

- (5) *Guébie* (Sande 2017)
- | | | | | | |
|----|-------------------------------------|----------------------|----|-------------------------------------|----------------------|
| a. | k ^w əli ^{2,2} | ‘face’ | b. | teɛ ^{3,2} | ‘snake’ |
| | ɛ- ³ kade ^{3,2} | ‘It (face) is big.’ | | ɛ- ³ kade ^{3,2} | ‘It (snake) is big.’ |
| c. | bitə ^{2,3} | ‘house’ | d. | ma ¹ | ‘butt’ |
| | a- ³ kade ^{3,2} | ‘It (house) is big.’ | | a- ³ kade ^{3,2} | ‘It (butt) is big.’ |

Table 1: *Partial phonological copy in non-human pronouns (adjusted from Sande 2017)*

	Final vowel of antecedent		3.SG pronoun vowel (either subject or object)
Class 1	u, ʊ, o, ɔ	→	ʊ
Class 2	i, ɪ, e, ɛ	→	ɛ
Class 3	ə, a	→	a

Analysis Type C concord involves partially pre-specified segmental features, which are supplemented by phonological copying of underspecified features. Specifically, in Guébie some phonological features are pre-specified: e.g., the pronoun is always [-ATR], irrespective of the [ATR] value of its antecedent stem. Similarly, height is pre-specified: high, (CL1) and mid (CL2). (By hypothesis CL3 is also pre-specified for height.) However, the [±back] value of a pronoun corresponds to that of its antecedent stem due to (again, non-local) phonological copying from an elided antecedent stem (see Sande 2017).

- (6) a. [Pro Class 1] ⇔ [-ATR, +high] b. [Pro Class 2] ⇔ [-ATR, -high]

Type D: Fròʔò In Type D concord, an agreement morpheme has a uniform exponent, even though this property is not necessarily reflected in the stem. In (7a) agreement consistently involves a (voiceless/ voiced) dorsal, even though the stem contains no dorsal segments. Similarly, in (7b) agreement morphemes are consistently a coronal obstruent, though the stem does not contain any coronal obstruents. The same is true for all functional morphemes of the seven nominal classes in Fròʔò, but with different features.

- (7) *Fròʔò* (Traoré in prep)

- | | | | | | | |
|----|---------------------------------|------|--------|------------|------|-------------|
| a. | jī-ō | ki | gíʔi | gī | gā | gè |
| | house.CL5 | PRO5 | which5 | IDENT.PTC5 | DEM5 | CL-END.PTC5 |
| | ‘Which house is this?’ | | | | | |
| b. | jē:-rē | tī | díʔi | dī | dā | dè |
| | months/moons-CL6 | PRO6 | which6 | IDENT.PTC6 | DEM6 | CL-END.PTC6 |
| | ‘Which months/moons are these?’ | | | | | |

Analysis Type D concord involves partially pre-specified phonological features, which however are not supplemented by copying segmental information from the stem.

- (8) a. CL5 ⇔ [dorsal, -continuant] b. PRO ⇔ /C_[voiceless]l/
c. DEM ⇔ /C_[voiced]ā/ d. ID ⇔ /C_[voiced]ī/

Conclusion We argue that an account that exclusively relies on fully specified agreement across the board dismisses the transparently visible role of non-local phonological copying. Though Vocabulary Items can be fully specified (Type B), they are not always (Type A,C,D). When underspecified for segmental material, they copy all segmental material from the stem (Type A), partially copy segmental material from the stem (Type C), or no copying from the stem takes place (Type D). In Type C concord it is, at least synchronically, accidental that some of the morphologically specified phonological properties sometimes coincide with an identical phonological property in their stems. That is, in Guébie it is a coincidence that the [ATR] and height values of antecedent stem and pronoun at times are identical (σ-σ, ε-ε, a-a). The only non-accidental (predictable) property in Guébie non-human pronouns is [±back], which is due to phonological copying. Type D concord simply shows that this this accidental property can be more phonologically obvious.

Table 2 summarises the four types of morpho-phonological concord. The strength of the current proposal is that it correctly predicts that all logical patterns should converge into the four types identified here.

Table 2: *Typology of morpho-phonological concord*

	<i>Morpho-phonology (VI)</i>	<i>Phonological copying from the stem</i>
Type A (Bainuk)	no segmental specification	full copy
Type B (Swahili)	full segmental specification	no copy
Type C (Guébie)	partial segmental specification	partial copy
Type D (Fròʔò)	partial segmental specification	no copy

Selected references: Corbett (1991). *Gender*. CUP. • Dobrin (1995). Theoretical consequences of literal alliterative concord. In *CLS Proceedings*. • Katamba (2003) In: *The Bantu Languages*. Routledge. • Nevins (2010). *Locality in vowel harmony*. MIT Press. • Sande (2017). *Distributing morphologically conditioned phonology: Three cases from Guébie*. PhD Diss. Berkeley. • Traoré (in prep.) *The phonology of nominal domain in Fròʔò*. Doctoral Diss. Frankfurt.