The Arabic Origins or Cognates of Negative Terms in World Languages: A Radical Linguistic Theory Approach

Zaidan Ali Jassem

Department of English Language and Translation,
Qassim University, P.O.Box 6611, Buraidah, KSA

Abstract:

This paper aims to establish the Arabic cognates, reflexes, or origins of "negative particles, terms, or words" in world languages from a radical linguistic (or lexical root) theory perspective. The data comprises key negative terms like no/not in 112 world languages, belonging to eleven major and minor families like Indo-European, Sino-Tibetan, Afro-Asiatic, Austronesian, Dravidian, Turkic, Mayan, Japonic, Niger-Congo, Uto-Aztec, and Tai-Kadai, which make up 60% of world languages and 96% of world population. The results clearly show that all such words, whether n-based (e.g., ne, na, in, no), l-based (e.g., la/lo, lain/lan 'not'), or m-based (e.g., ma/mei 'not'), have true Arabic cognates with the same or similar forms and meanings, whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of linguistic change. Therefore, the results support the adequacy of the radical linguistic theory according to which, unlike the Comparative Method and/or Family Tree Model, all world languages are related to one another, which eventually stemmed from a radical or root language which has been retained and preserved almost intact in Arabic as the most conservative and productive language. Thus Arabic can be safely said to be the radical language itself for sharing the negative cognates with all world languages and for having a huge phonetic, morphological, grammatical, and lexical repertoire and variety which is indispensable for interpreting its linguistic richness and versatility.

Keywords: Negative particles, world languages, language families and relationships, radical world language, radical linguistic (lexical root) theory

1. Introduction

The Radical Linguistic Theory (Jassem 2014h-l, 2015-2017) is a slightly revised version, which developed from the Lexical Root Theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g), which has passed through three stages so far. In the initial stage (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g), the lexical root theory was originally proposed to trace back the origins of Indo-European languages into Arabic at all linguistic levels. In general, Jassem (2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015-2017) has shown in fifty five studies that Arabic, English, German, French, and the so-called Indo-

European languages as a whole are genetically related very closely phonetically, morphologically, grammatically, and semantically or lexically to such an extent that they can all be regarded as dialects of the same language indeed. More precisely, the Arabic origins or cognates of their words were successfully traced in thirty seven lexical studies in key semantic fields like numerals, religious, love, democratic, military, and legal terms (Jassem 2012a-d, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015-2016); in three morphological studies on inflectional and derivational markers (Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b); in nine grammatical papers like pronouns, verb 'to be', wh-questions, and case (Jassem 2012c-e, 2013l, 2014c, 2015d); and in one phonetic study about the English, German, French, Latin, and Greek cognates of Arabic back consonants (Jassem 2013c). In the second stage (2014h-i), it was extended to trace the Arabic origins of Mandarin Chinese pronouns (Jassem 2014h) and Basque and Finnish pronouns (Jassem 2014i). In the final stage (Jassem 2015h), it was generalized to trace the Arabic origins of all language families in the areas of demonstrative pronouns in eleven major (and minor) language families, making up 95% of the total world population; the current topic, negative words, is a sequel to it. Finally, three papers applied the approach to translation studies (Jassem 2014e, 2015b, 2016i).

The Radical Linguistic Theory (Jassem 2014 h-k, 2015-2017) is a slightly revised version of the Lexical Root Theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g, 2015a-g), both deriving their name originally from the use of lexical (consonantal) roots or radicals in retracing genetic relationships between words in world languages. The theory first arose as a rejection of the Family Tree Model or Comparative Method in historical linguistics for classifying Arabic as a member of a different language family than English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and the so-called Indo-European languages (see Bergs and Brinton 2012; Algeo 2010; Crystal 2010: 302; Yule 2014; Campbell 2004: 190-191; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 61-94). In all the above fifty five studies, the tightly-knit genetic relationship between Arabic and such languages was, on the contrary, categorically established phonetically, morphologically, grammatically, and semantically or lexically so much so that they can be really considered dialects of the same language, where Arabic was found to be their source or parent language for several reasons (Jassem (2012-2017). In other words, Arabic, English, German, and French words of all types and sorts, for example, were shown to be true cognates with similar or identical forms and meanings, whose apparent differences are due to natural and plausible causes and diverse routes of linguistic change. This entails that all such languages developed, in fact must have developed, from an earlier single, perfect, suddenly-emerged Radical or Root Language from which all human languages emanated in the first place, and which could never have died out but rather has fully, though variably, survived into today's languages, to which they can all be traced, with Arabic in particular being the closest or most conservative and productive descendant.

In addition, the traditional classification of language families was found to be grossly inaccurate. Evidence from Chinese (Jassem 2014h) and Basque and Finnish pronouns (Jassem 2014i) as well as Indo-European pronouns (Jassem 2012c) supports this claim, which shows that

all such pronouns have true Arabic cognates or origins. Therefore, to aptly capture the close genetic linkage between European and Arabian languages in general, a new larger language family grouping has been proposed, called *Eurabian* or *Urban* (Jassem 2015c: 41; 2015d).

This paper is a revised follow-up to Jassem's (2015h) investigation of the Arabic origins and/or cognates of demonstrative pronouns in world languages as well as negation (Jassem 2015j) and plural markers (Jassem 2016a). In particular, it examines the Arabic origins and/or source cognates of *negative particles, terms,* or *words* in almost all world languages, comprising 61% of world languages and/or 96% of world population. The remainder of the paper includes four sections: (ii) research methods, (iii) results, (iv) discussion, and (v) conclusion.

2. Research Methods

2.1 The Data

2.1.1 The Language Sample

The data consists of negative terms like *no/not* in world languages, both in major and minor language families. These languages are shown in the following table by family and language and speaker numbers or statistics.

Table 1. A Statistical Summary of World Languages

Language Family	No. & % of Languages	No. & % of Speakers
Afro-Asiatic	366 (5.15%)	380, 821,999 (6.05%)
Indo-European	437 (6.15%)	1, 913,575, 380 (46.31%)
Sino-Tibetan	453 (6.38%)	1, 268, 181, 584 (20.16%)
Austronesian	1223 (17.22%)	323, 456, 908 (5.14%)
Altaic- Japonic	12 (0.17%)	129, 067,790 (2.05%)
Korean	2 (0.03%)	77 160 030 (1.23%) =
	14 (0.20%)	206 227 820 (3.28%)
Mayan	31 (0.44%)	6, 522,182 (0.10%)

Dravidian	84 (1.18%)	229, 346,860 (3.65%)
Niger-Congo	1524 (21.46%)	436, 814,956 (6.94%)
Uto-Aztec	58 (0.82%)	1, 910,442 (0.03%)
Turkic	39 (0.55%)	170, 156, 603 (2.70%)
Tai-Kadai	94 (1.32%)	80, 772,252 (1.28%).
Total	4331 (60.84%)	95.64%

Source: ethnologue.org 2015

It can be clearly seen in the table that these languages comprise about 61% of world languages which are spoken by around 96% of the world population. It also shows that the language families differ in their numbers and speaker populations. More precisely, the largest language families in terms of their native speaker numbers are the Indo-European and Sino-Tibetan whereas the largest in terms of language numbers are the Niger-Congo and Austronesian. Afro-Asiatic languages are about equally divided as to the ratio of speaker and language numbers. All the other language families are minor ones like Altaic, Dravidian, Uto-Aztec, Turkic, and Tai-Kadai.

2.1.2 Data Sources

Data selection and/or collection has been based on Swadesh's lists, English dictionaries and thesauri, and the author's knowledge of their frequency and use in especially today's fully natural Arabic, English, German, and French conversations and/or texts. A brief survey is given in section (3) below.

As for etymological data, all references to English and Indo-European languages are for Harper (2015). However, this etymology is not, like all other similar dictionaries, without its severe drawbacks owing to the many unknowns, uncertainties, and the seemingly illogical derivations or meanings of many words such as *not* (Jassem 2013b) which makes more sense if

derived straight from Arabic as shall be seen in section (4) below. Therefore, it has to be used with care and discretion.

Concerning Arabic data, the meanings are for Ibn Manzoor (2013) in the main, Ibn Seedah (1996: 13/248-257), Alghalayini (2010), Alafaghani (2003), e-dictionaries like *mu3jam alama3ani* (2015), and the author's knowledge and use of Shami (Syrian) Arabic as a native speaker. All the genetic linkages between Arabic and such languages are exclusively mine, unless otherwise stated.

2.1.3 Data Transcription

In transcribing the data, normal Romanized spelling is used for all languages for practical purposes. Nonetheless, certain symbols were used for unique Arabic sounds: namely, /2 & 3/ for the voiceless and voiced pharyngeal fricatives respectively, /kh & gh/ for the voiceless and voiced velar fricatives each, /q/ for the voiceless uvular stop, capital letters for the emphatic counterparts of plain consonants /T (t), D (d), Dh (dh), & S (s)/, and /'/ for the glottal stop (Jassem 2013c). Long vowels in Arabic are usually doubled- i.e., /aa, ee, & oo/. Numerals indicate tone marks in tone languages like Chinese without considering them in the analysis for having no semantic impact on the final output.

2.2 Data Analysis

2.2.1   Theoretical Framework: Radical Linguistic Theory

In data analysis, the Radical Linguistic Theory (Jassem 2014h-l, 2015a-h), which is a slightly revised and more generalized version of the original lexical root theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g), will be used as the theoretical framework here. The lexical root theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g) was so called because of employing the lexical (consonantal) roots or radicals in examining genetic relationships between words such as the derivation of   *observation* from *serve* (or simply *srv*) (see Jassem 2013o) and *description (subscription, prescription, inscription)* from *scribe (scrb)* (see Jassem 2013i, 2014e). The main reason for that is because the consonantal root carries and determines the basic meaning of the word irrespective of its affixation and vowels such as <u>*observation (srv)*</u>. Historically speaking, classical and modern Arabic dictionaries (e.g., Ibn Manzoor 1974, 2013) used consonantal roots in listing lexical entries, a practice first founded by Alkhaleel, an 8th century Arabic linguist, lexicographer, musician, and mathematician (Jassem 2012e).

The lexical root theory has a simple structure, which consists of a theoretical principle or hypothesis and five practical procedures of analysis. The principle states that:

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

In the radical linguistic theory, the above principle has been slightly revised to read:

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

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

Firstly, the methodological procedure concerns data collection, selection, and statistical analysis. Apart from loan words, *all* language words, affixes, and phonemes are amenable to investigation, and *not only* the core vocabulary as is the common practice in the field (Crystal 2010; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 76-77; Crowley 1997: 88-90, 175-178). However, data selection is practically inevitable since no single study can accomplish that at one time, no matter how ambitious it might be. The most appropriate method for approaching that goal would be to use semantic fields such as the present and the above topics. Cumulative evidence from such findings will aid in formulating rules and laws of language change at a later stage (cf. Jassem 2012f, 2013a-f, 2013l). The statistical analysis employs the percentage formula (see 2.2.2 below).

Secondly, the lexicological procedure is the initial step in the analysis. Words are analyzed by

(i)   deleting affixes (e.g., *explained → plain*),

(ii)   using primarily consonantal roots or radicals (e.g., *plain → pln*), and

(iii)   searching for correspondence in meaning on the basis of word etymologies and origins as a guide (e.g., Harper 2014), which should be used with discretion, though. Starting with

meanings, not sounds or sound laws, is *central* as the former are more stable and change very much less than the latter which do so extensively.

So the final outcome yields the derivation of *plain* form Arabic *baien, baan* (v) 'clear, plain' via /l/-insertion or split from /n/ (Jassem 2013i).

Thirdly, the linguistic procedure handles the analysis of phonetic, morphological, grammatical and semantic structures and differences between words. The phonetic analysis examines sound changes within and across categories. More precisely, consonants may change their place and manner of articulation as well as voicing. At the level of place, bilabial consonants ↔ labio-dental ↔ dental ↔ alveolar ↔ palatal ↔ velar ↔ uvular ↔ pharyngeal ↔ glottal (where ↔ signals change in both directions); at the level of manner, stops ↔ fricatives ↔ affricates ↔ nasals ↔ laterals ↔ approximants; and at the level of voice, voiced consonants ↔ voiceless. For example, /t/ may turn into /d/ by voice or /th & s/ by manner.

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

Sound changes result in natural and plausible processes like assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, merger, insertion, split, reordering, substitution, syllable loss, re-syllabification, consonant cluster reduction or creation and so on. In addition, sound change may operate in a multi-directional, cyclic, and lexically-diffuse or irregular manner (for detail, see Jassem 2012a-f, 2013c).

Regarding the morphological and grammatical analyses, some overlap obtains. The former examines the inflectional and derivational aspects of words in general (Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b); the latter handles grammatical classes, categories, and functions like pronouns, determiners, verbs, nouns, prepositions, question words, and case (Jassem 2012c-e, 2013l, 2014b-c, 2015d). Since their influence on the basic meaning of the lexical root is marginal, inflectional and derivational morphemes may also be ignored altogether. As both morphological and grammatical

features have already been dealt with in full, there is no need to include them in every single case later.

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

Fourthly, the relational procedure accounts for the relationship between form and meaning in words from three angles:

(i)   formal and semantic similarity (e.g., *three, third, tertiary* and Arabic *thalath* 'three' (Damascus Arabic *talaat* (Jassem 2012a)),

(ii)   formal similarity and semantic difference (e.g., *ship* and *sheep* (Jassem 2012b), and

(iii)   formal difference and semantic similarity (e.g., *quarter, quadrant, carat, cadre* and Arabic *qeeraaT* 'a fourth; carat' (Jassem 2012a)).

As in the morphological and syntactic or grammatical procedures, there is no need to tackle it in every single case for it will lead to undesirably lengthy treatments.

Finally, the comparative historical analysis compares every word in English in particular and German, French, Greek, Latin, and Sanskrit in general with its Arabic counterpart or cognate phonetically, morphologically, and semantically on the basis of its history and development in English (e.g., Harper 2014; Pyles and Algeo 1993) and Arabic (e.g., Ibn Manzour 2013; Altha3aalibi 2011; Ibn Seedah 1996) besides the author's knowledge of both Arabic as a first language and English as an equal second language. Discretion should be exercised here due to uncertainties and inaccuracies, especially in Harper's work, though.

In summary, the most appropriate procedure for genetically relating English and Arabic words, e.g., to each other can be summed up as follows:

(i)   select a word, e.g., *no, not, in*,

(ii)   identify the source, daughter, and/or sister language meaning (e.g., English or Latin) on the basis of especially word history or etymology. It is essential to start with meanings, not sounds or sound laws because they are more stable and change very much less than the latter which do so extensively; for example, all the sounds of a given word might change beyond recognition while meanings do so in a rather very limited way; so the meaning will lead you to the cognate easily whereas the sounds will get you lost definitely,

(iii)   search for the corresponding meaning and form in the target, parent, or reference language (e.g., Arabic), looking for cognates: i.e., sister words with the same or similar forms and meanings, and

(iv)   finally explain the differences in form and meaning between the cognates lexicologically, phonetically, morphologically, and semantically as indicated. As a matter of fact, finding the right cognate on the basis of its meaning first often leads you to the ensuing changes automatically.

That is the whole story briefly, simply, and truly. No fuss, no mess (see Jassem 2012-2015).

2.2.2 Statistical Analysis

The percentage formula will be used for calculating the ratio of cognate words or shared vocabulary (Cowley 1997: 173, 182), which has been fully described in earlier papers (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k).

3. Negation in World Languages: A Linguistic Survey

World languages use a variety of similar negative words, which cut across or are shared amongst language families. The following survey is for 111 languages in both major and minor 11 language families which, as stated earlier, constitute 61% of world languages and 96% of world population. Such negative words are listed below by family and language.

In Afro-Asiatic languages, Arabic has a wide array of negative terms which vary according to certain linguistic contexts which need not concern us here (Jassem 2013b). In fact, it has the largest number of such words, including *in/an, la/li, illa, ma, lam, lamma, lan, kalla,*

laisa, laata, ghair, siwa, the indirect question particles *man, lawla, law, laita,* the tongue clicks/gestures *tSi (tsk)*, *jok* 'derogatory, sarcastic *tSi*', *qi'/qi'qi'*, *hi'/hu'*, *ni'*, and *ba2* 'nothing for children'. Other languages have a lot less like Hebrew *lo, la*; Syriac *la*; Akkadian *ul, la*; Ge'ez: *'i*; Maltese *ma*; Coptic *an, at, ath*; Tarifit Berber *ur, ulah, ulash, mačči* (Tashelhit Berber *lah*); Hausa *a'a, ba, babu*; Oroma *ii'ii*; Somali *ma.*

Altaic includes Turkish *degil*; Mongolian *vyc*; Oroqen *e-*; Korean *ani, an, eops-*; Manchu *waka, aku*; Kyrgyz: *emes*; Japanese: *-na, -nu, na.*

Austronesian contains Malay *tidak, saan*; Tagalog *bukan, tidak*; Pampangan *dili, wala*; Pangasinan *ali*; Malagasy *tsy*; Maori *ehara, kahore/kaore, kare, kihai, kore, kaua, kauaka*; Sundanese *lain, henteu*; Javanese *dudu, ora.*

Indo-European, which is the largest in speaker numbers the world over, comprises

(i)   a Germanic branch like English *no(t)*; Scots *no*; German *nein, nie, nicht*; Dutch *niet*; Danish *ikke*; Norwegian (Bokmal) *ikke, ei*; Icelandic *ekki, eigi*;

(ii)   a Romance branch like Latin *non*; Portuguese *nao*; Spanish *no*; French *ne (pas)*; Italian *non*; Romanian *nu*;

(iii)   a Slavic branch typified by Old Church Slavonic *ne*; Czech *ne, ne*; Polish *nie*; Bulgarian *ne*; Macedonian *ne*; Russian *ne*; Ukrainian *ne*; and

(iv)   Indo-Aryan as in Persian *na*; Pashtu *ne*; Kurdish *na/ne*; Sanskrit *na*; Romani *na*; Hindi-Urdu *nahim*; Punjabi *nahin*;

(v)   Hellenic as in Ancient Greek *ou/ouk, mi*; Modern Greek *dhe, mi.*

Dravidian has Telugu *kadu* (negation), *ledu* (absence); Tamil *illai*; Malayalam *alla* (negation), *illa* (absence); Kannada *alla.*

Mayan is a small family, which contains K'iche' *b'i, ma, ja'i'*; Q'eqchi' *ink'a', moko… ta*; Tzotzil *mu*; Yucatec *ma'.*

Niger-Congo has the most languages, numerically speaking, which incude Yoruba *ko, ki*; Igbo *déedéet*; Wolof *du, bu, déedéet*; Fula *alaa*; Jango *na'a*; Vai *maa*, and Zulu, a Bantu sub-branch, *a-, akekho, abekho.*

Sino-Tibetan is the second largest family in terms of speaker numbers, containing Mandarin *bu* 'is not, does not', *bie* 'do not (imperative)', *mei* 'does not, have/did not'; Cantonese *mou5*; Min Nan (Amoy) *put* (literary), *mai* 'do not (imperative), *be* 'is not, does not'; Hakka *put2*; Burmese *ma … ne, ma… bu.*

Turkic is a small family such as Chuvash *cyk*; Yakut *cyox*; Tuvan *eves, yok*; Khakas *nemes, yox*; Standard Altai *emes, yox*; Tatar *tyrel*; Bashkir *tyrel*; Karachay-Balkar *emes*; Kazakh *emes*; Kyrgyz *em*; Uzbek *emas, yo'q*; Uyghur *emes*; Turkmen *däl*; Aziri *deyil*; Turkisk *degil*; Crimean Tatar *degil*.

Tai-Kadai is another small family such as Thai *mây*; Lao *bo*; Shan *maw2*; Southern Dong *'aai323*; Gelao *ma55, o55*; Zhuang *bou3, mi3*; Ong Be *men2*; White Hmong *tsis*.

Uralic is a small family again, e.g., Hungarian *nem*; Finnish *ei*; Karelian *ei*; Estonian *ei, mitte*; Erzya *a*; Mansi *at*; North Sami *ii*.

Finally, Uto-Aztec is a small family, exemplified by Nahuatl *me*; Yaqui *ini'i*; Hopi *qa*; Shoshone *gai*; O'odham *pi*; Cahuila *kill*; Tongva *xaay*.

4. Results

The results will mainly focus on the Arabic lexical (consonantal) radicals or roots of *negative words* in world languages and the changes that affected them. The exact quality of the vowel is ignored for having little or no semantic impact whatsoever on the final output (Jassem 2012-2015). The results will be presented family by family and language by language, all whose negative words can be traced back to Arabic as a Radical or Root Language. Furthermore, it will be seen that a large number of them are straightforward which can be traced back to Arabic very easily; a few need a little explanation.

3.1 Afro-Asiatic Languages

All their different negative words can be easily and directly traced back to Arabic as follows.

a) Hebrew *lo, la*, Syriac *la*, Akkadian *ul, la*, and Berber *lah/ulah* are true and identical cognates to or descend directly from Arabic *la*;

b) Ge'ez *'i*, Hausa *a'a*, and Oroma *ii'ii* come from Arabic *'a* 'yes/no particle; also negative particle in spoken Syrian Coast Arabic', *hi'/hu'* 'a negative gesture in spoken Arabic' via /h/-loss, *'ee* 'yes' via lexical divergence, or *la* via /l & a/-merger into /i (a)/;

c) Coptic *an* comes from Arabic *an* while Coptic *at* and *ath* are variants, both of which derive from Arabic *3ada* 'except' or *3aat* 'against' via lexical shift, /3/-loss, and turning /d (t)/ into /t (th)/, or *qaT* 'never' via /q & T/-merger into /t (th)/;

d) Maltese *ma*, Somali *ma*, and Arabic *ma* are true and identical cognates;

e) Hausa *ba/babu* came from Arabic *ma, mabi/mabu* (*ma* 'not' + *bi/bu* 'in') 'nothing', turning /m/ into /b/ or from Arabic *ba2* 'nothing for children' via /2/-loss, though less likely; and

f) Berber *ulash*, from Arabic *laisa* where /s/ became /sh/, *mačči* from Arabic *mashi*, and *ur* from Arabic *ghair* via /gh & r/-merger.

3.2 Indo-European Languages

a) English and Scots *no*, German *nein/nie*, Latin *non*, Portuguese *nao*, Spanish *no*, French *ne pas*, Italian *non*, and Romanian *nu*, Old Church Slavonic *ne*, Czech *ne, ne*, Polish *nie*, Bulgarian *ne*, Macedonian *ne*, Russian *ne*, and Ukrainian *ne*, Persian *na*, Pashtu *ne*, Kurdish *na/ne*, Sanskrit *na*, and Romani *na* are all variants, coming directly from Arabic *in/an* via reversal or *ma* where /m/ passed into /n/; French *pas* is from Arabic *(la) bas* '(no) finished, nothing' (see Jassem 2013b);

b) English *not* (Old English *no* + *wiht* 'thing, creature, being'), Dutch *niet*, and German *nicht* descend straight from Arabic *in/an* via reversal or *naD*, pasing /D/ into /t/ (see Jassem 2013b);

c) German *nicht* might also derive from Arabic *la shi(at), ma shi(at)* 'nothing', turning /l (m)/ into /n/;

d) Danish *ikke*, Norwegian (Bokmal) *ikke, ei*, Icelandic *ekki, eigi*, Ancient Greek *ouk* are all variants, descending straight from Arabic *qi'* 'a negative gesture (in spoken Arabic)' where /q/ became /g (k, y)/ or *iaka* 'warning no; lit., you (acc.)' via lexical shift; Norwegian (Bokmal) *ei* and Ancient Greek *ou* from Arabic *hu'/hi'* via /h/-loss or *ee/oo* 'yes' via divergence;

e) Ancient Greek and Modern Greek *mi*, from Arabic *ma* whereas Modern Greek *dhe* from Arabic *3ada* 'except' via /3/-loss and turning /d/ into /dh/ or *Did* where /D & d/ merged into /dh/;

f) Hindi-Urdu *nahim* and Punjabi *nahin*, from Arabic *nahi(n)* 'negation, stoppage, finish-off' where /n/ became /m/ or *na3am* 'yes' via lexical shift or divergence and turning /3/ into /h/.

3.3 Altaic Languages

a) Turkish *degil*, from Arabic *kalla* via /k/-split into /d & g/;

b)   Mongolian *vyc*, from Arabic *(ma) fish/feesh* 'nothing (in spoken Shami/Syrian Arabic)' where /sh/ became /s (k)/ (for detail, see Jassem 2013b);

c)   Oroqen *e-*, from Arabic *hi'* via /h/-loss or from *la* via /l & a/-merger into /e/;

d)   Manchu *waka, aku*, from Arabic *qi'* or *kalla* via /l & a/-merger into /u/;

e)   Kyrgyz *emes*, from Arabic *ma* or *mish/mash(i)* 'nothing (in spoken Arabic)' where /sh/ became /s/ (for detail, see Jassem 2013b);

f)   Korean *ani/an* and Japanese *-na, -nu, na-* come straight from Arabic *an/in* via reversal or from *ma*, passing /m/ into /n/;

g)   Korean *eops-* derives from Arabic *bas* 'finished, nothing; enough' via reordering and lexical shift;

h)   Javanese *dudu* is from Arabic *Did* while *ora* from Arabic *ghair* 'not' via /gh & r/-merger.

3.4 Austronesian Languages

a)   Malay and Tagalog *tidak*, from Arabic *qaT* 'never' via reversal and turning /q & T/ into /k & t (d)/ or *Did* where /D/ became /d/ and /k/ was inserted;

b)   Tagalog *bukan*, from Arabic *ba2(in)* 'nothing' where /2/ became /k/ or *ma kaan* 'nothing; lit, not was' where /m/ changed to /b/;

c)   Pampangan *dili*, from Arabic *kalla* where /k/ became /d/ or *laata* via reversal and turning /t/ into /d/ whereas *wala* from Arabic *la/wala*;

d)   Pangasinan *ali*, from Arabic *la*;

e)   Malagasy *tsy*, from Arabic *tSi'*;

f)   Maori *ehara, kahore/kaore, kare, kore* are all variants, which come from Arabic *ghair* where /gh/ became /h (k)/ while *kihai, kaua, kauaka* are from Arabic *qi'* or its doubled variant *qi'qi'* where /q & '/ changed into /h & k/;

g)   Sundanese *lain* is from Arabic *lan* while *henteu* from Arabic *intaha* 'finished' via reordering and lexical shift;

h)   Javanese *dudu*, from Arabic *Did* while *ora* from Arabic *ghair* via /gh & r/-merger.

3.5 Dravidian Languages

a)   Telugu *kadu* is from Arabic *qaT* 'never' where /q & T/ became /k & d/ while *ledu*, from Arabic *laata* where /t/ turned into /d/;

b)   Tamil *illai*, Malayalam *alla/illa*, and Kannada *alla* are all variants, which derive from Arabic *la/illa*.

3.6 Mayan Languages

a)   K'iche' *ma*, Tzotzil *mu*, and Yucatec *ma'*, from Arabic *ma*;

b)   K'iche' *b'i* comes from Arabic *bila* 'without', merging /l & a/ into /i/, *ba2* 'nothing for children' via /2/-loss, or *ma* where /m/ passed into /b/;

c)   K'iche' *ja'i'*, from Arabic *qi'* or *hi'*, passing /q (h)/ into /j/;

d)   Q'eqchi' *ink'a'*, from Arabic *kalla* via reordering and turning /l/ into /n/ while *moko... ta*, from Arabic *mashi/maku* 'nothing (in spoken Syrian/Iraqi Arabic)' where /sh/ became /k/ while *ta*, from Arabic *3ada* 'except' via lexical shift, /3/-loss, and turning /d/ into /t/.

3.7 Niger-Congo Languages

a)   Yoruba *ko, ki*, from Arabic *kalla* where /l & a/ merged into /i/ or *qi'* where /q/ became /k/;

b)   Igbo and Wolof *déedéet*, from Arabic *Did, taDaad* 'against' via reordering;

c)   Wolof *bu*, from Arabic *bila* 'without', merging /l & a/ into /o/, *ba2* 'nothing' via /2/-loss, or *ma* where /m/ passed into /b/;

d)   Fula *alaa*, from Arabic *la*;

e)   Jango *na'a* from Arabic *in/an* via reversal or *ma* where /m/ became /n/;

f)   Vai *maa* from Arabic *ma*;

g)   Zulu *a-*, from Arabic *la* via /l & a/-merger, *akekho* from Arabic *qi'qi'* where /q & q/ passed into /k & kh/ or *kikh* 'negative gesture for children', and *abekho*, from Arabic *ba2* 'nothing for children' via lexical shift or divergence and turning /2/ into /kh/.

3.8 Sino-Tibetan Languages

a)   Mandarin *bu/bie*, Min Nan (Amoy) *be*, and Burmese *bu*, from Arabic *bila* via /l & a/-merger into /i (e, u)/, *ba2* 'nothing to children' via /2/-loss and lexical shift, or *ma* where /m/ passed into /b/;

b)   Mandarin *mei*, Cantonese *mou5*, Min Nan *mai*, and Burmese *ma*, from Arabic *ma* (also *moo, mee* in spoken Arabic (Jassem 2013b));

c)   Burmese *ne*, from Arabic *in or ma*, turning /m/ into /n/;

d)   Hakka *put2*, from Arabic *abad(an), batta/batata(n), albatta* 'never', turning /d/ into /t/.

3.9 Turkic Languages

a)   Chuvash *cyk*, Yakut *cyox*, Tuvan *yok*, Khakas *yox*, Standard Altai *yox*, and Uzbek *yo'q* are all variants, which come from Arabic *tSi' (tsk)* and its spoken (Syrian Arabic) variant *jok* where /tS/ became /c & k/ or *qi'/qi'qi'* where /j (q)/ passed into /y/;

b)   Tatar and Bashkir *tyrel*, from Arabic *kalla* via /k & l/-mutation into /t & r/ or *laata* via reversal and /r/-insertion;

c)   Khakas *nemes*, Karachay-Balkar *emes*, Kazakh *emes*, Kyrgyz *em*, and Uzbek *emas* are all variants which derive from Arabic *ma* or *mish/mash(i)* 'nothing in spoken Arabic', passing /sh/ into /s/ (see Jassem 2013b);

d)   Turkmen *däl*, Aziri *deyil*, Turkisk *degil*, and Crimean Tatar *degil* are all alternants, coming from Arabic *kalla* via /k/-split into /d & g/ or *laata* via reversal and passing /t/ into /d/.

3.10 Thai-Kadai Languages

a)   Thai *mây*, Shan *maw2*, Gelao *ma55, o55*, and Zhuang *bou3, mi3* are all variants, which descend from Arabic *ma*, passing /m/ into /b/; Gelao *o55*, from Arabic *hu'* via /h/-loss (the numerals are tone marks);

b)   Ong Be *men2*, from Arabic *man* or *ma* via /n/-split from /m/;

c)   White Hmong *tsis*, from Arabic *tSi'*, turning /S/ into /s/;

d)   Lao *bo* and Zhuang *bou3*, from Arabic *ma* where /m/ passed into /b/, *bila* 'without' via /l & a/-merger into /o/, or *ba2* 'nothing' via /2/-loss.

3.11 Uralic Languages

a)   Hungarain *nem*, from Arabic *man* via reversal and lexical shift or *lam*, turning /l/ into /n/;

b)   Finnish *ei*, Karelian *ei*, Estonian *ei*, North Sami *ii*, and Erzya *a* are all variants, which come from Arabic *hi'* via /h/-loss, *'a* 'yes/no particle; also negative particle in spoken Syrian Coast Arabic', or *la* via /l & a/-merger;

c)   Estonian *mitte*, from Arabic *naD*, turning /n & D/ into /m & t/ or *laata* where /l/ became /m/;

d)   Mansi *at*, from Arabic *qaT* 'never', merging /q & T/ into /t/; or from *3ada* 'except' via /3/-loss, turning /d/ into /t/, and lexical shift.

3.12 Uto-Aztecan Languages

a)   Nahuatl *me*, from Arabic *ma*;

b)   Yaqui *ini'i*, from Arabic *in*;

c)   Hopi *qa*, Shoshone *gai*, and Tongva *xaay* are all variants, which come from Arabic *qi'*, turning /q/ into /g (x)/;

d)   O'odham *pi*, from Arabic *bila* via /l & a/-merger into /i/, *ba2* 'nothing' via /2/-loss, or *ma* by turning /m/ into /p/;

e)   Cahuila *kill*, from Arabic *kalla*.

In summary, the total number of language families is 11 with 111 languages, in all of which negative terms can be traced back to Arabic easily, smoothly, and directly.

5. Discussion

The results clearly indicate that *negation* is commonly expressed in the same or similar ways in all world languages. That is, *negative terms* like *no/ne/an* and *ma/mei/may/mou* in world languages are true cognates for sharing identical or similar forms and meanings. Concerning their differences, they are all due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of phonetic, morphological, grammatical, and semantic change.

The results support Jassem's (2013b) study on the Arabic origins of negative particles in Indo-European languages, all of which had Arabic true cognates. Indeed, they, on a more general level, substantiate Jassem (2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-k, 2015a-g) in which English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit and Arabic were all found to be not only members of the same

family but also rather dialects of the same language. This led the researcher to generally classify these languages as *Eurabian* or *Urban* which is a blend of European and Arabian languages (Jassem 2015c: 41, 2015d).

Furthermore, the results shed light on the traditional classification of world languages into families, most of which turns out not to be accurate at all as the data shows. As languages from different families around the world share the same or similar negative word(s) or form(s) as in the case of *no/ne/an*, *la/lo/alla*, and/or *ma/mei/may*, this clearly indicates that classifying them into separate, unrelated families is certainly wrong. More precisely, Arabic *ma* (spoken *mu* & *mi* also), Maltese and Somali *ma*, Greek *mi*, Thai *may*, Shan *maw2*, Chinese *mei*, Cantonese *mou5*, Min Nan *mai*, Burmese *ma*, K'ichi' *ma,* Tzotzil *mu*, Ycatec *ma'*, Kyrgyz *em*, Kazakh *emes*, Uzbek *emas*, Nahuatl *me*, Vai *maa* are all identical cognates, to which Mandarin *bu/bie*, Min Nan *be*, Burmese *bou*, furthermore, can be added via the replacement of /m/ by /b/. Similarly, Arabic *an/in*, Coptic *an*, English and Scots *no*, English *not*, Latin *non*, Portuguese *nao*, Spanish *no*, French *ne pas*, Italian *non*, and Romanian *nu*, Old Church Slavonic *ne*, Czech *ne, ne*, Polish *nie*, Bulgarian *ne*, Macedonian *ne*, Russian *ne*, and Ukrainian *ne*, Persian *na*, Pashtu *ne*, Kurdish *na/ne*, Sanskrit *na*, and Romani *na*, Korean *ani/an* and Japanese *-na, -nu, na-*, Burmese *ne*, and Yaqui *ini'i* are identical cognates. Another such example is Arabic *la/illa*, Hebrew *lo/la*, Syria *la*, Akkadian *ul/la*, Pangasinan *ali*, Tamil *illai*, Malayalam *alla/illa*, Kannada *alla*, and Fula *alaa*, all of which are identical cognates also. Thus, as can be clearly seen, grouping these languages into separate, unrelated families is certainly wrong.

Now what does all that mean? On the one hand, there is a need for reclassifying world languages on new grounds. One such attempt is Jassem (2015c-d) which grouped Arabic and Indo-European languages into one family, called Urabian or Urban (Jassem 2015c-d). On the other hand, this necessarily means, on a global level, that all human languages descended from a common source language from which all the negative words in all world languages are derived and used selectively and variably. The sheer percentage of shared *negative* words between Arabic and the other languages, which amounted to 100%, indicates that very clearly (cf. Cowley (997: 172-173).

Thus the results support the Radical Linguistic Theory on all theoretical and analytical levels. Theoretically, the main principle which states that all human languages are genetically related, which descended from a single parent language, which survived until today with Arabic and Indo-European languages like English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit being its closest descendants is, therefore, verifiably sound and empirically true. More precisely, all human languages descended from an earlier, perfect, suddenly-emerged language, called *radical (world) language* from which all human languages initially came and which has incessantly and variably survived into today's languages, though getting simpler and simpler over time. In other words, the *radical language* could never have died out beyond recognition. With proper methodology, it can be easily recovered and/or identified as already shown in this work. As this

work demonstrated, it seems that its closest or most conservative and productive descendant is Arabic for having preserved almost all its features (Jassem 2014h-k, 2015a-d). The next closest languages are European languages on the grounds of geographical proximity: i.e., the geographically nearer, the linguistically and genetically closer. In fact, all Indo-European languages were already found to have descended directly from Arabic (for details, see Jassem 2015a-b, 2015d: 131-132; 2014a-b, 2014e).

So because all the negative words of all types in all world languages can be easily traced back to Arabic only, it can thus be safely said that Arabic is *the* common source or the radical language which has been kept almost intact in it. Although the exact time and place of the split-up between Arabic and the so-called Indo-European languages is immaterial, one can safely say that the original place is where Arabic has continuously been spoken over the ages (for details, see Jassem 2015e-f).

The survival of the radical or root world language has already been established in a number of studies. First, Jassem (2015h) examined demonstrative pronouns in almost all world languages (96% of speakers) where it was found that all such pronouns are shared among all languages and which, furthermore, could all be traced back to Arabic. Again this confirms that Arabic has inherited and maintained all the features of the radical world language- i.e., Arabic is the radical language itself. Secondly, further evidence has been provided by examining personal pronouns in Arabic and Indo-European languages (Jassem 2012c, 2013l), Arabic and Chinese pronouns (Jassem 2014h), and Arabic and Basque and Finnish pronouns (Jassem 2014i) which all were traced back into Arabic as well. Other world languages such as Mayan show a very close relationship.

Thirdly, other evidence comes from divine and theological or religious terms like *Hallelujah (Halleluiah, Alleluia)* which variably occurs in all world languages and is traced back to Arabic (Jassem 2012a, 2o14e). More precisely, *Hallelujah* derives from a reduced and merged form of Arabic *la ilaha illa allah*

'(There's) no god but God'

with *Halle* being *Allah* 'God' in reverse, *lu* being *la* 'no', and *jah* being a reduction and merger of *ilaha illa iah* 'god but him' via /l & i/-merger.

In addition, the biblical names of ancient prophets and persons like *Adam, Eve, Noah, Abraham, Saleh, Hood, Moses, Jesus Christ, Charles, John, Matthew, Paul, Peter* is another case in point. Unlike other languages, all have recognizable meanings in Arabic only in which they are used extensively as normal words in different forms as nouns, verbs, adjectives, adverbs; no other language does that or has that capacity. For example, while *Noah* is just a name in Latin, Greek, English, German, French, and Russian without anybody knowing its meaning for real, all Arabic speakers in all Arabic dialects worldwide know it means 'crier' who

may also use it as a fully natural or normal word as a noun, verb, adjective, and adverb (Jassem 2014f).

There are three main reasons for postulating a *radical* or *root world language*, from which all human languages stemmed and which must have been perfect in all respects as stated earlier. First, language acquisition is impossible in isolation and without contact with and exposure to others. In other words, man acquires the language he was born into from his parents, family, and community. Without them, man could never speak or utter a single, meaningful word. That is, the first language ever was *perfect* from its sudden start. That language was then passed down with little changes from generation to generation in the central area of the birthplace of humanity, now commonly called the Middle East. Secondly, because totally new words can never be invented but are rather recombined from existing ones, the radical language must have been completely and fully developed at all linguistic levels: phonetic or phonological, morphological, syntactic, and semantic or lexical. Thirdly, language change involves simplification in the main which entails that the root language was fuller and more varied. In other words, it had a larger word stock or vocabulary, more word forms or morphemes, and more grammatical endings and/or structures that are variably maintained or preserved in world languages.

As a consequence, *reconstructing* an old world language is needless; rather that proto-language, called radical language here, is still very much alive and vibrant, having variably survived into today's languages, with Arabic being its closest descendant as the above data clearly shows (for detail, see Jassem 2014h: 254-256, 2014i: 116-117; 2014k, 2015a-b). Thus the quest should focus on relating those languages to it instead of reconstructing hypothetical, fictitious languages. The above-mentioned evidence from negative terms, personal pronouns, religious terms, proper names substantiate that claim. In fact, Jassem (2012-2015) followed that practice in all studies.

On the analytical level, the procedures of the radical linguistic theory all operated neatly and smoothly on all levels despite their limited occurrence due to the linguistic nature of the *negative words* themselves. For example, negative terms have no affixes, morphologically speaking, although all of them, whether inflectional or derivational, have true Arabic cognates as well (for detail, see Jassem 2012f, 2013a-b, 2013l, 2015d). Whatever the case may be, the whole changes were, phonetically speaking, natural and plausible, cyclic and multi-directional, including processes like substitution, deletion, reversal, merger, split, reordering, reduction, and so on.

Semantically, lexical stability was the commonest pattern where most *negative terms* preserved their basic meanings across the languages, e.g., *no (ne, in, an), ma (may, mei, mou), la (lo, alla, illa, ali)*, *lain (lan)*, and *kill (kein, kalla)*. The recurrence of lexical convergence in the data was due to formal and semantic similarity between Arabic words, on the one hand, and their

cognates in other languages, on the other. For instance, *no (ne, in, an)* and *bu/bou* might each derive from several Arabic words, all formally and semantically similar (see 4 above). Although only one cognate might be the ultimate source in the end, no need is presently felt to specify which one it might be; the reader may judge. Lexical shift occurred frequently as in Kakka *put2* which moved from its original or radical meaning 'never' to 'no, not' currently; other examples include *ikke (ekki/eigi)* and *a'a (ii'ii, ei)* (see 6.e-f). Lexical divergence is rare, which might have taken place in *nem/nahim* perhaps, from Arabic *na3am* 'yes' (see 4 above). Lexical split affected Arabic *ma*, which might have resulted, e.g., in English *no* and Chinese and Thai *mei/may*. Lexical change could have affected Arabic *bi* 'in', which became *bu/bou* 'not' in other languages like Chinese and Burmese, perhaps. Finally, lexical variability recurred in the data, whether at the level of the different forms of the same words within the same language such as English *in/un/no* (Jassem 2013b) or across the languages like English *in*, German *nie*, French *non*, Spanish, Latin *non*, and Arabic *an/in* 'not' (see 4 above). Arabic, in particular, is replete with linguistic variability of all types such as *lam/lamma, in/an*.

6. Conclusion and Recommendations

The main findings can be summed up as follows:

i) *Negative terms, particles*, or *words* in all world languages are true cognates whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of linguistic change; all can be easily traced back to Arabic as follows:

a) Arabic *ma (mu, mi)* 'not' (ما (مو، مي) gave rise to all *m*-centred words like Maltese and Somali *ma*, Greek *mi*, Thai *may*, Shan *maw2*, Chinese *mei*, Cantonese *mou5*, Min Nan *mai*, Burmese *ma*, K'ichi' *ma,* Tzotzil *mu*, Ycatec *ma'*, Kyrgyz *em*, Kazakh *emes*, Uzbek *emas*, Nahuatl *me*, Vai *maa*; furthermore, Mandarin *bu/bie,* Min Nan *be*, Burmese *bou* and such *b*-initial words might also come from the same Arabic source in which /m/ became /b/.

b) Arabic *an/in* أن/إن led to all *n*-based words like Coptic *an*, English and Scots *no*, English *not*, Latin *non*, Portuguese *nao*, Spanish *no*, French *ne (pas)*, Italian *non*, and Romanian *nu*, Old Church Slavonic *ne*, Czech *ne*, Polish *nie*, Bulgarian *ne*, Macedonian *ne*, Russian *ne*, Ukrainian *ne*, Persian *na*, Pashtu *ne*, Kurdish *na/ne*, Sanskrit *na*, Romani *na*, Korean *ani/an* and Japanese *-na, -nu, na-*, Burmese *ne*, and Yaqui *ini'i*.

c) Arabic *la/illa* لا/إلّا resulted in all *l*-based words like Hebrew *lo/la*, Syria *la*, Akkadian *ul/la*, Pangasinan *ali*, Tamil *illai*, Malayalam *alla/illa*, Kannada *alla*, Fula *alaa*, Tashelhit Berber *lah*.

d) From Arabic *lan* لن came Sundanese *lain* directly.

e) Danish and Norwegian *ikke*, Icelandic *ekki/eigi*, Ancient Greek *ouk*, Manchu *aku/waka*, K'ichi' *ja'i'*, Yoruba *ko/ki*, Hopi *qa*, and Shoshone *gai* are derived from Arabic *qi', kalla*, or *iaka* 'warning no; you';

f) Ge'ez *'i*, Hausa *a'a*, Oroma *ii'ii*, Norwgian *ei*, Greek *ou*, Finnish *ei*, Karelian *ei*, Estonian *ei*, North Sami *ii*, Erzya *a*, and Oroqe *e-* derive from Arabic *'a* via lexical shift, *hi'/hu'* via /h/-loss, or *la* via /l & a/-merger into /a (e, i)/;

g) Turkish *degil*, Tatar and Bashkir *tyrel*, and Cahuila *kill* derive from Arabic *kalla*;

h) Maori *ehara, kahore, kore* and Tarifit Berber *ur* obtain from Arabic *ghair*, turning /gh/ into /h (k) or merging it into /r/ in the latter;

i) Malagasy *tsy*, Chuvash *cyk*, Yakut *cyox*, Tuvan *yok*, Khakas *yox*, Standard Altai *yox*, and Uzbek *yo'q* are all variants, which come from Arabic *tSi' (tsk)* and its spoken (Syrian Arabic) variant *chok* where /tS/ became /c & k/ or *qi'/qi'qi'* where /j (q)/ passed into /y/;

j) Malay and Tagalog *tidak* and Telugu *kadu* are from Arabic *qaT* 'never' via reversal and turning /q & T/ into /k & t (d)/.

ii) The radical linguistic theory has been theoretically and analytically adequate for genetically relating *negative words* in all world languages to Arabic, which entails that the traditional classification of world languages into families is grossly mistaken. Theoretically, all these languages initially originated from one language that may be called *Radical* or *Root World Language*, which was not only perfect but also has variably survived into today's languages. As Arabic has, besides its phonetic and morphological capacity, variety, and complexity, the largest *negative words* compared to those in the other languages, it can be safely said that it has inherited almost all the Radical Language features, thereby showing its incessant permanence as the most conservative of all.

Analytically, the main phonetic changes were natural and plausible, cyclic and multidirectional, including substitution, reversal, reordering, split, and merger; lexically, the recurrent patterns were stability, convergence, shift, split, and variability.

iii) Finally, future research is needed to substantiate the theory further. Also the application of such findings to language teaching (Jassem 2016g), lexicology and lexicography (Jassem 2016g, 2017a-b), translation (Jassem 2014d, 2016i), cultural (including anthropological, historical, social, religious) awareness, understanding, and heritage is needed badly to promote cross-cultural and global understanding and cooperation in all areas of human life.

References

Alafaghani, Saeed. (2003). *Almoojaz fi qawa3id allugha al3arabia* (In Arabic, A concise Arabic grammar). Damascus: Dar Alfikr.

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

Alghalayini, Al-Shaikh Mustafa. (2010). *Jaami3 Al-duroos Al-3arabia*. Saida and Beirut: Al-Maktabat Al-3aSriyat.

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

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

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

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

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

Ethnologue. (2015). Summary statistics. Retrieved URL: http://www.ethnologue.com/statistics/family (August 31, 2015).

Harper, Douglas. (2015). *Online etymology dictionary*. Retrieved http://www.etymonline.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (1987). *Phonological variation and change in immigrant speech: A sociolinguistic study of a 1967 Arab-Israeli war immigrant speech community in Damascus, Syria*. PhD Thesis, Durham University, UK. Retrieved http://etheses.dur.ac.uk/1682/1/1682.pdf (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (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.

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

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012a). The Arabic origins of numeral words in English and European languages. *International Journal of Linguistics 4 (3)*, 225-41. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.1276 (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012b). The Arabic origins of common religious terms in English: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature 1 (6)*, 59-71. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.6p.59 (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012c). The Arabic origins of English pronouns: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Linguistics 4 (4)*, 83-103. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.227 (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012d). The Arabic origins of determiners in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 12 (11)*, 323-359. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012e). The Arabic Origins of Verb "To Be" in English, German, and French: A Lexical Root Theory Approach. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics and English Literature 1 (7)*, 185-196. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.7575/ijalel.v.1n.7p.185 (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2012f). The Arabic origins of number and gender markers in English, German, French, and Latin: a lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 12 (12)*, 89-119. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013a). The Arabic origins of derivational morphemes in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (1)*, 48-72. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013b). The Arabic origins of negative particles in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (1)*, 234-48. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013c). The English, German, and French cognates of Arabic back consonants: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (2)*: 108-128. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013d). The Arabic origins of "water and sea" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (2)*: 126-151. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013e). The Arabic origins of "air and fire" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (3)*: 631-651. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013f). The Arabic origins of "celestial and terrestrial" terms in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (2)*: 323-345. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013g). The Arabic origins of "animal" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (4)*: 68-106. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013h). The Arabic origins of "body part" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Current Applied Linguistics and English Literature (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.bretj.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013i). The Arabic origins of "speech and writing" terms in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (5)*: 108-159. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013j). The Arabic origins of "time words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 13 (6)*: 274-97. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013k). The Arabic origins of "family words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (3)*: 261-77. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013l). al'uSool al3arabiat lilDamaa'ir alshakSiat fi alingleeziat, walfiransiat, walalmaniat (The Arabic origins of "personal pronouns" in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach (In Arabic). *Almu'tamar aldawli althamin, tajdeed alkhiTaab al3arabi, jaami3at imam bonjul, Indonesia 28-31 August 2013* (8th International Conference of Arabic Speech Renewal, Imam Bonjul University, Indonesia, 28-31 August 2013). Retrieved URL: http://www.academia.edu (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013m). The Arabic origins of "cutting and breaking words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (2)*: 155-68. Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013n). The Arabic origins of "movement and action words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (3):* 187-202. Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013o). The Arabic origins of "perceptual and sensual words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of English Language and Literature 1 (4): 212-24.* Retrieved URL: http://rjelal.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013p). The Arabic origins of "cognitive and mental words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 2 (4)*: 65-83. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2013q). The Arabic origins of "love and sexual words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 1 (4)*: 97-114. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014a). The Arabic origins of "wining and dining words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 1 (4)*: 146-74. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014b). The Arabic origins of "question and auxiliary words" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal of Language and Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijll.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014c). The Arabic origins of "prepositions and conjunctions" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Journal for the Study of English Linguistics 2 (1)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.jsel.org (June 30, 2017).

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

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014e). The Arabic origins of "divine and theological terms" in English, German, and French: A lexical root theory approach. *Language in India 14 (3)*: 155-195. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014f). The Arabic origins of "proper names" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *Research Journal of ELT and Poetry 2 (2)*: 201-22. Retrieved URL: http://www.journalofelt.in (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014g). The Arabic origins of "mathematical and computational terms" in English and European languages: A lexical root theory approach. *International Journal on*

Studies in English and Literature 2 (5): 21-40. Retrieved URL: http://www.arcjournals.org/ijsell (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014h). The Arabic origins of "Mandarin Chinese Pronouns": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 3 (3)*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014i). The Arabic origins of "Finnish and Basque Pronouns": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English language and literature 2 (1): 109-20*. Retrieved URL: http://www.jellonline.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014j). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "colour and artistic terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English language, literature, and Translation 1 (1): 1-14*. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijels.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014k). I buy, Ich kaufe, & J'achéte as Arabic Dialectal Variants: A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of language and linguistics 2 (5): 317-27*. Retrieved URL: http://www.sciencepublishinggroup.com/ijll. Doi: 10.11648/j.ijll.20140205.15 (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2014l). Radical translation and translating names: A lexical root theory approach. Paper to be presented at *ASELS International Conference 2014*, Abdel Malek Essadi University, Tangier, Morocco, 25-27 November 2014.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015a). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "life and death terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 4/1:* 322-345. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015b). Towards a radical translation theory for names: A comparative historical linguistics approach. *International Journal of English and Education 4/1:* 298-321. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015c). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "medical terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English Language and Literature 2/1:* 18-47. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015d). The Arabic origins or cognates of English and Indo-European "case markings and word order": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Language in India 15/3:* 104-40. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015e). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "democratic terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of English Language and Literature 2/2:* 111-139. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015f). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "military terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Language in India 15/5:* 105-139. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015f). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "legal terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *Journal of Applied Linguistics and Translation 1/3*. Retrieved URL: http://www.languageinindia.com (August 31, 2015).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015g). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "urban terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *English Review: Journal of English Education 3/2*: 146-66. Retrieved URL: http://www.journal.uniku.ac.id/index.php/ERJEE/index (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015h). allugha alarabia wallugha alalamia aljadhria alwaritha al2afiDha: asmaa alishara fi lughat alalam qadeeman wa2adeethan min maDhoor 3ilm allugha aljadhri (in Arabic, Demonstrative Pronouns in World Languages: A Radical Linguistic Theory Perspective). Paper to be presented at *Almultaqa al3ilmi al3alami altasi3 lillugha alarabia walmu'tamat alkhamis li-ittihad mudarisee allugha alarabia, entitled allugha alarabia asas althaqafa alinsania, Indonesia 27-29 August 2015* (9th International Conference of *Arabic as Basis of Human Education*, Imam Maulna Malik Ibrahim Government Islamic University, Indonesia, 27-29 August 2015). Retrieved URL: http://www.academia.edu (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015i). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "urban terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *English Review: Journal of English Education* 3/2: 146-166. Retrieved URL: http://www.journal.uniku.ac.ind/index.php/ERJEE (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2015j). Negation in world languages: A radical linguistic theory approach. *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature* 2/4: 1-17. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016a). The Arabic origins of "plural markers" in world languages: A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education* 5/1: 193-223. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org (June 30, 2017). (Also in *Indonesian EFL Journal 1 (2):* 144-163, 2015.)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016b). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "floral terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal on Studies in English and Literature 4 (2)*: 81-99. Retrieved URL: http://www.arcjournals.org/ijsell (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016c). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "fashion and modeling terms": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal on Studies in*

English and Literature 4 (6): 40-60. Retrieved URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.20431/2347-3134.0405007 (June 30, 2017).

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016d). The Arabic origins of English and Indo-European "definite articles": A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities 4/6*: 530-55. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijellh.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/64.-Zaidan-Ali-Jassem-paper-final.pdf?cec.7d6 (June 30, 2017)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016e). English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit are entirely Arabic- Free Good Lovely Comely Merry Beautiful Girls Marry Noble Villains in Wedding and Engagement Rings Ceremoniously: A radical linguistic theory approach. *International Journal of English and Education 5/3*: 335-56. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/26.19215751.pdf (June 30, 2017)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016f). The Arabic origins and development of English, German, and French: A radical linguistic theory approach. *Proceedings of 9th International Conference on Allugha Alarabia asas althaqafa alinsania* 'Arabic as the Basis of Human Culture' *Vol. 1*. University of Jakarta in Cooperation with The University of Science and Technology of Jordan, and Indonesia's Arabic Teachers' Association, Jakarta, Indonesia, 9-10 August 2016, pp. 363-404.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016g). Vocabulary learning and teaching: A radical linguistic theory approach. *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Arabic Language and Culture in Inter-Continental Educational Institutions (PINBA X IMLA), Vol. 1*. The State Institute of Islamic Studies Pontianak in Cooperation with Arabic Teachers' Association of Indonesia, West Kalimantan, Indonesia, 26-28 August 2016, pp. 50-70.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016h). Campbell's (2013) Historical linguistics: An introduction: A critical review. *International Journal of English Language, Literature and Humanities 10/6*: 530-55. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijellh.com/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/64.-Zaidan-Ali-Jassem-paper-final.pdf?cec.7d6 (July 3, 2017)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2016i). Medical Translation: A Radical Linguistic Theory Approach**.** Paper presented at presented الترجمة وإشكالات المثاقفة *(3rd International Conference on Translation and the Problematics of Cross-Cultural Understanding)*, the Forum for Arab and International Relations, Doha, Qatar 12-13 December 2016.

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2017a). Harper's *Etymology Dictionary Online (etymonline)*: A critical review. *International Journal of English and Education 6/1*: 335-56. Retrieved URL: http://www.ijee.org/yahoo_site_admin/assets/docs/26.19215751.pdf (July 30, 2017)

Jassem, Zaidan Ali. (2017b). Myth and Fallacy in *the Oxford English Dictionary*: A Critique with Reference to "That Girl Marries the Villain". *Veda's Journal of English Language and Literature* 4/1: 42-55. Retrieved URL: http://www.joell.in (July 3, 2017)

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

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

Ruhlen, Merritt. (1994). *On the origin of languages: Studies in linguistic taxonomy.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Wikipedia.org. (2015). Swadesh's list. Retrieved URL: http://www.wikipedia.org (August 31, 2015).

Wiktionary.org. (2015). Swadesh's list. Retrieved URL: http://www.en.wiktionary.org (August 31, 2015).

Yule, G. (2014). *The study of language*. (5th ed). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.