

- (9) Ixyil [INT s-b'a] [EXT waj Xun]. (10) *Ixyil [INT waj Xun] [EXT s-b'a].
 3ERG.saw 3-self CLF Xun 3ERG.saw CLF Xun 3-self
 'Xun saw himself.' IM: 'Himself₁ saw Xun₁.'

This pattern can be captured through a separate constraint on binding domains. Many languages show anaphoric elements which are subject to a stricter constraint than condition A: they must be bound (i) by the EXT and (ii) in the vP. These are termed “Local Subject-Oriented Reflexives” (LSOR) by Ahn (2015). LSORs cannot be bound by other arguments (e.g. goals) or anything outside the vP (e.g. A-moved INTs). We propose that the Chuj anaphor is an element of this type.

5: The Anaphor Agreement Effect. We propose that the property which makes an anaphor an LSOR is the same which underlies the Anaphor Agreement Effect (AAE: Rizzi 1990). Many languages do not allow anaphors to surface in positions in which they would trigger agreement (Woolford 1997). This constraint may motivate the ban on ergative anaphors in ergative languages where the EXT sits in such a position (Mayan: Larsen & Norman 1979; Inuit: Bittner 1994).

We propose that the AAE and the requirement on local binding reduce to a problem of structural deficiency. There is a correlation between the morphological complexity of an anaphor and the size of the domain in which it must be bound (Pica 1987). We extend this proposal to LSORs like that of Chuj: these elements lack a layer of functional structure and therefore must be bound within the vP (evidenced by the fact that they cannot undergo A'-extraction, unlike regular DPs). We suggest that the same structural deficiency renders them unable to trigger agreement and yields the AAE.

6: The Western Austronesian Typology. Our model predicts the existence of two types of anaphor: (i) those which can trigger agreement and be the EXT in PV, and (ii) those which can do neither. The anaphors of Indonesian (11) and Toba Batak (12) are of type (i): these can be the EXT in PV. Though restricted by an *agentivity* constraint (Constraint I, §3), we propose that Mandar anaphors also belong to this class (**N.b.**: there is agreement between the verb and anaphor in (5)).

- (11) Indonesian (12) Toba Batak; Cole & Hermon 2008: 159
 Dia **di**-lihat [EXT dirinya sendiri] **Di**-ida [EXT dirina sandiri] [INT siJohn]
 3SG PV-see himself PV-see himself NAME
 'Himself saw him.' 'Himself saw John.'

On the other hand, anaphors which cannot appear as the PV EXT are structurally-reduced LSORs (Constraint II; like Chuj). The Malagasy anaphor *tena* is an element of this type (see Paul 2004).

In either case, the lack of ergative anaphors does not serve as a valid diagnostic against PV.

6: Conclusion: Bind Carefully. The notion that the INT moves above the EXT is contentious in work on ergativity outside Western Austronesian (Deal 2017). The *ban on ergative anaphors* is regularly taken as evidence against this step of movement (Bobaljik 1993, Otsuka 2006, Legate 2006). The facts above show that this conclusion is not sound: anaphor binding facts often run against other diagnostics for hierarchical asymmetries (scope, variable binding, condition C, quantifier float, extraction asymmetries). The ban on ergative anaphors therefore requires an alternative explanation. We have provided two reasons for the lack of ergative anaphors. In some languages, anaphors cannot be agentive (§3). In others, they must be bound within the vP (§4).

7: Citations. ◇ Aldridge, E.C. (2004). Ergativity and word order in AN languages. ◇ Aldridge, E. (2012). Antipassive and ergativity in Tagalog. ◇ Paul, I. (2004). NP versus DP reflexives: Evidence from Malagasy. ◇ Pearson, M. (2005). The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'-element. ◇ Legate, J. A. (2006). Split Absolutive.