Individual grammars select the particular features that are to receive overt expression in INFL. This selection is constrained to the members of a set of "closed-class" features, with "grammatical" rather than "lexical" semantic properties. What appears in INFL as a closed class category in one language may be expressed in another by means of a "periphrastic" syntactic construction that utilizes open class categories: for example, some languages have modal particles or affixes, while others express modal notions exclusively by nouns and verbs.

In the array of features marked in INFL across languages, we frequently see portmanteau elements, where some combination of features is expressed in a single non-compositional form. For example, tense and the subject are often marked together in the main verb or in an auxiliary. The distribution of some features may be mutually exclusive across clause type: mood and modality may be excluded from non-finite clauses. It is important to note that typically one member of an inflectional category (third person, singular, tense, singular agreement, polarity, etc.) is marked by default, or is phonologically null. This reflects the principle of economy of expression; when some value of the small closed inventory is obligatorily present, it is a unique member of the paradigm. The presence of null and portmanteau forms provides insight into some of the entailments that obtain between the inflectional categories.

In sum, parametric variation in the INFL component of the clause may be characterized as follows:

a) There is a universally available set of features that may be grammaticalized and marked in INFL;

b) Languages select among and articulate the marking of these features in a particular set of functional projections; and

c) There are certain entailments and scopal properties of these features that languages may exploit in determining the particular content of the functional projections they select.

The focus of this paper is on the pronominal elements that are introduced by the functional heads VOICE and TRANSITIVE in Lummi. I will argue that pronouns in these languages do not represent "agreement" with nominals, and therefore that Lummi is not a "pro-drop" language, but rather a language with Pronominal Arguments. Pronominal Arguments are a typological feature entailed by the presence of overt VOICE and TRANSITIVE inflection. I will begin with a description of TRANSITIVE inflection in Lummi and its function in introducing internal arguments.

1. TRANSITIVE. Kuipers (1968), in an early discussion of the question of a noun/verb contrast in Salish, points out the significance of the fact that the Salishic languages must be stigmatized for particular languages, since their behavior does not follow from the general principles that apply to basic predicate argument structures. In the INFL component of the grammatical projections where various sentence operators are marked, including Mood, Tense/Aspect/Modality, and Negation. "Main" or lexical verbs are claimed to raise and adjunct to functional projections in INFL when sentences are marked for voice. The movement of these elements present in INFL in particular languages include auxiliary verbs and particles, "adverbial" particles, and clitic pronouns; in many languages we see these elements as components of a second position clitic string (Hale 1973).

Languages differ essentially in what they must convey and not in what they may convey."

Chomsky (1991, 1992) restates this insight in the following terms: "Parametric variation across languages follows from differences in the strength of features across languages. Strong features receive overt expression in the syntax; they must be said, in the sense that they are obligatory grammaticalized features. Examples of strong features include the marking of gender in third person pronouns in Indo-European, or the marking of switch reference across clauses in Muskogian, where pronominal gender is not marked in the overt syntax; they will receive expression in the syntax; they must be said, in the sense that they are obligatory grammaticalized features.

Thus, in some languages Wh-raising is "strong" and receives overt expression in the syntax; in other languages, it is "weak", and the movement of Wh-words to operator positions can be delayed until later in the derivation, since the universal principles that determine the interpretation of the sentence insure that it will take place by LF.

If languages differ essentially in what is grammaticalized, then these differences across languages are not random, but are confined to those parts of the sentence where grammaticalized elements occur. The area of sentence structure where languages show the greatest num-
"The possibility of combinations with possessive affixes was used in the Squamish language [Kuipers 1967] as the basis for a distinction of noun and verb in Squamish. It is clear, however, that such labelings not only fail to give any information beyond the already known facts on which the labeling is based, but are even misleading as they suggest a far-reaching parallelism between languages that does not exist."

Kuiper (1968) also draws attention to the fact that the feature of Transitivity receives overt morphological expression in Salish. This morphological expression of transitivity is apparently present to varying degrees in all the Salish languages. Thompson and Thompson (1992), in their grammar of the Thompson language, observe (p.50): "All predicative words are either TRANSITIVE (TR), incorporating specific reference to the object or goal of an act; or INTRANSITIVE... All transitives are marked by the suffix -t-/ (although it often is phonologically disguised)... While transitive (or transitive pronoun) subject and object, intransitives take enclitic personal subject... They also can have Possessive infixes... This latter inflection takes on special importance in the casting of subordinated predications..."

These generalizations on Thompson provide insights into the structure of Lummi. Recent advances in syntactic theory have made it possible to appreciate the significance of the observations made by Kuipers, and Thompson and Thompson, for the identification of Transitivity as a functional projection in universal clause structure. These aspects of Salish grammar provide confirmation for analyses of argument structure in universal grammar that have been independently developed by linguists working on other languages.

2. Noun and verb. The feature of Transitivity relates to the noun/verb question in Salish in the following way. Within generative grammar, nouns and verbs have been distinguished on the basis of argument structure. While members of the category verb may assign structural case to an internal argument, nouns never assign structural case. Thus, nouns don't take direct objects. In the Minimality framework, direct arguments are marked by the suffix -t- (although it often is phonologically disguised)... While transitive pronoun subject and object, intransitives take enclitic personal subject... They also can have Possessive infixes... This latter inflection takes on special importance in the casting of subordinated predications..."

The particular case that the internal argument receives (ACC, ABS, or ERG) depends on the Voice of the construction, which we will consider in a moment.

Let us follow Murasugi and assume that [+ TRANSITIVE] is the proper designation for the functional head associated with the "internal" (suffix) argument in Lummi. Clauses marked [- TRAN] by the contrastive absence of an overt TRAN suffix (the default value), have only one direct argument, the subject; [+ TRAN] marks the presence of a morphologically "internal" argument as well. Salish and language families such as Athapaskan, Eskimo, Uto-Aztecan, some Philippine languages, and Basque provide us with explicit evidence of TRANSITIVE as a "strong" feature, marked in an overt functional head. Consider the following kind of parametric contrast:

a. In some languages (English, for example), TRANSITIVE is not overtly marked in the syntax, and Transitivity is a subcategorizing feature of a particular class of lexical items, Verbs.

b. In other languages (Lummi, for example) TRANSITIVE is an obligatory functional head in the syntax, which is responsible for coding internal arguments; thus, there is no class of lexical (open class) items which subcategorize for internal arguments.

From the perspective of English grammar, Lummi splits the verb into two parts, the lexical root and the "auxiliary" element, TRANSITIVE, that introduces internal arguments. From the perspective of Lummi grammar, English collapses the lexical root and the TRANSITIVE head into a single lexical item, the verb. The presence of VOICE and TRANSITIVE as overt inflectional elements in Lummi makes the surface syntactic structure closer to the kind of compositional argument structure defined for Logical Form by Parsons (1990).

3) PAST (e) [stabbings (e) & Subject (e, Brutus) & Object (e, Caesar)] Brutus stabbed Caesar.

I assume that in Lummi, the lexical root retains the event argument (or "sentential" argument, in Bach's terminology).

Salish is famous for the productivity of the transitivization process, a productivity made possible by the overt compositionality of argument structure. Some Lummi examples:

4) 'an'e-t-8=le'w=seen come-TRAN-JABS=PAST=1sgNOM I brought it.

5) smone6-t-8=le'piching VERG=TABS He is "pitching" it (covering it with pitch).

While processes that transitivize intransitive verbs and nouns are frequent across languages, the examples in (6, 7) are of a type less commonly seen.
The roots in Ex. (6a,b) are adverbial quantifiers elsewhere. In (7), the root assigns a quality.

The examples in (9) below illustrate non-agentive relations, feelings or experiences, a Possessive pronoun may be affixed.

3. Intransitives and Possessive pronouns. Possessive pronouns occur with nouns across languages. If the Salish root describes something that can be characterized grammatically as possessed, for example material objects, relations, feelings or experiences, a Possessive pronoun may be affixed.

8) a. na-nano-sxʷ
   1sPOSS=child=2sNOM
   You are my child.

   b. na-men=la'=sg
   1sPOSS=father=PAST=3ABS
   It is my late (deceased) father.

The point here is that the resulting complex form remains a predicate; these derived predicates occur with the clitic string to produce a finite sentence. In main clauses, a Possessive pronoun can occur only in predicates that are [- TRAN]. Technically, this follows from the fact that [+ TRAN] assigns a structural case (ACC, ABS or ERG) to an internal argument, and POSS case is incompatible with (cannot be checked at) [+ TRAN]. The examples in (9) below illustrate non-agentive "psych" predicates with a Possessive pronoun marking the Experiencer, an internal argument, while the subject is a second position clitic.

9) a. ne-e=kʷ'í-sxʷ
   1sPOSS=value=3NOM
   You are my dear/valued. (I like you.)
   [s-′kʷ'í be dear/valuable]

   b. na=slal=ʒ
   kʷ ye'-go
   1sPOSS=intent=3ABS DET go-1sSBD
   It is my intention to go.

Possessive pronouns appear also as subjects in normalized Propositional clauses. 10) 'aw' sli-t-š=san
   LINK know-TR-3ABS=1sNOM DET 2sPOSS-SBD-go
   (And so) I know (it), that you left.

Thus, the two functions of Possessive pronouns are clearly distinct syntactically in Lummi. They participate in deriving complex predicates (8, 9) where they are not subjects, and in deriving normalized Propositional clauses (10) where they are subjects. In other Salish languages, the situation is more complex; Thomas and Everett (1993) note the presence of Possessive pronouns in main clause paradigms in Flathead.

4. VOICE and the subject argument. I have proposed that TRANSITIVE is an overt functional head in the overt syntax which occurs with all roots, rather than a feature of a particular lexical class. Speaking informally, we can say that the Functional head [+ TRAN] takes over some of the syntactic work assumed by the noun/verb contrast in languages like English, and provides for relative freedom in the distribution of the morphologically bound roots. Following Thompson and Thompson, I assume that roots never appear without being inflected for [+ TRAN]; roots do not occur independently, but only within Predicates, which include [+ TRAN] and any internal argument.

Chomsky (1992) proposes, it is simply a question of internal argument. Kratzer (1992, 1994) argues that there is a universal functional head VOICE that introduces the external argument. Kratzer argues on semantic as well as syntactic grounds that external arguments are added via a neo-Davidsonian secondary predication, since all arguments must be introduced by some head, rather than by a phrase. VOICE determines the theta role assigned to the subject: Transitive subjects are Agents, while Passive subjects can show Tense.
subjects are Patients.
On Kratzer's analysis, the functional head VOICE is responsible both for assigning a theta role to the external argument and for assigning case to the internal argument; ACC case is not present unless there is an external argument as well as an internal one. The Salish languages provide evidence that we need to recognize both VOICE and TRANSITIVE as functional heads, since both are morphologically overt in Salish. The valence of the clause is determined at TRAN, and the theta role assignments are determined at both VOICE and TRAN, since there are entailments between voice and valence. If the value for the feature VOICE is Passive, then no argument may be introduced at VOICE, and structural (internal) case may not be assigned.

If we define voice contrasts as particular mappings between thematic roles and argument positions, then it follows that the Lummi Ergative construction is an Inverse Voice construction (Jelinek 1993a). The Lummi Inverse is a [+ TRAN] construction where the subject is the Patient, and the morphologically internal argument has the Agent theta role, as in Ex. (i): hit-PASS=2sgNOM You were hit by accident/finally hit got hit. It is important to note that [+ TRAN] in the Passive continues to mark the volitionality of the "implicit" agent. When the VOICE suffix -g follows

[= TRAN], it still marks the subject as affected, in a Middle construction.

12) hes-ŋə 

sneeze-MID=3ABS
He sneezed.

Both Lummi and Saanich (Montler 1986) have a "Non-control" Reflexive Passive.

13) 'išən-n-oŋt=son

eat-NCTR-REFL=lsgNOM
I (luckily) got to eat.

Kratzer points out that across languages, we see only a narrow range of theta roles assigned to transitive subjects: there are Agents, and "Holders" in Possessive sentences; there are also Experiencers.

14) a. He owns them.
b. He dislikes them.

I suggest that the theta roles assigned at VOICE and TRANSITIVE across languages represent the core thematic categories, along the lines of the "thematic proto-roles" defined in Dowty (1991). These thematic proto-roles receive syntactic expression where argument structure is overtly compositional. The particular argument array selected by the speaker in composing the clause must be consistent with the entailments imposed by the semantic features of the lexical root, or the derivation is ungrammatical. Thus, it is impossible to select more than one Agent or Patient argument in a simple clause.

There is minor variation across languages in the particular semantic content of the thematic proto-roles assigned at VOICE and TRANSITIVE. Agents and patients are the prototypical roles; in some languages, including Lummi, neither Experiencers nor "Holders" can be transitive subjects. One kind of Lummi Possessive sentence includes the Relational prefix:

15) a. sleniy'=son

female=1sNOM
I am a woman.
b. ę-sleniy'=sw

REL-female=2sNOM
You have a wife.

And Salish employs [- TRAN] constructions with Possessor non-subject arguments in "psych" constructions, as in (9) above, and (16).

16) 'on-sx'tin=son

2sgPOSS-dislike=1sgNOM
You dislike me. (I am your dislike.)

Similar constraints against non-agentive transitive subjects appear in other languages with Pronominal Arguments (Jelinek 1995b). This appears to be related to the fact that argument structure is overtly compositional in these languages. In Lummi we see agentive features (volitionality or
meanings, that occur in main clause predicates and may be \([\pm \text{TRAN}]\). In sum, the Oblique marker consisting of a preposition with a pronominal object, or an "inflected" preposition or postposition of the kind so common in Native America (Jelinek 1993b). This apparent typological idiosyncrasy can be readily explained with reference to the fact that structural case is assigned only to the TRANSITIVE functional head that is a feature of Salish languages. Some elements that appear in the VOICE and TRAN positions may interact phonologically and semantically; they may also combine with the pronominal arguments they introduce, producing portmanteau morphemes, in complex inflectional paradigms. This is additional evidence for the status of VOICE and TRAN as functional heads.

5. Further evidence: prepositional objects. A striking typological property of Straits Salish is the absence of prepositional phrases consisting of a preposition with a pronominal object, or an "inflected" preposition or postposition of the kind so common in Native America (Jelinek 1993b). This apparent typological idiosyncrasy can be readily explained with reference to the fact that structural case is assigned only by the TRANSITIVE functional head that is a feature of clause structure. The pronominal object forms are licensed only by TRAN, and thus cannot occur with prepositions. Compare:

17) a. leg-t-ogas
   b. *'e-ogas

The Oblique marker 'e and the few other attested prepositions in other Salish languages occur before Determiner Phrases, as in oblique agent and locative expressions. Oblique (non-subject, non-object) first, second and third person deictic arguments are expressed via use of the typologically interesting "person-deictic" roots, that occur with Determiners and are third person in syntax. These roots often are used to mark emphasis or focus, since the pronominal suffix and clitic arguments cannot be stressed.

18) a. č'sət-t-pəl-ə-wən
   hit-TRAN-PASS-PAST-2sgNOM (OBL DET YOU)
   I was hit (by YOU).

   b. nek'wə=la's=ə ə čəs-as-t-ən
   YOU=PAST=3ABS DET hit-TRAN-1sACC
   YOU were the one who hit me.

The Salish languages also have roots with "prepositional" (locative) meanings, that occur in main clause predicates and may be \([\pm \text{TRAN}]\). In sum, we may outline the distribution of objects in Lummi as follows:

19) a. PREDICATE: includes a functional head \([\pm \text{TRAN}]\) that may assign a structural case to an internal pronominal argument.

b. PREPOSITION: assigns Oblique case to a Determiner Phrase, deriving an oblique adjunct.

Note that there are no ditransitive predicates in Lummi, in the sense of an obligatory second object; TRAN introduces only one argument. The root that may be glossed "give" takes the Goal as the "direct object", the argument with structural case, and the Theme is an optional adjunct.

20) 'ogas-t-ogas=əw
   ('e čəs-tən-ə-əw')
   give-TRAN-1sACC=2sgNOM (OBL DET take-TR-2sgSBD)
   You gifted us (with the one you caught).

With Passive, the goal is subject:

21) 'ogas-t-pəwə
   ('e čəs-t-ən-ə)
   give-TR-PASS=2sgNOM
   You were gifted (with the one I caught).

In Saanich, there is an "Indirective" or Applicative construction, where the goal argument again becomes the direct object, and there is an implicit Theme argument. When le' "be in a place" appears with the "control" transitivizer, it is glossed "fix" or "repair".

22) le'-səs
   repair-INDIRECT:CTRAN
   You fixed [it] for me.

(Montler 1986:171)

6. Other voice alternates. There is also a Voice suffix that derives an Anti-Passive construction. Montler (1986) observes that in Saanich this construction usually refers to customary activities.

23) x'əl'-x'əl'-ə ə -əb
   He's rolling (a cigarette).
   Anti-Passive

The subjects of Anti-Passive constructions are Agents. This construction type also occurs in Lummi and other Salish languages; many Salish languages have a richer system of voice alternates than Lummi.

7. Head-Raising. By the process of head-raising, heads may "raise" successively in the course of a syntactic derivation to incorporate other functional heads. For Lummi, I assume a derivation where the lexical root raises to adjoin the TRAN suffix and the internal argument it introduces, and then adjoins the VOICE suffix. This raising and adjunction produce a complex phonological word, the Predicate, which can move as a unit. The Predicate word then raises to COMP, where the second position clitics are attached to it. These raising processes produce the correct order of constituents. The tree in (24) indicates roughly the relevant features of the structure.
TRAN or VOICE combine with a pronoun, are evidence for head raising, and for the status of TRAN and VOICE as functional heads.

A conspicuous advantage of an analysis that recognizes that argument structure is universally compositional, whether the functional heads that introduce the arguments are overt “strong” or “weak” features, is that it is no longer necessary to assume that arguments are introduced at positions within the VP, where they are assigned theta roles, and then raise to reconstitute in positions within IP, in order to receive case or get “case-checked”. Arguments receive both their case and theta role from their associated functional heads; this removes a great deal of redundancy from the system. In a language with Lexical arguments, such as English, there are Specifier positions associated with phrasal VOICE and TRANSITIVE projections, where NP arguments are base generated. In Promontional Argument languages such as Lummi, the pronouns that satisfy the argument positions of the clause are base generated as arguments of the functional heads that license them. These Promontional Arguments belong to closed inflectional paradigms, and are morphological affixes or clitics that attach to their associated functional heads.

Murasugi (1992) classifies the obligatory Transitive marker in Inuktitut as an auxiliary verb “do”. This is reminiscent of the function of “light” verbs in Chinese or other languages, where an “light” verb (“do” or “make”) often derives a complex predicate from a lexical noun. Hale and Keyser (1987) proposed an element “cause” as a universal feature of the Lexical Conceptual structure of transitive verbs. I assume that this feature is contributed by TRAN in some languages. TRAN may provide a landing site for object clitic raising (see Delsing and Jelinek, in press).

Other recent work on the VP “shell” gives converging results on the feature of Transitivity in universal grammar.

The following table shows informally the grammatical properties of TRAN and VOICE in Lummi:

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Transitivity</th>
<th>Single argument has default case</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. - TRAN -g</td>
<td>Introduces second argument, marks volition;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. + TRAN -g, -tx, -nax, -x, -ex</td>
<td>External argument has default case;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Internal argument has structural case</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B. Voice</th>
<th>Subject is Patient</th>
<th>Subject is Agent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. ACTIVE -g</td>
<td>[+ TRAN] Default voice and theta roles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. INVERSE -s</td>
<td>[- TRAN] Subject is Patient</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. PASS/MID -g</td>
<td>[- TRAN] Subject is Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. ANTI-PASS -el’s</td>
<td>[- TRAN] Subject is Agent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other Salish languages have more complex systems of Voice and Transitivity.

The functional heads VOICE and TRAN are present in all clause types in Lummi, and there are entailments between voice and valence as well as between the root and the argument projections. VOICE is associated with the agentive or active thematic proto-role; PASSIVE excludes an agent argument. The TRAN projection is associated with the patient or inactive thematic proto-role. There are Unergative and Unaccusative intransitive subjects in Lummi (aside from the function of the suffix -g in marking the Middle voice). I assume that Unergative subjects, like Transitive subjects, are introduced at the “active” projection, VOICE, where they receive an agentive thematic proto-role. In Unaccusative constructions, as in Passives, there is no agentive argument at VOICE, and the inactive or patient subject is introduced at [- TRAN]. Since the intransitive subject is by default in both cases the highest argument in the clause, it is syntactically external, and receives default case. We saw that in Lummi neither Experiencers nor “holders” (subjects in possessive sentences) can appear as transitive subjects; in Salish as in Athapaskan, transitive subjects are exclusively Agents, more or less successful ones. The interpretation of the sentence is compositional, based on the Lexical Functional features of the root and the argument array selected. If the Lexical Functional features (the entailments) of the root are not compatible with a particular argument array, the derivation crashes.

8. Summary and conclusions. Murasugi argues for the functional head TRAN as a universal clause feature, and Keyser (1987) proposed an element “cause” as a universal feature of the Lexical Conceptual structure of transitive verbs. Sahl provides evidence that we need both, since both occur overtly (are “strong” features) in Salish morphosyntax: TRAN and VOICE jointly determine the valence of the clause, case, and theta role assignment. Predicates with the value [+TRAN] are agentive only, and assign some structural case (ACC, ABS, or ERG) to an internal argument. Predicates with the value [-TRAN]
cannot assign structural case; default case is assigned to the single argument, which may be introduced at either projection. [- TRAN] predicates may include a Possessive argument. Note that [+ TRAN] does not equate with VP, and [- TRAN] does not equate with NP. [+ TRAN] includes forms glossed in other languages as non-agentive transitive verbs (possessive and psych constructions), intransitive verbs, adjectives, nouns, quantifiers, prepositions, etc. [- TRAN] freely occurs with lexical roots of a wide range of semantic features; there is no copula in Straits Salish. This permits all predicates to fall together into a single syntactic class, occurring with the second position clitic string. In languages with a noun/verb contrast at the word level, [+ TRAN] corresponds to subcategorizational features of the lexical categories that determine the argument structure of the phrasal categories (VP, NP, PF) they head. I close with some observations on parametric or typological variation as distinct from variation that follows from genetic affiliation. The finding that languages apply specific rules for marking of two distinct dialects (Samish, Saanich) of Straits Salish. As noted in Jelinek and Demers (1994), there are significant syntactic differences between members of the Salish family that bear on the noun/verb problem. Within a language family, historical change and language contact produce variation particularly with respect to what is grammaticalized — otherwise we see dialects that differ only in the lexicon or at the phonological level.

It is useful to compare the variation within Salish with that found in other language families. At the phonological level in Salish, we find a language that lacks nasals, and others with pharyngeals, both relatively rare phonological features; there are also considerable differences in syllabic structure. At the syntactic level, some Salish languages have ergative "splits"; some have constructions that mark patients as topics; some have agent hierarchies, while others lack these features. Some have Determiner Quantification and Lexical Arguments, while others do not. Some have a rich system of voice alternates, and others do not. Similarly, in the Athapaskan family, we see Lexical Arguments in some Athapaskan languages, such as Slave (Saxon 1989) and Pronominal Arguments in some Southern Athapaskan languages (Willie 1992; Sandoval and Jelinek, 1989). At the phonological level, some have tone languages, others have rich consonant clusters. Within Uto-Aztecan, Yaqui is a pitch-accent, SOV, Lexical Argument language with case-marked NPs (Jelinek 1995b), while O'odham (Papago) has none of these traits; it is a "non-configurational" Pronominal Argument language with a second position clitic string. Yaqui has a very complex system of voice alternates, including an Impersonal Passive, while O'odham has a minimal voice system. Although these languages are not mutually intelligible, speakers easily recognize and understand the languages as related (both are now spoken in Tucson, Arizona). In the syntactic component, it is in the domains of voice alternations and the compositionality of argument structure that the phenomena of parametric variation are more directly attested. By definition, languages differ in what is grammaticalized — what must be said, as opposed to what may be said.
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NOTES
1 Reflexive Passives are frequently seen across languages, evidence of the interaction of voice and valence in determining argument structure.
2 This analysis of the contrast in argument type as following from the overt marking of compositionality in argument structure provides an explanation for an array of apparently unrelated features:
   a) the incorporation of Pronominal Arguments, producing "polythetic" languages; b) the presence of second position clitic strings, or "UX" phenomena, where the same set of semantic features are marked in affixes and clitics in some languages and in auxiliaries in other languages; and c) the phenomena of non-configurational languages, where the second position clitic string, INFL, is the only fixed constituent in the clause, while other constituent moves around it (as in Warlpiri, for example). In these languages, the AUX clitics include the Pronominal Arguments, which remain in the INFL positions where they are base generated. Only free-standing lexical items move in Warlpiri.
3 Elsewhere, the contrast between Unergative and Unaccusative constructions is overtly marked in a verbal suffix (cf. Yaqui), or in an auxiliary verb (cf. Italian).
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