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Abstract

This paper aims to show that U.S. President Donald Trump tweets in Arabic and speaks deviant Arabic and that English is as much an Arabic dialect as are European and Indo-European languages. More precisely, it shows that, by using a consonantal radical or lexical root theory perspective, his infamous and notorious utterances Facts are lies, CNN's fake news, You're rude are entirely Arabic word by word and morpheme by morpheme. The data consists of the above utterances, words, and their affixes like factual, factuality, de facto, feat and formally similar but semantically different others including fuck, fake, fig, fog, lie, lay, and so on. The results clearly manifest that Mr. Trump speaks Arabic deviantly because all such related words have true Arabic cognates, with the same or similar forms and meanings whose different forms, however, are all found to be due to natural and plausible causes and different courses of linguistic change. Furthermore, they prove the adequacy of the consonantal radical theory in relating Indo-European languages to Arabic as their origin all because, unlike any other language in the group, it not only shares true, natural, and plausible cognates with all of them but also resolves uncertain, controversial, and unknown word origins in English and the so-called Indo-European languages. Besides, Arabic has a huge linguistic repertoire phonetically, phonologically, morphologically, syntactically, and semantically.
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1. Introduction

Can authentic, real, natural, and living English be traced back fully into Arabic? For example, does U.S. President Donald Trump tweet and speak in Arabic, though deviant it may be? Although this question sounds a bit strange to almost all people, the answer is definitely yes. I have shown in my previous research over the last 7 or 8 years, during which over 60 papers have been published in this area which have firmly established the close genetic relationship between Arabic and the so-called Indo-European languages, covering all aspects of language...
analysis phonetically, morphologically, grammatically, and lexically or semantically (Jassem 2012-2018). The purpose of all those papers was mainly to reject traditional thinking and practice as well as long-held views in the field which classifies Arabic and Indo-European languages like English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and so on as members of different families (Bergs and Brinton 2012; Algeo 2010; Crystal 2010: 302; Campbell 2013; Yule 2006; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 61-94).

The above research is of three types: The first and earliest type focused on the Arabic origins of single words, including sounds, morphemes, and grammatical categories (e.g., verb to be, pronouns, wh-questions, prepositions) in English and Indo-European languages. In fact, almost all my research is of this nature (Jassem 2012-2018). To this can be added a few papers that traced the Arabic origins of personal pronouns in Chinese, Finnish and Basque (Jassem 2014h-i), demonstratives, plural markers, and negation in world languages (Jassem 2015j, 2016a, 2018e). The second type comprised concocting and tracing whole English sentences and phrases back into Arabic in full without losing much of their meaning, noting linguistic change in the process. Four papers are of this type (Jassem 2016e-f, 2017b, 2019a). The third attempt is to select naturally occurring speech uttered by famous and/or ordinary native English speakers and tracing it back into Arabic without losing much of its original and current form and meaning. The current paper is the first of such kind.

In addition, there are other papers in this vein also that applied the theory to language teaching (Jassem 2016g, 2019b) and translation (Jassem 2014d, 2015b, 2016i). Furthermore, there are two book reviews, one on historical linguistics and another on etymological dictionaries (Jassem 2016h, 2017a). To this can added another short paper on especially etymological myth and fallacy in the Oxford English Dictionary (OED) (Jassem 2017b).

Thus, unlike all its predecessors (Jassem 2012-2019a), this paper focuses on tracing the origins of entirely natural, authentic, living English utterances, sentences, and phrases or expressions said by well-known and influential figures, e.g., U.S. President Donald Trump, in the Western World back into Arabic. It also examines those words that are similar in form and meaning but have different spellings and pronunciations which are listed in separate entries in English and Indo-European lexicography and linguistics like fuck, fike as well as those that are formally similar but semantically different words like fact, fake, fuck, fig, fog. The ultimate aim of this work is to show that English and European language are Arabic dialects which have developed along different routes of linguistic change. Despite that, they can still be traced back to Arabic quite easily and intelligibly.

The current paper has four sections: introduction, research methods, results, and conclusion.

2. Research Methods

2.1 The Data
The data consists of a few famous U.S. President Donald Trump's tweets Facts are lies, CNN's fake news, and you're rude and their derivatives as well as formally similar but semantically different words and expressions. Their selection has been primarily based on (i) their wider coverage in the mass and social media, including TV and Radio, Twitter, Facebook, newspapers, magazines, and tabloids, (ii) high frequency in English dictionaries, and (iii) above all their association with the most powerful president, country, and culture on earth, thus representing authentic, natural, living English. In addition, the ease with which every single word and morpheme thereof can be easily and smoothly traced back to Arabic cognates with the same or similar forms and meanings as shall be seen in Section 3 below.

The etymological data for English and Indo-European languages is based on Harper (2002-19) and his sources. For Arabic, the meanings are taken from Ibn Manzoor (2018) in the main and related e-dictionaries like Albaheth Alarabi (2019), a collection of the top five classical dictionaries, and Almaany.com (2019), a collection of both classical and modern dictionaries, in addition to my own knowledge of Arabic as a native speaker. The Arabic cognates of the above English and Indo-European words are exclusively mine, though.

In transcribing the data, normal spelling is used for practical purposes. However, certain symbols were used for unique Arabic sounds, including /ʔ&/ 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 (t), D (d), Dh (dh) & S (s),/ and /ء/ for the glottal stop (Jassem 2013c). Long vowels are doubled, e.g., /aa, oo, & ee/.

2.2 Data Analysis

2.2.1 Theoretical Framework: Consonantal Radical Theory

The consonantal radical theory (Jassem 2018c-d, 2019a), a more precise version of the lexical root or radical linguistic theory (Jassem 2012a-14c, 2014f-2018b), has been used as a theoretical framework for data analysis. The name derives from the use of consonantal radicals (letters) or, more generally, lexical roots in examining genetic relationships between words such as the derivation of persuasion from persuade, from suade (or simply suad), observation from serve (or simply srv), description from scribe (or simply scrb), writing from write (or simply wrt). The main reason stems from the fact that the consonantal root carries and determines the basic meaning of the word regardless of its affixation such as observation. As to vowels, they are neglected because they show mainly phonetic and grammatical relationships and functions as in English sing (inf.), sang (past), sung (p.p.), song (n), and Arabic qaad (v) 'to say'، qul (imp.) قال، qeel/yuqaal (passive) قول/يرقال، qawl (n) 'saying' قول، 'aqwaal (pl.) 'sayings' أقوال، 'aqaweel (pl. pl.) 'sayings' أقوايل، etc.
A full exposition of the consonantal radical or lexical root theory and its procedures can be found in Jassem (2018b) which will be skipped over here to save time, effort, and space. However, the main procedures of analysis in relating, e.g., English and Arabic words to each other genetically can be summed up in five steps as follows.

(i) Select any word, starting with consonantal roots and overlooking vowels, e.g., *is/are; fact, factual, faction; lie, lay; fake, news*.

(ii) Identify the source, daughter, or sister language meaning (e.g., English, Latin) on the basis of especially word history or etymology. It is essential to start with word root meanings, not sounds 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 have changed beyond recognition while meanings in a rather limited way. The meaning first approach will often lead the analyst to the correct cognate naturally whereas the sounds first will lead them nowhere 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.

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

That is the whole story simply and briefly. Section 3 illustrates that step by step.

2.2.2 Statistical Analysis

The percentage formula is used for calculating the ratio of cognate words or shared vocabulary, which 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 is 100, of which 90 are true cognates. The percentage of cognates is calculated thus: \( \frac{90}{100} = 9 \times 100 = 90\% \). 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 and Discussion
The main focus of the results will be on the Arabic consonantal radicals or lexical roots of English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Indo-European words and affixes (prefixes, infixes, and suffixes); vowels will be generally overlooked whose main function is phonetico-grammatical rather than semantic as has been stated above.

We will take the utterances ones by one. As to the first sentence Facts are lies and their derivatives, all such words and their morphemes derive from true Arabic cognates or roots with the same or similar forms and meanings, as follows.

**Fact** is a very frequent English word with many derivatives like faction, factual, factuality, de facto, which came from Latin factum 'an occurrence, achievement, deed, an event; lit., thing done; in Medieval Latin, state, condition, circumstance', from factus, past participle of facere (v) 'to do', (French fait, Spanish hecho, Italian fatto), from PIE root *dhe- 'to set, to put', which is definitely wrong formally and semantically. Although the PIE root comes straight from Arabic Da3 (Dha3 in my dialect) وضع (بَنَعُ, imperative of wDa3 'to put') وضع (بَنَعُ) it is not accurate anyway. Instead, it derives ultimately from Arabic waaqi3at(t) 'a happening, an event, something that happens' واقعة, from waqa3 (v) 'to happen, to occur, to fall' وَقَعُ where /w, q, & 3/ evolved into /f, k, & Ø/ in that order.

Furthermore, in French fait and Italian fatto, /q/ further developed into /t/. However, the Spanish form hecho could not have developed from the same cognate which comes instead straight from Arabic 2aqq 'something true, something that happens; right, a right' حق in which /2 & q/ became /h & ch/. Thus, Arabic provides the right cognates for all.

As to the derivational suffix –t in fact, it comes actually from Arabic –t 'inflectional and derivational affix' as in waaqi3at(t) above (for details, see Jassem 2012f, 2013a). Likewise, the Latin infinitive suffix –re in facere, which varies with –en in Germanic and Greek languages, derives directly from Arabic –en 'inflectional and derivational affix', turning /n/ into /l/ (for details, see Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b, 2015d).

**Faction** came from Middle French faction and directly from Latin factionem (nom. factio) 'political party, class of persons; lit., a making or doing', from past participle of facere (v) 'to do', from PIE root *dhe- 'to set, to put' above. It obtains ultimately from a related Arabic waqa3-derivative like:

i) waqee3at(un)/waq3at(un) 'battle, war' وَقَعِيْة/وَقْعَة, from waqa3 (v) 'to happen, to occur, to fall' وَقَعُ and related derivative 'awqa3a (tr. v.) 'to cause rift and trouble' أوَقْعَأ via sense shift and the evolution of /w, q, & 3/ into /f, k, & Ø/;

ii) waqa3at(t) 'an Arab tribe' وَقَعَة, from waqa3 (v) 'to happen, to occur, to fall' وَقَعُ via sense shift and the replacement of /w, q, & 3/ by /f, k, & Ø/; or
iii) \( \text{f̣ahkan, f̣ahkan(ātun) 'a tribal division; thigh'} \)
\( \text{ف̣خشدة} \) in which /kh & dh/ became /k & t/, which is the least likely.

As to the derivational suffix \(-tion\), it is directly derived from Arabic \(-tun \ (-t + -n)\) 'inflectional and derivational affixes' as in \(\text{waaqi3atun}\) above (for details, see Jassem 2012f, 2013a).

**Factual** is the adjective from *fact*, where the adjetival suffix \(-al\) derives straight from Arabic *al- 'definite article' \( \text{ﺍﻟـ} \) via morphological shift in which it used as a suffix in English rather than as a prefix in Arabic, thus signaling morphological change in the process.

**De Facto** is from Latin, literally meaning 'in reality, in fact; thus existing but not necessarily legally or morally right', where \( \text{de} \) (adv., prep.) 'down/away from, off; fig. concerning, by reason of' is a possessive pronoun, from PIE demonstrative stem \(*de-\) 'this', which ultimately derives from Arabic *dhi* and its variants *du, dha* 'this; whose; demonstrative and possessive pronoun' \( \text{ﺫﻱ} \text{، ﺩﻭ} \) in which /dh/ passed into /d/. The entire phrase *de facto* thus comes from Arabic *dhi waqqatu* \( \text{ﺫﻱ} \text{ ﻭﺍﻗﻌﺔ} \), which is a true, identical cognate, noting the phonetic changes alluded to above.

**Are** is a very common English word, with at least two meanings as an auxiliary verb and as a noun of land measurement. It is the present tense plural indicative of *be* (i.e., you/they/we are), which has a long story which I handled in several places (e.g., Jassem 2012d). Anyway, historically speaking, *are* came from Old English *earum* (Mercian), *aron* (Northumbrian), from Proto-Germanic *er-*, probably a variant of PIE *es-* 'to be'. In my view, it is definitely a morphologically conditioned variant of *is*, the third person singular present tense indicative of *be* (i.e., he/she/it is), from Old English *is*, from Germanic stem *es-* (source of Gothic and German *ist*, Old Norse *es, er*), from PIE *es-ti- 'to be' (source of Sanskrit *asti*, Greek *esti*, Latin *est*), third person singular form of root of PIE *es-* 'to be'.

This being so, both the variants *es-/er- come directly from Arabic *yaku* 'he is' \( \text{يﻚ} \) from *yakun* 'he is', from *kaan (kawan)* \( \text{ﻙﺎﻥ، ﻜﻮﻥ} \) 'to be (inf.); (he) was' in which /k/ developed into /s/ in *es-/is and later split into /s & t/ in *is/are (*es-/er-), depending on number (sing./pl.), person (1\text{st}, 2\text{nd}, 3\text{rd}), and tense (present/past).

**Are** (*area, areal*) may be used as a metrical noun also, especially as a metric unit of square measurement of 10 metres on each side, coming from Latin *area* 'vacant piece of ground', which is of uncertain origin, though. In fact, it comes direct from Arabic *3araa* 'vacant land' عَرَاء via /3l/-loss.

**Lie** (*lied, lying*) has several meanings like 'to say an untruth; to be situated' and consequently different, albeit uncertain, etymologies. As a noun, it may mean 'an untruth, false deceptive statement', which comes from Old English *lyge, lige 'lie, falsehood*, from *legen (ligan,
leogan) (v) ‘speak falsely, tell an untruth for the purpose of deceiving’, from Proto-Germanic *lugiz (source of Dutch leugen, German Lüge), which is of uncertain etymology and not found in Latin, Greek, or Sanskrit. Instead, Arabic provides a direct, true cognate, as follows:

i) laqqa, laqq (n) ‘talk too much; to strike with the hand in particular; every narrow, oblong or high land (cf. loca, locate)’, laqqaaq (n) ‘the one who talks a lot’، لقاق، the one who talks a lot’ لقاق، and related laqlaq (qalqaal) ‘acute, turbulent voice or sound; tongue; the one who talks a lot’ لقاق/لاقال via /q/-mutation into /g (y)/ (see ii) below);

ii) qalqal ‘to sound, shout, cry; to talk a lot’ قلق via reversal, syllable merger and /q/-mutation into /g (y)/;

iii) laqa3 ‘to say but not to do; to talk a lot; to have an instant answer; to look at enviously, to envy (cf. look via /3/-loss)’ لق٣ and related luqa3a(t) (n./adj.) ‘a person with an instant answer’ لقاعة via /q & 3/-loss; and/or

iv) la3i, la3a (v) ‘to talk a lot, talk nonsense’ لع٣://لق٣/لعا‘via /3/-loss or mutation into /g/ earlier.

It can be clearly seen that, on formal and semantic grounds, three English words might have actually developed from some of these cognates (i, iii), which are lie, loca/local, and look. It is a clear case of lexical split. As to the other meaning of lie ‘to rest horizontally’, it came from Old English licgan ‘lie down, be situated, be at rest, remain’, from Proto-Germanic *legjan (source of Dutch liggen, German liegen), from PIE root *legh- ‘to lie down, lay’, direct from Arabic laqa2a ‘put down, place’ لق٢ا via /2/-loss and turning /q/ into /g (y)/.

What about related lay? Again, it has a true, Arabic cognate as shall be seen below.

Lay came from Old English lecgan/laggian ‘place on the ground, put down; have sex with’, from Proto-Germanic *lagojanan (source of Dutch leggen, German legen), from PIE root *legh- ‘to lie down, lay’, from Arabic:

i) la(q)a2a ‘to place in the ground; have sex with; fertilize’ لق٢ا, merging /q & 2/ into /g (y); or

ii) alqa ‘put, throw’ لق٢, turning /q/ into /g (y)/.

Thus, the different senses of lie/lay are the result of lexical merger of formally similar but semantically different Arabic words.

As to the plural suffix –s in lies, it has many inflectional and derivational functions in English and European languages, which is a plural marker in lies above. As it varies with /t/ in European languages like German and French, in turn it comes from Arabic /t/ ‘plural marker; inflectional and derivational marker’ (for details, see Jassem 2012f, 2013a, 2015d).
Now, we turn to the second set of fake news and formally similar but semantically different forms like fake, fuck (fike), feces (faeces), fig, fog. As can be seen, they are formally similar but semantically different from the root fac- (fact). Again all such words descended from true Arabic roots or cognates with the same or similar forms (f-k, f-q) and meanings, as follows.

**Fake (faker, fakement)** is formally similar to but semantically different from the root of fact (i.e., fac-, facere). It is of unknown origin, which has several meanings as noun and verb, including 'counterfeit; to rob; a swindle; a swindler’. Several likely sources are given such as feague 'to spruce up by artificial means', from German fegen 'polish, sweep; clear out, plunder' or from Latin facere 'to do'. All these sources are fictitious and wrong. Alternatively, Arabic resolves the error and uncertainty immediately and provides the correct, straight answer very simply and elegantly, which is 'ifk 'a lie, an untruth', affaak 'liar, swindler', from 'afika (v.) 'to lie, to swindle, to forge'. No fuss, no mess.

**Fuck (fucker, fucking, F. (eff))** is also formally similar to but semantically different from the root of fact (i.e., fac-, facere) and fake. As a sex taboo, it has had a controversially turbulent history and thus was excluded from major English dictionaries. It is of unknown origin, which has, nevertheless, been traced to pseudo-Latin fuccant 'fuck they = they fuck', or Scottish, from Norwegian fukka 'to copulate', or Swedish focka 'to copulate, strike, push' and focka 'penis', or from Middle English fike, fyke 'to move restlessly, fidget; daily, flirt', probably from Middle Dutch fokken, German ficken 'fuck; make quick movements to and fro; flick; itch, scratch'.

Again, Arabic resolves the uncertainty and controversy immediately and provides the correct, straight answer very smartly in several likely cognates, all formally and semantically the same or similar to the root fac- (fact), and as follows.

i) **wiqaa3, wa(a)qa3 (v) 'sexual intercourse'**  وقٌع، وقَع via /w & q/-mutation into /f & k/ and /3/-loss (which is from the same Arabic root for fact above);

ii) **faja'a 'to have sex'**  فَجَا, turning /j/ into /k/;

iii) **fakh, fakhfakh 'to have a long fuck’**  فَخْنِح via syllable merger and turning /kh/ into /k/;

iv) **fakhat 'deflower, rip'**  فَخْت, merging /kh & t/ into /k/;

v) **fooq 'a woman's vagina'**  فوق via sense shift and turning /q/ into /k/;

vi) **hack/haqq 'intercourse'**  هَق, هَق where /h/ became /f/; or

vii) **baak 'donkey mating’**  بآك, turning /b/ into /f/.

Although any of the above words can be a potential cognate, the first may be the most likely on formal and semantic grounds. None of these words are sex taboos in Arabic, moreover.
**Fike** *(fuck)* is related to or is a variant of *fuck*, from Middle English *fyken* 'to move about restlessly', from Old Norse *fikjask* 'to desire eagerly', *fika* 'climb up nimbly', probably from Middle Dutch *fokken*, German *ficken* 'fuck; make quick movements to and fro, move about briskly; flick;itch, scratch; give trouble, have sex'. Again, it has the same Arabic cognate as in *fuck* above. In addition, it might derive from Arabic *fahaq* 'of one's back, to move, bend, lean back' *فهق* via /h/-loss, passing /q/ into /k/, and sense shift.

It's worth noting that all love, sexual, and marital words such as *sex, love, nookie, copulation, marry, bigamy*, etc. in English and Indo-European languages have been traced back into Arabic (Jassem 2013q).

**Feces** *(faeces, fecal, defecate, defecation)* is formally similar to but semantically different from the root of *fact* (i.e., *fac-, facere*), which arose from Latin *faeces* (pl. of *faex*) 'dregs, grounds, sediment, wine-lees; later human excrement in English', which is of unknown origin. Again, it comes directly from Arabic:

i)  *fu'aaq* 'stomach wind' *فوق* via sense shift and passing /q/ into /k/;

ii)  *fusa* 'body wind' *فساء* via sense shift;

iii)  *faSS* 'body sounding wind; essence and reality of everything; of wine, what's visible of it' *فس* in which /S/ became /s (k)/; or

iv)  *fasees, fasfaas* 'extremely stupid; malodorous plant' *فسيس/فساس, fusus* (pl.) 'physically feeble people' *فس* via sense shift (cf. Latin *faex populi* 'dregs of the people, the lowest class of society').

**Fog** *(foggy)* is formally similar to but semantically different from the root of *fact* (i.e., *fac-, facere*) and *fake, fuck*, which has two meanings, including 'cloud' and 'long grass'. Although it is of unknown, ultimate origin, it came from a Scandinavian source like Danish *fog* 'spray, shower, snowdrift', Old Norse *fjuok* 'drifting snow storm', (cf. Old English *fuht*, German *Feucht* 'damp, moist'). Again, Arabic removes the uncertainty and hesitancy immediately and provides the correct, straight answer very smoothly, which may be one of the following:

i)  *fuwaaq, 'afaaweeq* (pl.) 'often rainy cloud' *فوق, أفاريق*, passing /q/ into /g/;

ii)  *waq3,waqa3* (v) 'thin (rainy) cloud' *وقع*, mutating /w, q, & 3/ into /f, g, & Ø/, which is the same Arabic root of *fact* above;

iii)  *quff* (v) 'a mountain-like barrier of cloud' *قف* via reversal and replacing /q/ by /g/; or

iv)  *ghaith* 'rain' *غيث* via reversal, lexical shift, and changing /gh & th/ to /g & f/, which is the least likely.
The meaning 'long grass, second growth of grass after mowing' is probably of a Scandinavian origin like Norwegian fogg 'long grass in a moist hollow', Icelandic fuki 'rotten sea grass', probably from PIE root *pu- 'to rot, decay', which is certainly untrue. Instead, it comes from Arabic:

i) quffa(t) 'an old, rotten tree or plant' قفة via reversal and passing /q/ into /g/; or

ii) faakiha(t) 'a beautiful date or palm tree; any fruit' فاكهة via sense shift and mutating /k & h/ into /g & Ø/.

Fig (figgy) has several senses: 'fig; dress; vulva', which developed from Old English fic, from Old French figue, from Vulgar Latin fica, from Latin ficus 'fig tree, fig', (Greek sykon. Armenian t'uz), probably from a common Mediterranean source like Phoenician pagh 'half-ripe fig'. Similarly, it obtains directly from Arabic:

i) baghwa(t) 'any unripe fruit; an unripe date; every plant with small green unripe fruit' بغوة via lexical shift and passing /b & gh/ into /f & g/, which is the source of Phoenician pagh;

ii) faaq 'a kind of tree with broad leaves for oil' فاق via lexical shift and passing /q/ into /g/, which is the likeliest; or

ii) faakiha(t) 'any fruit; beautiful palm tree' فاكهة via lexical shift and merging /k & h/ into /g/.

The sexually insulting Shakespearean sense A fig for... is similar to Greek and Italian (fico) use of the word for 'vulva' because of how a ripe fig looks when split open, which again comes directly from Arabic fooq 'a woman's vagina' فوق where /q/ became /g/ (see fuck above). Thus, all these English and European words are the result of the lexical split or merger of different Arabic words which are formally similar but semantically different.

As can be clearly seen, Greek sykon and Armenian t'uz can't be cognates to Latin fica and English fig at all; they are different words. In my view, t'uz is cognate to Arabic teen 'fig' تين, turning /n/ into /l/. The Greek item sykon is probably from Arabic zaitoon 'olive' زيتون via lexical shift and turning /l/ into /kl/.

News (fake news, new, novel, novelty) is the plural of new (adj.) 'new thing', which evolved from French novelles, from Medieval Latin nova, novae (pl.) 'news, star; lit., new things', from novellus, dim. of novus 'new, young', ultimately from Arabic:

i) naw' 'star; star rise or setting' نوء via sense shift and turning /l/ into /s/, which is the likeliest as it matches Latin nova/novae 'star';

ii) nai' 'raw, fresh, uncooked' نيء via lexical shift;
iii) *naba* 'news, story' نبأ, *nab'a*(t) 'low hidden sound' نبأة via sense shift and passing /b & ' (t)/ into /w & s/, which is the second likeliest; or

iv) *3an* (adj., v., prep.) 'new; to give a title to a book; of ideas, to occur to one's mind; about, on'  عن via reversal and turning /3/ into /w/;

*What about formally similar noise? It comes from Arabic:*

i) *na3waS* 'to shout, cry in a low voice' نعوـس via sense shift, /3/-loss, and passing /S/ into /s/,

ii) *naweeS* 'crying' نوـيـس via sense shift and turning /S/ into /s/; or

iii) *nasheej* 'painful sounding' نـشـيـج via sense shift and /sh & j/-merger into /s/.

Now, let's turn to President Trump's *You're rude*, an utterance he leveled at CNN's White House correspondent, all of which is Arabic as follows.

**You** *(your, yours)* is an extremely common Modern English pronoun, which developed from Old and Middle English *ge*, directly from Arabic *iyak* (also –ka) 'you (acc.)' إياك in which /k/ became /g/ and later /y/. It is worth mentioning that all English and Indo-European pronouns have been traced back into Arabic roots (for details, see Jassem 2012c).

**Are** has already been settled, both as verb and noun.

**Rude** *(rudely, rudiment)* said this word in responding at a press conference to CNN's White House correspondent, which developed from Old French *ruide*, or directly from Latin *rudis* 'rough, crude, unlearned', a word of uncertain etymology, related to *rudus* 'rubble', which is not true. Instead, it comes directly from Arabic *radee* 'bad, lowly, ill-mannered' رديء، ردّي which can't be any nicer and tidier.

What about formally similar but semantically different *road/route*? Again, both come directly from Arabic *rawd* 'road' رود in which /d/ became /t/ in the latter. This exhibits a clear case of lexical split.

Finally, we come to *tweet*, *twitter*, and *notorious* and their Arabic cognates as well as the American President Donald Trump himself.

**Tweet** *(tweeter, twitter)* is 'imitative of the sound made by a small bird' and thus has no etymology. In fact, it comes straight from Arabic:

i) *TaaT* (v), *TooT/TeeT* (TaweeT in my accent) (n./adj.) 'of male camels, to sound when on heat; sound of metals, car horns, saddles, doors; of humans, stupid; tall' طاط، طـط طوطيط and/or related derivatives:
ii) ‘aTeeT (n), from ‘aTTa (v) ‘sound of camels; sound of one's belly in hunger or fear; a kind of bird’ أطيب، أطيب, and ‘aTTaaT (n./adj.) ‘the one who cries, shouts, screams, calls’ أطيط أطيط via lexical shift and turning /T/ into /t/.

**Twitter** *(atwitter)* is related to *tweet*, which, nevertheless, developed from Middle English twiteren 'in reference to birds, of imitative origin'; in Scottish English, it also means 'that part of a thread spun too small; later transferred to a slender, feeble person', which is of obscure origin (cf. Old High German zwizziron, German zwitschern, Danish kvidre, Old Swedish kviter). In fact, it descends directly from Arabic:

i) *TooT* 'cotton; snake; tall' طوط via lexical shift and passing /T/ into /t/;

ii) *TeeT* 'small; bat; hawk; animose; brave; stupid' طيط via lexical shift and passing /T/ into /t/;

iii) *watar* 'of arrows, musical instruments, and body organs, string, thread' وتر via reordering and doubling or copying /t/, which led to its Scottish English usage;

iv) *turr* '(building measurement) string, thread' تر and related derivatives tartar 'to talk a lot; stammer' تتر, and taar (adj.) 'tall, fat, full-up' تار via doubling or copying /t/, leading to its Scottish English usage; or

v) *TarToor* 'tall and slender; a weak rascal' طرطور and related *Turra(t)* 'side of dress' طرة via reordering and turning /T/ into /t/.

Thus, the Arabic cognates account for the entire, different senses of *tweet/twitter* in English and Scottish English, which is likely to be a merger of more than one like Arabic cognate.

**Notorious** *(notoriety)* underwent semantic shift from positive to negative connotations in the 17\(^{th}\) century, which developed from Medieval Latin notorius 'well-known, commonly known', from Latin notus 'known', past participle of noscere 'come to know', from PIE root *gno-* 'to know', directly from Arabic:

i) *'aiqan, yaqeen* (n) 'to know' أيقن, يقين via lexical shift and passing /q/ into /g (t)/; or

ii) *naDhar* 'to see; to ascertain' نظر via lexical shift and passing /Dh/ into /t/, which is the likeliest.

As to the adjectival suffix –ous in *notrious*, it arose from Arabic –at 'an inflectional and derivational affix' via morphological shift and passing /t/ into /s/ (Jassem 2013a).

**President** *(preside, presidency)* via Old French, from Latin praesidentum (nom. praesidens) 'president, governor', praesidere (v) 'act as head or chief', from (i) prae 'before', from Arabic baraa' 'first', barra' 'outside', or qabl 'before' قبل via reordering and merging /q & l/ into /r/ (Jassem 2014c), and (ii) sedere 'sit', from Arabic sada2 'sit, lie' مسح via /2/-
loss, jatha ‘sit’ or qa’ad ‘sit’ قعد by turning /j (q) & th/ into /s & d/; saiyed ‘lord, master’ سيد, saad (v) ‘to prevail, dominate’ ساعد or saaa’id ‘head, president’ ساعد via /3/-loss. That is, saiyed baar → baar saiyed → president.

(It has to be noted that all address terms and titles like English sir (Mr.), German Herr, French and Spanish Senior(a), Signeur, etc., have true Arabic cognates (Jassem (2015c)).)

**Donald** is originally a 13th century Scottish surname, meaning ‘world ruler’. Historically speaking, it arose from Dofnald, Dufenald, from Gaelic Domhnall (pronounced Downall), from Proto-Gaelic *Dubno-valos ‘world-mighty, ruler of the world’, from *walos ‘ruler’, (from PIE root *wal- ‘to be strong’), + domun ‘world’, from PIE root *dheub- ‘deep, hollow’, via sense development from ‘bottom’ to ‘foundation’ to ‘earth’ to ‘world’, which is very, very implausible, indeed. Instead, both parts come from Arabic nicely and smoothly where the first part don- came from Arabic dunia/doon ‘world/down’ in which /n/ split into /f & n/ or /m & n/ in the old languages whereas the second part stemmed from Arabic wali ‘ruler; ally’, thus both meaning ‘world ruler’ or dunia wali = wali dunia.

**Trump** (trumpet) has several senses and is used as noun and verb. The earliest usage is traced to Middle French trompe ‘long, tube-like musical wind instrument’, cognate with Provencal and Italian tromba, all probably from a Germanic source like Old High German trumpa, Old Norse trumba ‘trumpet’, of imitative origin, which is inaccurate, anyway. Instead, it comes straight from Arabic Tabl(at), from Tabal (v) ‘a drum; a beating; to beat, to drum’ طبل, طبالة in which /T/ passed into /t/ while /b/ split into /b & m/.

It may also mean ‘surpass, beat; to cheat, deceive’, which then comes from Arabic Darab ‘to beat; of witches, to tell one’s fortune by beating stones’ ضرب or Tarab ‘to sing’ طرب, muTrib (n.) where /D (T)/ became /t/ while /b/ split into /b & m/.

**America** is the geographical name of the land, which came from Latin Americanus, after Amerigo Vespucci (1454-1512) who claimed to have discovered it, whose first name comes from Gothic Amalrich ‘work-ruler’ (Old English Emmerich, Emery, Italian Amelia) as a compound of (i) amal ‘work’, direct from Arabic 3amal ‘work’ عمل via /3/-loss and (ii) rich ‘ruler’, straight from Arabic ra’ees ‘head, ruler, president’ رئيس via /s/-mutation into /ch (sh)/. However, according to Dr. Abdullatif Baltayeb in an Arabic educational debate entitled Safa2aat min taareekh al2aDaarat al3arabiat walilismati ‘Pages from the History of Arabic and Islamic Civilization’ hosted by Dr. N. Al-Janaby and aired on Al-Mustaqilla TV in September 2009, it comes from Arabic maariq ‘far’, remote; penetrating, coming out’, which is the second element of the geographical name of the continent on the map drawn by Al-Shareef Al-Idreesee, the top Arabic cartographer of the time, in his book Nuzhat Almushtaq which he presented to King Roger II of Italy (1095-1154). More
precisely, America was called al-arD al-mariqa 'the Far Land' where the word mariqa مارقة means 'far'. Hence the name America. Furthermore, according to the same TV source above, the Arabs arrived in America 400 years before Columbus, who admitted that himself (Jassem 2014f).

In summary, all the three authentic, living English utterances of the U.S. President Trump and their words and morphemes as well as formally similar but semantically different words have true Arabic cognates (100%).

4. Conclusion

To recapitulate, the main findings of this paper were as follows:

a) The entire English utterances Facts are lies, you're rude, and fake news as well as their formally similar but semantically different words like fuck, fig, fog, etc. are Arabic in origin, which shows that the U.S. President speaks and tweets in deviant Arabic. Natural and plausible causes and different routes of language change are responsible for the apparent differences and deviances in each language.

b) The findings lend further support to the adequacy of the consonantal radical theory in relating authentic, living, and natural English and Indo-European speech-words, roots, and affixes, to Arabic from which they arose in the end for sharing cognates with them all.

c) English Historical lexicography and linguistics abound with severe etymologically aberrances, blunders, errors, and drawbacks for failing to show the phonetic, morphological, and semantic relationships amongst such words like fact, fake, fuck, feces, fig, fog, etc. and their Arabic origins or cognates. A few points may be noted here:

i) The different forms of the above words may be due to 'bad' writing habits of early poorly or lowly educated scribes, typists, and printers (Campbell 2013; Pyles and Algeo 1993), linguistic variation and change, and/or lexical conditioning.

ii) Postulating Proto-Indo-European and Proto-Germanic roots is not only mythical and fictitious but is also ridden with severe problems of various kinds because there are (a) words without origins, whether PIE or Proto-Germanic, like tweet, twitter, (b) words with wrong origins such as fact, from PIE *dhe 'to set, to put', and (c) others with uncertain or unknown origins such as fake, fuck (fike), faeces, fog, fig, lie, rude; only Arabic can provide really living and true cognates for all words in those languages nicely, tidily, and adequately.
iii) The multiple meanings (polysemy) of English words besides the uncertainty of their origin such as fig ‘a fruit; vagina/vulva’ is most likely the result of the lexical merger of two or more Arabic cognates which are similar in both form and meaning like faaq ‘a kind of tree’ and fu’aq ‘vagina’ where /q/ became /g/ besides sense shift (see above). Similarly, the different senses of lie, fog, faeces, tweet, twitter are other cases in point.

iv) The formally similar but semantically different words like fake, fuck, fike, fecal (feces), fig, fog, etc. and their derivatives resulted from lexical split, which all came from one Arabic cognate (i.e., faaq) and its derivatives, which varied from language to language due to linguistic change of different types. By the same token, lie, loca, and look might have all split from Arabic laqa3/laqq (see above).

v) The close genetic relationship between Arabic, English and the so-called Indo-European languages cannot be accounted for adequately by other means such as linguistic borrowing, chance/accidence, pidginization/creolization, and/or erroneous analysis because every word and morpheme can be traced back to Arabic tidily and smartly. The relationship is so close to such an extent that English can be really considered a deviant Arabic dialect just like all other Indo-European languages, as has been shown in the above genetic analysis of President Trump's speech besides Jassem's (2012-2019) research in this area.
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