1: The Anaphor Problem. Many Philippine-type languages show a transitive construction where the internal argument (INT) moves to a position above the external argument (EXT): the Patient Voice (PV). Most tests for C-command yield clear results in this context: the INT takes scope over the EXT (Aldridge 2012), binds variables in the EXT (Rackowski 2002, Pearson 2005), is able to float quantifiers (Guilfoyle et al. 1992), and can undergo A'-extraction (Keenan 1976).

In this context, one diagnostic yields contradictory results: the distribution of anaphors. Many languages do not allow an anaphor to be the EXT in PV (Pearson 2001, Rackowski 2002). This pattern reflects a well-known typological constraint: *the ban on ergative anaphors* (Anderson 1976).

**2: The Source.** Previous work explains this pattern in two ways: (*i*) by denying movement of the INT (Legate 2006) or (*ii*) by placing binding at a separate level of the derivation (Manning 1996). We propose that neither is necessary. Rather, the ban arises from two separate constraints.

**3:** Constraint I: No Agentive Anaphors. The first constraint is a *ban on agentive anaphors*. This can be seen in Mandar (South Sulawesi). This language marks PV with an ergative prefix on the verb (1). In this voice, several facts show that the INT c-commands the EXT. For instance, a pronominal INT triggers a condition-C violation over a coindexed R-expression in the EXT (2).

(1)	Meloq=0	<b>u</b> -ita	[ <sub>INT</sub> <i>pro</i> ] [ <sub>EXT</sub> <i>pro</i> ] (2)	*Na-ita=i	[int	ia ] [ $_{EXT}$	kamaq	iKacoq ]	l
	will=2	1ERG-see		3ERG-see=3		3	dad	NAME	
	'I will see	e you.'		IM: 'Kacoq <sub>1</sub>	's fat	ther saw	him <sub>1</sub> .'		

Mandar has an anaphor *alawe* 'self' which is subject to condition A. It cannot appear in the absence of a clause-internal antecedent. It bears a possessive suffix which indexes its binder.

(3)	*Bemme(=i/=aq) <b>alawe</b> -u.		(4)	*Mappaui <b>muaq</b> bemme=i <b>alawe</b> -na.			
	fell=3/=1	self-my		he.said	that	fell=3	self-his
	IM: 'Myself fell.'			IM: 'He sa	aid that	himself fe	ell.'

This anaphor shows a semantic constraint on its distribution. It can be the EXT of a predicate like 'see' (5). It cannot, however, be the EXT of any predicate with agentive or cognitive semantics (punch, kill, think, hate; (6)). This pattern reflects a *ban on agentive anaphors*.

(5)	Na-ita=aq [EX	T <b>alawe</b> - $u_i$ ] [INT <i>pro<sub>i</sub></i> ](6)	*Na- <b>soso=</b> aq [ <sub>EX</sub>	T alawe- $u_i$ ] [INT pro <sub>i</sub> ]
	3ERG-see=1	self-my	3ERG-regret=1	self-my
	'Myself saw me (in the mirror)'		INT: 'Myself felt sh	ame about me'

**4: Constraint II: Local Binding.** The second constraint involves a restriction on the binding domains of some anaphors. We show this in Chuj (Mayan). As in PV sentences, Chuj cross-references the EXT with an ergative prefix in canonical transitive clauses (7), and the INT raises above the EXT (see e.g. Coon et al. to appear). As is the case in Mandar, a pronominal INT triggers a condition-C violation over a coindexed R-expression inside the EXT (8). Alongside other patterns, this shows that the INT C-commands the EXT in the canonical transitive clause.

(7)	Ol- <b>ach-w</b> -ila'	[ <sub>INT</sub> <i>pro</i> ] [ <sub>EXT</sub> <i>pro</i> ]	(8)	*Ix-y-il	[ <i>pro</i> ] [s-mam waj Xun].
	will=2-1ERG-see	e		PFV-3ERG-see	e 3-father CLF Xun
	'I will see you.'			IM: 'Xun <sub>1</sub> 's fat	ather saw him <sub>1</sub> .'

Chuj has a condition-A anaphor (9). It does not allow it to be the EXT in PV-like sentences (10).

(9)	Ixyil	[ <sub>INT</sub> s-b'a ] [ <sub>1</sub>	<sub>EXT</sub> waj Xun]. (10	)) *Ixyil	[ <sub>INT</sub> waj Xun ] [ <sub>EX</sub>	г s <b>-b'а</b> ].	
	3ERG.saw	3-self	CLF Xun	3ERG.saw	CLF Xun	3-self	
	'Xun saw I	himself.'		IM: 'Himself <sub>1</sub> saw Xun <sub>1</sub> .'			

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 Bata	ık; Cole & Herr	mon 2008: 159
	Dia <b>di</b> -lihat [ <sub>EXT</sub> dirinya sendiri ]			Di-ida [ <sub>EX</sub>	i ] [ <sub>INT</sub> 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.**  $\diamond$  Aldridge, E.C. (2004). Ergativity and word order in AN languages.  $\diamond$  Aldridge, E. (2012). Antipassive and ergativity in Tagalog..  $\diamond$  Paul, I. (2004). NP versus DP reflexives: Evidence from Malagasy.  $\diamond$  Pearson, M. (2005). The Malagasy subject/topic as an A'-element.  $\diamond$  Legate, J. A. (2006). Split Absolutive.