This paper proposes that subjunctive clauses in Romance (e.g., Juan desea que Maria venga - Juan wishes that Mary come) be analyzed as ECMs (e.g., Juan wants Mary to come): in particular, assuming that [1, 2, 3]’s “defectivity” is not restricted to φ-features alone and can thus be applied to Case/Tense features, it is claimed that C-T$_{subj}$ though φ-complete, is Case/Tense-defective. The proposal plausibly explains why bona fide subjunctive dependents lack wh-movement (see [14, 16]), have severely restricted peripheral fronting (see [13]), and yield long-distance obviation (see [4, 9]) without resorting to ill-understood truncation processes (see [10, 11]). Crucially, an account like this can only be pursued in a system like [7, 8]’s, where Case and Agreement are differentiated: we assume so (contra [1, 2, 3]), and argue that the embedded subject, while agreeing with the embedded verb, receives Case from the matrix v*-T$_O$ complex.

The standard assumption about ECMs (and raising) has a truncation-like flavor: these structures are taken to be introduced by a TP which, due to the lack of the CP layer, is defective (see [1, 2, 5, 6, 12]), as (1) shows. Secondly, ECMs display the possibility for the embedded subject to raise to the Case checking position of objects in the matrix clause, which explains both why the himself (not him) is licensed in (2a) and why objects can bind into matrix adjuncts in (2b) (see [3, 5, 6]). Here we argue that the analysis in (1) should be as in (3), where we introduce a defective CP layer to capture the subordination dependency that holds between matrix and embedded domains (mediated through C, we assume) and the idea that T is present if C is (sensu [3]).

Let’s now turn to Romance subjunctives — which, as advanced above, we want to analyze just like (3). As noted in the literature (see [9, 10, 12, 13]), Romance languages such as Spanish and Catalan lack true ECM structures (putting aside an ECM-like analysis of perception verbs of the see and hear sort): see (4). We want to qualify this by claiming that Romance subjunctives are the natural counterparts of English ECMs, although for that to be feasible we need to make some assumptions, the first one having to do with [1, 2, 3]’s “defectivity”. In this respect, we argue, following [8], that defectivity can be understood not as ‘lack of (some) feature’ (typically, [number]), but as ‘lack of value’, and that it is not a prerogative of φ-features alone — hence, it can apply to other features, like Case/Tense (see [7, 8]). With these assumptions in mind, we propose that subjunctive clauses have a C-T structure that is φ-complete but Case/Tense-defective, as roughly indicated in (5). We believe (5) is able to explain various things: first, given that the embedded subject Maria shows full agreement with the verb venga (Eng. come-SUBJ), the former is “frozen in place” and cannot raise (differently put, A-freezing is related to total checking of φ-features), nor can it plausibly bind into matrix adjuncts; second, since Case is dependent on the matrix v*-T$_O$ complex, it comes as no surprise that long-distance obviation (see (6)) follows from the same reason local-obviation does: because subject
and object receive a distinct Case value (we therefore adopt [15]’s idea that formal distinctness — Nominative vs. Accusative— entails interpretive distinctness). Our proposal makes the next prediction: if the embedded subject cannot receive (abstract) structural Case from matrix \( v^*-T_o \), then coreference with the matrix subject should in principle be possible: (7), which contains the quirky subject \( a \ él \) (Eng. \( \text{to him} \)), shows that the prediction is borne out.

Finally, consider the well-known fact, noted by [15], that \emph{consecutio temporum} effects only arise with subjunctives. The asymmetry in (8) can be accommodated into our proposal if, just like Case, Tense values (i.e., \( \{\text{present}, \text{past}, \text{future}\} \)) are valued from the matrix clause.

Synthesizing, in the preceding lines we have argued that Romance subjunctives are the counterpart of English ECMs. In order to do so, we have extended [1, 2, 3]’s “defectivity” to the Case/Tense realms, a possibility that allows us to provide a rationale not only to long-distance obviation, but also to the strong connectivity of subjunctives. A promising way of looking at this connectivity ensues if subjunctives do not qualify as (strong) phases: that is not only empirically tenable, but also conceptually sound, for it would bring more symmetry to the system, both \( v \) and \( C^* \) having ‘weak’ counterparts: \( v \) (passive/unaccusative) and \( C \) (subjunctive).

### Examples

(1) \( [\text{comp} \ [\text{John} \ T\text{comp} \ believes \ [\text{Mary} \ T\text{-to} \text{def} \ work \ hard \ ] ] ] \) \( ECM \) (standard analysis)

(2) a. \( [\text{John}, \ believed \ [\{\text{him/} \text{himself;} \ t, \ to \ be \ immoral \ ] ] \)

b. \( [\text{The} \ DA \ proved \ [\text{the} \ defendants; \ t, \ to \ be \ guilty \ during \ each \ other,’s \ trials \ ] ] \)

(3) \( [\text{comp} \ [\text{John} \ T\text{comp} \ believes \ [\text{C} \text{-def} \ [\text{Mary} \ T\text{-to} \text{def} \ work \ hard \ ] ] ] \) \( ECM \) (final version)

(4) a. *\( \text{Vull} \ \text{a María tener sort.} \)
   \( \text{Want.1.SG the María have luck} \)
   ‘I want María to be lucky.’

b. *\( \text{Creo a María ser afortunada.} \)
   \( \text{believe.1.SG to María be lucky} \)
   ‘I believe María to be lucky.’

(5) \( [\text{C} \ [\text{Yo} \ T \text{quiero} \ [v^*-T_o \ [\text{C-que} \text{ María} \ T \text{venga} \ ] ] ] ] \) (Spanish)
\( [\text{Case:Nom} \ [\text{Case:Nom} \ [\text{Case:Nom} \ [\text{Case:Acc} \ [\text{Case:} \ [\text{Case:} \ [\text{I want.1.SG that María come.SBJ.3SG} \]
   ‘I want for María to come.’)

(6) \( [\text{C} \ [\text{Juan} \ T \text{quiere} \ [v^*-T_o \ [\text{C-que} \text{ pro} \text{a} \text{ T \text{venga} \ ] ] ] ] \) (Spanish)
\( [\text{Case:Nom} \ [\text{Case:Nom} \ [\text{Case:Nom} \ [\text{Case:Acc} \ [\text{Case:} \ [\text{Case:} \ [\text{Juan want.3.SG that he come.SBJ.3.SG} \]
   ‘Juan wants him to come.’)

(7) \( [\text{C} \ [\text{Juan quiere-T} \ [\text{C-que a él[kj]} \text{ le guste} \text{ Charlie Mingus} \ ] ] \)
   \( \text{Juan want.3.SG that to him CL-to.him like.SBJ.3.SG Charlie Mingus} \)
   ‘Juan wants for him to like Charlie Mingus.’

(8) a. \( \text{Platón dice que Aristóteles lee/leía/leerá} \text{ a Sócrates} \)
   \( \text{Plato say.3.SG that Aristotle \{reads/read/will read\} Sócrates} \)
   ‘Plato says that Aristotle \{reads/read/will read\} Sócrates.’ (Spanish)
b. Platón quiere [ que Aristóteles {lea/*leyera/*leyere} a Sócrates] Subj.
Plato want.3sg that Aristotle read[PRES/PST/FUT].SUBJ.3.SG to Socrates
‘Plato wants Aristotle to read Socrates.’ (Spanish)
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