This paper examines differences in binding and pronoun realization in two types of Mayan languages, so-called HIGH and LOW-ABS languages (Coon, Mateo Pedro, and Preminger 2014). I bring new evidence in favour of a deep syntactic difference between these two types of languages, and argue for a new analysis governing the realization of subjects and possessors.

Puzzle: Chuj is VOS, has postnominal possessors, and pronouns can be null. This means that when the subject is co-referential with the possessor of the object in so-called "extended reflexives" (1), the DP that gets overtly realized could *prima facie* be either the possessor (2) or subject (3):

(1) Ix-s-b'o' ⎡s⎤-tek ix Malin.   (2) Ixsb'o' [$_O$ stek [$_{POSS}$ ix Malin]$_k$] [$_S$ *pro$_k$*]
     PFV-A3-make A3-meal CLF Malin

     'Malin$_k$ made her$_k$ meal.'   (3) Ixsb'o' [$_O$ stek [$_{POSS}$ *pro*]$_k$] [$_S$ ix Malin$_k$]

Given basic binding principles, it would be surprising if the right structure were (2), seeing as (2) literally translates as *She$_i$ made Malin$_i$'s meal*. Nevertheless, I **propose** in this paper that the right structure is in fact (2)—**the possessor is overt and the subject is null**. I provide two pieces of evidence. First, when the subject does not formally possess the object (4), adverbs like *ewi* 'yesterday' can appear either before or after the subject, in this case *ix Malin*. However, when the subject formally possesses the object (5), *ewi* is judged unacceptable before *ix Malin*. This supports (2), but not (3) (possessive marking boxed).

(4) S-b'o' tek {ewi} ix Malin {ewi}.   (5) S-b'o' ⎡s⎤-tek {*ewi} ix Malin {ewi}.
     'Malin made *the* meal yesterday.'   'Malin$_k$ made *her$_k$* meal yesterday.'

Second, when the subject formally possesses an A'-extracted object, a full DP is realized in possessor position (6), rather than in the expected subject position, as evidenced by the ungrammaticality of (7). This again supports the parse in (2), and not (3).

(6) [$_O$ Ha nok' ⎡s⎤-wakax [$_{POSS}$ **waj Xun**]]$_j$ ix-s-chonh-o' t_j [$_S$ Ø].
     FOC CLF A3-cow CLF Xun PFV-A3-sell-TV   PRON
     'It's his$_i$ cow that John$_i$ sold.' (lit: It's John's$_i$ cow that he$_i$ sold)

(7) *[$_O$ Ha nok' ⎡s⎤-wakax [$_{POSS}$ Ø]]$_j$ ix-s-chonh t_j [$_S$ waj Xun].

Previous account: Coon, Baier, and Levin (2020) (CBL) discuss data similar to (6) in relation to A'-extraction. As they note, the pattern in (6) is only observed in so-called "HIGH-ABS" Mayan languages, and not "LOW-ABS" languages. The LOW/HIGH-ABS distinction is independently proposed to derive an A'-extraction restriction known as the Ergative Extraction Constraint (EEC) (Aissen 2017). The EEC prohibits the extraction of transitive subjects <u>only</u> in HIGH-ABS languages, as in (8). Following previous work, CBL propose that the EEC arises because HIGH-ABS languages **require the object to raise above the subject**. This causes an intervention problem, and blocks the subject from extracting. Interestingly, however, it is well-known that subjects can exceptionally extract from extended reflexives like (1), as in (9).

(8) *Mach ix-y-il ix chichim.   (9) Mach ix-y-il ⎡s⎤-nun?
     who PFV-A3-see CLF elder   who PFV-A3-see A3-mother
     Intended: 'Who saw the elder?' (EEC)   'Who$_i$ saw her$_{i/*j}$ mother?'   (no EEC)

CBL tie the exceptionality of (6), (7) and (9) to binding and reconstruction. In both cases, an issue arises because the possessor must <u>reconstruct</u> to get bound by the subject. To explain (9), they argue that object reconstruction feeds *subject* extraction, allowing to circumvent the EEC. To explain (7), they argue that object reconstruction blocks *object* A'-extraction. To extract the object, a full DP is exceptionally generated as the object's possessor and a null pronoun in subject position, as in (6).

But the novel data in (5) cast doubt on CBL's account. The account of this phenomenon must be independent of extraction: (5) shows that it is always the possessor that gets realized, *regardless of extraction*. I therefore address (i) why configurations like (2) arise, (ii) why only in HIGH-ABS (and not LOW-ABS) languages, and (iii) I propose a preliminary alternative account of (9).

Proposal: Following previous work on A-movement (e.g. Chomsky 1995, Lasnik 1999), I propose, contra CBL, that raised DP objects in HIGH-ABS languages **cannot** reconstruct for binding. I also adopt the proposal that HIGH-ABS languages require objects to A-move over subjects (CBL, a.o.). These two proposals have a crucial consequence for binding: subjects will never c-command a co-referring DP contained within the moved object. Finally, I propose that the PF generalization in (10) holds across Mayan. (10) relies on the assumption that pronouns do not enter the derivation as "pronouns" (they are not part of the numeration, Hornstein 2007), but as full DPs, which under certain conditions undergo partial or full PF deletion (Postal 1966, Elbourne 2005).

(10)   If no c-command relationship can be established between two co-referential DPs, realize the linearly first DP in its full form and the second in its pro-form (null in Mayan).

Taken together, the above proposals explain why (2) arises: since the object raises, no c-command relationship holds between the subject and possessor, and so (10) triggers the overt realization of the possessor in Chuj. Extra evidence for (10) comes from HIGH-ABS EEC languages that exhibit VSO order, like Popti'. As discussed in Hoekstra 1989, while DP subjects are overt and possessors null in VSO clauses (11), the opposite is observed when the possessor is in a fronted object (12).

(11)   Xil [$_S$ **naj**] [$_O$ $\boxed{s}$-mam Ø].   (12)   [$_O$ $\boxed{S}$-tx'i **naj**] xtx'ani [$_S$ Ø].
         saw   him   A3-father *pro*   A3-dog him   bit   *pro*
         'He$_i$ saw$_{i/*j}$ father.'   (Hoekstra 1989)   'His$_i$ dog bit him$_{i/*j}$.' (Hoekstra 1989)

Finally, we can now explain why possessors are never realized instead of subjects in LOW-ABS languages (CBL). Since objects do not A-move in LOW-ABS languages (CBL), the subject is guaranteed to c-command (a copy of) the possessor DP, and so (10) is predicted not to apply.

Circumventing the EEC: Recall that CBL also rely on reconstruction to account for (9), where the EEC is exceptionally circumvented. However, I have just argued against reconstruction of A-moved objects. The sentence in (13) reveals additional evidence against a reconstruction account. In (13), the subject binds into the object, meaning the object should in principle reconstruct, yet the EEC cannot be circumvented. The only way to circumvent the EEC is for the subject to formally *possess* the object (see CBL ex. (69) for minimal pair with possessive marking on *libro*).

(13)   *Mach$_i$ ix-y-awt-ej [ch'anh libro [ix-s-man-a' *pro*$_{i/*j}$]] t$_i$.
         who PFV-A3-read-DTV CLF libro PFV-A3-buy-TV
         Intended: 'Who$_i$ read the book that they$_{i/*j}$ bought.'

The question thus remains: Why can extended reflexives like (9) circumvent the EEC? I hypothesize that what permits circumvention of the EEC in this case is the ability for A'-probe to exceptionally target the *DP possessor* (inside the raised object), instead of the DP subject. Assuming that subextraction from A-moved material is possible (e.g. Gallego and Uriagereka 2007), the ability for the probe to target the possessor is not surprising if, as I proposed, Chuj subjects never c-command possessors inside objects. I conclude by discussing the implications of this hypothesis for intervention-based accounts of A'-extraction asymmetries, including CBL 2020.

References

Aissen, Judith. 2017. Correlates of ergativity in Mayan. In *Oxford Handbook of Ergativity*, eds. Jessica Coon, Diane Massam, and Lisa Travis. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chomsky, Noam. 1995. *The Minimalist Program*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Coon, Jessica, Nico Baier, and Theodore Levin. 2020. Mayan agent focus and the ergative extraction constraint: Facts and fictions revisited. Ms. McGill.

Coon, Jessica, Pedro Mateo Pedro, and Omer Preminger. 2014. The role of case in A-bar extraction asymmetries: Evidence from Mayan. *Linguistic Variation* 14:179–242.

Elbourne, Paul D. 2005. On the acquisition of Principle B. *Linguistic Inquiry* 36:333–366.

Gallego, Ángel, and Juan Uriagereka. 2007. Sub-extraction from subjects: A phase theory account. In *Romance Linguistics 2006: Selected papers from the 36th Linguistic Symposium on Romance Languages*, eds. José Camacho, Nydia Flores-Ferrán, Liliana Sánchez, Viviane Déprez, and Mar{ia José Cabrera. John Benjamins.

Hoekstra, Eric. 1989. A parameter for anaphor binding: The case of Jacaltec. In *Configurationality: The Typology of Asymmetries*, eds. L. Marácz and P. Muysken. Foris.

Hornstein, Norbert. 2007. Pronouns in a minimalist setting. In *The Copy Theory of Movement*, 351–385. John Benjamins.

Lasnik, Howard. 1999. Chains of arguments. *Current Studies in Linguistics Series* 32:189–216.

Postal, Paul. 1966. On so-called pronouns in English. *Monograph series on language and linguistics* 19:177–206.