

*Self-motivation and getting to the top:  
A new view of Superiority and what it means for the theory of movement*  
John Frederick Bailyn  
Stony Brook University

Most minimalist theories of movement are “top-down” in the sense that the driving force of overt displacement is associated with the feature of the c-commanding Probe and not with the feature of the c-commanded Goal. In combination with Economy principles such as Attract Closest (Richards 1997 a.o.), this provides a highly elegant analysis of the English Superiority in (1):

- 1) a. Who said what? (SUBJ<sub>wh</sub> > OBJ<sub>wh</sub>)                      b. \*What did who say? \*(OBJ<sub>wh</sub> > SUBJ<sub>wh</sub>)

However, probe-driven movement theories require several unwanted stipulations to account for Bulgarian Superiority of the kind found in (2):

- 2) a. Koj kogo vižda?                      b. \*Kogo koj vižda? (Bulgarian)  
       who<sub>NOM</sub> whom<sub>ACC</sub> sees                      whom<sub>ACC</sub> who<sub>NOM</sub> sees  
       “Who sees whom?”                      \* “Whom does who see?”  
       (SUBJ<sub>wh</sub> > OBJ<sub>wh</sub>)                      \*(OBJ<sub>wh</sub> > SUBJ<sub>wh</sub>)

First, most theories of Bulgarian Superiority require stipulation that Bulgarian allows Multiple Specs (Richards 1997, a.o.), (or allows adjunction of a lower WH to a higher one as in Rudin 1988 and Grewendorf 2005) whereas English C heads do not allow multiple landing sites. Second, such accounts require that that the C probe in Bulgarian, but not in English, continues probing for additional WHs after attracting the first WH phrase. Third, top-down accounts must allow either adjunction *to the right* of a higher WH phrase (Rudin 1988, Grewendorf 2005) or Tucking-In (Richard 1997), both of which are problematic for Minimalist theories of displacement. The generally assumed process of Tucking-in is particularly problematic because it violates not only the core combinatorial principle of bare Phrase Structure (Extension), but also because it requires assuming that multiple Specs are not equidistant. Additionally, as shown by Bošković (2007), Probe-driven movement theories generally encounter serious look-ahead problems, especially with regard to successive-cyclic WH movement.

In this talk, I offer an alternative architecture of multiple overt movement that provides an account of (2) fully consistent with Bare Phrase Structure (that is, allowing only bottom-up, cyclic derivations, without Tucking-in). In particular, I propose a restricted version of the “Self-motivated Movement” proposal of Bošković (2007) (that posits a [*u*K] on the Goal of moving elements) in which only elements that undergo *multiple* movements to a single head (such as Bulgarian WH-mvt) carry the self-motivating [*u*K] feature. (Others do not, and are analyzed in the standard minimalist Probe-driven fashion.) The result is a hybrid theory of movement that allows both Probe-driven movement (parasitic on Agree), and Self-motivated Movement.

The hybrid movement theory supports the original Bošković (2007) theory of Move and Agree in two crucial aspects: (i) maintaining that Agree is not subject to locality restrictions, and (ii) maintaining that there is no feature-checking involved in successive-cyclic movement to intermediate SpecCP. However, the hybrid theory improves on its predecessor in crucial aspects of technical implementation, especially with regard to how self-motivated movement begins and in not relying on *optionality* of the [*u*K] feature to account for English WH movement.

The action takes place in Bulgarian multiple WH-constructions, where the analysis nicely avoids the stipulations of multiply-checking Probes, multiple Specifiers, and Tucking-In. Consequences for other phenomena are discussed, including apparent lack of superiority in Russian/BCS type multiple WH-languages, and locality restrictions on Slavic WH-movement generally.