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Abstract

This paper examines the Arabic cognates and/or origins of the names of days of the week in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit from a lexical root or radical linguistic theory viewpoint. The data consists of all the days of the week from Saturday to Friday. The results show that all such words have true Arabic cognates, with the same or similar forms and meanings. All their different forms, however, resulted from natural and plausible causes of linguistic change and its different routes in such languages. Contrary to Comparative Method or traditional linguistic family classification claims, this entails that Arabic, English and all European languages belong to the same language, let alone the same family. Owing to their phonetic complexity, morphological wealth, and huge lexical variety, Arabic words are the original source from which they stemmed. This proves the adequacy of the lexical root theory according to which Arabic, English, German, French, Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit are dialects of the same language where Arabic is their origin all.
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1. Introduction

The names of English and Indo-European days of the week not only have meanings but also have pagan origins in the sense that they indicated mainly Greek and Roman as well as Germanic deities (gods and goddesses) and heavenly stars such as the sun, moon, and Saturn, as well as women. They are similar to, in fact derived from, Babylonian and Sumerian names, all of which were called after stars familiar to them (www.friesian.com 2018; www.livescience.com 2018). These seven classical planets were the Moon, Mercury, Venus, Sun, Mars, Jupiter, and Saturn.
However, not all European names of such days are cognates, some of which are loan translations. In addition, some are unique to Germanic languages (e.g., German, Dutch, English), some to Latin and Romance (e.g., French, Spanish, Italian) languages, some to Greek, and some to Slavic languages like Polish and Russian. There are even some differences within the same branch such as the names for Saturday and Wednesday in English versus German Samstag and Mittwoch.

In Arabic, their names changed in three different stages. First, in pre-Islamic days, they had different names which marked the different stages of the moon, totaling 10 stages. Secondly, they had seven days, which were awwal (first, Sunday), ahwan (easier, Monday), Jubbaar (recovering, Tuesday), Dubbar (departing, Wednesday), mu'nis (entertainer, Thursday), 3aroobat (mercy, Friday), and shiyaar (counsel, Saturday). Finally, with the advent of Islam, totally new names emerged where five of them are now purely numerical in nature from one to five (Sunday-Thursday) whereas the seventh is called jum3a, aljum3at 'gathering' الجمعة in Arabic. Saturday is the first day of the week in Islamic calendar, which is called sabt, Alsabt 'lit., fixation, motionless' السبت. As can be seen, Arabic days are totally different and unique without any pagan origins in all stages.

Although no relationship exists between their Arabic and English names, it can be clearly seen that all English and Indo-European names have true Arabic cognates. This paper investigates the Arabic origins and/or source cognates of names of days of the week in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and the so-called Indo-European languages. This paper has four sections: (i) introduction, (ii) research methods, (iii) results and discussion, and (iv) conclusion.

2. Research Methods

2.1 The Data

The data consists of the words for the names of days of the week and their related derivatives in English, German, French, Latin, Greek, Sanskrit, and the so-called Indo-European languages.

All etymological references to English below are for Harper (2012-18) and his sources. As to Arabic, the meanings are based on classical Arabic dictionaries like Ibn Manzoor (2013) in the main and Ibn Seedah (1996).

Transcribing the data uses normal spelling for practical purposes. However, certain symbols were used for unique Arabic sounds- viz., /2 & 3/ for the voiceless and voiced pharyngeal fricatives respectively, /kh & gh/ for the voiceless and voiced velar fricatives each, capital letters for the emphatic counterparts of plain consonants /t (T), d (D), dh (Dh), & s (S)/, and /'/ for the glottal stop (Jassem 2013c).
2.2 Data Analysis

2.2.1 Theoretical Framework: The Lexical Root Theory

Data analysis employs the Radical Linguistic Theory (Jassem 2014h-l, 2015a-j, 2016a-h, 2017a-b), which is a slightly revised and more generalized version of the Lexical Root Theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g). The latter 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*), from Arabic *abSar, baSar* 'to see' via reordering and passing /b & S/ into /b & s/ (Jassem 2013o) or *description* (subscription, prescription, inscription, script, scripture) from *scribe* (scr; German schreiben, schr), from Arabic *zabar* 'to write; cut' via reordering and turning or splitting /z/ into /sk (sh)/ (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 *observation* (*srv*).

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, the greatest 8th century Arabic linguist, lexicographer, musician, and mathematician (Jassem 2012e).

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 (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). Thus far, fifty three studies have initially employed the lexical root theory (Jassem 2012a-f, 2013a-q, 2014a-g, 2015a-h) and subsequently its slightly revised and extended version, called radical linguistic theory (Jassem 2014 h-k, 2015a-j, 2016a-c, 2017a-c). These studies cover all aspects of language phonologically, morphologically, grammatically, and lexically besides their application to language teaching and translation in a few cases.

The lexical root theory has a simple, straightforward 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, sudden language which developed over time into countless human dialects and languages, that continue to become simpler and simpler. That original first language, which may be called radical or root language, has not died out at all but has instead survived uninterruptedly into modern day languages to various degrees where some languages have preserved words and forms more than others. Perhaps Arabic, on spatial and temporal grounds, has preserved almost all of its features phonetically, morphologically, syntactically or grammatically, and semantically or lexically.

As to the five applied procedures of the lexical root theory which have been used all along to empirically prove that principle in data collection and analysis, they remain the same, which are (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 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 and form on the basis of word etymologies and origins as a guide (e.g., Harper 2016), which should be used with discretion, though. The final outcome of the above example yields Arabic baien, baan (v) ‘clear, plain’ via /l/-insertion or split from /n/ (Jassem 2013i). Observation and description have already been described this way exactly.

Thirdly, the linguistic procedure handles the analysis of the phonetic, morphological, grammatical and semantic structures and differences between words. The phonetic analysis examines sound changes within and across categories. More precisely, consonants may change their place and manner of articulation as well as voicing. At the level of place, bilabial consonants ↔ labio-dental ↔ dental ↔ alveolar ↔ palatal ↔ velar ↔ uvular ↔ pharyngeal ↔ glottal (where ↔ signals change in both directions); at the level of manner, stops ↔ fricatives ↔ affricates ↔ nasals ↔ laterals ↔ approximants; and at the level of voice, voiced consonants ↔ voiceless. For example, /t/ may 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 English (Roach 2008; Celce-Mercia et al. 2010) and Arabic (Jassem 2012g, 1987, 1993), all can be reduced to three basic long vowels, which are /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; Arabic qaal, qul, qeel, qawl, qaala(t), aqwal, maqal ‘to say’). Thus their semantic weight is marginal in significance, if not at all. For these reasons, vowels may be totally ignored in the analysis because the limited nature of the changes do not affect the final semantic result at all.

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

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, 2015d, 2016a); the latter handles grammatical classes, categories, and functions like determiners, pronouns, prepositions, question words, nouns, verbs, and case (Jassem 2012c-e, 2013l, 2014b-c, 2016d). 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 regards the semantic analysis, meaning relationships between words are examined, including lexical stability, multiplicity, convergence, divergence, shift, split, change, and variability. Stability means that word meanings have remained constant over time such as cut, from Arabic qaTTa (or qaTa3, qadda) ‘cut’, turning /q, T (d), & 3/ into /k, t, & Ø/ (Jassem 2013m). Multiplicity denotes that words might have two or more meanings such as dwell (Jassem 2015a, 2015i) and write ‘cut; write’ (Jassem 2013i), from Arabic qaraTa ‘cut’ and/or qira’at ‘reading’ in which /q & T/ became /w & t/ besides lexical shift. Convergence means two or more formally and semantically similar Arabic words might have yielded the same cognate in English like write ‘cut; write’ (Jassem 2013i), from Arabic qaraTa ‘cut’ and/or qira’at ‘reading’ in which /q & T/ became /w & t/ besides lexical shift. German schön ‘nice’ might have come from Arabic zain ‘beautiful’ in which /z/ became .sh. or from shain ‘bad’ via sense divergence (see
3.2iv below) Divergence signals that words became antonyms of one another like English nice, from Arabic na2s 'bad' or najs 'dirty' via /l (j) & sl-merger or German schö(, from Arabic shain 'bad' (see 3.2iv below). Shift indicates that words switched their sense within the same field such as write 'cut; write' (Jassem 2013i) above, from Arabic qira'at 'reading' in which /q/ changed into /w/. Split means a word led to two different cognates. Change means a new meaning developed or feature added or lost such as inflecting the definite articles for gender, number, and case in German (e.g., der, die, das; den, dem) 'this' and Romance languages (e.g., French le, la, les), all from Arabic dha (dh, dh) 'this; whose' and invariant al 'the' respectively (Jassem 2012c, 2016e). Variability signals the presence of two or more variants for the same word such as English air, aero-, from Arabic air, iar, iar 'air' (Jassem 2013e) (for detail, see Jassem 2012a-f). All my previous papers abound with countless cases of all those types, some being commoner than others, though.

Fourthly, the relational procedure accounts for the relationship between form and meaning from three angles. The first is formal and semantic similarity such as three, third, tertiary, tri-, trio- and Arabic thalath, thulth, thalith 'three, a third; third' (Damascus Arabic talaat) in which /th & l/ became /t & / (Jassem 2012a). The second is formal similarity and semantic difference like English tail, tell, tall; sheep, ship, shape (Jassem 2012b); marry, mare, mere, more, mar, marine, mayor (emperor), mirror, merry, myrrh, moor, admire (Jassem 2016f); all these words have similar Arabic cognates. For example, the set marry, mare, mere, more, mar, marine, mayor (emperor), mirror, merry, myrrh, moor, admire, which all share /m & r/, have identical Arabic cognates, which are the same or similar in form (with /m & r/) and meaning. More precisely, mare comes from Arabic muhra(t) 'mare' via /h/-loss; mayor & emperor (empire, imperial, imperative) from Arabic 'ameer 'emir, prince, ruler' via /b/-insertion; mar & myrrh from Arabic murr 'bitter; embitter'; marine from Arabic marr(in) 'sea, rain'; mirror & admire from Arabic mira(t) 'mirror' for the former and tamarra (v) 'to look in a mirror; to admire' for the latter, from the root ra(a) (v) 'to see', where /l/ became /d/ besides reordering; mere & more from Arabic marr(a)t 'once' and its irregular plural miraar 'many times'; moor from Arabic mar3a 'grazing ground' or maraa2 'animals' den; water area; washing' via /3/-loss and turning /b/ into /m/ (Jassem 2016f). Finally, formal difference and semantic similarity, e.g., quarter, quadrant, carat, cadre, write 'originally 'cut' and Arabic qeeraaT 'a fourth; carat', from qaraT 'cut' (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 cognate phonetically, morphologically, and semantically on the basis of its history and development by using historical dictionaries and textbooks in English like Harper (2016) and Pyles and Algeo (1993) and in Arabic such as Ibn Manzour (2013), Altha3aalibi (2011), and Ibn Seedah (1996) besides the author's knowledge of both Arabic as a first language and English as an equal second language.
(Jassem 1987, 1993, 1994). Discretion should be exercised here due to uncertainties, inaccuracies, and deficiencies, especially in Harper's work, though.

To sum up, the most appropriate operational procedure in relating words to each other genetically are the following:

(i) Select any word, e.g., the, that, to, Saturday.

(ii) Identify the source, daughter, 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 as the former are more stable and change a lot less than the latter which do so extensively and drastically; for example, all the sounds of a given word might change beyond recognition while meanings in a rather limited way. The meaning first will often lead one to the correct cognate naturally whereas the sounds first will lead them nowhere definitely.

(iii) Search for the word with the equivalent 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.

(iv) Explain the differences, if any, in both 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 one to the resultant changes automatically.

(v) Finally, formulate phonological, morphological, grammatical, and semantic rules after sufficient data has been amassed and analyzed.

That is the whole story simply, briefly, and truly. For example, consider day, daily, Sunday or any word in Section 4 below.

2.2.2 Statistical Analysis

The percentage formula is used in calculating the ratio of cognate words, which is obtained by dividing the number of cognates over the total number of investigated words multiplied by 100. For example, suppose the total number of investigated words is 100, of which 90 are true cognates. The percentage of cognates is calculated thus: $\frac{90}{100} = 9 \times 100 = 90\%$. Finally, the results are checked against Cowley's (1997: 173, 182) formula to determine whether such words belong to the same language or family (for a survey, see Jassem 2012a-b).

All the names of days of the week in English and European languages are compounds, the second of which being mostly the word day itself or a similar derivative or cognate. All have true, identical Arabic parent cognates as follows.
Let’s begin with the second element first.

**Day** *(daily, diurnal, dawn)* is the second element in English day names, meaning 'light, shining'. Historically, it came from Old English *dæg* 'day, lifetime', from Proto-Germanic *dagaz 'day' (source also of Old Saxon, Dutch *dag*, German *Tag*), from Latin *dies* 'day' and *deus 'god', Sanskrit *deva* 'god, shining one' and *dah* 'to burn', from PIE root *dyeu- 'to shine'.

Furthermore, according to Watkins, cited in Harper (2018), *day* does not relate to Latin *dies* 'day' but rather to PIE root *agh- 'a day', whose Germanic initial /d-/ is of obscure origin; this is incorrect in my view from a formal point of view.

In light of its meaning "light, shine", *day* ultimately developed from Arabic:

(a)  
*Dau*, *Dia* 'light' ضوء، ضياء where /D & ' / turned into /d & (g) y/;

(b)  
*Du2a* 'forenoon, morning, day' ضحي where /D & 2/ passed into /d & (g) y/; or

(c)  
*ghad(at)* 'tomorrow, early part of day' غد, غداة via reversal, lexical shift, and turning /gh/ into /(g) y/.

As you can see, Arabic provides cognates for all options. **Day** has many related derivatives, including:

**Dawn** came from Old English *dagung, dagian (v)* 'to light', *dæg* 'day, lifetime', directly from the same Arabic cognates above: i.e., (a) *Daw/*Dia*, *Dawian* (adj) 'light' ضوء، ضياء، ضوئان via /l/-mutation into /g (Ø)/ and /n/-insertion or (b) *Du2a* 'forenoon, morning' ضحي via lexical shift, passing /D & 2/ into /d & (g) y/, and /n/-insertion.

**Diurnal** *(day)* is a related derivative which came from a Latin compound: (i) *dies* 'day' (and *deus 'god') as in **day** above and (ii) -*urnus* 'time', immediately from Arabic *nahaar* 'day' نهار via reordering and /h/-loss; or *3umr* 'time, lifetime' عمر via reordering, /3/-loss, and turning /m/ into /n/.

The suffixes have Arabic cognates as well. First, the adjectival suffix –*al* directly came from Arabic *a*ل the, definite article' via morphological shift (see Jassem 2016a). Likewise, the adjectival suffix –*ly*, which came from Old English *lic/lace* 'form, shape' and developed into Modern English *like*, ultimately stemmed from Arabic *shakl* شكل 'form, shape' via reversal and /sh & k/-merger into /k/ and then /ly/ (see Jassem 2016a).

**Today** is a combination of (i) *to- 'this' and (ii) **day** above. The former came directly from Arabic *ti/tihi* 'this (f.)' TH via /h/-deletion or *dha* 'this (m.)' ذا via /dh/-mutation into /h/ (Jassem 2012c, 2015b).
In addition, names of God in Indo-European languages like Greek Zeus and Theo-, Latin Deus and French Dieu, English Divinity, Deity, Divine, Diana and related derivatives eventually came from the same root *dyeu- 'light, shine'. All derive ultimately from the same Arabic source cognate for day above- i.e., Dau’, Diaa’ ‘light’ to which different sound and morphological changes applied in these languages where /D/ became /z, th, & d/ (for detail, see Jassem 2014e).

Now, we turn to the first element of days of the week. As has already been shown, this often marks stars and gods/goddesses, representing celestial paganism or star worship and echoing Babylonian and/or Sumerian pagan practices and customs. Again, all have Arabic cognates as follows:-

**Sunday** stemmed from Old English sunnandæg (Northumbrian sunnadag) 'day of the sun', from sunnan, oblique case of sunne 'sun', from German Sonntag, from Sonne 'sun', Dutch zondag, which is a loan-translation of Latin dies solis 'day of the sun', itself a loan-translation of Greek hemera heliou, a loan-translation from Babylonian in the end.

The Arabic cognates for sun are varied, including:

(a) jawn 'sun' حَون via /j/-mutation into /s/, which is the likeliest;

(b) sana 'light' نَتا via lexical shift; or

(c) shams 'sun' شَمْس via /sh & s/-merger into /s/ and /mu/-mutation into /n/ or /l/ in Latin (cf. son, from Arabic Sunu 'son, uncle' صَنْو where /S/ became /s/ or from Dana 'son, children; tiredness' صَنْن where /D/ became /s/) (Jassem 2013g).

As for the Greek expression, both words have Arabic cognates: (a) hemera 'day' derives from Arabic yawm 'day' يوم in which /y/ became /h/ and /r/ was inserted whereas (b) heliou is from Arabic 'ulooha ('alooha, 'aaliha) 'sun' الْوُهَاء الأَلِيْهَا via reordering. Thus, as can be seen, the Greek, Latin, and English words are not cognates here; however, Arabic provides cognates for all, which is why it must be their origin all, indeed.

**Monday** (moon) descended from Old English monandæg, monandæg 'Monday; lit., day of the moon', from German Montag, Dutch maandag), from a loan-translation of Latin Lunae dies 'day of the moon', (source of French lundi, Italian lunedi, Spanish lunes), from a loan-translation of Greek selenes hemera, again a loan-translation from Babylonian and/or Sumerian in the end.

More precisely, English moon came from mona (genitive monan 'moon'), from Proto-Germanic *menon- (source of Old Saxon and Old High German mano, German Mond), from Latin mensis 'month', from Greek mene/men 'moon, month', from PIE
*me(n)ses- 'moon, month', from root *mi- 'to measure' (source of Sanskrit masah, Persian mah, Old Church Slavonic meseci, Old Irish mi, Lithuanian menesis 'moon, month', Welsh/Breton mis/miz).

As can be seen, two points can be noted on the above. First, not all the above terms are cognates like Sanskrit, Persian, Greek, and Latin. Secondly, moon has two senses 'moon, month'. In view of these two senses, moon ultimately came from Arabic:

a) manoon 'time' منون via lexical shift and reduction;
b) (ibn) muznat 'moon; lit., child of rain, white cloud' ابن مزنة, from muzn(at) 'rain, white cloud' مزنة, مزن via reordering and turning /z & t/ into /s/ and later deletion;
c) zaman 'time' زمن via lexical shift, reordering, and turning /z/ into /s/;
d) shams, mushmis (adj.) 'sun' شمس, مشمس via lexical shift, reordering, and turning /sh & m/ into /s & n/; or
e) manaat, mana 'a pagan Arab god; measure' مناة, منى via /t/-substitution by /s (Ø)/.

The PIE root *mi- 'to measure' is from Arabic yawm 'day, period' يوم via reversal and sense shift. Sanskrit masah and Persian mah are from Arabic masaa' 'evening' مساء via lexical shift and passing /'/ into /h/.

**Tuesday** came from Old English tiwesdæg, from Tiwes, genitive of Tiw 'Tiu', from Proto-Germanic *Tiwaz 'god of the sky', related to Tiw 'ancient Germanic god of war; to shine' and to Zeus 'Greek god of light', from PIE *deiwos 'god', from root *dyeu- 'to shine; sky, heaven, god', with cognates in Old Frisian tiesdei, Old Norse tysdagr, Swedish tisdag, Old High German ziestag.

On the basis of its meaning 'shining, sky god', it directly came from either Arabic:

(a) Dau'/Dia' 'light, fire' ضوء, ضياء where /D & '/ became /t & s/; or
(b) jaw 'sky, air space' جو where /j/ passed into /t/; or
(c) Tais 'war; its dust' طبس where /T/ turned into /t/ (Jassem 2013g).

The first is the likeliest.

As to the infix or suffix -s-, it comes directly from Arabic -t 'inflectional and derivational suffix' (see Jassem 2012f, 2013a, 2016a).

**Wednesday** has three parts or morphemes (Wedene- + -s + day), which emanated from Old English wodnesdæg 'Woden's day', a Germanic loan-translation of Latin dies Mercurii 'day
of Mercury. It has cognates in Old Frisian Wonsdei, Swedish Onsdag, Middle Dutch Wudensdach but not in German Mittwoch 'mid-week', Polish and Russian sreda 'Wednesday; lit., middle' in all of which a different word is used which means 'middle of the week' as in German.

Historically, the first part Wedne- came from Old English Woden (wood) or Odin 'chief Teutonic god, the All-Father, mad, inspire, arouse spiritually', from Old High German Wuotan, from Danish, from Old Norse Odhinn, from Proto-Germanic *Wodonaz, name of the chief Germanic god, from PIE *wod-eno-, *wod-ono- 'raging, mad, inspired', from root *wet- (1) 'to blow, inspire, spiritually arouse'.

Based on its varied meanings, its ultimate Arabic cognate may be any of the following:

(a) wudd/wadd, widan 'a pre-Islamic god; originally a righteous man from the people of Prophet Noah, meaning love' وَد and related derivatives like widan 'wet, rainy plant areas; a valley', wadn 'taking care of one's bride' وَدْن, wadan 'to soak, to wet, to bury' وَدْن, wada'a 'to level, to wreck' وَدّا;

(b) wad3 'a pre-Islamic Arabic god' وَد٣ and related wadee3 'gentle, kind; a proper name' وَدِئ via /3/-loss or passage into /n/;

(c) wa3eed 'threat; promise' وَعِيد via /3/-loss and lexical shift,

(d) wa'd/wa'eed 'strong, loud sound' وَأوَادٍ via sense shift.

(e) widd '(a piece of) wood; log' وَد via /3/-loss and /l/-mutation into /n/;

(f) waalid 'father' وَالْد via reordering and /l/-mutation into /n/;

(g) 3ood '(a piece of) wood' via /3/-loss عوَد;

(h) wajd/wijdan 'passion, love, strong emotion, sadness, conscience' وَجَد and related wajd(at) 'cut fire wood' وَجَدة via /j & d/-merger;

(i) 'udhaina 'a man/tribe's name' وأذينة and related 'adheen/mu'dhin 'guarantor, leader' وأذين/مودَن, 'udht(u)n 'hearer, knower' وأذن via sense shift;

(j) 'uthn 'origin' أَوْثِن via sense shift and related wathan 'statue, motionless structure' وَثَن.
(k)  faatin, fitna 'raging, inspiring, turbulent, loving

The English adjective wood 'violently insane, mad, frenzied' comes from the same root *wet- (1) 'to blow, inspire, spiritually arouse' above, from Arabic wajd 'strong emotion' وجد or waghd 'bad, violent person' وغد via lexical shift and /j (gh) & dl/-merger, or mawt(at) 'madness, death' موتة, passing /m & t/ into /w & d/. Its cognates in Latin vates 'seer, poet', Old Irish faith 'poet', Old English woth 'sound, melody, song' are all from Arabic fattaa2 'a witch, seer, opener' فتاح via /2/-loss or waDDaa2 'a clarifier; white' وضاح via /2/-loss and turning /w & D/ into /f & t/.

The Latin Mercury is both a star and trade name in origin, both of which come from Arabic mushtari 'Mercury; buyer, seller' or makr, makari 'buying, selling, hiring' via reordering and merging /sh & t/ into /k/.

In German, Mittwoch means 'mid-week', consisting of (i) mitt 'middle, mid', from Arabic mata 'mid, middle' متي (Jassme 2014g) and (ii) woch 'week' below.

Week came from Old English wice 'a turning, a succession', from German Woche, from either Arabic:

a) awjas 'time' أوجس via lexical shift and /j & s/-merger into /kl/, or

b) waqt 'time' وقت via lexical shift and /q & t/-merger into /kl/, or

c) waqa3i3 (pl.) 'days, events' وقائع, from waqa3 (v) 'to fall, happen' via lexical shift and /3/-loss, which is the likeliest (cf. weak from Arabic waah 'weak' واه where /h/ became /kl, waqa3/waaqi3 'fall/falling' وقعت, أووقعت, or qawee 'strong' قوي via reversal and lexical shift; wake from Arabic afuaq 'wake' أوقع أوقت where /f & q/ became /w & k/).

Thursday has three morphemes (Thur- + -s + day), which stemmed from Old English thurresdæg, a contraction of thunnerdag 'lit., Thor's day', from thunre, genitive of thunor 'Thor; thunder; strongest of the gods', from Proto-Germanic *thonorus daga (source of Dutch donnerdag, German Donnerstag, Danish and Swedish Torsdag), from a loan-translation of Latin Jovis dies 'day of Jupiter' (source of Italian giovedi, Old French jeusdi, French jeudi, Spanish jueves), from a loan-translation of Greek dios hemera 'the day of Zeus', again a loan-translation of Babylonian in the end. Thus, Latin, Greek, and English are not cognates here.

In light of the above, Thur- ultimately derives from any of Arabic:

a) Sarr (SarSar, Sarra, Sawran) 'extreme cold and its sound; noise' صر, صرصر, صرة via sense shit and passing /S/ into /th/, which is the likeliest;
(b) *sinnawr* 'master; head of tribe' and related *sanawwar* 'arms, armour; iron in general' and *sanar* 'bad manners' via sense shift and passing /s/ into /th/ besides /n/-loss later;

(c) *tannoor* 'oven, fire; water spring' via sense shift and passing /t/ into /th/ besides /n/-loss later;

(d) *thawr* 'bull; strongest, obstinate; pre-evening redness' and related *thawaran, thwra(t)* 'eruption, revolt' via lexical shift, reordering, and deleting /n/ later;

(e) *Dars* 'little rain, rain; brave' and related *Daris* 'hunger-related anger; ill-tempered, bad' where /D/ became /th/;

(f) *tars* 'strong, obstinate' where /t/ became /th/;

(g) *Tarash* 'strong, deafening sound; rain' via lexical shift and passing /T & sh/ into /th & s/;

(h) *ra3d* 'thunder' رعد via reversal, turning /d/ into /th/, and /3/-mutation into /n/ and later loss.

As can be seen, the Latin and Greek names are not cognates, both of which have Arabic cognates, though. While the Greek names have already been tackled, Latin *Jupiter (Jove, jovial)* 'supreme Roman god' came from Latin *Iupiter, Iupeter, Iuppiter* 'Jove, sky god, chief god', from PIE compound root *dyeu-peter* 'god-father', from *dyeu-* 'to shine; sky, heaven, god' and *peter* 'father'. Both parts come from Arabic *Dau* 'light' ضوء as has been show in *day* above and *abb, abat* 'father' آب، آبت via /r/-insertion (see Jassem 2013k).

**Friday** *(free, freedom)* came from Old English *frigedæg* 'Friday, Frigga's day', from *Friga*, genitive of *Frigo* 'Germanic goddess of married love' and frigg 'free, noble, joyful; beloved, loving; wife'. Its cognates in West Germanic languages such as German *Freitag* and Dutch *vrijdag* are all loan-translations of Latin *dies Veneris* 'day of (the planet) Venus', itself a loan-translation of Greek *Aphrodites hemera* which occurs in French *vendredi* and Spanish *viernes*.

In light of its meaning and sound, the first element *Fri-* ultimately comes from either Arabic:

(a) *furja(t), faraj* 'a show, happiness, release, freeing; a proper name' فرج, فرجة, فرج in which /j/ became /g/ and later /ee/; or

(b) *fara2* 'happiness, a proper name' فرح where /2/ became /g/; or
There are other words in English and European languages that derive directly from this root, including:

**Free** *(freedom, friend, Friday)* came from Old English *freo, freogan* *(v)* 'free, exempt from; noble, joyful', from German *frei* *(Old vri)*, ultimately from Arabic *faraj, afraja* *(v)* 'free, freedom, to set free' فرح، أفرج, turning /j/ into /ee/ and/or *fari2* *(v)* 'joyful' فرح via /2/-loss. In other words, the resultant word is most likely a lexical merger of both Arabic words.

**Friend** *(befriend, friendship)* is related to *free* in root, which developed from Old English *freond* 'friend', present participle of *freogan* 'to love, to favour', from German *Freund*. It ultimately comes from Arabic *far2aan(at), fari2a* *(v)* 'happy, to be happy' فرحان, فرح via lexical shift and turning /2/ into /g (Ø)/; or *rafeq, rufqaan* *(pl.)* 'friend, gentle, kind' رفق، رفقة via reordering and turning /q/ into /l/.

**Saturday** came from Old English *sæterdæg, sæterndæg* 'lit., day of the planet Saturn', from *Sæternes* *(genitive of Sætern 'Saturn, the most remote planet, a Roman god'), from Latin *Saturni dies* 'Saturn's day', from Latin *Saturnus* 'an Italic god of agriculture', possibly from Etruscan, from root *serere* *(v)* 'to sow'; *(past participle *satus*). Similar cognates occur in European languages like Dutch *Zaterdag*, Old Frisian *Saterdi*, Middle Low German *Saterdach*, Irish dia *Sathuirn*, Welsh *dydd Sadwin*.

On the basis of its root meaning *serere* *(v)* 'to sow' above, it ultimately comes from Arabic *zara3* *(v), zar3, zira3aat(t)* *(n), zar3ana(t)* *(n)* 'to sow' زرع, زراعة, زرعنة via reordering, turning /z/ into /s/, and /3/-loss *(Cf. Arabic *shi3ra* 'a star' شعرى via lexical shift, /3/-loss, and turning /sh/ into /sl.)*

**Sabbath** is the Biblical equivalent for *Saturday*, which came from Old English *sabat* 'Saturday as day of rest for Jews', from Latin *sabbatum*, from Greek *sabbaton*, from Hebrew *shabbath* 'probably day of rest', from *shabath* 'he rested'.

Many European languages base their forms for *Saturday* on it like German *Samstag* *(Old High German *sambaztag)*, French *samedi*, Old Church Slavonic *sabota*, Polish *sobota*, Russian *subbota*, Hungarian *szombat*, all from Greek *sambaton*, a nasalized colloquial form of *sabbaton* 'sabbath'.

Its direct, ultimate Arabic cognate is *sabt* 'Saturday; lit., fixation, rest, sleep, motionlessness; time' ضِبَت (السِبْت) from *sabat/thabat* *(v)* /l/ became /th/. 
In summary, all the names of week days and their derivatives can be traced back to Arabic cognates easily. That is, all have Arabic cognates- i.e., 100%.

4. Discussion and Conclusion

The main results and findings of this paper can be summed up as follows:

a) English and European days of the week are pagan in origin, indicating deities and stars such as the ‘sun, moon, Saturn’, natural phenomena like Thursday and agricultural phenomena like Saturday; in contrast, their Arabic names are numerical in nature except for the first and seventh days of the week, which are alsabt ‘Saturday, fixation, rest’ and aljum3at ‘gathering, joining, joint’.

b) Not all European names of such days are cognates, most of which are merely loan translations from Latin, from Greek, all dating back to Babylonian and/or Sumerian origins essentially, in which all days were named after stars or planets.

c) All English and European days of the week have true Arabic cognates, whose differences are due to natural and plausible causes and different routes of language change according to language such as Sabbath.

d) There are many words related to or derived from such words like day, daily, Deus, Zeus, Theo-, divine, all of which can be traced back to Arabic easily morpheme by morpheme as shown above.

e) The results support the adequacy of the lexical root or radical linguistic theory in relating English and the so-called Indo-European languages to Arabic from which they all stemmed because only it shares cognates with all.

f) The myth and fallacy of postulating Proto-Indo-European, Proto-Germanic cognates and/or roots because Arabic provides live and ready cognates for all such living languages. We have seen how all loan translations date back to Babylonian and/or Sumerian origins, itself a Semitic language (for further details, see Jassem 2017a-b).

g) The multiple meanings of English and European words is most likely the result of the lexical merger of two or more Arabic cognates which are similar in both form and meaning such as Monday, Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday, & Friday (free, friend).
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