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1 Introduction

- Lithuanian belongs to the East Baltic branch.

- The first publication is a catechism written by Mažvydas in 1547.

- Lithuanian distinguishes the following three kinds of accents. The tone-bearing unit in Lithuanian is considered a mora. The description below is following Blevins (1993).
  - stress accent on monomoraic vowels:
    (i) grave \( \breve{\text{V}} \) = /\text{V}/
    \[
    \begin{array}{c|c}
    \hline
    \mu & \alpha \\
    \hline
    \end{array}
    \]
  - two tonal accents on a long vowel, a diphthong, or mixed diphthong (a tautosyllabic sequence of a vowel and resonant):
The Proto-Balto-Slavic long vowels inherited from PIE are supposed to obtain “acute nucleus,” which yielded “acute accent” in its daughter languages, while other long vowels with secondary origins (e.g., vowel contraction) did not obtain “acute nucleus,” resulting in circumflex accent in the daughter languages:¹ ² ³

(1) a. PIE (*ɡʰu`ers >) *ɡʰu`ēr ‘wild animal’ → Lith. žvėris (3), Latv. zvērs,

¹Acute nuclei are marked with underline following Jasanoff (2004).
²Latvian accents are:
(i) even tone (˜V): Lithuanian acute (AP1)
(ii) falling tone (`V): Lithuanian circumflex (AP2, 4)
(iii) broken tone (ˆV): Lithuanian acute (AP3)

The “AP”s above mean “accentual paradigms (AP).” Lithuanian nominals are classified into four APs according to the pattern of the stress alternation between the stem and the ending throughout the nominal paradigm. Regarding nouns with a monosyllabic stem, the tone of the stem is connected to the AP to which the noun belongs. AP1 denotes a barytone paradigm with the acute accent on the root, while AP2 is a historically barytone paradigm where the root is non-acute and the stress alternation between the stem and the ending is caused by Saussure’s Law and other morphological factors. AP3 comprises mobile paradigms with the acute root, whereas AP4 denotes a mobile paradigm with the non-acute root where further stress alternation has been brought about by Saussure’s Law and other morphological factors.

³The notation employed for Proto-Slavic accentuation as well as for Serbo-Croatian accentuation is as follows:
(i) ˜V: long rising tone
(ii) `V: short rising tone
(iii) ˇV: long falling tone
(iv) ˇ̂V: short falling tone

Proto-Slavic acute syllables had long rising tone, which are reflected as short falling vowels in Serbo-Croatian, while circumflex vowels used to have a falling tone and they are remaining as such in Serbo-Croatian (but a circumflex root syllable can have a rising tone in the case where the stress was retracted to it, which is called neo-acute).

(i) PIE *uHnev ‘wool’ > PBS *uIlna > PS *vélna > Scr. vúna
(ii) PIE *uIk’os ‘wolf’ > PBS *uIkó̆s > PS *vúlk > Scr. vúk
OCS zvēr, SCr. zvēr, Sln. zvēr (PS *zvēr̥), Gk. ὑρ

b. PIE stēh₂- → PBS stā-tei > Lith. stoti ‘to stand,’ Latv. stāt ‘to stand, stop, begin,’ OCS stati ‘to stand,’ SCr. stāti ‘to stand’

c. in word final position, an acute syllable was shortened by Leskien’s Law; thematic ending of 1sg. pres. ind. PIE*-oh₂ > PBS *-ō > *-ō > *uo > Lith. -u as in vedū ‘I lead’

(2) the gen. sg. ending of f. ā-stem: PIE *-ēh₂-es > PBS *-ēHas > PB *-ēs > Lith. -os as in dienōs ‘of a day’

2 Monosyllabic Circumflexion

In the Baltic and Slavic languages, circumflex intonation is often found in monosyllabic words instead of acute intonation based on the historical background reviewed in the previous section.

2.1 Balto-Slavic

Rasmussen (1999: 481ff.) considers the phenomenon can be traced back to Proto-Balto-Slavic since this phenomenon is observed both in Baltic and Slavic languages as follows:

(3) a. Lith. nuo ‘from’ cf. nuo-jauta ‘presentiment’ ∼ jau̯t- [the stem of the verb jaũsti ‘to forebode’]

b. Lith. tiẽ ‘those (m. mon. pl.)’ cf. gerieji ‘the good (def. m. nom. pl.),’ geri ‘good (indef.m.nom.pl.)”

---

4Modern Lithuanian ⟨o⟩ denotes a long vowel /o/, which originates from OLith. ⟨a⟩ /a/.  
5The relative chronology of this series of changes is following Yoshida (forthcoming: 11). It is certainly hard to know whether the laryngeal had been preserved as such at the stage of Proto-Balto-Slavic. It is postulated here that the laryngeal was not completely dropped but still had its trace as a glottal stop or a syllable boundary, and the vowel contraction in *-a.as (< *-e.h₂es) had not yet taken place. The preservation of hiatus breaker originating from laryngeals until a stage later than Proto-Balto-Slavic can be supported by the following example from OCS (Yoshida forthcoming: 9): gen.sg. ženy ‘woman’ < *-ēs < *-ēs < PS *-eHos (or *-o.os) < *ah₂as < PIE *-ēh₂es, cf. nom.sg. žena < PS *-a < *-a < PIE *-eh₂.
6Lithuanian has a definite form for adjectives. The definite form is built to the inflectional form of adjectives by adding the long ending, which originated from the declensional form of the 3rd person pronoun ḯis, ḯi. Therefore, the adjective ending is not in the final syllable of the definite form, protected by the long ending. As a result, the original form of the adjective ending which is not affected by Leskien’s Law can be observed in definite forms. Additionally, the nom.pl. ending
c. Lith. jūs ‘you (2pl.nom.)’ cf. jūsų ‘your (2pl.gen.),’ Latv. jūs, PIE *juH-
d. SCR. pī ‘drank’ < 2sg. *pih3-s, 3sg. *pih3-t

e. SCR. bī ‘was’ < 2sg. *bīHuH-s, 3sg. *bīHuH-t, cf. OCS by

f. Sln. tū ‘you (2sg.nom.)’ < PS *ty < PBS *tū < PIE *tuH

g. Sln. mī ‘we (1pl.nom.)’ < PS *my,7 cf. OCS my

h. Sln. vī ‘you (2pl.nom.)’ < PS *vy ← PBS *jū(s)8 < PIE *juH-
i. Sln. tā ‘that (f.sg.nom.) or those (n.nom.pl/acc.pl.)’ < PBS *tā ← PIE *sch2

However, in my opinion, monosyllabic circumflexion cannot be traced back to
the Proto-Balto-Slavic stage, but it must have occurred independently in Baltic
and Slavic languages.

• The Baltic forms corresponding to (3f) and (3i) are Lith. tū ‘you (sg.)’ and
Lith. tā, Latv. tā ‘that,’ respectively. They did not undergo monosyllabic
circumflexion (at the same time, they are exceptions of monosyllabic cir-
cumflexion. Exceptions of monosyllabic circumflexion will be studied in
§3).

• The tonal difference between Lith. nōsis, Latv. nāss ‘nose’ and SCR. nōs, Sln. nōs (< PBS *nāsis) also suggests that monosyllabic circumflexion took
place in Proto-Slavic after the syncope, while it did not take place in Proto-
Baltic.

2.2 Lithuanian

• Stang (1966: 1261) and Senn (1966: 85) point out that Leskien’s Law did
not apply on monosyllabic forms. Stang (1966: 167) also states that the
acute syllable that have not been shortened by Leskien’s Law in final position
became circumflex: fut. 3rd. duōs ‘will give’ ~ duōșiu ‘I will give’;

of o-stem adjectives has been replaced by the pronominal ending *-oi, and therefore, the endings
in tē and gerēji are etymologically identical to each other.

7According to Derksen (2008: 336), “the *m- probably originates from the ending of the first
person plural. The *y must have been adopted from *vy ‘you (pl.)’ < *juH-.”
8According to Derksen (2008:533), “the anlaut of the pronoun was apparently remodelled after
the oblique cases.”
pronominal forms tiė (m.mon.pl.), tuō (m.instr.sg.), tuōs (m.acc.pl.) ∼ gerieji, geruoju, geruosius (∼ indef. geri, gerù, gerû).

• Zinkevičius (1998: 94ff.) gives some examples from Lithuanian monosyllabic words in which we find metatony (falling tone [acute] → rising tone [circumflex]). These forms have been exempted from Leskien’s Law.

(4) a. nom.2pl. jūs < *jūs ‘you’. cf. gen.2pl. jūsu
   b. m.nom.pl. tiė < *tíe ‘those’. cf. gerieji ‘good’
   c. m.acc.pl. tuōs < *túos ‘those’. cf. geruosius ‘good’
   d. 3fut. duōs ‘will give’, dēs ‘will put’ < *duōs, *dēs. cf. 1sg. duōsiu, dēsiu

3 The “Minimal Word Syndrome”
Blevins (1993) discusses monosyllabic circumflexion in Lithuanian, relating it to a cross-linguistic phenomenon “minimal word syndrome.”

• McCarthy and Prince (1996: 50): a minimal word in a given language is synonymous with the structure of a licit foot therein.

• Hayes (1995: 86ff.): the minimal size of phonological words in individual languages is predictable based on the licit foot of a given language. He calls this “minimal word syndrome.”

• Blevins (1993: 243): Lithuanian nouns and verbs are minimally bimoraic, which is described as below:

9There are exceptions for monosyllabic circumflexion among future 3rd person forms with root vowels -ý- and -ū, cf. dūgs (dūgti ‘to spring’), būs (būti), etc. Senn (1966: 231) considers that monosyllabic furture forms with -ý- or -ū have been shortened, while Zinkevičius (1998: 148) considers monosyllabic circumflexion is regular and the shortening in būs type words are for some morphological reason. Also, Jay Jasanoff (p.c.) points out to me that Leskien’s Law could have applied to any acute endings including acute monosyllables and the long vowels are restored later for most words with some exceptions for morphological reasons.

I think this problem should be handled with a special attention at another time.
MINIMAL WORD CONSTRAINT: Word$_{\text{min}}$ = [μμ].

Some exceptions for this constraint are (i) prepositions and adverbial particles: bè ‘without,’ iš ‘from,’ në ‘not, no,’ etc.; (ii) conjunctions: bêt ‘but,’ jük ‘but, well,’ kàd ‘so, so that,’ etc.; (iii) interjections: màt ‘indeed,’ nà/hû ‘well, there...’ và ‘here,’ etc.; (iv) pronouns and numerals: àš ‘I,’ dû ‘two,’ kàs ‘who, what,’ tás/tà ‘that,’ etc.

It would be noteworthy that the exceptions in Blevins (1993) include some monosyllabic words which have originally short vowels; bè (< PBS *be(z), cf. Latv. bez), iš (< PBS *iž < PIE *(h₁)ezh₁(s), cf. OCS iz, Gk. ēz), në (< PIE *ne), àš (OLith. eš < PB *ež < PIE *egeh₂, cf. Latv. es), tás (< PBS *to-s — PIE *so-s), kàs (< PIE *kʷo-s). Actually, except one case of mës ‘we,’ we do not find a monosyllabic word with original short vowels lengthened in Lithuanian. ¹⁰

This suggests that the constraint (5) was not effective consistently, but effective exclusively for the monosyllabic words with original long acute vowels, which had a potential to be affected by Leskien’s Law.

4 When did Monosyllabic Circumflexion Take Place?

— Informative Forms

4.1 Monosyllables as the Results of Recent Syncope

The monosyllables as the results of syncope do not exhibit the result of monosyllabic circumflexion, staying with the original acute accent. The following acute monosyllables are the results of the syncope that is observed already in the texts from 16th century (Bjarnadóttir 2003: 7, 13).

(6) a. tóm < OLith. tómus
b. tíem < OLith. tíemus
c. jiém < OLith. jiému(s)
d. kíek < OLith. kíeka(s)
e. jóg ‘because’ < OLith. jógi

¹⁰The lengthening found in mës is explained as an emphatic lengthening in Stang (1966: 254). I do not think this lengthening can be as old as 16th century when the inherited long *ë was shifting to the narrower é. This must be a recent lengthening, which is different from monosyllabic circumflexion.
dvím ‘two (m./f.dat.du.)’ (< PBS *dvēmā) might be included here, although the exact date of the syncope in this word is unclear.

Those words do not undergo either monosyllabic circumflexion or Leskien’s Law.

4.2 Imperative Forms
2sg. imperative forms built to monosyllabic stems do not undergo either monosyllabic circumflexion or Leskien’s Law, either.

- Lithuanian imperative in 2sg.: Verbal Stem + k(i)
  e.g., dirbk ‘work!’ ∼ dirbtį ‘to work,’ dúok ‘give!’ ∼ dúoti ‘to give.’

- They used to be disyllabic, cf. vβmuschki ‘kill!’ (Mod.Lith. inf. užmûšti), waky ‘steal!’ (vógti) in Mažvydas, but the final -i has already started to be lost as in gielbek ‘save!’ (gelbëti) in the same text.

4.3 Summary of §4
The forms handled in §4 testify that the acute monosyllabic forms that were disyllabic when Leskien’s Law was active have not been shortened by Leskien’s Law nor circumflexed by monosyllabic circumflexion, while acute monosyllables which had existed as such when Leskien’s Law was active were strongly prone to it.

This means that monosyllabic circumflexion took place only among the words which had a potential to be shortened by Leskien’s Law.

5 Conclusion
- monosyllabic circumflexion was a phenomenon closely associated with Leskien’s Law. Probably, Lsekien’s Law was barred from applying to monosyllabic acute words as a result of the constraint (5) or a tendency for monosyllables to have resistance to sound changes as the Latin case discussed in Barr (1994: 540), with the acute tone of those words turning into circumflex.

- Monosyllabic circumflexion was a contemporary sound law of Leskien’s Law. Leskien’s Law is estimated to have taken place by 14th Century based on the morphological behavior of Polish loan words in Zinkevičius (1998: 93). Therefore, monosyllabic circumflexion in Lithuanian could be considered also to have taken place around 14th century.

11 These forms are from the edited version of Mažvydas Catechism in Ford (1971: 30, 36).
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