In Lithuanian or in Balto-Slavic, a phenomenon called Monosyllabic Circumflexion (MC) is known. This phenomenon denotes that many of the monosyllabic words exhibit a circumflex tone instead of the expected acute tone: e.g., *geršė* ‘the good’ ~ *tiė* ‘they’. For the relative chronology of the phenomenon, two different opinions have been suggested. Rasmussen (1999: 481ff.) considers that the circumflex tone of some Baltic and Slavic pronominal forms (Lith. *tiė*, *jūs* ‘you (pl.)’; Sln. *tiė* ‘you (sg.)’; mī ‘we,’ vi ‘you (pl.)’; tā ‘that (f.sg.nom.)’) points to an MC at a Proto-Balto-Slavic stage. On the other hand, Kortlandt (2014) assumes that the Lithuanian dialectal variants of the pronominal forms attested with the acute tone (e.g., *tīe* (nom.pl.), *tūos* (acc.pl.), *tūo* (instr.sg.)) in the westernmost Aukštaitian and Žemaitian dialects mean that MC of those words only took place in the Aukštaitian dialects where those pronominal forms have the circumflex tone. In addition, he considers that an old MC took place at a Proto-Balto-Slavic stage based on the data of the 3rd person future forms in Lithuanian and Latv. *sāls* ‘salt’ and *guovs* ‘cow,’ which are traced back to PIE root nouns.

In this paper, I will examine those previous studies on the relative chronology of MC observed in the pronominal forms, also referring to what other categories of MC (East Baltic reflexes of PIE root nouns and particles/prepositions) tell us on the issue.
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