

# The Curious Case of Lithuanian Adjuncts

Steven Franks, Indiana University

As in Slavic, Lithuanian seems to apply structural mechanisms to case-mark (duration) time and distance phrase adjuncts. The case of these adjuncts is not fixed, however, but—somewhat akin to geographically proximate Finnish—varies with the structure. As in other languages, these variations are comparable to the variations found with direct objects. Unsurprisingly, like direct objects, adjuncts are canonically accusative (1) and under negation become genitive (2):

(1) Lijo **valandaç.**  
rained hour:ACC  
'It rained for an hour.'

(2) Neskaiteæ (laikras=c=io) neæ **valandos**  
(he)-not-read newspaper:GEN even hour:GEN  
'He didn't read (the newspaper) even for an hour.'

Unlike in Finnish (cf. Maling 1993, Sakuma 2000), no “Case in Tiers” effects (cf. Yip et. al 1987) obtain: adjuncts in Lithuanian remain accusative regardless of case marking pertaining to arguments, such as voice and mood manipulations. Lavine and Franks (2005) however note (citing Ambrazas et al. 1997) that adjuncts with infinitival themes of psych verbs behave like direct objects, optionally appearing in the nominative (and shifting to the left), as in (3):

(3) Ne vaikui (yra) **kilometras** nueiti¶nueiti**kilometraç.**  
not child:DAT AUX:PRES kilometer:NOM to-go/to-go kilometer:ACC  
'It is not for a child to walk a kilometer.'

Franks and Lavine (in press) assimilates the infamous nominative object construction to two other other quirky case shifted-object infinitival constructions, dative (general) purpose clauses and genitive (supine) purpose clauses, but does not consider the behavior of adjuncts in these constructions. In the former, as expected, adjuncts turn out to be dative (with relative order of adjunct and object free):

(4) As== nuspirkau kirviç <sup>a</sup> malkoms **visai dienai** kirsti°.  
I bought axe:ACC logs:DAT all:DAT day:DAT to-chop  
'I bought an axe to chop logs all day.'

Curiously, adjuncts are dative, not genitive, in the supine construction as well:

(5) As== ateæjau <sup>a</sup>**visai dienai** malkuç kirsti°.  
I came all:DAT day:DAT logs:GEN to-chop  
'I came to chop logs all day.'

This suggests, contra Franks and Lavine, that the source for dative in purpose clauses is not a (silent) prepositional complementizer, but some much lower element, since its effects are felt on

adjuncts in the supine construction even when the direct object is genitive. A more local source for purpose dative could also explain formal similarities with the Slavic quantificational genitive.

#### REFERENCES

- Ambrazas, V. et al. (eds.) (1997). *Lithuanian grammar*. Vilnius: Baltos lankos.
- Franks, S. & J. Lavine (in press). Case and word order in Lithuanian. To appear in *Journal of Linguistics*.
- Lavine, J. & S. Franks (2005). On nominative objects. In Franks, S. et al. (eds.), *Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 13: The South Carolina Meeting*. Ann Arbor: Michigan Slavic Publications. 195-206.
- Maling, J. (1993). Of nominative and accusative: the hierarchical assignment of Grammatical Case in Finnish. In Holmberg, A. & Nikanne, U. (eds.), *Case and Other Functional Categories in Finnish Syntax*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 49-74.
- Sakuma, J. (2000). On adverbial phrases expressing duration or distance in the Finnish language. *Nagoya Daigaku Bungakubu Kenkyu Ronsyu* 136: 71–82.
- Yip, M. et al. (1987). Case in tiers. *Language* 63. 217-250.