A Comparative Analysis of the Similar Word-formation Processes in English and Arabic

[1,*]Tareq Abdo Abdullah Al-Hamidi; [2]Milana Abbasova; [3]Azad Mammadov

[1,2]Khazar University, Baku, Azerbaijan; [3]Azerbaijan University of Languages, Baku, Azerbaijan.
[*]Corresponding author: g.h555@yahoo.com

Abstract

This paper sets out on a comparative analysis of similar word-formation processes in English and Arabic. In doing so, it hopes to emerge and serve as subsequent and reliable, albeit partial, reference material for English and Arabic linguistics, especially in reference to linguistic structures. The framework herein for the study and analysis of word-formation processes in both languages may also be applied in future studies and other genres, corpora, and texts. This study enriches the research findings and meta-theory in the field of linguistics, contributing to the current linguistic intellectualism trends. The specific processes discussed are acronyms, antonomasia, backformation, blending, borrowing, compounding, and derivation.

Keywords: English, Arabic, word-formation, similar process, linguistics

Introduction

One of the features that make human beings distinguished from non-human animals is the language that we speak. The way that we acquire it is a part of our nature. According to the Universal Grammar theory (UG) –credited to Noam Chomsky– that proposes that human's brain has an innate ability to learn grammar. This ability is built into the brain from birth regardless of language. Therefore, the basic structures of language are already encoded in the brain at birth. Additional to that the UG theory suggests that every language has some of the same laws. In other words, every language has the way to identify gender, to ask questions, to express feelings or to show something that happened in the past or will be in the future.

Linguistically, there is something called linguistic universals. This term may include a variety of meanings. It means generally the shared features between most or all

languages. From a typological universal approach point of view, it is a true statement for all-natural languages. Hence, linguistic typology is a branch of linguistics that classifies and studies languages according to their structural features. It aims to explain and describe the structural similarities and differences in the world's languages.

The study of how languages structures are different began out of the interest to classify the world language families. Historical or comparative linguists initiated this. Their efforts were geared towards demonstrating similarities. Nevertheless, some comparative studies have shown that languages may share similarities even if they are genetically unrelated. Buhari (2006: p.11). Every language is unique by its linguistic system. This system has many branches, each with sub-branches. One of these branches is typology it has many types. One of its major types is morphological typology. It is a way of categorising the world's languages. It classifies languages according to their shared morphological structures.

Morphology is mainly concerned with the inner structures of words. It explores word structures, specifically the smallest units of language (morphemes). Therefore, languages can be compared morphologically by looking at their affixation systems and the nature of the affixes themselves. Explicitly, whether the languages employ prefixes and suffixes only or even circumfixes and infixes and to what extent. The word-formation process is a sub-section of morphology. It deals with the formation of new words and their derived relationships. Further, it explores how the old form of words are re-used while maintaining the old meanings or having new ones.

Genetically, English is an Indo-European language whereas Arabic is a Semitic, therefore the considerable differences between their systems will be noticeable. Both languages do use certain processes to enrich their lexicons and adapt to new linguistic and extra-linguistic changes. The newly formed words must go through one or more linguistic procedures. They could be morphological, phonological, grammatical or syntactical processes to be fully well used in the language system.

There are many significant advantages for investigating and teaching the word-formation theory. For example, teachers can contribute towards faster and better second language learning by analysing some compound words that their students know. Then, teach them how the morphemes are combined to create these words. Besides, teachers need to use some simple words that students know to show them the applicable rules that can be used to derive new meaning from them. Therefore, students will know the interrelationship between the derived words and their roots. This way of teaching might trigger the special UG device in their brains, which Chomsky mentioned in his theory. Dixon & Aikhenvald (2007: p.65). It is important

for language lecturers to admit that teaching the word-formation processes helps learners to enrich and widen their lexicon knowledge. also, it helps them to understand the complex words analysis in a better way. In addition, it shows them how linguistic and extra-linguistic factors affect languages. Comparing any two languages at any linguistic level might be very monotonous; the results therefrom could be quite beneficial. For example, it can go far off to enhance existing intellectual materials, which are usually insufficient for academic purposes. Hence, a comparative study of word-formation processes can contribute to the study of language as a communicatory tool or a mental facility. It is hoped that this study will prove or disprove some assumptions in the morphological field, particularly in its comparative dimension in both the languages.

To carry out a productive comparative analysis of the aforementioned processes, the study must answer the following questions:
1. To what extent and how do English and Arabic form words?
2. How do the two languages apply these processes, if applicable?
3. What are the similar word-formation processes between English and Arabic?
4. What are the similarities and differences within similar processes?

Literature Review

Some studies have focused on comparing word-formation processes between English and some other languages. Some of the most important studies are mentioned herein. Al-Jarf (1994) authored a small book for students of English and Arabic translation. It describes eight word-formation processes and three stylistics devices or extra linguistics models. Al-Jarf briefly mentioned each process, its definition and some examples from English and Arabic. The book demonstrates how many words are formed and provides utility for translating from one language to the other.

Elesawy (2002) separately discussed the word-formation processes in English and Arabic from a different point of view. Most processes were included in the study even if they are not similar. The study reviewed 14 English processes with different names and divisions than the eight Arabic processes. In conclusion, Elesawy mentioned that there are some processes in Arabic as they are in English, but they still have sub-divisions under them. The author analysed some newspapers samples from Egypt and the United Kingdom.

Nasser (2008) discussed all processes of word-formation in English and Arabic distinctively, even if they are not similar (11 processes in English and nine in Arabic). Nasser then compared the similar processes in a list format. Nasser detailed their existence as well as their limit of use in both the languages.

Buhari (2011) investigated the English and Hausa word-formation processes. Buhari attempted to reveal, to a great extent, how complex, diverse and similar the languages are at the morphological level. This study has shed a light only on the word-formation processes, which are familiar to both English and Hausa.

Some previous studies like Al-Jarf (1994) and Elesawy (2002) dealt with the issue of word-formation extensively. In other words, the way that they discussed the processes is too distracted for researchers and students. Each study discussed the processes in each language separately (one section for the English processes and another one for the Arabic). Furthermore, they discussed the processes despite their existence, similarity or difference in both the languages. Nasser (2008) was too brief addition to the separate discussion of processes in both the languages. Buhari (2011) wrote a well-designed and fully-discussed study but it was in English and Hausa.

Methodology and Corpus

This paper is a summary of a thesis of a contrastive case study where lexical items were selected randomly, collected, categorized and then contrasted on both sides. The concern was to study only similar processes in both languages. After finding each process feature, the study moved on to the analysis of the chosen words to the smallest units (morphemes) after which there was an attempt to find to what extent this process can be applied to them. Therefore, this study was not usage-based; it was based on comparative structural analysis, meaning that the comparison was on the level of the lexical structure of the morphemes. The total number of examined words was 306.

This paper was only limited to the major similar processes in the two languages. The data of the research included the processes of word formation in both English and Arabic, as well as the words exemplifying these processes. The source of these data was a set of words selected from dictionaries, some literary works and some journals in both languages. The previous resources were chosen in particular to ensure the use of SE and MSA.

Processes Results and Discussion

In linguistics, word-formation is a process for the creation of new words. Sometimes the change goes against the semantics of the word. That is to say, the change is in the meaning of the word. The borderline between word-formation and semantic change can be a challenge to define. Some scholars define the new use of any old word as a kind of new word derivation where they are similar in form but different in meaning.

Word-formation is a morphological and sometimes grammatical process. Crystal (2003: pp.523-524) described the whole morphological process as changing the word's constitution. It means including the two main divisions (derivation and inflexion). It deals with both existing words and newly created words as well. It adopts special grammatical and lexical conditions like affixation, inflexion and derivation for words that follow a collection of fixed rules.

Enesi (2017) states its important status in applied linguistics is represented by the effect of teaching word-formation theory in any language. As it is known, vocabularies are very important in several fields. They are considered the building blocks of all different discourses either spoken or written. Hence, it must be admitted that the word-formation processes are very important in the progression of education (teaching and learning). Since all languages' vocabularies can be enriched by the application of these processes.

As mentioned previously, the study of these processes tries to investigate through which process new forms of words can be created. Therefore, if these processes are analysed one by one systematically; it is going to be easier for the teachers and learners to do well in many linguistic fields. In brief, the morphemes and the way they work to create different new words are well understood. It means the other linguistic branches like syntax, grammar, morphology, etc. will be grasped easily.

Most of these processes can be found discussed in different academic works. But in this paper, some of them will be investigated deeply and closely. That will be achieved by using analytical and exploratory comparative methods, rather than just looking at lists of entries and their functions.

Acronym

A study of the acronym's origin shows that it was formed from the Greek words "akros onyma". That means akros 'tip' and onyma 'name'. Some believe it was coined in 1943 (Ethridge and Ruffner, 1965: p.7). In Arabic, the first authentic records of

using acronyms or abbreviation dated back to 1410 AD, in *Al-Qamus Al-Muhit*, by
Fairuzabadi. It was the first dictionary that used such acronyms for the most repeated
terms. Recently, new Arabic acronyms appeared because of globalization and
exposure to other languages via TV channels, internet and radio stations, which are
broadcasting in other languages. The Arabic acronymization is controlled by
phonological, pragmatic, semantic factors (Altakhaineh, 2017: pp.1-2).

The acronym is one of three fruitful ways where the abbreviation is involved to form
new words (acronyms, clipping and initialisms) (Quirk et al., 1985: p.1580). The
analysis of the acronym process in different languages proves that it is quite common
cross-linguistically Altakhaineh (2017: p.1).

Acronymization or initialisms include the selection of the first letters from the words
in a phrase. Additionally, they are categorised into two categories (نصير, 1987: pp.
117-118; Akmajian et al., 1984: p.69):

(1) منحوتات البدوء /mʌnħu:ta:t lbudu:ʔ/ (Alphabetisms) are letter by letter pronounced,
e.g. VIP for 'Very Important Person' and ق م /qa:f mi:m/ (BC).

(2) المختصرات /ʔlmuxtʌsʌra:t/ (Acronyms) are pronounced as one word, e.g. NATO
for 'North Atlantic Treaty Organization', حماس /ħəməs/ (Hamas) حركة المقاومة الإسلامية
/ħərəkt əlmuqa:wəmtu əlʔla:mji:h/ (Islamic Resistance Movement) and فتح /fətħ/
/ħʌrʌkt l-tʌħri:r ʌl-wʌtˤʌni: ʌl-fʌlʌstˤini:/ حركة التحرير الوطني الفلسطيني (Fatah)
(National Liberation Movement). The latest one is called a reversed acronym, Arabic
has it but English does not.

Orthographically, English acronyms can be spelt in lower case like 'laser' (light
amplification by stimulated emission of radiation), or an upper case like NASA
(National Aeronautics and Space Administration) (Altakhaineh, 2017: p.2). In both
the languages, there are two ways to write the same alphabetised words: with dots
between letters, e.g. U.S.A and ق. م. the other way is without dots (a row of letters),
e.g. USA and ق م in both the languages.

Then, acronymization is a morphological process of the first letter(s) selection from
some or all of the component-words in a phrase. They may be joint together in the
same order as they are in the origin and pronounced as a word. In English, they are
always taken left to right, but in Arabic, they could be taken from right to left or vice
versa (Akmajian, et al., 1984: p.69; Hamdan & Fareh, 2003).

To conclude, it seems that acronymization involves a dynamic interaction of the
orthography, phonetics and semantics with the generator's philosophy, purpose and
taste. That leads, sometimes, to create acronyms that look like some meaningful

words in the language itself, e.g. MUST (Maximum Utilization of Skills and Training).

Antonomasia

Antonomasia was borrowed from the Grecian word *antonomasia*. Literally it means "to call by a new name." (Encyclopaedia Britannica, 2017). This term is used to denote the substitution of any epithet, periphrasis or appellative for a proper name. Since the 17th century, antonomasia has been defined as the use of a proper name to stand for a class of person (Grgić & Nikolić, 2011).

Many Arab scholars consider antonomasia a controversial issue of whether to be viewed as a rhetorical or a linguistic component of the language (Adeeb & Khudhayir, 2013: p.6). It is a literary term where a descriptive phrase replaces something's name. This thing could be a person, place, animal or action.

It ranges from cheerful to heroic names. It can be classified into two types. The first one as a figure of speech that is used in literary language. Therefore, it may have a rhetoric term to express a transferable meaning like a metaphor (Bussmann, 1996: p.1227). In other words, it is a replacement of a proper noun by a periphrasis or reworded common noun (appellative). It also can work the other way around from an appellative use to a proper noun. The second type, as a stylistic device. It is a replacement of more words by fewer. That means a word is substituted by a more colourful and expanded expression for linguistic emphasis, explanation or variation. E.g., Ireland is *the Emerald Isle*, Berlin was *the divided city* (Kagramanov, 2003: p.23).

There are many reasons behind the use of antonomasia. Sort (1989: p.73) said it helps to give abstract notions of concrete expressions. It provides people with unique descriptions that may memorialize and praise their great performances in the rhetorical and stylistics fields. To some extra, antonomasia uses vary depending on the time and place. In the past, it was used to label different class members, as oftentimes names of people were associated with their occupations or professions. It had been used to give positive labels to courageous warriors and negative labels to coward people. Literary Terms (2015).

In Arabic, it plays a great part in the speakers' morality; this could be its basic purpose. One of its necessity is to avoid using rude, inappropriate or abusive words and utterances. Another purpose is to praise, show respect or exalt others. For example, instead of calling someone by his/her given name. He/she will be called by

his/her son or daughter's name, e.g. أبو محمد, أم محمد /abu mohammed/, /om mohammed/ (Mohammed's father, Mohammed's mother). This shows a sign of esteem and respect for people (Adeeb, 2013: p.10).

 Antonomasia resources rely on the knowledge of some historical, literary or religious backgrounds in each language. In English, it is classified according to the objective and purpose into two types: stylistic and linguistic. Whereas in Arabic, there is still an argument whether it is a stylistic/rhetorical or linguistic device. It is considered a linguistic device because it denotes two purely linguistic applications of the language (pronouns and synonyms). It also can be used as an elliptical device. In the other hand, it is considered a rhetorical device because it is used to deliver a type of stylistic meaning with more impact than using a simple lexical one. It also used for some stylistic purposes like a euphemism, hyperbolic description and indirect intention (Adeeb, et al., 2013: pp.6-7).

In English, literature is the essential basis of antonomasia while in Arabic more attention is paid to verbs and acts to be applied in this process. Arabic also has a further technique for forming antonomasia that is الكناية بالنسبة /ʌlkina:itu bin-nisbh/ (relative antonomasia). It depends on a collocation to utilize the metonymical meaning, e.g., he has an open hand, (generous) (Adeeb, et al., 2013: pp.10-11).

Back-formation

The use of back-formation process is rare. It can be considered one of the secondary processes of word formation due to the relation between compounding, exclusively compound verbs and back-formation.

Usually creating new words is to have new adjectives or nouns from verbs. It is the opposite in this process. Knowing the history of words makes it easy to recognize the back-formed words. In English, new verbs, nouns or adjectives are formed from existing words by taking away what looks like to be a suffix added to them. Therefore, this process commonly happens because of a wrong morphological comparison between the nouns with real suffixes (worker, work) and the nouns with the look-like suffixes (editor, edit). The latter is treated like the former, especially in English. So, it is based on a morphological analysis, which makes a change in the syntactic function of the new back-formed word (Tahaineh, 2012: p.1110).

In Arabic, this process is different somehow from the English. To be more accurate, it is a derivational process. Words are back-formed by derivation, not deduction like in English. It is used only with the non-Arabic-origin words or the Arabicized ones

(borrowed). That will be based on the Arabic derivational rules. It is called الاشتقاق العكسي /ʔl-iʃtiqaq lʕksi/ (the reversed derivation) and it is rarely used (Al aloosi, 2018; Elesawy, 2002: p.97).

The Arabic new back-formed words have other word-classes than their origins. All these new words are derivative verbs from adjectives or nouns, e.g. برمجة (n) /bərmdʒh/ (programming), برمج (v) /bərmədʒ/ (to programme) (Nasser, 2008: p.80). To conclude, this process is a deletion process in English while in Arabic it is a modification and addition process (Al aloosi, 2018).

Blending

Blending is the process where one word is made of a consequence of two words or more. It is not limited to a combination of morphological elements; it can be in the phonological elements as well. The new blended word consists of some parts of its source words. It may consist of one whole word from them plus one part from the other one (Elesawy, 2002: pp.31-32).

There are many definitions for this process, and all of them share the same core issues. Crystal (1981), Hatch (1995: p.211), Nordquist (2019a) and الموسى (1984: p.67) believe that this process is done by combining two separate words that have different meanings to create a new single word. The effect of the new word takes some phonic feature from all its original words and denotes them all in meaning. The new word often describes a new invention or phenomenon that combines the traits of two existing things like names for products, bureaucracies, entertainment industry and technical fields. E.g.

Medical + care = Medicare.

حيعل /ħiʔi:ʕl/ حي على الفلاح /ħəi:ə ʕla əlfəla:ħ/ (come to success).

This process shows how languages change, develop and reflect their cultural features. Additional to that by a kind of linguistic creativity is shown by using this process (Curran, 2018).

Borrowing

This process enriches languages with ready coined words. Khrisat & Mohamad (2014: p.136) believe the connection between different cultures and civilizations is

the main way of borrowing words. This connection could happen through different means like trade, education, science, literature, war, politics, media and technology. This process may occur when people consider some languages to have higher statuses than others do. Minority languages commonly borrow words from dominant languages if they are spoken in the same geographical area. Winford (2002) said the mixture of languages (borrowing) does not require their users to be in actual physical interactions. It could be achieved by transferring words by lexicographers, media, writers or translators.

Franklin et al (2003: p.512) state that borrowing is one of the important sources to add new vocabularies to any language; languages are lenders and borrowers at the same time. This process happens when one language borrows a word or even a morpheme from another language. Besides, it may add it to its lexicon due to the demand to use that word. Typically, the borrowed words are adapted (going through certain procedures) to fit the phonological and syntactic systems of the host language. That is to say, the borrowed words are remodelled to accommodate the different aspects of the borrower philology.

Sometimes, a word does not fit some phonological systems in the host language. Therefore, it must be remodelled to be completely adapted. In both the languages, some phonological changes will be done if a sound does not exist in their phonological systems. It will be replaced by the nearest sound that they have. For instance, in English, replacing the sound ح /ħ/ by /h/ and in Arabic there is no /p/ so it is replaced by /b/. Briefly, any borrowed word is subjected to the same analogies as any native word under the same word-class (verb, noun, adjective...etc.). That means processes like derivation and inflection can be applied to them as well (Elesawy, 2002: pp.38,66).

According to Armstrong (2005: p.143) as cited in Khrisat & Mohamad (2014: pp. 133-134), borrowing is "how a language reviews its lexicon." This process is not limited only to words but it may also cover syntax, grammar, morphemes, phonemes and semantic. Buhari (2006: p.47), Wisniewski (2007) and Cornelius (2008) believe this process is a universal linguistic phenomenon that exists in all languages.

There are two ways in which English borrows words from other languages: either by direct borrowing where there is no translation, or, alternatively, by using the loan translation technique (calque), where there is a direct translation of the word components to English (word-by-word), e.g. from German *Lenhert* "*superman*" (Cornelius, 2008; Buhari, 2006; Elesawy, 2002; Buhari, 2006; Yule, 1997; Wisniewski, 2007).

Arabic has a well-known method of borrowing that is called Arabization. This method does not have any guideline or rule to follow. It can be seen as a process of translation. That means finding a suitable translation for the borrowed word. If it is not possible to translate, it looks for its equivalent as a counterpart to the non-Arabic word (calque), e.g. from English keyboard لوحة مفاتيح /ləwħt məfa:ti:ħ/. If none of the previous methods is possible, it arabizes that word based on its sounds. It used the same word after making some phonological changes; if it is necessary e.g. Television تلفاز /tilfa:z/ (Khrisat & Mohamad, 2014: pp.135-140).

Compounding

There are many definitions to the compounding process. Buhari (2006: p.60) summed up many definitions saying, "a compound is a word that consists of two smaller words or more whose meaning cannot be portrayed by taking each word in isolation." So, the new isolated units (compounds) are joined together without using derivational affixes Al-Jarf (1994: p.2); e.g. teapot, bedside, and fingerprint. As cited in Elesawy (2002: pp.23-24), Barbara (1977: p.27) says "especially, but not exclusively, in the fields of science and technology, abundant new formations depend on processes more akin to compounding than affixation.".

According to Al-Jarf (1994: p.2) compounds can be primary or secondary. In the primary or base-compounds, two derivationally bound forms (bases) are connected, e.g. hypothyroid. In the secondary or stem-compounds, all components of the compound word are stems (free forms), e.g. greenhouse

In English, this process provides a large number of adjectival samples. It comes second in frequency of usage. Notwithstanding that frequency, it does not show any regularity of pattern (Elesawy, 2002: p.98).

According to Al-Jarf (1994: pp.135-142), English uses compounding extensively while the Arabic use is very limited. In Arabic, compounded words are usually phrases with normal words-order. The Arabic forms are not fruitful that much in creating new formations. Typically, these forms are outside of the Arabic ordinary derivational structure. There are different ways to write compounded words in both the languages. Most Arabic compounds are spaced (separated by a blank), e.g. مكة المكرمة /makət lmukərməh/ (the Sacred City of Makkah). There are few solid compounds (agglutinated) in Arabic, e.g. حضرموت /ħdˤrəməu:t/ (Hadhramaut). There is no hyphenated compound word in Arabic. While in English, it is common to spot all three varieties. Not only that, even it is possible to find the three patterns to

represent the same compound word, e.g. particleboard, particle-board and particle board.

Derivation

The word *Derivation* came from the Latin "to draw off," (Nordquist, 2019b). Every so often, the derived word has a different class from its origin. It may take the new inflectional affixes too. According to Essay Sauce (2019: p.2), this process is the formation of new words by adding and/or inserting certain kinds of affixes to the roots. It creates words with different meanings or categories (word-classes) from their bases.

In English, this process is mainly based on affixation. For instance "unhappiness" this word consists of three morphemes: a base (a free morpheme) 'happy', a prefix 'un-' and a suffix '-ness' (bound morphemes) (Tahaineh, 2012: p.1109). The English affixes can be classified into two types: class-changing derivational (producing derived forms of another class e.g. beauty, beautiful). The other type is class-maintaining derivational (producing derived forms of the same class e.g. man, manhood). English derivation is less regular and predictable. Thus, memorization is needed in derivational morphology and learning in the inflectional morphology.

Igaab & Kareem (2018: p.95) believe a recycling process is a good description of the Arabic derivation process. It allows learners to use the linguistic raw substance (stem) to get something else out of it (a derived word). Unlike English, Arabic is a non-linear language. That means new words are not only made by adding affixes. It allows forming new words by making changes in the word template (stem). These changes could be in the written form or pronunciation, e.g. كَتَبَ /kʌtəbə/ (he wrote), كُتِبَ /kʊtibə/ (was written), كُتُبْ /kʊtʊb/ (books) and كاتب /ka:tib/ (a male writer). In Arabic, this process is classified into four types: simple derivation, great derivation, greater derivation and the greatest derivation (acronyms). In general, it has standard patterns, which indicate the classification of any word that is called الوزن /əlwʌzn/ (the phonological scale) (Setiawan, 2018: p.10; Igaab & Kareem, 2018: p.92).

English inflectional suffixes lock the word, e.g. book(s), go(es) and cook(ed). That means it is impossible to add any affixe after the inflectional one. While in Arabic, it is different. It allows doing that (Igaab & Kareem, 2018, p. 99). According to Stockwell et al. (1965: p.55) and Al-Jarf (1994: p.119), there is no shared equivalent form of derivational affixes, which shows a common meaning or origin between the two languages.

Conclusion, Results and Findings

Table 1

Word-formation process samples analysis.

	Arabic	English	Similar	Different
Acronyms	13	15	26	2
Antonomasia	6	6	11	1
Back-formation	17	24	39	2
Blending	7	7	11	3
Borrowing	14	24	36	2
Compounding	26	44	48	22
Derivation	36	67	90	13
Total	119	187	261	45
Total word Number	306			

The word-formation does not only refer to the creation of new words. It deals with both the existing words and the newly created as well. Sometimes, it customizes some special grammatical and lexical conditions like affixation, inflexion and derivation for the words that follow a collection of fixed rules. The study of word-formation processes tries to investigate the procedures through which new words can be created or used. In this paper, seven processes (only the similar) have been investigated. Using exploratory, analytical comparative methods, rather than just looking at long lists of entries and their functions.

The differences between the two languages' systems are already known. Nevertheless, as there are some questions mentioned at the very beginning of this paper. In this section, the answers and the sum up for the whole study will be.

The first question was: to what extent and how do English and Arabic form words? Both languages use word-formation processes at their needs of use. In other words, they use a suitable process that can form a suitable form or adapt it to the language's different systems.

The second question was: how do the two languages apply these processes, if applicable? Through analysing some words' structures, it is clear both languages use certain processes in specific ways to expand their lexicon bases. Every language has

its own set of processes that could be unique or similar to another language.

The third question was: what are the similar word-formation processes between English and Arabic? There are seven main similar processes between them. These processes share the fundamental bases and rules. They are acronyms, antonomasia, backformation, blending, borrowing, compounding and derivation.

The fourth question was: what are the similarities and differences within the similar processes? There are many similarities and differences between them. They can be spotted through the previous comparative analysis of each process. To mention them briefly, a list of them will be written below.

1. Acronyms

As the table above, shows that 28 words in both the languages were analysed under the acronyms process; 13 in Arabic and 15 in English. The similar features were 26 and the differences were two. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, the acronym is one of three fruitful ways where the abbreviation is involved to form new words. It is a morphological process of the first letter/s selection of some or all component words in a phrase.

2) In both the languages, the main reasons for using this process are to save time and place in the written and spoken discourses as the researcher believes.

3) Both languages do not represent the definite article ال /ʔal/ or the in this process as the researcher noted.

4) In both the languages, the alphabetism is pronounced with the phonetic value of these letters. Each letter is pronounced separately as a series.

5) In both the languages, alphabetism has two ways to be written in, with dots between letters and without dots (a row of letters). Additionally, in English, some words are written in uppercase and other in lowercase.

6) The Arabic acronyms are more context-restricted and less frequent than they are in English as the researcher believes.

7) There are many acronyms in English than they are in Arabic. Many English acronyms are introduced as entries in dictionaries, but the Arabic ones not yet.

8) The reversed-acronym exists in Arabic; the researcher did not come across any in English.

2. Antonomasia

As the table above shows that 12 words in both the languages were analysed under the antonomasia process; six in Arabic and six in English. The similar features were 11 and the difference was only one. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, this process helps to give abstract notions of concrete expressions. It is used to avoid rude, inappropriate, or abusive utterances and to praise, show respect or exalt others, as the researcher believes.

2) The main purpose of antonomasia is to add features of an epithet or proper noun to the meaning of common words in the two languages.

3) In both the languages, this process provides others with names that reflect acts, specific characteristics, classes, ranks or professions.

4) In both the languages, the resources of antonomasia rely on the knowledge of some religious, literary and historical backgrounds of each language. Besides, both languages rely upon some semantic techniques to form antonomasia.

5) English has two types of antonomasia use: stylistic and linguistic. Whereas, in Arabic, there is still an argument whether it is a stylistic or a linguistic device as the researcher believes.

6) Arabic has a further technique to form antonomasia that is the relative antonomasia to utilize the metonymical meaning.

3. Back-formation

As the table above, shows that 41 words in both the languages were analysed under the back-formation process; 17 in Arabic and 24 in English. The similar features were 39 and the differences were two. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, this process is one of the secondary processes of forming words. It is based on morphological analysis.

2) In both the languages, the back-formed words can be considered short forms from longer words. Most back-formed words have different word-classes from their origins.

3) In English, it is reductive, but in Arabic, it is a derivational process.

4. Blending

As the table above, shows that 14 words in both the languages were analysed under the blending process; seven in Arabic and seven in English. The similar features were 11 and the differences were three. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, a blended word may consist of a combination of morphological elements, phonological elements, some parts of its source-words or one whole word plus parts from the other source-words.

2) In both the languages, the main functions of this process are willing to be concise, swift, catching the target audience attention and the desire to save space and time, especially in English as the researcher believes.

3) In Arabic, this process is more comprehensive than in English. One blended word may consist of a consequence of more than four words (a full-sentence). While in English, it is limited to blend only two successive words as the researcher found.

4) Because of the Arabic comprehensiveness, the linguistic stabile situation and the absence of any rules to blend words; Arabic has less blended words than English does as the researcher thinks.

5. Borrowing

As the table above, shows that 38 words in both the languages were analysed under the borrowing process; 14 in Arabic and 24 in English. The similar features were 36 and the differences were two. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, a borrowed word is subject to some morphological changes and same analogies as any native word under the same word-class.

2) In both the languages, the main linguistics factors behind borrowing are the slow coining of new words and the lexical gap between concepts and

innovations as the researcher believes.

3) In both the languages, there are extra-linguistics factors behind borrowing like religion, prestige, imperialism, politics and culture.

4) In English, this process is used widely. It shows more ability to adapt new borrowed words than Arabic does, as the researcher believes.

5) In Arabic, borrowed words may go through three stages. First translation (Arabization), second finding a literal-equivalent in Arabic (calque) and third arabized that word (borrowing/adaption). Whereas English uses two ways, the first (calque) and the second anglicized (borrowing/adaption) as the researcher thinks.

6. Compounding

As the table above, shows that 70 words in both the languages were analysed under the compounding process; 26 in Arabic and 44 in English. The similar features were 48 and the differences were 22. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, a compound is a set of elements (two words or more) that are connected without affixes and represents an isolated unit.

2) The researcher thinks, in both languages, this process is orthographic more than oratorical. It is used in the written media where space is at a premium to add different ways referring to the same concepts.

3) In Arabic, this process is only in nouns and prepositions; unlike in English, it covers all parts of speech, as the researcher believes.

4) In Arabic, most compounds are separated by a blank, there are few joined compounds and the researcher did not come across any hyphenated one. Whereas English has all three varieties. It is possible to find the three patterns representing the same compound word.

7. Derivation

As the table above, shows that 103 words in both the languages were analysed under the derivation process; 36 in Arabic and 67 in English. The similar features were 90 and the differences were 13. The following list sums up that.

1) In both the languages, more than one affix can be added after each other to one word.

2) In both the languages, derivational suffixes do not close off a word. It is possible to add another derivational or inflectional suffix after them.

3) English derivational affixes have two types: class-changing derivational and class-maintaining derivational. While in Arabic, the derivation process is classified into four types: simple derivation, great derivation, greater derivation and the greatest derivation (acronyms).

4) English uses derivational suffixes and prefixes. While in Arabic, there are only derivational suffixes. The researcher did not come across any Arabic derivational prefixes.

5) English has more Affixes than Arabic. However, Arabic affixes are more flexible. They have morphological functional varieties more than the English affixes; as the researcher thinks.

6) In English, this process is irregular and unpredictable. Whereas in Arabic, it is regular and has standard patterns (more predictable).

7) In English, inflectional suffixes close off the word. Whereas in Arabic, it is possible to add some affixes after them.

8) As the researcher believes English pays attention to the multiple affixations and affix-order phenomena. While Arabic pays more attention to the phonological scale, not to the classification of affixes or their order in the word.

This paper shows how Arabic and English share many features in common within similar word-formation processes. The paper concludes that there is a kind of universal similarity between the Indo-European and Afro-Asiatic families. If the two languages are considered representatives of the two families. This might be supportive evidence of the monogenesis hypothesis, which assumes the existence of one origin for all languages, a single proto-language. Due to the limitations of this study, further researches are recommended to investigate the issue in more depth to find out other morphological similarities between the two languages. Especially, in the other word-formation processes, which do not show clear similarities such as conversion, creative respelling and analogy. Future studies can tap into the behaviour of functionalist word formation processes across languages (Arbabi & Vasheghan, 2019) and also the pedagogical implications of such research (Khojasteh & Shokrpour, 2014).

References

Adeeb, E. R., & Khudhayir, S. (2013). A Comparative Study of Antonomasia in English and Arabic. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/309609518

Akmajian, A., R. Demers & R. Hamish. (1984). An Introduction to Language and Communication. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Al aloosi, A. (2018). Back-formation and antonomasia as word-formation processes. Noor Publishing.

Al- Jobouri, S. H., & Kadhim, R. J. (2017). The Use of English Back-formation Process by Iraqi EFL University Learners: Errors Analysis. doi:10.13140/RG.2.2.17767.75682

Al-Jarf, R. (1994). *English and Arabic Word-formation Processes for Translation Students*. Retrieved from https://www.researchgate.net/publication/281003183

Altakhaineh, A. M. (2017). The Linguistic Features of Acronyms in Arabic (4th ed.). Retrieved from https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244017746710

Ana, Grgić, & Nikolić. (2011). The Use and the Recognition of Antonomasia – the Comparison Between Younger and Older Speakers. Retrieved from http://darhiv.ffzg.unizg.hr/id/eprint/6005

Arbabi, M. & Vasheghani, F. M. (2019). Functionalism in Translation: A Case Study Investigation into Translation literature based on Nord's Documentary vs. Instrumental Dichotomy. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 22 (2), 51-70. DOI: 10.5782/2223-2621.2019.22.2.51

Armstrong, N. (2005). Translation, linguistics, culture: A French–English handbook. Clevedon, Buffalo and Toronto: Multilingual Matters Ltd.

Buhari, H. A. (2011). *A Comparative Analysis of Word – Formation Processes in English and Hausa.* Zaria: Department of English and Literary Studies, Faculty of Arts, Ahmadu Bello University.

Bussmann, H. (1996). Routledge Dictionary of Language and Linguistics Gregory Trauth (tr.). Kerstin Kazzazi (ed.). London Routledge.

Cornelius, P. (2008). 'Introduction to English Linguistics – Morphology', University of Düsseldorf.

Crystal, D. (1981). Directions in Applied Linguistics, Academic Press Ltd, (Subsidiary of Harcourt Brace Jovanovich) London.

Crystal, D. (2003). A Dictionary of Linguistics and Phonetics. 6th ed. Oxford: Blackwell Publishing.

Curran, E. (2018, February 12). Blended Words in English [Web log post]. Retrieved from https://blogs.transparent.com/english/blended-words-in-english/

Dixon, R. & Aikhenvald, A. Word: a cross linguistic typology. Cambridge: Cambridge university press, 2007.

Elesawy, E. M. (2002). *Word-formation in Modern Standard Arabic and English*. A Corpus-based Study. Minia: Minia University.

Encyclopaedia Britannica, Inc. (2017, July 28). Antonomasia. Retrieved from https://www.britannica.com/art/antonomasia

Enesi, M. (2017). "The Effect of Teaching Word-formation Theory to English Students," *European Journal of Language and Literature Studies Articles, European Centre for Science Education and Research*, vol. 7, EJLS Janu.

Franklin, V., R. Rodman, & N. Hyams. (2003). An introduction to language. 7th ed. Boston: Thomson Heide.

Hamdan, J., & Fareh, S. (2003). Acronyms in English and Arabic. Dirasat, 30 (1).

Hatch, E. M., & Brown, C. (1995). Vocabulary, Semantics, and Language Education. Cambridge University Press. The U.S.A.

Igaab, Z. K., & Kareem, I. A. (2018). Affixation in English and Arabic: A Contrastive Study. *Canadian Center of Science and Education*, 8 (1925-4776), 92-103. Retrieved from http://doi.org/10.5539/ells.v8n1p92

Kagramanov, K. R. (2003) "On the determination of antonomasia". Proceedings of the UN Regional Scientific Conference. Science University. North Caucasus region: Stavropol NCSTU.

Khojasteh, L. & Shokrpour, N. (2014). Corpus Linguistics and English Language Teaching Materials: A Review of Recent Research. *Khazar Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 17 (3), 5-17. DOI: 10.5782/2223-2621.2014.17.3.5

Khrisat, A. A., & Mohamad, M. S. (2014). Language's Borrowings: The Role of the Borrowed and Arabized Words in Enriching Arabic Language. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 133-142. doi: 10.11634/232907811402533.

Literary Terms. (2015, June 1). Retrieved November 3, 2015, from https://literaryterms.net/

Nasser, M. (2008). *Processes of Word-formation in English and Arabic*. Journal of the College of Education, Babylon University, Iraq, 2 (3), 71-87.

Nordquist, R. (2019b, September 14). The Derivations of Words Used in English. Retrieved from https://www.thoughtco.com/derivation-words-term-1690438

Quirk R., Greenbaun S., Leech G., & Svartvicks J. (1973/ 1975/ 1985). A University Grammar of English. London: Longman Group Ltd.

Setiawan, J. (2018). A Contrastive Analysis Between English and Arabic Word-formation (Thesis, Department Of English, Faculty Of Cultural Studies University Of Sumatera Utara Medan, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia). Retrieved from http://repositori.usu.ac.id/handle/123456789/10257

Sort, M. H. (1989) Accident stylisticians. London: Routledge.

Stockwell, R. P., Bowen, J. D. 1., & Martin, J. W. 1. (1965). *The grammatical structures of English and Spanish.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Strang, Barbara M. H. (1977) A History of English. Methuen & Co. Ltd. London.

Tahaineh, Y. (2012). The Awareness of the English Word-formation Mechanisms is a Necessity to Make an Autonomous L2 Learner in EFL Context. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(6). doi: 10.4304/jltr.3.6.1105-1113

Thomas, R., J. Ethridge & F. Ruffner, Jr. (1965). Acronyms and Initialisms Dictionary. Detroit: Gale Research Company.

Winford, D. (2002). An introduction to contact linguistics. (New York: Blackwell Ltd.

Wisniewski, K. (2007) Word-formation. Tlumaczenia Angielski. Retrieved from, http://www.tlumaczeniaangielski.info/linguistics/word-formation.htm.

Yule, G. (1997). *Referential comunication tasks*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

الموسى، ن (1984كتاب اللغة في النحت). اللغة العربية، ط ١ العربية. دار العلوم للطباعة: الرياض

نصير، ع. (1987). منحوتات البدوء. مجلة مجمع اللغة العربية الأردني، (32) , 121-115 Retrieved from https://www.majma.org.jo/ojs/index.php/JJaa/article/view/179/447