This paper argues that Split Subject Agreement follows from the same general principles as morphological typology in general. I propose a new theory of morphology, Contrast Preservation Morphology (based on Contrast Preservation Theory, Lubowicz 2003), which is able to derive Sapir’s (1921) typology of isolating, fusional, and agglutinating languages in OT by the re-ranking of three constraint-types: Contrast, No-Allomorphy, and Alignment. These constraints refer to a mapping relation between f-structures (Bresnan 2001) and phonological correspondence relations (McCarthy & Prince 1995, McCarthy & Wolf 2005). No-Allomorphy demands that phonological forms coindexed with the same f-structure be in correspondence, Contrast demands that phonological forms coindexed with different f-structures not be incorrespondence, and Alignment governs linear order within the Lexical Word. These interaction of these three principles generates the following typology:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranking</th>
<th>Language Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contrast, No-Allomorphy &gt;&gt; Alignment</td>
<td>Agglutinating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No-Allomorphy, Alignment &gt;&gt; Contrast</td>
<td>Isolating</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast, Alignment &gt;&gt; No-Allomorphy</td>
<td>Fusional</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I then show that the interaction of these constraint-types is able to derive the pattern of Split Subject Agreement in Northern Athabaskan languages, a phenomenon whose analysis has been controversial (cf. Potter 1996, Hargus & Tuttle 1997, Rice & Saxon 1994, Rice 2000). In this pattern, subject agreement is split between subject person and subject number, which occupy two different positions in the verbal template (or two distinct functional projections, cf. Rice 2000). I show that this system can be derived straightforwardly in Contrast Preservation Morphology through the local conjunction of No-Allomorphy:

\[\text{[No-Allomorphy]}^2 >> \text{Contrast, Alignment} >> \text{No-Allomorphy}\]

I conclude that a language’s morphological type should be considered a structural property and not an epiphenomenon of historical change, and that the principles which motivate these structural patterns, Contrast, No-Allomorphy, and Alignment, are functionally motivated.
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