This assignment deals with Bejar & Massam (1999), and how their ideas integrate with the discussion on case in class. Read the paper carefully before you start answering. Note: The questions are very specific and demand concise answers. The assignment must not exceed 5 pages!

(1) Discuss whether B&M's proposal can (be extended to) account for Marantz's "Ergative case generalization" [6] and the "morphology-bound version" of Burzio's generalization as presented by Marantz (see, e.g., [31] in Handout dated 10/15/03).

(2) Discuss whether B&M's proposal can (be extended to) account for the Japanese and Icelandic data [11,15-16] that Marantz presents as evidence against the Case-Filter ("Case-drives-movement") framework.

(3) Single out one specific aspect of B&M's data that is most problematic to Marantz's proposal regarding the morphological realization of case. Illustrate with one piece of data from B&M's paper and state the nature of the challenge.

(4) Unlike Korean, no language examined by B&M exhibits case-stacking. The possibility remains, therefore, that the A-chains they consider all bear a single case. Single out the specific features of the data in B&M’s paper that nonetheless support MCC (Multiple Case Checking); i.e., what aspects of the data are particularly problematic for an MCC-denier.

(5) Suppose that case-stacking in Korean genuinely falls under MCC (contra B&M’s fn. 2). What problems does it raise for B&M’s analysis, and for the typology in [19]? How can the analysis/typology be modified to accommodate Korean? Note: Some modifications may be consistent with B&M’s analysis, others not. Be explicit about the implications of whatever you propose.

(6) Similarly, suppose that Farsi and Tongan, discussed by Yoon (1996, ex. 37, 38), are genuine cases of MCC. What problems do they raise for B&M, and how can the system be modified to accommodate these languages.