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Subject clitics (SCs) in Teotitlán del Valle Zapotec (TdVZ) have a prima facie complex distribution: they are sometimes optional, sometimes obligatory, and sometimes disallowed. For instance, when coindexed with a preverbal R-expression, subject clitics are allowed, but not required.

(1) Juayn ba-ded(-an) Marie te d-ye.
   Juan PERF-give(-3) María a PL-flower
   ‘Juan gave María some flowers.’

When the subject is first or second person, the subject clitic is obligatory, and may or may not be accompanied by a free-standing pronoun.

(2) Naa {gu-dagu-a / *gu-do} te getguu.
   1.SG {PERF-eat-1.SG / *PERF-eat} a tortilla
   ‘I ate a tortilla.’

Finally, a subject clitic may not be coindexed with a postverbal R-expression.

(3) Xi siemprte {ru-in / *ru-ni-an} Juayn?
   what always {HAB-do / *HAB-do-3} Juan
   ‘What does Juan always do?’

Under traditional analyses (Marlett 1993 and many others), SCs are arguments, and the complementary distribution of SCs and postverbal subjects follows from the θ-Criterion. But in TdVZ, this complementarity breaks down when a wh-expression forces other constituents to remain low in the clause, as in (4).

(4) Ri-kaaz-a yakbe xi kay-uni-u lui, atladi Juayn.
   HAB-want-1.SG TAM.know.1.SG what PROG-do-2 you, not Juan
   ‘I want to know what [YOU]F are doing, not (what) Juayn (is doing).’

Given the possibility of a postverbal pronoun coindexed with the SC, the question arises as to whether SCs are in fact doubled clitics or agreement markers in TdVZ, rather than true arguments. I argue that, despite facts like these, SCs in TdVZ are arguments, and that the interaction of Condition C, cliticization, and adjunction allow for a principled account of the facts.

With SCs as arguments, postverbal R-expressions are correctly ruled out by Condition C within the domain of a coindexed clitic. Pronominals, by contrast, may adjoin below the verb without incurring a Condition B violation, which I show to be expected on independent grounds. Since the clitic does not command positions above the verb, however, R-expressions may safely adjoin in the left periphery. As for preverbal DPs in sentences without SCs, I argue that while an R-expression argument may move above the verb, cliticization of pronominal arguments in their base positions bleeds movement.

In sum, non-complementarity of subject clitics and postverbal coindexed DPs does not invalidate the argumental subject clitic analysis of Marlett (1993) and others with respect to TdVZ. Rather, the above patterns are shown to follow from independent facts about TdVZ syntax, and an agreement mechanism with various idiosyncratic properties is not required.