International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

Arabic–Urdu Linguistic Affinity as a Pedagogical Resource in English Language Teaching: Perspectives from Saudi Arabian Classrooms

Dr. Nehal Ahmad
Assistant Professor
Department of English Language & Literature
College of Arts and Letters
University of Bisha,
(Al Namas), Kingdom of Saudi Arabia

Abstract: The present study explores the pedagogical potential of Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity in English language teaching, with reference to Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabian university classrooms. The motivation for the study arises from the researcher's extensive experience of teaching English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia, where familiarity with Arabic vocabulary as well as the linguistic structures through Urdu has frequently facilitated the researcher's own comprehension of Arabic and, in turn, provided opportunities to support students' understanding of English. Although Arabic and Urdu are genetically unrelated languages, centuries of historical, cultural, religious, and intellectual interaction have resulted in the incorporation of a substantial body of Arabic-derived vocabulary into Urdu. This lexical affinity may provide an additional linguistic bridge between students' existing Arabic knowledge and unfamiliar English vocabulary.

Drawing on perspectives from cross-linguistic influence, vocabulary learning, multilingual pedagogy, and translanguaging, the study examines how Arabic–Urdu lexical and structural correspondences can be strategically employed to facilitate the comprehension and acquisition of English as a foreign language at the University of Bisha. It argues that the linguistic repertoire of Urdu-speaking language instructors can serve as an additional pedagogical resource in teaching English to native Arabic-

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

speaking students, particularly by drawing on familiar Arabic–Urdu lexical and structural correspondences to establish meaningful connections with unfamiliar English words. The study does not seek to replace established approaches to English language teaching; rather, it advocates their augmentation through a linguistically responsive pedagogical strategy that strategically draws upon the multilingual resources available to instructors and embedded within the classroom context.

The findings suggest that Urdu-speaking language instructors who possess an awareness of Arabic can strategically draw upon their knowledge of Urdu and its substantial Arabic-derived lexical and as well as grammatical structural components when teaching English to Arabic-speaking students. Such linguistic knowledge can function as a cognitive and pedagogical bridge between students' existing Arabic lexical knowledge and unfamiliar English lexical items, while also facilitating their recognition of corresponding morphological and syntactic patterns. By drawing on these cross-linguistic correspondences, the students can construct meaning more effectively, enhance their comprehension of the target language, and develop a deeper understanding of its broader lexical and structural patterns. The study consequently underscores the significance of recognizing and strategically leveraging the pedagogical resources embedded within language instructors' multilingual repertoires. The purposeful integration of these resources has the potential to enhance students' understanding of English lexical, morphological, and syntactic structures, foster greater metalinguistic awareness, and contribute to a more flexible, context-sensitive, and linguistically responsive approach to English language teaching and learning.

Keywords: Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity; English language teaching; cross-linguistic influence; vocabulary learning; translanguaging; multilingual pedagogy; morphological and syntactic patterns; Saudi Arabian EFL classrooms

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

Introduction

Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language belonging to the Indo-European language family, whose grammatical and structural foundations are deeply rooted in the linguistic traditions of North India. Its development was a gradual and complex process shaped by prolonged linguistic, cultural, political, and intellectual interaction among the indigenous languages of the Indian subcontinent and the languages introduced through successive Muslim dynasties. Although the precise chronology and geographical contours of its emergence remain subjects of scholarly debate, the formative stages of Urdu are generally associated with the linguistic environment of North India, particularly the Delhi region, from approximately the twelfth century onward.

The establishment of the Delhi Sultanate and, subsequently, the Mughal Empire played a significant role in the historical development and literary maturation of Urdu. Persian, which functioned as a major language of administration, scholarship, and literary expression under these regimes, exerted a profound lexical influence on the emerging language. Through sustained contact with Persian and Arabic, Urdu gradually incorporated an extensive body of vocabulary, while also absorbing a comparatively smaller number of words from Turkish and other languages. Its early varieties were referred to by names such as Hindavi, Hindui, Zaban-e-Hind, and Rekhta, reflecting the diverse linguistic and sociocultural contexts in which the language evolved.

The term "Urdu" is generally traced to the Turkic word **'ordu'**, meaning **"camp" or "army,"** reflecting the historical context of linguistic and cultural interaction associated with the development of the language. This etymological connection, however, does not indicate that Urdu is a Turkic language. Genetically and structurally, Urdu belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family and shares its fundamental grammatical features with other Indo-Aryan languages, particularly Hindi. Its distinctive linguistic identity has developed through sustained contact with Persian and Arabic, which have contributed extensively to its vocabulary and literary tradition. The adoption of the Perso-Arabic script further contributed to the establishment of Urdu as a distinct written language. Thus, Urdu may

be characterized as an Indo-Aryan language whose grammatical foundation has evolved in conjunction with substantial Persian and Arabic lexical and cultural influences.

Thus, Urdu may be understood not simply as a product of linguistic borrowing, but as the outcome of centuries of sustained contact, cultural exchange, and linguistic convergence. Its historical development illustrates the dynamic nature of language formation, in which indigenous linguistic structures interact with external linguistic influences to produce a distinct and culturally significant linguistic identity.

1. 1 Pedagogical Rationale and Context of the Study

Teaching English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabian classrooms involves the use of a wide range of established pedagogical approaches designed to enhance students' comprehension, participation, and proficiency in the target language. Depending on the instructional context and students' needs, language instructors may draw upon methods and approaches such as the Direct Method, Grammar-Translation Method, Total Physical Response, Audio-Lingual Method, and Communicative Language Teaching. Each of these approaches offers valuable pedagogical principles and techniques for supporting language development. Nevertheless, classroom experience suggests that even the systematic application of established teaching methods may not fully address all the difficulties encountered by students, particularly those related to the comprehension and acquisition of unfamiliar vocabulary.

The present study emerges from this pedagogical observation. Drawing on approximately fifteen years of experience teaching English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabian university classrooms, the researcher has observed that Arabic-speaking students may occasionally experience difficulty understanding English lexical items and consequently the despite the use of a variety of established instructional techniques. Such difficulties may persist even when language instructors employ communicative activities, contextualized explanations, pronunciation practice, physical demonstration, translation, and other classroom strategies. This observation suggests that the effectiveness of established methods may, at times, be

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

enhanced by drawing upon additional linguistic resources already available within the classroom.

One such resource identified by the researcher is the linguistic affinity between Arabic and Urdu. As a native speaker of Urdu, the researcher has observed that Urdu contains a substantial body of Arabic-derived vocabulary, much of which retains recognizable forms and closely related meanings in contemporary Arabic. For example, the word **تجزیہ 'segmentation'** **تحلیل** with the meaning **"analysis."** are used in both Urdu and Arabic. Similar lexical correspondences can be found in a considerable number of academic, intellectual, religious, and everyday terms. Although Arabic and Urdu are genetically unrelated languages, centuries of sustained historical, cultural, and intellectual contact between their speech communities have resulted in considerable linguistic convergence, most notably in the form of extensive lexical borrowing. The influence of Arabic on Urdu is particularly evident in the substantial incorporation of Arabic-derived vocabulary, alongside the adoption and adaptation of certain linguistic structures over the course of Urdu's historical development.

This lexical and structural affinity may provide an additional pathway for facilitating the comprehension of overall comprehension of the class in English among Arabic-speaking students. When students encounter an unfamiliar English lexical itemthat are difficult to explain through conventional classroom techniques, an Urdu-speaking language instructor may, where an appropriate correspondence exists, draw upon the Arabic–Urdu lexical connection to establish a meaningful association with a concept already familiar to the students through Arabic. Such a strategy can potentially reduce the lexical distance between unfamiliar English vocabulary and the students' existing linguistic knowledge. For example, where an English academic term corresponds closely in meaning to an Arabic word that also occurs in Urdu, the language instructor may use the Arabic–Urdu connection as an intermediate point of explanation before returning the students' attention to the English target item.

The significance of this approach lies not in replacing established methods of English language teaching, but in complementing them with an additional multilingual resource. The Direct Method, Audio-Lingual Method, Total Physical Response, Communicative Language

Teaching, and other approaches remain valuable components of EFL pedagogy. However, no single pedagogical approach can necessarily accommodate every linguistic difficulty encountered by students. A language instructor's broader linguistic repertoire may therefore function as a valuable supplementary pedagogical resource for facilitating meaning-making when students encounter difficulties in comprehending the target language through the target language alone.

The present perspective also corresponds with broader developments in multilingual pedagogy and translanguaging, which increasingly recognize that language instructors and students can draw strategically upon their available linguistic resources to facilitate meaning making and learning. In this context, the language instructors' knowledge of Urdu may constitute a pedagogically relevant resource when teaching English to native Arabic-speaking students. The relevant linguistic resource is not Urdu as a replacement for Arabic or English, but rather the Arabic-derived lexical component of Urdu, which may create points of connection among the students' first language, the language instructors' additional language, and the target language.

A review of the existing literature indicates that considerable attention has been devoted to Arabic–English linguistic transfer, English vocabulary acquisition among Arabic-speaking students, cross-linguistic influence, and multilingual approaches to language teaching. Research has also documented the extensive presence of Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu. However, the pedagogical intersection of these areas remains comparatively underexplored. Limited attention has been given to the deliberate and strategic use of Arabic–Urdu lexical correspondences by Urdu-speaking language instructors to facilitate English vocabulary acquisition and structural comprehension among Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabian university classrooms. The present study therefore seeks to explore this relatively underexamined pedagogical possibility. It proposes that the Arabic–Urdu lexical affinity embedded within the language instructors' linguistic repertoire can function as an additional pedagogical bridge between students' existing Arabic knowledge and unfamiliar English vocabulary. By bringing these linguistic resources into conscious pedagogical use in a practical

classroom situation, the study aims to contribute to a more flexible, multilingual, and linguistically responsive approach to English language teaching in Saudi Arabian colleges and universities. Ultimately, the study argues that effective language pedagogy may be strengthened when language instructors recognize not only the methods they employ, but also the diverse linguistic resources they themselves possess and can strategically mobilize and manipulate in accordance with thestudents' needs.

2. Urdu: The Historical and Linguistic Evolution

Urdu developed gradually in North India, particularly in and around the Delhi region, from the Indo-Aryan vernaculars that evolved from the Middle Indo-Aryan and **Apabhraṃśa** linguistic traditions. Its development was influenced significantly by historical contact between local Indian languages and Persian-, Arabic-, and Turkish-speaking communities, especially during the Delhi Sultanate and the Mughal period.In its early stages, Urdu was known by various names, including Hindavi, **Dehlavi**, Zaban-e-Hind, and Rekhta. Persian, which served as an important language of administration and high culture under the Delhi Sultanate and the Mughal Empire, had a profound influence on Urdu vocabulary, literature, and literary style. Arabic also contributed extensively to Urdu vocabulary, often through Persian, while Turkish made a comparatively smaller contribution.

The word **"Urdu"** is derived from the Turkic word **ordu**, meaning "camp" or "military encampment." The term became associated with the language used in the royal or military camps and eventually developed into the established name of the language.From a linguistic perspective, Urdu belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family. Its grammatical structure is closely related to Hindi and other North Indian Indo-Aryan languages, while its vocabulary contains a substantial number of Persian and Arabic loanwords, along with words of Sanskrit-derived and indigenous origin.Although Urdu has been strongly influenced by Persian, Arabic, and Turkish, it is not genetically related to Turkish or Arabic. Its fundamental linguistic structure is Indo-Aryan. Therefore, Urdu can be described as an Indo-Aryan language that developed in a multilingual cultural environment and acquired a distinctive vocabulary and literary tradition through extensive interaction with Persian and Arabic.Urdu belongs to the Indo-

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family. Its grammatical foundation developed primarily from the languages of North India, especially the Khari Boli linguistic base. **Early development:** Urdu developed gradually through interaction among different linguistic communities in North India. **Medieval period:** Persian was the dominant language of administration and high culture in much of North India. Persian and Arabic vocabulary consequently entered the developing vernacular. **Delhi and Deccan:** The language developed important literary traditions in both North India and the Deccan. **18th century:** Urdu emerged as a major literary language, with poets such as Mir Taqi Mir and Mirza Ghalib contributing greatly to its literary development. **19th – 20th centuries:** Urdu became an important language of literature, journalism, education, and political discourse. **Modern period:** Urdu is widely spoken and studied particularly in Pakistan and India, and it has communities of speakers around the world. Arabic is a Semitic language belonging to the Afro-Asiatic language family. It developed in the Arabian Peninsula and had a very long literary and cultural history. **Pre-Islamic period:** Arabic existed in several regional varieties. Classical Arabic is preserved particularly in pre-Islamic poetry. **7th century CE:** The revelation of the Qur'an gave Arabic an exceptionally important religious and literary status. **Islamic expansion:** From the 7th century onward, Arabic spread across the Middle East, North Africa, and parts of Europe. **Golden Age:** Between approximately the 8th and 13th centuries, Arabic became a major language of scholarship, philosophy, medicine, mathematics, astronomy, and literature. **Modern period:** Modern Standard Arabic developed as the formal written variety, while many regional Arabic dialects are spoken across the Arab world. Arabic has also had a major influence on languages such as Persian, Urdu, Turkish, Malay, and Swahili, particularly in religious, academic, administrative, and philosophical vocabulary.

Arabic and Urdu: A Study of Linguistic Commonalities

Arabic and Urdu are not genetically closely related. Urdu is Indo-Aryan, whereas Arabic is Semitic. However, Urdu has absorbed a large amount of Arabic vocabulary, mostly through Persian as well as through direct religious and scholarly transmission. For example: Arabic → Persian/Islamic cultural transmission → Urdu. The examples include **علم، کتاب، قلم، مدرسہ، تعلیم،**

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

حکومت، عدالت، حقیقت، انسان، اخلاق ، تاریخ. Thus, Arabic's influence on Urdu is primarily lexical and cultural, while the basic grammatical structure of Urdu remains Indo-Aryan.

2.1 Linguistic Characteristics of Urdu

Although Urdu has borrowed extensively from Arabic and Persian, its basic grammatical structure remains fundamentally Indo-Aryan. Urdu generally follows a subject-object-verb word order. For example, the sentence "Sultan plays football" can be expressed as " سلطان فٹ بال کھیلتا ہے۔" in which the verb appears at the end of the sentence. Urdu also makes extensive use of postpositions rather than prepositions. Expressions such as "کالج میں" and "سڑک پر" illustrate this feature.

Urdu has grammatical gender, generally distinguishing between masculine and feminine nouns. It also has grammatical distinctions involving number and case. Case relationships are frequently expressed through postpositions such as نے، کو، سے، میں، پر، کا، کی and کے. The Urdu verbal system is also fundamentally Indo-Aryan, although Urdu has borrowed many verbal nouns, participles and other lexical forms from Persian and Arabic.

The vocabulary of Urdu is particularly interesting from a linguistic perspective because it represents several layers of historical contact. The basic vocabulary contains many Indo-Aryan words, while Persian has contributed extensively to literary and cultural vocabulary. Arabic has contributed especially strongly to religious, philosophical, academic, legal, administrative and intellectual vocabulary. English has become increasingly influential in modern Urdu, particularly in science, technology, business, education and popular culture.

2.2 Origin and Development of Urdu

The origins of Urdu can be traced to the development of Indo-Aryan vernaculars in North India. Its grammatical foundation developed from local varieties of the Indo-Aryan linguistic continuum, particularly the Khari Boli variety associated with the Delhi region. During the medieval period, these local languages came into prolonged contact with Persian-speaking rulers, administrators, soldiers, scholars, merchants, and other communities. This contact created an environment in which vocabulary from Persian, Arabic, and Turkish entered the local vernaculars. In its early stages, the developing language was known by different names,

including **Hindavi, Hindui, Dehlavi and Rekhta**. The language developed in different geographical regions, especially in North India and the Deccan. The Deccan played a particularly important role in the early development of Urdu literary traditions. Over time, the language became increasingly standardized and developed a rich literary tradition. By the eighteenth century, Urdu had emerged as a major language of poetry and literature. Poets such as Wali Deccani, Mir Taqi Mir, Sauda and later Mirza Ghalib played important roles in establishing Urdu as a sophisticated literary language.

During the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, Urdu expanded beyond poetry into prose, journalism, education, criticism, political writing, history, science and other intellectual fields. Urdu today is an important language particularly in Pakistan and India and is also spoken by communities in many other parts of the world. Its vocabulary reflects its complex historical development, containing a substantial native Indo-Aryan component as well as extensive Persian and Arabic elements and smaller contributions from Turkish, English and other languages.

2.3 Urdu Language and Its Relationship with Arabic:

This relationship is important for research. For such a research study concerning English language teaching, the Arabic–Urdu relationship can be particularly interesting. Urdu-speaking language instructors teaching English to Arabic-speaking students may unconsciously use Arabic–Urdu similarities to facilitate communication, especially when explaining the vocabulary, Islamic/religious terminology, abstract concepts, academic terminology, classroom instructions.

However, the shared vocabulary can also create false assumptions: a word may look or sound similar in Urdu and Arabic but have a somewhat different pronunciation, grammatical function, or meaning. Urdu is one of the major languages of South Asia and has a rich history of linguistic and cultural interaction. It belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family, whereas Arabic belongs to the Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family. Therefore, Urdu and Arabic are not genetically related languages. Nevertheless, they have maintained a close historical relationship for many centuries, particularly through Islam, Persian literary culture, education, administration, religion, philosophy, and scholarship. As a result, Urdu has incorporated a very large number of Arabic words, expressions, and learned

terms. The relationship between the two languages is therefore best understood in terms of historical contact, lexical borrowing, cultural transmission, and, to a more limited extent, morphological influence.

2.4 Urdu and Arabic: A Comparative Linguistic Perspective

Urdu is one of the major languages of South Asia and has a rich history of linguistic and cultural interaction. It belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family, whereas Arabic belongs to the Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family. Therefore, Urdu and Arabic are not genetically related languages. Nevertheless, they have maintained a close historical relationship for many centuries, particularly through Islam, Persian literary culture, education, administration, religion, philosophy, and scholarship. As a result, Urdu has incorporated a very large number of Arabic words, expressions, and learned terms. The relationship between the two languages is therefore best understood in terms of historical contact, lexical borrowing, cultural transmission, and, to a more limited extent, morphological influence.

2.5 Linguistic Affinities between Urdu and Arabic: Implications for English Language Teaching

The similarities between Urdu and Arabic should be understood carefully. Urdu and Arabic do not share a common recent linguistic ancestor. Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language, while Arabic is a Semitic language. Their grammatical systems are therefore fundamentally different.

Their similarities can largely be attributed to centuries of sustained linguistic and cultural contact. Urdu has incorporated a substantial body of vocabulary of Arabic origin, much of which is associated with important domains of intellectual, religious, educational, social, administrative, and cultural life. Words such as **علم، تعلیم، کتاب، قلم، مدرسہ، حکومت، عدالت، حقیقت، اخلاق، انسان، تاریخ، سیاست، فکر، ادب، دین، دنیا، آخرت، حق، باطل، عدل، قانون، تحقیق، معلومات، موضوع، مسئلہ، سوال، جواب، مقصد، ضرورت، اہمیت، فطرت، شخصیت، معاشرہ، ثقافت، تہذیب، معیشت، تجارت، صنعت، تربیت، وقت** and **مطالعہ، مشاہدہ، گفتگو، تعلق، تعاون، ترقی، کامیابی، معرفت، عبادت، اجازت، محبت، خدمت، قدرت، عادت،** etc. are examples of Arabic-origin vocabulary that have become firmly established in Urdu and are widely used in everyday, formal, academic, religious, and intellectual contexts. The presence

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

of such vocabulary in Urdu demonstrates the considerable lexical affinity between Arabic and Urdu and reflects the enduring linguistic and cultural interaction between the two languages. These two languages also share the Perso-Arabic writing tradition. Urdu is normally written in a modified form of the Perso-Arabic script, particularly the **Nastaliq** style. This creates a strong visual and orthographic connection between Urdu and Arabic, although the Urdu writing system contains additional letters to represent sounds that are not present in Arabic. Thus, the linguistic commonness between Urdu and Arabic should not be described as genetic similarity. It is more accurately described as contact-induced similarity, especially in vocabulary, script, terminology and cultural expressions.

2.6 Arabic Influence on Urdu Vocabulary

Arabic has exercised a profound influence on Urdu vocabulary. Much of this influence reached Urdu through Persian, because Persian served for centuries as an important language of administration, literature and high culture in South Asia. Arabic was the major language of Islamic scripture and scholarship, while Persian functioned as an important medium through which Arabic intellectual and religious vocabulary entered South Asian languages.

Arabic vocabulary in Urdu is particularly prominent in religion. Words such as **اسلام، ایمان، عبادت، قرآن، حدیث، شریعت** and **آخرت** are deeply integrated into Urdu religious discourse. Arabic influence can also be seen in education and scholarship through words such as **علم، تعلیم، تحقیق، تدریس، مدرسہ** and. In administration and law, words such as **حکومت، عدالت، قانون، ریاست، شہادت** and **وزارت** are widely used. In philosophy and intellectual discourse, words such as **حقیقت، وجود، معنی، عقل، فلسفہ** and **انسان** are common.

One important linguistic phenomenon is that Arabic words borrowed into Urdu do not always retain exactly the same meaning, pronunciation or grammatical function that they had in Arabic. Once a word enters another language, it may undergo phonological, morphological or semantic adaptation. Consequently, an Arabic-origin word can become completely naturalized in Urdu and may be used by Urdu speakers without any awareness of its foreign origin.

2.7 Arabic Lexical Influence onUrdu Language and commonly used in Urdu in day today communication

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

Arabic	Urdu	English meanings	Arabic	Urdu	English meanings
علم	علم	knowledge	وحدت	وحدت	unity
عالم	عالم	scholar/world	محکمہ	محکمہ	department
کتاب	کتاب	Book	جماعت	جماعت	group/class
قلم	قلم	Pen	ادارہ	ادارہ	Institution
مدرسہ	مدرسہ	religious school	تعلیمات	تعلیمات	teachings
استاد	استاد	Teacher	مجلس	مجلس	assembly/council
طالب	طالب	seeker/student	معلومات	معلومات	Information
طالب علم	طالب علم	Student	تحقیقات	تحقیقات	investigations
درس	درس	Lesson	خدمات	خدمات	services
تعلیم	تعلیم	Education	ضروریات	ضروریات	necessities
تدریس	تدریس	Teaching	امکانات	امکانات	possibilities
تحقیق	تحقیق	Research	حالات	حالات	circumstances
تحریر	تحریر	Writing	مرکز	مرکز	center
تقریر	تقریر	Speech	مسائل	مسائل	problems/issues
سوال	سوال	Question	نتائج	نتائج	results
جواب	جواب	Answer	افکار	افکار	thoughts
امتحان	امتحان	examination	اقدار	اقدار	values
نتیجہ	نتیجہ	Result	نظریات	نظریات	theories/ideas
مقصد	مقصد	objective/purpose	تعاون	تعاون	cooperation
معنی	معنی	Meaning	دین	دین	religion
لفظ	لفظ	Word	ایمان	ایمان	faith
زبان	زبان	Language	اسلام	اسلام	Islam
ادب	ادب	Literature	مسلمان	مسلمان	Muslim
شاعر	شاعر	Poet	عبادت	عبادت	worship
شعر	شعر	verse/poetry	زکوٰۃ	زکوٰۃ	alms
نظم	نظم	poem/order	حج	حج	pilgrimage

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

نثر	نثر	Prose	دعا	دعا	supplication
تاریخ	تاریخ	history/date	مسجد	مسجد	mosque
جغرافیہ	جغرافیہ	geography	قرآن	قرآن	Qur'an
فلسفہ	فلسفہ	philosophy	حدیث	حدیث	tradition/report
منطق	منطق	Logic	سنت	سنت	tradition/practice
سیاست	سیاست	Politics	شریعت	شریعت	Islamic law
حکومت	حکومت	government	حلال	حلال	lawful
عدالت	عدالت	court/justice	حرام	حرام	forbidden
قانون	قانون	Law	فرض	فرض	obligatory duty
نظام	نظام	System	واجب	واجب	obligator
ریاست	ریاست	State	حق	حق	right/truth
قوم	قوم	Nation	باطل	باطل	falsehood
ملت	ملت	community/nation	عدل	عدل	justice
ثقافت	ثقافت	Culture	ظلم	ظلم	oppression
اخلاق	اخلاق	Morals	رحم	رحم	mercy
انسان	انسان	human being	رحمت	رحمت	mercy/blessing
شخصیت	شخصیت	personality	اخلاص	اخلاص	sincerity
دنیا	دنیا	World	صبر	صبر	patience
آخرت	آخرت	Hereafter	شکر	شکر	gratitude
خوف	خوف	Fear	اصطلاح	اصطلاح	technical term
غم	غم	Sorrow	تعریف	تعریف	definition/praise
عقل	عقل	Intellect	تشریح	تشریح	explanation
فکر	فکر	thought/concern	تنقید	تنقید	criticism
شعور	شعور	consciousness	تحقیق	تحقیق	research
احساس	احساس	Feeling	حوالہ	حوالہ	reference
تجربہ	تجربہ	experience	موضوع	موضوع	topic/subject
ضرورت	ضرورت	Need	عنوان	عنوان	title

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

امكان	امكان	possibility	مقدمہ	مقدمہ	introduction/case
حقيقت	حقيقت	Reality	خلاصہ	خلاصہ	summary
كيفيت	كيفيت	condition/state	نتيجہ	نتيجہ	conclusion/result
صورت	صورت	form/condition	اختلاف	اختلاف	disagreement
حالت	حالت	Condition	اتحاد	اتحاد	unity
سَبَب	سَبَب	Reason	اجتماع	اجتماع	gathering
قصيدة	قصيده	narration / novel	إخلاص	إخلاص	sincerity
قصة	قصة	Story	مساواة مساوات	مساواة مساوات	equality
مضمون	مضمون	essay / article	مشكل مشكلة	مشكلة مشكل	problem
رسالة	رسالة	letter / treatise	اعلان	إعلان	announcement
جديد	جديد	New	شجر	شجر	tree
قمر	قمر	Moon	شمس	شمس	sun
بحر	بحر	sea/ocean	سماء	سماء	sky
نجم	نجم	Star	نجوم	نجوم	stars
نهر	نهر	River	جبل	جبل	mountain
وادي	وادي	Lake	صحراء	صحراء	desert
زهرة	زهرة	Flower	ورقة	ورقة	leaf
نبات	نبات	Plants	حجر	حجر	stone
طين	طين	mud/clay	نار	نار	fire
برق	برق	Lightning	موج	موج	wave
جزيرة	جزيرة	Island	ماء	ماء	water
غروب	غروب	Sunset	مِيزَان	مِيزَان	weighing scale
مثال	مثال	Example	قوانين	قوانين	laws

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

دلیل	دلیل	argument/evidence	اصول	اصول	principles
اعلان	اعلان	announcement	قواعد	قواعد	rules/grammar
مساوات	مساوات	Equality	مفردات	مفردات	vocabulary
تجزیہ	تجزیہ	Analysis	منطق	منطق	logic
وحدت	وحدت	Unity	جماعت	جماعت	group / class
وکیل	وکیل	Advocacy	حق	حق	right / Truth
منصف	منصف	judge / justice	روح	روح	soul
حکم	حکم	order / commands	مرض	مرض	disease
جسم	جسم	Body	علاج	علاج	Treatment
نبض	نبض	Pulse	دماغ	دماغ	brain
طبیب	طبیب	doctor / physician	قرض	قرض	loan / debt
تجارت	تجارت	trade / commerce	مال	مال	property / goods
حساب	حساب	account	دعا	دعا	prayer
امانت	امانت	trust / deposit	قدیم	قدیم	old
حدیث	حدیث	prophetic tradition	شریعت	شریعت	Islamic law
بحث	بحث	research	باب	باب	chapter / door
معلم	معلم	Teacher	قسم	قسم	department / oath
نص	نص	Text	صفحة	صفحہ	page
کرسی	کرسی	Chair	منصف	منصف	judge
مُسَبَّب	مُسَبَّب	name of a person	جرم	جرم	crime
صحت	صحت	Health	غرور	غرور	pride / arrogance
السلام علیکم	السلام علیکم	peace be upon you	سفر	سفر	travel / journey
اللہ	اللہ	almighty/creator	نور	نور	Light
فائدہ	فائدہ	benefit / Loss	مضمون	مضمون	Essay / Article
عمر	عمر	age / lifetime	ہندسہ	ہندسہ	Geometry / Digit
ترجمہ	ترجمہ	translation	شہادت	شہادت	witness
صبر	صبر	Patience	طبیعت	طبیعت	disposition

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

2.8.1 *Arabic Plural Forms in Urdu: A Linguistic Overview*

لفظ	word	الفاظ	words	اصول	principle	اصل	principles
کتاب	book	کتب	books	خبر	news	اخبار	newspapers
مسئلہ	problem	مسائل	problems	شخص	person	اشخاص	persons
نتیجہ	result	نتائج	results	فکر	thought	افکار	thoughts
قاعدہ	rule	قواعد	rules	عالم	scholar	علماء	scholars
معنی	meaning	معانی	Meanings	استاد	language	اساتذہ	teacher
قانون	Law	قوانین	Laws	شاعر	poet	شعراء	poets
فاضل	learned	فضلاء	learned people	ضرورت	need	ضروریات	necessities
ادارہ	Institution	ادارے	institutions	خدمت	service	خدمات	services
حکم	Order	احکامات	Orders	وزیر	Minister	وزراء	Ministers
شعر	couplet	اشعار	couplets	طفل	child	اطفال	children
مَدْرَسَةٌ	school	مَدَارِس	schools	وَلَد	son	أَوْلَاد	sons
بَابٌ	door	أَبْوَاب	Doors	شَجَرَة	tree	أَشْجَار	trees

2.9 Arabic Loanwords in Urdu

A loanword is a word adopted by one language from another language. Urdu contains a very large number of Arabic loanwords. Some entered Urdu directly through religious and scholarly contact, while others entered through Persian. It is therefore useful to distinguish between the ultimate origin of a word and the immediate language through which it entered Urdu.

For example, the word **کتاب** is ultimately Arabic in origin, but its historical transmission into Urdu may be associated with the broader Persianate literary and educational environment. Similar examples include **تاریخ، اخلاق، حقیقت، عدالت، حکومت، مدرسہ،** قلم، علم and **انسان**.

Arabic loanwords have undergone different degrees of integration into Urdu. Some retain forms relatively close to Arabic, while others have been adapted to Urdu pronunciation and grammar. Some Arabic nouns are also used naturally with Urdu grammatical constructions. For

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

example, Urdu speakers can form expressions around Arabic-origin nouns using Urdu postpositions, auxiliary verbs and pluralization patterns. This demonstrates that borrowed vocabulary becomes incorporated into the grammatical system of the receiving language.

2.10.1 The Arabic Root System

One of the most important features of Arabic morphology is its root-and-pattern system. The Arabic term **جذر(ذرj)** refers to a root, which normally consists of three consonants in the common triliteral system. The root carries a broad semantic field, while different morphological patterns produce different words related to that field.

A classic example is the root **ك - ت - ب,** which is associated with writing. From this root, Arabic forms words such as **كَتَبَ** meaning "he wrote," **كِتَاب** meaning "book," **كَاتِب** meaning "writer," **مَكْتَب** meaning "office or desk," **مَكْتَبَة** meaning "library," **مَكْتُوب** meaning "written," and **كِتَابَة** meaning "writing." Urdu has borrowed many of these forms, including **کتاب، کاتب، مکتب، مکتوب** and **کتابت**.

Another important example is the root **ع - ل - م**, which is associated with knowledge and knowing. Arabic forms include **عِلْم** meaning "knowledge," **عَالِم** meaning "scholar or knower," **مُعَلِّم** meaning "teacher," **تَعْلِيم** meaning "teaching or education," **مَعْلُوم** meaning "known," and **مَعْلُومَات** meaning "information." Urdu has incorporated all of these forms to varying degrees: **علم، عالم، معلّم، تعلیم، معلوم** and **معلومات**.

The root **م - ك - ح** provides another useful example. It is associated with judgment, authority and governance. Arabic forms such as **حُكْم, حَاكِم, حُكُومَة, مَحْكُوم** and **حِكْمَة** correspond to Urdu forms such as **حکم، حاکم، حکومت، محکوم** and **حکمت**.

Similarly, the root **ع - م - ل** is associated with action or work. Arabic forms include **عَمَل, عَامِل, أَعْمَال,** and **مَعْمُول**, which have corresponding forms in Urdu such as **عمل، عامل، اعمال** and **معمول**. The root **س-ل-م** produces forms such as **سلام، اسلام، مسلم** and **تسلیم**, all of which are familiar in Urdu.

2.10.2 Arabic Derivation and اشتقاق

The Arabic term **اشتقاق** (**ishtiqāq**) refers broadly to derivation, particularly the formation of related words from a common root. Arabic morphology uses patterns known as **أوزان** (awzān).

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

The combination of a root with a particular morphological pattern can produce a word with a related but more specific meaning.

For example, from the root **ك - ت - ب**, the form **كاتب** is an agent noun meaning "writer," while **مكتوب** represents something that has been written. The relationship between words is systematic because the root remains recognizable while the morphological pattern changes.

Arabic also has a system of derived verbal forms, traditionally numbered from Form I through Form X and beyond in grammatical descriptions. These forms can express meanings such as causation, reflexivity, reciprocity, seeking, intensity and other semantic relationships. This system makes Arabic morphology highly productive and systematic.

Urdu has borrowed many words belonging to Arabic derivational families, but this does not mean that Urdu has adopted the complete Arabic root-and-pattern system. Urdu speakers generally treat many Arabic-derived forms as established lexical items. They do not normally take every Arabic root and freely generate new words according to Arabic morphological patterns.

This distinction is extremely important. Urdu has borrowed a large amount of Arabic vocabulary, but it has not borrowed Arabic morphology in its entirety.

2.10.3 Arabic Roots and Their Use in Urdu

The relationship between Arabic roots and Urdu can be demonstrated through several lexical families. The root **ك - ت - ب** gives **كتاب، كاتب، مكتب، مكتوب** and **كتابت**. The root **ع - ل - م** gives **علم، عالم، معلّم، تعليم، معلوم** and **معلومات**. The root **ح - ك - م** gives **حكم، حاكم، حكومت، محكوم** and **حكمت**. The root **ع - م - ل** gives **عمل، عامل، اعمال** and **معمول**. The root **س - ل - م** gives **سلام، اسلام، مسلم** and **تسليم**.

These examples demonstrate that Urdu has preserved numerous members of Arabic derivational families. However, the semantic relationships between these forms may sometimes be less transparent to modern Urdu speakers than they are to Arabic speakers. A speaker of Urdu may know the meanings of **كتاب، كاتب** and **مكتوب** as separate vocabulary items without necessarily analyzing them as forms derived from the common Arabic root **ك - ت - ب**.

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

This is an important distinction between historical derivation and synchronically productive morphology. Historically, the words may belong to the same Arabic derivational family. In modern Urdu, however, their relationship may simply be lexical rather than actively morphological.

2.11 Arabic, Persian and Urdu Word Formation

The relationship among Arabic, Persian and Urdu is particularly important because these three languages have interacted historically in South Asia and the wider Islamic world. Arabic is a Semitic language with a strong root-and-pattern morphological system. Persian is an Indo-Iranian language and has its own derivational and compounding mechanisms. Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language whose grammatical structure developed from the languages of North India.

Persian played an important mediating role between Arabic and Urdu. For centuries, Persian was a major language of administration, literature and scholarship in South Asia. Consequently, many Arabic words entered Urdu through Persian. This historical pathway can be represented simply as Arabic → Persian → Urdu, although this should not be interpreted as applying to every Arabic-origin word in Urdu. Some words entered Urdu through direct religious, educational and scholarly contact with Arabic.

Persian also contributed numerous morphological elements and compound-word structures to Urdu. Consequently, Urdu vocabulary often contains Arabic lexical material combined with Persian morphological or syntactic structures. This creates a complex linguistic mixture that is characteristic of literary Urdu.

2.11.1 Arabic, Persian and Urdu: An Important Distinction

Arabic provides much of the religious and scholarly vocabulary, Persian provides a major layer of literary and cultural vocabulary and many patterns of compound formation, while the underlying grammar of Urdu remains fundamentally Indo-Aryan. This makes Urdu a particularly interesting example of prolonged linguistic contact.

For example, words such as **علم، تعلیم، حکومت، عدالت، حقیقت** and **اخلاق** have Arabic origins, but they function within Urdu sentences according to Urdu grammar. Urdu speakers can use

these words with Urdu postpositions, auxiliary verbs, tense markers and other grammatical elements. Therefore, these words have become integrated into the Urdu linguistic system.

The same phenomenon occurs with Persian-derived vocabulary. A borrowed word may retain its historical origin but become fully naturalized in the receiving language. Language contact therefore involves more than simply adding foreign words to a dictionary; borrowed words can become part of the phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic structure of the receiving language.

2.12 Arabic Influence on Urdu Vocabulary

Arabic has exercised a profound influence on Urdu vocabulary. Much of this influence reached Urdu through Persian, because Persian served for centuries as an important language of administration, literature and high culture in South Asia. Arabic was the major language of Islamic scripture and scholarship, while Persian functioned as an important medium through which Arabic intellectual and religious vocabulary entered South Asian languages.

Arabic vocabulary in Urdu is particularly prominent in religion. Words such as **اسلام، ایمان، عبادت، قرآن، حدیث، شریعت** and آخرت are deeply integrated into Urdu religious discourse. Arabic influence can also be seen in education and scholarship through words such as **علم، تعلیم، تحقیق** and **تدریس، مدرسہ**. In administration and law, words such as **حکومت، عدالت، قانون، ریاست، شہادت** and **وزارت** are widely used. In philosophy and intellectual discourse, words such as **حقیقت، وجود، معنی، عقل، فلسفہ** and **انسان** are common.

One important linguistic phenomenon is that Arabic words borrowed into Urdu do not always retain exactly the same meaning, pronunciation or grammatical function that they had in Arabic. Once a word enters another language, it may undergo phonological, morphological or semantic adaptation. Consequently, an Arabic-origin word can become completely naturalized in Urdu and may be used by Urdu speakers without any awareness of its foreign origin.

2.13 Arabic Loanwords in Urdu

A loanword is a word adopted by one language from another language. Urdu contains a very large number of Arabic loanwords. Some entered Urdu directly through religious and scholarly contact, while others entered through Persian. It is therefore useful to distinguish

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

between the ultimate origin of a word and the immediate language through which it entered Urdu.

For example, the word **کتاب** is ultimately Arabic in origin, but its historical transmission into Urdu may be associated with the broader Persianate literary and educational environment. Similar examples include **علم، قلم، مدرسہ، حکومت، عدالت، حقیقت، اخلاق، تاریخ** and **انسان**.

Arabic loanwords have undergone different degrees of integration into Urdu. Some retain forms relatively close to Arabic, while others have been adapted to Urdu pronunciation and grammar. Some Arabic nouns are also used naturally with Urdu grammatical constructions. For example, Urdu speakers can form expressions around Arabic-origin nouns using Urdu postpositions, auxiliary verbs and pluralization patterns. This demonstrates that borrowed vocabulary becomes incorporated into the grammatical system of the receiving language.

2.14 Arabic Roots and Their Use in Urdu

The relationship between Arabic roots and Urdu can be demonstrated through several lexical families. The root **ك - ت - ب** gives **کتاب، کاتب، مکتب، مکتوب** and **کتابت**. The root **ع - ل - م** gives **علم، عالم، معلّم، تعلیم، معلوم** and **معلومات**. The root م - ك - ح gives **حکم، حاکم، حکومت، محکوم** and حکمت. The root **ع - م - ل** gives **عمل، عامل، اعمال** and **معمول**. The root **س - ل - م** gives **سلام، اسلام، مسلم** and **تسلیم**.

These examples demonstrate that Urdu has preserved numerous members of Arabic derivational families. However, the semantic relationships between these forms may sometimes be less transparent to modern Urdu speakers than they are to Arabic speakers. A speaker of Urdu may know the meanings of **کتاب، کاتب** and **مکتوب** as separate vocabulary items without necessarily analyzing them as forms derived from the common Arabic root **ك - ت - ب**.

This is an important distinction between historical derivation and synchronically productive morphology. Historically, the words may belong to the same Arabic derivational family. In modern Urdu, however, their relationship may simply be lexical rather than actively morphological.

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

2.15 Arabic, Persian and Urdu Word Formation

The relationship among Arabic, Persian and Urdu is particularly important because these three languages have interacted historically in South Asia and the wider Islamic world. Arabic is a Semitic language with a strong root-and-pattern morphological system. Persian is an Indo-Iranian language and has its own derivational and compounding mechanisms. Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language whose grammatical structure developed from the languages of North India.

Persian played an important mediating role between Arabic and Urdu. For centuries, Persian was a major language of administration, literature and scholarship in South Asia. Consequently, many Arabic words entered Urdu through Persian. This historical pathway can be represented simply as Arabic → Persian → Urdu, although this should not be interpreted as applying to every Arabic-origin word in Urdu. Some words entered Urdu through direct religious, educational and scholarly contact with Arabic.

Persian also contributed numerous of morphological elements and compound structures to Urdu. Consequently, Urdu vocabulary often contains Arabic lexical material combined with Persian morphological or syntactic structures. This creates a complex linguistic mixture that is characteristic of literary Urdu.

2.16 Arabic, Persian and Urdu: An Important Distinction

Arabic provides much of the religious and scholarly vocabulary, Persian provides a major layer of literary and cultural vocabulary and many patterns of compound formation, while the underlying grammar of Urdu remains fundamentally Indo-Aryan. This makes Urdu a particularly interesting example of prolonged linguistic contact.

For example, words such as **علم، تعلیم، حکومت، عدالت، حقیقت** and **اخلاق** have Arabic origins, but they function within Urdu sentences according to Urdu grammar. Urdu speakers can use these words with Urdu postpositions, auxiliary verbs, tense markers and other grammatical elements. Therefore, these words have become integrated into the Urdu linguistic system.

2.17 Structural Similarities and Dissimilarities between Urdu and Arabic

The most important point is that Urdu and Arabic do not have the same basic grammatical structure. Urdu generally follows a **Subject–Object–Verb (SOV)** pattern, whereas

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

Arabic commonly uses **Verb–Subject–Object (VSO) or Subject–Verb–Object (SVO)** patterns depending on the construction. Urdu also uses postpositions, while Arabic primarily uses prepositions. Thus, their major similarities are found in script, vocabulary, morphology of borrowed words, terminology, and literary conventions, rather than in their fundamental syntax.

In short, Urdu is structurally an Indo-Aryan language with extensive Arabic and Persian lexical and literary influence, whereas Arabic is a Semitic language with its own distinctive root-and-pattern morphology and grammatical system.

Urdu and Arabic belong to different language families—Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language, while Arabic is a Semitic language. Therefore, they are not structurally related in the same way as closely related languages. However, centuries of contact, particularly through Islamic, Persian, literary, and administrative traditions, have created several important structural similarities between them.

1. Use of the Perso-Arabic script: Urdu is written in a modified form of the Perso-Arabic script, known as **Nastaliq**. Urdu therefore shares many Arabic letters and orthographic conventions, although Urdu has also developed additional letters such as ٹ، ڈ، ڑ، چ، پ، گ to represent sounds that are not present in Arabic.

2. Right-to-left writing: Both Urdu and Arabic are written and read from right to left. This is one of their most immediately visible structural similarities.

3. Arabic vocabulary in Urdu: A substantial portion of Urdu's formal, literary, religious, academic, and administrative vocabulary comes from Arabic, usually through direct borrowing or through Persian. Words such as **علم، کتاب، قلم، مدرسہ، تعلیم، عدالت، حکومت، انسان، دنیا، وقت، ضرورت** are used extensively in Urdu.

4. Arabic morphological patterns in borrowed vocabulary: Arabic words borrowed into Urdu often retain aspects of their original morphological structure. For example, the Arabic root ع - ل - م produces words such as **علم، عالم، معلوم، تعلیم، معلم.** These forms have entered Urdu vocabulary and are used as established Urdu words.

5. Use of Arabic plurals: Urdu uses both its own plural formations and several Arabic plural patterns, particularly in formal and literary vocabulary.

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

For example, الفاظ → لفظ, مسائل → مسئلہ, کتب →کتاب, and طلبہ → طالب. Such Arabic plurals are especially common in academic and religious Urdu.

6. Gender distinction: Both languages distinguish between masculine and feminine gender. However, the grammatical systems are not identical. Urdu has masculine and feminine nouns and requires corresponding agreement in many contexts, while Arabic has a more systematic grammatical gender system.

7. Grammatical categories: Both languages make extensive use of categories such as nouns, verbs, adjectives, pronouns, adverbs, and particles. Nevertheless, the way these categories function is substantially different because Urdu and Arabic belong to different linguistic families.

8. Construct and possessive relationships: Arabic has the **iḍāfa** construction for expressing possession or close association, while Urdu frequently expresses similar relationships through the کا/کی/کے construction. Urdu also uses the Persian izāfat construction in formal and literary language, which further strengthens its structural resemblance to Arabic-influenced Persian usage.

9. Religious and scholarly terminology: Because of the historical influence of Arabic Islamic scholarship, Urdu has adopted a large number of Arabic grammatical, theological, philosophical, legal, and academic terms. Examples include نحو، صرف، ادب، منطق، فلسفہ، فقہ، حدیث، تفسیر، شریعت.

10. Formal and literary register: Urdu's highly formal and literary register contains many Arabic-derived words and expressions. Consequently, the syntax of Urdu remains fundamentally Indo-Aryan, but its lexical and stylistic structure can sometimes appear strongly Arabic-influenced.

3. Arabic–Urdu Shared Prefixes as a Pedagogical Resource in EFL Instruction

Over the course of my long English teaching career, I have made several observations in actual classroom settings concerning the potential pedagogical value of students' existing linguistic knowledge. One particularly noteworthy observation is that familiarity with Arabic prefixes may provide a valuable resource for instructors teaching English to Arabic-speaking students, especially in contexts where the instructor possesses knowledge of both Arabic and Urdu. This potential stems from the fact that Arabic and Urdu share a substantial number of

prefixes and prefix-derived lexical forms, many of which are familiar to Urdu speakers through their extensive use in the Urdu lexicon.

In practical classroom contexts, students frequently encounter difficulties in understanding English vocabulary, word formation, and the semantic and structural relationships among words. Although instructors may employ a variety of teaching methods, approaches, techniques, and strategies to address such difficulties, certain lexical and structural concepts may remain challenging for students. In such circumstances, the strategic use of students' prior linguistic knowledge can provide an additional means of facilitating comprehension. In particular, when instructors draw attention to Arabic prefixes that are also familiar to students through Urdu, they can establish meaningful cross-linguistic connections between previously acquired linguistic knowledge and unfamiliar English forms.

The pedagogical significance of these shared prefixes lies in their potential to function as a linguistic bridge between the students' existing repertoire and the target language. Urdu-speaking language instructors who are familiar with Arabic-derived vocabulary may already possess an implicit understanding of the semantic functions associated with certain prefixes. By drawing upon this familiarity, an instructor can introduce corresponding or semantically related English forms in a more comprehensible manner. Such cross-linguistic connections may facilitate vocabulary development, enhance morphological awareness, and assist students in recognizing patterns of word formation in English.

The relevance of this approach extends beyond everyday vocabulary. Arabic-derived lexical items and morphological elements are frequently encountered in formal, academic, journalistic, literary, and other specialized forms of discourse. Consequently, an instructor's awareness of the Arabic–Urdu linguistic relationship can be particularly useful in explaining unfamiliar vocabulary and elucidating certain aspects of lexical structure. Rather than relying exclusively on conventional vocabulary-teaching techniques, language instructors can strategically activate students' existing linguistic knowledge to provide additional semantic and morphological support.

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

From a pedagogical perspective, therefore, the shared linguistic features of Arabic and Urdu may constitute a potentially valuable resource in English language instruction. The instructor's familiarity with both languages can facilitate the identification of meaningful cross-linguistic correspondences and enable such correspondences to be incorporated into practical classroom situations and contexts. This approach does not imply that Arabic and Urdu connections should replace established methods of English language teaching; rather, it suggests that students' existing linguistic resources can be strategically integrated into instruction to facilitate the acquisition and interpretation of unfamiliar English vocabulary and structures.

Accordingly, the classroom observation presented here suggests that Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity, particularly in relation to shared prefixes and prefix-derived vocabulary, merits consideration as a pedagogical resource in EFL contexts. By recognizing and strategically exploiting such cross-linguistic connections, language instructors may be able to make certain aspects of English vocabulary and word formation more accessible to Urdu-speaking students and thereby contribute to a more context-sensitive and linguistically informed approach to EFL instruction.

3.1 Arabic Prefixes Used in Urdu language

Prefixes are added to the beginning of a word to modify its meaning. It is better to say that Arabic-derived prefixes and prefix-like elements used in Urdu. In Urdu, Arabic prefixes are highly productive, especially in formal, journalistic, and literary writing.

Examples:

غیر and لا

Urdu	Arabic	meanings	Urdu	Arabic	meanings
غیر ضروری	غیر ضروری	unnecessary	غیر یقینی	غیر یقینی	uncertain
غیر حاضر	غیر حاضر	Absent	غیر رسمی	غیر رسمی	informal
غیر قانونی	غیر قانونی	Illegal	غیر اخلاقی	غیر اخلاقی	immoral
غیر ملکی	غیر ملکی	Foreign	غیر انسانی	غیر انسانی	inhuman
غیر متعلق	غیر متعلق	Irrelevant	غیر سیاسی	غیر سیاسی	non-political
غیر معروف	غیر معروف	Unknown	غیر مسلح	غیر مسلح	unarmed

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

غیر متوقع	غیر متوقع	unexpected	غیر مسلم	غیر مسلم	non-Muslim
غیر متعلقہ	غیر متعلقہ	Unrelated	غیر عرب	غیر عرب	non-Arab
غیر محفوظ	غیر محفوظ	Unsafe	غیر مناسب	غیر مناسب	Unsuitable
غیر فعال	غیر فعال	Inactive	غیر متوقع	غیر متوقع	unexpected
غیر مؤثر	غیر مؤثر	ineffective	غیر محدود	غیر محدود	unlimited
غیر مساوی	غیر مساوی	Unequal	غیر مستقل	غیر مستقل	non-permanent
لا علاج	لا علاج	Incurable	لا شعور	لا شعور	Unconsciousness
لا جواب	لا جواب	matchless	لا حاصل	لا حاصل	Fruitless
لا محدود	لا محدود	Unlimited	لا تعلق	لا تعلق	Unrelated
لا علم	لا علم	Not known	لا فانی	لا فانی	Imperishable

3.2 Arabic Suffixes Used in Urdu

Over the course of its historical development, Urdu borrowed a range of suffixes and othermorphological elements from Arabic, subsequently integrating them into its own grammatical and structural patterns.

ین / ین (-ain / -ayn)

Urdu	Arabic	meanings	Urdu	Arabic	meanings
والدین	والدین	parents	فریقین	فریقین	both parties
طرفین	طرفین	both parties	عابدین	عابدین	worshippers
جانبین	جانبین	both sides	حرمین	حرمین	the two holy sanctuaries
حاضرین	حاضرین	those present	سامعین	سامعین	listeners
ناظرین	ناظرین	viewer	قارئین	قارئین	readers
مجرمین	مجرمین	criminals			

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

ـین / ـون (-ūn / -īn)

مسلمین	مسلمین	Muslims	مومنین	مومنین	Muslims
کافرین	کافرین	Disbelievers	منافقین	منافقین	hypocrites
مجاہدین	مجاہدین	freedom fighters	مہاجرین	مہاجرین	migrants
غائبین	غائبین	Absentees	متعلمین	متعلمین	learners
معلمین	معلمین	Teachers	مدرسین	مدرسین	teachers
مصنفین	مصنفین	Authors	محققین	محققین	researchers
مترجمین	مترجمین	Translators	تحقیقات	تحقیقات	research

- **An Arabic plural suffix that is highly productive in the Urdu lexical system**

ـات (-āt)

معلومات	معلومات	information	خدمات	خدمات	services
تعلیمات	تعلیمات	teachings	اصطلاحات	اصطلاحات	terms / terminology
ترجیحات	ترجیحات	preferences	ضروریات	ضروریات	necessities
خصوصیات	خصوصیات	characteristics	مشکلات	مشکلات	difficulties
امکانات	امکانات	possibilities	حالات	حالات	conditions
علامات	علامات	signs / symptoms	عبادات	عبادات	acts of worship
اخلاقیات	اخلاقیات	ethics	شخصیات	شخصیات	personalities

ـہ / ـہ (-ah / -a(h))

- Many Urdu words ending in ـہ are derived from Arabic feminine nouns whose original Arabic form typically ends in ـة (tāʾmarbūṭa). In Urdu, this Arabic feminine marker has generally been adapted orthographically as ـہ, while the borrowed words have been integrated into the phonological and morphological system of Urdu.

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

حکومت	حُكُومَة	Government	عبادت	عِبَادَة	Prayer, worship
عدالت	عَدَالَة	Court	ہدایت	هِدَايَة	guidance
حقیقت	حَقِيقَة	Real	اجازت	إِجَازَة	permission
ضرورت	ضَرُورَة	Necessity	سیاست	سِيَاسَة	politics

ہ / ی (-iyy / -iyya)

- Arabic **nisbah** (adjectival) formations have made a significant contribution to the development of Urdu vocabulary.

Urdu	**Arabic**	**English meanings**	**Urdu**	**Arabic**	**English meanings**
اسلامی	إِسْلَامِيّ	Islamic	سیاسی	سِيَاسِيّ	political
عربی	عَرَبِيّ	Arabic	اقتصادی	اقتصادي	economic
انسانی	إِنْسَانِيّ	Human	قانونی	قَانُونِيّ	legal
روحانی	رُوحَانِيّ	Spiritual	اجتماعی	اِجْتِمَاعِيّ	social / collective
جسمانی	جِسْمَانِيّ	Physical	تاریخی	تَارِيخِيّ	historical
علمی	عِلْمِيّ	Scholarly	جغرافیائی	جُغْرَافِيّ	geographical
ادبی	أَدَبِيّ	Literary	نفسیاتی	نَفْسِيّ	psychological
اخلاقی	أَخْلَاقِيّ	Ethical	ثقافتی	ثَقَافِيّ	cultural

3.3 Arabic Words That Have Undergone Semantic Change in Urdu

Languages naturally evolve as they come into contact with other linguistic and cultural systems. In the process of borrowing Arabic vocabulary, Urdu has incorporated numerous Arabic words whose meanings have undergone semantic shifts, ranging from subtle modifications to substantial changes. These changes often reflect the linguistic, social, and cultural contexts in which the borrowed words have been adopted and used in Urdu.

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

Languages are dynamic systems that continually evolve through processes of linguistic contact, borrowing, and adaptation. During its historical development, Urdu has incorporated a substantial body of Arabic vocabulary. However, many Arabic-derived words have undergone semantic modification in Urdu, resulting in shifts, extensions, restrictions, or, in some cases, substantial changes in their original meanings. Such semantic changes may be attributed to the sociocultural, historical, and linguistic contexts in which these words have been adopted and subsequently integrated into Urdu. These developments demonstrate how borrowed lexical items can acquire new meanings and functions within the receiving language while retaining varying degrees of connection with their Arabic origins.

3.4 Nativization of Arabic Linguistic Elements in Urdu

The influence of Arabic on Urdu extends beyond lexical borrowing to the nativization of various linguistic elements within the structural and grammatical framework of Urdu. Throughout its historical development, Urdu has incorporated a considerable number of Arabic words, prefixes, suffixes, and morphological patterns, adapting them to its own phonological, morphological, syntactic, and grammatical conventions. Consequently, many of these borrowed elements have acquired a natural and productive status within Urdu and now function as integral components of its linguistic system rather than as merely foreign insertions.

Nativization refers to the process through which a word, linguistic element, or structural pattern borrowed from another language is adapted to and integrated into the linguistic system of the receiving language. In the context of Arabic–Urdu linguistic contact, nativization refers to the process by which Arabic lexical and morphological elements are incorporated into Urdu and subsequently adapted to its phonological, morphological, grammatical, and structural patterns. Through this process, originally Arabic elements become naturalized within Urdu and function in accordance with the linguistic conventions of the receiving language.

The historical development of Urdu demonstrates numerous instances of such nativization. Over time, a wide range of Arabic linguistic elements have been assimilated into Urdu and adapted to its morphological, syntactic, and structural patterns. Their widespread and conventionalized use indicates that Arabic influence on Urdu is not confined to the borrowing of

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

individual lexical items; rather, it encompasses the broader adaptation and integration of linguistic elements into the structure of Urdu. Thus, nativization represents an important dimension of Arabic–Urdu linguistic interaction and provides evidence of the depth and historical continuity of the relationship between the two languages.

For example, the Arabic suffix –īn **(ين)** occurs in Urdu words such as: **والدين** (parents), **حاضرين** (those present), **مسلمين** (Muslims), **مؤمنين** (believers), **عابدين** (worshippers), **سامعين** (listeners).

4. Pedagogical Significance of Arabic–Urdu Linguistic Affinity in English as a Foreign Language Pedagogy

The present study is not positioned as an empirical investigation, as it does not involve the systematic collection or statistical analysis of data through questionnaires, interviews, tests, observation schedules, or other quantitative or qualitative research instruments. Rather, the study is situated within an observational, reflective, and experience-based research framework, drawing upon the researcher's extensive professional experience in the area of foreign language pedagogy particularly English language teaching at the University of Bisha, Saudi Arabia.The study draws upon nearly three decades of experience in English as a foreign language (EFL) pedagogy, including approximately eighteen years of teaching English to Arabic -speaking students in Saudi Arabia. This sustained professionalexperience provides a well- grounded pedagogical perspective for examining cross-linguistic influence and the role of students' background in English language teaching. The researcher's' extensive professional experience has provided valuable insights into linguistic patterns, classroom interactions students' responses, and pedagogical challenges that characterize the English Language learning experiences of Arabic-speaking students. Accordingly, the present study may be characterized as a practitioner-oriented observational inquiry grounded in professional experience and reflective pedagogical practice. Its primary purpose is not to establish statistically generalizable findings, but to offer informed pedagogical insights based on the researcher's long-term engagement with language teaching and learning.

From this perspective, the study draws upon concepts such as observational perspective, reflective practitioner perspective, experience-based inquiry, practice-based research, professional classroom observation, and researcher reflection. These perspectives provide an appropriate methodological foundation for examining the potential pedagogical relevance of Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity in the context of English Language Teaching to Arabic-speaking students.

The rationale for the present study is grounded in the researcher's extensive professional experience in English as a foreign language (EFL) pedagogy, including several years of teaching English to Arabic-speaking students at the University of Bisha, Saudi Arabia. This sustained engagement with EFL instruction has provided the researcher with considerable opportunities to observe students' linguistic behaviour, patterns of vocabulary acquisition, classroom interactions, and recurring difficulties in comprehending unfamiliar lexical items. These observations have, in turn, prompted a critical consideration of the extent to which students' existing linguistic resources can be strategically utilized to facilitate the acquisition of English.

Although a range of established approaches and techniques—including the Grammar-Translation Method, the Direct Method, the Audio-Lingual Method, and Total Physical Response—can provide effective means of presenting and reinforcing vocabulary, classroom situations may arise in which the meaning of a particular lexical item cannot be adequately conveyed through English alone or readily demonstrated through conventional pedagogical techniques. In such circumstances, the strategic use of the students' first language may provide an effective supplementary resource, particularly when the language instructor possesses relevant knowledge of both the students' first language and another linguistically related language.

This possibility is especially significant in the context of Arabic-speaking students taught by language instructors whose first language is Urdu. Arabic and Urdu share a substantial degree of lexical and historical affinity, reflected in the presence of numerous cognates, borrowed, and structurally comparable lexical items. Consequently, an Urdu-speaking language instructor with an adequate degree of familiarity with Arabic may be able to identify lexical correspondences between the two languages and use them judiciously to clarify otherwise difficult English

vocabulary. Such cross-linguistic mediation can provide students with an accessible semantic reference point and may consequently facilitate their comprehension and retention of unfamiliar English lexical items.

Importantly, the proposed use of Arabic in this context is not intended to advocate a systematic return to first language-dependent instruction or to undermine the primacy of English in the EFL classroom. Rather, it is conceptualized as a selective and pedagogically purposeful strategy that may be employed when conventional English-medium explanations, contextualization, demonstration, or other instructional techniques prove insufficient to resolve a particular lexical difficulty. The pedagogical value of such an approach lies precisely in its strategic and limited application, whereby the students' existing linguistic knowledge is mobilized to support, rather than replace, meaningful engagement with the target language.

The researcher's prolonged experience of teaching English to Arabic-speaking students has provided a practical basis for identifying instances in which such cross-linguistic mediation may contribute to enhanced lexical comprehension. These observations suggest that the linguistic affinity between Arabic and Urdu warrants closer pedagogical consideration, particularly in EFL contexts involving Urdu-speaking language instructors and Arabic-speaking students. Accordingly, the present study seeks to examine Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity not merely as a linguistic phenomenon, but as a potentially valuable pedagogical resource that can be strategically incorporated into English language teaching. The findings may therefore be of particular relevance to Urdu-speaking EFL practitioners who possess some familiarity with Arabic and seek contextually appropriate strategies for addressing vocabulary-related difficulties among Arabic-speaking students of English.

As English as a Foreign Language (EFL) language instructors working in Saudi Arabian universities and colleges, Urdu-speaking language instructors may possess a distinctive linguistic resource that can be effectively integrated into their pedagogical practices. Drawing on sustained teaching experience in the Saudi Arabian higher-education context, the present study observes that Arabic and Urdu exhibit considerable linguistic affinity in several domains, including vocabulary, grammatical features, lexical root systems, pronunciation patterns, and writing

conventions. Although Arabic and Urdu are historically and structurally distinct languages, their extensive contact and shared lexical and linguistic features provide a potentially valuable basis for pedagogical mediation in English language classrooms.

The pedagogical value of this linguistic affinity extends beyond the recognition of individual lexical similarities. An Urdu-speaking instructor who is familiar with both Arabic and Urdu may be able to draw meaningful connections among the students' first language, the language instructors' linguistic background, and the target language, English. Such awareness can be particularly useful when explaining vocabulary, grammatical concepts, word formation, pronunciation, and other linguistic features that may present difficulties for Arabic-speaking students of English. By identifying relevant similarities, differences, and patterns across the three languages, the instructor may provide explanations that are more accessible, context-sensitive, and cognitively meaningful to students.

Conventional EFL pedagogy offers a wide range of instructional resources, including textbooks, workbooks, audio materials, video resources, digital platforms, and other multimedia technologies. Nevertheless, standardized teaching materials cannot always address the specific linguistic, cultural, and contextual needs of every group of students. In Saudi Arabian university classrooms, therefore, the language instructors' linguistic awareness and contextual knowledge may serve as an important supplementary pedagogical resource. When appropriately employed, knowledge of Arabic–Urdu linguistic relationships can enable instructors to supplement prescribed materials with explanations and examples that are directly relevant to the linguistic background of their students.

This consideration is particularly significant for Urdu-speaking instructors teaching English to Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabian higher-education institutions. Familiarity with Arabic and Urdu may enable such instructors to anticipate certain areas of linguistic difficulty and to employ comparative and contrastive explanations where appropriate. For instance, an instructor may draw attention to similarities in lexical items or patterns of word formation while simultaneously highlighting differences that could lead to misunderstanding or negative transfer. Similarly, awareness of pronunciation patterns and writing conventions may

assist instructors in explaining aspects of English that differ from the linguistic systems with which students are already familiar.

From a pedagogical perspective, this approach should not be construed as advocating the replacement of established EFL methodologies with Arabic- or Urdu-based instructional practices, nor should linguistic similarities be assumed to guarantee successful language acquisition. Rather, systematic awareness of Arabic–Urdu linguistic correspondences may function as a complementary pedagogical resource through which EFL instructors can respond more effectively and flexibly to the linguistic needs of their learners. Such an approach may further enable instructors to move beyond a predominantly textbook-dependent model of instruction by incorporating context-sensitive explanations that draw upon students' existing linguistic repertoire. The strategic integration of Arabic–Urdu linguistic knowledge into EFL pedagogy can therefore facilitate greater learner engagement, enhance metalinguistic awareness, and provide meaningful points of comparison between students' first or additional languages and English, while remaining consistent with established principles of communicative and learner-centered language teaching.

The relevance of this approach becomes even more apparent when considered in relation to Course Learning Outcomes (CLOs) and Intended Learning Outcomes (ILOs), which constitute fundamental components of university course specifications and instructional planning. Effective achievement of these outcomes requires instructors not only to possess strong proficiency in the target language but also to employ appropriate pedagogical strategies that respond to students' needs. An instructor with a sound understanding of Arabic and Urdu, in addition to English, may be better positioned to diagnose areas of difficulty, select appropriate explanatory strategies, and facilitate students' comprehension of complex linguistic concepts.

Accordingly, the present study conceptualizes Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity not merely as a matter of lexical or structural correspondence, but as a potentially valuable pedagogical resource in Saudi Arabian EFL contexts. For Urdu-speaking instructors teaching English to Arabic-speaking students, an informed awareness of the similarities and differences between Arabic and Urdu may enrich classroom interaction, complement conventional instructional

materials, and support more context-sensitive teaching practices. Ultimately, such linguistic awareness may contribute to more effective instruction and facilitate the attainment of the intended learning outcomes of EFL courses in Saudi Arabian higher-education institutions.

5. The Intellectual and Pedagogical Rationale Underpinning the Present Study

The principal rationale for the present study lies in examining the linguistic affinity between Urdu and Arabic and investigating its potential pedagogical significance within the context of English Language Teaching (ELT) in Arabic-speaking educational settings. This line of inquiry has emerged from the researcher's extensive professional engagement with English language teaching, particularly from his experience as an Assistant Professor in the Department of English at the University of Bisha, Saudi Arabia. Over the course of sustained interaction with Arabic-speaking students, the researcher has repeatedly encountered Arabic lexical items embedded in everyday communication. The established and familiar usage of these Arabic expressions in Urdu facilitated their recognition and comprehension by the researcher, a native speaker of Urdu and an instructor of English as a foreign language in Saudi Arabia.Such linguistic familiarity has not merely facilitated the researcher's own comprehension of Arabic; it has also contributed to greater confidence, immediacy, and effectiveness in classroom communication. On numerous occasions, recognition of an Arabic lexical item through its corresponding or closely related form in Urdu has enabled the researcher to infer meaning, interpret classroom discourse, and respond more effectively to students' communicative needs. This linguistic connection has, in turn, provided opportunities to employ Urdu–Arabic lexical correspondences as a supplementary resource for clarifying meanings, explaining unfamiliar English vocabulary, negotiating meaning, and supporting students' comprehension of the target language.

The cumulative experience of sustained classroom interaction has consequently drawn the researcher's attention to the potential role of Urdu as an indirect linguistic bridge between Arabic and English. The recurrent nature of these observations provides the principal impetus for the present inquiry. More specifically, the study seeks to examine whether the historical and lexical relationship between Urdu and Arabic may constitute an underrecognized pedagogical

resource for Urdu-speaking language instructors of English working with Arabic-speaking students, particularly within the Saudi Arabian educational context.

The study, however, does not presuppose structural equivalence between Urdu and Arabic, nor does it claim that familiarity with Urdu necessarily or automatically results in enhanced English language proficiency. Rather, its focus is deliberately confined to the potential pedagogical contribution of Urdu–Arabic lexical affinity to vocabulary clarification, classroom communication, meaning negotiation, and learner comprehension. By articulating and critically examining these practitioner-based observations, the study seeks to broaden scholarly consideration of multilingual linguistic resources in ELT and to draw attention to the ways in which students' and language instructors' existing linguistic repertoires may be strategically leveraged to support language learning. In this respect, the study offers a practitioner-informed perspective that may serve as a conceptual point of departure for subsequent empirical research into the pedagogical utility of Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity in English language education.

6. Literature Review

A review of the available literature reveals a dearth of research on the pedagogical potential of Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity in English language teaching, particularly within the context of Saudi Arabian universities. The intersection of Arabic–Urdu lexical affinity and English language pedagogy remains relatively underexplored. Although previous studies have examined Arabic–Urdu lexical relationships, cross-linguistic influence, and the use of multilingual resources in language teaching, comparatively little attention has been devoted to the pedagogical application of Arabic–Urdu lexical correspondences in English language classrooms. This underexplored area provides a rationale for investigating how an Urdu-speaking language instructors' knowledge of Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu may serve as an additional linguistic resource for facilitating English vocabulary learning among Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabian university classrooms. The study contributes specifically using an Urdu-speaking language instructors' knowledge of Arabic-derived vocabulary to support Arabic-speaking students of English.

The relationship between language, multilingualism, and second-language learning has received considerable attention in applied linguistics. In particular, growing research has demonstrated that students' existing linguistic knowledge can influence the acquisition and processing of an additional language. Rather than viewing students' previously acquired languages solely as potential sources of interference, contemporary approaches increasingly recognize multilingual linguistic resources as potentially valuable tools for facilitating comprehension, vocabulary development, and meaning making. This perspective provides an appropriate theoretical foundation for examining whether Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity can function as a pedagogical resource in English language teaching.

Urdu belongs to the Indo-Aryan branch of the Indo-European language family and developed historically in the linguistic environment of North India. Although its grammatical structure is fundamentally Indo-Aryan, its lexical and literary development has been strongly influenced by prolonged contact with Persian and Arabic. Arabic, in particular, has made a substantial contribution to the Urdu lexicon through centuries of religious, intellectual, cultural, and historical contact. Khan and Alward (2011) demonstrate that Arabic lexical items have become deeply integrated into Urdu, undergoing various processes of phonological, morphological, and grammatical adaptation.

Similarly, Ramasamy and Mangrio (2018) show that Arabic loan nouns in Urdu have been incorporated into the recipient language through processes of linguistic adaptation. These studies indicate that the presence of Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu is not incidental but represents a significant and enduring component of the language.

The relationship between Arabic and Urdu, however, should be understood in terms of lexical influence and historical language contact rather than genetic relatedness. Arabic belongs to the Semitic branch of the Afro-Asiatic language family, whereas Urdu is an Indo-Aryan language. Nevertheless, extensive historical contact has resulted in numerous lexical correspondences between the two languages. Ahmed (2017), for instance, examines common words in Arabic and Urdu and demonstrates that although many lexical items share similar forms and meanings, differences in semantic range and usage may also occur. Such findings are

particularly relevant to language pedagogy because lexical similarity can facilitate comprehension, while partial semantic correspondence may occasionally result in misunderstanding. Thus, Arabic–Urdu lexical relationships need to be examined critically rather than being treated as straightforward equivalence.

The pedagogical significance of lexical similarity can be understood more broadly through research on cross-linguistic influence and second-language vocabulary learning. Jarvis (2000) emphasizes the importance of identifying systematic L1 influence in the lexical development of second-language students, while Jarvis and Pavlenko (2007) provide a broader account of cross-linguistic influence in language and cognition. Research on cognates and lexical similarity further suggests that similarities between languages can facilitate the acquisition and processing of new vocabulary. Granger (1993) notes that cognates may function as either an aid or a potential source of difficulty in L2 vocabulary development, depending on the degree of similarity and the accuracy of the perceived correspondence. Tonzar et al. (2009) similarly found that cognate status can facilitate second-language vocabulary acquisition, although its effects may interact with learning conditions and learner characteristics.

More recent research has provided further evidence for the role of cross-linguistic lexical relationships in vocabulary learning. Mulder et al. (2019) demonstrate that L1–L2 lexical overlap is among the factors that can influence second-language vocabulary learning. Kemp and McDonald (2021) likewise show that semantic relatedness and formal similarity can affect vocabulary acquisition. More specifically, Shatz et al. (2023) examine the potential influence of crosslinguistic lexical similarity on lexical choices in L2 English, highlighting the relevance of lexical relationships between languages in English language learning. Such findings provide a useful theoretical basis for considering whether Arabic–Urdu lexical correspondences might provide Arabic-speaking students with an additional route to understanding unfamiliar English vocabulary.

Another relevant strand of scholarship concerns multilingual pedagogy and translanguaging. Creese and Blackledge (2010) argue that students' bilingual and multilingual resources can be strategically employed to support learning and teaching. García and Wei (2014)

similarly conceptualize translanguaging as a process through which multilingual speakers draw upon their broader linguistic repertoires in meaning-making and learning. From this perspective, linguistic resources should not necessarily be viewed as belonging to isolated and strictly separated language systems. Rather, language instructors and students may strategically mobilize their available linguistic knowledge according to the communicative and pedagogical demands of a particular context.

This perspective is particularly relevant to the Saudi Arabian EFL context, where Arabic-speaking students constitute the dominant linguistic group. Research has already demonstrated the potential usefulness of Arabic in English vocabulary learning. Khan (2016), for example, investigated the impact of native-language use on second-language vocabulary learning among Saudi EFL students and found that the use of Arabic translation could facilitate students' understanding of English vocabulary. Similarly, Masrai and Milton (2015) examined vocabulary learning among native Arabic-speaking students of English in Saudi Arabia and highlighted the relevance of L1 translation equivalents and other lexical factors in vocabulary learning. More recent research has also examined vocabulary-learning strategies among Saudi EFL students, indicating the continuing importance of bilingual and meaning-based strategies in the acquisition of English vocabulary (Aljasir, 2025).

Research on translanguaging in Saudi higher education provides an additional contextual basis for the present study. Almatrafi (2023), for example, examined Saudi EFL students' perceptions of pedagogical translanguaging and reported generally positive perceptions of the use of multiple linguistic resources in English-medium instruction. Such findings suggest that the strategic use of students' existing linguistic resources can have pedagogical value within Saudi university classrooms. The emerging literature therefore supports a broader understanding of English language teaching in which multilingual resources may be selectively employed to facilitate comprehension, explanation, and learning.

Taking together, the existing literature establishes three important points. First, Arabic has exerted substantial lexical influence on Urdu, resulting in a considerable body of Arabic-derived vocabulary within the Urdu lexicon (Khan & Alward, 2011; Ramasamy & Mangrio,

2018). Second, research on cross-linguistic influence and vocabulary acquisition indicates that lexical similarity, semantic relatedness, and previously acquired linguistic knowledge can contribute to second-language learning (Jarvis, 2000; Jarvis & Pavlenko, 2007; Mulder et al., 2019; Shatz et al., 2023). Third, research on multilingual pedagogy and Saudi EFL classrooms demonstrates the potential pedagogical value of drawing upon students' and language instructors' existing linguistic resources (Creese & Blackledge, 2010; García & Wei, 2014; Khan, 2016; Almatrafi, 2023).

Despite these developments, a relatively underexplored area remains at the intersection of these three strands of research. While previous studies have examined Arabic–Urdu lexical relationships, cross-linguistic influence, and the use of Arabic and other linguistic resources in English language teaching, comparatively little attention has been devoted to the pedagogical potential of Arabic–Urdu lexical affinity in English language instruction. In particular, limited research has examined how an Urdu-speaking language instructors' knowledge of Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu may be strategically employed to facilitate the comprehension of English lexical items among native Arabic-speaking students. The present study seeks to address this gap by investigating Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity as a potential pedagogical resource in English language teaching within Saudi Arabian university classrooms.

Research on multilingual language learning has increasingly emphasized the pedagogical value of students' existing linguistic resources. Rather than viewing the first language exclusively as a potential source of interference, recent scholarship has highlighted the ways in which previously acquired linguistic knowledge can facilitate additional language learning. This perspective is particularly relevant to vocabulary development, where lexical similarities across languages may provide students with useful points of semantic and formal association. In multilingual classrooms, therefore, language instructors may draw upon more than one linguistic system to mediate meaning and facilitate comprehension.

This perspective is especially relevant in contexts where students' first language shares substantial lexical material with another language known to the language instructor. In the case of Arabic-speaking students of English, the Arabic-derived lexical component of Urdu presents a

potentially valuable but comparatively underexplored pedagogical resource. Although Arabic and Urdu are genetically unrelated, extensive historical contact has resulted in a substantial body of Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu. Consequently, selected Arabic–Urdu lexical correspondences may provide a linguistic bridge through which difficult English vocabulary can be explained or contextualized for Arabic-speaking students.

7. Research Questions

The present study is guided by a set of significant research questions that are closely aligned with its objectives and scope. These questions provide the conceptual framework for the investigation and address the key issues underlying the study. Accordingly, the researcher seeks to examine these questions systematically and provide observational-based answers in its true sense through the insights, analysis and discussion presented in the study.

Language relationship → language instructor experience → classroom application → EFL pedagogy.

There are some possible research questions.

1. How can the linguistic affinity between Arabic and Urdu, particularly the extensive presence of Arabic-derived vocabulary as well as the common linguistic structures in Urdu, function as a pedagogical resource for Urdu-speaking English language instructors teaching Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabia?
2. What lexical and selected linguistic correspondences exist between Arabic and Urdu that are relevant to classroom communication?
3. How does knowledge of Urdu help Urdu-speaking English language instructors communicate with Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabian classrooms?
4. To what extent do language instructors perceive Urdu–Arabic linguistic familiarity as facilitating students' comprehension of English as a foreign language?
5. How does knowledge of Urdu facilitate classroom communication between Urdu-speaking English language instructors and Arabic-speaking students?
6. To what extent do Urdu-speaking EFL language instructors perceive Urdu–Arabic linguistic affinity as supporting students' comprehension of English?

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

7. Research Focus: Urdu–Arabic Linguistic Affinity in Saudi Arabian EFL Pedagogy

The present study seeks to explore the pedagogical potential of **Urdu–Arabic linguistic affinity** in the teaching of English as a Foreign Language (EFL) to Arabic-speaking students. Drawing upon the researcher's extensive professional experience and sustained classroom observations, the study pursues the following objectives:

- To identify and analyze significant lexical and linguistic commonalities between Urdu and Arabic and explore their potential role in facilitating students' comprehension and learning in the English language classroom.
- To explore the potential pedagogical relevance of **Urdu–Arabic linguistic similarities** in supporting the teaching and learning of English as a Foreign Language.
- To examine how Urdu-speaking English language instructors may draw upon their familiarity with Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu to facilitate communication and support English language learning among Arabic-speaking students.
- To explore the potential role of shared or closely related Arabic-derived lexical items and linguistic structures in clarifying English vocabulary and facilitating students' comprehension of related linguistic patterns and structures.
- To examine the potential benefits and limitations of employing Urdu–Arabic linguistic affinity as a supplementary pedagogical resource in EFL classrooms.
- To identify potential areas of **cross-linguistic influence and linguistic interference** arising from similarities and differences among Urdu, Arabic, and English.
- To examine how language instructors' awareness of Urdu–Arabic linguistic correspondences may facilitate classroom communication, meaning negotiation, vocabulary clarification, and the effective teaching of English.
- To underscore the potential of multilingual linguistic knowledge as an underrecognized pedagogical resource for enriching English language teaching and facilitating students' comprehension in Arabic-speaking educational contexts.

- To provide a practitioner-informed conceptual foundation for future empirical research into the pedagogical potential and utility of Urdu–Arabic linguistic affinity in English language education.

8. Morphological Structures as a Pedagogical Resource

The present study examines the potential pedagogical value of the historical and linguistic relationship between Arabic and Urdu, with particular emphasis on the substantial body of **Arabic-derived vocabulary and other common linguistic structures that are used in in spoken as well as written forms.** It explores how this linguistic affinity may function as a supplementary pedagogical resource for Urdu-speaking language instructors of English working with Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabia. The rationale for this inquiry has emerged from the researcher's extensive professional experience in foreign language pedagogy and from sustained engagement with Arabic-speaking students within the Saudi Arabian educational context.

A language instructor's familiarity with the morphological structures of both Urdu and Arabic can serve as an effective pedagogical resource in the English language classroom. For instance, when students experience difficulty understanding English words formed through prefixes, the language instructor can facilitate comprehension by decomposing the words into their constituent morphological elements. Consider, for example, the word impossible. The language instructor may first explain the base word possible, relating it to the familiar Urdu and Arabic lexical item **ممکن** (mumkin). The language instructor can then explain that the addition of the negative prefix im- changes the meaning of possible to impossible.Accordingly, an English language instructor's familiarity with the morphological, syntactic, and lexical structures of both Urdu and Arabic can be particularly valuable in multilingual classroom contexts. Such knowledge enables the instructors to identify relevant areas of linguistic correspondence and to employ them as intermediary resources for explaining unfamiliar English forms. By drawing attention to similarities and functional correspondences across the three languages, the language instructor can promote greater awareness of morphological structure and facilitate students'

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

understanding of English vocabulary in a systematic, comprehensible, and pedagogically effective manner.

As a native speaker of Urdu and an experienced language instructor of English at the University of Bisha, Saudi Arabia, the researcher has repeatedly observed that familiarity with Urdu, particularly its extensive Arabic-derived lexical repertoire as well the structural patterns, may facilitate certain dimensions of classroom teaching with Arabic-speaking students. Such linguistic familiarity may enable language instructors to establish rapport with students, clarify complex or unfamiliar concepts, negotiate meaning more effectively, interpret certain Arabic expressions, and provide supplementary explanations that support students'complete comprehension of the target language.Apart from the similar lexical items the morphological structures of both the languages too assist the compression of the entire class. For instance, A similar strategy can be applied to other words and expressions. For example, the concepts expressed by informal, illegal, and absent can be related to familiar Urdu–Arabic morphological patterns. In Urdu, students are familiar with formations such as **غیر رسمی** (ghair-rasmī, informal), **غیر قانونی** (ghair-qānūnī, illegal), and **غیر حاضر** (ghair-ḥāzir, absent). In these formations, غیر functions as a productive negative or privative prefix. Because this morphological pattern is already familiar to students through Urdu and Arabic, the language instructor can use it as a point of comparison when explaining English words that express negation or absence. Such cross-linguistic comparisons can make unfamiliar English vocabulary and the morphological patters more comprehensible by connecting new linguistic forms with structures that students already know. The pedagogical value, therefore, does not lie in treating Urdu or Arabic as substitutes for English, but in strategically activating students' existing linguistic knowledge to facilitate the acquisition of English vocabulary and word-formation patterns. Similarly, suffixation is a common morphological feature in both Arabic and Urdu, and several suffixal patterns exhibit noticeable similarities between the two languages. For example, the Arabic dual ending **ـين** (-ayn) occurs in words such as **والدين** (wālidayn), **جانبين** (jānibayn), and **ناظرين** (nāẓirayn), all of which are familiar forms within Arabic. Urdu has also incorporated numerous Arabic-derived words and morphological patterns, although these forms are often adapted

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

according to the phonological and morphological conventions of Urdu. For instance, Arabic-derived abstract nouns such as انسانیت (insāniyat), اہمیت (ahmiyat), and اکثریت (aksariyat) are widely used in Urdu. The word انسان (insān) is common to both Arabic and Urdu, while the addition of the suffix یت (-iyat) in Urdu produces the abstract noun انسانیت (insāniyat). Similarly, the Arabic أهمية (ahammiyyah) corresponds to the Urdu اہمیت (ahmiyat), while أكثرية (akthariyyah) corresponds to اکثریت (aksariyat). These examples demonstrate that Arabic-derived lexical and morphological elements have been integrated into Urdu and, in many cases, have been adapted to conform to Urdu's own linguistic patterns. Such similarities indicate that the relationship between Arabic and Urdu extends beyond vocabulary to include certain morphological structures and word-formation patterns. This linguistic affinity can be particularly valuable in English language teaching contexts in which the students have an Arabic linguistic background and the language instructor possesses familiarity with both Arabic and Urdu. The language instructors can draw upon these shared or familiar linguistic patterns as an additional pedagogical resource to clarify unfamiliar concepts, facilitate comprehension, and establish connections between students' existing linguistic knowledge and the structures of English.

In classroom situations, language instructors may sometimes find that, despite employing a range of established teaching methods, techniques, and strategies, certain linguistic concepts remain difficult for students to comprehend. This may create a communicative or pedagogical gap between the teacher's explanation and the students' understanding. Familiarity with Arabic–Urdu lexical and morphological correspondences can help language instructors bridge this gap by using linguistic structures that are already familiar to students as points of reference. Thus, Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity may function as an intermediary linguistic resource that complements conventional English language teaching practices and contributes to more effective classroom communication and comprehension. These sustained professional observations constitute the pedagogical impetus for the present inquiry and have prompted a closer examination of whether the Urdu–Arabic linguistic relationship can be strategically leveraged as an additional resource in English language teaching. The study does not, therefore, position Urdu as a substitute for Arabic proficiency; rather, it conceptualizes Urdu–Arabic lexical affinity as a

potentially valuable intermediary linguistic resource that can complement established pedagogical practices and facilitate classroom interaction, vocabulary clarification, meaning negotiation, and students' comprehension. More broadly, the study seeks to draw scholarly attention to the pedagogical possibilities inherent in language instructors' existing multilingual repertoires. It advances the view that linguistic knowledge acquired through one language may, under appropriate circumstances, provide useful points of connection with another language and thereby contribute to more responsive and context-sensitive language teaching. In this respect, the Urdu–Arabic linguistic relationship represents a potentially underexplored dimension of multilingual pedagogy in Saudi Arabian EFL contexts and warrants further scholarly consideration and empirical investigation.

8. Classroom Observations and Reflective Pedagogical Insights

Throughout my teaching experience, I have observed that my knowledge of Urdu has often been a useful linguistic resource while teaching English to native Arabic-speaking students. One aspect that has particularly attracted my attention is the presence of a large number of Arabic-derived words in Urdu. Because these words are familiar to me as an Urdu speaker, I have sometimes been able to recognize their Arabic counterparts and use this familiarity to understand or clarify expressions encountered in classroom interaction.

On several occasions, this linguistic connection has helped me explain unfamiliar English words and concepts to Arabic-speaking students. When I recognized an Arabic word through its familiar form or meaning in Urdu, I could use that connection to establish a link between the students' first language, Arabic, and the English language being taught. In such situations, the relationship between Urdu and Arabic provided an additional way of approaching meaning and communicating with students.

These recurring classroom experiences have led me to reflect on the possible pedagogical value of **Urdu–Arabic lexical affinity**. In particular, the study suggests that familiarity with Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu can, in certain instructional contexts, assist learners in interpreting the meanings of unfamiliar English lexical items and facilitate classroom communication. Such cross-linguistic associations may enable learners to draw upon previously

acquired linguistic knowledge when encountering new English forms. However, these correspondences should not be regarded as an automatic mechanism for English language acquisition. Rather, they may function as a supplementary pedagogical resource that instructors can strategically employ to support vocabulary comprehension, meaning negotiation, and classroom interaction in appropriate instructional contexts.

From my perspective as an English language instructor and a native speaker of Urdu, these observations have gradually drawn my attention to the possibility that Urdu may function as an **indirect linguistic bridge between Arabic and English**. This does not mean that Urdu can replace knowledge of Arabic, nor that the two languages are structurally identical. Rather, it suggests that the lexical relationship between Urdu and Arabic may offer an additional resource that Urdu-speaking language instructors can draw upon when working with Arabic-speaking students.

These observations form an important part of the motivation for the present study. They have encouraged me to examine more closely how the linguistic relationship between Urdu and Arabic may be understood and potentially utilized within English language teaching, particularly in the Saudi Arabian context. The study therefore emerges not only from linguistic interest but also from sustained classroom experience and reflection on the ways in which a language instructor's multilingual knowledge can contribute to communication, vocabulary clarification, and learner comprehension.

9. The Language instructors' familiarities of Urdu in Facilitating Classroom Communication and Vocabulary Comprehension

In English language classrooms where Urdu-speaking language instructors instruct native Arabic-speaking students, the language instructor's multilingual linguistic repertoire can serve as a valuable resource for facilitating classroom communication and supporting vocabulary comprehension. Although the Direct Method traditionally emphasizes the exclusive use of the target language and discourages reliance on the students' first language, actual classroom situations may occasionally require language instructors to draw upon additional linguistic resources when students encounter difficulty understanding unfamiliar words, expressions, or

International Journal of Indian Languages and Literature
A Peer-Reviewed Open Access Journal
ISSN : 3108-2254 IMPACT FACTOR : 4.25
Vol. 1, Issue 4 www.ijill.in July-Sept 2026

concepts. In contrast, approaches such as the Grammar-Translation Method explicitly acknowledge the pedagogical use of both the students' first language and the target language.

The researcher's extensive classroom experience suggests that Urdu-speaking language instructors may sometimes experience a gap between their own understanding of an English lexical item and their ability to communicate its precise meaning effectively to Arabic-speaking students, particularly when the students have limited proficiency in English. In such circumstances, although the language instructors may fully understand the meaning of a particular word, explaining it exclusively in English may not always lead to immediate or satisfactory comprehension. A carefully selected Arabic equivalent or explanation may therefore provide an effective means of overcoming this difficulty and helping students grasp the intended meaning.

Through sustained classroom interaction, the researcher has repeatedly observed that when Arabic-speaking students encounter difficulty understanding an English word, an appropriate explanation or clarification in Arabic can substantially facilitate their comprehension. Such clarification allows students to establish an immediate semantic connection between the unfamiliar English lexical item and a concept that is already familiar to them through their first language. This can be particularly valuable in vocabulary instruction, where accurate understanding of lexical meaning provides an essential foundation for further language development.

Within this context, the language instructor's knowledge of Urdu may serve as an additional linguistic resource. Urdu contains a considerable body of Arabic-derived vocabulary, reflecting centuries of historical, cultural, religious, and intellectual interaction between the two languages. Consequently, Urdu-speaking language instructors may recognize Arabic lexical forms, meanings, or semantic associations through their established counterparts in Urdu, even without extensive formal knowledge of Arabic. This familiarity can enable the language instructors to establish an indirect linguistic connection among Urdu, Arabic, and English, thereby supporting the explanation of unfamiliar vocabulary and facilitating classroom communication.

The researcher's classroom observations further indicate that such cross-linguistic connections can be particularly useful when students encounter difficulties in understanding or acquiring unfamiliar English vocabulary. Once an appropriate Arabic explanation is provided, students may demonstrate greater confidence and a clearer understanding of the lexical item being discussed. From this perspective, language instructors' Urdu linguistic repertoire can function as an indirect mediating resource, enabling them to recognize and strategically draw upon Arabic–Urdu lexical correspondences to support English language instruction. It is important to emphasize, however, that this perspective does not advocate the indiscriminate use of the students' first language, nor does it suggest that Urdu-speaking language instructors should replace English with Arabic as the primary medium of instruction. Rather, it supports the strategic, selective, and pedagogically motivated use of multilingual resources when explanations in the target language alone may not adequately facilitate comprehension. Such an approach is broadly compatible with contemporary perspectives on multilingual pedagogy and translanguaging, which view the linguistic repertoires of both language instructors and students as potentially valuable resources for meaning making and learning.

Accordingly, the researcher's long-term classroom observations provide an experiential basis for examining the pedagogical potential of Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity in Saudi Arabian EFL classrooms. These observations suggest that familiarity with Arabic-derived vocabulary in Urdu may enable Urdu-speaking language instructors to clarify difficult vocabulary, negotiate meaning, overcome occasional communication barriers, and support Arabic-speaking students' comprehension of English. The phenomenon therefore merits further scholarly investigation as a potentially underexplored dimension of multilingual pedagogy, cross-linguistic influence, and vocabulary instruction in English language teaching.

Conclusion

The linguistic relationship between Arabic and Urdu represents a valuable yet underexplored resource for English language teaching, particularly in multilingual classrooms where Urdu-speaking instructors teach Arabic-speaking students. The historical and sustained interaction between Arabic and Urdu has resulted not only in extensive lexical as well as

structuralborrowing but also in the adaptation and nativization of numerous linguistic elements, including morphological patterns, prefixes, suffixes, and word-formation processes. These shared features create points of linguistic familiarity that can be strategically utilized to facilitate English language learning in Saudi Arabian colleges and universities.

The overall presence of Arabic–Urdu lexical and structural correspondences may enable instructors to establish meaningful connections between students' existing linguistic knowledge and unfamiliar target language system. Similarly, awareness of morphological similarities between Arabic and Urdu can help instructors break down complex English words, explain prefixes and suffixes, clarify meanings, and draw attention to recognizable linguistic patterns. Such an approach may reduce students' cognitive burden, facilitate the negotiation of meaning, and promote greater classroom interaction and comprehension.However, Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity should not be viewed as a substitute for English language proficiency or for established pedagogical approaches. Rather, it can function as an additional intermediary linguistic resource that complements existing teaching practices in a practical room situation. Its effective use requires instructors to recognize both the similarities and differences among Arabic, Urdu, and English and to employ cross-linguistic connections selectively and pedagogically.

From a broader perspective, the Arabic–Urdu linguistic relationship illustrates how students' and instructors' existing linguistic repertoires can function as significant pedagogical resources in pedagogical educational programme. By systematically drawing upon lexical correspondences, morphological affinities, and nativized linguistic features shared across Arabic and Urdu, English language instructors can facilitate the explanation and acquisition of unfamiliar English forms. Such cross-linguistic connections may enhance students' comprehension, promote greater classroom engagement, and support more effective meaning-making processes. This perspective underscores the value of a multilingual and linguistically informed approach to English language pedagogy, particularly in educational contexts characterized by sustained contact among Arabic, Urdu, and English.

The present study has examined Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity as a potential pedagogical resource in English language teaching, with particular reference to the University of

Bisha in Saudi Arabia. Although Arabic and Urdu are genetically unrelated languages, centuries of sustained historical, cultural, religious, and intellectual contact have resulted in extensive Arabic lexical influence on Urdu, as well as the incorporation and adaptation of certain Arabic-derived morphological and structural features. These linguistic affinities constitute a potentially valuable cross-linguistic resource for Arabic-speaking students of English. In particular, recognition of familiar Arabic-derived lexical items and linguistic patterns embedded in Urdu may enable the students to establish meaningful associations with unfamiliar English vocabulary, morphological forms, and less familiar syntactic structures. By drawing upon students' existing multilingual repertoires, English language instructors can potentially facilitate the interpretation of unfamiliar linguistic forms, support processes of meaning construction, and enhance entire class engagement with English. The study therefore suggests that greater pedagogical attention to Arabic–Urdu linguistic correspondences may contribute to a more linguistically responsive, context-sensitive, and inclusive approach to English language teaching in multilingual Saudi Arabian university contexts.

The study suggests that the pedagogical value of Arabic–Urdu correspondence lies not merely in structural similarity in a broader perspective itself, but in the way such similarity can be purposefully employed to facilitate over all comprehension of the target language. An Urdu-speaking language instructor's linguistic repertoire may therefore constitute an additional classroom resource through which difficult English lexical items and other linguistic structures can be explained and contextualized for Arabic-speaking students. However, such correspondences must be selected carefully, as differences in pronunciation, usage, and semantic range may sometimes produce misleading associations.

More broadly, the study supports a multilingual and linguistically responsive approach to English language teaching in which students' and language instructors' existing linguistic resources are viewed as potential assets rather than obstacles. It extends existing research on cross-linguistic influence, vocabulary learning, grammatical structures, and translanguaging by drawing attention to the relatively underexplored pedagogical intersection of Arabic and Urdu in English language instruction. The study consequently argues, based on personal observations,

that multilingual language instructors can strategically use their linguistic knowledge to create additional pathways to learning while maintaining English as the primary target language of instruction.

Ultimately, Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity should be understood not simply as a historical outcome of language contact, but as a potentially valuable pedagogical resource. In the Saudi Arabian EFL context, its careful and purposeful use may facilitate vocabulary as well as structural patterns in learning, strengthen comprehension, and promote greater linguistic awareness. Further empirical research is warranted to examine the effectiveness of this approach across different proficiency levels and instructional contexts.

The relationship between Urdu and Arabic is not a relationship of genetic descent. Urdu is Indo-Aryan, whereas Arabic is Semitic. Their principal connection is therefore historical, cultural and lexical. Arabic has contributed a vast number of words to Urdu, and many of these words belong to recognizable Arabic derivational families based on consonantal roots.

The Arabic root system, particularly the triliteral root system, is one of the most significant features distinguishing Arabic morphology from Urdu morphology. Urdu has borrowed numerous products of Arabic derivation, but it has not adopted the complete Arabic root-and-pattern system as a productive native morphological mechanism. This distinction between borrowing vocabulary and borrowing a morphological system is fundamental to the linguistic study of Arabic and Urdu. Ultimately, Urdu may be understood as a language whose grammatical foundation is rooted in the Indo-Aryan linguistic tradition, while its vocabulary reflects centuries of sustained interaction with Persian, Arabic, Turkish, English, and other languages. Among these influences, the contribution of Arabic is particularly prominent in the intellectual, religious, literary, and scholarly registers of Urdu. The depth and continuity of this linguistic interaction make Arabic–Urdu linguistic relations a significant area of inquiry within South Asian linguistics and the broader field of language-contact studies.Furthermore, the linguistic affinity between Arabicand Urdu and may have important pedagogical implications for Urdu-speaking instructors teaching English as a foreign language to Arabic-speaking students in Saudi Arabian colleges and universities. When learners encounter persistent difficulties in

comprehending unfamiliar English lexical, morphological, or syntactic features, instructors may draw strategically on their knowledge of Arabic and Urdu to provide additional linguistic support. Existing correspondences between these languages can be used to establish cross-linguistic connections between unfamiliar English forms and linguistic patterns already familiar to students through their multilingual repertoires. Such an approach may offer an alternative means of clarifying complex linguistic concepts, facilitating comprehension, and enabling students to relate new English forms to their existing linguistic knowledge.

By recognizing and appropriately drawing upon similarities, correspondences, and shared linguistic patterns between Arabic and Urdu, instructors may be able to establish meaningful connections between language instructors' linguistic background and difficult aspects of the target language. Their linguistic awareness, professional experience, and classroom observations can therefore contribute to making certain areas of English more accessible and comprehensible. In this respect, Arabic–Urdu linguistic affinity should not be construed as a replacement for established methodologies of English language teaching; rather, it may be conceptualized as a complementary linguistic resource that can be integrated into existing pedagogical practices to support and potentially enhance the teaching and learning of English as a foreign language in the Saudi Arabian colleges and universities.

Bibliographical References

Ahmed, A. (2022). A survey of usage of Quranic words in Urdu language: Semantic, accentual and orthographic perspective. Bunyad, 13(1).

Ahmed, Z. (2017). The differences of semantics of common words between Arabic and Urdu and its impact on the teaching of the Arabic language. Journal of Islamic and Religious Studies, 2(1), 43–56. https://doi.org/10.36476/JIRS.2:1.06.2017.16

Aljasir, N. (2025). Vocabulary learning strategies among Saudi EFL language instructors: A proficiency-level comparison using think-aloud protocols. Cogent Education, 12(1), Article 2472480. https://doi.org/10.1080/2331186X.2025.2472480

Almatrafi, B. S. (2023). Saudi EFL students' perceptions of pedagogical translanguaging in English medium instruction. International Journal of Language and Literary Studies, 5(4), 172–191. https://doi.org/10.36892/ijlls.v5i4.1460

Barker, M. A. R., et al. (1975). Spoken Urdu (Vols. 1–3). Ithaca, NY: Spoken Language Services.

Batool, R., & Saleem, T. (2023). Comparative construction morphology of diminutive forms in English and Urdu. Cogent Arts & Humanities.

Chatterji, S. K. (1942). Indo-Aryan and Hindi. Calcutta: University of Calcutta.

Creese, A., & Blackledge, A. (2010). Translanguaging in the bilingual classroom: A pedagogy for learning and teaching? The Modern Language Journal, 94(1), 103–115. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4781.2009.00986.x

García, O., & Wei, L. (2014). Translanguaging: Language, bilingualism and education. Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1057/9781137385765

Granger, S. (1993). Cognates: An aid or a barrier to successful L2 vocabulary development? ITL – International Journal of Applied Linguistics, 99–100, 43–56. https://doi.org/10.1075/itl.99-100.03gra

Grierson, G. A. (1916). Linguistic Survey of India. Calcutta: Office of the Superintendent of Government Printing.

Iḥsānulḥaq. (2005). Urdūʿ Arabīkelisānīrishte [Linguistic relations between Urdu and Arabic]. Karachi: Qirtas.

Ilyas, M., & Al-Shibani, M. (2019). Asymmetrical subject-verb agreement in Standard Arabic and Urdu languages: A comparative study. International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 7(5), 228–243.

Islam, R. A. (2012). The morphology of loanwords in Urdu: The Persian, Arabic and English strands (Doctoral dissertation). Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne.

Islam, R. A. (2015). The morphology of loanwords in Urdu: The Persian, Arabic and English strands. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Jarvis, S. (2000). Methodological rigor in the study of transfer: Identifying L1 influence in the interlanguage lexicon. Language Learning, 50(2), 245–309. https://doi.org/10.1111/0023 8333.00118

Jarvis, S., & Pavlenko, A. (2007). Crosslinguistic influence in language and cognition. Routledge.

Kemp, L. S., & McDonald, J. L. (2021). Second language vocabulary acquisition: The effects of semantic relatedness, form similarity, and translation direction. Language Learning, 71(3), 716–756. https://doi.org/10.1111/lang.12449

Kerānawī, W. (1968). Al-Qāmūs al-Jadīd: Urdū–ʿArabī dictionary. Delhi: MaktabaIshāʿat al Qurʾān.

Khan Khweshgi, M. A. (1989). Farhang-iʿĀmirah: Urdūzabān men mustaʿmalʿArabī, Fārsī aur Turkīalfāẓ. Islamabad: MuqtadirahQaumī Zaban.

Khan, A. G., & Alward, M. A. (2011). Arabic loan words in Urdu: A linguistic analysis. Limbajși Context / Speech and Context, 3(1), 27–36. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.502047

Khan, I. A. (2014). Lexical borrowings from Arabic and semantic change in Urdu: A cross linguistic analysis. Hope Journal of Research, 2(3), 47–55.

Khan, M. H. (1948). Muqaddama-e-Tārīkh-e Zabān-e Urdu. Aligarh.

---. (1966). Muqaddamat-e-Sher-o-Zaban. Lahore: Urdu Markaz.

---. (1973). Urdu ka Almiya. Shoba-e-Lisaniyat, Muslim University, Aligarh.

---. (1979). Yeh qadim Deccani Urdu ki lughat. Andhra Pradesh Sahitya Akademi, Hyderabad.

---. (1983). Iqbal ki nazari-o-amalisheriyat. Iqbal Institute, Kashmir University, Srinagar.

---. (1984). Urdu zaban ki tareekh ka khaka. Aligarh: Sir Syed Book Depot. Aligarh

---. (1986). Urdu lafz ka sautiyati aur tajzi-e-sautiyatimutala.

---. (1988). Urdu zaban: Tareekh, tashkeel, taqdeer.

---. (1989). Maqalat-e-Masud: Lisani-o-ilmimazameen ka majmua.

---. (1990). Yusuf Husain Khan.

---. (1995). Urdu ghazal kenashtar.

---. (1997). Mazameen-e-Masud.

---. (1998). Mohammad Quli Qutub Shah.

---. (2016). The impact of native language use on second language vocabulary learning by Saudi EFL students. English Language Teaching, 9(5), 134–140. https://doi.org/10.5539/elt.v9n5p134

Khan, S. (2013). The sociocultural impact of Arabic loanwords on the present-day vocabulary of Urdu. Language in India, 13(1).

Maqsood, B., Saleem, T., Aziz, A., & Azam, S. (2019). Grammatical constraints on the borrowing of nouns and verbs in Urdu and English. SAGE Open. https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019853469

Matthews, D. J., & Dalvi, M. K. (1999). Teach Yourself Urdu. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Matthews, D. J., Shackle, C., & Husain, S. (2003). Urdu Literature. Islamabad: Oxford University Press.

Mirdehghan, M. (2010). Persian, Urdu, and Pashto: A comparative orthographic analysis. Writing Systems Research, 2(1), 9–23. https://doi.org/10.1093/wsr/wsq005

Mulder, E., van de Ven, M., Segers, E., & Verhoeven, L. (2019). Context, word, and student predictors in second language vocabulary learning. Applied Psycholinguistics, 40(1), 137–166. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0142716418000504

Nadwi Azhari, M. Z. (2017). Al-Qāmūs al-Azhar: Urdu–Arabic dictionary. Mau Nath Bhanjan, Uttar Pradesh: Maktaba Al-Faheem.

Nation, I. S. P. (2001). Learning vocabulary in another language. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139524759

Otwinowska, A., & Szewczyk, J. M. (2019). The more similar the better? Factors in learning cognates, false cognates and non-cognate words. International Journal of Bilingual Education and Bilingualism, 22(8), 974–991. https://doi.org/10.1080/13670050.2017.1325834

Platts, J. T. (1884a). A grammar of the Hindustani or Urdu language. London: W. H. Allen and Co.

Platts, J. T. (1884b). A dictionary of Urdu, classical Hindi, and English. London: W. H. Allen and Co.

Rafi, Z., &Sholla, S. (2023). Towards an Arabic–Urdu common lexicon using NLP [Preprint]. TechRxiv. https://doi.org/10.36227/techrxiv.23536284.v1

Ramasamy, M. D., &Mangrio, R. A. (2018). Adaptation of Arabic loan nouns in Urdu and Malay: A comparative study. Journal of Indian Studies, 11(1), 92–137. https://doi.org/10.22452/JIS.vol11no1.8

Schmidt, R. L. (1981). Dakhini Urdu: History and structure. New Delhi: Motilal Banarsidass.

---. (1999). Urdu: An essential grammar. London: Routledge.

---. (2004). Urdu. In G. Cardona & D. Jain (Eds.), The Indo-Aryan languages (pp. 286–350). London: Routledge.

Shackle, C., & Snell, R. (1990). Hindi and Urdu since 1800: A common reader. London: SOAS.

Shatz, I., Alexopoulou, T., & Murakami, A. (2023). Examining the potential influence of crosslinguistic lexical similarity on word-choice transfer in L2 English. PLOS ONE, 18(2), e0281137. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0281137

Small, G. (1895). A grammar of the Urdū or Hindūstānī language in its Romanized character. Calcutta: Thacker, Spink and Co.

Stratton, J. M. (2022). Intentional and incidental vocabulary learning: The role of historical linguistics in the second language classroom. The Modern Language Journal, 106(4), 837–857. https://doi.org/10.1111/modl.12805

Tonzar, C., Lotto, L., & Job, R. (2009). L2 vocabulary acquisition in children: Effects of learning method and cognate status. Language Learning, 59(3), 623–646. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9922.2009.00519.x

Web resources and references

https://www.google.com/search?q=arabic+words+used+in+urdu+in+communication+and+writi g+etc.+&sca_esv=7815bc7e9a9f8b73&rlz=1C1GCEA_enSA1142SA1142&biw=1440 bih=739&sxsrf=APpeQnuSaFyv6IRbKshJE_TI4O5ThoC_NA%3A1788078874162&ei P-qTao6bErHGi-gP5O2B0Q8&uact=5&sclient=gws-wiz-

serp&fbs=ABfTbFVyMZGZf1hfvX9uKjN_G8c4u0nXx4bEIpwm1lnNH832a9BVCEiB2iPJNeNderQwLP8msUKsz-6AMxGyueJZ9cK2mNBy2II_6WvkKSZWdegslZITv4C2ITIiG_Zhv1CUVVCFZGgo3Z3gGlpWh4hmaVbQHT1-5w12lVdW-6Wi-I2FI08mKlJq6aK8xb91xerMNRhHhYeKLDDB9urDhxYqUhm4-VQ&aep=10&ntc=1&mstk=AUtExfCbMGV_VKxY5RPaE2aRlvAUdlhoaaSQZKwWPBSHwcS6M2mZNQuj0aSP1s-DdriuvuMFUkoypX-gTKWKUjYVEvBS6afj3FeUWuJ1y5wPZYaMFIslNuhbXTKXcQ_oednm6qYuajFtkg7N4ioE8WlXUIJhyoiMRxetYWklsNwkcHLr6I2qglKHrQLT-8MLk4dD75LrYohq85P3JPwheDvzyfR4VdqZvhXqf71Cz9nJC2-druZRSjDaQJaVrMLJpH4MszKsrdkAYm3w&aioh=3&csuir=1&cs=0&atvm=2&mtid=IOuTaoUNpONhbIPnY25gQU&udm=50