ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

Towards a Radical Translation Theory for Names: A Comparative Historical Linguistics Approach

Zaidan Ali Jassem
Department of English Language and Translation,
Qassim University, KSA

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 بول, which is simply written

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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), wining 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، كباب 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 yieldss احمدوا الرب 'praise the Lord'; in radical translation it produces and/or derives from Arabic *Allaha la ilaaha illah (la ilaaha illa Allah)* لا إله إلا الله 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**.**

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

is because the consonantal root carries and determines the basic meaning of the word irrespective of its affixation and vowels such as *ob*serv*ation* *(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, *all* language words, affixes, and phonemes are amenable to investigation, and *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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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* → *plain*), (ii) using primarily consonantal roots or radicals (e.g., *plain* → *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 ↔ labio-dental ↔ dental ↔ alveolar ↔ palatal ↔ velar ↔ uvular ↔ pharyngeal ↔ glottal (where ↔ signals change in both directions); at the level of manner, stops ↔ fricatives ↔ affricates ↔ nasals ↔ laterals ↔ approximants; and at the level of voice, voiced consonants ↔ 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 /u:/ respectively). They may change according to modifications in (i) tongue part (e.g., front ↔ centre ↔ back), (ii) tongue height (e.g., high ↔ mid ↔ low), (iii) length (e.g., long ↔ short), and (iv) lip shape (e.g., round ↔ unround). In fact, the vowels can be, more or less, treated like consonants where /i:/ is a kind of /j (y)/, /u:/ a kind of /w/, and /a:/ 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).

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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' القدوس 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)' عبد القدوس (cf. Khushaim 2002: 19-23.). It is worth noting that **Ghost** (Old

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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* حسن، 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, Charlotte, Carl, Carla, Karl)* via Latin *Carolus* 'man, husband' from Arabic *rajul, rijjaal* 'man, husband' 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 /r/-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' ضوء/ضياء, *iDa'at* (n) 'lighting' اضاءة, *muDee'* (adj.) مضيء, *Dau'i* (adj.) 'lighted, giving light' ضوئي, *aDaa'* (v) 'to light' أضاء; /D/ turned into /d (z, th)/ while /'/ into /s (Ø)/. Thus *Diaa'/Dau'* ضياء/ضوء 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' دكيناء/دكنى; *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 /n/; *dajn, dijaan/dujoon* (pl.) 'heavy fog, rain, or darkness' دجن، دجان/دجون, *dajnat* 'worst blackness' دجنة, *dajaani/dujaana(t)* 'a proper name' دجاني، دجانة where /j/ became /k/; *deek* 'rooster; a proper family name' ديك via /n/-insertion (cf. **duck** via lexical shift); or *dajaaj, dajan* (pl.)

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

'chickens, fowl; domestic animals like camels and sheep; a proper family name' دجاجة، دجن, 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، دويك or *jaaja(t), jwejaati* 'hen, hen-owner' *جاجة، جويجاتي*.

Elizabeth via Latin *Elisabeth*, Greek *Eleisabet(h)* 'God's an oath' as a compound of (i) *Eli* 'God' from Arabic *eel/ilaah* 'god' إيل/إله 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' سبتة; or *sabba(t)* 'swearing, choice, sheltering, veil, thin clothes, time, intimacy, life'. So *sabta(t)* سبتة (الله؟) 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 *imperiator(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 /g/.

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 /q/-mutation into /g/ (Jassem 2013f) and (ii) *ergon* 'work' from Arabic *2arak (*also *3arak, 3araq)* 'move, work, sweat' حرك via /2/-loss and turning /k/ into /g/; 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) *jaraj* 'stony earth; mid-way' جرج, *jarij* 'worried wanderer' جرج. So *zur3a(t), zurai3* زرعة، زريع 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.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

Now compare **God bless you** 'lit., Saleeb jaddi 3alaik' صليب الجد عليك with Arabic *ismallah (3alaik)* 'lit., God's name on you' اسم 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' الله 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*) إلـه, (b) *illa* 'except' (*illa* → *ia*) إلا, and (c) *h(u)/iah* 'him' (*iah/h(u)* → *h (Ø)*) ((و)هـ)/إياه. Diagrammatically, this looks like:

↕ Halle	↕ -lu	↕ -jah		
Allah	*la*	*ilaaha*	*illa*	*h(u)/(iah)*
God	'no, not'	god	except	him
الله	لا	إله	إلا	(إياه) /هـ(ـو)
Allah la ilaaha illa h(u)/iah				
'God no god but him = There's no god but Allah (God)'				
الله لا إله إلا إياه؛ الله لا إله إلاهـ(ـو) = (لا إله إلا الله)				

* ↔ 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 إله إلاهـ(ـو), which is more frequently spoken *la ilaha illa Allah* 'no god but God (Allah) = There's no god but Allah' لا إلـه إلاالله, 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 /3 & j/-mutation into /h & g/; and (ii) 'hail', which may then derive from either Arabic *2aalool* 'hail; frozen snow balls' in which /2/ 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 *gast* 'life, breath, appearance, angel, demon', German *Geist*, (and Latin *August, Augustan, Augustus* 'sacred, holy' (see 3.3 below)) from

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

Arabic *qudus* 'sacred, holy' قدس via reordering and turning /q & d/ into /g & t/. Radically, *alqudus alSaali2* القدس الصالح is 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' سادن، سدن, *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'; /n/ became /m/. Radically, *sadan Saali2* السادن الصالح 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' عقب, *3iqaab* 'follower, hawk, a proper name' □عقا via /3 & b/-loss. Otherwise, it comes from Arabic *ja2sh* 'chief; donkey, a male's proper name' (زينب بنت جحش مثلا) جحش 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' عقب, *3iqaab/3aqeeb* 'follower, hawk, proper name' □عقا, *ya3qub* 'to follow' يعقب 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 *jum3a(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* (pronounced *Alloh* in some accents) 'God' (ﷻ) 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' وضح، واضح، وضاح 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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

proper name' حنين، حنون، حنان 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' يا and (ii) *Pater* 'father' from Arabic *abat(aah)* 'father' (أبتـ(ـاه via /r/-insertion, leading to *ya abat(aah)* 'father' يا أبتاه. 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' قمقام via reordering and turning /q & m/ into /k & n/; *qinaan* 'an ancient king who used to take all ships by force; leader' قنان via /q/-mutation and copying into /k & g/; *qinqin* 'an underground water expert' قنقن via lexical shift, reordering, and turning /q & q/ into /k & g/. So *qamqaam* قمقام would be the right radical choice perhaps, though obsolete.

Margaret via Latin *Margarita*, Greek *Margarites* 'pearl' from Arabic *marjaan(at)* 'pearl; a proper name' رجانة□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' رج□ or related derivative *maarij* 'smokeless fire' ج□ا□where /j/ became /k/; *mar(r)eekh* 'fool; long arrow; a star' ريخ□, *markh* 'light-inducing tree; fire' رخ□, *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/ ا□ح; or *mar3ee/mar3a* 'pasture, meadow; a proper name' رعي□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' عطي□, *a3Ta/anTa* (v) via reordering and /3/-mutation into /w/ or loss and (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 /y/, 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;

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

curse; a KSA tribe's proper name' (الباهلي) باهل 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 *batra/batar* 'soft, loose land; white-stoned earth' (ء)بتر, *battaar/baatir* 'cutter, stoner, sword' بتا; *turaab* 'earth, dust' راب via reordering and lexical shift; or *balaaT* 'rock; a proper name' بلاط via reordering and turning /T & l/ into /t & r/; any word would be fine radically, especially the second, which is a nickname (*abu turaab*) for Caliph Ali, may Allah be pleased with him.

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' قينة، قين, 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)' شاكي or *shaa2* 'shake, spin, move to and fro' شاح where /2/ became /k/ and (ii) *spear* from Arabic *sibaal* 'arrows' سبال where /l/ turned into /r/ or *shibaari* 'hand-size knives', changing /sh/ into /s/. So *shaaki sibaal* 'wearing spears' (أبو شاكي السبال سبال/شبا□ي؟) 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' طعمة via /3/-loss and changing /T/ into /th/, *thoom* 'garlic; a proper name' ثوم; *taim* 'enslaved lover; a proper name' يم□ 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)* حلاوة '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.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

Waters *(Waterman)* via German *wasser* 'water' from Arabic *wird* '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)' (لهو) ولهان ،وله via /h/-loss or *2ilm* 'dream, wish' لم where /2/ became /w/ while /m & l/ merged and (ii) *helm* 'helmet' from Arabic *la'ma(t)* 'battle head gear' لأمة via reordering and turning /'/ into /h/ or *3ammat (3amaamat)* 'helmet, head gear' عمامة where /3 & m/ changed into /h & l/; otherwise, it derives, as a whole, from Arabic (i) *2aleem* 'meek, tolerant, wishing, dreaming' ليم where /2/ became /w/ or (ii) *wailummih* 'lit., woe to his mother; a vicious boy, villain; troublemaker; a nickname' ويلمه 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, who, 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 /t/ in Greek. In Latin and Sanskrit, almost no change ensued. As to /t/ 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.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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.

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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.) كباب، كبة 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 is 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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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* ماثيو, and *White* وايت 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., /b/ became /p/, /h/ was deleted, /a/ became /au/, 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

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

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.

Acknowledgements

Sincere thanks are extended to everyone who contributed to this research in any way worldwide. I wish to particularly thank Prof. Dr. Mujab Imam, Forum for Arab and International Relations, Qatar for an earlier invitation to participate in International Conference on Translation and the

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

Problematics of Cross-Cultural Understanding, held by the Forum for Arab and International Relations, Doha, Qatar 26-27 February 2014, in which the notion of radical translation was first mooted. Thanks are also due to Dr. Khairi Al-Zubaidi, Arab Society of English Language Studies, and Dr. Mohamed Behaddou, Vice-Director of the King Fahd School of Translation, Abdel Malek Essaadi University, Tangier, Morocco, for accepting an earlier version of the abstract for presentation at ASELS International Conference 2014, which was cancelled, unfortunately. I would like to thank Dr. Adullah Alfawzan, Head of the Department of English Language and Translation, Prof. Dr. Ali Alsaood, Dean of the College of Arabic Language and Social Studies, for their support to participate in the Conference. Finally, I would also like to thank all colleagues and students, especially Prof. Mamadou Salif Diallo, for his comments and feedback. For my supportive and inspiring wife, Amandy M. Ibrahim, I remain indebted as ever.

References

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

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

Berlin, Brent and Kaye, Paul. (1969). *Basic color terms*: *Their universality and evolution*. University of California Press.

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

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

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

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

Harper, Douglas. (2014). *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved http://www.etymonline.com (June 20, 2014).

Ibn Manzoor, Abi Alfadl Almisri. (2013). *Lisan al3arab*. Beirut: Dar Sadir. Retrieved http://www.lisan.com (August 8, 2014).

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

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1987). *Phonological variation and change in immigrant speech: A sociolinguistic study of a 1967 Arab-Israeli war immigrant speech community in Damascus, Syria*. PhD Thesis, Durham University, UK. Retrieved http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1682/1/1682.pdf (August 8, 2014).

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

_____. (1993). *Dirasa fi 3ilmi allugha al-ijtima3i: Bahth lughawi Sauti ijtima3i fi allahajat al3arabia alshamia muqaranatan ma3a alingleeziyya wa ghairiha*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara. Retrieved http://www.academia.edu (June 12, 2014).

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

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

_____. (2012a). The Arabic origins of numeral words in English and European languages. *International Journal of Linguistics 4 (3)*, 225-41. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.1276 (August 1, 2014).

_____. (2012b). The Arabic origins of common religious terms in English: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature 1 (6)*, 59-71. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.59 (August 2, 2014).

_____. (2012c). The Arabic origins of English pronouns: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Linguistics 4 (4)*, 83-103. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.227 (July 31, 2014).

_____. (2012d). The Arabic origins of determiners in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 12 (11)*, 323-359. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 6, 2014).

_____. (2012e). The Arabic Origins of Verb "To Be" in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature 1 (7)*, 185-196. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.185 (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2012f). The Arabic origins of number and gender markers in English, German, French, and Latin: a lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 12 (12)*, 89-119. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 2, 2014).

_____. (2013a). The Arabic origins of derivational morphemes in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (1)*, 48-72. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2013b). The Arabic origins of negative particles in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (1)*, 234-48. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013c). The English, German, and French cognates of Arabic back consonants: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (2)*: 108-128. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (August 7, 2014).

_____. (2013d). The Arabic origins of "water and sea" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (2)*: 126-151. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 8, 2014).

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

_____. (2013e). The Arabic origins of "air and fire" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (3)*: 631-651. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013f). The Arabic origins of "celestial and terrestrial" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (2)*: 323-345. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013g). The Arabic origins of "animal" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (4)*: 68-106. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2013h). The Arabic origins of "body part" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Current Applied Linguistics and English Literature (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.bretj.com (August 6, 2014).

_____. (2013i). The Arabic origins of "speech and writing" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (5)*: 108-159. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2013j). The Arabic origins of "time words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (6)*: 274-97. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013k). The Arabic origins of "family words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (3)*: 261-77. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013l). al'uSool al3arabiat lilDamaa'ir alshakSiat fi alingleeziat, walfiransiat, walalmaniat (The Arabic origins of "personal pronouns" in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach (In Arabic). *Almu'tamar aldawli althamin, tajdeed alkhiTaab al3arabi, jaami3at imam bonjul, Indonesia 28-31 August 2013* (8th International Conference of Arabic Speech Renewal, Imam Bonjul University, Indonesia, 28-31 August 2013). Retrieved URL: http://www.academia.edu (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013m). The Arabic origins of "cutting and breaking words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (2)*: 155-68. Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013n). The Arabic origins of "movement and action words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (3):* 187-202. Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013o). The Arabic origins of "perceptual and sensual words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (4): 212-24.* Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2013p). The Arabic origins of "cognitive and mental words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (4)*: 65-83. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (August 8, 2014).

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

_____. (2013q). The Arabic origins of "love and sexual words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 1 (4)*: 97-114. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2014a). The Arabic origins of "wining and dining words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 1 (4)*: 146-74. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2014b). The Arabic origins of "question and auxiliary words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2014c). The Arabic origins of "prepositions and conjunctions" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.jsel.org (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2014d). Translating cultural universals radically: A lexical root theory approach for translating English, French, and German cultural terms into Arabic. Paper presented at *International Conference on Translation and the Problematics of Cross-Cultural Understanding, the Forum for Arab and International Relations*, Doha, Qatar 26-27 February 2014.

_____. (2014e). The Arabic origins of "divine and theological terms" in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 14 (3)*: 155-195. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2014f). The Arabic origins of "proper names" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of ELT and Poetry 2 (2)*: 201-22. Retrieved URL: http://www.journalofelt.in (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2014g). The Arabic origins of "mathematical and computational terms" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal on Studies in English and Literature 2 (5)*: 21-40. Retrieved URL: http://www.arcjournals.org/ijsell (August 8, 2014).

_____. (2014h). The Arabic origins of "Mandarin Chinese Pronouns": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 3 (3)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (August 9, 2014).

_____. (2014i). The Arabic origins of "Finnish and Basque Pronouns": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English language and literature 2 (1): 109-20*. Retrieved URL: http://www.jellonline.com (August 10, 2014).

_____. (2014j). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "colour and artistic terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English language, literature, and Translation 1 (1): 1-14*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijels.com (August 10, 2014).

_____. (2014k). I buy, Ich kaufe, and J'achéte as Arabic dialectal Variants: A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (September 30, 2014).

ISSN: 2278-4012, Volume:4, Issue:1, January 2015

_____. (2014l). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "life and death terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English Language and Translation Studies 2 (4)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.eltsjournal.org (December 10, 2014).

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

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

Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language*. (3rd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.