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1. INTRODUCTORY REMARKS

Main goal of the lesson: to present and analyze some empirical data from European Portuguese (EP) and Brazilian Portuguese (BP) in a comparative perspective in order to provide additional evidence for the role of functional categories in accounting for differences between the two varieties:

- Different functional heads may be projected in the same structure across the two varieties;
- The same functional heads may present different features in each variety.

It follows the two lines of research underlying the syllabus of Comparative Linguistics: Topics on Portuguese Syntax in a Comparative Perspective, a seminar included in the curricular plan of the Masters Degree in Linguistics:

(i) The Lexicon-Syntax interface;
(ii) The functional architecture of the sentence.

The discussion intends to be comprehensive and to span the syllabus as it is conceived (see the Report of the Seminar):

- It corresponds to part of the last session of the seminar, which allows us to resume some of the phenomena that were addressed during the semester. These phenomena are revisited in the light of new data and a specific theoretical hypothesis.
- The comparison is twofold since it aims at
  (i) accounting for the differences between EP and BP with respect to each structure under discussion;
  (ii) analyzing these structures (some of which were already independently accounted for) in an integrated manner. This approach will allow us to show that assuming a particular functional category or assigning it distinct properties in each variety explains a substantial number of effects on different structures. 2

The structures under discussion:

- Restructuring
- Hyper-raising
- Personal infinitives in adjunct clauses

Motivation for selecting these structures:

- Different analyses of these topics usually rely on the properties of C/T/v, even when no comparison between EP and BP is carried out.

---

1 Lesson submitted to public examination in order to obtain the title of Agregado in Linguistics (General Linguistics).

2 An integrated analysis of different phenomena comparing EP with BP is also carried out in Ambar et al. (2009) and Costa (2011), a.o. Ambar et al. (2009) even suggest that some cases must be seen as co-variation.
C-T-v uniformly constitute the core functional structure, thus the discussion of these phenomena may shed some light on the functional architecture of the sentence across languages.

Parametric variation as the result of:
- functional structure
- and / or
- features of functional categories

### 2. THE LOCUS OF VARIATION: A BRIEF OVERVIEW OF PARAMETRIC VARIATION

The comparative study of languages has been a primary goal of Generative Grammar since the transformational models of the 1960’s and the 1970’s, which highlighted the need to

(i) find the regularities underlying natural languages → similarities between languages;
(ii) determine language-specific rules → specific properties of a language or a group of languages.

In the late 1970s, transformational models were severely questioned due to their vulnerability with respect to the following aspects:

(i) Contrary to the available empirical evidence, these models ultimately allowed for unlimited variation between languages;
(ii) The resulting theoretical constructs were too complex and could not relate different constructions, as rules were not only language-specific but also construction-specific.

Rizzi (1978): the first essay arguing for a model in which conditions on rules were somehow parametrized, resulting in a simplification of the theoretical apparatus and the structure of grammar.

Chomsky (1981): deepens the notion of parameter, while maintaining the existence of universal principles – the Principles and Parameters (P&P) model.

→ Universal Grammar (UG) = faculty of language

Universal principles + finite set of parameters allowing the determination of linguistic variation and its limits (Chomsky 1981: 4)

### Huge impact of the P&P model on comparative syntax, involving both diachronic and synchronic data: it deepened the study of grammar (in particular, of syntax) on an unprecedented scale, since it proved capable of relating structures that were not accounted for by a merely inductive analysis (Picallo 2014: 2).

A new approach to UG and hence to parameters is introduced by the Minimalist Program (MP) (see, for instance, Chomsky 1995, 2005; Kayne 2005, a.o.).

### AS FOR UG

(i) An impoverished and more unspecified UG
(ii) Broad Faculty of Language (FLB) vs. Narrow Faculty of Language (FLN)

→ “FLB includes an internal computational system (FLN, below) combined with at least two other organism-internal systems, which we call ‘sensory-motor’ and ‘conceptual-intentional’.” (Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch 2002: 1570-1571) – memory, attention, systems of neuronal organization

→ “FLN is the abstract linguistic computational system alone, independent of the other systems with which it interacts and interfaces. FLN is a component of FLB, and the mechanisms underlying it are some subset of those underlying FLB.” (Hauser, Chomsky & Fitch 2002: 1571)
Three factors in language design (Chomsky 2005):

| Genetic endowment (the topic of UG) |
| Experience |
| Principles that are language – or organism – independent |

Core question in the MP: how perfect is language? (Chomsky 1995, 2005, 2013, a.o.)

- Economy of derivations and representations minimizes the descriptive and theoretical apparatus that characterizes the earlier models of P&P (in the 1980’s).
- Variation is an imperfection, although it actually exists.

As for parameters

Debate on the need of parameters:


Alternative approaches to the source of linguistic variation:

- Lexicon
  - and / or
- Articulatory-Perceptual level

The lexicon as the source of linguistic variation:


  Properties of functional categories = formal features, capacity to check / value the formal features of other categories, position in the skeleton of the sentence.

BUT: In recent works, there is broad consensus that if they exist, parameters are not part of either UG or of the syntactic module.

In the words of Adger (2007), “Minimalism is unlike other ‘lexicalist’ theories in that almost all the interesting structure is syntactic, although the information which leads to the building of that structure is almost entirely lexical.”

3 Barbiers (2014) claims that the two approaches are complementary, that is, the locus of variation can be both the Lexicon and the A-P level.

4 In the words of Adger (2007), “Minimalism is unlike other ‘lexicalist’ theories in that almost all the interesting structure is syntactic, although the information which leads to the building of that structure is almost entirely lexical.”
This lesson aims at contributing to this approach, namely in order to account for EP / BP variation. Although the Lexicon is the locus of variation, there is impact on Syntax, in the way functional categories interrelate in the sentence structure and drive Merge and Agree operations.

The features of functional categories encoded in the Lexicon trigger the operations in the syntactic component of grammar.

3. A PRELIMINARY LOOK INTO THE DATA

The structures under discussion:
- Restructuring
- Hyper-raising
- Personal infinitives in adjunct clauses

A. Restructuring

In Italian, some verbs selecting for infinitival complements appear to form a syntactic unit with the verb of these complements regarding some clause-bound phenomena (Rizzi 1978, 1982): clitic climbing (Cl-Cl), long object movement (LOM), assignment of essere auxiliary. → transparency effects (Bok-Bennema & Kampers-Manhe 1994)

1. a. Piero verrà a parlarti di parapsicologia. / Piero ti verrà a parlare di parapsicologia. (Cl-Cl)
   b. Si vuole vendere queste case a caro prezzo. / Queste case si vogliono vendere a caro prezzo. (LOM)
   c. Gianni ha voluto tornare a casa. / Gianni è voluto tornare a casa. (assignment of essere auxiliary)

BP is uniformly characterized by the absence of restructuring (and of any kind of syntactic complex predicates) – see Cyrino (2010).

2. a. O Pedro não quis emprestar o livro ao irmão.
   b. O Pedro não o quis emprestar ao irmão. (Cl-Cl)
   c. O Pedro não quis emprestá-lo ao irmão.

3. a. O João não pode emprestar o livro ao irmão.
   b. O Pedro não o pode emprestar ao irmão. (Cl-Cl)
   c. O Pedro não pode emprestá-lo ao irmão.

4. a. Agora já se quer resolver os problemas de desemprego.
   b. Agora já se querem resolver os problemas de desemprego. (LOM)

5. a. Agora já se pode resolver os problemas de desemprego.
   b. Agora já se podem resolver os problemas de desemprego. (LOM)

   b. João quer te ver.

   b. João pode te ver.

8. a. Em situações como estas, pode-se aplicar metodologias de antecipação do cenário eleitoral. (Cavalcante 2010: 76)
   b. ??*Em situações como estas, não se podem aplicar metodologias de antecipação do cenário eleitoral. (LOM)
The (apparent) absence of long object movement in BP relates to the loss of passive SE (Nunes 1990, 1991; Cavalcante 2006, 2010; Martins & Nunes 2016, a.o.).

Results of a search on the BP Corpus NILC/S. Carlos [www.linguateca.pt]

- 71 occurrences of LOM with poder and cl-cl
- 0 occurrences of LOM with poder without cl-cl
- 1 occurrence of LOM with querer and cl-cl

“The surviving (infrequent) instances of passive se in present‐day BP are generally restricted to written language and formal style and are arguably due to a prescriptivist tradition that condemns the use of impersonal se with transitive verbs (see e.g. Galves 1986, Nunes 1990, 1991).” (Martins & Nunes 2016: 323)

B. Hyper‐raising

- In colloquial BP (ColBP) the embedded subject of a finite complement clause selected by some raising verbs (parecer, perigar, acabar que) can raise to the matrix subject position (Ferreira 2004; Rodrigues 2002, 2004; Martins & Nunes 2005, 2009, 2010; Nunes 2008). This is a grammatical option in other languages, such as Moroccan Arabic and Bhojpuri (Ura 1994).

(11) Os meninos, parecem que tiveram a tarefa.
(12) Os estudantes acabaram que tiveram mais cedo.
(13) Aqueles funcionários parecem que vão ser demitidos.

(Examples from Nunes 2008: 99)

- Hyper‐raising has been described as a structure specific to ColBP. But see Costa & Rooryck (1995), Rooryck (2000) and Costa (2011) for pseudo/hyper‐raising in colloquial EP (ColEP):

(14) a. Não sei de que região és natural, mas pareces que estás numa pega.
(b. As pessoas dizem que eu nem pareço que tenho 17 anos.
(c. Escrever é bom, sobretudo quando não temos alguém em quem confiar, quando estamos sozinhos e parecemos que vamos rebentar e então explodimos.
(d. oh esquece eu às vezes até pareço que como palha com um garfo.

(Examples from Costa 2011)

C. Personal infinitives

- In ColBP, uninflected infinitives appear to license nominative overt subjects, especially in adjunct clauses, i.e. in non‐control contexts. (Mensching 2000; Pires 2002, 2006; Rothman et al. 2013; Alexandre, Duarte & Santos 2013; Vanderschueren 2013, a.o.).
BP contrasts with EP, which blocks such structures as (15), even in colloquial varieties. Only inflected infinitives license overt nominative subjects (16), an option that is also available in BP (Mensching 2000; Pires 2006; Sitaridou 2002, 2009; Alexandre, Duarte & Santos 2013).

In ECM contexts, with the uninflected infinitive, specified ‘subjects’ are licensed but bear accusative Case:

(17)  
\[\text{a. A chuva fez os meninos correr para casa.} \]
\[\text{b. A chuva (fê-los / *fez eles) correr para casa.} \]

\[\Rightarrow \text{The possibility of an uninflected infinitive co-occurring with a specified subject is also available in Spanish, a language that does not have inflected infinitives (a.o., Hernanz 1982, 1999; Rigau 1995; Lagunilla & Anula 1994; Torrego 1998; Mensching 2000).} \]

(i) **Adjunct clauses** – highly productive option, resulting in grammatical sentences.

(18)  
\[\text{a. [De tener yo dinero], me compraria la casa. (Hernanz 1999: 2265)} \]
\[\text{b. No me sorprendería tener algun tio ricacho en América, [sin yo saberlo]. (Mensching 2000: 26)} \]

(ii) **Subject clauses** – a marked option, restricted to colloquial varieties.

**ColBP**: personal infinitive restricted to adjunct clauses, introduced by an overt C/preposition.

**INTERIM CONCLUSIONS: EP vs. BP**

(i) Comparing the three structures, we conclude that

- Restructuring and personal infinitives are to a certain extent complementary and definitely distinguish EP from BP:
  \[\Rightarrow \text{Restructuring is restricted to EP} \]
  \[\Rightarrow \text{Personal infinitives are restricted to BP} \]

- Hyper-raising is found in colloquial varieties of both BP and EP, the major difference being the number of verbs that allow for the structure in each variety (a more extensive group of verbs in BP than in EP, according to Nunes 2008, a.o.).
  \[\Rightarrow \text{Restructuring in EP is attested in the standard variety; hyper-raising and personal infinitives are colloquial in the varieties they occur.} \]

(ii) Differences between EP and BP regarding these constructions have been attributed to the properties of T (or Infl) and/or C. Generally, it has been argued that differences in the agreement systems of the two varieties are the source of variation in the case of the structures under analysis.
4. **What do these data tell us?**

**Preliminary remarks: how does intuition guide our analysis?**

(i) The contrast concerning **restructuring** seems to indicate that infinitival domains are less defective in BP than in EP: non-defective CPs/TPs preclude the formation of complex predicates, which blocks transparency effects such as clitic climbing and long object movement.

(ii) The possibility of **hyper-raising** is unexpected and contradictory to (i): indicative (finite) domains should be more complete (less defective) than infinitival ones. If the embedded CP is complete, how is subject raising out of a finite clause licensed?

(iii) **Personal infinitives** in BP should also be unexpected: specified (or overt) nominative subjects in embedded clauses should only be possible if T is specified for ϕ-features, which does not seem to be the case of uninflected infinitival domains.

⇒ From (i) to (iii), we may conclude that the properties of C-T-v must be at stake when the three structures are considered in a comparative perspective.

4.1. **Starting with restructuring...**

Restructuring in EP is ruled by two independent conditions:

(i) The semantic condition

(a) The matrix verb is specified for the **temporal orientation** of the infinitival domain (Duarte, Gonçalves & Santos 2012; Gonçalves, Santos & Duarte 2014).

(21) a. O João não quis *ver/ter visto* o irmão.
    b. O João não o quis ver.

(22) a. O João não afirmou *ver/ter visto* o irmão.
    b. *O João não o afirmou (ver/ter visto).

(b) The complement clause is **tense dependent** on the matrix clause, i.e., the two situations share the same temporal domain (Declerck 1991), the temporal perspective point (Kamp & Reyle 1993) of the embedded infinitive being the time of the matrix clause (Gonçalves 1999; Gonçalves, Cunha & Silva 2010).

(23) a. *O João não quis ver o irmão amanhã.
     b. O João não quis ver o irmão nos dias que se seguiram ao acidente.
     c. O João não o quis ver.

(24) a. O João não prometeu consultar esse médico amanhã.
     b. O João não prometeu consultar esse médico nos dias que se seguiram ao acidente.
     c. *O João não o prometeu consultar.

(ii) The structural condition: in restructuring contexts, the embedded (C-)T is defective for V-features, unspecified for ϕ-features and for the features related to temporal orientation and temporal perspective point ([t π? ; TPpt: ?]; Gonçalves, Santos & Duarte 2014).

The case of BP:

⇒ Condition (i) is met (the same judgments for (21a), (22a), (23a, b), (24a, b)), but restructuring is blocked.

⇒ The EP / BP contrast should be related to condition (ii).

**Cyrino (2010):**

(i) In BP, nonfinite T is incomplete. In EP, nonfinite T selected by restructuring verbs is defective (it lacks all of its ϕ-features).

(ii) A ϕ-bundle is incomplete if it lacks some of its features (Cyrino 2010: 202).
In BP, nonfinite Ts are only specified for [number] features (following Nunes’s 2007, 2008 proposal for considering [person] features to be dissociated features in finite Ts).

Nonfinite T is not different from finite T in its $\phi$-features → BP lacks restructuring.

The major problems of Cyrino’s (2010) analysis:

- If infinitival incomplete Ts are identical to finite incomplete Ts, restructuring and hyper-raising should not co-occur in the same variety (but see the case of EP).

  An incomplete T blocks the possibility of clitic climbing and LOM in infinitival contexts, but it allows for subject raising out of the finite embedded TP in the case of hyper-raising.\(^5\)

- The difference between a defective T and an incomplete T is quite imperceptible (i.e., they have similar effects) and cannot be the source of variation: neither in standard EP nor in standard BP are overt nominative subjects possible in uninflected infinitival domains.

**But**

Part of Cyrino’s (2010) analysis may be adopted in order to account for the contrast between EP and BP: the idea that if lower functional heads possess $\phi$-features, upper categories cannot probe the (nominal) features in the nonfinite heads. (p. 200)

Assuming a $C>T>\text{ASP}>\nu$ hierarchy, we may hypothesize that embedded $\nu$ and $\text{ASP}$

(i) are always complete for their $\phi$-features in BP (something independently advocated by Ambar et al. 2009 for $\nu\text{P}$),

(ii) but may be defective for their $\phi$-features in non-finite contexts of EP.

In BP:

- clitics (characterized as a bundle of $\phi$-features; Déchaine & Wiltshko 2002) are probed within $\nu\text{P}$ and check / value their $\phi$-features against the features of $\nu$ (or Asp; Duarte, Matos & Gonçalves 2005). \(\rightarrow\) clitic climbing is blocked.

- The same is true for the internal argument of the embedded verb, which checks / values its features inside the embedded Asp-$\nu$ domain \(\rightarrow\) LOM is blocked.

- In non-finite contexts, the verb moves no further than Asp.\(^6\)

In EP:

- When Asp-$\nu$ are $\phi$-defective, clitics cannot check / value their features within the embedded domain, the same being true for the internal argument of the embedded verb \(\rightarrow\) clitic climbing and LOM show up.

- The T domain in which clitics are licensed must be complete \(\rightarrow\) this is true for the matrix domain, not for the embedded clause in restructuring.

---

\(^5\) Modesto (2011a) presents several counterarguments to Nunes’s (2008) proposal.

\(^6\) In fact, Ambar et al. (2009) present several arguments for the claim that V does not move out of $\nu\text{P}$ in BP.
As Wurmbrand (2001, 2004) argues, **restructuring is not an operation but a syntactic effect of the selection properties of some verbs that co-occur with infinitival complements**: bare VPs in German, as Wurmbrand advocates; defective (T-)Asp-ν domains in EP.

**Summing up:** the contrast between EP and BP regarding restructuring is due to differences in the Asp-ν system in these varieties.

### 4.2. ... going through hyper-raising...

The possibility of hyper-raising has been analyzed as a specificity of ColBP also resulting from distinctive properties of T in this variety (Ferreira 2000, 2004; Martins & Nunes 2005, 2009, 2010; Nunes 2008, 2016, a.o.) – the same was advocated for restructuring.

**BUT**

Costa & Rooryck (1995), Rooryck (2000) and Costa (2011) show that the structure (which they call pseudo-raising) is not specific to ColBP – see (14) for EP.

#### The problem

- Subject raising out of tensed CPs should be banned
  - (i) it constitutes a case of improper movement; CP is a phase;
  - (ii) the embedded subject should check / value its features inside the tensed CP, thus it would be frozen for movement.

#### The two major proposals considered here

---

7 The idea that Agr is somehow defective for person features in BP is also advocated by Galves (1993) and Figueiredo Silva (1996).
(26) Eu parece que [eu estou parva].


⇒ But some speakers of EP also produce hyper-raising in colloquial contexts: Nunes’s analysis cannot account for the EP data in (14), (25b) – being a morphologically rich language, finite Ts qualify as Case assigners, which should prevent subject raising out of tensed CPs.

Searching for an alternative approach...

The possibility of hyper-raising is in fact related to the properties of embedded T in the context of raising verbs, as claimed by Nunes (2008) and subsequent works.

Speakers who produce hyper-raising

⇒ Reanalyze the complementizer que as a particular instance of T on C (a proposal by Pesetsky & Torrego 2001, 2004, explored by Duarte, Gonçalves & Miguel 2005 for the discussion of the properties of C in EP, and Colaço & Gonçalves in press for the \textit{<ir-e-V>} structure) – que is merged into T and moves to C, in order to value its [T] features.

⇒ The fact that the complementizer que has a particular status in this structure is also suggested by Costa & Rooryck (1995) and Rooryck (2000), who compare pseudo-raising in EP with \textit{like} structures selected by \textit{seem} in English and conclude that in the latter Cs are fully comparative (\textit{The cows seem like / ??as if / *that they have eaten too much grass.}).

⇒ Reanalyze the finite complement selected by the raising verb as a defective CP domain (the complementizer is in fact the lexicaization of T), keeping some of the properties of raising constructions, in which the complement clause is a defective TP (27).

(27) Eu parece [TPde/que estar parva].

⇒ Dissociate Case-features from (the other) $\phi$-features, something that is often attenuated in Minimalism (but see, for instance, Ussery 2012: “(…) case and phi features on T can behave independently, and do not necessarily constitute an indivisible feature bundle. As such, I argue that the case and phi features are independent probes on T.”)\(^9\)

In hyper-raising, the embedded T is defective for Case-features (which triggers the raising of the embedded subject to the matrix clause) but it is complete for (the other) $\phi$-features, which show up overtly in the shape of the embedded finite verb form (explaining subject-verb agreement).\(^{10}\)⇒ in between raising structures (27) and head starts (Perlmutter 1976; (28))

(28) Eu parece que estou parva.

\(^8\) The particular behavior of the complementizer que is also displayed by the alternation \textit{de/que} under the modal \textit{ter}.

(i) Tenho (de/que) acabar rapidamente este trabalho.

\(^9\) The fact that Case-features may be dissociated from $\phi$-features is also advocated in the first works within the MP, and underlies the Split-Infl hypothesis (inherited from Pollack 1989), which considers the existence of two functional categories, each one associated to those features: T to Case-features and Agr to $\phi$-features.

\(^{10}\) See Hornstein, Martins & Nunes (2008) for inflected infinitival Ts whose $\phi$-set is incomplete, which prevents nominative Case valuation of the embedded subject in the context of perception and causative structures.
Summing up: hyper-raising relates to an incomplete / defective T (Nunes 2008 for ColBP). The incompleteness / defectiveness is ascribed to Case-features only (which accounts for both BP and EP).

4.3. … ending up in personal infinitives.
The occurrence of personal infinitives in ColBP (29) is often argued to relate to the impoverishment (or reduction) of verbal morphology in this variety (Pires 2002, 2006, a.o.).

(29) A Maria ligou [antes de nós sair].
The problem: nominative Case is usually checked / valued in the presence of overt verbal inflection – finite and inflected infinitival contexts.

Pires (2006: 144) claims that inflected infinitives in ColBP lost the inflectional morphology, but “they didn’t lose their ability to license overt subjects, which indicates that the morphological loss didn’t turn them into the usual kind of non-inflected infinitives (…)“.

In fact, personal infinitives highly resemble inflected infinitives (see Alexandre, Duarte & Santos 2013, and Sitaridou 2009, who bring Spanish personal infinitives and Portuguese and Galician inflected infinitives together):

(i) Nominative Case is licensed on the subject.
(ii) The embedded infinitival clause is a tense independent domain (in the sense of Gonçalves, Santos & Duarte 2014) – preferably adjunct clauses; complement clauses excluded; no clear judgments for subject clauses.

→ The fact that personal infinitives are preferred in adjunct clauses, introduced by a complementizer, is of great importance.

A tentative analysis...

- The infinitival form in BP personal infinitive constructions bears Φ-features like inflected infinitive forms.
- Due to the impoverishment of the verbal morphology, these features may be syntactically present on T without a morphological counterpart (Pires 2006: 146 ff) – abstract/implicit Φ-features in Alexandre, Santos & Duarte (2013), Rothman et al. (2013). Notwithstanding, this does not mean that BP lost inflected infinitives (see, a.o., Modesto 2011b).
- The abstract Φ-features on T are licensed, via Agree, by C. This head is specified for Φ-features, inasmuch as it is lexicalized by a complementizer. The Φ-features on T are licensed by C, though they do not have an overt manifestation. This roughly corresponds to [+Agr] in C in the sense of Mensching (2000).
- The prominent role of C is markedly visible in languages in which personal infinitives may occur in complement clauses as long as these clauses are introduced by a complementizer (this is the case of Sardinian; Jones 1993, Sitaridou 2009)
- Nominative case on the DP is checked / valued the same way it is checked / valued in finite and inflected infinitives (with explicit Φ-features) contexts.

Summing up: T in personal infinitives bears the same features that T in inflected infinitival contexts, but the morphological realization of these features is distinct in EP and in BP.

5. Concluding remarks
The comparative approach to the three structures under discussion allow us to conclude that:
Some phenomena that are classically argued to represent a break between EP and BP are not really distinctive, as Costa (2011) also remarks (see hyper-raising). Hyper-raising involves the features of embedded T.

Differences between the two varieties (restructuring and personal infinitives) may be derived from the properties of functional heads:

\( \Rightarrow \) **BP:** the domains of functional heads below T are always complete for \( \phi \)-features (absence of restructuring and other syntactic complex predicates); T may be as defective for \( \phi \)-features as in EP (for instance, in uninflected infinitival complements selected by control predicates) or syntactically similar to EP regarding the features of the same head, but morphologically distinct (personal infinitives).

From a theoretical point of view:

(i) As widely remarked in the literature, the relationship between finiteness and \( \phi \)-features does not work both ways, that is

\[
\text{Finite domains } \Rightarrow \phi \text{-features } \not\Rightarrow \text{finite domains}
\]

(ii) The same feature may show up in different functional heads and in different forms (syntactically and morphologically, or only syntactically).

(iii) Case may be a dissociated feature.
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