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**Issue.** In colloquial Romanian (Rom) verbs expressing knowledge from reasoning (e.g. *cunoașc, știu ‘know’*) or inference (e.g. *văd ‘see/realize’, aud ‘hear/find out’*) allow for the thematic subject of their embedded clause to surface either in the finite indicative complement CP, with NOM spell-out, see (1a), or, in the matrix clause, with ACC spell-out, see (1b). Both (1a) and (1b) have evidential readings.

1. (a) Am văzut [că *Ion/elk* elk pompier / lăcomeștek la mâncare].
   
   **AUX.1** seen that *Ion/ he.NOM* is firefighter / is.greedy at food
   
   ‘I/We saw (= realized) that Ion is a fire-fighter / greedy with food.’

   (b) Lk-am văzut pe *Ionk* [că (*elk pompier) / lăcomeștek la mâncare].
   
   **CL.3SGM.ACC-AUX.1** seen PRT *Ion* that (is firefighter) / is.greedy.3SG at food
   
   ‘I/We saw Ion being (*a firefighter) / greedy with food.’

The evidential nature of perception verbs is not surprising, but the following facts might be:

(i) Subject raising changes evidentiality: in (1a), there is inference of a fact, while in (1b), the raised subject is evaluated by the speaker, thus ruling out individual-level predicates. Specifically, there is a shift in speaker commitment, so a shift in ‘evidence type’ (Roelryck 2001) with raising: either from indirect to direct/attested evidentiality (in the sense of Willett 1988), or within indirect evidentiality, from hearsay/reportative to inferential. (ii) While Su-to-Su raising is known to trigger evidential meanings (Ruwet 1972, Roelryck 2001), Su-to-Obj raising has not thus been analysed. (iii) Su raising is out of a finite, Case-licensing CP, so the trigger for this DP movement must be accounted for independently of Case requirements.

**Objective.** We argue for the following: (i) The derivation in (1b) arises from Raising to Object (RtoO)/ECM, across the phasal indicative CP; (ii) RtoO in Rom is both A-bar and A-movement; (iii) The trigger for movement is an [Eval(uative)] feature grammaticized onto the inherently evidential main clause predicate with shifted evidentiality.

**Background.** Formal analyses of constructions similar to (1b) show a split between: (i) a cross-clausal movement analysis, where the DP moves from a non-finite complement clause to a matrix Case position (i.e. standard ECM), e.g. Bošković (2007), Bowers (2002), Johnson (1991); or (ii) an external Merge/proleptic construction, where the DP (or associated clitic) is base-generated in the matrix clause for discourse requirements, and is chain related to an A or A-bar position in the complement clause which, cross-linguistically, could be finite or non-finite (e.g. Bruening 2001, Davies 2005, Massam 1985).

**Properties.** First, matrix base-generation cannot be assumed for Rom, on several grounds:

(i) Evaluative/evidential Vs disallow the CAUSE+HAVE/LOCATION analysis of ditransitives (Harley 2002) and are exclusively mono-transitive; (ii) The relevant DP disallows resumptive pronouns in the embedded clause, whereas object control constructions, which are ditransitive, allow them: compare (2a) to control (2b); (iii) A relative clause analysis is ruled out due to lack of adjacency: see (3) with the intervening matrix subject intervening. Hence, in both (1a) & (1b), the matrix verb selects only the obligatorily indicative CP complement.

2. (a) Îlk știu pe Rareșk [că e (*elk) om bun (*elk)].
   
   **CL.3SGM.ACC** know.1SG PRT Rareș [that’ is 3SG.M.NOM man good 3SG.M.NOM
   
   ‘I know Rares to be a good man.’

   (b) Lk-am convins (pe *Ionk* [să plătească (elk) lumina).
   
   **3CL.3SGM.ACC-AUX.1** convinced (PRT Ion) [SUBJ pay.subj.3 3SG.M.NOM light
   
   ‘We convinced Ion to pay the hydro bill.’

3. (b) Îl știa pe Ion toată lumea [că era om bun].
   
   him knew DOM Ion all world.the that was man good
   
   ‘Everybody knew Ion to be a good man.’
Second, tests replicated from Bruening (2001), Bošković (2007), and Davies (2005), show that movement/RtoO across the embedded CP is involved. These include: (i) CP constituency tests (substitution & fronting), which fail when the DP is in the matrix; (ii) sensitivity to islands (complex NP, see (4); coordination); and (iii) reconstruction into the embedded clause. Crucially, the RtoO DP cannot be assumed to be in an A-bar CP internal position (as in Massam 1985, Rafel 2000), since it can precede the matrix subject: see (3). We conclude that the DP landing site in Rom RtoO is in the matrix v*P domain, given ACC spell-out.

(4) a. Ion miroise [faptul că Maria aranja plecarea].
   Ion smelled fact-the [that Maria CL.REFL.3.DAT arranged departure-the
   ‘Ion smelled/figured out the fact that Maria was preparing her exit.’

   b. *Ion oₖ miroise pe Mariaₖ [faptul că-şi aranja plecarea].
   Ion CL₃SG.F.ACC smelled PRT Maria fact-the [that-CL.REFL arrange departure-the
   ‘Ion figured out that Maria was arranging her exit.’

   c. Ion oₖ miroise pe Mariaₖ [că-şi aranja plecarea.]
   Ion CL₃SG.F.ACC smelled PRT Maria [that-CL.REFL. arranged departure-the
   ‘Ion figured out that Maria was arranging her exit.’

Analysis. First, RtoO DP, unlike ECM, shows A-bar properties: (i) bare quantifiers are disallowed (5); and (ii) concurrent wh-movement to the matrix is barred (6).

(5) Îlk stim pe Ionₖ/*pe cinea) [că nu gustă teatru].
3CL₃SG.M.ACC know.1PL PRT Ion PRT someone [that not tastes theatre]
   ‘We know that Ion doesn’t like the theatre.’

(6) *Ce-lₖ stim pe Ionₖ [că nu gustă]?
what-3CL₃SG.M.ACC know.1PL PRT Ion [that not tastes]
These facts indicate that Rom evidential driven RtoO is successive-cyclic A-bar movement via embedded Spec,CP. Second, we discuss DP ACC lexicalization. The embedded indicative clause is finite, has independent tense, and [C că] ‘that’ is a phasal head. Assuming that structural Case is a property of the Phase (Chomsky 2008), NOM Case valuation is available in both (1a) and (1b) for the embedded subject DP. This strengthens the claim that RtoO is not Case driven (as in standard ECM). Given its interpretive effects, in Rom RtoO the matrix v* has an [Eval] property with an EF (Edge Feature, Chomsky 2008) alongside its [u\ψ/ACC]. Maximize match guarantees checking of both by the embedded subject (defined hierarchically). Since, following Gallego (2011), type of movement is defined by the probe, not configurationally, with A-bar movement triggered by EF and A-movement triggered by \φ features, RtoO is expected to show dual properties, given the simultaneity of both probes. Indeed, A movement effects, such as reversal of binding possibilities, see (7), and passivization, are also noted. Lastly, as in Chomsky’s (2008) account of Who saw John, where the base-generated copy of who is engaged separately by T and by C, we propose that the embedded subject establishes 2 chains in (1b): one with embedded T and the other with matrix v* via Spec,CP. This is supported by the exclusively post-verbal position of floated quantifiers, see (8), and accounts for multiple Case checking (i.e. ‘MCC’, à la Bejar/Massam 1999) effects, which we also discuss.

(7) O văd [pe fiecare mamă]ₖ copii eiₖ [că muncește mult].
CL₃SG.F.ACC see.3PL.PRT each mother children her that works hard
   ‘Her children see each mother working hard.’

(8) Îₖ-am văzut eu pe studentiₖ [că (*cam toți) ezită (cam toțiₖ)[să voteze]].
CL₃PL.M.ACC-AUX.1 seen I PRT students [that (most all) hesitate (most all)[SUBJ vote]]
   ‘I noticed that most all students are hesitant to vote.’

Conclusions. This paper argues for dual A/A-bar movement in Rom RtoO, thus challenging the notion that movement is uniformly of one type or the other. It contributes to a sharper understanding of issues at the syntax-semantics interface and supports availability of MCC.