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## Monosyllabic Circumflexion I

In Lithuanian (also in other Balto-Slavic languages), long vowels in monosyllabic words exhibit a circumflex tone instead of the expected acute.
cf. Hanssen (1885), Zinkevičius (1980-81: II, 161ff.), Rasmussen (1999), Kortlandt (2002, 2014), Villanueva Svensson (2011), etc.
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## Monosyllabic Circumflexion II

- the 3rd person future forms of monosyllabic acute root

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { duõs } \sim \text { dúoti 'give' }\left(\leftarrow \leftarrow^{*} \text { deh }_{3-}-, \text { Gk. } \delta i \delta \delta \omega \mu\right) \text { ); } \\
& \text { dễs } \sim \text { déti 'put' }\left(\leftarrow{ }^{*} d^{h} h_{1^{-}}\right. \text {, Skt. dadhāti) }
\end{aligned}
$$

- pronominal forms
- tiẽ 'that' (m.pl.nom.) ~ ger-íe-ji 'the good' (m.pl.nom.) (<*-oi) cf. OCS ti, Skt. te
- tuõ 'that' (m.pl.acc.) ~ ger-úo-ju 'the good' (m.pl.acc.) cf. Skt. tắn, Gk. toús
- reflexes of PIE root nouns

Lithuanian: šuõ 'dog,' cf. Skt. śvấ, Gk.kú $\omega v$; žmuõ 'man' cf. Lat. hemo
Latvian: gùovs 'cow' cf. Skt. gáus < gó́u-s; sà̀ls 'salt' cf. Lat. sāl

- adverbs/prepositions/particles

$$
\begin{aligned}
& n \tilde{\tilde{u}} \text { 'now' } \sim \text { OCS nyně 'now,' Skt. nú, Gk. vũv 'now'; } \\
& \text { vél 'again' ~ Latv. vêl' }
\end{aligned}
$$




## 3rd person future forms: irregularity I

future paradigm of dúoti 'give'

$$
\begin{array}{rlrlrl}
\text { sg. 1. dúosiu } & \text { du. 1. } & \text { dúosiva } & \text { pl. 1. } & \text { dúosime } \\
\text { 2. } & \text { dúosi } & 2 . & \text { dúosita } & 2 . & \text { dúosite } \\
\text { 3. duõs } & & - & & -
\end{array}
$$

future paradigm of búti 'be'
sg. 1. búsiu
2. bū́si
3. bùs (< *bứs)
du. 1. búsiva pl. 1. bū́sime
2. búsita
2. búsite

Data of 3rd person future forms
future paradigm of Latv. duôt 'give'
sg. 1. duôšu pl. 1. duôsim
2. duôsi 2. duôsit
3. duôs

## 3rd person future forms: irregularity II

Distribution of MC and shortening:

- MC (infinitive - 3p. future):
- šókti - šõks 'to dance'
- déti - dẽ̃s 'to place'
- dúoti - duõs 'to give'
- trúkti - trũks 'to lack'
- grū́sti - grũ̃s 'to crush'
- gnýbti - gnỹbs 'to pinch, bite'
- žnýbti - žnỹbs 'to pinch, to tweak'
- klýsti - klỹs 'to be mistaken'
- slýsti - slỹs 'to slide,' etc.
- shortening:
- bliúti - bliùs 'to bleat'
- búti-bùs 'to be'
- púti - pùs 'to rot'
- džiúti - džiùs 'to dry, wither'
- griūti - griùs 'to fall down'


## 3rd person future forms: irregularity III

- gýti - gis 'to get better'
- kliū́ti - kliùs 'to touch'
- lýti - lìs 'to rain'
- rýti - rìs 'to swallow'
- rū́gti - rùgs 'to grow/turn sour'
- sýti - sis 'to link to'
- šlýti - šlis 'to lean, tilt'
- slúgti - slùgs 'to subside'
- srúti - srùs 'to stream'
- žúti - žùs 'to perish, die'
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## 3rd person future forms: irregularity IV

Suggested explanations for such a distribution:

- Senn (1966: 231ff.), Kazlauskas (1968: 104): the acute long vowels $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{u}$ are regularly shortened by Leskien's Law in the word final position, including in monosyllables. Therefore the shortening is regular in those 3 p. future forms. Some of them remain with circumflex long vowels due to the expected homonymic clash, e.g., vỹs 'will droop' vs. vis (visti 'to fall apart'), siū̃s 'will sew' vs. siùs (siùsti 'to rage').
- Zinkevičius (1984-95: II, 161ff.): MC is the regular outcome of the 3p. future forms. Some gained the short vowels through polysyllabic variants, e.g., bùs 'will be' from nebùs 'will not be' < *nebús.
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## 3rd person future forms: irregularity V

- Petit (2002): Leskien's Law did not shortened íe and úo but $\bar{y}$ and $\bar{u}$ in general. Therefore, the shortened future forms are regular for the monosyllabic root in $\dot{y}$ and $\bar{u}$. Some remained with a long circumflex root because of their preterit forms with a long vowel (e.g., gnÿbs 'will pinch' $\leftarrow$ gnýbo 'he/they pinched').
- Villanueva Svensson (2011: 19): MC was probably regular among all the 3 p. future forms. For those shortened, the acute root vocalism was restored for some reason.


## 3rd person future forms: irregularity VI

Questions:

- Why some verbs like gnỹbs - gnýbti 'pinch,' žnỹbs žnýbti 'tweak' have their future forms with long circumflex vowels, although there are no gnibti or žnibti.
- Why copying the vocalism of preterit forms only to the 3p. future forms? Motivation??
- If Villanuva Svensson's opinion is right, what could be the condition of the alleged "restoration of the acute tone" to the future forms?


## Distribution of the shortened forms I

Yamazaki (2014) showed that the paradigms of the verbs with the shortened 3rd person future forms have:

- nasal-infix present
- ā-preterit.

For example (infinitive, present, preterit - 3p. future):

- búti, yra/bũna/bũ̃va/ẽsti, bùvo - bùs 'to be'
- lýti, lỹja/lỹna, lijo - liss 'to rain'
- púti, pũ̃va/pũna/pũsta/pū́sta, pùvo - pùs 'to rot'
- srū́ti, srū̃a/srū̃na/srústa, srùvo - srùs 'to stream'
- žúti, žũva/žũva/žũna/žústa, žùvo - žùs 'to perish, die'
- džiúti, džiũva/džiū̃a/džiūna/džiústa, džiúvo - džiùs 'to dry, wither'
- bliúti, bliũ̃va/bliũna, briùvo - bliùs 'to bleat'
- kliúti, kliũna/kliũ̃va/kliústa, kliùvo - kliùs 'to touch'
- griúti, griũ̃va/griū̃na, griùvo - griùs 'to fall down,' etc.


## Distribution of the shortened forms II

The verbs which have circumflex tone in their 3p. future forms do not have nasal-infix present.

- výti, vẽja/vija/vỹna, vijo - vỹs 'to drive, wind'
- grứsti, grú́da, grúdo - grũ̃s 'to crush'
- gnýbti, gnýba, gnýbo - gnỹbs 'to pinch, bite'
- žnýbti, žnýbia, žnýbé - žnỹbs 'to pinch, to tweak'
- dýgti, dýgsta, dýgo - dỹgs 'to spring, shoot'
- klýsti, klýsta, klýdo - klỹs 'to be mistaken'
- slýsti, slýsta, slýdo/slido - slỹs 'to slide'
- lýsti, lýsta, lýso - lỹs 'to become thin'
- lýžti, ly̌žta, ly̌zo - ly̌s 'to slacken'


## Historical background: nasal infix presents I

- Both nasal infix present and $\bar{a}$-preterit are built on the zero-grade of the root, and the verbs which have a nasa-infix present almost always have $\bar{a}$-preterit as their preterit paradigm, cf. Stang (1942: 132ff.), Gorbachov (2007: 152ff.). Semantically, they are inchoatives.
 'to become alive,' Skt. jívati 'lives' LIV 215ff.), present ${ }^{*} g^{w} i-n-h_{3}-0->P B{ }^{*}$ gina ( $\rightarrow$ Lith. gỹja), preterit ${ }^{*} g^{w}$ ih $h_{3}-\bar{a}->$ Lith. gìjo
- for lýti 'to rain' (PIE *leih- 'to pour,' Gk. $\lambda \varepsilon$ 'í $\omega$ 'pour out' OCS Iějg (lijati) 'pour' LIV 405ff.), present *li-n-H-o- > PB *lina ( $\rightarrow$ Lith. Iỹja) preterit *liH-ā-> Lith. lijo


## Historical background: nasal infix presents II

- Introduction of a root-final semivowel to the nasal infix present: the expected nasal-infix form of the verbs would be Xlìna- 'rain' (< */i-n-H-o-), Xpùna- 'rot' (< *pu-n-H-o-), etc.
Proportion of Analogy (Gorbachov 2007: 167): miñga 'sleep(s)' : *migā 'slept' $=X$ 'rain(s)' : */ijjā 'rained' $X={ }^{*}$ liñja.
- regular nasal loss:

$$
V_{n}>\tilde{V}>\bar{V} / \_\left\{\begin{array}{cccc}
r, & \mathrm{I}, & \mathrm{~m}, & \mathrm{n}, \\
j, & \mathrm{v} & & \\
\mathrm{~s}, & \mathrm{~s}, & \text { ž } &
\end{array}\right\} .
$$

*liñja > lỹja

## Historical background: nasal infix presents III

- Their infinitives (dative or locative sg. of ti-stem) kept their old zero-grade formation, e.g., ${ }^{*} g^{w}$ ih $h_{3}$-tei $>$ Lith. gýti, *liH-tei > Lith. lýti, etc.
- Many of the verbs of this type have good IE root etymology, and some of them belong to the intransitive inchoative thmatic verbs established for Northern Indo-European languages (i.e., Germanic, Baltic and Slavic) in Grobachov (2007: 159ff.).
- Lith. pũ̃va ~ PG *fŭni/a- (cf. ON fúnar 'rots')
- Lith. šlỹja ~ PG *hlini/a- (cf. OE hlinian, OHG hlinēn 'to lean')
- The Lithuanian verbs whose 3p. future forms are shortened are likely to have developed from this morpho-semantic group, i.e., the intransitive inchoative thmatic verbs.

The historical background of the future formation: PIE s-future/desiderative I

Skt. $\sqrt{ } d \bar{a}$ 'to give'
sg. 1. dāsyắmi du. 1. dāsyắvas pl. 1. dāsyắmas
2. dāsyási 2. dāsyáthas 2. dāsyátha
3. dāsyáti
3. dāsyátas
3. dāsyánti

Gk. $\delta i \delta \omega \mu \mathrm{l}$ 'to give'

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { sg. 1. } \delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \omega \text { du. 1. - pl.1. } \delta \omega \sigma \sigma \mu \varepsilon v \\
& \text { 2. } \delta \omega ́ \sigma \varepsilon เ \varsigma ~ 2 . ~ \delta \omega ́ \sigma \varepsilon \tau о \vee ~ \\
& \text { 3. } \delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \text { เ } \\
& \text { 3. } \delta \omega \dot{\omega} \varepsilon \tau \circ \vee \\
& \text { 2. } \delta \omega \dot{\sigma} \tau \varepsilon
\end{aligned}
$$

- The origin of $s$-future may be desiderative formation in $-\left(h_{1}\right)$ se/o-, - $\left(h_{1}\right)$ sie/o-, and - $\left(h_{1}\right) s$ s-, the last one of which is continued as Baltic future (Jasanoff 2003: 132ff.; Villanueva Svensson 2010: 218ff.).
- Endzelīns (1928: 107; 1971: 234), further advanced in Schmalstieg (1958: 120ff.) and Jasanoff (1978: 103ff.), has proposed that the origin of the $-i$ - element in the Baltic future suffix in 1 sg ./du./pl., 2 sg ./du./pl. forms is the now disappeared athematic 3pl. ending *-nt(i) which developed into PBS *-int(i). Its implication is that the 3pl. (weak) form had the accent on the root, i.e., the paradigm was in Narten type:
$S: R(\bar{e})-S(\varnothing)-E(\varnothing), W: R(e ́)-S(\varnothing)-E(\varnothing)$.

The historical background of the future formation: PIE s-future/desiderative III

- The future forms of intransitive inchoative thematic verbs (e.g., lis < *líst(i)) are not in $R(e ́)-S(\varnothing)-E(\varnothing)$. Instead, they are in ' $\mathrm{R}(\varnothing)-\mathrm{S}(\varnothing)-\mathrm{E}(\varnothing)$.' This must be secondarily formed based on the Baltic future formation grammar, i.e., forming the future stem based on the infinitive stem. Their original formation before the restructuring possibly mirrored their present formation, i.e., thematic formation, cf. Jasanoff (2003: 135).
- On the other hand, there was no need for the verbs that inherited the full-grade vocalism both in the infinitive (cf. Vine 2004) and future stems to reform their future stems, e.g., dúoti - duõs 'will give,' déti - dẽ̃s 'will place,' stóti - stõs 'will stand,' etc.
- i-apocope must precede MC:

PBS *dōsti $>{ }^{*}$ dō-st $>{ }^{*}$ dōst ( $>$ Lith. duõs)

The historical background of the future formation: PIE s-future/desiderative IV

| present nasal infix | preterit <br> $\bar{a}$-aorist | future (unclear | infinitive (zero-gr.) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (zero-grade) | (zero-gr.) | $\rightarrow$ zero-gr.) |  |
| *liñja | *lijat | */Isat(i)?? | *ítéi |
| 'rain' |  | $\rightarrow$ * $/$ Is |  |
| ${ }^{*}$ puñva | *pùvāt | ${ }^{*}$ pūsat(i)?? | *pútē̆i |
| 'rot' |  | $\rightarrow{ }^{*} p \overline{\text { uns }}$ |  |
| - | (full-gr.) | (full-gr.) | (zero-gr. |
|  |  |  | $\rightarrow$ full-gr.) |
| *dōsti | *dovēt | *dō̃st | *dōtēi |
| 'give' |  |  |  |
| *desti | *dējā | *dē̃st | *dētē̃i |
| 'place' |  |  |  |
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## Conclusion

- the condition of the restoration of the acute tone was that the verbs belong to an inchoative thematic group with inherited zeso-grade infinitive, nasal-infix present, and $\bar{a}$-preterit. It is not motivated by the avoidance of homonymic clash at Lithuanian stage.
- This means that circumflex tone through MC is the phonological outcome for the 3rd p. fut. forms of monosyllabic acute stem, while the shortened 3rd. p. fut. forms reflect the acute roots that were copied from their infinitive stems when Baltic future formation rule was established. This indicates that MC is an old sound change, which can be estimated no later than Proto-Baltic.
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