It is well-known that Bulgarian multiple WH-movement constructions show strong word order restrictions, whereas Serbian/Croatian equivalents do not, as shown in (1)-(2):

1) a. **Koj kogo vižda?**  
   who\textsubscript{NOM} whom\textsubscript{ACC} sees  
   “Who sees whom?”  
   SUBJ\textsubscript{wh} > OBJ\textsubscript{wh}  

   b. *Kogo koj vižda? (Bulgarian)  
   whom\textsubscript{ACC} who\textsubscript{NOM} sees  
   *“Whom does who see?”  
   *OBJ\textsubscript{wh} > SUBJ\textsubscript{wh}

2) a. **Ko koga vidi?**  
   who\textsubscript{NOM} whom\textsubscript{ACC} sees  
   “Who sees whom?”  
   SUBJ\textsubscript{wh} > OBJ\textsubscript{wh}  

   b. Koga ko vidi? (SC)  
   whom\textsubscript{ACC} who\textsubscript{NOM} sees  
   “Whom does who see?”  
   OBJ\textsubscript{wh} > SUBJ\textsubscript{wh}

Traditional accounts (Rudin 1988, Richards 1997, Bošković 1997, 2002, Stepanov 1998, Stepanov & Stateva 2009 a.o.) share the following claims:

(i) that the effect in (1)b is a form of Superiority, similar to English (3)b  
(ii) that (1)b and (3)b should be accounted for in the same way  
(iii) that Superiority is in some sense parameterized (hence the acceptability of (2)b)

3) a. **Who said what?**  
   SUBJ\textsubscript{wh} > OBJ\textsubscript{wh}  

   b. *What did who say?  
   *OBJ\textsubscript{wh} > SUBJ\textsubscript{wh}

In the first part of this talk, I argue that although conclusion (i) is in some sense true, claims (ii) and (iii) are problematic, both technically and conceptually, and must be dispensed with. I offer an alternative architecture of multiple overt movement that provides an account of (1)b fully consistent with Bare Phrase Structure (that is, allowing only bottom-up, cyclic derivations, without Tucking-in). In the second part of the talk, I discuss two important consequences of the system: (a) that claim (iii) must be false, and we need a different understanding of Serbo-Croatian type languages, and (b) that Superiority accounts of Scope-Freezing phenomena such as (4) (Bruening 2001) cannot be correct, but that there are independently motivated alternative accounts of Scope Freezing that are both empirically and conceptually superior.

4) a. The teacher assigned an exercise to every student. (PC) (a > every), (every > a)  
   b. The teacher assigned a student every exercise. (DOC) (a > every), *(every > a)
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