly show. Historically speaking, classical and modern Arabic dictionaries (e.g., Ibn Manzoor 1974, 2013) used consonantal roots in listing lexical entries, a characteristically unique practice first founded by Alkhaleel, an 8th century Arabic linguist, lexicographer, musician, and mathematician (Jassem 2012e).

The Lexical Root Theory has a simple structure, consisting of a theoretical principle or hypothesis and five practical procedures of analysis. The principle states that:

Arabic and English as well as the so-called Indo-European languages are not only genetically related but also are directly descended from one language, which may be Arabic in the end. In fact, it claims in its strongest version that they are all dialects of the same language, whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and different courses of linguistic change.

In the Radical Linguistic Theory, the above principle has been slightly revised in relating Chinese (Jassem 2014h) and Basque and Finnish (Jassem 2014i) pronouns to Arabic besides other studies (Jassem 2014j-k) to read:

All human languages are genetically related, which eventually emanated from a single, perfect, sudden language which developed over time into countless human dialects and languages, that continue to become simpler and simpler. That original first language, which may be called Radical or Root Language, has not died out at all but has instead survived uninterruptedly into modern day languages to various degrees where some languages have preserved words and forms more than others. Perhaps Arabic, on spatial and temporal grounds, has preserved almost all of its features phonetically, morphologically, syntactically or grammatically, and semantically or lexically.

As to the five applied procedures of the Lexical Root Theory which have been used all along to empirically prove that principle in data collection and analysis, they remain the same in the revised version: i.e., (a) methodological, (b) lexicological, (c) linguistic, (d) relational, and (e) comparative/historical. As all have been reasonably described in the above studies (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-j), a brief summary will suffice here.

Firstly, the methodological procedure concerns data collection, selection, and statistical analysis. Apart from loan words, \textit{all} language words, affixes, and phonemes are amenable to investigation, and \textit{not only} the core vocabulary as is the common practice in the field (Crystal 2010; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 76-77; Crowley 1997: 88-90, 175-178). However, data selection is practically inevitable since no single study can accomplish that at one time, no matter how ambitious it might be. The most appropriate method for approaching that goal would be to use semantic fields such as the present and the above topics. Cumulative evidence from such
findings will aid in formulating rules and laws of language change at a later stage (cf. Jassem 2012f, 2013a-f, 2013l). The statistical analysis employs the percentage formula (see 2.2 below).

Secondly, the lexicological procedure is the initial step in the analysis. Words are analyzed by (i) deleting affixes (e.g., explained $\rightarrow$ plain), (ii) using primarily consonant roots or radicals (e.g., plain $\rightarrow$ pln), and (iii) search for correspondence in meaning on the basis of word etymologies and origins as a guide (e.g., Harper 2014), which should be used with discretion, though. The final outcome yields Arabic baien, baan (v) ‘clear, plain’ via /l/-insertion or split from /n/ (Jassem 2013i).

Thirdly, the linguistic procedure handles the analysis of the phonetic, morphological, grammatical and semantic structures and differences between words. The phonetic analysis examines sound changes within and across categories. More precisely, consonants may change their place and manner of articulation as well as voicing. At the level of place, bilabial consonants $\leftrightarrow$ labio-dental $\leftrightarrow$ dental $\leftrightarrow$ alveolar $\leftrightarrow$ palatal $\leftrightarrow$ velar $\leftrightarrow$ uvular $\leftrightarrow$ pharyngeal $\leftrightarrow$ glottal (where $\leftrightarrow$ signals change in both directions); at the level of manner, stops $\leftrightarrow$ fricatives $\leftrightarrow$ affricates $\leftrightarrow$ nasals $\leftrightarrow$ laterals $\leftrightarrow$ approximants; and at the level of voice, voiced consonants $\leftrightarrow$ voiceless. For example, /t/ may naturally and/or plausibly turn into /d/ by voice, /s/ by manner, /l/ by place and voice, or /th & k/ by place and manner. The literature (Roach 2008; Campbell 2006; Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-j; Algeo 2010) is replete with examples.

In similar fashion, vowels change as well. Although the number of vowels differ greatly within and between English (Roach 2008; Celce-Mercia et al 2010) and Arabic (Jassem 2012g, 1987, 1993), all can be reduced to three basic long vowels /a:/ (aa), /i:/ (ee), & /u:/ (oo) (and their short versions besides the two diphthongs /ai (ay)/ and /au (aw)/ which are a kind of /i:/ and /a:/ respectively). They may change according to modifications in (i) tongue part (e.g., front $\leftrightarrow$ centre $\leftrightarrow$ back), (ii) tongue height (e.g., high $\leftrightarrow$ mid $\leftrightarrow$ low), (iii) length (e.g., long $\leftrightarrow$ short), and (iv) lip shape (e.g., round $\leftrightarrow$ unround). In fact, the vowels can be, more or less, treated like consonants where /i:/ is a kind of /j (y)/, /a:/ a kind of /w/, and /u:/ a kind of /h/ or vice versa. Their functions are mainly (i) phonetic in linking consonants to each other in speech and (ii) grammatical by indicating tense, word class, and number (e.g., sing, sang, sung, song; man/men). Thus their semantic weight is marginal in significance, if not at all. For these reasons, vowels may be totally ignored in the analysis because the limited nature of the changes do not affect the final semantic result at all.

Sound changes result in natural and plausible processes like assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, merger, insertion, split, reordering, substitution, syllable loss, re-syllabification, consonant cluster reduction or creation and so on. In addition, sound change may operate in a multi-directional, cyclic, and lexically-diffuse or irregular manner (for detail, see Jassem 2012a-f, 2013c).
Regarding the morphological and grammatical analyses, some overlap obtains. The former examines the inflectional and derivational aspects of words in general (Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b); the latter handles grammatical classes, categories, and functions like determiners, pronouns, prepositions, question words, nouns, verbs, and case (Jassem 2012c-e, 2013l, 2014b-c). Since their influence on the basic meaning of the lexical root is marginal, inflectional and derivational morphemes may also be ignored altogether. As both morphological and grammatical features have already been dealt with in full, there may be no need to include them in every single case later.

As regards the semantic analysis, meaning relationships between words are examined, including lexical stability, multiplicity, convergence, divergence, shift, split, change, and variability. Stability means that word meanings have remained constant over time. Multiplicity denotes that words might have two or more meanings. Convergence means two or more formally and semantically similar Arabic words might have yielded the same cognate in English. Divergence signals that words became opposites or antonyms of one another. Shift indicates that words switched their sense within the same field. Lexical split means a word led to two different cognates. Change means a new meaning developed. Variability signals the presence of two or more variants for the same word (for detail, see Jassem 2012a-f).

Fourthly, the relational procedure accounts for the relationship between form and meaning from three angles: (i) formal and semantic similarity (e.g., three, third, tertiary and Arabic thalath 'three' (Damascus Arabic talaat (Jassem 2012a)), (ii) formal similarity and semantic difference (e.g., ship and sheep (Jassem 2012b), and (iii) formal difference and semantic similarity (e.g., quarter, quadrant, carat, cadre and Arabic qeeraaT 'a fourth; carat' (Jassem 2012a)). As in the morphological and syntactic or grammatical procedures, there is no need to tackle it in every single case for it will lead to undesirably lengthy treatments.

Finally, the comparative historical analysis compares every word in English in particular and German, French, Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit in general with its Arabic counterpart phonetically, morphologically, and semantically on the basis of its history and development in English (e.g., Harper 2014; Pyles and Algeo 1993) and Arabic (e.g., Ibn Manzour 2013; Ibn Seedah 1996) besides the author's knowledge of both Arabic as a first language and English as an equal second language. Discretion should be exercised here due to uncertainties and inaccuracies, especially in Harper's work, though.

To sum up, the most appropriate operational procedure in relating words to each other genetically would be to:

(i) select a word (a proper name in this case),
(ii) identify the source language meaning (e.g., English, Latin, Greek) on the basis of especially word root history or etymology. It is essential to begin with meanings, not
sounds or sound laws; the former will lead you to the cognate naturally and automatically; the latter will definitely get you lost,

(iii) search for the equivalent meaning in the target language (e.g., Arabic), looking for cognates: i.e., sister words with similar forms and meanings,

(iv) strip each word down to its bare (consonantal) root, base, or stem, and

(v) finally, analyze and/or explain the differences and similarities in form and meaning between the cognates by following the above steps lexicologically, phonetically, morphologically, and semantically.

That is the whole story simply and truly. For example, 

Augustine (Augusta, Augustan, Augustus) all come from Latin August 'holy, sacred', English Ghost, and German Geist, which eventually derives from Arabic qudus (al-qudus) '(the-) holy, sacred' via reordering and turning /l, q, & d/ into /u, g, & t/ (see below; see Jassem 2014e-f for detail).

2.4.2 Statistical Analysis

The percentage formula, a standard statistical technique in linguistics and applied linguistics as well as all other disciplines (e.g., Jassem 1987, 1993, 1994a-b), will be used for calculating the ratio of cognate words or shared vocabulary; it is obtained by dividing the number of cognates over the total number of investigated words multiplied by a 100. For example, suppose the total number of investigated words or names is 100, of which 90 are true cognates. The percentage of cognates is calculated thus: 90/100 = 9 X 100 = 90%. Finally, the results are checked against Cowley's (1997: 173, 182) formula to determine whether such words belong to the same language or family (for a survey, see Jassem 2012a-b).

3. Results

The main focus of the results will be on the Arabic lexical (consonantal) radicals or roots of English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit words. Therefore, affixes and vowels or their exact quality will be overlooked generally for having little or no semantic impact whatsoever on the final output.

Augustus (Augusta, Augustine, Augustan, August) via Latin augustus 'sacred, grand', from Arabic alqudus (alquddoos, alqiddees, alqudsi, almuqaddas, almaqdisi) 'the sacred' via reordering and turning /l, q, & d/ into /u, g, & t/. That is, Augustus consists of three morphemes or parts: (i) au from Arabic al 'the' where /l/ became /u/ as in Cockney /miuk/ for milk (Jassem 2012d), (ii) gust 'holy, sacred' from Arabic qudus 'sacred' via reordering and turning /q & d/ into /g & t/, and (iii) –us 'masculine marker' from Arabic –at 'feminine (and sometimes masculine) marker' where /t/ became /s/ (Jassem 2012f). In Arabic culture, it is used as the second element of the proper name 3abd-ul-quddoos 'servant of the Sacred One (God)' (cf. Khushaim 2002: 19-23.). It is worth noting that Ghost (Old
English *gast* and German *Geist* 'spirit' come from the same Arabic source as well. See *Holy Ghost*.

**Casanova** via Italian for 'a man of carnal, sexual adventures' from Arabic *2asan, 2assoon* 'a beautiful, good-looking man'  حسن، حسان, حسون where /2 & w (oo)/ evolved into /k & v/. So *2assan حسان, حسان* or, better still, *2assoon(a) حسون* would be the right radical choice. In Arabic culture, the last version is very flirtatious: i.e., a womanizer.

**Celt** (*Celtic, Keltic*) 'stone chisel' via Latin *Celta, Celtae* (pl.), Greek *Keltoi* 'Gauls (i.e., French)', from Arabic *kaleet* 'a rectangular stone used for closing holes; a hyena's neighbour', *kalat* (v.) 'gather, collect' where /k/ evolved into /s/, *kalt* 'a name of a Palestinian valley area'.

**Charles** (*Charle, Charlie, Charleston, Charlene, Carl, Carla, Karl*) via Latin *Carolus* 'man, husband' from Arabic *rajul, rijjaal* رجل, رجال via reordering and turning /j/ into /k (ch)/, which may be the right radical choice. Although no Arab is named *rajul* as far as I know, it is often used in addressing and depicting people to express such desirable traits as manliness, truthfulness, strength, and toughness, nonetheless. For this reason, it may derive instead from Arabic *khaleel* 'friend, husband' where /kh/ became /k (ch)/ besides /t/-insertion or split from /l/. This is the likeliest because of its high frequency in Arabic and European languages at all times as well as its association with the name of the biblical and Islamic progenitor of all prophets, Abraham (Ibraheem in Arabic), peace be upon them all. Almost all European names are religious or biblical in origin, indeed.

**Deus** (*deity, deify, deification, Diana, Diva, divine, divinity, diviner, theism, atheism, atheist, pantheism, polytheism, monotheism, theology, theologian, Theodore, day, daily; Zeus*) via Latin *deus* 'god, light', Greek *Zeus* 'light', and Sanskrit *deva* 'shining' from Arabic *Dau'/Diaa* 'light', اضاءة *iDa'at* (n) 'lighting', *muDee* (adj), *Dau*i (adj) 'lighted, giving light' ضئوؤضياء, *aDaa* (v) 'to light' ضئياء/ضياء where /j/ became /k (ch)/ besides /t/-insertion or split from /l/. Thus *Diaa'/Dau* would be the right radical translation, which is in line with ancient pagan practice in which there were two gods: one for light or good and one for darkness or evil. Indo-European cultures and languages have partially retained that distinction until now.

**Dickens** (*Dickenson; Duck*) via Old English *dicken* 'devil' from Arabic *dakn* 'heavy fog, rain, or darkness' دكن and related *dukainaa/dukna* 'snake; a proper name' طيبان/كتني *Taishaan* 'foolish, aggressive' طيشان where /T & sh/ changed into /d & k/; *Taugh, Taaghoot* (pl.) 'devil, idol, witch' طوغ, طاغوت, changing /T & gh/ into /d & k/ and inserting /nu/; *dajn, diaan/dujoon* (pl.) *heavy fog, rain, or darkness* دجن, دجنان/دجوبن, *dajnat* 'worst blackness' دجنة, *dajaani/dujaana(t)* 'a proper name' دجاني, دجانية, دجينة where /j/ became /k/; *deek* 'rooster; a proper family name' ديك via /n/-insertion (cf. *duck* via lexical shift); or *dajaaj, dajan* (pl.)
'chickens, fowl; domestic animals like camels and sheep; a proper family name' دجاجة، دجن، دجاجة، دجاجة. 'Turning /j/ into /k/. However, since nobody would probably give his child terrible names which does happen sometimes, I profess, it is more likely that it comes from either of the last two, which would be the right radical translation as both are popular Syrian Arab family names- i.e., deek, duwaik (pronounced dwek) (dim.) 'rooster, cock' ديك، دویک or jaaja(t), jwejaati 'hen, hen-owner' دجاجة، جوياجاتي. Elizabeth via Latin Elisabeth, Greek Eleisabet(h) 'God's an oath' as a compound of (i) Eli 'God' from Arabic eel/ilaah 'god' إيل/الله via /h/-loss and and (ii) zabeth 'seven' from Hebrew shebah 'seven' from Arabic sab3a(t/h) 'seven' سبعة, turning /s/ into /z/ and deleting /3/; alternatively, it comes from Arabic sabt 'Saturday, rest, tanned skin, time, a week, sleep, shaving, desert', sabta(t) 'a female's proper name; courageous woman' سنة (الله) or sabbat(t) 'swearing, choice, sheltering, veil, thin clothes, time, intimacy, life'. So sabta(t) (سامة) would be the right radical choice, which is also a proper female's name in Syrian Arabic dialects (Jassem 1987, 1993a). Emperor (empress, empire, imperial, imperialism, imperialist, imperative; mayor) via French from Latin imperator(em) 'commander, emperor', imperare (v) 'command', from Arabic 'ameer(at) 'ruler, prince', 'amar (v) 'command' أمير، أمر; /p/ was inserted or split from /m/. England (English, Angles, angular) refers to a German tribe that invaded Britain together with the Saxons and Jutes (see below) in the eighth century, which means 'crook-shaped; a kind of weapon'. It comes from Arabic naqla(t), niqaal (pl.) 'a wide, short arrow' via reordering and turning /q/ into /g/; manjal 'sickle' where /m & j/ changed into /n & g/; shankal 'a hook, a club' in which /sh & j/ merged into /gl/. George (Georgette, Georgina, Jorge) via Latin Georgius, Greek Georgos 'husbandman, farmer' as a compound of (i) ge 'earth' from Arabic qaa3 'earth' قاع via /3/-loss and /l/-mutation into /gl/ (Jassem 2013f) and (ii) ergon 'work' from Arabic 2arak (also 3arak, 3araq) 'move, work, sweat' حرك via /2/-loss and turning /k/ into /gl/; alternatively, it comes, as an indivisible whole, from Arabic (i) zur3a(t), zurai3 'planter, farmer, grower; a plant; a proper name' زرعة, turning /z & 3/ into /g & j/ or (ii) jara' 'stone earth; mid-way, جرج جرج 'worried wanderer'. So zur3a(t), zurai3 جرج زرعة، زرعي would be the right radical choice as both were common Arabic names in the past. God (goddess, godmother; good, Goodness) via German Gott from Arabic jadd 'grandfather' or jood 'generosity, goodness', jawaad 'generous, good, giver, God' where /j/ became /g/. The first translation, Jadd جد, reflects ancient pagan practice according to which God was thought to be the father of humanity, though incorrectly and perversely. The second, Jawaad جواد, agrees with Islamic thought in which God has 99 beautiful names, of which it is one. Either is radically acceptable according to context, of course.
Now compare God bless you 'lit., Saleeb jaddi 3alaik' with Arabic ismallah (3alaik) 'lit., God's name on you' أسم الله عليك.

Goethe (Göthe) is a very famous German writer, which means 'god as in godfather; the one invoked for help', from Arabic jadd 'grandfather', replacing /j & d/ by /g & th/; or from ghawth (ghaith, ghiath) 'help, helper, supporter; a proper name' via /gh/-mutation into /g/.

Hallelujah (halleluiah, alleluia) via Greek and Latin as a compound of (i) Halle from Arabic Allah 'God' لله via reversal (i.e., Allah → Halle 'God'), (ii) lu from Arabic la 'no, not' لا, and (iii) jah as a reduction and/or merger of three formally similar Arabic words via /l/-deletion or merger into /ee (y)/, which are: (a) ilaah 'god' (ilaah → ia) الله, (b) illa 'except' (illa → ia) إلا, and (c) h(u)/iah 'him' (iah/h(u) → h (Ø) إياه/ه). Diagrammatically, this looks like:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>↑ Halle</th>
<th>↓ -lu</th>
<th>↓ -jah</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allah</td>
<td>la</td>
<td>ilaaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>God</td>
<td>'no, not'</td>
<td>illa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>الله</td>
<td>لا</td>
<td>h(u)/iah</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Allah la ilaaha illa h(u)/iah

'God no god but him = There's no god but Allah (God)'

 الله لا إلإ إياه إلإ هو

* ↔ indicates change in both directions.

Thus, halleluiah is a mutilated, distorted, and/or reduced version of Arabic Allah la ilaaha illa h(u) 'God no god but him' الله لا إلإ هو, which is more frequently spoken la ilaha illa Allah 'no god but God (Allah) = There's no god but Allah' الله لا إلإ هو, which is the fundamental statement of faith not only in Islam 'peace, safety, submission' but also in all major world religions (for detail and background critique, see Jassem 2012b).

Hegel is a famous German surname, which means (i) 'bull breeder', from Arabic 3ijl, 3ajjaal 'bull, bull owner' via /j & j/-mutation into /h & g/; and (ii) 'hail', which may then derive from either Arabic 2aalool 'hail; frozen snow balls' in which /l/ split into /h & g/, qa2eel 'ice (ji2eel in my accent (Jassem 1987, 1993, 1994))' via reordering and passing /q & 2/ into /g & h/, or thalj 'snow' via reordering and turning /th & j/ into /h & g/.

Holy Ghost via (i) Old English holig and German heilig from Arabic Saali2 'good, holy' صالح where /S/ turned into /h/ and (ii) Old English gost 'life, breath, appearance, angel, demon', German Geist, (and Latin August, Augustan, Augustus 'sacred, holy' (see 3.3 below)) from
Arabic *quds* 'sacred, holy' via reordering and turning /q & d/ into /g & t/. Radically, *alquds alSaali2* the desired outcome (see Jassem 2014e-f).

**Holy** See via (i) Old English *holig* from Arabic *Saali2* 'good, holy' صالح above and (ii) Latin *sede(m/s)* 'seat, abode', *sedere* (v) 'to sit' from Arabic *saadin, sadan* (pl.) 'Kaaba servant/keeper before Islam' سدان. *sadan* (v) 'to serve the Idol House; to serve pre-Islamic Kaaba which was full of idols that were later destroyed in Islam; conceal; shelter; to prolong one's dress'; /l/ became /m/. Radically, *sadan Saali2* is the right output, a pre-Islamic catchphrase (see Jassem 2012b).

**Jack** (Jackass, Jacob) is a diminutive of Latin/Greek *Iacob(u/o)s* from Hebrew *Ya'qobh* 'one that takes by the heel' from Arabic *3aqib* 'heel, back' عبد, *3iqaab* 'follower, hawk, a proper name' عبد via /3 & h/-loss. Otherwise, it comes from Arabic *ja2sh* 'chief; donkey, a male's proper name' جشع زينب بنت جشن مثلا via /2 & sh/-merger into /k/, which would be the right radical choice. See Jacob.

**Jacob** (Jacobson) via Latin/Greek *Iacob(u/o)s* from Hebrew *Ya'qobh* 'one that takes by the heel' from Arabic *3aqib* 'heel, back' عبد, *3iqaab* 'follower, hawk, proper name' عبد, *ya3qub* 'to follow' عبد via /3/-loss and turning /y/ into /j/. So either Arabic variant would be a suitable radical choice.

**James** (Jimmy, Jim, Jacob) via Latin *Jacomus* as an alteration of Jacob above. Alternatively, it obtains from Arabic *jam3a(t)* 'gatherer, gathering, Friday, a proper name' via reordering and turning /3/ into /k/ (Ø) (cf. King James I (1603-1625) who united 'gathered' Scotland and England).

**Jehovah** (Yahweh, Yah; Jehovah Witnesses) via Hebrew *Yahweh* from *hawah/hayah* 'is/was (the Existing One)' from Arabic *Allah* (prounced *Alloh* in some accents) 'God' (الله) via reordering, /h/-split or copying, and turning /l & a (o)/ into /y & v/; i.e., *Allah* → *Ayyah* → *yahayah* → *yahayoh* → *jahwa* (Jehovah) or something similar. In southern Saudi Jizani Arabic, the pronunciation *aiyah* for *Allah* is widespread as /l/ is replaced by /y/ there, which is similar to Spanish, (French and English in certain contexts).

As to witness, it came via Latin *videre* (vision, visible, video) 'see' from Arabic *waDa2* 'whiteness, light, appearance, seeing', *waaDi2*, *waDDa2*, *waD2a* (adj.) 'clear, seen; a proper name' وضع, واضح, واضح, واضح in which /D & 2/ became /t & Ø/. See White.

**John** (Johnson, Jean, Jane, Jensen, Evan, Ivan) is the most common English name which was supplanted by William after the French conquest to Britain in 1066-1266. It came via Medieval Latin *Johannes*, Late Latin *Joannes*, Greek *Ionannes*, Hebrew *Yohanan*, hanan 'kind, gracious' from Arabic *2anaan* (2anoon, 2aneen, 2unain) 'kind, good, nice, gentle; a
proper name’. حنان، حنون، حنين via reordering and turning /2 & y/ into /h & j/. Any would be the right radical choice.

**Jupiter** via Latin for ‘supreme deity of ancient Romans; vocative God-father (i.e., O God-father), Greek Zeus Pater ‘father of light’, Sanskrit Dyaus pita ‘father of light’ as a compound of Latin (i) Ju ‘O’ from Arabic ya ‘O’ and (ii) Pater ‘father’ from Arabic abat(aah) ‘father’ (أب) via /t/-insertion, leading to ya abat(aah) ‘father’. Thus the right radical translation is simply al’ab(at) الأب.

**King** via Old English cyning ’king, ruler’, Old High German kuning, German König from Arabic qamqaam ‘king, leader’ ﻓﻘﻤﻘﻤﺎم via reordering and turning /q & m/ into /k & n/; qinaan ‘an ancient king who used to take all ships by force; leader’ ﻓﻨﺎن via /q/-mutation and copying into /k & g/; qinqin ‘an underground water expert’ ﻓﻨ through lexical shift, reordering, and turning /q & q/ into /k & g/. So qamqaam ﻓﻘﻤﻘﻤﺎم would be the right radical choice perhaps, though obsolete.

**Margaret** via Latin Margarita, Greek Margarites ‘pearl’ from Arabic marjaan(at) ‘pearl; a proper name’ ﻣﺮﺟﺎﻧﺔ where /j & n/ became /g & r/.

**Mark** (Marx, Marcus) via Latin Marcus ‘Roman god of war who had agricultural attributes’, Mars ‘the red planet Mars’ from Arabic marj(at) ‘meadow; mixture; marriage, intercourse; corruption, killing; a (Syrian Arab) proper name’ مﺮﺟ where /j/ became /k/; mar(r)eekh ‘fool; long arrow; a star’ ﻣﺮﯿﺦ, markh ‘light-inducing tree; fire’ مﺮخ, marakh(v) ‘anoint, paint; add more water (to dough)’ via /kh/-mutation into /k/; rimaa2 ‘arrows; a proper name’ via reordering and substituting /k/ for /2/ ﻣﺮﻋﻲ; or mar3ee/mar3a ‘pasture, meadow; a proper name’ ﻣﺮﻋﻲ where /k/ replaced /3/; any variant would be radically acceptable.

**Matthew** (Matthews, Mathew) via Latin/Greek Matthe(u/o)s from Hebrew Mattathyah ‘gift of God’ as a compound of (i) mattath ‘gift’ from Arabic mu3Tee ‘giver; a proper name’ مﻄ４ where /j & /n/ became /g & r/; (ii) yah ‘short for Yahweh, Jehovah, God’s name in Judaism’ from Arabic Allah ‘God’s greatest name in Islam’ via reordering and turning /l/ into /j/, a common phonetic process in Jizani Arabic, KSA. In Arabic culture, there are several other name variants such as 3aTia(t) ‘gift’, 3aTaa’ ‘gift’, 3aTallah ‘God’s gift’, 3abd-ul-mu3Tee ‘lit., servant-the-giver; God’s servant, worshipper’ ﻋﺒﺪ اﻟﻤﻌﻄﻲ, all revolving around God’s countless gifts. So it does seem that Matthew is short for 3abd-ul-mu3Tee as happens in similar Islamic name compounds today around the world. See Hallelujah and Jehovah.

**Paul** (Paula) via Latin/Greek Paul(u/o)s ‘lit., small, little; apostle to the gentiles or non-Jews’ from Arabic baah(i)l ‘small, little; neglected, left; a stickless, armless shepherd; implore;
curse; a KSA tribe's proper name' via /h/-loss; that would be the right radical choice.

Peter via Latin/Greek Petr(u/o)s 'lit., stone, rock', French Pierre, Italian Petro, Spanish/Portuguese Pedro from Arabic batara/batar 'soft, loose land; white-stoned earth' via /h/-loss; that would be the right radical choice.

Queen(s) via Old English cwen 'queen, female ruler, woman, wife', Greek gyne 'woman, wife', Sanskrit janis 'woman', gna 'wife of a god, a goddess', Old Church Slavonic zina from Arabic qaiyen 'beautiful girl, female singer, woman' which would be the right radical choice (see Jassem 2013k).

Shakespeare 'spearman' as a compound of (i) Old English sceacan 'shake, move something quickly to and fro; brandish and flourish weapons' from Arabic shaaki 'brandishing, wearing (weapons)' or shaa2 'shake, spin, move to and fro' where /2/ became /k/ and (ii) spear from Arabic sibaal 'arrows' where /l/ turned into /r/ or shibaari 'hand-size knives', changing /sh/ into /sl/. So shaaki sibaal 'wearing spears' would be the right radical choice, a common practice in Yemeni Arab culture. See William.

Theodore via Greek as a compound of (i) theo 'god, light' from Arabic Dau' 'light' where /D/ became /th/ and (ii) doron 'gift' from Arabic darra 'give (milk), rain' or durra(t), durar (pl.) 'light' via /n/-insertion (cf. Arabic Dau' durri 'shining, bright light') (Jassem 2104e).

Thomas (Tommy, Tom) via Greek from Aramaic and Syriac tom 'twin' from Arabic taw'am (pronounced tom in spoken Arabic). However, since nobody may be called such a name in all cultures, it seems that it comes from Arabic Tu3ma(t) 'a proper name, meaning (a gift of) food, feeding, taste, eating' طمعة via /3/-loss and changing /T/ into /th/, thoom 'garlic; a proper name' ثوم; taim 'enslaved lover; a proper name' تيم; or dihaam (also 'adham, dahim, daheem, dahmaan) 'proper names meaning black' دهام, أدهم via /d & h/-merger into /th/; all are common Arabic names today.

Valentine (Valentino) 'a good-looking man of carnal desires' from Arabic 2uloo, 2ulwa(t) حلو, حلوة 'sweet, good-looking (person); a proper name', 2alaawa(t) حلوة 'a (Syrian) doughy sweet; good-looking (person), a proper name', 2alwaan حلوان 'a sweet, a good-looking (person), marrying a woman for a dowry'; /2/ became /v/. In light of this, any such variant would be fine although 2alwaan حلوان or 2uloo حلو could be the right radical choice.
Waters (Waterman) via German wasser 'water' from Arabic werd 'water' via reordering and turning /d/ into /t/; or qaTr(at) 'water (drop)' via /q, T, & t/-evolution into /w, t, & s/ (Jassem 2013d).

White (Whites) via Old English hwit and German weiss from Arabic waDa2 'white, light, appear, see' وﺿﺢ, waDDa2 'a male's proper name' وﺿﺎح, waD2a 'a female's proper name' وﺿﺤﻰ; /D & 2/ became /t & Ø/. What a perfect radical choice!

William was the most common name during the French conquest to Britain (1066-1266 A.C.) to be supplanted by John afterwards. It came via Old French Willaume, French Guilaume from Germanic Willahelm as a compound of (i) willio 'will, wish, desire' from Arabic walah(aan) (also lahoo) 'love(r), desire(r)' وﻟﮫ، وﻟﮭﺎن) ﻭﻟﲽ (via /h/-loss or 2ilm 'dream, wish' ﻷﻣﺔ where /2/ became /w/ while /m & l/ merged and (ii) helm 'helmet' from Arabic la'mat(t) 'battle head gear' لَآمَة via reordering and turning /l/ into /h/ or 3ammat (3amaamat) helmet, head gear لَآمَة where /3 & m/ changed into /h & l/; otherwise, it derives, as a whole, from Arabic (i) 2aleem 'meek, tolerant, wishing, dreaming' ﻷم where /2/ became /w/ or (ii) wailummih 'lit., woe to his mother; a vicious boy, villain; troublemaker; a nickname' ﻷمم where /3 & m/ changed into /h & l/; otherwise, it derives, as a whole, from Arabic (i) 2aleem 'meek, tolerant, wishing, dreaming' ﻷم where /2/ became /w/ or (ii) wailummih 'lit., woe to his mother; a vicious boy, villain; troublemaker; a nickname' ﻷمم via reordering. Either of the last two would be the right radical choice according to context, of course. Mil2im 'fighter'.

What's your name? My Name is Empress Augusta (Emperor Augustus, Augustine); call me Augusta derives from Arabic as follows:

i) What (how, who, why, where, when, which, whose) Jassem (2014b) traced the Arabic origins of "wh-questions" in English and Indo-European languages, in all of which only one question word is employed to which suffixes are added to ask about manner, person, time, place, cause, and so on. In (Old) English, for example, it is hwæ- 'how' from which came how, what (hwæ + t), when, and so on. German uses similar words like wie 'how', was 'what', wer 'who'. In Latin and Romance languages like French, que (quid, quis, quand) are used; in Sanskrit, kah; in Greek, ti(s). All these different forms descend directly from Arabic kai (kaifa) 'how', kaa 'how, what' and its variants via different phonetic routes: /k (& f)/ became (a) /h (& w)/ in English, (b) merged into /w/ in German, and (c) turned into /l/ in Greek. In Latin and Sanskrit, almost no change ensued. As to /l/ in what, it comes from Arabic dha 'this (m)' or ti 'this (f)', which became /d/ or /s/ in Latin, French, and Greek, for instance. Arabic dha often combines with question words as in man dha 'who (this), ma dha 'what (this)' (for detail, see Jassem 2012d).

ii) is (German is-, French es-, Latin/Greek esse-) Jassem (2012e) retraced the Arabic origins or cognates of "verb to be" in English and Indo-European languages, in all of which it derives directly from the Arabic root kaan 'to be; was' and/or its variants like yakoon, yakun, yaku 'is' where /k/ became /s/ in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit.
iii) **your** (German *Ihr*) Jassem (2012d) retraced the Arabic origins or cognates of personal pronouns in English and Indo-European languages, all of which descend directly from Arabic again. In the case of **you**, it came via Old and Middle English *ge* 'you', from Arabic *-ka* (*iaka*) 'you (acc.)' where /k/ turned into /g/ and later into /y/; the same happened in German. The morpheme /r/ derives from Arabic /n/, an adjectival suffix (Jassem 2013a & b). As to French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit pronouns, they derive from the nominative form of the same pronoun in Arabic: i.e., –*ta* (*anta*) 'you'.

As to **me** (*my, mine*), it comes from Arabic *ana* (spoken *ani* in my accent (Jassem 1987, 1993, 1994)) 'I' via /n/-mutation into /m/ or split into /m & n/.

iv) **Name** (*Surname*) via Old English *n(a/o)ma* 'name, reputation', German *Name*, Sanskrit *nama*, Latin *nomen*, Old Church Slavonic *ime*, Russian *imya*, from Arabic *ism*, *samma* (v) 'name' where /s/ became /n/ but merged into /m/ in Russian; or *ma3na* 'meaning' via reordering and /3/-loss (Jassem 2014f, 2013k), though less likely.

In German and French, other words may be used. In the former, **heissen** 'to name' comes directly from Arabic *ism* 'name', turning /' & m/ into /h & n/. In the latter, **appeller** 'to name' (*appellate, appellation*) obtains from Arabic *labba* 'respond, ask' via reordering and lexical shift, *abi al-* 'lit., father of the-, a very common title in Arabic' (*abil* for short, as in *abil qaasim* 'Father of Al-Qassim') via lexical shift, or from *laqab* 'surname' via reordering and turning /q/ into /t/.

v) **Call** (recall) via Old English *ceallian* 'to call, shout', Old Norse *kalla* 'to cry loudly', Old High German *kallon* 'to call', German *Klage* 'complaint, accusation', Old Church Slavonic *glagolu* 'word', Welsh *galw* 'call', Latin *gallus* 'cock', from Arabic *qaal*, *qawl* (n), *qul* (imp.), *qalqal* (repetitive) 'say, speak'. In light of this, Latin *gallus* does not belong here but comes from Arabic *2ajal(at)* 'cock-like bird', merging /2 & j/ into /g/.

In short, English *what is your name*, German *was ist ihr Name* (or *wie heissen Sie*), and French *quel est votre nom* (or *comment t'appelles tu*), come from Arabic *kaifa dha ismuk* (*kaidha yak ismak* (*ak ism*) verbatim) to which sound changes were effected, leading to the current European forms.

In statistical terms, all the above English and European names and related words have true Arabic cognates and/or origins: i.e., 100%. This means that they all came from the same language in origin.
4. Discussion

The results above show several things. First, they manifest that proper names, which are common linguistic terms recurring in more than one language and culture, have specific lexical and cultural meanings such as *Paul* and its Arabic parent cognate *bahili*, both meaning 'little, neglected' (see 3. above). Secondly and more importantly, though, they show that proper names in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit are closely and inextricably related genetically in both form (spelling and/or pronunciation) and meaning. Finally, they show, as a consequence, that names are translatable as cognates. More precisely, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit proper names can be translated into Arabic and vice versa by retracing and utilizing their cognates. Thus, names in all those language were found to be true and real cognates for having similar forms and meanings in light of their historical background or origin linguistically and culturally.

The above picture contrasts sharply with traditional and current translation theory and practice (e.g., Baker 2009; Baker and Saldanha 2008; Bassnett 2002; Kenny 2008; Munday 2006; Jassem 2009) in which names are simply transliterated: i.e., using a different script or alphabet to suit the target language at hand (see 1. above). In radical translation, cognates are traced, recovered, and employed in view of the premise that the languages at hand are genetically related to one another linguistically and culturally. Put more simply, the cognate-based translations use words that are identical or similar in form, meaning, and culture. For example, personal names like *Paul* and *Matthew* are better translated as cognates rather than transliterated (see 3. above).

On the other hand, the results support Jassem (2014e) in which radical translation was first mooted and advocated as opposed to equivalent translation for which examples and illustrations were drawn from five key areas, including religious terms, food terms, numeral and informatic terms, greeting terms, and names. For instance, in equivalence translation *pie* is rendered as *faTeera(t)* into Arabic while in radical (cognate-based) translation as *kubba(t)*, *kabaab* (pl.) because it came from Latin *pica* to which linguistic changes like reversal and */k/-deletion applied (see Jassem 2014a, 2014d). All words may be translated this way. There is an extremely and incredibly huge difference between the two renderings. In short, equivalence relates words through meanings as unrelated entities while radical translation relates them as cognates, sister words, or federal lexical entities through form and meaning.

In light of the above, the lexical root or radical linguistic theory approach has been found adequate for radically translating or relating names to each other as it captures and preserves their forms and meanings intact. This can only be accomplished by uncovering and unearthing the original (etymological or historical) meaning of the word root in the source language from which the translation is being made and matching it to its cognate or sister word in the target language into which the translation is rendered. Radical translation cannot work otherwise. It is a
branch of comparative historical linguistics or the application of which principles and procedures to translation studies, in other words.

As to the differences in forms and meanings amongst words in such languages, these are due to the variable operation of sound and semantic changes (see 2.2 and 3. above). Phonetic differences are the result of deletion, substitution, merger, split, and so on. Similarly, semantic differences are the consequence of divergence, convergence, shift, and variability. Convergence is particularly important, especially in words like George, Mark, William, which may have more than one possible Arabic source on the grounds of formal and semantic similarity between words (see 3. above). Needless to say, semantic stability exists in most words or names.

Now which is better for names and all other areas indeed: transliteration, equivalent (normal, traditional) translation, or radical translation? Jassem (2014e) handled the choice between equivalent and radical translations more fully, in which the latter was preferred, opted for, and favoured. Similarly, in the present case, the radical is definitely better because (a) it shows the genetic relationship between the relevant languages, (b) because it is closer to heart and mind, and (c) because it leads to cultural unity and fusion (melting pot) in the end, which is every translator’s ambition. For example, if one compares the transliteration of Paul ﺑﻮل, Matthew ﻣﺎﺛﯿﻮ, and White واﯾﺖ with their radicals baahili, mu3Ti, and waDaa2, the difference is marvelously stupendous, stunning, and incredible (see 3. above). Such names have been successfully shown to be equally Arabic names as well in origin this way, radically speaking.

But, then, why don’t we really and instantly recognize such names as Arabic ones? Or, more generally, why don’t we understand each other if these languages are considered dialects of the same language, someone might ask? For example, consider the conversation What’s your name? My name’s Augustine in 2. above, which is seemingly unintelligible to us although every single word and morpheme of which can be traced back into Arabic (see 3. above). Why? That is a very reasonable question, indeed, which was discussed at length in Jassem (2012a, 2013l, 2014b) to which the curious reader might refer. However, the main reason for that is the cyclicity of language change which means in every single case more than one linguistic change might have applied. Take Augustine, for instance, in which four linguistic changes applied: (a) reordering, (b) substitution, (c) deletion, (d) script modification and (e) advanced phonetic change of the type not found in adjacent Arabic dialects (see 3. above). In Paul also, many changes happened: viz., /bl became /pl/, /lh/ was deleted, /alu became /aul/, and /l/ darkened (see 3. above). On top of that, external factors had their impact too such as physical isolation (e.g., natural barriers like oceans, mountains), socio-cultural isolation (e.g., race, class, sex, culture), and racial bias (e.g., superiority, arrogance). How can one recognize a structure that has been knocked down or revamped completely? Only by piecing things together, which may be a tedious and time-consuming process, though interestingly. That is exactly what happened to the
above languages. Piecing things together leads to rebuilding, reconstructing them once again real and alive, as a united, though diverse, whole.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main findings of the paper can be summarized as follows:

(i) Proper (personal and place) names are better translated, rather than transliterated, as cognates in genetically related languages because they have similar or identical forms and meanings as well as cultural underpinnings.

(ii) The lexical root or radical linguistic theory has been found adequate for translating names by relating form and meaning as well as history and culture amongst words across languages. Therefore, transliteration should be abandoned in favour of the radical (cognate-based) approach.

(iii) Radical translation has advantages over other approaches such as equivalence because of uncovering language relationships and rendering the message closer to mind and heart, thus bringing seemingly diverse cultures and languages closer which serves to attain better cooperation, eliminate bias, arrogance, and dispel, annihilate or uproot evil for the common good of all.

(iv) To do a radical translation, a few easy steps need to be followed as has been stated in section 2.2 above.

As to recommendations, research is needed into:

(a) all areas of translation, especially translating religious (the Quran and Hadith besides the Bible), literary, medical, scientific, computational, engineering, and educational terms and texts radically. In particular, retranslating conventional literature may be required in light of such findings (Jassem 2013i);

(b) students and ordinary people's language attitudes to radical translation vis-à-vis normal translation; and

(c) the applicability of teaching translation and language radically.
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