

LANGUAGE IN INDIA

Strength for Today and Bright Hope for Tomorrow

Volume 13 : 1 January 2013

ISSN 1930-2940

Managing Editor: M. S. Thirumalai, Ph.D.

Editors: B. Mallikarjun, Ph.D.

Sam Mohanlal, Ph.D.

B. A. Sharada, Ph.D.

A. R. Fatihi, Ph.D.

Lakhan Gusain, Ph.D.

Jennifer Marie Bayer, Ph.D.

S. M. Ravichandran, Ph.D.

G. Baskaran, Ph.D.

L. Ramamoorthy, Ph.D.

Assistant Managing Editor: Swarna Thirumalai, M.A.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

Abstract

This paper aims to establish, through the application of the lexical root theory, the Arabic origins of negative particles and words in English mainly besides German, French, Latin, and Greek. Rejecting traditional Comparative (Historical Linguistics) Method views that Arabic and English, for example, are members of different language families, it shows that such particles are related to and derived from one another, with Arabic being their end origin perhaps. More precisely, negative particles like *no*, *not*, *in-*, *un-*, *ill-*, *mal-*, *dis-* and Arabic *in*, *ma*, *la*, *lan*, *lam*, *Did* are shown to be identical cognates with the same or similar forms and meanings or functions, albeit with slight phonetic and morphological changes.

Keywords: Negative particles, Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, historical linguistics, lexical root theory

1. Introduction

The lexical root theory was first proposed in Jassem's (2012a) study of numeral words as a rejection of the claims of the Comparative 'Historical Linguistics' Method that Arabic and English, German, French, and so on belong to different language families (Bergs and Brinton 2012; Algeo 2010; Crystal 2010: 302; Campbell 2006: 190-191; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 61-94). The theory established instead the genetic relationship between Arabic and English, in particular, and all other (Indo-)European languages. Such a position is justifiable on three counts. The first is geographical continuity and/or proximity

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

between both sides of the Mediterranean which were historically one land stretch; the second is cultural similarity and the persistence of cultural contacts between Mediterranean peoples over the ages, turbulent at times though; the last and most important is the overwhelming similarity between their languages. Therefore, it would be impossible for the above languages and cultures not to be genetically related; in fact, the barriers and divisions are flimsy and artificial which can by no means mar, obviate or break up the deeply and genuinely interlinked relationship between the languages and cultures of these peoples across time and space.

The linguistic evidence came compelling, decisive, and clear-cut in all his studies in the field. First, in his investigation of all the numeral words from *one* to *trillion* in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek and Sanskrit, he found that all are the same or similar in form and meaning in general, forming true cognates with Arabic as their end origin (Jassem 2012a). All his subsequent studies have followed suit. Jassem (2012b) investigated common contextualized religious terms such as *Hallelujah*, *God*, *Anno Domini*, *Christianity*, *Judaism*, *welcome*, *worship*, and so on, which were also found to have true Arabic cognates. *Hallelujah*, for instance, is a reversal and reduction of the Arabic phrase *la ilaha illa Allah* '(There's) no god but Allah (God)' as follows:

<i>Halle</i>	+	<i>lu</i>	+	<i>jah</i>
<i>Allah</i>		<i>la</i>		<i>ilaaha & illa</i>
'God'		'no'		'god' & 'but, except'.

That is, *Halle* and *Allah* are the reverse of each other, *lu* and *la* (pronounced *lo* also) are the same, *jah* is a shortening of both *ilaaha* 'god' and *illa* 'but, except' which sound almost the same. Jassem (2012c) showed that personal pronouns in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin and related languages are true cognates, which descend from Arabic directly. Jassem (2012d) examined determiners like *the*, *this*, *an*, *both*, *a lot*, *very* in English, German, French, and Latin which were all found to have identical Arabic cognates. Jassem (2012e) established the Arabic genetic origins of verb *to be* forms in those languages. Jassem (2012f) showed that inflectional 'plural and gender' markers formed true cognates in all. Finally, Jassem (2013a) demonstrated the Arabic origins of English, German, and French derivational morphemes like *activity*, *activate*, *determine*, *whiten*.

The lexical root theory has a simple structure. To economize on space and avoid repetition, a briefly revised summary is given below. The lexical (consonantal) root is used in examining genetic relationships between words like the derivation of *rewritten* from *write* (or simply *wrt*). Hence the name. It has a construct, hypothesis or principle and five practical procedures. The theoretical principle states that Arabic and English as well as (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. The applied procedures for analyzing lexical roots are (i) methodological, (ii) lexicological, (iii) linguistic, (iv) relational, and (v) comparative/historical.

The methodological procedure concerns data collection, selection, and statistical analysis. Except loan words, all language words and affixes or morphemes may be subject to study, and not only core vocabulary as is the practice in the field (Bergs and Brinton 2012;

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

Crystal 2010; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 76-77; Crowley 1997: 88-90, 175-178). However, data selection is inevitable for practical reasons for which the most appropriate way is by using semantic fields like the present and the above topics. The steady accumulation of evidence from such findings will aid in formulating rules and laws of language change later (cf. Jassem 2012f, 2013a). The statistical analysis employs the percentage formula (see 2.2 below).

The lexicological procedure is the first step in the analysis, which is dictionary-based. Words are analyzed by (i) deleting affixes (e.g., *overwritten* → *write*), (ii) using primarily consonantal roots (e.g., *write* → *wrt*), and (iii) search for correspondence in meaning on the basis of word etymologies and origins (e.g., Harper 2012) (for further detail, see Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a.)

The linguistic procedure handles the analysis of the phonetic, morphological, grammatical and semantic structure and differences between words. The phonetic analysis considers sound changes within and across categories. That is, consonants may change their place and manner of articulation as well as voicing. Place relates to bilabial consonants ↔ labio-dental ↔ dental ↔ alveolar ↔ palatal ↔ velar ↔ uvular ↔ pharyngeal ↔ glottal (where ↔ signals change in both directions); manner concerns stops ↔ fricatives ↔ affricates ↔ nasals ↔ laterals ↔ approximants; and voice indicates voiced consonants ↔ voiceless. Similarly, vowels, though marginal in significance, may change as well. The 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), may change according to (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). Such sound changes result in processes like assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, merger, insertion, split, syllable loss, resyllabification, consonant cluster reduction or creation and so on. Finally, Sound change may operate in a multi-directional, cyclic, and lexically-diffuse or irregular manner. The criterion in all the changes is naturalness and plausibility; for example, the change from /k/ (e.g., *kirk*), a voiceless velar stop, to /ch/ (e.g., *church*), a voiceless palatal affricate, is more natural than to /s/, a voiceless alveolar fricative, as the first two are closer by place and manner (see Jassem 2012b); the last is plausible. (For further detail, see Jassem 2012a-g.)

The morphological and grammatical analyses overlap. The former examines the inflectional and derivational aspects of the grammar such as the use of prefixes, suffixes, and infixes in general (Jassem 2012f, 2013a); the latter handles grammatical categories like case and word order (Jassem 2012c-d). Since their influence on the basic meaning of the lexical root is marginal, they may be ignored, therefore.

The semantic analysis looks at meaning relationships between words, including lexical stability, multiplicity, convergence, divergence, shift, split, change, and variability (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a). Stability means that word meanings have remained constant. 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 have become opposites or antonyms of one another. Shift indicates that words have switched their sense within the same field. Lexical split means a word led to two different cognates. Change means a new meaning developed. Variability

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

occurs in the presence of two or more variants for the same word. (For further detail, see Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a, and below.)

The relational procedure examines and accounts for the relationship between form and meaning from three perspectives (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a). First, words may be similar in form and meaning such as *three*, *third*, *tertiary* and Arabic *thalath* 'three' (Damascus Arabic *talaat*) (see Jassem 2012a). Secondly, other words may be similar in form but different in meaning like *ship* and *sheep* (see Jassem 2012b). Finally, still others may be different in form but similar in meaning such as *quarter*, *quadrant* and *cadre* (see Jassem 2012a).

Finally, the comparative historical analysis concerns comparing every word in English in particular and German, French, and Latin in general with its Arabic counterpart phonetically, morphologically, and semantically on the basis of its history and development in English (e.g., Harper 2012; Pyles and Algeo 1993; Algeo 2010) and Arabic (e.g., Ibn Manzour 1974; Ibn Seedah 1996; Alghalayeeni 2010) besides the author's knowledge of both Arabic as a first language and English as a second language.

This paper applies the lexical root theory, though with different degrees of focus, to the investigation of negative morphemes in Arabic, English, German, French, and Latin to show their genetic relationship to and/or their descent from Arabic cognates. It has six sections: introduction, research methods, data, results, discussion, and conclusion.

2. Research Methods

2.1 Data Sampling

The data consists of *all* negative morphemes in English, German, French and Arabic, which may be prefixes, suffixes, and full words. For the sake of economy and due to their similarity in European languages (e.g., Caroonet 2012; Lawless 2012; Green 2008), all the exemplary particles and words below will be for English.

2.2 Data Analysis

The data will be analyzed theoretically and statistically. The theoretical analysis utilizes the lexical root theory as a framework as surveyed above. The statistical analysis calculates the percentage of shared vocabulary or morphemes by dividing the number of cognate words over the total number of investigated words multiplied by a 100. For example, suppose the total number of investigated numeral words is 20, of which 18 are true cognates (see Jassem 2102a). Calculating the percentage of cognates would be $18/20 \times 100 = 90\%$. Finally, the resultant figures are checked against Cowley's (1997: 173, 182) formula to determine whether such words are dialects of the same language or languages of the same family, and so on (for a survey, see Jassem 2012a).

3. Negative Particles and Morphemes: A Brief Survey

3.1 In English

3.1.1 Prefixes

English has a number of negative prefixes, which are:

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

- i) *in-* (*im-*, *il-*, *ir-*) as in *insane*, *impossible*, *illegal*, *irresponsible*;
- ii) *un-* as in *unripe*, *untidy*;
- iii) *no(n)-* as in *nothing*, *nonsense*;
- iv) *ill-* as in *ill-treatment*, *ill-health*;
- v) *a-* as in *asocial*, *abnormal*;
- vi) *anti-* (*anto-*, *ante-*) as in *antinuclear*, *antonym*, *antedate*, *anterior*;
- vii) *mal-* as in *maltreatment*, *malpractice*;
- viii) *mis-* as in *misunderstand*, *misanthrope*;
- ix) *de-* as in *deactivate*, *depreciate*;
- x) *d(i/y)s-* as in *disunite*, *dysfunctional*;
- xi) *contra/counter* as in *contrary*, *contraceptive*, *counteractive*;
- xii) *ex-* as in *exclude* (cf. *include*);
- xiii) *down* as in *downgrade*;
- xiv) *under* as in *underestimate*; and
- xv) *semi* as in *semi-circle*;

As can be seen, some particles are *n*-based; some may have other (inflectional and derivational) functions such as *describe*, *discuss*; *wanted*; *insure*, *oxen*; *arise*, *await*; some others may be independent words like *in*, *ill*, *down*.

3.1.2 The Suffix –less (German *-los*)

In English, *–less* is used as a:

- i) negative noun suffix, e.g., *careless* (cf. German *sprachlos* 'speechless'), and
- ii) full word in (a) negative comparison, e.g., *Sylvia is less pretty than Mandy* and (b) mathematical operations like *2 less 'minus' 1 equals 1*.

3.1.3 Full Words

Some negative words occur on their own, including:

- i) *no* (*nay*) (cf. *nobody* above);
- ii) *none* as in *None came* (cf. *nonsense* above);
- iii) *not* as in *do not do that*;
- iv) *nought* 'zero, dot, nothing' as in *He got nought*.
- v) *never*;
- vi) *seldom*, *rarely*, *scarcely*, *barely*, *hardly*, *just*, *yet*;
- vii) German *nicht* 'not' as in *nicht gut* 'not good';
- viii) German *kein* before nouns as in *kein Mann* 'no man';
- ix) French *ne* --- *pas*;
- x) *off* as in *turn off* (cf. *on*), *hands off*, *off-hand*, *offset*; and
- xi) *negative*, *refuse*, *refute*, *reject*, *object*, *deny*, *opposite*, *other*, *against*, and their derivatives.

3.2 Negative Particles in Arabic

Arabic has quite a large number of full negative particles, some of which are general and some are tense-specific as follows.

- i) *La* 'no, not' is very common, which may also be prefixed to nouns.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

- ii) *Ma* 'no, not' is general.
- iii) *Lam* 'did not' negates past tense verbs in Standard Arabic.
- iv) *Lamma* 'do not' negates present tense verbs in Standard Arabic; elsewhere, it means *when* in all varieties.
- v) *Lan* 'will not' negates future tense verbs in Standard Arabic.
- vi) *In* 'not, if' occurs in Standard Arabic, especially in the Holy Quran and sayings of the Prophet (peace be upon him). For example, *wa in min qaryatin illa ...* 'There is no town but...' (4: 112) (for similar examples, see 10: 15, 31; 12: 58; 16: 15; 19: 26; 24: 12).
- vii) *Illa* 'except, not' is a reduced assimilatory compound of *in* 'not, if' plus *la* 'not'. As a negative prefix, it was used during the Abbasid period, the golden era of Arabic language, literature, culture and thought, e.g., *illa-musawaat* 'inequality' (*la-musawaat* in current Arabic) (Hani Hasna, Katana (Damascus, Syria) Secondary School teacher, 1971-73).
- viii) *Laisa* 'not' negates nouns, adjectives, and present tense verbs as in *laisa jameelan* '(it's) not beautiful', *laisa yaktub* '(he) does not write'.
- ix) *Laata* 'no, not' is rare, negating nouns in Standard Arabic, especially in the Holy Quran (e.g., 49: 14; 28: 3). Its present tense form is *yalit* 'reduce, belittle'.
- x) *Did* 'against' and related *muDaad* 'anti'.
- xi) *Kalla* 'no' is formal.
- xii) *Ghair* 'not, other than' is common.
- xiii) *Mala* 'not not' is a negative compound of *ma* 'not' plus *la* 'not'.
- xiv) *Bila* 'without' is a negative compound of *bi* 'with, by' plus *la* 'not'.
- xv) *M(i/u/a)sh* 'no(thing)' is a reduced compound of *ma* 'not' plus *shai* 'thing'.
- xvi) *(Ma)fish* 'no(thing)' is a like reduction of *ma* 'not', *fi* 'in' plus *shai* 'thing'.
- xvii) *Balash* 'for nothing' is a similar compound of *bi* 'with', *la* 'not', and *shai* 'thing'. The last three are vernacular or spoken Arabic variants.

Some of the above words have certain grammatical characteristics and may have other context-based functions. For example, *ma* may be used as a (i) negative particle 'not', (b) question word 'what', and (c) relative pronoun 'that, which'. As such uses fall beyond the scope of this work, the curious reader may consult standard grammars like Alghalayeeni (2012) for further details.

4. Results

A closer scrutiny of English and Arabic negative particles shows that they make up really true, identical cognates.

- 1) The English prefixes *in-* (*im-*, *ir-*, and *il-* being due to assimilation) and *un-* and Arabic *in/lan* 'not' are identical cognates where /l & n/ merged in the latter.

As a preposition/adverb (e.g., *in* water, he's *in*, come *in*; divide *into*), *in* has three formally similar but semantically different Arabic cognates: (a) *huna* (*heen* in my accent) 'here' where /h/ was deleted (cf. English *inn* from Arabic *2aana(t)* 'bar' where /2/ was deleted), (b) *ila* 'to' in which /l/ became /n/ coupled with semantic shift, and (c) *min* 'from' where /m/ merged into /n/ coupled with lexical shift.

- 2) *No* (Old English *na; nay*) is a cognate of (a) Arabic *ma* 'no, not' in which /m/ turned into /n/, (b) a reversed *in* 'no', or *la* 'no' where /l/ became /n/.
- 3) *None* consists of *no* plus *one* (Harper 2012). *No* has just been settled; *one* is from a reduced Arabic *awwal/oola* 'first, one (m/f)' where /l/ became /n/ (Jassem 2012a).
- 4) *Not* comes from a reduced Old English *nawiht* 'nothing' (*na* 'not' plus *wiht/(wight)* 'thing, creature, being', further reduced to *n(o/a)ht* 'in no way') (Harper 2012). As a compound, *nawiht* derives from Arabic *ma/la wihdat/wahid* 'no one (f/m), nothing' where /m & l/ turned into /n/ while /d/ into /t/ (cf. *nought, naught(y)* below). Alternatively, it obtains from *laat(a)* 'not' where /l/ became /n/.
- 5) *Ill-* may derive from either a (a) reduced Arabic *illa* 'not, except' or (b) reversed *la* 'no' where /a/ raised to /i/. (Cf. *ill* and *ail* v. *all* from Arabic *3aleel* 'ill' where /3/ was dropped and *al* 'the' via lexical shift (Jassem 2012d).)
- 6) *A-* may obtain from (a) a reduced Arabic *la* 'not' where /l/ was dropped (cf. Cockney *miuk* 'milk' and *miyen* 'million') or (b) *a-* 'not in Syrian 'Nusairi/Alawi' Arabic' as in *a-katab* '(he) not-wrote'.
- 7) *Anti-/ante-/anto-* 'before' is from Arabic (a) *amaam* 'in front of, before', *imam(at)* (n) 'being in the front, leader(ship)' in which /m/ became /n/ or (b) a reordered *aqdam/quddam* 'before' where /m/ became /n/ while /q & d/ merged into /t/.
- 8) *Mal-* (Latin *male* 'bad, poor, evil, wrong') derives from (a) a reversed Arabic *la'eem* 'evil, bad', (b) *malee2* 'good, salty' via lexical shift (antonymy) and /2/-loss, (c) *maal* 'leaning, declined', (d) a reversed *lam(ma)* 'not', or (e) a reduced *mala* 'not'.

(Cf. *mile* from Arabic *meel* 'mile' or *miat* '100' where /t/ became /l/ (Jassem 2012a), *mail* from Arabic *3ilm* 'news' via reversal and /3/-deletion, *lame* from Arabic *mayel* 'lame, declining' in reverse, *lime* from Arabic *male2* 'salty' via reversal and /2/-deletion, *mule* from Arabic *2imar* 'donkey' via /2/-deletion and the change of /r/ to /l/; all are similar in form but different in meaning in both English and Arabic.)

- 9) *Mis-* (from Latin *minus* 'less' via French *més-* 'lack' as in *mésintelligence*) comes from Arabic (a) *naqiS/manqoos* 'lack' where /n/ turned into /m/ while /q & S/ merged into /s/, (b) *mish* 'not, nothing' where /sh/ became /s/, or (c) a reduced *musee* 'one doing wrong'. (Cf. *mis-*, *miss* 'forget', and *Miss* 'young lady' v. Arabic *musee* 'one doing wrong', *nasa* 'forget' and *(a)nisa* 'wom(a/e)n' where /n/ changed to /m/.)
- 10) *De-* 'down, down from, from, off, concerning in Latin' (Harper 2012) comes from Arabic (a) *doon* 'down' in which /n/ merged into /d/ or (b) a reduced *ta2t* 'down, under' where /t & t/ coalesced into /d/ while /2/ was deleted (cf. *dis-* below); French *de/du* 'of' is from Arabic *dh(i/u/a)* 'of' where /dh/ became /d/ (Jassem 2012c). (For other uses, see Jassem 2012e-f).
- 11) *Dis-* 'apart, in a different direction, between' (Harper 2012) derives from (a) Arabic *Did* 'against' where /d/ turned into /s/ or (b) a reversed *shatta* 'apart, diverse' where /sh & t/ became /s & d/ each (for further details, see Jassem 2012e-f).
- 12) *-less* and Arabic *laisa* 'not' are identical cognates. As a full word, however, it comes from (a) a reversed Arabic *qaleel, aqal* (my accent *galeel, jil(eel)*; Qassimi Arabic *dzil(eel)*) 'little, less' in which /q/ became /s/ or (b) *laat(a)* 'no, reduced' where /t/ became /s/. (Cf. *laisa/laata* in Arabic with *less/little* in English (see Jassem 2012f).)
- 13) *Ex-* is from Arabic *aqSa/qaaS* 'out, far' where /q & S/ merged into /s/.
- 14) *Down* is from Arabic *doon* 'down'.
- 15) *Under* comes from *doon* above and related *adna* 'lower' via reordering and /r/-split from /n/ or from *in2adar* 'go down' where /2/ was deleted.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

- 16) *Contra* (*contrary, counter, encounter, pros and cons*) (from Latin *con* 'with, together + *ter* 'zero comparative degree' (Harper 2012)) comes from a reversed Arabic *ma3a* 'with, together' in which /m & 3/ changed to /n & k/ each. Alternatively, it comes from Arabic *qaTi3* 'counter, against' in which /q & 3/ became /k & n/ each while /T/ split into /t & r/.
- 17) *Semi* comes from a reversed Arabic *niSf* 'half' where /S & f/ merged into /s/ while /n/ became /m/.
- 18) *Or* comes from Arabic *ghair* 'not' in which /gh & r/ merged into /r/.
- 19) *Nought* (*naught(y)*), which consists of *na* 'not' plus *aught* 'anything' or *ought* 'zero, cipher' in Old English (Harper 2012), derives from the Arabic compound *mashai* (*ma sheet* in Damascus Arabic) 'nothing' in which /m & sh/ became /n & g/. Alternatively, it comes from Arabic *nuqT(at)* 'dot, zero, nothing' where /q/ developed into /g/; *dot* 'nought, point' is a further reduction of *nuqT(at)* where /n/ became /d/ while /q & T/ merged into /t/.

In German, *nicht* is a cognate of English *nought* and/or *nawiht*, whose Arabic cognates have just been settled. German *kein* and Arabic *kalla* 'no' are identical cognates where /l/ became /n/. In French *ne --- pas*, *ne* is like English *no* above while *pas* obtains from Arabic *ba3d* 'yet' where /3 & d/ merged into /s/ or *batta(tan)* 'never' where /t/ became /s/, which follow negative particles like *ma nimt ba3d* 'I haven't slept yet'.

- 20) *Never* (Old English *ne* 'no' + *æfre* 'ever, always, at any time' (Harper 2012)) comes from Arabic *3aSr* 'time' where /3 & S/ merged into /f/ or *dahr* 'time' in which /d & h/ merged into /f/ (cf. Jassem 2012e). Spoken Arabic (*bi*)-*nob(at)* 'never' is likely where /b & t/ became /v & r/ each.
- 21) *Barely* (Old English *barlice* 'openly, clear, public') comes from Arabic *barra(ni)* 'outside'. The new negative meaning is probably from (a) Arabic *bila* 'without' where /r/ split from /l/, (b) *bizra* 'seed' in which /z & r/ merged, or (c) *ibra(t)* 'needle', the last two of which signaling 'smallness'. (Cf. *barley* from Arabic (*al*)-*burr* '(the)-wheat' via lexical shift and resyllabification.)
- 22) *Just* 'merely, barely' is from a reordered Arabic *faqaT* 'only' in which /f & q/ turned into /s & j/; *just* (*justice*) 'fairness' comes from Arabic *qisT(as)* 'justice' in which /q & s/ merged into /j/; *just* as in *just* (right) *now* is from a reduced Arabic *issaat* (i.e., *dhi* 'this' plus *saa3at* 'hour' where /dh/ assimilated into /s/) 'this hour' in which /i/ became /j/ (cf. *Jesus* from Arabic *3eesa* 'Jesus' in which /3 & s/ merged and /ee/ became /j/ (Jassem 2012b)). Thus the different senses derive from formally similar but semantically different Arabic cognates.
- 23) *Yet* is from Arabic *qaTT* 'no(t)' in which /q/ turned into /y via j/ while /T/ into /t/. Both cognates occur in negative contexts, following *not* and Arabic *ma/lam*.
- 24) *Hardly* 'in a hard manner, with great exertion or effort' from Old English *hardlice* 'stern, severe, hard' (Harper 2012), comes from a reordered Arabic *3atr* 'hard, severe' in which /3 & t/ passed into /h & d/ each or *3arraT* 'harden' in which /3 & T/ turned into /h & d/ each.
- 25) *Rarely* (*rare, rarity*) comes from Arabic *nadir* 'rare' in which /n & d/ merged into /r/. (Cf. *rear/arrears* from Arabic *wara* 'behind, rear' where initial /r/ is a copy; *rear* 'graze' from Arabic *ra3a* 'graze' where /3/ became /r/; *air* from a reversed Arabic *ree2*

- 'air' or *Zarr* 'hot air' where /z/ was dropped; and *reek* from *ree2* 'air' where /z/ became /k/. All are formally similar but semantically different.)
- 26) *Seldom* (Old English *seld(a/u)n* 'rare') derives from Arabic *qillat-un* 'littleness-nom.' where /q & t/ turned into /s & d/ each.
 - 27) *Scarcely* 'restricted in quantity' (from Latin via French *scars* 'small') is from a reordered Arabic *Sagheer(at)* 'small' where /gh/ split into /k & s/.
 - 28) *Nil* (*nihilism*, *annihilate*, *annihilation*) (from Latin *nihil(um)* 'nothing' (*ne* 'no' + *hil(um)* 'small thing, trifle') comes from Arabic *qal(eel)* 'little' in which /q/ turned into /h/. (Cf. *willy-nilly* from spoken Arabic *ya lee ya malee* 'either for me or not for me' perhaps.)
 - 29) *Negate* (*negation*, *negative*) (from Latin *negationem*, *negare* 'denial, deny' via French *negacion*) obtains from Arabic (a) *naha* 'forbid, prohibit', (b) *ankar*, *nukr(an)*, *nakirat* 'deny, denial, unknown' in both of which /h & k/ became /g/, or (c) *naqaD* 'reject' in which /q & D/ changed to /g & t/ each; the likeliest is the first based on the root *negare*.
 - 30) *Refuse* (*refusal*) and *refute* (*refutation*) come from Arabic *rafaD* 'refute' in which /D/ turned into /s/ or /t/.
 - 31) *Reject* (*rejection*) (Latin *rejectus* 'thrown back, tossed back' via French *jeter* 'throw, thrust') is from Arabic (a) *qadhf* 'throw, toss (back)' where /q/ became /j/ while /dh & f/ merged into /t/, or (b) *rashaq(at)* 'throw away' in which /sh & q/ turned into /j & k/. (Cf. *inject(ion)*, *deject*, *eject*, (*dis*)*sect(ion)* from Arabic *shaqq(at)* 'cut' where /q/ became /k/ or /s/; *abject/dejected* from Arabic *shaqi(at)* 'abject, miserable'; *object* from Arabic *shaaqqa/shaaqaq* 'object to'; *project* from Arabic *qathf* 'throw'; all are formally similar but semantically different.)
 - 32) *Deny* (*denial*), which consists of *de-* 'verb suffix' plus *-ny* (*ne* 'not'), comes from Arabic *ta-* 'verb suffix' where /t/ became /d/ (Jassem 2012f, 2013a) and *ma/la* 'no' above. Alternatively, it obtains from *na'a*, *na'i* (n) 'keep away, avoid', though less likely.
 - 33) *But* derives from Arabic *bas*, *bal* or *baida* 'but' where /s, l & d/ became /t/.
 - 34) *Other* comes from Arabic *thaani* 'next, other' in which /n/ changed to /r/ (cf. Jassem 2012a).
 - 35) *Against* (Old English *agan*, *angean*, *agenes*, *agen* 'toward, opposite' (Harper 2012); German *gegen*) comes from a reordered Arabic *na2wa* 'towards' in which /z/ changed to /g/.
 - 36) *Opposite* (*opposition*, *position*, *posit*, *pose*, *posture*, *opponent* from Latin *opponere* (*ob* + *ponere* 'put, set, place (against)') obtains from Arabic (a) *bana/binaiat* 'build/(ing)', (b) a reversed *naba/naabi* 'come up against', or (c) *naSab*, *naaSib* (n), 'stand (against)' where /S/ merged into /n/.

Pose (*pause*, *post*, *position*, *opposition*, *opposite*; *suppose*, *propose*) (from French *poser* via Literary Latin *pausare*, Greek *pausis* (Harper 2012)) 'halt, pause, puzzle, confuse, put in a certain position; suggest, propose' come from three formally similar but semantically different Arabic cognates: (a) *Zabas* 'pause, stop, jail', (b) a reordered *Zasab* 'think, suppose' in both of which /z/ merged into /s/ or was dropped, and (c) *shabak* 'entangle, confuse' via shortening and the merger of /k & sh/ into /s/.

Post 'after, send/mail, doorpost' has the same Arabic story: (a) *ba3d* 'after' in which /3 & d/ became /s & t/ each, (b) *ba3ath* 'send, mail' in which /3 & th/ became /s & t/ each, and a reordered *3ataba(t)* 'doorstep/post' in which /3/ became /s/.

- 37) *off* (Old English *of* 'away (from)', German *ab* 'off, from, down') obtains from Arabic *fī/bi* 'in, with' via lexical shift (cf. *off*-final English swear words like *fu--/pi-- off* with the same *fī*-final ones in Arabic such as *Tu--/zu-- fee*). Alternatively, in *hands off, cut off*, it derives from Arabic *waaf(i)* 'enough', *waqaf* or *kaffa* 'stop' in which /q & k/ merged into /f/.

In sum, the total number of the main negative particles (16) and words (25) above is 41, disregarding their variants and derivatives. All have Arabic cognates. That is, 41/41 X 100 = 100%, which means that they are dialects of the same language (see 5. below).

5. Discussion

The results above support Jassem's (2012a) studies of numeral words, common religious terms (Jassem 2012b), personal pronouns (Jassem 2012c), determiners (Jassem 2012d), verb *to be* forms (Jassem 2012e), inflectional 'gender and plurality' markers (2012f), and derivational morphemes (Jassem 2013a) in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and Arabic which formed true cognates. In all, the percentage of shared vocabulary between Arabic and English, for instance, was 100%, which means that they belong to the same language (i.e., dialects), according to Cowley's (1997: 172-173) classification.

Jassem (2012f, 2013a) merit special mention because some affixes and words are common to all. In all studies, the same morphemes like *en, a, de-* may be used inflectionally (as suffixes), derivationally (as prefixes and suffixes) and negatively. Since such morphemes change form or pronunciation due to morphological causes (morphologically conditioning) such as derivation, grammatical category, word position, and so on, they are termed morphophonemes: i.e., phonemes with a grammatical function or morphemes with a different pronunciation. The result is morphophonemic rules (Jassem 2012f, 2013a), for which a brief summary is given below.

- i) The *n*-based affixes had several functions as (a) negative prefixes and independent words in here (4.1-4 above), (b) derivational noun and verb suffixes and prefixes with *n-*, *m-*, *r-*, and *l-* forms being phonetically conditioned in English, German, and French (Jassem 2013a), and (c) inflectional markers of plurality (in Arabic, English, German, and French) and gender (masculine in Arabic but feminine in English, German, and French) (Jassem 2012f; also cf. 2012c).
- ii) The affix *a* was used in English and Arabic as a (a) negative prefix here (4.6 above), (b) derivational prefix for making verbs (Jassem 2013a), and (c) inflectional 'feminine gender and plurality' suffix (Jassem 2012f).
- iii) The affixes *de-/dis-* and Arabic *Did* 'against' functioned as (a) negative prefixes in this work (4.10-11 above) and (b) derivational verb markers as in *describe, discuss, dissect, dissolve, wanted* (cf. *learnt, wept*) whose Arabic cognate is the verbal prefix *ta-* as in *takallam* 'talk' (Jassem 2013a) (cf. inflectional Arabic *-at* and its English cognates *-ate/-s* in Jassem (2012f, 2012c)).
- iv) *mal* in English, French, and Latin and *lam* in Arabic are identical cognates (4.8 above).

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

- v) The full negative words like *negate*, *deny*, *opposite*, *reject* (4.18-37 above) are identical cognates in Arabic and English.

Thus this study demonstrates over and over again the adequacy of the lexical root theory for the analysis of the close genetic relationships between the above languages in all the investigated areas where the percentage of shared words in general was 100% which means that they are dialects of the same language according to Cowley's (1997: 172-73) classification. Therefore, the main construct of the lexical root theory that states that Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, and so on are not only genetically related but also are dialects of the same language is empirically sound and verifiably true.

Concerning the five applied analytic procedures, all operated neatly. Lexicologically, the lexical (consonantal) root was an adequate, analytic tool in relating negative morphemes to each other. For example, English *in-/un-* have been successfully traced back to their Arabic root cognates *in/lan* 'no' (4.1-4 above) and so have *de-/di(s)-* to *Did* 'against' and/or *doon* 'down' (4.9-10 above) by isolating the root 'consonants' and overlooking the 'precise quality of' vowels (cf. Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a). The etymology or historical origin of words or morphemes was very useful in tracing word form and meaning; for instance, English *mis-* came into Middle English from Latin via French (Harper 2012), whose Arabic cognate is *manqooS/naqiS* 'minus' where /q & S/ merged into /s/.

Phonetically, enormous changes affected Arabic consonants especially not only in English, German, French, and Latin but also in Arabic varieties themselves (e.g., Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 2012a-f, 2013a). The main sound changes here can be summed up as follows:

- (a) Arabic /D/, an emphatic /d/, and /d/ in *Did* 'against' changed to /d & s/ in *dis-* (cf. Jassem 2013a).
- (b) Arabic /n/ in *in* 'no' passed into /l, r, & m/ in *illogical*, *irregular*, *impossible* (cf. Jassem 2012g) or merged into /d/ in *de* from Arabic *doon* 'down'.
- (c) Arabic /m/ in *ma* 'no' turned into /n/ in *no* (cf. Jassem 2013a).
- (d) Arabic /l/ in *la* 'no' changed to /n/ in *no* (cf. Jassem 2013a).
- (e) Arabic /h/ in *naha* 'forbid, prohibit' became /g/ in *negative* or Ø as in *in* from Arabic *huna* 'here'.
- (f) Arabic /S/, an emphatic /s/, in *niSf* 'half' became /s/ in *semi*.
- (g) Arabic /f/ in *niSf* 'half' became /s/ in *semi*.
- (h) Arabic /2/, a voiceless pharyngeal fricative, in *ta2t* 'under' changed to Ø in *de*.
- (i) Arabic /3/, a voiced pharyngeal fricative, in *3atr/3arraT* 'hard' passed into /h/ in *hard* or /r/ in *rear*.
- (j) Arabic /t/ in *ta2t* 'under' became /d/ in *de*.
- (k) Arabic /gh/, a voiced fricative velar, in *ghair* 'other, or' became /r/ in *or*.
- (l) Arabic /q/, a voiceless uvular stop, in *qal* 'little' became /s/ in *seldom* or /h/ in *nihilism*.
- (m) Vowel shift happened in all; for example, the low central vowel /a/ in *ma/la* 'no(t)' became mid back in English *no* (cf. Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a).
- (n) Phonetic processes resulted in assimilation, dissimilation, reversal, reordering, merger, loss, resyllabification, and so on. Besides, the changes were multi-directional, lexical, and cyclic (see Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a).

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

Morphologically and grammatically, all the negative morphemes here and their inflectional (Jassem 2012f), and derivational counterparts or variants (Jassem 2013a) had Arabic cognates.

Finally, semantically, the same or similar patterns were replicated as reported in Jassem (2012f, 2013a). Semantic stability was evident in all negative morphemes and particles like *in-*, *no*, *de-/dis-*, and *less* in English, French, and German, which still retain the same or similar meanings or functions as their Arabic cognates (4.1-12 above). Semantic shift affected Arabic *in/lan* 'no/not' whose function shifted from an independent negative word to a prefix in English, German, and French as in *unhappy*, *inhuman* (4.1-4 above); Arabic *ghair* 'no, other than' shifted to *or* in which /gh & r/ merged (4.18 above). Morphological split affected *dis-/de-/-ed* which function inflectionally (Jassem 2012f), derivationally (Jassem 2013a), and negatively (4.10-11 above). Lexical convergence occurred in *mal-* which might derive from (i) Arabic *lam* 'not', (ii) *maali2* 'salty', or (iii) *maal* 'leaning' (4.8 above); *ill-* might come from *illa* 'not, except' or *la* 'not' or *3aleel* 'ill' (4.5 above); *no* is from *ma*, *la* or *in*; *(u/i)n-* is from *ma*, *in* or *lan* (4.1-4 above). Semantic multiplicity is manifested in the multiple usage of some morphemes negatively, derivationally and inflectionally; e.g., *n-* forms mark (i) verbs, (ii) nouns, and (iii) adjectives (Jassem 2013a), (iv) plurality and (v) feminine gender (Jassem 2012f), and (vi) negation here (4.1-4 above). *Less* and *just* have several meanings, all of which have Arabic cognates (4.12, 22 above). Semantic change happened to Arabic *in* 'no' which is used as a negative prefix and preposition in English (4.1 above). Finally, morphological variability was evident in the presence of several negative variants, which are utilized in different ways in all the languages above, e.g., *in-*, *un-*, *de-/dis-/dys-*, *-less*, etc. in English (4.1-11 above).

As regards the relationship between form and meaning, all the above negative morphemes like *in-*, *un-*, *ill-*, *a-*, *-less*, *mis-* and *mal-* in Arabic, English, German, and French have the same or similar forms and meanings: i.e., true cognates, with Arabic being their main origin (4.1-11 above). Some are formally different but semantically similar such as *mis-* (Latin *minus*) 'not' which derive from Arabic *naqiS/manqooS* 'minus' where /q & S/ merged into /s/ (4.9 above). Formally similar but semantically different particles or words were accounted for such as *mal-*, *mile*, *mail*, *mule*, *lame*, and *lime*, which all have Arabic cognates (4.8 above) (cf. Jassem 2012c).

In light of the above, therefore, all the foregoing negative particles in Arabic, English, German, French, and Latin are true cognates in the sense of having the same or similar forms and meanings. Arabic can be safely said to be their origin all, for which Jassem (2012a-g) offered some equally valid reasons which the curious reader can refer to. Meanwhile, it suffices to mention Arabic variety and multiplicity (e.g., *in* 'no', *ma* 'not', *la* 'no', *lan* 'no', *lam* 'not') as opposed to English simplicity (e.g., *in-/un-/no*) as one such major reason.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The different negative 'particular and lexical' morphemes in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Arabic make up identical cognates, some of which (e.g., *n-* based ones) have multiple functions: negative, inflectional, and derivational. Because they change form

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

according to phonological, morphological and lexical factors or conditions, they are technically called morphophonemes (Jassem 2013a). The main ideas of this paper can be summed up as follows.

- i) The *n*-based morphemes (*in-*, *un-*, *no*, *not*) in English, German, and French and *in/ma* 'no' in Arabic are identical cognates negatively (this paper), inflectionally (Jassem 2012f), and derivationally (Jassem 2013a) where /n/ turned into /m, r, & l/ also (4.1-4 above). As a rule, one can state that *in* and its variants may function derivationally, inflectionally, and negatively in all such languages. Using /n/ as a pivotal consonant makes it easier to generalize than would be otherwise (Jassem 2013a).
- ii) The *l*-based affixes like English *ill-*, *a-* as in *ill-timed*, *asocial* and Arabic *la/illa* are identical cognates where /l/ merged into *a* (4.5-6 above).
- iii) The *d*-based particles like English *d(i/y)s-/de-* as in *deactivate*, *dismantle*, *dysfunctional* and Arabic *Did* 'against' (4.10-11 above) are identical cognates where /d/ became /s/ (cf. Jassem 2012c); similarly, English *de-* and Arabic *ta-* are identical inflectional (Jassem 2012f) and derivational (Jassem 2013a) cognates where /t/ became /d/.
- iv) The *m*-based affixes like English *mal-/mis-* and Arabic *lam/naqiS* are identical cognates where /n/ became /m/ and /q & S/ merged into /s/ (4.8-9 above).
- v) All the negative full words are identical cognates like *less* and *laisa* 'not', German *kein* 'no' and Arabic *kalla* 'no' where /l/ changed to /n/ (4.12-37 above).

In conclusion, the lexical root theory has proven over and over again its applicability to and adequacy for the analysis of the close genetic relationship between negative morphemes in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, and Greek. The multiple uses of the same morphemes such as *in* and *de-* in all point to a common genetic source at the top of which Arabic stands firmly. To consolidate these findings further, research is required into all language levels; moreover, their application to language teaching, lexicology and lexicography, translation, cultural (including anthropological and historical) awareness, understanding, and heritage (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a) is badly needed. Such research is endless, interesting and useful, whose results will hopefully bring about unity in a deeply disunited, biased, and prejudiced world in which learning a language and, consequently, adapting to a new culture will become a lot easier eventually.

=====

Acknowledgements

Warm thanks are extended to everybody who contributed to this research in any way worldwide. For my inspiring, understanding, enthusiastic, tolerant, and supportive wife, Amandy M. Ibrahim, words fumble.

=====

References

- Algeo, J. (2010). *The origins and development of the English language*. (6th ed.). Wadsworth Cengage Learning.
- Alghalayeeni, Al-Shaikh Mustafa. (2010). *Jaami3 Al-duroos Al-3arabiyat*. Saida and Beirut: Al-Maktabat Al-3aSriyat.

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

- Bergs, Alexander and Brinton, Laurel (eds). (2012). *Handbook of English historical linguistics*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.
- Campbell, L. (2006). *Historical linguistics: An introduction*. (2nd ed). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.
- Canoonet. (2012). Derivation. Retrieved <http://www.canoo.net> (1 November 2012).
- Chambers, J. K. (2009). *Sociolinguistic theory: Linguistic variation and its social significance*. (3rd edn). Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell.
- 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.
- Green, Tamara N. (2008). *The Greek and Latin roots of English*. (4th ed.) Plymouth: Rowman and Littlefield.
- Harper, Douglas. (2012). *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved <http://www.etymonline.com> (October 10, 2012).
- Ibn Manzoor, Abi Alfadl Almisri. (74). *Lisan al3arab*. Beirut: Dar Sadir.
- Ibn Seedah, Ali bin Ismail. (1996). *AlmukhaSSaS*. Beirut: Daar I2ya Alturath Al3arabi and Muassasat Altareekh al3arabi.
- Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1993). *Dirasa fi 3ilmi allugha al-ijtima3i: Bahth lughawi Sauti ijtima3i fi allahajat al3arabia alshamia muqaranatan ma3a alingleeziyya wa ghairiha*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.
- _____. (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.
- _____. (2012a). The Arabic origins of numeral words in English and European languages. *International Journal of Linguistics* 4 (3), 225-41. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.1276>
- _____. (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. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.59>
- _____. (2012c). The Arabic origins of English pronouns: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Linguistics* 4 (4), 83-103. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.227>.
- _____. (2012d). The Arabic origins of determiners in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India* 12 (11), 323-359. URL: <http://www.languageinindia.com>.
- _____. (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. URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.185>.
- _____. (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), 98-119. URL: <http://www.languageinindia.com>.
- _____. (2013a). The Arabic origins of derivational morphemes in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India* 12 (12). URL: <http://www.languageinindia.com>.
- Lawless, Laura K. (2012). French negation. Retrieved <http://french.about.com/od/grammar/a/negation.htm> (11 November 2012).

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

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

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.
Department of English Language and Translation
Qassim University
P.O. Box 6611
Buraidah
KSA
zajassems@gmail.com

Language in India www.languageinindia.com

13 : 1 January 2013

Zaidan Ali Jassem, Ph.D.

The Arabic Origins of Negative Particles in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root
Theory Approach