Macrothink Institute™

International Journal of Linguistics
ISSN 1948-5425
2012, Vol. 4, No. 4

# The Arabic Origins of English Pronouns: A Lexical Root Theory Approach

Zaidan Ali Jassem

Department of English Language and Translation, Qassim University

P. O. Box 6611, Buraidah, KSA

Tel: 966-6385-2338 Fax: 966-6322-0112 E-mail: zajassems@gmail.com

Received: August 20, 2012 Accepted: September 10, 2012 Published: December 1, 2012

doi:10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2271 URL: http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i4.2271

**Abstract**

This paper examines the genetic relationship between all personal pronouns, which are part of the core vocabulary of language, in Arabic and English mainly as well as German, French, and Latin secondarily. Converse to traditional views in comparative historical linguistics in which Arabic and English, for example, are classified as members of different language families, it shows how such pronouns are related to and derived from one another, where Arabic may be their end origin. The paper applies the principles and tools of the lexical root theory according to which the pronouns are shown to have the same or similar forms and meanings with slight phonetic, morphological and semantic or lexical changes.

**Keywords:** Pronouns, Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Comparative historical linguistics, Lexical root theory

## 1. Introduction

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

The number of core cognates used in classifying language families and dialects varies between 100-1000. Glottochronologists or lexicostatisticians such as Swadesh (e.g., Crowley 1997: 173; Campbell 2004: 201-211) suggested a list of 200 core words (e.g., Crowley 1997: 174), later reduced to 100 (e.g., Campbell 2004: 201-202). Based on the 100-word list, Crowley (1997: 173, 182) classified languages into five sub-groups, of which the most important are languages of a family and dialects of a language. For languages of a family, the percentage of shared core vocabulary should be between 36-81% while for dialects of a language between 81-100%. For example, English and French share a core vocabulary of 6% (or 6/100 words) against a peripheral vocabulary of 50% (Crowley 1997: 172). Then that percentage was used in dating their separation: if it is between 81-100%, languages split less than 500 years ago and if between 36-81%, it occurred between 500-2500 years ago. However, Campbell (2004: 204-211) and Crowley (1997: 175-187) severely attacked such lists and criteria on various grounds which lie beyond the scope of this work.

English and Arabic belong to entirely different language families: one Semitic and one Germanic. The former is affiliated to the Indo-European family, which is split into sub-families such as the Germanic family (e.g., English, German), the Italic (e.g., French, Italian), the Hellenic (e.g., Greek), the Slavic (e.g., Russian), and the Indic (e.g., Sanskrit, Kurdish, Persian). The latter is a member of the Semitic family, which is divided into several branches which include Arabic, Hebrew, Syriac, Aramaic, etc., with Arabic being the largest living language in the group (for a survey, see Crystal 2010: 308; Campbell 2006: 190-191; Crowley 1997: 22-25, 110-111; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 61-94; Ruhlen 1987, 1994).

However, Jassem (2012a) contested such taxonomy in his investigation of numeral words in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek and Sanskrit which use the same or similar words, broadly speaking. More precisely, all the numeral words from *one* to *trillion* in all such languages were found to have true Arabic cognates, considered to be their end origin. (*Zero* was excluded from the data as it is already recognized as an Arabic loan word into all such languages.) Jassem (2012b) provided further backing by examining select, common religious terms in Arabic, English, German, French, Greek, Latin, and so on which were

found to be true cognates such as *Hallelujah, God, ruthful, welcome, worship, bead, solemnity, salutation, evolution, vigour, exacerbation, superiority, Anno Domini*, *dominion, Christianity, Judaism,* and so on. The interesting thing in this paper was presenting such expressions in context in the form of phrases and sentences, every single word of which had a true Arabic cognate. For example, *Anno Domini* is cognate to Arabic *3aam* 'year' and *daiyaan*, *daana* (v) 'dominator, to be subdued to' through different sound changes: in the former, /3/, a voiced pharyngeal fricative, was deleted and /m/ turned into /n/ while /n/ split into /m & n/ in the latter. *Hallelujah* derives from a reversed and reduced form of the Arabic phrase *la ilaha illa Allah* 'There's no god but Allah (God)' where *Halle* corresponds exactly to the Arabic word *Allah* in reverse- i.e., *Allah* → *Halla* (*Halle* 'God') (for further detail, see Jassem 2012b). This paper provides further evidence which will prove that Arabic and English are genetically related. More precisely, it extends and applies the same principles, tools and techniques of the lexical root theory proposed in Jassem (2012a, 2012b) to the investigation of personal pronouns in Arabic and English (and, in consequence, all European languages) to show not only their genetic relationship to each other but also their descent and/or derivation from Arabic cognates, which may be their end origin. The paper has six sections: section one is introductory, two introduces the data, three deals with data analysis, four describes the results, five is discussion, and six is conclusion.

## 2. The Data: Personal Pronouns

### *2.1 Personal Pronouns in English*

Modern English personal pronouns are divided into several groups by person (first, second and third), number (singular and plural), gender (masculine and feminine) and case (subject, object and genitive) as follows:

| | **Person/Subject** | **Object** | **Possessive/Genitive** |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1. | I/We | Me/Us | My, Mine/Our(s) |
| 2. | You | You | Your(s) |
| 3. | He (M)/ | Him/ | His/ |
| | She (F)/ They | Her/ Them | Hers/ Their(s) |
| | It (N)/ | It/ | Its/ |

The above pronouns had other forms and variants in the earlier stages of the English language, known as the Old English period (449-1100) and Middle English period (1100-1500) (e.g., Pyles and Algeo 1993; Baugh and Cable 1993; Viney 2008). Some of these forms have completely disappeared since Modern English times (1500-now) but most are still the same and remain as complex. Below is a list of both, which will be referred to in due course to support the following analysis in this work.

**Old English Pronouns (449-1100)**

| **Case/Singular** | **Dual** | **Plural** |
|---|---|---|

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| N. | ic 'I' | wit 'we both' | wē 'we all' |
| A-D. | mē 'me' | unc 'us both' | ūs 'us all' |
| G. | mīn 'my, mine' | uncer 'our(s) both' | ūre 'our(s) all' |
| N. | ðū 'you' | git 'you both' | gē 'you all' |
| A-D. | ðē 'you' | inc 'you both' | ēow 'you all' |
| G. | ðīn 'your(s)' | uncer 'your(s) both' | ēower 'your(s) all' |

| **Case/Masculine** | **Feminine** | **Neuter** | **Plural** |
|---|---|---|---|
| N. hē 'he' | hēo 'she' | hit 'it' | hī 'they' |
| A. hine 'him' | hī 'her' | hit 'it' | hī 'them' |
| D. him 'him' | hire 'her' | him 'it' | him, heom 'them' |
| G. his 'his' | hire 'her(s)' | his 'its' | hira, heora 'their(s)' |

Source: Pyles and Algeo (1993: 117)

**Middle English Pronouns (1100-1500)**

| **First Person** | **Second Person** |
|---|---|
| **Singular/Plural** | **Singular/Plural** |
| N. ich, I, ik / wē | thōū/ yē |
| A. mē / us | thee/ yōū (you all) |
| G. mī, mīn/ ōūr(e), ōūres | ðī, ðīn/yōūr(e), yōūres |
| **Third Person Singular** | **Plural** |
| N. hē 'he' | hī, they, thai |
| A. him, hine | hem, heom, them, thaim, theim |
| G. his | her(e), their(e), heres, theires |
| N. Shē, hō, hyō, hyē, hī, schō, chō, hē | |
| A. hir(e), her(e), hī | |
| G. hir(e), her(e), hires | |
| N.-A. hit (it) | |
| G. his | |

Source: Pyles and Algeo (1993: 155)

Baugh and Cable (1993: 17, 236-240) gave a similar list with some differences in spelling, which were so chaotic that *she*, for example, had more than sixty spellings (Viney 2008: 25).

In short, one can notice that (Modern English) pronouns vary in their forms by case in particular. The first person pronouns have completely different forms or words (e.g., *I* v. *me*; *we* v. *us*); the second person pronouns do not exhibit much variety except for the addition of *–r(s)* (e.g., *you* v. *your(s)*) in the genitive; the third person pronouns have more variety, where *–m* (e.g., *they* v. *them; he* v. *him*) is used in the accusative; in the case of *she*, many more forms are used. In the genitive, *-r(s)* is used in almost all pronouns.

*2.2 Personal Pronouns in Arabic*

In Arabic, there is a larger number of personal pronouns, which have slight phonetic differences amongst each other. In addition, Arabic has for each category of pronouns two sets: (i) independent and (ii) dependent. The former occur on their own as separate words whereas the latter are attached to other words as either prefixes to nouns and verbs (in the present tense only) or suffixes to nouns and verbs (in the past tense only). These are listed by case below.

**Arabic Subject Pronouns by Person, Number and Gender**

| *Independent* | *Dependent* | |
|---|---|---|
| | Prefixed | Suffixed |
| 1. Sg. *ana* 'I' | *a-* | *-tu* |
| Pl. *na2nu* 'We′ | *na-* | *-na* |
| 2. Sg. *ant(a/i)* 'You (M/F)' | *ta-* | *-t(a/i)* |
| Pl. *antu(m/n)* 'You (M/F)' | *ta-(u/a)n* | *-(tum/n)* |
| 3. Sg. *hu(wa)* 'he' / *Hi(ya)* 'she' | *ya-/ta-* | *--/-t* |
| Pl. *hu(m/n)* 'they (M/F)' | *ya-* | *-oo/-n(a)* |

In the accusative and genitive cases, certain changes happen, affecting suffixed forms only as follows.

**Arabic Suffixed Objective/Possessive Pronouns**

| Singular | Plural |
|---|---|
| 1. *–(*n)ee* '*me/my' | *-na* 'us/our' |
| 2. *-k(a/i)* 'you/your (M/F)' | *-ku(m/n)* 'you, your (M/F)' |
| 3. *–h(u/a)* 'him/her' | *-hu(m/n)* 'them/their (M/F)' |

As can be seen here, the same forms are used for first and third person pronouns except for

second person pronouns which have different forms. In *-(*n)ee*, /n/ is deleted in the genitive, which is treated as a phonetic insertion by Arabic scholars.

Moreover, Arabic has another set of independent objective pronouns, which are formed by the addition of the prefix *iya-* to the above-mentioned suffixed objective pronouns as follows:

**Independent Objective Pronouns**

| Singular | Plural |
|---|---|
| 1. *iyay* 'me', | *iyana* 'us', |
| 2. *iyak(a/i)* 'you (M/F)', | *iyaku(m/n)* 'you (M/F)', |
| 3. *iyah(u/a)* 'him/her', | *iyahu(m/n)* 'them (M/F)'. |

In short, one can notice that Arabic pronouns, unlike English ones, do not inflect for case. Instead, the majority of Arabic dependent and independent pronoun forms are formally related in the sense that the former are further reductions or shortenings of the latter (cf. Pyles and Algeo 1993: 119-120, 160-161; Baugh and Cable 1993: 59). For example, *-na-* is a reduction of *na2nu* 'we', *a-* a shortening of *ana* 'I', *-ta-* a shortening of *anta* 'you'. Furthermore, Arabic pronouns add *–m* and *–n* in the plural for the masculine and feminine respectively. It is worth noting here that in no other case does Arabic use *–m* as a plural marker. Also many varieties of spoken Arabic replace *–m* with *–oo*, a masculine plural suffix, as in *antum* v. *intoo* 'you (pl. m./f.) and use *hun(na)* 'they- f.' (pronounced *hinne* in Urban Syrian Arabic) for both genders. These points are extremely important, especially in relating English, German, and French pronouns to their Arabic cognates.

## 3. Data Analysis

### *3.1 Theoretical Framework: Lexical Root Theory*

The theoretical framework for the analysis of the pronominal data will be the lexical root theory, which has been proposed by Jassem (2012a, 2012b, MS) to establish the genetic relationship between Arabic and English, in particular, and all other (Indo-)European languages in the field of the above-mentioned numeral words and common religious terms. It is so called because it is based on the lexical root of the word in examining genetic relationships between words such as the derivation of *written, writer, underwriting*, *overwritten* from *write* and *kitaabat* 'writing', *maktoob* 'written', *iktitaab/istiktaab* 'subscription' from *katab* 'write'. It has a principle or construct and three practical procedures, which have been slightly refined. The principle is theoretical in nature, which states that Arabic and English as well as (Indo-)European languages of all branches are not only genetically related but also are directly descended from Arabic in the end. In fact, it claims in its strongest version that they are dialects of the same language. The three procedures constitute the applied steps to be followed in analyzing lexical roots, including (i) a lexical, procedure, (ii) a linguistic analysis procedure, and (iii) a relational procedure, all of which are described briefly below.

First, the lexical procedure is dictionary-based, which concerns the method of analyzing

words by (i) deleting affixes, (ii) using primarily consonantal roots, (iii) selecting semantic fields (personal pronouns in the present case), and (iv) search for correspondence in meaning. For instance, relating *fifthly* or *uniqueness* to their Arabic cognates must start with reducing them to the roots *five* and *one* first (for detail, see Jassem 2012a). Then the search for related cognates begins on the basis of word etymologies and origins as recorded in standard works in the field (e.g., Harper 2012).

As to the linguistic analysis procedure, it deals with the phonetic, morphological, grammatical and semantic structure of words which might lead to any differences between them. The phonetic analysis is crucial, the main tenet of which is that all sounds may change within and across categories, from top to bottom or bottom to top, from left to right or right to left. In other words, consonants may change their place and manner of articulation as well as voicing. For example, at the level of place, bilabial consonants ↔ labio-dental ↔ dental ↔ alveolar ↔ palatal ↔ velar ↔ uvular ↔ pharyngeal ↔ glottal (where ↔ signals change in both directions); at the level of manner, stops ↔ fricatives ↔ affricates ↔ nasals ↔ laterals ↔ approximants; and at the level of voice, voiced consonants ↔ voiceless. Similarly, vowels may change as well. The basic vowels in this research are the three long vowels /a:, i:, & u:/ and their short versions besides the two diphthongs /ai/ and /au/. All may change according to the tongue part involved (e.g., front ↔ back), tongue height (e.g., high ↔ low), length (e.g., long ↔ short), and lip shape (e.g., round ↔ spread or unround). It will be seen later that vowels are marginal in significance and can be ignored in the analysis. Other sound processes may occur as well such as assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, merger, insertion, split, syllable loss, resyllabification, consonant cluster reduction or creation and so on.

Sound change, it has to be noted, may proceed in three different courses (Jassem 2012a, 2012b). It may be multi-directional in the sense that a particular sound may change in different directions at the same time such as the different pronunciations of /th/, a voiceless interdental fricative, as in *three* in Arabic, English, French, Latin and so on (Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b, 2012a). It may be cyclic where more than one process may be involved in any given case such as the differences between the words for *three* in Arabic, English, German, French, etc. (see Jassem 2012a). Finally, it may be lexical where words may be affected by the change in different ways. That is, a particular sound change may operate in some words, may vary in others, and may not operate at all in some others. For example, the different words or forms for *three* in English is a case in point, which derives from Arabic *thalath* 'three', where /th/ varies with /t/ in *tri-, trio, tertiary*, /d/ in *third*, and /s/ in *thrice* (see Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b, below).

The morphological and grammatical analyses are intertwined and overlapping. The former takes care of the inflectional and derivational aspects of the grammar such as the use of prefixes, suffixes, and infixes in general; the latter handles grammatical categories like nouns and verbs and their functions like subject and object. Because they do not influence the meaning of the lexical root, they are not critical at this stage and can be ignored, therefore.

The semantic analysis looks at meaning relationships between words like meaning stability, multiplicity, convergence, divergence, shift, split, and change (Jassem 2012a, 2012b).

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

Concerning the relational procedure, it examines the relationship between form and meaning from three perspectives (Jassem 2012a, 2012b). First, words may be similar in form and meaning such as *three, third, tertiary* and *thalath* 'three' (*talaat/tilt/taalit* in Damascus Arabic), *twin* and *thintan* (or *thani*) 'two, second' (*tinten/tnen* in Damascus Arabic). Secondly, other words may be similar in form but different in meaning like *eleven* (*elf* in German) and *alf* 'thousand' in Arabic or *ship* and *sheep* (see Jassem 2012b). Finally, still others may be different in form but similar in meaning such as *measure* and *rate*; *quarter, quadrant* and *cadre*; or *size* and *gauge*.

In the following analysis, all the above procedures will be utilized with different degrees of focus, though.

### *3.2 Method of Analysis*

The method of describing and analyzing the genetic relationship between pronominal terms in English and Arabic is comparative historical. It is comparative in the sense that every 'personal pronoun' in English in particular and German, French, and Latin in general will be compared with its Arabic counterpart phonetically, morphologically, and semantically. It is historical in considering language development central to the analysis as pronouns, in fact all words, may change, swap or reverse their forms and meanings across languages altogether. Indeed, it would be an almost impossible task to relate words without knowing their origin, history, and meaning. The sources of such meanings are English etymological dictionaries and grammars (e.g., Harper 2012; Pyles and Algeo 1993) and Arabic dictionaries and grammars (e.g., Ibn Manzour 1974; Ibn Seedah 1996; Al-Ghalayeeni 2010) besides the author's knowledge of both Arabic as a mother tongue and English as a second language and specialty.

## 4. The Results

All English pronouns have direct, true and real Arabic cognates as follows.

*4.1 First Person Pronouns*

a) *I*, the Arabic suffixed pronoun *–ee/-i* 'my, me', and the independent pronoun *iyyay* 'me, I' are identical cognates. The Old English or German form *Ich* was due to /j/-insertion and its subsequent change to /ch/ and zero in English. In certain ancient Arabic dialects, /j/ was added to *y*-final nouns and adjectives as in *nady* → *nadij* 'wet', *qaaDi* → *qaaDij* 'judge'; in current Kuwaiti and Emirati Arabic, /j/ varies with /y/ (see Jassem 1993: Ch. 5, 1994: Ch. 5). Schematically, the change might look like *iyay* → *iyayj* (*Ich* in Old English) → *I* in Modern English.

The French pronoun *je* 'I' is a reversed form of *iyay* 'me, I' in which /y/ became /j/. In Latin *ego* 'I', /j/ turned into /g/.

b) *Me* (*my, mine;* German *mich, mein*; French *moi*) and Arabic *ana (ani)* 'I' are identical cognates in which /a-/ was dropped and /n/ changed to /m/. In *mine*, /n/ split into /m & n/.

c) *We* (*us, our, ours*; Old English *unc* 'us both', *uncer* 'ours both'; German *wir* 'we', *uns* 'us', *unser* 'our'; French *nous*) are cognates of Arabic *na2nu* 'we' (pronounced *2inna* or *i2na* in spoken Arabic) via different sound changes. How?

i) *We* is an advanced phonetic evolution and reduction of Arabic *na2nu (2inna* or *i2na*) 'we' in which /2/, a voiceless pharyngeal fricative, turned into /w/, into which /n/ merged. Schematically, the change might look like *na2nu* → *2inna* → *2i* → *wi* (*we* in Modern English).

The German form *wir* is like English *we*, in which /n/ turned into /r/. The French pronoun *nous* 'we' is the closest to its Arabic cognate *na2nu* 'we' in which /2/ became /s/ while final and initial /n/ merged.

ii) In Old English, *unc* 'us both' and *uncer* 'ours both' came from *na2nu* (*2inna*) 'we' where /2/ passed into /k & s/; in German *uns, unser* 'us, our', /2/ passed into /s/. Schematically, *na2nu* → *2inna/i2na* → *in2* → *inc* (*unc* in Old English) → *ins* (*un*s in German).

iii) *Our(s)* developed from a reversed form of the suffixed Arabic pronoun *–na* 'us, our' in which /n/ changed to /r/. Schematically, the change might look like *-na* → *-an* → *-ar* (*our* in Modern English).

iv) *Us* is a further reduction of Arabic *na2nu* (*2inna* or *i2na*) 'we' through Old English *unc* 'us both', *uncer* 'ours both', and the subsequent assimilation of /n/ and/or the evolution of /2/ into /s/, yielding *us* in today's English. Schematically, *na2nu* → *2inna/i2na* → *in2* → *inc* (*unc* in Old English) → *ic* (*us* in Modern English).

To sum up, it can be clearly seen how close Old English *unc/uncer*, German *uns/unser*, and French *nous* are to Arabic *na2nu (2inna, i2na)* where /2/ developed into /k & s/, common sound changes (cf. Jassem 2012a, 2012b). Thus the English forms *us, our, ours* are further reductions of the Old English and German forms, which, in turn, are still further reductions of

their corresponding Arabic forms.

*4.2 Second Person Pronouns*

d) *You* (*your, yours*) developed from *gē* 'nom., you all', *ēow* 'acc., you all', *ēower* 'gen., ours all' in Old English via *yē, yōū, yōūre, yōūres* in Middle English. The key pronoun here is the nominative form *gē,* whose direct Arabic cognate is a reversal of the independent accusative pronoun *iyyaka* 'you, acc.' or simply the dependent form *–k(a)*, in which /k/ turned into /g/ and then into /y/. In German *Sie* 'you', it further turned into /z/; *euch* 'you', *eur/Ihr* 'your' have the same story as *you(r)* in English.

A similar process happened in Arabic to the dependent second person feminine pronoun /*-ki*/ which developed into several pronunciations such as /-(t)sh/ and /-(t)s/ in many spoken dialects of Arabic in Yemen, the Gulf, Iraq and Syria, including mine. For example, *laki, litsh, lish, lits, lis* 'to you (fem. sg.)' are all still common (Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b). All this supports the evolution of the English second person pronouns from that independent accusative pronoun in Arabic.

e) As to the Old and Middle English singular forms *thou, thee, thine* and their dual forms in the former- *git* 'nom., you both', *inc* 'acc., you both', and *uncer* 'gen., your(s) both', their Arabic cognates are as follows. *Thine* is a reversed form of *ant(a/i)* 'you- (m./f.)' in which /t/ became /th/; *thou* and *thee* are direct cognates of (i) the suffixed pronoun *–ta/-ti* 'you' in which /t/ passed into /th/ or (ii) the reduced form of *anta,* as is the case in Latakian Arabic where it is shortened to *itte* by deleting the first syllable /a-/ and assimilating /n/ into /t/.

The French second person pronoun *tu* (and *vu (vous)*) and German *du* derive from the same source as well in which /t/ became /d/. Moreover, French *vu* is derived from the demonstrative form (i) *dha* 'this' in Arabic where /th/ became /v/ and which is commonly used in addressing people as in *man dha* 'who is this?', *ya dha* 'O you' or (ii) *dhu* 'one with' as used before names as in *dh(u/a) al-kifl* '(one) with portion', *dh(u/a) al-faqaar* '(one) with sword'.

As for the dual Old English form *git* 'nom., you both' may be analyzed into *ge* + *t*. As such it could have arisen out of the Arabic pronoun *iyyak* (or *–ka*) 'you, acc.' plus /t/, a feminine plural suffix in Arabic. *Inc* 'acc., you both' and *uncer* 'gen., your(s) both' are direct cognates of Arabic *innak* 'you' which consists of the prefix *inna-* 'intensifier' and the objective and possessive suffixed pronoun *–k(a)* 'you', in which /k/ passed into /s/. Thus one can easily see the sameness and/or similarity in form and meaning between these English and Arabic pronouns.

*4.3 Third Person Pronouns*

f) *He (him* and *his)* descended directly from the independent and/or dependent Arabic third person singular pronoun *hu(wa)* 'he'. *Him* came from the Arabic third masculine plural pronoun *hum* 'they' via grammatical shift where a plural form is used instead of a singular form.

g) *She* had over sixty spellings (Viney 2008: 25) in Old and Middle English. In Old English, it had the forms *hēo* 'she, nom.', *hī* 'her, acc.', *hire* 'her, dat.', and *hers*, 'gen.' (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 117). Its Middle English forms included *shē, hō, hyō, hyē, hī, scho, chō, hē* in the nominative (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 155). In light of this situation, it can be affirmed that *he* and *she* were originally one pronoun in English, with initial *h*. In Arabic the same happens where the masculine and feminine forms *hu(wa)* 'he', *hi(ya)* 'she' are almost identical, differing only in their vowels. In Greek, *he* 'she' is used, which is identical to its Arabic cognate. Thus, Old and Middle English *heo, hy(o/e)*, and Greek *he* are real and direct cognates of Arabic *hi(ya)* 'she'.

*She* came from Middle English *shē, scho,* or *chō*, which came from the feminine form *seo* of the demonstrative pronoun *se* 'the' in Old English (Harper 2012), whose Arabic cognate is *tha* 'this'. In my view, however, *she* derives from the Arabic independent or suffixed second person feminine pronoun *iyyaki* 'you (f.)' via lexical shift in which /k/ became /sh/ as happens in many Arabic accents, both past and present. This is actually what happens in the German pronouns *Sie* 'you' and *sie* 'she', which have the same form because both came from the same Arabic suffix *iyyak(a/i)* 'you (m./f,) (see 2.2 above) in which /k/ became /z/.

In short, Middle English *she* might have developed from Old English *hēo* and Middle English *hō, hyō, hyē, hī, hē*, which are identical to their Arabic equivalent *hi(ya)* 'she' where /h/ changed to /s/ and/or /sh/ later.

h) *It* had the forms *hit, him* and *his* in Old English and the forms *hit/it,* and *his* in Middle English. As such it can be considered a variant of *he* and *she* into which /t/ is an insertion. Alternatively, since Arabic has only the equivalents of *he* & *she*, *it* could be a reversed feminine form of the demonstrative pronoun *(ha)tihi* 'this- fem.', which can be reduced to *ti(h)* (see below).

i) *They (them, their, theirs*) developed from their Middle English forms *they, thai* 'nom.', *hem, heom, them, thaim, theim* 'acc.', and *her(e), their(e), heres, theirs* 'gen.' (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 117, 155). As these pronouns have different forms, they have different Arabic cognates. *Hem* and *heom* are direct cognates to *hum* (or *him*) 'they-mas.' in Arabic. As to *they*, it developed from the 'masculine demonstrative form of the pronoun *this*' (Harper 2012). As such, its immediate Arabic cognate is *ða/ðih* 'this (mas. sg.)' in the latter of which /h/ became /s/. In *them,* /-m/ may be analyzed as cognate to Arabic /-m/, an exclusively pronominal masculine plural marker as in *anta* 'you' v, *antum* 'you (pl.), *hu(wa)* 'he' v. *hum* 'they'; or as cognate to Arabic /-n(n)/, a feminine plural suffix as in *thann(e)* 'these (fem.)' (*tha* 'this' + *-nn(e)* 'fem. pl. suf.', where /n/ became /m/. Notice how close *them* and *thann(e)* are. Alternatively, *they, them, their(s)* might be due to the loss of /h/, a glottal fricative, in many accents of English and its replacement by an inter-dental fricative /ð/, an extremely likely change.

j) The Old English forms *hī* 'nom./acc., they/them', *him, heom* 'dat., them', *hira, heora* 'gen., their(s)' as well as the Middle English ones *hī, they, thai* 'nom.', *hem, heom,*

*them, thaim, theim* (acc.), and *her(e), their(e), heres, theirs* 'gen.' (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 117, 155) can all be traced back to one or two origins at the most: i.e., *he* or *him*. As such, their Arabic cognates are *huwa/hiya* 'he/she' and/or *hum* 'they'. The use of /r/ in some of these forms might have stemmed from /n/ in Arabic *hunna* 'they-fem.' They were not all used by the way (Viney 2008: 25).

The French and German third person pronouns have two possible Arabic sources. First, they may derive from the same Arabic cognates as well. In the French pronouns *il* 'he', *elle* 'she', /h/ was deleted and the usually mute /l/ was inserted. In German, *er* 'he' lost /h/ and inserted /r/; in *sie* 'she', the same story for English *she* applies; ihr 'their' comes from Arabic *hum/hun(na)* 'they (m/f)' in which /h/ was dropped and /n/ turned into /r/. This is reinforced by the fact that in spoken Syrian Arabic, *hinn(e)* 'they (f)' is used for both genders (see 2.2 above). Secondly, they may derive from the Arabic plural demonstrative pronoun *ulai* 'these' in which /l/ became /r/ in German. In Latin, a similar situation happens in which a wide host of demonstratives are used according to number, gender, and case such as *hic/haec/hac* 'this (m/f/n)', *ille/illa/illud* 'that (m/f/n)', *iste/ista/istud* 'this (contemptuous)', and *is/ia/id* 'he/she/it' in the nominative (Gill 2012). As can be seen, the Latin pronouns *is/ia/id* 'he/she/it' are demonstratives whose Arabic cognate is a reversed *tha/ti* 'this' in which /th & t/ became /s & d/ each; Latin *ille/illa* 'that (m/f)' gave rise to French *il/elle* 'he/she', all of which come from *ulai* 'these' in Arabic.

*4.4 English Dependent Pronouns*

Dependent personal pronouns are attached as suffixes to verbs, known as verb inflections or personal endings in Arabic, Latin, German, French, English, and so on. Originally, these are shortenings of the full, independent pronouns (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 119-120, 160-161; Baugh and Cable 1993: 19). For example, Arabic *ana* 'I' may be shortened to *a-*, *anta* 'you' to *-ta*, etc. (see 2.2 above).

Modern English verbs have only two forms in the present tense: One with *-s* as in *he (she, it) comes* and one without as in *I (you, we, they) come*. In the past tense, one form is used with all the pronouns- e.g., *came/wanted*. These forms are the result of a long story of evolution from Old and Middle English ones, especially the former.

In Old English, verbs had different endings depending on person, number, case, tense, and mood. For example, the typical weak verb *cēpan* 'to keep' had the following conjugation (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 119-120):

***Present System: Indicative***

| | |
|---|---|
| Ic cēpe 'I keep' | Wē, gē, hī cēpað 'we, you, they keep' |
| ðū cepēst 'you keep' | He, heo, hit cēpeð 'he, she, it keeps' |

***Present System: Subjunctive***

| | |
|---|---|
| Singular | cēpe 'I, you, he, she, it keep' |

Plural cepēn 'we, you, they keep'

***Preterit System: Indicative***

Ic cēpte 'I kept' Wē, gē, hī cēpton 'we, you, they kept'

ðū ceptēst 'you kept' Hē, hēo, hit cēpte 'he, she, it kept'

***Preterit System: Subjunctive***

Singular cēpte 'I, you, he, she, it kept'

Plural ceptēn 'we, you, they kept'

In Middle English, these inflections remained the same, more or less, although they were reduced in number. For example, the weak verb *thanken* 'to thank' had the following conjugation (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 160):

| **Present Singular** | **Present Plural (All Persons)** |
|---|---|
| 1. thanke | thanke(n)(-s) |
| 2. thankest | |
| 3. thanketh(-es) | |

| **Preterit Singular** | **Preterit Plural (All Persons)** |
|---|---|
| 1. & 3. thanked(e) | thanked(e)(n) |
| 2. thankedest | |

One can notice that in the present tense the same forms continued to be used except for spelling *ð* as *th* or *s*. In the past, *t* was replaced by *d*.

The classical languages, Greek and Latin, had similar endings (Pyles and Algeo 1993: 78-80). For example, the Latin verb *amare* 'to love' had the following endings (Yule 2006: 77).

*amo* 'I love' *amamus* 'We love'

*amas* 'You love' *amatis* 'You love'

*amat* 'He, she loves' *amant* 'They love'

4.4.1 The Arabic Cognates of English Suffixed Pronouns

A close examination of Old English verb forms and their personal endings clearly shows that they are either the same or further evolutions of the same forms of Arabic verbs. How?

a) The first person endings *-e* and *–te* as in *cēpe, cēpte* 'I keep/kept' have direct Arabic cognates. The former is a cognate of either the prefixed (present tense) first person singular pronoun *a-* as in *a-ktub* 'I write' or the suffixed objective/possessive form of the same pronoun *–ee/-i* as in *shuf-ta-(n)ee* 'saw-you-me = you saw me' and *kitaab-ee*

'book-my = my book'; the latter is a cognate of the `suffixed (past tense) first person singular pronoun *-tu* as in *katab-tu* 'wrote-I= I wrote'.

b) The second person endings *–est* and *–test* as in *cēpest, cēptest* 'you keep/kept' are cognates of the suffixed second person singular subjective pronoun /-ta/ as in *katab-ta* 'wrote-you= you wrote' in which /s/ is an insertion or its objective form /-ka/ as in *shuf-tu-ka* 'saw-I-you= I saw you' in which /k/ split into /s & t/. (In Saudi Qassimi Arabic, a similar process happens affecting the suffixed second person feminine pronoun /–k/, in which /k/ split into /ts/ as in *li-ts* 'to- you (f.)'.)

c) The present tense endings *-eð* 'third person singular' as in *cēpeð* 'he, she, it keeps' and *-að* 'first, second and third person plural' as in *cēpað* 'we, you, they keep' are further phonetic changes of the suffixed third person singular feminine and/or masculine subjective pronoun *-at* & *-ta* as in *katab-at* 'wrote-she= she wrote' and *katab-ta* 'wrote-you= you (m) wrote', where *t* became *ð*. The third person singular past ending *-te* as in *cēpte* 'he, she, it kept' developed from the same Arabic cognate also.

d) The past tense endings *-ton* and *-ten* 'first, second and third person plural' as in *cēpton/cēpten* 'we, you, they kept' are cognates of the suffixed second person feminine plural pronoun as in *katab-tun* 'wrote-you = you all (f) wrote' (cf. *katab-tum* 'you all (m) wrote'). In many varieties of Syrian Arabic, the suffix *–tun* (pronounced */t(a/e)n/* in the vernacular) is used for both genders, a common process known as simplification or generalization.

e) The Modern English present simple tense suffix *–s* as in *he/she/it comes* is a further phonetic evolution of the original Old English form *cēpeð* 'he, she, it keeps' in which /t/ became /s/. As has just been stated in c) above, its direct Arabic cognate is the suffixed third person singular feminine and/or masculine subjective pronoun *-at* & *-ta* as in *katab-at* 'wrote-she= she wrote' and *katab-ta* 'wrote-you= you (m) wrote', where /t/ became /s/.

Thus the similarities between the use (i.e., form and meaning) of the personal endings in English and Arabic are very obvious and direct. For clarity, they are summarized below:

| English | Arabic |
|---|---|
| *-e* | *a-/–ee* |
| *-te, -test* | *-tu, -ta, -ti, -at, (-ka)* |
| *-ton,* and *-ten* | *-tun* (*tum*) |

All are aspects of the same phenomenon: viz., shortening of originally full, whole independent pronouns. The difference lies in position only. That is, while Arabic dependent pronouns might occur as prefixes and suffixes in the present and past tenses respectively, English personal endings are used as suffixes only. This eventually led to the use of an additional phoneme /t/ or its retrieval in the distinction between the present and past tenses, for example, *cēp-e* 'keep-I = I keep' and *cēp-te* 'kept-I = I kept'. Notice how closely this corresponds to the Arabic forms

*a-ktub* 'I write' and *katab-tu* 'I wrote': i.e., *a-* versus *–e* and *–tu* versus *–te*. In other words, English fixes and uses both forms of the Arabic pronouns as suffixes in different tenses.

As to the Latin verb endings, they can be similarly explained. For example, the personal ending in *amat* is exactly the same as in Arabic *taktub*, *katabat* 'she writes/wrote'; *amant* resembles *katabtan* 'wrote-they (f)' in reverse; *amamus* is like *katabna* 'wrote-we' where /n/ became /m/. Like English, the main difference is that the endings in Latin are suffixed whereas in Arabic they can be prefixed as well. In short, the existence and the behaviour of the same phenomenon in these languages definitely points to a common genetic source, being Arabic of course.

## 5. Discussion

The above description and analysis of personal pronouns in Arabic and English has shown the applicability and adequacy of the lexical root theory for analyzing word relationships where Arabic and English pronouns, both independent and dependent or suffixed, were found to be genetically related. The percentage of shared pronouns between Arabic and English is 100%, which, according to Cowley's classification, means that they belong to or are dialects of the same language. The minor differences between the forms of such pronouns are due to normal causes of historical change at the phonetic, morphological and semantic levels, especially lexical shift. In light of this, the main principle that states that Arabic and English are not only genetically related but also are dialects of the same language holds true.

Thus, these findings agree with Jassem's (2012a) description of numeral words in Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit in which he found that such languages do not only belong to the same family but also are rather dialects of the same language, in which the percentage of shared numeral vocabulary between Arabic and such languages was 100%. It also supports his (2012b) investigation of common religious terms in such languages where the same pattern was replicated.

The question as to why such languages are not mutually intelligible was discussed at length in Jassem (2012a, 2012b), to which this work lends further support. The main reasons for that were multidirectionality, cyclicity, and irregularity of sound change. It is multidirectional in the sense that, for example, the pharyngeal consonant /2/ turned into different sounds in different words such as /w/ in *we*, /k/ in *unc*, and /s/ in *us* (see 4.1c above). It is cyclic where a particular word like *thine* underwent more than one sound change affecting its Arabic cognate *anta/anti*, including (a) reversal, (b) initial a-deletion, (c) turning /t/ into /th/, and d) voicing (see 4.2e above). *You* had a similar story (see 4.2d above). It is irregular or lexical where words were affected by the change differently. For example, the different forms of English *we* (*unc, uncer, us*) underwent different sound changes as far as /2/ is concerned (see above). That is, it became /w/ in *we*, /s/ in *uncer*, and /k/ in *unc*. Also lexical or semantic shift, a common linguistic process, was one of the most significant factors here where words shifted their reference or sense within the same domain or category (see below).

As to the three applied procedures, they will be discussed one by one below. First, the lexical procedure showed the applicability of the lexical root as an adequate, analytic tool in relating pronouns to each other. For instance, *them (their, theirs)* has been successfully traced back to

its Arabic cognate *tha* 'this' by isolating the root *the* and ignoring the affixes *–m* and *–r*(*s*). Also it manifested the importance of considering the etymology or historical origin and meaning of lexical items in this area. For example, *they (them, their(s))* was originally a demonstrative pronoun *thai* 'this' (Harper 2012; Pyles and Algeo 1993: 157), whose Arabic cognate is *tha* 'this'. Similarly, *she* came from Old English *hēo* 'she, nom.', *hī* 'her, acc.' or *seo* 'the' and Middle English forms *hō, hyō, hyē, hī, hē*, *scho, chō,* and *shē* where /h/ changed to /sh/. In other words, both *he* and *she* had /h/ as an initial consonant, which is exactly the case in Arabic (see 2.2 above). Furthermore, it showed the primacy of consonants and the marginality of vowels because the former are essential for meaning whereas the latter are rather phonetic and morphological in function. On the one hand, vowels link consonants to each other without which they would be impossible to pronounce; on the other, they signal grammatical categories such as the nominative, accusative, genitive and so on. For example, the vowels in *thou* 'you- nom.', *thee* 'you- acc.', *thine* 'your(s)' in Old English, *me*, *my*, *mine* in Modern English change to indicate such classes while the consonants remain constant. The same happens in Arabic such as *anta* 'you-mas.' and *anti* 'you-fem.', *hum* 'they-nom.' as in *min-hum* 'from them' and *him* 'they-dat.' as in *bi-him* 'by them', etc. For these reasons vowels can be generally ignored as they have no impact on the final result whatsoever.

The phonetic analysis is extremely important in relating pronouns to each other owing to the enormous changes that affected Arabic consonants especially not only in English and other European languages but also in mainstream Arabic varieties themselves, both old and modern (e.g., Jassem 1993, 1994a, 1994b). These changes included mutation, shift, assimilation, dissimilation, deletion, insertion, reversal, reordering, merger, split, duplication, and so on. The main sound changes that affected Arabic consonants here can be summed up as follows:

(a) /2/, a voiceless fricative pharyngeal, was either deleted, merged with similar consonants or turned into /w/, /k/ and /s/ as in *we*, *unc,* and *us* (see 4.1 above);

(b) /?/, a voiceless glottal stop, which was not shown in the transcription as it is automatically used before every Arabic vowel but usually deleted in connected speech, was deleted in *I, thou* and *you*.

(c) /t/, a voiceless alveolar stop, changed to (i) /th/ in English *thou, thee* and to (ii) /d/ in German *du*;

(d) /k/, a voiceless velar stop, passed into /g/ which later changed to /y/ as in *ge, you*; in German *Sie* 'you', it turned into /z/;

(e) /j/, a voiced palatal affricate, became /sh/ in *Ich* in Old English and German, which later merged into /y/ in Middle and Modern English *I*;

(f) /n/, a voiced alveolar nasal, changed to (i) /m/ as in *me, my*, (ii) /r/ as in *her*, and (iii) /s/ as in *us*;

(g) /h/, a voiceless glottal fricative, changed to (i) /sh/ as in *she* and (ii) Ø as in *it (hit* in Old English). It also turned into zero in German and French third person pronouns;

(h) /dh/, a voiced interdental fricative, changed to /v/ as in French *vu*.

All such sound changes occurred at the levels of place and manner of articulation as well as voice where some consonants changed place, some manner, some voice while others changed two or all features. For instance, the change from /t/ to /th/ in *thou* from Arabic *anta* involved place (from alveolar to dental), manner (from stop to fricative), and voice (from voiceless to voiced). The change of /2/ to /w/ in *we* from Arabic *na2nu (2inna, i2na)* 'we' included place (from pharyngeal to labio-velar), manner (from fricative to approximant), and voice (from voiceless to voiced). The change of /k/ to /g/ in English *ge* from Arabic *–ka* 'you' centred on voice (from voiceless to voiced).

As to the vowels, the three basic long vowels /a:/, i:/, and /u:/, their short counterparts /a/, /i/, and /u/, and the diphthongs /ay/ and /aw/ all underwent different sound changes by exchanging values amongst one another, including fronting, backing, raising, lowering, centering, lengthening, shortening, diphthongization and monophthongization or smoothing. In fact, vocalic changes are very much simpler than the consonantal ones, which are the primary focus of this research (see 3.1 above). As stated earlier, vowels are not as essential as consonants in establishing genetic word relationships.

Suprasegmental changes also occurred such as initial syllable deletion as in *thou, thee* from *anta* 'you' (see 4.2 above), *me, my, mine* from *ana* 'I' (see 4.1 above), and final syllable deletion as in *he* from *hu(wa)* 'he', *she* from *hi(ya)* 'she' (see 4.3 above). In addition, the operation of all the above sound changes was multidirectional, cyclic and irregular or lexical (see above).

It is worth noting that the different forms of Arabic pronouns in both classical and modern European languages such as *du* 'you' in German, *tu* 'you' in French are due to different courses of sound change in these languages. Jassem (2012a, 2012b) reported similar processes.

Morphologically and grammatically, all such differences here can be ignored altogether without adversely impacting the results of the final analysis in any way whatsoever because morphological differences are mostly affixes that do not alter the meaning of the root itself. However, two points can be mentioned in this regard. First, Arabic pronouns do not inflect for case whereas English ones do. The former uses full and shortened forms such as *huwa* 'he- nom.' v. *–hu* 'him/his- acc./gen.' while the latter uses full pronouns such as *he, (hine), him, his*; *she, her, hers*, etc. (Perhaps the weak forms of pronouns in English can be treated as shortened pronominal forms as in Arabic.) For this reason, the different pronominal forms in English can be treated as different variants of Arabic pronouns. In other words, *him* corresponds to *hum* 'they- mas.', *hine* and *her* to *hun(na)* 'they- fem.', in the latter of which /n/ developed into /r/. The same applies to *they* and *them* in which /m/ can be considered a plural marker as is the case in all Arabic masculine pronouns such as *hu(wa)* 'he' v. *hum* 'they- masc.', *anta* 'you' v. *antum* 'you- masc. pl.'. In short, /m/ in English 'plural' pronouns corresponds to the plural masculine form of Arabic pronouns whereas /r/ in English to /n/, a feminine plural suffix in Arabic. The second main reason for this is morphological and grammatical shift and change. For example, Arabic *hum* 'they- m.' shifted to *him* in English while *hunna* 'they- f.' to *her* (see below). That is, /-m/ shifted its function from the masculine

plural in Arabic to the accusative in English while /-n/ from the feminine plural in Arabic to the genitive in English.

Finally, on the semantic level, the following lexical patterns were noted. Lexical stability was evident in most pronouns such as *I* (*me, my, mine*), *we (our(s), us), he, she (her(s), you(rs)*, the cognates of all of which still retain the same or similar meanings in both Arabic and English. Lexical shift was noted in *they*, whose meaning shifted from 'this' to 'they'; in *it* (*hit* in Old English) from 'this' to 'it'; in *him* from 'they' to 'him', in Old English *hine* from 'they- f.' to 'him'; and in *she* from (i) Old English *seo* 'this-f.' to its current use as a pronoun or (ii) Arabic *–ka* 'you (f.)' in which /k/ changed to /s or sh/. Lexical split took place in words like *they, them, this*, *these,* (also *the* and *she*), all of which came from Arabic *tha/thih* 'this'. That is, the first two are used as pronouns whereas the next two as demonstratives. Also *hunna* 'they-fem.' split into *hine* in Old English and *her* in Modern English. Lexical convergence was attested in *hine* in Old English which might derive from either Arabic *hunna* 'they- fem.' or *hum* 'they- mas.' in which /m/ became /n/. Lexical multiplicity was attested in *they* from Old English *thai* 'this' which means 'they', 'this, these, those', and 'the', which all derive from Arabic *tha* (also *thih*) 'this' in which /h/ became /s/. Lexical change was evident in the use of *you* from Old English *ge* and the death of *thou, thee, thine* in Modern English. Finally, lexical variability was manifested in the presence of variant or alternative words, which are utilized in different ways. For example, the pronouns *him, hine, her* in Old and Middle English vary in their final consonants due to their different Arabic cognates from which they came (see above). The different forms of *she* in Old and Middle English are another interesting example (see above), all of which stem from Arabic *hi(ya)* 'she', which has different, vowel-based pronunciations in vernacular Arabic. Jassem (2012a, 2012b) reported similar patterns.

Concerning the relational procedure which deals with the relationship between form and meaning, all of the above pronominal cognates are both formally and semantically similar. For example, the third person plural pronouns *they, them, their(s),* and *the* are all related, all of which derive from the same Arabic source *tha/thih* 'this', to which lexical shift was applied. Some, however, are formally different but semantically similar such as *she* and *the*, both of which derive from the demonstrative pronoun *thai* 'this', from Arabic *tha/thih* 'this' where /dh/ became /s/ and /sh/ later. Another example is *he* and *who* 'relative pronoun, wh-question about person' in English, both of which derive from Arabic *huwa* 'he'. According to Pyles and Algeo (1993: 118-119), *who* (*hwa-* nom. masc.) is the Old English source word from which *whom* (dat./inst. masc.), *whose* (gen.), *what* (nom./acc. masc./neut.), and *why* (inst. neut.) emerged, with the different forms being due to case in Old and Middle English. It seems that Arabic *he* split into two forms in English: one as a personal pronoun and one as a relative pronoun. In Modern English, relative *who* has several variants, one of which is *he* (see Trudgill 2001: 13), which reinforces the assertion that *he* and *hwa* were originally one pronoun. Note how orthographically identical Arabic *hu(w)a* 'he' and Old English *hwa* 'who'. Semantic change later led to their current use in English. Thus it can be seen that the formal similarities and/or differences between English words reflect those of their Arabic cognates.

Thus, in light of the above description and analysis, Arabic can be safely said to be the origin of English pronouns as well as those of German, French, Latin, and related languages. All are

real cognates in the sense of having similar forms and meanings. Jassem (2012a) adduced a number of equally valid reasons for that to which the interested reader can be referred.

## 6. Conclusion

All the personal pronouns in English, German, French, and Latin have true Arabic cognates, to some of which lexical shift was applied while others had demonstrative origins. They can be summed up as follows:

i) *I, me, my, mine*: *I* derives from Arabic *iyai* 'me' or *ee* 'my' while *me, my* and *mine* from *an(a/i)* 'I' in which /n/ turned or split into /m & n/; in Latin *ego*, French *je* and German *Ich*, they resulted from the usual addition of /j/ after /y (ee)/ in some old Arabic dialects, which subsequently passed into /g, j, or sh/.

ii) *We, us, our(s)*: *We* derives from a reduced Arabic *na2nu* (colloquial *2inna/i2na*) 'we' in which /2 (& n)/ turned or merged into /w/ while *us* and *our* from a reversed *na* 'us' in which /n/ turned into /r/ or (merged with /2/) into /s/; in German *wir, unser*, a similar process happened besides the change of /2/ into /s/; in French *nous*, /2/ became /s/.

iii) *You, your(s)*: *You* (*ge* in Old English) derives from Arabic *(iya)ka* 'you- acc.' in which /k/ became /g/, which in turn became /y/, while *your* from *(iya)kun* 'you (f. pl.)' in which /n/ turned into /r/; *thou, thee,* and *thine* in Old and Middle English derive from a reversed Arabic *anta* 'you- nom.' and/or *ta* 'you- suf.' in which /t/ became /th/; French *tu*, German *du,* and Arabic *ta* are identical cognates; German *Sie, euch, eur*, *Ihr*, *Ihnen* are similar to English *you(r)* and (*ge*), in which /k/ became /z, sh & y/.

iv) *He, she, it, they:* Both *he* and *she* had nearly identical forms in Old English, which derive from Arabic *hu(wa)/hi(ya)* 'he/she'; Middle English *she* (and German *sie*) 'she' come from Arabic *(iya)ki* 'you-acc. (f.)' in which /k/ turned into /sh & z/; *it* (*es* in German)*, they, them, their(s)* are demonstrative pronouns in origin, which derive from Arabic *tha/ti* 'this'. The Latin pronouns *is/ia/id* 'he/she/it', which are also demonstrative in origin, have the same story where /th/ became /s & d/. (Notice how close Latin *ia* 'she' and Arabic *hiya* 'she' are in which /h/ was dropped.) Similarly, French *il/elle* 'he/she' are of Latin demonstrative pronoun origins, all of which come from *ulai* 'these' in Arabic.

v) The suffixed pronouns all disappeared in Modern English except for verbal *-s* (e.g., he/she/it drinks); its Arabic cognate is *–at* where /t/ became /s/.

To conclude, the lexical root theory has proven to be applicable to and adequate for the analysis of the genetic relationship between personal pronouns in Arabic, English, German, French and Latin where Arabic was found to be their main origin, indeed. To further corroborate that, this work agrees with Jassem (2012a, 2012b) in calling for more research into other morphological features as well as all language levels. In addition, applying these findings to grammar and language teaching, lexicography, translation, cultural (including anthropological and historical) awareness and understanding is in dire need. The results of

such research will be extremely useful not only in bringing minds and hearts closer than ever before but also in enshrining and fostering a culture of peace, security, stability, harmony, and unity in the world through positive diversity, of course. In brief, this research area opens up immensely huge, new windows for the study of a limitlessly fertile and virgin territory in all kinds of ways and manners, linguistic and non-linguistic.

**Acknowledgements**

Thanks are due to everyone who contributed directly or indirectly to this research, especially my colleagues and students in Syria, U.K., Malaysia, and KSA as well as the IJL's editorial team and anonymous reviewers. I would also like to thank my wife, Amandy Mufleh Ibrahim, for her inspiration, understanding, and tolerance.

**References**

Al-Ghalayeeni, & Al-Shaikh Mustaf. (2010). *Jaami3 Al-duroos Al-3arabiyat*. Saida and Beirut: Al-Maktabat Al-3aSriyat.

Campbell, L. (2004). *Historical linguistics: An introduction. (*2nd ed). Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press.

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

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

Gil, N. S. (2012). *About.com guide.* [Online] Available: http://www.about.com/library (September 12, 2012)

Harper, Douglas. (2012). *Online etymology dictionary*. [Online] Available: http://www.etymonline.com/index (August 20, 2012)

Ibn Manzoor, & Abi AlFadl Al-Misri. (1955-1974). *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 lughawee Sauti ijtima3i fi allahajat al-3arabiyya al-shamiyya muqaranatan ma3a al-ingleeziyya wa ghairiha*. Kuala Lumpur: Pustaka Antara.

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*. 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. http://dx.doi.org/10.5296/ijl.v4i3.1876

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

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

Ruhlen, M. (1987). *A guide to the world's languages: Classification, 1.* London: Arnold.

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

Viney, B. (2008). *The history of the English language*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

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