

DAVID L. GOLD  
New York  
dovedleyzer@yahoo.com

## TWO COMMENTS ON MAREK STACHOWSKI'S "HOW TO COMBINE BARK, FIBULA, AND CHASM (IF ONE SPEAKS PROTO-TURKIC)?"

**Keywords:** Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew, Latin, Persian, Proto-Turkic

### Abstract

This note reacts to an article by Marek Stachowski in *Studia Linguistica UIC* (no. 127, 2010, pp. 179–186) by suggesting that a phonemic opposition between /b/ and /v/ may be a relatively late development in the world's known languages and by suggesting that dialectal Turkish *goğuz* 'nutshell' may in some way be etymologically related to certain words in Arabic, Aramaic, Hebrew, and Persian meaning 'nut'.

M.S.'s "How to combine bark, fibula, and chasm (if one speaks Proto-Turkic)?" (*Studia Linguistica Universitatis Iagellonicae Cracoviensis*, no. 127, 2010, pp. 179–186) prompts two comments.

M.S. writes:

The sound value of the respective rune in the Old Turkic alphabet might have positionally varied between a fricative  $\beta \sim \nu$  and a stop  $b$  (Erdal 1998: 139). Nevertheless, we usually do not accept simultaneous existence of both  $b$  and  $\nu$  at the phonological level. (p. 180).

M.S.'s reluctance to accept Erdal's assumption of a phonemic contrast between /b/ and /v/ is based on Turkological considerations. It is also justified by the fact that that opposition is, probably more often than not, a relatively late development in the world's known languages.

For instance, whereas most latter-day varieties of Hebrew have a phonemic opposition between /b/ and /v/, it is not believed to have existed in Earliest Hebrew.

Rather, Earliest Hebrew is presumed to have had \*/u/, \*/b/, and \*/bb/ but not \*/v/. In certain later varieties of the language, these changes occurred (in the order shown):

- 1) \*/u/ split into /u/ and /v/.
- 2) \*/b/ became \*/v/ (thus merging with /v/ reflecting \*/u/).
- 3) \*/bb/ became /b/ (which, of course, is historically not the \*/b/ mentioned in the previous paragraph).

Or, to take another example, Classical Latin is assumed to have had \*/b/ and \*/u/ but not \*/v/. Only in post-Classical Latin did the language acquire \*/v/ (when \*/u/ split into \*/u/ and \*/v/).

\*  
\*\*

M.S. writes:

There exists only one variant pointing to \*-g, i.e. Tksh.dial. *goğuz* 'nutshell' [...] (p. 180).

Not only is it easy to agree that the word should be considered an innovation (thus, a word that does not go back, at least not entirely, to Proto-Turkic) but it is also possible that the word is either a borrowing of an Arabic, Aramaic, or Persian word or a blend of a native Turkish word and an Arabic, Aramaic, or Persian word (in both cases, I have in mind Arabic, Aramaic, and Persian words that are cognate with Hebrew *egoz* 'nut').