

Frederik KORTLANDT

Leiden University

## WHAT IS STANG'S LAW?

**Abstract.** Stang's law is an ambiguous concept. On the one hand, it refers to a retraction of the stress from non-acute long vowels to the preceding syllable in Slavic. On the other hand, it refers to the development of acc.sg. Vedic *dyám* 'sky', *gám* 'bull, cow', Greek Ζῆν(α), βῶν, from *\*dieum*, *\*g<sup>w</sup>oum*. Stang derived the long vowel from the diphthong before the tautosyllabic nasal consonant. Alternatively, the long vowel can be attributed to monosyllabic lengthening followed by the loss of *\*-u-* before the tautosyllabic nasal.

I have proposed that *\*-u-* was lost before word-final *\*-m* at a stage before the monosyllabic lengthening, yielding *\*diēm* < *\*diem* < *\*dieum* and *\*g<sup>w</sup>ēH<sub>3</sub>m* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>m* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>um*. Latvian *gūovs* reflects the acc.sg. form *\*g<sup>w</sup>ēH<sub>3</sub>m* with loss of the laryngeal after the long vowel. The paradigm with a full grade suffix *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>-* and the loss of laryngeals before final *\*-m* were dialectal Indo-European innovations. Nasal vowels in final syllables lost their nasality in East Baltic.

The loss of *\*-u-* before *\*-m* in Vedic *gám* and Greek βῶν, the rise of the long vowel in these forms, the loss of the laryngeal in Latvian *gūovs*, the generalization of the full grade *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>-* in the paradigm, the loss of laryngeals before *\*-m*, and the loss of nasality in East Baltic final syllables are all chronologically distinct developments, none of which can appropriately be called Stang's law. It is therefore preferable to use this term only in reference to the retraction of the stress from non-acute long vowels in Slavic, which is the basis of modern Slavic accentology.

**Keywords:** Balto-Slavic; Indo-European; historical phonology; Stang's law.

Stang's law is an ambiguous concept. On the one hand, it refers to a retraction of the stress from non-acute long vowels to the preceding syllable in Slavic (cf. Stang 1957, 169; Ebeling 1967, 591f.; Vermeer 1984, 333; Collinge 1985, 179; Kortlandt 2011, 172, 271). This development gave rise to the neo-acute in accent paradigm (b). It is sometimes collapsed with the retraction of the stress from medial and final jers, which also gave rise to a neo-acute (cf. Stang 1957, 168; Olander 2009, 131; Kortlandt 2011, 170, 173, 272). This is a big mistake because the retraction from final jers

was a Proto-Slavic development that affected accent paradigm (c) whereas the retraction from medial jers belonged to the separate languages and was independent of the accent paradigms (cf. Kortlandt 2014a, 129). All of these retractions are sometimes called Ivšić’s law (cf. Holzer 2007, 72f.), which sometimes includes even later retractions (cf. Kapović 2015, who distinguishes between “Ivšić’s law” for Stang’s law, “Ivšić’s rule” for the retraction from final jers, and “Ivšić’s retraction” for what I have called Ivšić’s law, cf. Kortlandt 2011, 272). While Ivšić recognized accent retractions as a source of the neo-acute (1911), he did not understand the extent of his findings. It is Stang’s great merit that he has identified the relation between retractions of the stress and the accent paradigms where they operated. The rejection of Stang’s law by the Moscow Accentological School (cf. Hendriks 2003) is based on a misunderstanding of its conditions (cf. Kortlandt 2011, 111–115, also 2015 and 2016b).

On the other hand, Stang’s law refers to the development of acc.sg. Vedic *dyám* ‘sky’, *gám* ‘bull, cow’, Greek Ζῆν(α), βῶν, Latin *diem*, Umbrian *bum* from *\*dieum*, *\*g<sup>w</sup>oum*, also acc.pl. Vedic *gás*, Greek βῶς, Umbrian *buf* from *\*g<sup>w</sup>ouns* (cf. Stang 1970, 40–44; Collinge 1995, 37f.; Pronk 2016). Stang derived the long vowel from the diphthong before the tautosyllabic nasal consonant. Alternatively, the long vowel can be attributed to monosyllabic lengthening followed by the loss of *\*-u-* before the tautosyllabic nasal (cf. Kortlandt 2014c, 219f.; Pronk 2016, 28–31). The problem with this hypothesis is that the accentual difference between Greek Ζεύς on the one hand and ναῦς ‘ship’ and βοῦς ‘bull, cow’ on the other suggests that the latter represent disyllabic *\*naHus* < *\*neH<sub>2</sub>us* and *\*g<sup>w</sup>oHus* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>us*. Indeed, this reconstruction is confirmed by Vedic disyllabic *náus* < *\*neH<sub>2</sub>u-s* (cf. Lubotsky 1995, 229). It follows that Vedic monosyllabic *gáus* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>ōus* cannot be the phonetic reflex of the PIE form.

The PIE words for ‘ship’ and ‘bovine animal’ belonged to different accent paradigms (cf. Kortlandt 1985, 118):

	Vedic	Greek	PIE	Vedic	Greek	PIE
nom.sg.	<i>náus</i>	ναῦς	<i>*neH<sub>2</sub>us</i>	<i>gáus</i>	βοῦς	<i>*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>us</i>
acc.sg.	<i>návam</i>	ναῦν	<i>*nH<sub>2</sub>eum</i>	<i>gám</i>	βῶν	<i>*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>um</i>
gen.sg.	<i>nāvás</i>	ναῖός	<i>*nH<sub>2</sub>ues</i>	<i>gós</i>	βοός	<i>*g<sup>w</sup>H<sub>3</sub>eus</i>

The questionable form *vāv* (Herodian I 328) beside analogical *vaūv* “peut être ancien” (Chantraine 1967, 97). The difference between the two

accent paradigms suggests the possibility that the word for ‘bovine animal’ was an original neuter that adopted the endings  $*-s$  and  $*-m$  at an early stage of Proto-Indo-European. It thus appears that Vedic monosyllabic *gáus* cannot reflect PIE  $*g^w eH_3us$  phonetically and that the accusative *gám* (Gathic monosyllabic *gqm*) from PIE  $*g^w eH_3um$  cannot have resulted from the loss of  $*-u-$  after a long vowel from monosyllabic lengthening. Pronk reconstructs an analogical acc.sg. form  $*g^w H_3eum$  for which there is no evidence, “probably [...] in analogy to *\*dieum*” (2016, 30). This is improbable because nom.sg. *\*dieus* was created on the analogy of acc.sg. *\*dieum* at an early stage of Proto-Indo-European (cf. *ibidem*) while nom.sg.  $*g^w eH_3us$  was preserved in Greek βούς. I have therefore proposed that  $*-u-$  was lost before word-final  $*-m$  at a stage before the monosyllabic lengthening, yielding  $*diēm < *diem < *dieum$ ,  $*nH_2ē̄m < *nH_2em < *nH_2eum$ ,  $*g^w ē̄H_3m < *g^w eH_3m < *g^w eH_3um$  (cf. Kortlandt 2014c, 220f.). The circumflex of *vāv̄ς* and βῶν may have been taken from nom.sg. *vāv̄ς*, βούς as well as from acc.pl. *vāv̄ς < \*neH\_2uns*, βούς  $< *g^w eH_3uns$ , where the long vowel never originated. Vedic generalized the oblique stem *nāv-*  $< *neH_2u-$  with analogical full grade and introduced lengthened grade in the nominative *gáus* for disambiguation from gen.sg. *gós*. The acc.pl. form *gás* was created on the analogy of acc.sg. *gám*. Latvian *gùovs* reflects the acc.sg. form  $*g^w ē̄H_3m$ , with loss of the laryngeal after the long vowel, like *sàls < \*sē̄H\_2l*, which is an original neuter *l*-stem.

The loss of  $*-u-$  before word-final  $*-m$  has important consequences for the aorist of the verb ‘to be’, the root of which I reconstruct as  $*b^h eH_3u-$ , not  $*b^h eH_2u-$ , on the evidence of Middle Welsh *bu* ‘was’ and Armenian *busanim* ‘I grow’ (cf. Kortlandt 2007, 125). The laryngeal preceded the semivowel in view of the broken tone in Latvian *bût*, final stress in Russian *bylá* (where Hirt’s law did not operate), the acute in Serbo-Croatian *bàviti < \*b^h oHu-*, Old English *bōgian*, and the short vowel in Old Irish *buith* (= Lith. *būtis*), *ro-both*, and Latin *fūtūrus* (cf. Kortlandt 2007, 43). After the loss of  $*-u-$  before  $*-m$  we have a paradigm 1st sg.  $*b^h eH_3m$ , 2nd sg.  $*b^h eH_3us$ , 3rd sg.  $*b^h eH_3ut$ , pl.  $*b^h H_3u-$ , with metathesis  $*b^h uH_3-$  before a consonant. This paradigm is reflected in the Old Irish preterit 1st sg. *-bá < \*bōm*, *-roba*, *-bsa*, 3rd sg. *-boí < \*bou-e*, *-robae*, *-bo < \*bou* ‘was’ (cf. Thurneysen 1946, 483; Kortlandt 2007, 125f.). The Central Indo-European languages (i.e. Classic Indo-European without Italo-Celtic) generalized the zero grade variant of the root, e.g. 3rd sg. Vedic *ábhūt*, Greek *ἔφῦ < \*b^h uHt < \*b^h H\_3ut*. The vocalization

of the ending in the Vedic 1st sg. form *ābhuvam* suggests earlier  $*b^h euH_3m$  replacing monosyllabic  $*b^h eH_3m$ .

The distinction between proterodynamic and hysterodynamic nouns has been preserved in Vedic *devī* <  $*-iH_2$ , acc. *devīm* <  $*-iH_2m$ , gen. *devyās* <  $*-ieH_2s$  ‘goddess’ versus *vṛkís* <  $*-iH_2s$ , acc. *vṛkyàm* < *vṛkíam* <  $*-iH_2m$ , gen. *vṛkyàs* < *vṛkías* <  $*-iH_2es$  ‘she-wolf’, also Latin *militia* ‘military service’ versus *māteriēs* ‘material’, Russian *bogínja* ‘goddess’ versus *mólnija* ‘lightning’, Lithuanian *patì* ‘wife’ versus *vilkė* ‘she-wolf’, Prussian *sansy* ‘goose’ versus *mealde* ‘lightning’ (cf. Kortlandt 1997). I have argued that the acc.sg. form of the hysterodynamic paradigm ended in  $*-eiHm$ , which is reflected in Latin *māteriem* <  $*māteriēm$  <  $*-eiem$  (as distinct from *velim* ‘I will’ <  $*uelīm$  <  $*ueliH_1m$ ) and Prussian *warein* ‘power’ (Latvian *vara*, *vare*), also Slavic *svekrovь* <  $*-euHm$  (cf. Rozwadowski 1914, 14–18), similar to the Vedic 1st sg. thematic optative ending *-eyam* <  $*-oiH_1m$ . Pronk thinks that PIE  $*-VHm$  regularly yielded vocalization of the final nasal in Indo-Iranian and that the Vedic monosyllabic acc.sg. endings  $-ām$  and  $-īm$  are analogical (2016, 23). The problem with this view, as Pronk points out himself, is that the nom. sg. endings  $-ā$  and  $-ī$  are never shortened before a pause and cannot therefore directly reflect  $*-aH$  and  $*-iH$  (cf. Kuiper 1997, 319). It follows that the long vowels must have been taken from the acc.sg. endings  $-ām$  <  $*-aHm$  and  $-īm$  <  $*-iHm$  after the loss of the laryngeal with compensatory lengthening before the final nasal. I conclude that Pronk’s examples of disyllabic  $*-VHm$  partly represent earlier diphthongs before  $*-Hm$  and partly analogical  $*-Ham$  after a full grade vowel, e.g. in Vedic disyllabic *gnām* < *gnāam* ‘woman’ <  $*g^w neH_2-$ , trisyllabic *yāyām* < *yāyāam* ‘I may go’ <  $*ieH_2-ieH_1-$ , Gothic *mazdqm* < *mazdaqm* ‘wise’ <  $*mns-d^h eH_1-$ . The loss of  $*-H-$  before final  $*-m$  may have been an innovation of the Central Indo-European languages, as is clear from Lithuanian non-acute  $-q$ , Greek  $-áv$ , Gothic  $-a$ , all from  $*-ām$  <  $*-aHm$  <  $*-eH_2m$ , distinct from the 1st sg. thematic optative ending Vedic *-eyam*, Greek  $-oia$ , Gothic  $-au$  <  $*-oiH_1m$ , where  $*-m$  became syllabic. The restoration of the laryngeal in Indo-Iranian  $*gnaHam$ ,  $*-iaHam$ ,  $*-d^h aHam$  was more recent than the contraction in gen.sg.  $*-ās$ , dat.sg.  $*-āi$ , nom.pl.  $*-ās$  and the Indo-Iranian vocalization of the syllabic nasals that gave rise to new intervocalic laryngeals, e.g. in Vedic *mās* ‘moon’ <  $*maHas$  <  $*meH_1ns$  and *vātas* ‘wind’ <  $*vaHatas$  <  $*ueH_1ntos$ .

The Latin paradigm of the  $H_2$ -stems has a short vowel in nom.sg.  $-a$  and acc.sg.  $-am$  and an ambiguous diphthong  $-ae$  in the gen.sg. and dat.

sg. endings. The Old Irish nom.sg. and dat.sg. forms are ambiguous while the acc.sg. ending *\*-em* must be derived from short *\*-am* and the gen.sg. ending *-e* points to *\*-ias*. There is no evidence for long *\*ā* either in Latin or in Old Irish and the short vowel of the acc.sg. ending in the latter language is unambiguous (cf. Kortlandt 2014b, 9f.). The alleged shortening of long vowels before a final nasal consonant is based exclusively on the evidence of Indo-Iranian and Greek and must be rejected in favor of the view that *-a* and *-am* represent zero grade endings *\*-H<sub>2</sub>* and *\*-H<sub>2</sub>m* with vocalization of the laryngeal. The Old Irish gen.sg. ending *-e* suggests that the original Italo-Celtic ending was *\*-ī*, as it was in the *o*-stems, and that it was replaced by *\*-āī* in Latin and adopted an additional gen.sg. ending *\*-os* in the ancestor of Old Irish. It follows that the paradigm with a long vowel was an innovation of the Central Indo-European languages. It now appears that the full grade suffix *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>-* was generalized on the basis of the proterodynamic paradigm and subsequently adopted the hysterodynamic endings gen.sg. *\*-es* or *\*-os*, dat. sg. *\*-ei*, loc.sg. *\*-i*, yielding a circumflex tone in Greek. The original gen.sg. ending *\*-ī* < *\*-iH* was preserved in the Armenian *H<sub>2</sub>*-stems (cf. Kortlandt 2003, 47) and the generalization of *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>-* in the genitive plural did not reach Armenian and Balto-Slavic and was recent in Germanic and Indo-Iranian (cf. Kortlandt 2014b).

The derivation of the Lithuanian acc.sg. ending *-q* from *\*-ām* < *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>m* shows that the inst.sg. ending *-q* with an acute cannot have the same origin. Since it is difficult to see how the acute can be secondary, we have to start from the original ending *\*-H<sub>2</sub>eH<sub>1</sub>* or *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>H<sub>1</sub>*, both of which would yield the same result *\*-aH* as nom.sg. *\*-eH<sub>2</sub>*. The obvious way to disambiguate this ending is to add the new instrumental ending *\*-mi* for PIE *\*b<sup>h</sup>i*, yielding an ending *\*-aH-mi*, as in the Slavic pronoun *těmb* < *\*toi-mi*. Here *\*toi* is the original loc.sg. form that adopted the function of the instrumental in Indo-Iranian and Balto-Slavic, as in Vedic masc. *té-na*, fem. *táy-ā*, Slavic masc. *tě-mb*, fem. *toj-q* (cf. Kortlandt 2016a, 93). The new Balto-Slavic form *\*toi-aH-mi* was apparently subject to an early apocope, yielding *\*tojaHm* (with new *\*-aHm*), Lith. *\*tājq* with an acute *-q*, Slavic *tojq*. The Lith. acute ending *-q* was then adopted in the nominal paradigm. The accentuation of inst.sg. *gálva* (3) still preserves the original root stress of the proterodynamic paradigm (cf. Beekes 1985, 129) while the definite adjective has adopted the accentuation of the pronoun. The identification of Slavic *tojq* with Vedic loc.sg. *tásyām* (cf. Kortlandt 2005, 154) must be abandoned.

Thus, we arrive at a reconstruction of Proto-Balto-Slavic nom.sg.  $*-aH$  <  $*-eH_2$ , acc.sg.  $*-ām$  <  $*-eH_2m$ , nom.pl.  $*-ās$  <  $*-eH_2es$ , acc.pl.  $*-aHns$  <  $*-eH_2ns$ , all with Central Indo-European generalization of  $*-eH_2-$  replacing the earlier zero grade  $*-H_2-$ . The apparent acc.pl. ending  $*-Hns$  now spread from the  $aH-$ ,  $iH-$  and  $uH-$  stems to the  $o-$ ,  $i-$  and  $u-$  stems (cf. Kortlandt 2016a, 92). After the rise of the broken tone and nasal vowels in East Baltic (cf. Kortlandt 1977, 324) and after the univerbation of the definite adjective, nasal vowels in final syllables lost their nasality in East Baltic, giving the impression that the acc.pl. ending reflects  $*-Hs$  (cf. Derksen 1997, 24f. and 1998, 134). In fact, there is no evidence for a PIE acc.pl. ending  $*-ās$  <  $*-eH_2s$  (cf. Stang 1966, 200; Pronk 2016, 26). It is clear that the loss of  $*-u-$  before  $*-m$  in Vedic  $gām$  and Greek  $βῶν$ , the rise of the long vowel in these forms, the loss of the laryngeal in Latvian  $gūovs$ , the rise of disyllabic endings, the generalization of the full grade  $*-eH_2-$  in the paradigm, the loss of laryngeals with compensatory lengthening before  $*-m$ , the loss and restoration of intervocalic laryngeals, the rise of the Balto-Slavic acute, and the loss of nasality in East Baltic final syllables are all chronologically distinct developments, none of which can appropriately be called Stang's law. It is therefore preferable to use this term only in reference to the retraction of the stress from non-acute long vowels in Slavic, which is the basis of modern Slavic accentology.

## KAS YRA STANGO DĒSNIS?

### *Santrauka*

Stango dėsnis yra dviprasmė sąvoka. Viena vertus, taip vadinamas kirčio atitraukimas iš neakūtinių ilgųjų balsių į priešį tai einantį skiemenį slavų kalbose. Kita vertus, taip vadinamas ir vedų *dyām* 'dangus', *gām* 'jautis, karvė', gr. Ζῆν(α), βῶν raida iš *\*dieum*, *\*g<sup>w</sup>oum*. Stangas kildino ilgąjį balsį iš dvibalsio, einančio prieš tautosilabinį nosinį priebalsį. Be to ilgasis balsis gali būti aiškinamas ir pailgėjimu vienskiemeniame žodyje, vėliau iškritus  $*-u-$  prieš tautosilabinį nosinį priebalsį.

Aš esu teigęs, kad  $*-u-$  iškritęs prieš žodžio galo  $*-m$  dar iki monosilabinio pailgėjimo, taigi *\*diēm* < *\*diem* < *\*dieum* ir *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>m* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>m* < *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>um*. La. *gūovs* atspindi acc. sg. formą *\*g<sup>w</sup>eH<sub>3</sub>m* su iškritusiu laringalu po ilgojo balsio. Paradigma su pamatinio laipsnio priesaga  $*-eH_2-$  ir laringalų iškritimas prieš žodžio galo  $*-m$  buvo indoeuropiečių tarminės inovacijos. Nosiniai balsiai galiniuose skiemenyse neteko nosinumo rytų baltų kalbose.

\*-u- iškritimas prieš \*-m vedų *gām* ir gr. βῶν, ilgojo balsio atsiradimas šiose formose, laringalo iškritimas la. *gūovs*, pamatinio laipsnio \*-eH<sub>2</sub>- apibendrinimas paradigmoje, laringalų iškritimas prieš \*-m ir nosinumo netekimas rytų baltų galiniuose skiemenyse yra chronologiškai skirtingi pakitimai, kurių nė vienas negali būti pavadinti Stango dėsnium. Todėl geriau šį terminą vartoti tik kalbant apie kirčio atitraukimą iš neakūitinių ilgųjų balsių slavų kalbose, sudarantį šiolaikinės slavų akcentologijos pagrindą.

## REFERENCES

Beekes, Robert S. P. 1985, *The origins of the Indo-European nominal inflection*, Innsbruck: IBS.

Chantraine, Pierre 1967, *Morphologie historique du grec*, Paris: Klincksieck.

Collinge, Neville E. 1985, *The laws of Indo-European*, Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Collinge, Neville E. 1991, Further laws of Indo-European, in Werner Winter (ed.), *On languages and language*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 27–52.

Derksen, Rick 1997, Vowel raising in the anonymous Lithuanian catechism of 1605, in Alexander Lubotsky (ed.), *Sound law and analogy* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 9), Amsterdam: Rodopi, 21–26.

Derksen, Rick 1998, Lithuanian *mėsà*, *Res Balticae* 4, 131–137.

Ebeling, Carl L. 1967, Historical laws of Slavic accentuation, in *To honor Roman Jakobson* 1, The Hague: Mouton, 577–593.

Hendriks, Pepijn 2003, A note on Stang's law in Moscow accentology, in Jos Schaecken, Peter Houtzagers, Janneke Kalsbeek (eds.), *Dutch contributions to the 13th International Congress of Slavists: Linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 30), Amsterdam: Rodopi, 107–123.

Holzer, Georg. 2007, *Historische Grammatik des Kroatischen*, Frankfurt: Peter Lang.

Ivšić, Stjepan 1911, Prilog za slavenski akcenat, *Rad JAZU* 187, 133–208.

Kapović, Mate 2015, *Povijest hrvatske akcentuacije*, Zagreb: Matica Hrvatska.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1977, Historical laws of Baltic accentuation, *Baltistica* 13(2), 319–330.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1985, Long vowels in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 21(2), 112–124.

Kortlandt, Frederik 1997, Baltic *ē-* and *ī/jā-*stems, *Baltistica* 32(2), 157–163.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2003, *Armeniaca: Comparative notes*, Ann Arbor: Caravan.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2005, Holger Pedersen's *Études lituaniennes* revisited, *Baltistica* 6 priedas, 151–157.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2007, *Italo-Celtic origins and prehistoric development of the Irish language* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 14), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2011, *Selected writings on Slavic and general linguistics* (= *Studies in Slavic and General Linguistics* 39), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2014a, On the accentuation of *nesl̥b* and related issues, *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 40(1), 127–131.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2014b, Reconstructing Balto-Slavic and Indo-European, *Baltistica* 49(1), 5–13.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2014c, Metatony in monosyllables, *Baltistica* 49(2), 217–224.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2015, The development of vowel length in Slavic, *Jezikoslovní Zapiski* 21(2), 21–30.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2016a, The inflexion of the Indo-European *o*-stems in Balto-Slavic, *Baltistica* 51(1), 87–96.

Kortlandt, Frederik 2016b, Slavic *i*-verbs, imperfect, and *jā*-stem nouns, *Rasprave Instituta za hrvatski jezik i jezikoslovlje* 42(1), 75–81.

Kuiper, Franciscus B. J. 1997, *Selected writings on Indian linguistics and philology* (= *Leiden Studies in Indo-European* 8), Amsterdam: Rodopi.

Lubotsky, Alexander 1995, Reflexes of intervocalic laryngeals in Sanskrit, in Wojciech Smoczyński (ed.), *Kuryłowicz memorial volume* 1, Cracow: Universitas, 213–233.

Olander, Thomas 2009, *Balto-Slavic accentual mobility*, Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Pronk, Tijmen 2016, Stang's law in Baltic, Greek and Indo-Iranian, *Baltistica* 51(1), 19–35.

Rozwadowski, Jan 1914, Przyczyunki do historycznej fonetyki języków słowiańskich, *Rocznik Slawistyczny* 7, 9–21.

Stang, Christian S. 1957, *Slavonic accentuation*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stang, Christian S. 1966, *Vergleichende Grammatik der baltischen Sprachen*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget.

Stang, Christian S. 1970, Indo-européen \**g<sup>w</sup>ōm*, \**diēm*, in Idem, *Opuscula linguistica*, Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 40–44.

Thurneysen, Rudolf 1946, *A grammar of Old Irish*, Dublin: DIAS.

Vermeer, Willem 1984, On clarifying some points of Slavonic accentology: The quantity of the thematic vowel in the present tense and related issues, *Folia Linguistica Historica* 5(2), 331–395.

Frederik KORTLANDT

Cobetstraat 24

NL-2313 KC Leiden

The Netherlands

[f.kortlandt@hum.leidenuniv.nl]