Architectural consequences of distinguishing two kinds of Superiority
John Frederick Bailyn
Stony Brook University

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?   b. ***Kogo**   **koj**   vižda?   (Bulgarian)
     who$_{NOM}$ whom$_{ACC}$ sees   whom$_{ACC}$ who$_{NOM}$ sees
     "Who sees whom?"   *"Whom does who see?"

     SUBJ$_{wh}$ > OBJ$_{wh}$ *OBJ$_{wh}$ > SUBJ$_{wh}$

2)   a. **Ko**   **koga**   vidi?   b. **Koga**   **ko**   vidi?   (SC)
     who$_{NOM}$ whom$_{ACC}$ sees   whom$_{ACC}$ who$_{NOM}$ sees
     "Who sees whom?"   "Whom does who see?"

     SUBJ$_{wh}$ > OBJ$_{wh}$ OBJ$_{wh}$ > SUBJ$_{wh}$

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$_{wh}$ > OBJ$_{wh}$
         b. ***What** did **who** say?   *OBJ$_{wh}$ > SUBJ$_{wh}$

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)

References:

Bošković, Zeljko. 1997 "Superiority effects with multiple wh-fronting in Serbo-Croatian" *Lingua* 102
Bošković, Zeljko 2002 "On multiple wh-fronting" *Linguistic Inquiry* 33
Bruening, Benjamin. 2001 "QR Obeys Superiority: Frozen Scope and ACD" *Linguistic Inquiry* 32
Richards, Norvin 1997 *What moves where when in which languages?* PhD. Diss. MIT.
Rudin, Catherine. 1988 'On Multiple Questions and Multiple WH-fronting, *NLLT* 6.
Stepanov, Artur & Penka Stateva 2009 'When QR Disobeys Superiority', *Linguistic Inquiry* 40