Split Subject Agreement and Morphological Typology.
Alessandro Jaker

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 corespondence, 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:

Ranking	Language Type
Contrast, No-Allomorphy >> Alignment	Agglutinating
No-Allomorphy, Alignment >> Contrast	Isolating
Contrast, Alignment >> No-Allomorphy	Fusional

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

References:
·Bresnan, Joan. Lexical Functional Syntax. Blackwell Publishers, 2001.
·Sharon Hargus and Siri Tuttle. Augmentation as affixation in Athabaskan languages. Phonology 14 (1997), 177-220.
·Lubowicz, Anna. Contrast Preservation in Phonological Mappings. Doctoral Dissertation, UMass Amherst, 2003.
·McCarthy, John J. and Prince, Alan. Faithfulness and Reduplicative Identity. 1995. Available ROA.
·McCarthy, John J. and Wolf, Matthew. Less than Zero: Correspondence and the Null Output. 2005. Available on ROA, http://roa.rutgers.edu.

·Potter, Brian. <u>Minimalism and the Mirror Principle.</u> *Proceedings of NELS 26*, 289-302.
·Rice, Keren. <u>A Grammar of Slave.</u> Mouton de Gruyter, 1989.
·Rice, Keren. <u>Morpheme Order and Semantic Scope: Word Formation in the Athapaskan Verb.</u> Cambridge University Press, 2000.
·Keren Rice and Leslie Saxon. <u>The subject positions in Athapaskan languages.</u> MIT Working Papers in Linguistics 22, pg. 173-195, 1994.
·Sapir, Edward. <u>Language.</u> Harvest Books, 1921.