Raising to Object from finite CPs: dual A/A-bar and MCC

Gabriela Alboiu & Virginia Hill

Issue. In colloquial Romanian (Rom) verbs expressing knowledge from reasoning (e.g. *cunosc, ştiu* '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$_k$/el$_k$** e$_k$ pompier / lăcomeşte$_k$ 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. **L$_k$**-am văzut **pe Ion$_k$** [că (*e$_k$ pompier) / lăcomeşte$_k$ 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' (Rooryck 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, Rooryck 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 di-transitive, 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. **Îl$_k$** ştiu **pe Rareş$_k$** [că e (***el$_k$**) om bun (***el$_k$**).
CL.3SG.M.**ACC** know.1SG PRT Rares [that is 3SG.M.**NOM** man good 3SG.M.**NOM**
'I know Rares to be a good man.'

b. **L$_k$**-am convins (**pe Ion$_k$**) [să plătească (**el$_k$**) lumina].
3CL.SG.M.**ACC**-AUX.1 convinced (PRT Ion) [SUBJ pay.subj.3 3SG.M.**NOM** light
'I/We convinced Ion to pay the hydro bill.'

(3) b. **Îl** ştia **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 mirosise [faptul [că **Maria** îşi aranja plecarea]].
Ion smelled fact-the [that Maria CL.REFL.3.DAT arrangedeparture-the
'Ion smelled/figured out the fact that Maria was preparing her exit.'

b. *Ion **o$_k$** mirosise **pe Maria$_k$** [faptul [că-şi aranja plecarea]].
Ion CL.3SG.F.**ACC** smelled PRT Maria fact-the [that-CL.REFL arrange departure-the

c. Ion **o$_k$** mirosise **pe Maria$_k$** [că-şi aranja plecarea.]
Ion CL.3SG.F.**ACC** smelled PRT Maria [that-CL.REFL. arrangedeparture-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) **Îl$_k$** ştim **pe Ion$_k$/(*pe cineva)** [că nu gustă teatru].
3CL.3SG.M.**ACC** know.1PL PRT Ion PRT someone [that not tastes theatre]
'We know that Ion doesn't like the theatre.'

(6) ***Ce*-l$_k$** ştim **pe Ion$_k$** [că nu gustă]?
what-3CL.3SG.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 [uϕ/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]$_k$ copiii ei$_{k/j}$ [că munceşte mult].
CL.3SG.F.**ACC** see.3PL PRT each mother children her that works hard
'Her children see each mother working hard.'

(8) **I**$_k$-am văzut eu **pe studenţi$_k$** [că (*cam toţi) ezită (**cam toţi$_k$**)[să voteze]].
CL.3PL.M.A**CC**-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.