



The Arabic Origins of Common Religious Terms in English:

A Lexical Root Theory Approach

Zaidan Ali Jassem
Department of English Language and Translation,
Qassim University,
P.O.Box 6611, Buraidah, KSA
Tel. +966-6- 385 2338 E-mail: zajassem@gmail.com

Received: 12-07- 2012

Accepted: 03-08- 2012

Published: 01-11- 2012

doi:10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.59

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.59>

Abstract

The aim of this paper is to extend the application of the lexical root theory to the investigation of select religious terms in English and Arabic to prove their genetic relationship. It criticizes and rejects the claims of the Comparative Historical Method that Indo-European languages have no genetic relationship to Arabic whatsoever. It provides further definitive counter evidence that such languages are not only related to Arabic but are also descended from it directly. The evidence concerns Arabic and English words in the area of faith and religion, which have been deliberately excluded from Swadesh's 100- and 200-word lists used in language family classifications. The paper argues that religious terms are as central as core vocabulary because man's life is meaningless without faith that opens up windows of future hope and achieves internal and external peace and security. More precisely, it shows how certain extremely common Arabic religious words and expressions exist in today's English, noting minor phonetic and semantic changes.

Keywords: comparative historical method, lexical root theory, English, Arabic, religious terms, genetic relationships

1. Introduction

Comparative historical linguists classify the languages of the world into families and subfamilies on the basis of formal and semantic similarities between words in certain fields. These words are known as *cognates*, which are words of the same or similar form and meaning in two or more languages such as *father* and *Vater* in English and German (e.g., Pyles & Algeo 1993: 76-77; Crowley 1997: 88-90, 175-178; Campbell 2004: 126-128; Yule 2006: 184; Crystal 2010: 301). Cognates are part of the universal core or basic vocabulary of the language which cannot be borrowed across languages, including pronouns, numerals, certain body parts, geographical features and phenomena, certain plant and animal names, basic actions, basic states, certain cultural terms, and taboo words for sex and excretion (Pyles & Algeo 1993: 76-77; Crowley 1997: 88-90, 175-178). Non-cognates are called peripheral or general vocabulary, which express culture-specific concepts that may be borrowed from other tongues (Crowley 1997: 171-172).

The number of core cognates on the basis of which language families and dialects are classified varies. Lexicostatisticians or glottochronologists such as Swadesh (e.g., Crowley 1997: 173; Campbell 2004: 201-211) suggested a list of 200 core words (Crowley 1997: 174), later reduced to 100 (Campbell 2004: 201-202). On the basis of the 100-word list, Crowley (1997: 173, 182) classified languages into five sub-groups, the most important amongst which here are languages of a family and dialects of a language. According to that classification, the percentage of shared core vocabulary between languages of a family should be between 36-81 words and between dialects of a language between 81-100. He then dated their separation based on that percentage: if it is between 81-100%, languages split less than 500 years ago and if between 36-81%, it occurred between 500-2500 years ago. For example, English and French share a core vocabulary of 6% (or 6 words) but a peripheral vocabulary of 50% (Crowley 1997: 172). However, Campbell (2004: 204-211) and Crowley (1997: 175-187) severely criticized such lists and criteria on a number of grounds which do not concern us here.

In light of this, the Indo-European family, for example, is split into sub-families such as the Germanic family (e.g., English, German), the Italic (e.g., French, Italian), the Hellenic (e.g., Greek), the Slavic (e.g., Russian), and



the Indic (e.g., Sanskrit, Kurdish, Persian). Similarly, the Semitic family is divided into several branches which include Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, etc., with Arabic being the largest living language in the group (for a survey, see Crystal 2010: 308; Campbell 2006: 190-191; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993).

As French, Latin, Greek can be clearly seen, Arabic and English belong to entirely different language families: one Semitic and one Germanic. However, Jassem (2012) contested that in his investigation of numeral words in Arabic, English, German, and Sanskrit which use the same or similar words, broadly speaking. All the numeral words from *one* to *trillion* in all such language were found to have true Arabic cognates, considered to be their end origin. (*Zero* was excluded from the data as it is already recognized as an Arabic loan word into all such languages.) This paper provides further evidence which will prove that Arabic and English are genetically related. More precisely, it extends and applies the same principles, tools and techniques in Jassem (2012) to the investigation of certain commonly used religious words for two reasons. The first concerns the unjustifiable exclusion of religious words from Swadesh's lists owing to the centrality of religion and faith in human life without which life on earth would be meaningless; the second deals with the genetic relationship between Arabic and English (and, in consequence, all European languages) in this field where the paper will show that all English religious terms derive from Arabic cognates, which may be their end origin. The paper has five sections: section one is introductory, section two introduces the data, section three deals with data analysis, section four describes the results, and section five is discussion and conclusion.

2. The Data

The data consists of some very common religious expressions in Arabic and English, which manifest man's view and perception about the nature and qualities of God as well as the relationship between God, man, and the universe, a relationship of power, control, knowledge, care and mercy on God's part and love and dependence on man's. God is viewed as a Single, absolutely Powerful, unboundedly and infinitely Merciful Creator for all; man needs Him at all times and places, and so he performs certain acts that bring him closer and closer to Him based on nurturing clean, pure hearts accompanied by good, useful deeds towards all, whether human, animal, or physical. All of the expressions are ultimately drawn from the Holy Quran, the Word of God revealed unto His Prophet Muhammad, and the sayings (called 'hadiths') of the Prophet, may Allah's peace and blessings be upon him.

A number of such expressions have been selected because they are highly frequent in people's speech in the sense of being said nearly every hour of the day and night by all the faithful worldwide, especially the Muslims. Although some of these particularly religious expressions may be used as single words such as *Allah*, *God*, *heaven*, *hell*, *prophet*, *Jesus* and *Muhammad*, may Allah's peace and blessings be upon them, most are used in context in the form of phrases, short sentences and/or paragraphs. All such words and expressions are still used in today's English (and other European languages), taking into account particularly phonetic changes that affected them. In this research, the expressions will be presented in two forms: one in context, which is the real use of language and so forms the bulk of the data, and one as single words. The contextual data is of three types: i) short phrases, ii) sentences, and iii) a text or paragraph. To save on space, they will be introduced one by one in the results' section.

Although the main focus of the paper will be on English and Arabic, reference to cognates in other European languages may be used to trace linguistic development for resolving linguistic matters and setting up genetic relationships accurately. The examination of the data will demonstrate that Arabic and English as well as other European languages have a common genetic origin, at the top of which Arabic firmly stands.

3. Data Analysis

3.1 Theoretical Framework: Lexical Root Theory

The theoretical framework for the analysis of the data will be the lexical root theory, which has been proposed by Jassem (2012, MS) to establish the genetic relationship between Arabic and English, in particular, and all other (Indo-)European languages in the field of numeral words from 'one to trillion'. The lexical root theory is so called because it is based on the lexical root of the word in examining genetic relationships between words such as *write* v. *written*, *underwriting* and *katab* 'write' v. *kitaabat* 'writing', *maktoob* 'written'. It has a principle or construct and four practical components. Theoretical in nature, the principle states that Arabic and (Indo-)European languages of all branches are not only genetically related but also are directly descended from Arabic in the end. In fact, it claims in its strongest version that they are dialects of the same language. As to the four components, which constitute the applied steps in analyzing lexical roots, they include (i) a procedural



component, (ii) a semantic component, (iii) a form-meaning component, and (iv) a linguistic analysis component, all of which are described briefly below.

First, the procedural component shows the method of analyzing words by (i) deleting affixes, (ii) using primarily consonantal roots, (iii) selecting semantic fields (religious terms in the present case), and (iv) search for meaning. For instance, in order to relate *uniqueness* to its Arabic cognate, it must be reduced to *one* first (for further detail, see Jassem 2012). Then the search for related cognates begins on the basis of word etymologies and origins as recorded in standard works in the field (e.g., Harper 2012).

As to the lexical component, it looks at the semantic relationships between words like meaning stability, multiplicity, convergence, divergence, shift, split, and change (Jassem 2012). Stability means the meanings of words have not changed such as the numeral words for *two* in Arabic and English. Multiplicity denotes that words might have two or more meanings like *fold* as in *ten-fold*, *folded paper*. Convergence means two or more formally and semantically similar Arabic words might have yielded the same cognate in English such as the cognate words for *thousand* in English. Divergence signals that words have become opposites or antonyms of one another such as *nice* in English and Arabic (i.e., *na2s* 'sinister' in which /2/ and /s/ merged into /s/). Shift indicates that words have switched their sense within the same field, a process common to all languages and varieties. For example, the numeral words *eight* and *nine* are the other way round in Arabic, English, and all European languages. Lexical split means a word led to two different cognates such as Arabic *hind(eed)* '100' from which *hundred* and *thousand* stemmed. Lexical change means a new meaning developed such as the word for *four* in French and Latin. (For further detail, see Jassem 2012 and below.)

Concerning the form-meaning component, it examines the relationship between form and meaning from three perspectives. First, words may be similar in form and meaning such as *twin* and *thintan* (or *thani*) 'two, second' (*tinten/tnen* in Damascus Arabic). Secondly, other words may be similar in form but different in meaning like *eleven* (*elf* in German) and *alf* 'thousand' in Arabic. Finally, still others may be different in form but similar in meaning such as *measure* and *rate*, *quarter*, *quadrant* and *cadre*, or *size* and *gauge*. (For a fuller discussion, see Jassem 2012; Jassem MS; also below.)

Finally, the linguistic component considers the linguistic analysis of words in the way their phonetic, morphological, grammatical and lexical structure might lead to any differences between them. While the morphological and grammatical analysis is not critical at this stage, the phonetic level needs a little elaboration before proceeding any further with the analysis. The main tenet is that all sounds may change within and across categories, from top to bottom or bottom to top, from left to right or right to left. In other words, consonants may change their place and manner of articulation as well as voicing. That is, 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. Similarly, vowels may change as well. The basic vowels in this research are the three long vowels /a:, i:, & u:/ and their short versions besides the two diphthongs /ai/ and /au/. All may change according to the tongue part involved (e.g., front ↔ back), tongue height (e.g., high ↔ low), length (e.g., long ↔ short), and lip shape (e.g., round ↔ spread or unround). It will be seen later that vowels are marginal in significance and can be ignored in the analysis. Other processes may occur as well such as assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, merger, insertion, split, syllable loss, resyllabification, consonant cluster reduction or creation and so on.

Sound change, it has to be noted, may have three different courses. It may be multi-directional in the sense that a particular sound may change in different directions at the same time such as the different pronunciations of /q/, a voiceless uvular stop, as in *carat* 'gold measurement unit' in Arabic, English, French, Latin and so on (Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 2012). It may be cyclic where more than one process may be involved in any given case such as the differences between the words for *three* in Arabic, English, Ferman, French, etc. (Jassem 2012). It may be lexical where words may be affected by the change in different ways (see Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b). A brief description and discussion of all such matters is given in Jassem (2012) whereas a fuller description is still in manuscript form, awaiting publication. In the following analysis, all the above components will be utilized, though with different degrees of focus.

3.2 Method of Analysis

The method of describing the genetic relationship between religious terms in English and Arabic is comparative historical. It is comparative in the sense that every 'religious' word in English in particular and German, French, Greek, Latin, etc. in general will be compared with its counterpart in Arabic phonetically, morphologically and

semantically. It is historical in considering language development central to the analysis as religious, in fact all words may change, swap or reverse their forms and meanings from one language into another altogether. Indeed, it would be an almost impossible task to relate words without knowing their origin, history, and meaning. The sources of such meanings are Arabic dictionaries (e.g., Ibn Manzour 1974; Ibn Seedah 1996) and English etymological dictionaries (e.g., Harper 2012) in addition to the author's knowledge of both Arabic as a mother tongue and English as a second language, a specialty and a career.

4. The Results

4.1 *Allah-u Acber (Akbar) 'God is Great'*

The expression *Allah-u acber (ackbar, akbar)*

God-nom. bigger

'God is Great.'

has two words, both of which are currently used in English in different forms. How? The first word *Allah* is the reverse of the first element of the biblical expression *Hallelujah* (also *Halleluiah, alleluia*), which is a compound of three parts: *Halle*, *-lu* and *-jah*. According to Harper (2012), *Halleluiah* is an originally Hebrew compound, composed of *hallalu*, pl. of *hallel* 'praise, song of praise' and *-jah*, a shortened form of *Jahweh* 'Jehova', a name of God. The final meaning is 'Praise ye, Jehovah'. However, Deedat (1986: 37-38) stated that *Hallelujah* derives ultimately from an Arabic expression of two parts, which are (i) *ya* 'O' and *Allahu* 'God'- i.e., *Ya Allahu* 'O God'. Furthermore, he (1986: 35) noted that *Allah* occurs as a word in every Bible in every language.

In my view, although *Hallelu* means the same in Arabic (i.e., *hallal* 'to praise God by saying *There's no god but Allah* and *-u* 'you- pl.') as in Hebrew, such an analysis is inaccurate. Without going into much detail at this stage, *Halle*, the first part of the biblical phrase, is a reversed form of *Allah* in Arabic. In other words, if you move /h/ to the end of the word, you get *Alleh*, which is the Arabic form exactly. H-shifting happened as a result of reiterating the same term several times, where the /-h/ of the first occurrence of *Allah* is linked to the first vowel of its second occurrence, a common phonetic process in connected speech (Celece-Murcia 2010: 165-167). So if you were to say *Allah* a number of times successively, you would end up producing expressions such as *Alla-halla-hallah* and so on, especially in interjections and exclamations. Recall this is the greatest and most majestic name for Allah, Who has over a hundred beautiful ones in Arabic.

As to *acber (akbar, ackber)*, it has several English cognates: namely,

- i) *super (supra, superior(s), superiority, supreme, supremacy)* in which /k/ became /s/ coupled with lexical shift from 'higher' to 'bigger, larger, greater',
- ii) *hyper (hypo)* in which /k/ became /h/,
- iii) *exacerbate (exacerbation)* in which /k/ turned into /s/ together with reordering and affixation (note the similarity between my deliberate spelling *ac(k)ber* and the emboldened stem *acerb-*),
- iv) *grave (aggravate, aggravation)* in which /k & b/ passed into /g & v/ each together with reordering, and
- v) *big* which underwent sound reordering, turning /k/ into /g/ and /r/-deletion.

In brief, *Allahu akbar* has several, true cognates in current English. So you can equally say *Allah* (or *Hallelujah*) *Super, Hyper, Grave, Big, or Exacerbated* for *Allahu akbar*. Every word of these still maintains both the form and meaning of the original Arabic phrase.

Now what about other names for Allah in English and European languages? All such names have direct and true Arabic cognates. Amongst these are the following terms:

Creator (*create, creation, creature, creative, creativity*) derives from Arabic *khalaq, khaaliq* (n) 'to create, creator' in which /kh, l, & q/ became /k, r, & t/ in that order. (Cf. **folk** comes from *khalq* 'people', a related derivative, in which /kh & q/ passed into /f & k/.) In Arabic, *Al-khaaliq* 'the Creator' is a beautiful God's name.

Deus (*Zeus, deity, deify, deification, dean, deanery, deanship, divine, divinity, diviner, theism, atheism, atheist, pantheism, monotheism, theology, theologian, Theodore, day, daily*) means 'light' as opposed to *darkness* in Greek which people worshipped in the old pagan days. In Arabic, their direct cognate is the root *aDaa?* 'to light' and its derivatives *Dau?* 'light', *Diyaa?*, *iDa?at* 'lighting', *muDee?*, *Dau?i* 'lighted,

giving light' and so on. Sound change turned /D/ into /d/, (or /z/ in *Zeus*) while /ʔ/ into /s/ or Ø.

Dominus (*A(nno) D(omini), domination, dominion*) is cognate to Arabic *daiyaan* (n) 'dominator' in which /n/ split into /m & n/ (see below).

God (*goddess, godliness, godmother, godship; good, Goodness*) derives directly from Arabic *jadd* 'grandfather' in which /j/ became /g/, a common pronunciation in some Arabic varieties (for a survey, see Jassem 1993, 1994a-b). The reason is because in pagan worship God is considered the 'father of humanity', the 'Father in Heaven'. However, in my view, *God* is related to *good* and *Goodness*, both of which are derived from Arabic *jood* 'generosity, goodness' and *jawaad* 'generous, good, giver,' in which /j/ became /g/. *Al-Jawad* 'the Good' is another beautiful name for Allah in Arabic.

Lord (*lordship; lead, leader, leadership*) comes from either (i) Arabic *raada, raaid* (n) 'to lead, leader' in which /r/ split into /l/ and /r/ or (ii) *araada, mureed* (n) 'to want/order, the one who wants/orders'. In Arabic, the phrase *raaid al-qaum* is 'community leader, head'. *Al-mureed* 'the One Who wants' is another beautiful Arabic God's name.

In Arabic, there are over a hundred or so beautiful names for God. Although all will be listed and annotated in a separate study, a few are mentioned below by using their English cognates first.

Clement (*clemency*) derives from a reordered Arabic *ra2maan, ra2mat* (n) 'clement, merciful' in which /2 & r/ changed to /k & l/ each.

Ruthful (*ruthfulness, Ruth*) derives from Arabic *raoof* 'ruthful' in which /f/ turned into /th/.

Learn (*learning*) derives from a reordered Arabic *3aleem* 'knowing' in which /3 & m/ turned into /r & n/. (Cf. **realm** from Arabic *3aalam* 'realm, world' in which /3/ became /r/.)

4.2 *sub2ana Allah* 'Glory be to God'

The phrase *sub2an-a Allah*
Glory-v. suf. God
'Glory be to God.'

has two elements, the second of which has already been explained. As to the first element, it is currently used in English, though in a very different form. How? Used as a nominal verb here, *sub2ana* derives from the Arabic root *sabba2* (glorify, purify, bathe) and/or *saba2* (swim, bathe). In English, its cognate is *worship*, the commonest form of worship performed by all creatures, which underwent resyllabification and the passage of /s/ into /sh/, /2/, a voiceless pharyngeal fricative, into /w/, and /n/ into /r/. The course of its change might look like *sub2an* → *shub2an* → *shubwan* → *wanshup* → *warshup* (worship).

To further substantiate this derivation, consider the closely related word *saba2* 'to swim', whose direct English cognate is *ship* in which /s/ became /sh/ while /2/ was either deleted or merged into /sh/. Such derivation is certainly true as all 'ships swim in water'. Notice how similar the Arabic and English cognates are in both cases. In short, one can equally say *Worship Hallelujah* in English for *sub2ana Allah* in Arabic without any difference in meaning and form, to a lesser extent.

What about **warship**, **friendship**, **sheep**, **shop**, and **shape** which are similar in sounds but different in meanings? Again they are taken from formally similar Arabic words as follows.

- warship** is a compound of *war* and *ship*, the latter of which has just been linked. The former is from Arabic *wagha* 'war' wherein /gh/ became /r/ or *2arb* 'war' wherein /2/ became /w/ into which /b/ assimilated. In *friendship*, its cognate is *Saa2ib* 'friend', in which /S & 2/ merged into /sh/ (while *friend* is from a reordered Arabic *rafeeq, rufqan* (pl.) 'friend' in which /q/ turned into /d/).
- sheep** is directly derived from Arabic *kabsh* (ram, male of sheep) in which /k & sh/ coalesced or merged into /sh/.
- shop** is taken from a reversed form of Arabic *baa3* 'to sell' and derivatives *bai3* 'sale', *baiya3* 'seller' in which /3/ passed into /sh/.
- shape** comes from Arabic *shabah* 'form' in which /h/ was deleted.

Notice how formally similar and semantically different they all are, which are accounted for easily.



4.3 *Al-2amdu li-(A)llah 'Praise be to God'*

The phrase *al-2amd-u* *li-(A)llah*
the- praise- nom. to-God
'Praise be to God.'

has two main lexical elements: viz., *2amd* 'praise' and *Allah* 'God'. As to *2amd* 'praise', a noun, it comes from the root *2amada* 'to praise, thank' and related words like the proper nouns *2ameed*, *2amdaan*, *Muhammad*, *ma2mood* and *a2mad* 'the praised one'. Its true, current English cognates are *commend*, *recommend*, *recommendation*, in which /2/, a voiceless pharyngeal fricative close to /h/, became /k/ while /n/ split from /m/. Alternatively, *commend* may derive from a related Arabic word *mada2* (to praise) and related derivatives like *mamdoo2* 'praised' via reversal, the passage of /2/ into /k/, and /n/-insertion or split from /m/. In summary, *al-2amdu li-(A)llah* can be equally said as *Commend Hallelujah* or, more properly, *Commend Allah*. *Al-2ameed* is a beautiful name for Allah in Arabic.

4.4 *La ilaha illa Allah 'There's no God but Allah'*

The expression *la ilah-a* *illa* *Allah*
No god-ac. but God
'There's no god but Allah.'

is the first part of the statement of faith in Islam, by saying which wholeheartedly, one immediately becomes a Muslim. It has four words- viz., (i) *la* 'no, not', (ii) *ilah* 'god', (iii) *illa* 'but, except', and (iv) *Allah* 'God'. To determine its English cognates, it can be analyzed singly or wholly, both of which give similar results as to their Arabic origins. First, analyzing them one by one yields the following results:

- i) *la* is cognate to *ill-* 'not' in reverse as in *ill-fed*;
- ii) the two main words *ilah* and *Allah* are related in form and meaning in Arabic. So what has been already said about *Allah* can still apply to *ilah*, to which the definite article *al-* (the) has been added. In other words, both *Allah* and *ilah* are reflected in *Hallelujah*, which can be diagrammed as *Allah* → *Halla* (Halle) and *ilah* → *Hali* (Halle). Alternatively, *ilah* 'god, ruler' might have led to *rule* in English in which /h/ was deleted while /l/ split into /r & l/; and
- iii) *illa* 'if not, not, except' can be treated as a compound or one word. The former consists of *in* 'if' plus *la* 'not' where /n/ merged into /l/, whose function indicates restrictiveness and exceptionality. In such a case, the nearest English cognate is *only*, which consists of *on-* (corresponding to Arabic *in*) and *-ly* (corresponding to Arabic *la*), thus indicating a similar or the same function (cf. Jassem 2012). As one word, it means 'not, except' as used in the Arabic of the Abbasi Age, the golden era of Arabic language, literature, culture and thought (Hani Hasna of Katana Secondary School for Boys in Damascus, Syria, pers. com.), whose English cognate then is the prefix *ill-* above.

So you can say "*Ill (Ill) Only Allah*" for *la ilaha illa Allah* without losing much sound and sense.

However, a more straightforward analysis would be to consider the whole expression a shortened form of the commonly used biblical English phrase *Hallelujah* (*halleluiah*, *alleluia*); indeed, this is the exact mirror-image replica of *la ilaha illa Allah*, though distortedly. How? The main reason for this is because such a phrase is a universal of faith, a general principle of all major world religions, all of which called for the worship of the One and Only Single God and the rejection of all other gods, whatever and whoever they may be. Every ordinary Muslim says this phrase tens, if not hundreds, of times every day without which life would be intolerably meaningless. As such, it is a vestige, relic, or residue of what has been left of pure, untainted faith. According to Dr. Abdul-Rahman Al-SumaiT, a Kuwait medic-cum-Islamist, in an interview on Al-Jazeera TV and others, this phrase is the only verbal ritual remembered by Muslims who have been cut off from the rest of the Muslim world and completely abandoned their Islamic way of life for hundreds of years in the jungles and wilderness of Africa and elsewhere in response to queries about their religion, if any. In other words, it exists at a subconscious level for such people.

In light of this, *Allah* shows up clearly in the word *Halle* in which /h/ shifted from back position in Arabic to front position in English owing to linking via repetition (see above). The syllable *-lu-* stands for the word *la* 'not' in Arabic, in which /a/ became /u/, which is also common in many varieties in Arabic. The last syllable *-jah* (-

iah) corresponds to *illa* 'except, but' in which /l/ turned or merged into /y/ as usually happens in similar cases in French and English; it also corresponds to the word *ilah* 'god', in which /l/ merged into /y/. So because of the phonetic similarity between *ilah* and *illa* in Arabic, they had been both reduced to *-jah/-ia(h)*. In addition, the similarity between *ilah* and *Allah* made this all the more likely. That is, if you reverse *ilah*, you will obtain *hali* (or *Halle*) and if you reverse *Allah*, you will get *Halla* (*Halle*). For these reasons, the argument that *-jah* is short for *Jehovah* is untenable and implausible because God's name is irreducible as one does not reduce, for example, the name of one's king or president, let alone God or Allah, the Greatest, Most Majestic, Most Merciful and Most Beautiful of all. To do so would be contemptible and blasphemous. In summary, *Hallelujah* means *la-ilaha-ill-allah* via reversal, elision or deletion of repeated sounds, and linkage. Schematically, the change might look like *la-ilaha-ill-allah* → *halla-li-ahali-al* → *halla-liahal* → *halli-lilah* → *halli-le-iah* (*Halleluiah*) or something similar. Try to say it several times, you will end up with something very much alike, if not the same exactly.

4.5 *La 2awla wa la quwwata illa bi-(A)llah* 'There's No Strength and Power but by Allah'

The expression: *La 2awl-a wa la quwwat-a illa bi-(A)llah*
No strength-ac. and no power-ac. but by God
'There can be no strength and power without Allah.'

has seven words, three of which have already been described: viz., (i) *la* 'no, not', (ii) *illa* 'but, except', and (iii) *Allah* 'God'. The new words are *wa* 'and, swearing particle', *2awl(a)*, and *quwwat*. In English, their cognates are as follows:

- 2awla* has several forms and meanings in Arabic such as (i) 'about, around', (ii) 'develop, grow, change', (iii) 'ability, strength', and (iv) 'turning around'. In English, its immediate cognates are (a) *evolve, evolution, evolutionary*, (b) *involve, involvement*, (c) *revolve, revolution, revolutionary*, (d) *devolve, devolution, devolutionary*, (e) *convolve, convolution*, and (f) *Volvo* in all of which /2/ and /w/ merged into /v/. They all share the same or similar meanings;
- quwwat, qawi* (adj.) 'power, vigour' and *vigour, vigorous(ly), invigorate, invigoration, invigorant* are cognates, in which reordering occurred together with the passage of /w & t/ into /v & r/ each; and
- wa* 'and, swearing particle' is cognate to *vow (avow, avowal, avowedly)* 'swear' in English where /w/ became /v/.

4.6 *Rabbi Ighfir li* 'Forgive me, God'

Muslims seek Allah's forgiveness at all times in all circumstances and situations by using different expressions, some of which are shorter than others. Amongst the shorter ones are:

- rabb-i ighfir l-i*
God-my forgive to-me
'My God, forgive me.'
- rabb-i 3afw-ak*
Lord-my excuse-your
'My Lord, excuse/pardon (me).'

These sentences contain the key words (i) *rabb(at)* 'god(ess), lord', (ii) *ighfir* 'forgive', and (iii) *3afw* 'pardon, all of which have cognates in current English. The first word comes from the root *rabab* 'to own, to master, lord over, bring up', yielding such words as *rabeeb* 'well-brought up', *ruboobiyat* 'lordship, possession, ownership'. In English, its immediate cognate is *proprietor* (*property, appropriate, appropriation, misappropriate, misappropriation, proper, properly, propriety*, etc.) in which reordering and /r/-copying or insertion took place. **Prophet(hood)** (*prophecy, prophecy*) comes from the same word *rabbat* 'goddess' above in which reordering and the split of /b/ into /p & f/ occurred. (Cf. **probable** (*probably, probability, improbably*) derives from a formally similar but semantically different root, which is *rubba(ma)* 'perhaps' in which reordering and /r/-split into /l & r/ occurred.)

As to *ighfir* 'forgive-imp.', it comes from the root *ghafar* 'to forgive'. Its direct English cognate is *forgive* (*forgiving, forgiveness*) via resyllabification and the split of /f/ into /f & v/. So, whether you say (a) *Proprietor forgive* or *Rabbi ighfir*, (b) *Allah forgive* or *Hallelujah ghafar*, they are all the same on phonetic and semantic grounds.



In (b), *3afw*, which derives from the root *3afa*, *3afoo* (n) 'excuse, pardon', yielded its direct English cognate *waive(r)* where /3 & f/ turned into /w & v/ each. So *Proprietor waive (it for me)* is verbally equivalent to *rabb-i 3afw-(ak)*.

4.7 *la ilaha illa Allah wa2dahu la shareeka lahu, lahu almulku wa lahu al2amdu, yu2yee wa yumeet, biyadihi alkhair; wa huwa 3ala kulli shaien qadeer* 'There's no god but Allah, Who has no partner, causes life and death, owns all and deserves praise, controls all good, and is able to do every thing.'

The sentence

la ilah-a illa Allah wa2d-a-hu la shareek-a la-hu,
 no god-ac. but Allah one-ac.-he no partner-ac. to-him

'There's no god but Allah, Who has no partner',

la-hu al-mulk-u wa la-hu al-2amd-u,
 to-him the-possession-nom. and to-him the-thank-nom.

Who owns all and deserves thank,

yu-2yee wa yu-meet,
 he-causes life and he-causes death,

Who causes life and death,

bi-yad-i-hi al-khair,
in-hand-dat.-his the-good

controls all good,

wa huwa 3ala kull-i shai-en qadeer
 and he on all-dat. thing-dat. able

and He is able to do every thing.'

consists of many words, all of which have true Arabic cognates as follows.

- a) *la ilah-a illa Allah* (see above);
- b) *wa2(i)d* is cognate to *odd* in English (see Jassem 2012);
- c) *hu(wa)* is cognate to *he* in English;
- d) *shareek* is cognate to *share* in which /k/ turned and merged into /sh/;
- e) *la* is cognate to *unto/into* in which /l/ split into /n & t/;
- f) *al-* is cognate to *all* in English (Jassem MS);
- g) *mulk* is cognate to *monarch(y)* in which /l/ split into /n & r/ and *reclaim* in reverse;
- h) *wa* is cognate to *vow* (see above);
- i) *2amd* is cognate to *(re)commend* (see above);
- j) *yu2yee*, which comes from the root *a2ya* 'to cause life', *2ayat* (n) 'life', is cognate to *vita* (*vital, vitality, revitalize; viva, vivacious, vivaciousness, vivacity; revive, revival, revivalist, revivalism; survive, survival, survivalist*, etc.) in which /2/ developed into /v/ (via /h/ or /w/);
- k) *yumeet*, which is from the root *maata* 'to die', *mawt* (n) 'death', yielded its cognates *mortal, immortal, mortality, immortality, immortalize; martyr, martyrdom; murder, murderous; mute, mutation, mutative; submit, submission, submissive, submissiveness*; (also *remote, demote, promote* perhaps). /t/ is an insertion;
- l) *bi-* 'in, with, by' is cognate to English *by*
- m) *yad, yadaan* and *?aidee* (pl.) (pronounced *id(ay/e)n* in spoken Arabic) 'hand' and English *hand* are true cognates in which reordering and the passage of /?/ into /h/ occurred ;
- n) *khair, khairaat* (pl.) is cognate to *charity* in English in which /kh/ became /ch/ via /k/;

- o) *3ala* 'on' is cognate to *over* in which /ʒ & l/ turned into /v & r/ each;
- p) *kull, kulliat* (n) 'all' is cognate to *total* in which /k/ turned into /t/;
- q) *shai* 'thing, object' is cognate to *object* in which reordering was applied together with the split of /sh/ to /k & t/ and the change of /ai/ to /j/;
- r) *qadeer* is cognate to reordered *grand, great, and could* 'able to': /q/ turned into /g or k/ in all; /n/ split from /r/ in the first; /d/ became /t/ in the second; /r/ became /l/ in the last (Jassem MS).

Thus, as can be seen, every single Arabic word has a true cognate in current use in today's English and, similarly, in all European languages.

4.8 *Inna Allaha rabbi wa rabbukum fa3budoo* 'God is my and your Lord, so Worship Him'

The sentence *Inna Allah-a rabb-i wa rabb-u-kum fa-3budoo-hu*
Intensifier Allah-ac. lord-my and lord-nom-your so-worship-you-Him
'God is my and your Lord, so worship Him.'

is fully traceable in English as follows.

- a) *inna* is an intensifier whose English cognate is *only* in which /n/ split into /n & l/; both signal emphasis, restriction and exclusion. Furthermore, its cognate in Old English is the emphatic infinitive suffix *-enne* versus the normal one *-an* as in *cēp-an* 'to keep' and *cēp-enne* 'to keep' (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 119-120; Jassem MS).
- b) *Allah* (see above).
- c) *rabb* 'proprietor' is cognate to *proprietor* as has been explained above.
- d) *fa* 'so' is cognate to *so* in which /f/ became /s/.
- e) *3abada* 'to worship' produced the Modern English cognate *bead* (from *gebedan* 'to worship' in Old English (Harper 2012; Pyles and Algeo 1993) as in *rosary beads*, in which /ʒ/ passed into /g/ but was deleted at a later stage.

So you can equally say *Bead Proprietor* for *u3budoo rabbakum* without any loss of meaning and form or pronunciation.

4.9 Single Words

To save on space, a few single common words will be mentioned below without context. All have Arabic and English cognates as follows.

Christianity (*Christ, Christian, Christopher, Christina, Christie, Chris*) derives from a reordered form of Arabic *naSraniat* (n) 'Christianity' from the root *naSara* 'to help, assist' and its derivatives *tanaSSara* 'become Christian', *naaSir(at)* 'helper (fem.)', *naSrani, naSaara* (pl.) 'Christians'. In all, /S/ became /k/. (Cf. **Nicholas, Nicole** 'victory' derive from Arabic *naSir* 'victory, victorious' of the same root in which /S/ and /r/ changed to /k/ and /l/ each.

Church (*kirk*) is from Arabic *kanees(at)* 'church' in which /k & s/ became /ch/ while /n/ became /r/.

Dominion (*dominate, domination, dominant, dominance, predomination, anno domini*) derives from Arabic *deen* 'religion, subordination' from the root *daana* 'to submit, to subdue, to be dominated by' and derivatives *daiyaan* (n) 'dominator, (Anno) Domini', *dainoonat* (n) 'domination', in which /n/ split into /m & n/. (Cf. *domain* from Arabic *dunya* 'world, field, domain' in which /n/ split into /m & n/.)

Heathen(ism) (*hedonism*) derives from Arabic *wathan* 'stone' in which /w/ became /h/.

Islam means 'peace, security, safety, tranquility, submission, surrender, quietude, greeting' and derives from *salima* 'to be safe' and related derivatives like *sallam* 'to greet', *salaam* 'peace, greeting', *salamat* 'safety', *salman* 'safe'. It has the following English cognates:

- (a) **Welcome** derives from Arabic *salaam* 'greeting, peace' via reordering and the passage of /s/ into /k/; the change can be diagrammed as *salaam* → *salom* → *olsam* → *olkam* (welcome in English) or something similar.
- (b) **Solemn** (*solemnity, solemnize*) comes from *salim(an)* 'safe, quiet', *salam(at)* 'safety', *salmaniat* 'safety'.

- (c) **Solomon, salmon** is from *salman* 'safe, Solomon'.
- (d) **Asylum** is from *sallam, aslam* 'to greet, to surrender, to keep safe' and related derivatives like *islam* 'peace, submission'. As can be seen, all share the same root and meaning.

Jesus Christ, the name of the Prophet *Jesus*, son of Mary, peace be upon them both, is from the Arabic word *3eesa* or *yasoo3* 'Jesus' in the first of which /3/ was either deleted or merged with /y/ into /j/ while it changed to /s/ in the latter. (For *Christ*, see above.)

Juda(ism) (*Jew, Jewish, Yiddish*) comes from Arabic *yahood* 'Jews' from the root *hada* 'to guide, heed' in which /y/ and /h/ merged into /j/.

Religion and Arabic *quraan* (*al-quraan*) 'the Quran' are true cognates. How? The former derives from the Latin word *relegere* 'read, collect' with *re-* being a prefix (Harper 2012) while the latter from a reordered form of the Arabic root *qara(?a)* 'read, collect' in which /q/ changed to /g/ while /r/ split into /l & r/. (Alternatively, /l/ may be a residue of Arabic *al-* 'the' above.) How identical! Schematically, *quraan* → *rugan* → *rulugan* (religion) or something similar. So *religion* is a mutated pronunciation of the Arabic word *Quran* 'the Holy Book of Islam or Allah's Words revealed unto His Prophet Muhammad, may His peace and blessings be upon him'. This is consonant with the mission of all prophets, who had scriptures to be *read*.

5. Discussion and Conclusion

In this discussion, we shall describe the relevance of the lexical root theory to the data at hand in terms of its principles and four components. First, the above description of religious terms in Arabic and English has shown the applicability and adequacy of the lexical root theory to analyzing word relationships in language. Thus the principle that states Arabic and English are not only genetically related but also are dialects of the same language holds true. The presentation of the above data in context was meant to demonstrate that in the clearest possible terms. For example, if you take any expression so far such as *Hallelujah* or *Allahu Acber* and compare their Arabic and English cognates, you will find that they are practically the same. Actually, if you were to calculate the percentage of shared vocabulary between Arabic and English in all of the above examples, you will find that it is about 100% according to Cowley's classification. The minor differences between the forms of such words are due to normal causes of change at the phonetic, morphological and semantic levels, especially lexical shift. They were aggravated by a very long history of development, huge geographical isolation, complete lack of social contact and linguistic interchange. In short, Arabic is the origin of English religious terms, which are real cognates in the sense of having similar forms and meanings.

Thus, these findings agree with Jassem's (2012) description of numeral words in Arabic, English, and European languages in which he asserted that such languages do not only belong to the same family but also are rather dialects of the same language, which is Arabic as the end origin perhaps. In that work, the percentage of shared numeral vocabulary between Arabic and such languages was 100%, which is higher than Cowley's estimate in this regard.

The question as to why such languages are not mutually intelligible was discussed at length in Jassem (2012), to which this work lends further support. The main reasons for that were multidirectionality, cyclicity, and irregularity of sound change (see Jassem 2012, below). Also lexical or semantic shift, a common linguistic process (Jassem 2012), was one of the most significant factors here where words shifted their reference or sense within the same domain or category (see below).

As to the four applied components, the most relevant are the procedural, the phonetic and the semantic while the morphological and the grammatical are marginal in importance. First, the procedural component showed that the adoption of the lexical root in relating words is an adequate, analytic tool. For example, *exacerbate* has been successfully traced back to its Arabic cognate *kabeer* 'big' or *akbar* 'bigger' by isolating the root *acerb-* (*exacerbation*) and ignoring the affixes. Also it showed the importance of considering the etymology or historical origin and meaning of lexical items in this area such as *bead* which came from *gebedan* 'to worship' in Old English, which made it quite easy to relate to its Arabic cognate *3abada* 'to worship' where /3/ became /g/. Furthermore, it showed the primacy of consonants and the marginality of vowels. For example, if you compare the vowels in words like *martyr*, *exacerbate* and their Arabic cognates, you'll find that the vowels have no impact on the result whatsoever. The reason is because the function of vowels is not semantic but rather phonetic and morphological. On the one hand, vowels link consonants to each other without which they would be impossible to pronounce; on the other, they signal grammatical categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives and so on; for

example, the vowels in *maat* 'died', *mawt* 'death', *maiyet* 'dead', *meetat* 'one death', *amwaat* 'the dead', *m(u/oo)t* 'die- imp.', etc. change to indicate such word classes while the consonants remain constant. The same happens in English such as *martyr*, *mortal*, *murder*; *sing*, *sang*, *sung*, *song*, etc.

The phonetic component is extremely important in relating words because of the huge changes that affected Arabic consonants especially not only in English and other European languages but also in mainstream Arabic varieties themselves, both present and past (e.g., Jassem 1993, 1994a-b). These changes included mutation, shift, assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, insertion, reversal, reordering, merger, split, duplication, and so on. The main sound changes that affected Arabic consonants in English in the present case occurred at the levels of place and manner of articulation as well as voice where some consonants changed place, some manner, some voice while others changed two or all features. For instance, the change from /q/ to /g/ in *vigour* from Arabic *quwwat* involved place (from uvular to velar) and voice (from voiceless to voiced) (see 4.5 above). The change of /k/ to /s/ in *exacerbate* from Arabic *akbar* 'bigger' included place (from velar to alveolar) and manner (from stop to fricative) (see 4.1 above). The change of /j/ to /g/ in English *God* from Arabic *jadd* 'grandfather' centred on place (from palatal to velar) (see 4.1 above). Changes by voice were straightforward where voiceless consonants turned into voiced ones and vice versa such as the passage of (i) /b/ into /p/ as in *worship* from *sub2aana* in Arabic (4.2) and (ii) /f/ into /v/ as in *forgive* from Arabic *ghafara* 'forgive' (4.6), etc. It has to be noted that such changes were not always carried out; sometimes no changes occurred. In short, all the changes are natural and plausible. (A summary of the changes affecting each consonant would prolong the paper unnecessarily; cf. Jassem 2012.)

As to the vowels, all the vowels underwent different sound changes by exchanging values amongst one another, including fronting, backing, raising, lowering, centering, lengthening, shortening, diphthongization and monophthongization or smoothing. As stated earlier, vowels were not as essential as consonants in genetic word relationships. In fact, vocalic changes are very much simpler than the consonantal ones, which are the primary focus of this research (see above).

Suprasegmental changes also occurred such as resyllabification as in *worship* from Arabic *sub2an* 'to purify-glorify' (4.2), syllable reduction and merger as in *Hallelujah* from *la ilaha illa Allah* (4.4) as well as consonant clustering as in *exacerbate* from *kabeer* in Arabic (4.1).

It is worth noting that the different forms of Arabic religious words in both classical and modern European languages such as *Zeus* in Greek, *deus* in French or Latin, *deity*, *divine*, *day*, *theology* in English are due to different courses of sound change in these languages. Jassem (2012) reported the same processes.

In addition, the above sound changes were multidirectional, cyclic and irregular or lexical. They were multidirectional in the sense that, for example, the pharyngeal consonants /2/ and /3/ turned into different sounds in different words such as /v/, /w/, /k/, /g/ and 0 (see 4.2-3, 4.5, 4.7-8 above). They were cyclic where a particular word like *worship* underwent more than one sound change at a time (4.2). They were lexical where words were affected by the change differently. (For a similar picture, see Jassem (2012).)

Morphologically and grammatically, all such differences here can be ignored altogether without adversely impacting the results of the analysis in any way whatsoever because morphological differences are mostly affixes that do not alter the meaning of the root itself. For example, although *exacerbate* differs from *akbar* 'bigger' morphologically in having prefixes and suffixes and phonetically in having different sounds, their meaning is virtually the same. In fact, most of the different forms of words in English parallel morphological differences of Arabic origins. For instance, *grave*, *aggravate*, *exacerbate* parallel *kabeer*, *akbar*, *istakbar* and so on in Arabic. Jassem (MS) gives a full description of the Arabic origins of the morphological and grammatical aspects of English and European languages.

Finally, on the lexical level, different semantic patterns were noted. Lexical stability was evident in most words such as *vigour*, *involve*, *evolve*, *recommendation*, *welcome*, *solemnity*, *exacerbate*, *vitality*, *mortality*, etc., the cognates of all of which still retain the same or similar meanings in both Arabic and English. Lexical shift was common in such words as *Halleluiah*, whose meaning shifted from 'There's no god but Allah' to 'praise the Lord'; in *God* from 'grandfather' to 'the Creator'; in *Deus*, *deity*, etc. from 'light' to 'God'; in *super* from 'higher' to 'greater, bigger'; in *worship* from 'swim' to 'worship'; in *bead* from 'worship' to 'rosary beads', etc. Lexical split was obvious in words like *exacerbate*, *grave*, *super*, *hyper*, all of which came from Arabic *kabeer* 'big'. Lexical convergence was attested in such words as *God* which might derive from either Arabic *jadd* 'grandfather' or *jawaad* 'generous, giving' in which /j/ became /g/. Lexical multiplicity was attested in words like *grave* in its two senses of 'serious, great' and 'tomb', the first of which is from *kabeer* 'big' while the latter derives from a

reordered Arabic *qabr* 'grave' where /q & b/ turned into /g & v/ each. *Ship* has different meanings as used in *worship*, *warship*, and *friendship*, all of which can be traced back to different Arabic cognates depending on the intended meaning: in *worship* and *warship*, it derives from *sab(b)a2* 'swim, glorify' and from *Sa2ib* 'friend' in *friendship* (see 4.2 above). Thus the multiple meanings of such words stem from their different Arabic cognates, which are formally similar but semantically different. Finally, lexical variability was manifested in the presence of variant or alternative words, which are utilized differently in different languages. For example, the words for *God* in Greek, Latin, French, German, and English vary (4.1). However, Arabic has cognates for all, which again demonstrates that it is their end origin. Jassem (2012) reported similar patterns.

Concerning the form-meaning component, most of the above cognates are both formally and semantically similar like *exacerbate* and *kabeer* 'big'. Some, however, are formally different but semantically similar such as the different English cognates for Arabic *kabeer* 'big' and *Dau?* 'light' (see 4.1 above). Finally, others were formally similar but semantically different words such as *ship* as in *worship*, *warship*, and *friendship* as against *shop*, *sheep* and *shape* (see 4.2 above). Thus it can be seen that the formal similarities and/or differences between English words mirror those of their Arabic cognates.

Now one can move to Swadesh's lists which excluded religious words from the core vocabulary of language. The data has clearly shown that such terms are really as central and vital as air, water and food are to one's existence, even more so oftentimes. Therefore, religious terms are not peripheral, nor can they be culturally borrowed because the main tenets or principles of religion, all monotheistic or Unitarian religions, have the same principles which emanate from a single source: i.e., Allah or God. That is, the words that refer to such matters as Allah, God, angels, prophets, heaven, hell, acts of worship and so on can be found in all languages because all prophets and messengers preached the same message to all (cf. Deedat 1986: 35). The minor differences between religions, however, are in the legal and transactional fields of day-to-day affairs. As a result, religious terms in English and Arabic are real and true cognates in the sense of being genetically related formally and semantically.

To conclude, the lexical root theory has once again successfully proven to be applicable to and adequate for the analysis of the genetic relationship between 'highly frequent Arabic religious words and their counterparts in English and other European languages where Arabic was found to be their main origin, indeed. To further substantiate that, this work agrees with Jassem (2012) in calling for more research on all language levels, especially the lexical. In fact, there are many more religious words which showed the same results but could not be included here for space and word limitation requirements. In addition, there is an urgently practical need to apply these findings to language teaching, lexicography, cultural awareness and understanding because they do not only bring minds and hearts closer than ever before but also can foster peace, security, stability and harmony in the world. In brief, it is a fertile and virgin territory for research which need to be investigated in depth in all kinds of ways and manners.

Acknowledgements

Thanks are due to everyone who contributed directly or indirectly to this research, especially my colleagues and students in Syria, U.K., Malaysia, and KSA. I would also like to thank my wife, Amandy Mufleh brahim, for her inspiration, understanding, and enthusiasm.

References

- Campbell, L. (2004). *Historical linguistics: An introduction*. (2nd ed.). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Celce-Murcia, M., Brinton, D.M., Goodwin, J.M., & Griner, B. (2010). *Teaching pronunciation: A course book and reference guide*. (2nd ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crowley, T. (1997). *An Introduction to historical linguistics*. (3rd ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Crystal, D. (2010). *The Cambridge encyclopedia of language*. (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Deedat, A. 1986. *What is His name*. Islamic Propagation Centre.
- Harper, D. (2012). *Online etymology dictionary*. [Online] Available: <http://www.etymonline.com/index.htm> (July 10, 2012)
- Ibn Manzoor, A. F. (1955-1974). *Lisan al3arab*. Beirut: Dar Sadir.



- Ibn Seedah, A.I. (1996). *AlmukhaSSaS*. Beirut: Daar I2ya Alturath Al3arabi and Muassasat Altareekh al3arabi.
- Jassem, Z. A. (1993). *Dirasa fi 3ilmi allugha al-ijtima3i: Bahth lughawee Sauti ijtima3i fi allahajat al-3arabiyya al-shamiyya muqaranatan ma3a al-ingleeziyya wa ghairiha*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.
- _____. (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*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.
- _____. (2012). The Arabic origins of numeral words in English and European languages. *International Journal of Linguistics* 4 (3). URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.x>
- Pyles, T., & Algeo, J. (1993). *The origins and development of the English language*. (4th ed.). San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.
- Yule, G. (2006). *The study of language*. (3rd ed.). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.