2. Franks & Lavine 2006
FL06’s main empirical tenets are as follows:

1. Case alternation in infinitival clauses is possible only with Accusative direct objects, which receive case via general mechanisms of structural case assignment, and not with indirect objects assigned “quirky” case by the verb, cf. (6) vs. (7).

    we:Nom take.care.of-INF-1PL-InfRFL child:Acc.PL
    ‘We take care of children.’

b. Mes pastat-ė-me ligon-ę-į [ruipin-tį-s vaik-ais].
    we:Nom build-PST-1PL hospital:Acc.PL take.care.of-INF-InfRFL child:Nom.PL
    ‘We built a hospital to take care of children.’ (FL06: 250)

    we:Nom build-PST-1PL hospital:Acc.PL child:Dat.PL take.care.of-INF-InfRFL
    ‘We built a hospital to take children.’ (FL06: 250)

d. Atėj-o [ruipin-tį-s draug-ų].
    come-PST(3) take.care.of-INF-InfRFL friend:Nom.PL
    ‘He came to take care of a friend.’ (FL06: 255)

e. *Atėj-o [draug-ų ruipin-tį-s].
    come-PST(3) friend:Nom.PL take.care.of-INF-InfRFL
    ‘The doctor came to treat the child.’

2. Case alternation is coupled with “object shift” whereby the direct object moves to a preverbal position in order to receive case assigned from the upper clause, (7b) vs. (7c) and (8).

(7) a. Mes gyd-o-me vaik-us.
    we:Nom treat-PST-1PL child:Acc.PL
    ‘We treat children.’

b. Mes pastat-ė-me ligon-ę-į [vaik-ams gydy-ti].
    we:Nom build-PST-1PL hospital:Acc.PL child:Dat.PL treat-Inf
    ‘We built a hospital to treat children.’ (FL06: 252)

c. Daktar-as atėj-o [vaik-o gydy-ti].
    doctor:Nom.PL come-PST(3) child:Gen.SG treat-Inf
    ‘The doctor came to repair the road.’

(4) d. Ilėvę [zmėms pagaid-tn].
    shoot-PST(3) people:Dat.PL frighten-Inf
    ‘He fired to scare the people.’ (ibid.: 557)

    3-Nom.PL put-PST(3) effort:Acc.PL long-DAT.SGL finish-Inf
    ‘The made efforts to end the long war.’

b. J-ie dėj-o pastang-ąs [užbaig-tį ilg-ąm kar-ui]
    3-Nom.PL put-PST(3) effort:Acc.PL finish-Inf long-DAT.SGL
    acceptable only under the narrow focus interpretation (FL06: 251-252)

However, FL06 (256–257) note that the OV preference is attested only in Dat+Inf, and is not observed with Gen + Inf, cf. (9).

(9) a. Siunt-ę mergait-ę [parvež-ti daktor-o].
    send-PST(3) girl:Acc.PL bring-Inf doctor:Gen.SG
    ‘He sent the girl to fetch a doctor.’ (FL06: 256) — both variants are claimed to be neutral in terms of information structure.

The main focus of this paper is constructions with the Dative and the Genitive marking illustrated in (3) (Gen + Inf) and (4) (Dat + Inf). They have been extensively studied by Stephen Franks and James Lavine (2006) (further FL06), and one of my goals is to review their analysis in the light of new and more reliable empirical data and to propose an alternative account, based on typologically-informed revision of the Minimalist case theory.

The structure of the paper:
- § 2: outline of FL06’s analysis and claims;
- § 3: revision of FL06’s analysis;
- § 4 and § 5: typological parallels and attempt at a new analysis.
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In purpose infinitival clauses, but not in goal infinitival clauses with verbs of motion, the replacement of the Accusative by the Dative is obligatory, cf. (10) vs. (11).

(10) Pastat-ė daržin-ę [šien-ui sukrau-ti šien-ą].
build-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG keep-INF hay-ACC.SG
intended: 'They built a hayloft to keep hay.' (FL06: 254)

(11) Parvažiav-o [pastiim-ti sukel-ę].
come.back-PST(3) take.RFL-INF dress-ACC.SG
'She came back to take the dress.' (ibid.)

In the OV Infinitive constructions, the Dative or Genitive object is moved out of the VP, which is indicated by the position of manner adverbials, cf. (12a), and even higher, i.e. to the left edge of the InfP, which is indicated by the position of epistemic adverbials in (12b) and the OSV order in examples where both the Dative object and the Dative subject co-occur, cf. (13).

(12) a. Pastat-ė daržin-ę [šien-ui [saugiai sukrau-ti]].
built-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG hay-DAT.SG safely keep-INF
'The built a hayloft to keep the hay safely.'

b. Išvažiav-o [keli-o tikriausiai [VP taisy-ti]].
drive.out-PST(3) road-GEN.SG probably repair-INF
'They went probably to repair the road.' (FL06: 260)

(13) Pastat-ė daržin-ę [InfP šien-ui [vP mums sukrau-ti]].
build-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG hay-DAT.SG for-us keep-INF
'They built a hayloft for us to keep hay.' (FL06: 266)

The displaced Dative or Genitive object forms a constituent with the Infinitive, which is evidenced by the following diagnostics:

– in many cases, it is impossible to omit the Infinitive, since the object is not licensed in the matrix clause, cf. (14a) vs. (14b), (15a) vs. (15b):

(14) a. Parvež-ė-me lent-ų nam-ui (apmuš-ti).
bring-PST-1PL board-GEN.PL house-DAT.PL frighten-INF
'We brought some boards for the house / to cover the house.' (FL06: 270)

b. Ilgų-ė žmon-ėms *(pagasdin-ti).*
shoot-PST(3) people-DAT.PL frighten-INF
'He fired to frighten the people / *for people.' (FL06: 271)

(15) a. Išėj-o pien-o (parneš-ti).
go.out-PST(3) milk-GEN.SG bring-INF
'He went for milk / to bring some milk.' (FL06: 268)

b. Išvažiav-o keli-o *(taisy-ti).*
drive.out-PST road-GEN.SG repair-INF
'The went to repair the road / *to fetch the road.' (FL06: 271)

– constituency tests such as coordination, (16), “clefting” (17) or fragmenting (18):

built-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG hay-DAT keep-INF and grain-DAT.PL protect-INF
'They built a hayloft to keep hay and protect grain.' (FL06: 272)

it hay-DAT keep-INF built-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG
'It is (for them) to keep hay that they built a hayloft.' (FL06: 273)

(18) a. K-am pastat-ė daržin-ę?
what-DAT built-PST(3) hayloft-ACC.SG
'For what purpose did they build a hayloft?'

Dat + Inf and Gen + Inf clauses differ in their syntactic status, the former being purpose adjuncts, the latter (optional) goal arguments of motion verbs. This is evidenced by the difference in wh-extraction possibilities, cf. (19) vs. (20).

(19) *K-am, atneš-ė vanden-s [tī palaisty-ti]?
what-DAT bring-PST(3) water-GEN.SG pour-INF
intended: 'What did he bring some water in order to pour on?' (FL06: 277)

(20) K-o, atėj-o [tī aplanky-ti]?
who-GEN come-PST(3) visit-INF
'Whom did he come to visit?' (FL06: 278)

In order to account for both case marking and the object shift, FL06 (273ff) propose a mechanism of “agnostic movement”, whereby an NP with an unvalued case feature moves to a higher position where it can be assigned Genitive by an aspectual projection associated with verbs of motion (21), or Dative by the purpose head C (22).

(21) (FL06: 277)

(22) (FL06: 274)

b. Šien-ui sukrau-ti.
hay-DAT keep-INF
'To keep hay.' (FL06: 272–273)
There are several empirical as well as conceptual problems with FL06’s analysis, which have a much subtler nature. First, the native speakers I consulted (five VU students in their 20-ies) all tend to prefer will be discussed here together with additional data, coming both from native speakers and the Internet (note that any real corpus, let alone statistical analysis is virtually impossible, because LKT does not have morphological annotation).

Examples parallel to (23) are also found in the Internet, cf. (25):

a. Veiksm-ai [si-oms problem-oms išveng-ti].
   action-nom-pl problem-dat-sg avoid-inf
   ‘Actions in order to avoid these problems.’

b. ...dokument-ai [finansin-ei param-ai prašy-ti].
   document-nom-pl financial-dat.sg support-dat-sg ask-inf
   ‘documents in order to ask for financial support.’

This unexpected phenomenon does not seem to be correlated with the (non-standard) Accusative case marking of the object of verbs such as išvengti ‘avoid’ or prašyti ‘ask’, since the latter is attested much less frequently than the Dative marking with the infinitive:

3.1. Of the points 3–6 outlined above, only 3 holds without any further qualifications.

The VO order seems to be slightly favoured when the object NP is heavy, cf. (32)–(33).

(30) a. [(draugo aplankyti) atėj-es] berniuk-as.
   friend-gen.sg visit-inf come-pst,pa,nom.sg,m boy-nom.sg
   ‘the boy who came to visit his friend’

b. [(vaiko- a pasiim-ti) atvyk-us-i].
   child-nom.sg take-care.of-inf-rfl child-dat-pl
   ‘the mother who came to take along her child’

– For Dat+Inf, the corpus data shows a clear preference for OV, but VO is clearly a well-established, though yet minor, pattern:

(31) Google search 04.01.2013:
   durims uždaryti ‘to close doors’ 30 results
   – 7 results
   namai pasiimti ‘to build a house’ ~ 300 results
   – 10 results
   mašinai nusipirkta ‘to buy a car’ 60 results
   – 11 results
   nuomai sumoketi ‘to repay the loan’ ~ 55 results
   – 10 results
   knygai skaityti ‘to read a book’ ~ 70 results
   – 10 results
   The VO order seems to be slightly favoured when the object NP is heavy, cf. (32)–(33).

1 http://support.google.com/webmasters/bin/answer.py?hl=lt&answer=76401
2 http://kekstas.darbastalis.lt/istorija/
4 http://www.15min.lt/komentaras/2492729
(32) neelektrini-ai įtais-ai [atidary-ti ir uždary-ti [dur-ims, non.electric-NOM.PL device-NOM.PL open-INF and close-INF door-DAT.PL]
lang-ams, ir. langin-ims]
window-DAT.PL and shutter-DAT.PL

‘non-electric devices for opening and closing of doors, windows and shutters’

(33) Vis dėto ne pat-s geriausi-as laik-as
b. Atidėj-au pinig-ų [mums pastaty-ti nam-q].
put.by-PST.1SG money-GEN.PL we.DAT build-INF house-ACC.SG
‘I put by some money for us to build a house.’

Moreover, this restriction is not limited to the co-occurrence of the object and the subject, but is operative in prohibiting the Dative of the direct object in the presence of a Dative indirect object regardless of word order, cf. (38a,b); here again only Accusative is possible, cf. (38c):

(38) a. *pinig-ai vaz-ai motin-ai nupirk-ti
money-NOM.PL vase-DAT.SG mother-DAT.SG buy-INF
‘money in order to buy a vase for mother’

b. *pinig-ai vaz-ai nupirk-ti motin-ai
money-NOM.PL vase-DAT.SG buy-INF mother-DAT.SG
‘money to repay the loan’

c. pinig-ai nupirk-ti motin-ai vaz-q
money-NOM.PL buy-INF vase-DAT.SG
‘money in order to buy a vase for mother’

The Genitive direct object is compatible with the Dative indirect object, but not with the Dative subject, cf. (39).
Moreover, passivization of the matrix clause, which dissociates the InfP from the noun, improves extraction, cf. (44):

(44) a. **Nauj-oji ligonin-ė** buv-o pastaty-t-a
   new-NOM.SG.F.DEF hospital-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.F
   child-DAT.PL treat-INF

   'The new hospital was built to treat children.'

b. **K-am, nauj-oji ligonin-ė buv-o pastaty-t-a**
   who-DAT new-NOM.SG.F.DEF hospital-NOM.SG AUX-PST(3) build-PST.PP-NOM.SG.F
   [t, gydy-ti]?
   treat-INF

   'Whom was the new hospital built to treat?'

This suggests (if we take such a diagnostic seriously at all) that there is no syntactic difference between Gen + Inf and Dat + Inf constructions, at least in terms of the argument vs. adjunct distinction.

3.2. Some additional observations on the data not treated by FL06.

(1) Neither Dat + Inf nor Gen + Inf allow negated infinitives, cf. (45) and (46). As the ungrammatical (45b) shows, this is not because Genitive triggered by Negation cannot be replaced by the Dative.

(45) a. **Jon-as užmerk-ė ak-is [žmon-ėms ne-maty-ti].**
   Jonas-NOM.SG close-eyes-PST(3) eye-ACC.PL people-DAT.PL NEG-see-INF
   intended: 'Jonas closed his eyes in order not to see the people.'

b. **Jon-as užmerk-ė ak-is [ne-maty-ti žmoni-ų].**
   Jonas-NOM.SG close-eyes-PST(3) eye-ACC.PL people-GEN.PL
   intended: 'Jonas closed his eyes in order not to see the people.'

(46) a. **Jon-as išėj-o [ne-pykin-ti motin-ox].**
   Jonas-NOM.SG go-out-PST(3) NEG-irritate-INF mother-GEN.SG
   intended: 'Jonas went in order not to irritate his mother.'

A possible explanation of this fact may be that the kind of INFS appearing in purpose constructions is too small to include negation, i.e. is a bare VP, and not a TP, in contrast to the ordinary complement Infinitive clauses with Accusative object, cf. (5a). This idea, however, won't be pursued in the account of purpose clauses in § 5, and the peculiar ban on negated purpose Infinitives will remain unaccounted for.

(2) The Gen + Inf construction can appear not only with unequivocal verbs of motion like eit ‘go’, važiuoti ‘drive’ etc., but also with verbs like sustoži ‘stop’ (47) or būti ‘be’ in the locative meaning (48):

(47) ...ir net buv-o stabtelėj-ės [nuapirk-ti laikrašči-o].
   and even AUX-PST(3) stop-PST.PP.NOM.SG.M buy-RFL-INF newspaper-GEN.SG
   ‘...and even had stopped to buy a newspaper.’

(48) o aš va ką tik griž-au iš ligonin-ės,
   and NOM PTCL just return-PST.1SG from hospital-GEN.SG
   buv-o-m [aplanky-ti vyr-o sės-ės]...
   buy-INF husband-GEN.PL sister-GEN.SG
   ‘And I've just returned from the hospital, we went to visit my husband’s sister...’

3.3. The observed properties of Dat + Inf and Gen + Inf constructions are summarized in the table.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dat + Inf</th>
<th>Gen + Inf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) replacement of “quirky” case</td>
<td>marginally possible</td>
<td>impossible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) accusative retention</td>
<td>marginally possible</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) VO order</td>
<td>possible, though less frequent</td>
<td>preferred</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) overt subject</td>
<td>i. possible with Acc object</td>
<td>ii. impossible with Dat object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) overt Dat indirect object</td>
<td>i. possible with Acc object</td>
<td>ii. impossible with Gen object</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(f) wh-extraction</td>
<td>possible</td>
<td>possible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(g) negation</td>
<td>impossible</td>
<td>impossible</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Among the features listed, (d-ii) and (e) are most probably a reflection of a processing-related surface ban on two Dative argument NPs, while others call for a deeper structural explanation.

3.4. Some typological parallels

“Non-canonical” marking of objects of infinitival or purpose clauses seems to be an infrequent phenomenon cross-linguistically; e.g. in a recent typological work on purpose clauses (Schmidtke-Bode 2009) such patterns are not mentioned at all.

4.1. In the neighbouring languages (Latvian, Letgalian, Estonian, Polish, East Slavic), no direct parallels to the Lithuanian Dat + Inf and Gen + Inf construction are found, with the exception of the Letgalian Genitive + Supine construction occurring with verbs of motion:

**LATGALIAN**

(50) **Rogon-a izzutej-a būrinęt-i [drēb-u valāt]**
    witch-NOM.SG send-PST(3) orphan-ACC.PL clothes-GEN.PL beat-SUP
    'The witch sent out the orphan to beat clothes.' (Nau 2011: 61)

The Infinitive in Letgalian differs from the Supine in the range of matrix verbs it occurs with, the root vocalism and the Accusative object marking (51), though examples are attested where the Infinitive is used instead of the Supine with verbs of motion, retaining the Genitive case of the object (52).

---

LATGALIAN

(51) Bōrineit-ia sōk-a [viajāt driāb-is].
orphan-NOM.SG begin-PST(3) beat-INF
‘The orphan began to beat clothes.’ [ibid.]

(52) Jei aizguoj-a is klāv-u [daciern-t pādej-ās vusā-u].
3:NOM.SG.F go.OUT-PST(3) to barn-ACC.SG shear-INF last-GEN.PL sheep-GEN.PL
‘She went out to the barn in order to shear the last sheep.’ [ibid.: 79]

In Lithuanian, the Supine construction with the Genitive object has been well-attested in older language up to the beginning of the 20-th century (Schmalstieg 1987: 174–176), and is still used in the North-Eastern Aukštaitian dialects (Zinkevičius 1966: 390), which border on Latgale, cf. (53).

(53) [Svtem-uos mišk-uos walk-ν- pirk-tu] važinėjo.
alien-LOC.PL.M forest-LOC.PL.M buy-SUP ride-PST(3)
‘They rode to buy wood in other people’s forests.’ (BA 185913, II)

The Supine with the Genitive direct object was also (vestigially) attested in the older Slavic languages (Vaillant 1966: 127–129; 1977: 171–172), cf. (54).

OLD CHURCH SLAVONIC

(54) id-ŋ [ugotova-ν měst-ν vamos].
go-PRES.1SG prepare-SUP place-GEN.SG you-DAT.PL
‘I am going in order to prepare a place for you.’ (Sav 103014 J 14:2, Lunt 2001: 160)

The Supine as a verbal form distinct from the Infinitive is still attested in Slovene and Lower Sorbian, but here the direct object is marked Accusative and not Genitive, cf. (55).

SLOVENE

(55) Še-l je [gleda-t nov-i film].
go-PST.M AUX-PRES.3SG watch-SUP new-ACC.SG.M film(ACC.SG)
‘He went to watch the new film.’ (Brežar et al. 2005: 114)

4.2. Constructions with “non-canonical” case marking of the object of purpose clauses are attested in some Australian languages, where the so-called complementizing and associating functions of case have been singled out by Dench & Evans (1988) (DE88) in addition to the more familiar relational and adnominal case functions.

– Complementizing case appears on a subordinate (usually, though not necessarily non-finite) clause and can spread to some or all of its subconstituents (DE88: 18–23), cf. (51) from Warumungu with the Dative complementizing case.

WARUMUNGU (Pama-Nyungan > Warumungic, Northern Australia)

(56) api-jiera warnapart=arna [ngapa-ka pari-nji-kki].
walk-towards tomorrow=1SG.FUT water-DAT get-NML-DAT
‘I will go tomorrow to get water.’ (DE88: 18)

– Associating case appears on arguments of nominalized verbs instead of the ordinary case-marking (DE88: 31–32); thus, the Genitive marking of subjects and/or objects on action nominalizations in the familiar Indo-European languages is actually an instance of the associating case.

Different functions of case have different sources and domains of application, i.e. are associated with different lexical or functional heads:

– relational case is assigned in the VP/vP domain;
– adnominal case is assigned in the NP/DP domain;
– “modal” case (DE88: 23–28) is assigned in the TP domain;
– associating case in assigned in the v-N or T_sวลa domain;
– complementizing case is assigned in the CP domain.

In a number of Australian languages cases assigned at different levels of structure do not exclude each other but are expressed by stacked case suffixes whose order normally reflects the scope of case-ascribing domains.

KAYARDILD (Tangkic, Northern Australia; Evans 1995: 102–103, 115–116; for an alternative analysis of Kayardild data see Round 2010)

(57) a. maku-tha yalawu-jarra-tha yukuri-naa-tha
woman-cobl catch-pst-cobl fish-m:abl-c:obl
‘The woman must have caught fish with the man’s net.’

b. T' [MUST] → TP

C-Oblique domain

The Supine as a verbal form distinct from the Infinitive is still attested in Slovene and Lower Sorbian, but here the direct object is marked Accusative and not Genitive, cf. (55).

(58) a. balmb-u ngada warnaju [bijarba-ring-ku raa-jiring-ku].
tomorrow-MEPROP 1SG/NOM go-POT to-spear-MEPROP speak-SUP-MEPROP
‘Tomorrow I will go to spear dugong.’ [Evans 1995: 487]

b. T' [SUP] → TP

M-Allative domain

In Kayardild there is a special non-finite verbal form similar to the Indo-European Supine, appearing with matrix verbs of motion and assigning to the object the modal Allative, which appears to the left of the “outer” “modal” case assigned by the matrix T, cf. (58).
(In (58b) I assume that the Supine is simply a special kind of T head; an alternative CP analysis is also possible.)

We have seen that in Kayardild the case assigned by a head is by default morphologically expressed on all subconstituents of the head’s complement. The easiest way to account for this is to assume that the head simply assigns case to its complement, even if the latter is not a nominal (cf. Matushansky 2008, 2010).

The most striking parallel to the Lithuanian Dat+Inf construction is constituted by non-finite purpose clauses in the Pama-Nyungan languages Nyamal and Jiwarli, whose object appears in the (associating or complementizing) Dative, cf. (59) and (60). In particular, examples (59b) and (60b) can be translated into Lithuanian literally, with the use of the Dative-plus-Infinitive construction. The diagram in (61) shows the structure of (59b).

**NYAMAL** (Pama-Nyungan > South-West)

(59) a. Nganti-ma-rna *jilya [kurti-larta yurta-yu].* (61)

send-PST-1SG child get-PURP fish-DAT

‘I sent the child to get fish.’ [Dench 2009: 761]


that-ERG woman-ERG stick get-PREI hit-PURP-ERG dog-DAT

‘That woman is getting a stick to hit the dog.’ [ibid.: 767]

**JIWARLI** (Pama-Nyungan > South-West)

(60) a. Ngatha *kamuri-a-rnu [pirru-wu thika-rrkarringu].* (63)

get-hungry-PRS-now meat-DAT eat-PURP

‘I am becoming hungry to eat meat.’ [Austin 2009: 4]

b. Kuwarti *kuriya purra-rninjya [patha-rrkarringu-r ru jiriparri-yi].* (64)

boomerang toss-PST pelt-PURP-ERG echidna-DAT

‘Next (he) threw a boomerang to hit echidna.’ [ibid.]

**The only empirically tenable answer** (cf. Dench 2009: 766–768) is that there exist language-specific morphological restrictions on the co-occurrence or co-expression of several cases (see also DE88: 35–43).

**DIAPU** (Pama-Nyungan > Yuulnguan, Northern Australia): relational case markers must be omitted before the complementizing case markers (DE88: 40), cf. (63a), and Locative case markers are deleted after the (adnominal) Oblique (ibid.: 41), cf. (63b).

(64)

(i) [acc][dat] → [dat] or [acc]

(ii) [acc][gen] → [gen] or [acc]

(iii) [gen][dat] → [gen] or marginally [dat] (for ex. like (26))

(iv) [α-case][dat] → [α-case]

(v) [α-case][gen] → [α-case]

(vi) Surface constraint: *[[α-case] NP_1 ... NP_n]]*
Object shift is not dependent on case assignment, cf. (65a) and (65b); exact mechanisms
triggering the movement of the object are not substantial for the present discussion.

\[(65)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{a. } & \text{NP} & \text{daržinė sukrauti šienui} \\
& \text{hayloft} & \text{CP} & \text{Dative domain} & \\
& & & \text{C \{PURP\} \rightarrow TP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{vP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{to-keep} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{V}_k & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v}' & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{Accusative domain} & \\
& & & \text{v} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{b. } & \text{NP} & \text{daržinė šienui sukrauti} \\
& \text{hayloft} & \text{CP} & \text{Dative domain} & \\
& & & \text{C \{PURP\} \rightarrow TP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{vP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{to-keep} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{V}_k & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v}' & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{Accusative domain} & \\
& & & \text{v} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

\[(66)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Atėjo aplankyti draugo} \\
& \text{VP} & \text{TP} & \text{Genitive domain} & \\
& & & \text{T \{SUP\} \rightarrow vP-Gen} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{come\(_(k)\)} & \\
& & & \text{to-visit} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Gen} & \\
& & & \text{V}_i & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{friend\(_(acc)\)} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Infinitive constructions with Dative subjects, being not limited to purpose infinitives, suggest a different analysis, i.e. the one where the subject NP is assigned associating Dative by the T\{inf\} head. If an Infinitive clause with an overt subject gets embedded under C\{purp\}, its direct object can potentially also receive the complementizing Dative from the latter, but such a surface structure is ruled out by the constraint against two Datives in one TP (64vi), cf. (67).

\[(67)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pinigai mums pastatyti namą / *namui} \\
& \text{NP} & \text{CP} & \text{C-Dative domain} & \\
& & & \text{C \{PURP\} \rightarrow TP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{vP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{V}_i & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{Accusative domain} & \\
& & & \text{v} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

The ban on the Accusative \(\rightarrow\) Dative conversion in the presence of a Dative indirect object is accounted in the same way, cf. (68).

\[(68)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{pinigai nupirkti motinai vazą / *vazai} \\
& \text{NP} & \text{CP} & \text{C-Dative domain} & \\
& & & \text{C \{PURP\} \rightarrow TP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{vP-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{V}_i & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{PRO} & \\
& & & \text{Accusative domain} & \\
& & & \text{v} & \\
& & & \text{VP-Acc-Dat} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v'} & \\
& & & \text{NP} & \\
& & & \text{v} & \\
& & & \text{NP-Dat-Acc-Dat} & \\
\end{align*}
\]

Note that the “double-dative” constraint is violable, since not all structures with more than one Dative NP are ruled out, but only those where there is an alternative variant of case-marking (i.e. Accusative). Cf. a modal Infinitive clause (69) with a Dative subject and a Dative indirect object.

\[(69)\]
\[
\begin{align*}
\text{Kaip [mums padė-ti j-am pripras-ti prie nauj-ų nam-ų]?} \\
\text{how we.DAT help-INF 3-DAT.SG.M get.used-INF at new-GEN.PL house-GEN.PL} \\
\text{‘How can we help him to get accustomed to the new home?’} \\
\text{15} \\
\text{http://www.paukstis.lt/forumas/viewtopic.php?f=23&t=6006&start=810}
\]

Such violability can in principle be handled by OT-style constraint interaction, cf. Erschler 2009.

\[\text{15}\]
\[
\text{http://www.paukstis.lt/forumas/viewtopic.php?f=23&t=6006&start=810}
\]
6. Conclusions and implications
The Lithuanian Dat + Inf and Gen + Inf constructions pose very peculiar problems for a formal analysis. I have presented empirical arguments for a revision of the only such analysis proposed in the literature (FL06), and have drawn upon “very exotic” typological parallels from Australian languages with “complementizing” and “associating” case and overt multiple case marking, which help us better understand the nature of the actually no less “exotic” Lithuanian constructions.

The analysis presented above has some immediate consequences for the formal theory of case (cf. Erschler 2009 and Matsushansky 2008, 2010 for very similar proposals).

Metaphorically speaking, instead of assuming that “all languages are like English”, the belief which has guided much of the Government-and-Binding theory of “abstract case”, I propose to assume that in fact “all languages are like Kayardild”:

– NPs receive case from many (potentially all) lexical and/or functional heads which c-command them;
– morphological realization of these multiple cases assigned in syntax is subject to language-particular rules and constraints, which do not belong to “narrow syntax”;
– some languages, like Kayardild or Nyamal, allow simultaneous morphological realization of several layers of case on a nominal; this is the strongest empirical evidence for the syntactic mechanism of multiple case assignment;
– other languages (arguably the majority) do not allow overt multiple case marking in morphology, but in some (and probably many) of them the mechanism of syntactic multiple case assignment reveals itself in alternations of case marking.

Some implications for the architecture of grammar:
– in the “classic” case theory (e.g. Chomsky 1981: 162–176; Stowell 1981: 110–125; see Bobaljik & Wurmbrand 2009 for a review) case assignment is a local operation, sometimes assumed to be just a reflection of Agree ultimately constrained by the Phase theory of the Minimalist program (Chomsky 2001: 6ff);
– by contrast, the current analysis and the data supporting it imply a non-local view of case: case is assigned by a head to its complement and percolates down to all subconstituents of the latter; thus, though case assignment per se is still a strictly local (head-complement) operation, case percolation is unbounded and in particular pays no attention to phase boundaries;
– a possible way to reconcile the novel view of case and the independently motivated Phase theory is to exclude case percolation from narrow syntax and to transfer it to PF, where case realization belongs, anyway;
– this move, however, necessarily requires that PF-spellout occur not as soon as each phase is constructed, but only after the whole derivation in narrow syntax is completed (cf. Richards 2007).
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