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1 Introduction

1. pronominal forms (tiē [ < *toi pl.nom. ~ gerieji ‘the good’], tuōs [ < *tōns pl.acc. ~ gerūosius ‘id.;’ Zinkevičius 1980–81: II, 162])
2. reflexes of root nouns (Latv. guōvs ‘cow’ [ < *gʷōys ← acc.sg. *gʷōm (Villanueva Svensson 2011: 20)]; šuō ‘dog’ [ < *kūō Hanssen 1885])
4. 3rd person future forms of monosyllabic stems ṣōks – ŝōkti ‘to jump;’ vēys – vēyi ‘to drive,’ etc.

2 Paradigm of Demonstrative Pronoun
Std. Lithuanian demonstrative pronouns tas, ta ‘that:’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m.</td>
<td>f.</td>
<td>m.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom.</td>
<td>tās</td>
<td>tā</td>
<td>tiē</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>tō</td>
<td>tōs</td>
<td>tū̄</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>tām</td>
<td>tāi</td>
<td>tiems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>tā̄</td>
<td>tā̄</td>
<td>tuōs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>tuō̄</td>
<td>tā̄</td>
<td>taï̄s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>tamē</td>
<td>tojē</td>
<td>tuosë</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill.</td>
<td>tañ (tāna)</td>
<td>tōn (tōna)</td>
<td>tuosna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The monosyllabic forms which are traced back to forms containing an old plain long vowel and have evidence for the acute tone will be treated. They are marked in bold face in the paradigm.

3 Etymological examination

3.1 Form derived from disyllabic preform: instr. sg. f. tà

3.1.1 Dialectal forms

Summary of dialectal forms are based on Zinkevičius (1966) and (Rosinas 1995).


- Aukštaitian: In W. Aukšt., tá, tāj (Liuavas, Vilkaviškis, etc...). In E. Aukšt., we find tā type forms around Kupiškis and its neighbors. Elsewhere, tā (the pronunciation is tū, tū; spread northeastern-ward), which indicates the proto form *tān, or tāj (spread southeastern-ward; tūi; in Žasliai tāi) (Zinkevičius 1966: 311). In Pašvitiniai also tāi is found.

- Prussian Lithuanian: tā

3.1.2 Comparative evidence

Lithuanian definite adjective ending -ája and Latv. tuō point to Proto-East-Baltic *tān. OCS tojo also has a nasal segment. This nasal segment in the ending is peculiar with Balto-Slavic (Stang 1966: 199), which may be from *-mi, the instr. sg. ending of the consonantal, i- and u-stems (Vaillant 1958: 82; 373–374).

PBS *taiâN can be reconstructed. Outside of BS, Skt. tāyā. Wackernagel (1905: 115–119, 504) discusses that -āyā is a pronominal ending in fem.instr.sg., while -ā is a substantive ending. Based on this, PIE *tojah2(a)h₁ can be reconstructed.

Therefore, it can be hypothesized that PBS *taiâN was not in the environment of MC when MC was active in PBS. In Proto Baltic, it was reduced to *tān, whose acute tone is preserved to the daughter languages.

| PIE       | *tojah2(a)h₁               |
| PBS       | *taiā                     |
| MC [vacuous operation] | *taiā + N → *taiāN     |
| PB        | *tān                      |

3.2 instr. sg. m. tuō

3.2.1 Dialectal forms

The dialectal data diverse.
● Žemaitian: tò

● Aukštaitian: E. Aukšt./S. Aukšt. tūo, tūoj; W. Aukšt. tūo (in the periphery of South and East Aukšt.)/tūoj (in south east)/tuô; in addition, tuôm is found in almost all Aukšt. area; tuôm < *tuômì, with the instr.sg. ending of i-stem pats ‘oneself’ due to a compound pronoun *tas patis ‘the same’ (instr. sg. m. tuô patimi; Rosinas 1995: 126ff.).

● Prussian Lithuanian: tû

3.2.2 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE

Latv. tuô, OCS têmb (probably with the plural stem *toi and sg. instr. ending of i-/u-stem *-mi; OCS ta-že ‘therefore’ would reflect the original ending *-ô (Arumaa 1985: 175)). Lat. quô ‘whither’ and Gk. ποῦ ‘where’ with the same ending.

3.3 nom. sg. f. tà

3.3.1 DIALECTAL FORMS

● Žemaitian: tà (< *tá through Leskien’s Law).

● Aukštaitian: E. Aukšt. tà (West Panevėžiskai), tó/tój (elsewhere); S. Aukšt. tój, W. Aukst. tà. According to Zinkevičius (1966: 311), the form tój is possibly from a pronominal form with double pronominal ending *tôji or *tôja.

Those dialectal forms allow us to reconstruct pre-Lith. *tá. However, it is unclear whether the long acute vowel was inherited from the proto language as such or it was restored through the adjectival definite ending.

3.3.2 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE

The cognates from other IE languages:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>fem.sg.nom.</th>
<th>m.sg.nom.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skt.</td>
<td>sí</td>
<td>sá</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gk.</td>
<td>ḳ</td>
<td>ó</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goth.</td>
<td>só</td>
<td>sa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCS</td>
<td>ta</td>
<td>tê</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latv.</td>
<td>tã</td>
<td>tas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PIE</td>
<td>*seh₂</td>
<td>*sa</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It seems the paradigm was suppletive in PIE: *so/á- for animate nominative
singular and *to/ā- for the remaining. Only in BS languages, the animate nominative singular stem is replaced with the other stem.

3.4 acc. pl. m. tuōs

3.4.1 DIALECTAL FORMS

- Žemaitian: tūs

- Aukštaitian: E. Aukš/S. Aukš. tūos, W. Aukš. tūos/tuōs

- Prussian Lithuanian: tūs

3.4.2 COMPARATIVE LITHUANIAN

Latv. tuōs, OPruss. stans, OCS ty, Skt. tán, Gk. τοῦς, Cret. τόνς, Goth. þans.

Lithuanian definite ending is -uasis. The Baltic and Slavic forms allow a reconstruction *tōns with the acute tone, and the other comparative data points to PIE *tōns (< *tōms). ¹

3.5 acc. pl. f. tās

3.5.1 DIALECTAL FORMS

- Žemaitian: tās

- Aukštaitian: E. Aukš. tās (Ukmergė, Svėdasai, Panemunėlis, etc.), tōs (elsewhere, especially characteristic to Utena and Vilnius), S. Aukš. tās, W. Aukš. tās

- Prussian Lithuanian: tās

Aukšt. tās points to pre-Lith. *tās with the support from the illative ending -ōsna (AP3, 4), while tās is probably from definite forms in -aśias. However, tōs cannot be analogical from the definite ending but from the illative form tōsna.

3.5.2 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE

Latv. tās, OPruss. stans, OCS ty, Skt. tās, Gk. τας (Cret. θμας ‘worship’ in acc.pl.), Goth. þos.

Taking into account the Lithuanian definite ending -aśias, the Balto-Slavic

¹As Olander (2015: §3.14) discusses, PBS *ō in a long diphthong usually results in a (cf. Villanueva Svensson (2011: 303)), therefore PBS *tōns would give rise to Lith. tvūtus, -ūs-. I assume following Arumaa (1985: 153), that the *-n- may have been lost in -V(ns)word before Ostoff’s Law (shortening of long diphthong), while it took place much later in -V[n/þ(s)]s (as in ząs’ goose; tōsias). In this respect, illative f. pl. -os-na (e.g., galvōsna ‘into heads’) formed to an accusative stem plus a postposition shows that it is a younger formation based on the accusative plural ending with nasal loss, in contrast to the definite ending (-aśias) which indicates that the nasal
forms point to *tāns, with the Slavic ending probably analogical (Arumaa 1985: 154). The other comparative evidence points to PIE *tāms < *teh₂ms.

3.6 nom. pl. m. tiē

3.6.1 DIALECTAL FORMS


- Prussian Lithuanian: Prussian Lithuanian alone has the shortened form ti.

It is interesting that all the Žemaitian forms have the circumflex tone, since Žemaitian pronominal forms otherwise show the evidence for the acute tone. E. Aukštaitian acute long forms must be secondarily introduced after Leskien’s Law, possibly from *tieji with double pronominal ending. However, as PLith. ti shows, the data are diverse, and it is hard to decide with one proto form.

3.6.2 COMPARATIVE EVIDENCE

OPruсс. staī (III) (cf. Lith. šitas ‘(emphatic) this’ (Stang 1966: 232)), Latv. tiē, OCS ti, SCr. tī, Bulg. tija, Skt. te, OAv. töi, YAv. te, Gk. τοί, Goth. þai.

The Latvian evidence points to Proto-East-Baltic *tē; PB/PBS *tá can be reconstructed despite Lithuanian circumflex tone; for PIE, *toi.

According to Bräuer (1961: 70, 104), Slavic -ē is the reflex of PS *-aī with the circumflex tone, while -i from PS *-aī with the acute tone. If Bräuer’s equation is correct, OCS ti points to PBS acute tone.

4 Analyses of data in previous studies

- Zinkevičius (1981–81: 162): Leskien’s Law affected only di-/polysyllabic forms and the acute long vowels (incl. ie, uo) turned to circumflex in the monosyllabic forms. In dialects still some pronominal forms remain with the acute tone taken from the definite pronominal forms. On the other hand, the shortened pronominal forms are analogically from polysyllabic forms (gerā, kitā, etc.).

- Rasmussen: some Slavic pronouns also have the circumflex tone: Slov. ti ‘you (sg.)’ mī ‘we’ vī ‘you’ tā ‘she;’ they may suggest the Proto-Balto-Slavic MC (Rasmussen 1999: 481);

the acute forms in Lithuanian dialects and Latvian (tiē (m.pl.nom.), tuōs still remained at a pre-Lithuanian stage.
(m.pl.acc.), etc.) may easily have adopted the acute form from the adjective and nominal endings (Rasmussen 2007: 31).

- Villanueva Svensson (2011: 17–18): Admitting the possibility of analogy for Lithuanian forms, he considers the Slavic pronouns do not provide unambiguous evidence because they were mobile in PS, therefore their circumflex tone may be resulted from Meillet’s Law.

- Kortlandt (2014): Based on the fact that metatony forms are mostly found in (W.) Aukštaitian dialects, he considers that the phenomenon is recent and local in the area; metatony was later than Leskien’s Law, which affected the high vowels -ý- and -ū- in monosyllables.

5 Compound pronouns in Balto-Slavic and Indo-European

5.1 Pronouns with definite ending in Lithuanian

Senn (1966: 192ff.) states that for personal pronouns in the 3rd person and demonstrative pronouns, there exist the “definite forms” or the form with the inflectional form of jis, ji. They are not used so frequently now. The paradigm of the definite forms of tās, tā is as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>singular</th>
<th></th>
<th>plural</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>m. nom.</td>
<td>f. gen.</td>
<td>m. dat. O Lith.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tasaī</td>
<td>tōji</td>
<td>tājam</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gen.</td>
<td>tōjo</td>
<td>tōsios</td>
<td>tējuj</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dat.</td>
<td>OLith. tāmui</td>
<td>tājai</td>
<td>tēsiems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc.</td>
<td>tājā</td>
<td>tājā</td>
<td>tūsius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instr.</td>
<td>tuņjū</td>
<td>tāja</td>
<td>taņjais</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loc.</td>
<td>tājame</td>
<td>tōjoje</td>
<td>tuņsiūs(e)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ill.</td>
<td>tōjon (DP)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the forms mentioned as dialectal forms can be shortened forms of those with definite endings, as already mentioned by Zinkevičius (1966: 313; 1980–81: 162), e.g., m.pl.nom. tēj < *tīējī, f.pl.nom. tōj < tōjī, m.sg.instr. tūoj < *tūoju, f.sg.instr. tāj < tāja. These forms can be seen as some sort of compound pronoun of tās/ta and jis, ji.

Various “compound pronouns” can be found in more Baltic and Slavic languages.
5.2 Old Prussian
Rosinas (1995: 86) takes up the attestation of f.gen.sg. stesseias (III, 1256), stesses, stessies and analyses them as *stās + *jās. tāns ‘he’ is also from a contaminated stem tana- < ta- + ana- (Stang 1966: 236).

5.3 Latvian
A definite form-like pronominal form šuojuo is found in Latwju dainas 10232, 1 (Endzelins 1923: 390). šitas, E. Latv. šitis (cf. Lith. šitas ‘this’), also ELatv. itis (Lith. itas ‘this’) which descends PIE *eij-tō- (Endzelins 1923: 395; Dunkel 2014: II, 371); viņš/viņa possibly from *įîna- (← *geina- ‘one’) + jis/ji ‘he/she’ (Forssman 2001: 137).

5.4 Slavic
SCr. taj, Bulg. toi < PS *tajh (Townsend & Janda 1996: 183ff.). Farrell (1963: 103ff.) mentions a possibility that the full form OCS sjž (in contrast to its allegro form sa) may be from combined pronominal elements: *šis + *jis (cf. Lith. šisai (m./šisij (f.) ‘this (def.)’). Sussex and Cubberley (2006: 270) attribute this phenomenon to the loss of jers in Proto-Slavic. Vasmer (1921: 139ff.) discusses that OCS kjž ‘who/what’ is compounded from *kwo/o-/ + *jo/o-.

Schmalstieg (1972: 133ff.) mentions a possibility that some Slavic inflectional form of jž may continue definite pronominal form; s.g., f.sg.dat. jeji ~ Lith. jâjai.

5.5 Other IE
Lane (1961: 469) discusses the possible formation of compounded pronouns in PIE: “a demonstrative tends to become weaker and weaker in its deictic force, and is therefore continually reinforced by being compounded with itself or with other demonstratives or with adverbs.” He names many examples from IE languages, among which are: Lat. is-te, is-ta, is-tud ‘that’ (*is + *to-; Sihler 1995: 394), Gk. οὗτος, αὕτη, τοῦτο ‘this’ (< ὁ/῾α/το + full-grade of a particle *u + *to-; Sihler 1995: 390). In addition, Skt. enâ- ‘he’ (< *eî-nô-); Skt. etâd, Lith. itas, ELatv. itis ‘this’ (< *eij-tō-; Dunkel 2014: II, 371) may belong here.

5.6 Analysis
- although Slavic has a phonetic motivation to form compounded pronouns, the comparative parallels suggest that it could be an old process as Lane

---

2 Location of the attested form is from Mažiulis (1988–1997: IV, 155). The other two were not found in the dictionary.

some fragments of evidence for MC in PBS (the circumflex tone of Latvian reflexes of PIE root nouns, particles (ti̞ [permissive], nū ‘now,’ etc.), and the Lithuanian 3rd person future forms with the inherited full-grade formation, e.g., duōs, dēs.) predict the circumflex tone for monosyllabic pronominal forms; therefore, the acute tone in some definite forms (e.g., tōji) indicates that their formation may be at the Proto-Balto-Slavic stage just like the definite adjective forms (for def. adj., Fraenkel 1950: 82)

the combination of the compounded pronominal are various among IE languages, but it is possible that some compounded pronouns involving demonstrative *to/ā- and anaphoric *jo/ā- existed in Balto-Slavic.

thus, a possibility that MC brought about allomorphs in monosyllables with the circumflex tone and in compounded forms with the expected acute tone.

6 Summary
The suggestion of the circumflex allomorph as a simplex and the acute allomorph in a compound will explain:

the circumflex tone in m.pl.nom. *ti̞ for pre-Lithuanian and the acute tone in the same item of Latvian and Slavic forms can result from different choices between the two allomorphs.

rather than considering the analogy from the adjective definite endings to the pronominal endings only for some forms (e.g., masculine forms in W. Aukšt. dial., all the forms in E. Aukšt. dial.), it may be simpler to consider that either one of the two allomorphs was chosen in different dialects.

For accusative plural forms, the situation can be different because of the illative forms which preserved the regular outcome of the endings in the word-final position: tuōsna (m.), tōsna (f.). They can be another possible source of m.acc.pl. tuōs, and for feminine, the only source of E. Aukš. tōs.
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