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In this paper we revisit and revise the typology of multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting (MWF) in the light of data from Romeyka, a Greek variety spoken in Pontus, Turkey, and from another Pontic Greek variety spoken in northern Greece. Both varieties provide evidence for wh-fronting as focus movement, their most striking feature being the availability of single-pair interpretations in spite of strict Superiority. It turns out that the parametric system deriving the space of variation in multiple wh-fronting must be extended to accommodate the facts presented here, which seem to instantiate a further type of MWF (with a corresponding type of non-MWF languages), not predicted by the existing typology. At the same time, put in a cross-linguistic perspective, the Romeyka facts may help us uncover independent restrictions on the possibilities that this parametric system makes available. We propose that the availability of peripheral positions and their activation in the left or low periphery may be a point of parametric variation. Furthermore, still complying with Bošković’s (2007) theory of Attract-1/all, certain Focus heads can be Attract-1, thus deriving the compatibility of Superiority with single pair readings. Finally, we present some speculations about a potential correlation between word order/head directionality in the clausal domain and the kind of information structure-related head (e.g. Topic vs. Focus) that can take on an Attract-1 feature.
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1 Introduction

The aim of this article is twofold: (a) to discuss some previously understudied dimensions of variation in the syntax of multiple questions, focusing on novel data from Romeyka, a Greek variety spoken in Pontus, Turkey, and from another Pontic Greek variety spoken in northern Greece; (b) to revisit and revise the typology of multiple questions and multiple wh-fronting (MWF) in the light of the Romeyka data. It turns out that the parametric system deriving the space of variation in multiple wh-fronting must be extended to accommodate the facts presented here, and at the same time, put in a cross-linguistic perspective, the Romeyka facts may help us uncover independent restrictions on the possibilities that this parametric system makes available.

In Bošković’s (2002; 2003; 2007) typology (see also Grohmann 2000; Simpson 2000), a correlation between Superiority effects and the availability of wh-movement to SpecCP is postulated. For Bošković, a multiple question in a language will show Superiority effects if it requires a wh-phrase to move to SpecCP for wh-feature checking. Bošković comes to this conclusion based on the following two observations. First, he notes that with respect
to whether languages show Superiority effects or not, there are at least three groups of multiple wh-fronting languages:

(1) **MWF languages**
   a. Languages like Russian that never show Superiority effects.
   b. Languages like Bulgarian that always show Superiority effects.
   c. Languages like Serbo-Croatian that show Superiority effects in some contexts (i.e., in long distance questions, in embedded questions, and in sentences in which C is overt), but not in others.

Second, he shows that with respect to whether languages involve wh-movement to SpecCP or not, there are also three groups of languages:

(2) **Non-MWF languages** (Bošković 2002; 2007)
   a. Languages like Chinese or Japanese, which do not move any wh-phrases to SpecCP.
   b. Languages like English, which involve wh-movement to SpecCP.
   c. Languages like French, which may, but in some contexts do not need to, involve wh-movement to SpecCP.

French is a language that allows both the wh-movement and the wh in-situ strategy in constructions corresponding to English examples such as ‘What did John buy?’. Nevertheless, Bošković (2002; 2003; 2007) points out that the contexts in which Serbo-Croatian shows Superiority effects are exactly the contexts in which French has obligatory wh-movement. Given this, he reaches the following conclusion: Serbo-Croatian has superiority effects where French must have wh-movement (namely, in some contexts); Bulgarian has superiority effects where English must have wh-movement (namely, in all contexts), and Russian has superiority effects where Chinese must have wh-movement (namely, never).

In other words, the range of parametric options with respect to obligatory wh-movement is exactly the same as the range of possibilities with respect to Superiority effects in multiple wh-fronting. Therefore, whatever regulates the former (a strong [+wh] feature in C according to Bošković) also regulates the latter. Overt movement of a wh-phrase is required for wh-feature checking in both cases and only the highest wh-phrase can be attracted. If no wh-phrase moves to SpecCP, Superiority effects are absent. Going back to multiple wh-fronting languages, this means that in languages like Russian, no wh-phrase moves to SpecCP, and that all of them move to a Focus position lower than SpecCP. In multiple questions in Bulgarian, one wh-phrase must always move to SpecCP, since Bulgarian exhibits Superiority effects in all contexts. And in languages like Serbo-Croatian, one wh-phrase must move to SpecCP in the contexts where Serbo-Croatian shows Superiority effects (long-distance questions, embedded questions, and in questions with an overt C). In other cases, where Serbo-Croatian does not show Superiority effects, no wh-phrase moves to SpecCP overtly, but they all undergo focus movement. Notably, Focus movement does not obey Superiority, as focused phrases can be attracted in any order. So, under Bošković’s analysis, there is a perfect correlation between Superiority and wh-movement; any time a MWF language must have wh-movement (i.e., movement to SpecCP), it shows Superiority effects.

Additionally, Bošković shows that there is also another type of correlation: if a multiple wh-question involves wh-movement (i.e., at least one wh-phrase undergoes movement to SpecCP for wh-feature checking), the multiple wh-question cannot have a single pair reading. If a multiple question does not involve wh-movement, it may (but does not have to) have a single pair reading. Bošković shows that this correlation falls out of the
mechanisms of multiple question interpretation employed in Hagstrom (1998) – see 4.2 below. Thus, Bošković's two generalisations can be summarized as follows:

(3) a. If a multiple question allows a single pair reading, it does not involve wh-movement to SpecCP.
   b. If a multiple question exhibits Superiority effects, it involves wh-movement to SpecCP, i.e. the checking of a wh-feature with an Attract-1 property, see Bošković (2007).

It is exactly this correlation that Pontic Greek appears to challenge, as we will see below, while also being exceptional in being the only dialectal group within Greek exhibiting multiple wh-fronting.

Standard Modern Greek (henceforth SMG), at least prima facie, behaves like English, since both English and SMG behave alike with regards to wh-in-situ in multiple questions and in terms of Superiority, as shown in (4) and (5):

(4) a. \([CP \text{ Who}_i [TP t_i \text{ brought what}]]\)?
   b. \(*[CP \text{ Who}_i \text{ what}_k [TP t_i \text{ brought } t_k]]\)?
   c. \(*[CP \text{ What}_k \text{ will } [TP \text{ who}_i \text{ bring } t_k]]\)?

(5) a. \(\text{Pços efere ti?} \) who.NOM bring.PAST.3SG what.ACC
   ‘Who brought what?’
   b. \(*\text{Pços ti efere?} \) who.NOM what.ACC bring.PAST.3SG
   c. \(\text{Pços filise pçon?} \) who.NOM kiss.PAST.3SG who.ACC
   ‘Who kissed whom?’
   d. \(*\text{Pçon filise pços?} \) who.ACC kiss.3SG.PAST who.NOM

However, in the absence of almost any work on wh-formation across Greek varieties (but see Kontossopoulos 1981; Tsiplakou et al. 2007 on Cypriot Greek), very little is known about the fact that Pontic Greek varieties are the only Greek varieties which seem to fall under the MWF type, where all wh-phrases are fronted (but see Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012: 220 for a brief discussion). Consider (6) from the Romeyka variety of Of (henceforth ROf), as spoken in the region of Çaykara (Of) in Turkey, and (7) from Pontic Greek, as spoken in Thessaloniki and Northern Greece (henceforth TPG) but also elsewhere – note that both varieties belong to Pontic Greek Group within the broader Asia Minor Greek Group (see Sitaridou 2013; 2014):

(6) \(\text{ROf} \)
   Tinan doynna endžes?
   who.ACC.HUM what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
   ‘What did you bring for whom?’

(7) \(\text{TPG} \)
   Tinan do eferes?
   who.ACC.HUM what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
   ‘What did you bring for whom?’
Crucially, in Pontic Greek, putting aside D-linked \textit{wh}-phrases for the time being, multiple \textit{wh}-fronting is strictly order-preserving (8), as e.g. in Bulgarian (9) (see Bošković 1997), i.e. Superiority is obeyed (even in questions with a single pair interpretation, as shown later on):

(8) \textit{ROf}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Pios tinan aγapa?  
  who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3SG  
  \textit{‘Who loves whom?’}

  \item b. *Tinan pios aγapa?  
  who.ACC.HUM who.NOM love.3SG  
  \textit{TPG (Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012: 221)}

  \item c. Pios tinan aγapa?  
  who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3SG  
  \textit{‘Who loves whom?’}

  \item d. *Tinan pios aγapa?  
  who.ACC.HUM who.NOM love.3SG
\end{itemize}

(9) \textit{Bulgarian}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Koj kogo obia?  
  who.NOM who.ACC love.3SG  
  \textit{‘Who loves whom?’}

  \item b. *Kogo koj obia?  
  who.ACC who.NOM love.3SG
\end{itemize}

In this article, we establish that Pontic Greek MWF only partially resembles MWF of the Bulgarian type and in fact instantiates a new distinct type of MWF language, which constitutes an apparent challenge to the set of predictions in (3) above, featuring both single-pair readings and strict superiority effects. Crucially, Bošković's (2002) idea that each type of MWF language has its non-MWF counterpart is further reinforced by correlating and coupling the understudied Pontic Greek MWF with a non-MWF language, namely SMG. We extend Bošković's (2007) Attract-1/Attract-all system in such a way that languages may also allow for Attract-1 heads other than C[+wh], e.g. Topic\textsuperscript{0} or, crucially for Pontic Greek, Focus\textsuperscript{0}, though arguably constrained by independent language-specific properties, Drawing on the relevant contrasts between Pontic Greek and Basque, we argue that head-directionality in the VP/clause may be such a property. We further propose that activating an Attract-1 Focus position in the left periphery or in the low/vP periphery is a parametric option, deriving the contrast between languages instantiating the new MWF type (e.g. Romeyka) and their non-MWF counterpart (e.g. SMG).

The article is organised as follows. In section 2.1 we present our methodology, whilst in section 2.2 we contrast Pontic to SMG. In section 3, we focus on Pontic, and in 3.1 we analyse the \textit{wh}-patterns attested in Romeyka, while in 3.2 we discuss (nano-)variation within the Pontic Greek dialectal group, contrasting Romeyka to TPG. In section 4.1 we argue for a fourth, separate MWF type whilst in section 4.2 we link the syntax of focus to \textit{wh}-syntax to derive the fourth type and provide a detailed analysis of the landing sites of \textit{wh}-phrases in Pontic and SMG. We conclude our findings in section 5.

\section{Micro-variation in Greek \textit{wh}-questions}

The goal of this section is to set the stage for the micro-comparative analysis presented in the following sections by (a) providing some necessary information on the methodology of data collection and (b) providing relevant information on micro-variation, as is demonstrated by various differences between the Pontic Greek language group on the one hand and SMG on the other.
2.1 Methodology of data collection
The dialectal data examined in this article derive from two Pontic Greek varieties: (a) Pontic Greek as spoken in Thessaloniki and Northern Greece (henceforth, TPG); and (b) Romeyka as spoken in the Of region of Pontus in Turkey (henceforth ROf). When we use the term Pontic Greek in this article we refer to both ROf and TPG. In both cases, the data derive exclusively from fieldwork conducted by one of the authors. In particular: (a) for the Romeyka data, data collection was carried out in the village of Anasta, in the Of (Çaykara) region of Pontus in Turkey (see Sitaridou 2013). Data was obtained, principally, from three informants: three females (20 years old, 42 year old and 65 years old, respectively), and occasionally from one male (45 years old); (b) as for TPG, two informants have been consulted, one 67 years old female from Thessaloniki and one 55 years old female from Komotini (who has also been living in Thessaloniki for some years) who have been exposed to Pontic Greek from birth. These speakers have been consulted in other works too (see Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012; Sitaridou & Kaltsa 2014). In all cases, the data were elicited using a structured questionnaire on wh-fronting and multiple wh-fronting comprising ca. 70 tokens (for more information regarding the field techniques employed, see Sitaridou 2013).

2.2 Dimensions of variation: exponents and other variables
As we have already seen in the introduction, the main parametric difference between SMG on the one hand and Pontic Greek on the other is that the latter allows for MWF. Other variables include: (i) different lexical items (Table 1), (ii) (un)availability of spurious coordination, (iii) morphological exponence/syncretisms of number and gender, (iv) exponence of D-linking and/or the lack thereof.

Second, in SMG, fronting of more than one wh-phrase is possible with the use of spurious coordinators (Sinopoulou 2011; see also Merchant 2008 for Vlach), as shown in (10), whereas these are absent in Pontic Greek, as shown in (11):

(10)  Background: ‘One student came and got a book out of your library’

SMG
Boris na mu pis [pços ce ti] / [pço can.2SG SUBJ.PRT me tell.PNP.2SG who.NOM and what.ACC / which.ACC (vivlio) ce pços *(to)] pire?
book.ACC and who.NOM it.ACC take.PAST.3SG
‘Can you tell me who took which book?’

(11)  ROf
a. *Pios tše tinan efilise?
who.NOM and who.ACC.HUM kiss.PAST.3SG
‘Who kissed whom?’

b. TPG
*Pios ce tinan efilise?
who.NOM and who.ACC.HUM kiss.PAST.3SG
‘Who kissed whom?’

Third, Pontic Greek lacks number/gender distinctions on the interrogative pronoun, i.e., there is no plural/gender form of ‘who’ (12), in sharp contrast to SMG (12e–f). Instead, we observe that Pontic Greek either (i) uses the same form (underspecified) as in the singular (12a–b); or (ii) resorts to alternative devices: (a) ROF optionally uses a Turkish loanword (kaç kisi ‘how many people) to mark plurality (12c). However, it should be noted that kaš(i)kisi, when used alone/not accompanying ‘pios’, becomes obligatory in the
accusative, as shown in (13a), which features the Greek inflection –\(\pi\)s (despite the fact that in Turkish there is no \(\phi\)i-agreement between the numeral and the noun); (b) TPG uses a periphrastic expression (12d):

\begin{verbatim}
(12) ROf/TPG
a. Pios er\(\theta\)en?
   who.NOM come.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who came?’

a’. ROf
   T\(\acute{s}\}
   who.NOM come.PAST.3SG

b. ROf
   Pios er\(\theta\)en?
   who.NOM come.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who (= many) came?’
\end{verbatim}
c. **ROf**
   (Pios) kaš(i)kisi er∅en
   who many.person.NOM.PL come.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who (= many) came?’

d. **TPG**
   Posi nomat er∅ane?
   how many.NOM.PL person.NOM.PL come.PAST.3PL
   ‘Who and how many came?’

e. **SMG**
   Pços ir∅e?
   who.NOM.SG come.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who came?’

f. **SMG**
   Pçi ir∅an?
   who.NOM.PL come.PAST.3PL
   ‘Who (= many) came?’

(13) a. **ROf**
   Esi kaš kisus ayapas?
   you.NOM how many.ACC person.ACC.PL love.2SG
   ‘How many/who (= many) do you love?’

b. –E∅o eki kisus ayapo.
   I.NOM two.ACC person.ACC.PL love.1SG
   ‘I love two people.’

For a summary of the number/[+/-human] distinctions in Pontic Greek and SMG, consider Table 2:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number/Singular</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>Pontic Greek</th>
<th>SMG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>+Human</td>
<td>–Human</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nom</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>pios/-on (TPG)/tš (ROf)³</td>
<td>pios/pion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>pios/pion</td>
<td>pços/-a/-o</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Acc**         |      | tinan                         | do/doxna/doynan² (ROf)/
|                 |      | pçon/-a/-o                   | pçon/-a/-o       |
|                 |      | pion/-a (TPG)                 |                   |
| **Gen**         |      | tinos                         | tinos            |
|                 |      | tinos                         | tinos pç(an)u/-is/-u |
| **Plural**      | Nom  | pios.MASC/-a.FEM (TPG)/ pios kaš(i) kisi, tš (ROf)/ pios nomat (TPG) |
|                 |      | pios                          | pçi/-es/-a       |
| **Acc**         |      | tinan/tinas (TPG)             | do/doxna/doynan (ROf)/
|                 |      | pçus/-es/a                    | pçus/-es/a       |
|                 |      | pion (ROf)                    |                   |
| **Gen**         |      | tinon (TPG)/ tinos (ROf)      | pion             |
|                 |      | pç(an)on                      |                   |

Table 2: Number/[+/-human] distinctions on interrogatives in Pontic Greek and SMG.

Fourth, Pontic Greek *do* is genuinely non-D-linked (14) as shown by its contrast to D-linked *pion fai* ‘what (food)’ (14c). ROf *doxna*, on the other hand, is aggressively non-D-linked (in the sense of Pesetsky’s (1982) ‘aggressively non-D-linked wh-phrases’) as

1 This form, namely tš, is also recorded by Dawkins (1914: 67) for Romeyka of Santa and is etymologized as deriving from *tis* (indefinite/wh-element in Classical Greek).

2 The form *doxna/doyna(n)* is also attested in our data. If *doxna* derives out of *do + na* then the diachronic trajectory of *doxna* indicates amalgamation of *na* with an interrogative C head. Given the strictly synchronic goal of this article we leave this and other diachronic issues aside.
shown in (15), whereas Pontic Greek do is less so. In our case, ‘aggressively non-D-linked’ means that the answer to (15a) cannot be a concrete action, but rather a more generic state of affairs, which is why *daxna could never be selected with a verb such as “make” – cf. (14b, e). In other words, ROf has lexicalized the D-linking properties to the maximum. Crucially, in SMG this distinction does not hold, as shown in (16), since the same wh-word is used regardless of the (non-)D-linking properties of the question (for periphrases marking aggressively non-D-linked environments in SMG, see Roussou, Vlachos & Papazachariou 2013: 482–484):

(14)  
  a. Esi d’ epitšes?  
      you.NOM what.ACC make.PAST.2SG  
      ‘What did you make?’
  b. *Doxna epitšes?  
      what.ACC make.PAST.2SG
  c. Pion fai epitše?  
      which.ACC food.ACC make.PAST.3SG  
      ‘Which food did she make?’
  d. Esi do fai epitšes?  
      you.NOM what.ACC food.ACC make.PAST.2SG  
      ‘What food did you make?’
  e. *Esi doxna fai epitšes?  
      you.NOM what.ACC food.ACC make.PAST.2SG  
      ‘What food did you make?’
  TPG
  f. Do endžen?  
      what.ACC bring.PAST.3SG  
      ‘What did he bring?’
  TPG
  g. Pion fai epices?  
      which.ACC food.ACC make.PAST.2SG  
      ‘What food did you make?’

(15)  
  a. –Esi doxna ayaapas?  
      you.NOM what.ACC love.2SG  
      ‘What do you love in general?’
  b. –Eyo ayaapo to porpatima, to tšimiðin = emuneθe,  
      I.NOM love.1SG the.ACC walking.ACC the.ACC sleep.INFIN.its  
      to maireman...  
      the.ACC cooking.ACC  
      ‘I love walking, sleeping, cooking...’

(16)  
  a. –Apo ola osa mu ipes, apofasises ti θa ftçaksis telika?  
      Of all that me said.2SG decided.2SG what will make.2SG in the end  
      ‘Of all the things/dishes you told me about, have you decided which one  
      you will make in the end?’
  b. –Ti kanis ta apojevmata?  
      What.ACC do.2SG the afternoons  
      ‘What do you (usually) do in the afternoon?’
3 Wh-patterns and nano-variation in Pontic Greek

In this section, we focus on nano-variation within Pontic Greek (in the way it was conducted in Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012): (a) a detailed description of all attested patterns in the syntax of multiple wh-phrases in ROf; and (b) nano-variation within Pontic, i.e. between ROf and TPG.

3.1 Wh-patterns in Romeyka (ROf)

The major empirical generalisations regarding the distribution of wh-items are: (i) all wh-phrases move, in situ spellout is not an option; (ii) as opposed to other MWF languages, even D-linked wh-phrases are fronted; (iii) if there is a D-linked wh-phrase, it goes to the leftmost position; (iv) even echo wh-phrases are fronted; (v) putting D-linked wh-phrases aside, Superiority is obeyed, without excluding single pair interpretations; (vi) Superiority is only suspended with two or more D-linked wh-phrases, which can be fronted in any order. We illustrate and discuss these observations in turn.

First, all wh-phrases obligatorily move to the left periphery, where two (17) or more wh-phrases (18) can be fronted, with no option to leave any wh-phrase in situ:

(17) ROf
a. Pios tinan endže?
   who.NOM who.ACC.HUM bring.3SG
   ‘Who brought whom?’
b. *Pios endže tinan?
   who.NOM bring.PAST.3SG who.ACC.HUM
c. Tinan doxna endžes?
   who.ACC.HUM what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
   ‘What did you ever bring to whom?’
d. *Tinan endžes doxna?
   who.ACC.HUM bring.PAST.2SG what.ACC
e. Pios mo tinan erῆe?
   who.NOM with who.ACC.HUM come.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who came with whom?’
f. *Pios erῆe mo tinan?
   who.NOM come.PAST.3SG with who.ACC.HUM

(18) ROf
a. –Pios tinan endže? endže?
   who.NOM who.ACC.HUM what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
   ‘Who brought what to whom?’
b. –O Yusifis tin Ilaidan yalemin endže.
   the Yusufis.NOM the.ACC Ilaida.ACC pencil.ACC bring.PAST.3SG
   ‘Yusufis brought Ilaida a pencil.’

In the data considered so far, it is not in principle clear if the ungrammatical options in (17) exemplify the unavailability of postverbal positions for (wh-) non-subjects, due to ‘some degree’ of OV\(^3\) for instance, or indeed the unavailability of wh-in-situ. Let us first deal with the former question, namely whether the MWF in ROf is a consequence

---

\(^3\) Michelioudakis & Sitaridou (2012: 216–217) in a preliminary discussion of head directionality in Romeyka note that, apart from the DP which is head-final (i.e.) (as in TPG), there is some indication that the VP can be superficially head-final as well (i.a–b) without, however, excluding unmarked VO orders. Our working hypothesis here is that ROf is underlingly VO, with OV arising in all/most contexts with objects presented as (new and contrastive) information, possibly also influenced by its contact with Turkish, though we do not
of ‘some degree of OV’ since this may be relevant in the case of ROf, given its previously noted OV ‘tendency’. Put differently, from a typological perspective, in an OV language, it is not clear how there can be any other option other than having all wh-phrases precede the verb. In the case of MWF languages like Bulgarian this has never been an issue since Bulgarian is VO, but what about languages such as Latin, Classical Greek, which are considered to be OV? We therefore need some diagnostic for discriminating between VO MWF and OV MWF languages. We assume that in an OV non-MWF language (19) should be possible, but not (20). Crucially, this is not to say that (19) is never possible in a MWF language. In fact, it is possible to split (i.e., separate) fronted wh-phrases as in (19) in languages of the Serbo-Croatian type (see Rudin 1988; Stjepanović 2003), which are both MWF and VO, though not in languages of the Bulgarian type. It is thus the availability of (20) that serves as a safe diagnostic for MWF, while the unavailability of (19) is a sufficient, though not necessary, condition for MWF in a VO language.

(19) OV non-MWF language

\[ WH_1 \ XP \ WH_2 \ldots \ V \]

(20) VO MWF language

\[ WH_1 \ WH_2 \ XP \ldots \ V \]

The prediction seems to be borne out in e.g. Latin, an OV/V-final language with no MWF, which allows for the equivalent of (19) but not (20), as shown in (21):

(21) Latin

a. Quis hoc quando faciet?
   who.NOM that.ACC when make.FUT.3SG
   ‘Who will make that when?’

b. *Quis quando hoc faciet?
   Who.NOM when that.ACC make.FUT.3SG

On the other hand, in a truly MWF language (20) is expected to be fine. Additionally, a language of the Bulgarian type is also differentiated by ruling out (19). The fact that, in ROf, (22) is the only grammatical option confirms the prediction that the MWF in ROf is not an artefact of OV, but rather an instantiation of true multiple wh-movement.

(22) ROf

a. *Tinan esi doxna endzęs?
   who.ACC.HUM you.NOM what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
   ‘What did you bring to whom?’

b. (Esi) tinan doxna (esi) endzęs?
   you.NOM who.ACC.HUM what.ACC you.NOM bring.PAST.2SG
   ‘Mehmet gave bread to Aiše.’

c. Tu zu to ýilitšin pola ayapo.
   the.GEN animal.GEN the.NOM milk.NOM much like.1SG
   ‘I very much like the milk of the cow.’

explore this here in any detail (for a discussion of word order and its interaction with information structure, see Sitariđou & Kaltsa 2014 and Neocleous in prep. for TPG and ROf, respectively).
Second, in ROf, even D-linked wh-phrases have to be fronted (23) in the same way as non-D-linked wh-phrases do (22), as the ungrammaticality of an in situ D-linked wh-phrase indicates in (23b):

(23)  ROf
   a. Pion faiₙ₁ pios  episện =æₙ₁?
      which.ACC food.ACC who.NOM make.PAST.3SG = it
      ‘Who made what food?’
   b. *pios episện  pion fai?
      who.NOM make.PAST.3SG which.ACC food.ACC
   c. Pion fai pion patši episšen?
      which.ACC food.ACC which.NOM woman.NOM make.PAST.3SG
      ‘Which woman made what food?’

Third, in ROf when any one of the wh-phrases is D-linked/referential, it has to appear in the leftmost position. A D-linked wh-phrase may also license/co-occur with a co-indexed (resumptive) clitic, even in short matrix questions (23a), just like (other) base-generated XPs, e.g. CLLD topics, and unlike non-referential/non-D-linked wh-phrases – consider (24):

(24)  ROf
   a. Background:
      Ađašeka pola faia in, pola patšidæ i
      here many.ACC food.NOM be.3PL many women.NOM be.3PL
      ‘There are many dishes here, many women are here.’
   b. Question:
      Pion fai( = D-linked) pios ( = D-linked in the context) episšen =æₙ₁?
      which.ACC food.ACC who.NOM make.PAST.3SG = it
      ‘Who made what food?’
   c. Answer:
      To xavitšin epika evo,
      the.NOM pudding.ACC make.PAST.1SG I.NOM
      to kartofin episšen i Aiše,
      the.ACC potato.ACC make.PAST.3SG the.NOM Ayše.NOM
      to seker-pare episšen i Miriam.
      the.ACC cake.ACC make.PAST.3SG the.NOM Miriam.NOM
      ‘I made the pudding, Aiše made the potato dish, Miriam made the cake.’

Fourth, echo questions too require wh-movement (25); therefore, there appears to be no wh-in-situ in ROf at all.

       ROf
   a. Doxnå ipes? Pios tinan ayapai?
      who.NOM who.ACC love.3SG
      ‘Who loves whom?’ (ok on both default and echo interpretation)
   b. *Doxnå ipes? Pios ayapai tinan?
      who.NOM love.3SG who.ACC.HUM
      ‘Who loves whom?’ (*on both default and echo interpretation)
   c. Tinan doxnå endžen? Kala uš ekusa.
      who.ACC what.ACC bring.PAST.3SG well NEG hear.PAST.1SG
      ‘What did (s)he bring to whom? I didn’t hear well enough.’
      (ok on both default and echo interpretation)
Fifth, with regard to Superiority effects in ROf, these are only sensitive to D-linking. More specifically, when all fronted wh-phrases are non-D-linked, wh-fronting is strictly order preserving, as shown in (26):

(26) \(ROf\)

a. Pios tinan pote efisile?
   who.NOM who.ACC.HUM when kiss.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who kissed whom and when?’

b. *Tinan > pios
   who.ACC.HUM > who.NOM

c. *Pote > pios
   when > who.NOM

d. *Pote > tinan
   when > who.ACC.HUM

e. *doxna > tinan?
   what.ACC > who.ACC/DAT.HUM

Interestingly, as (26) shows, ROf exhibits Superiority effects even between the second highest and other lower wh-phrases. Moreover, in ROf, echo wh-phrases also exhibit Superiority effects, as shown in (27):

(27) Context: ‘Mehmet brought many cows to Ayşe.’

\(ROf\)

   who.ACC.HUM what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG well NEG hear.PAST.1SG
   ‘What did you bring to whom? I didn’t hear well enough.’

   what.ACC who.ACC bring.PAST.2SG well NEG hear.PAST.1SG

Furthermore, (28) and (29) illustrate the possibility of having Superiority effects in embedded and long-distance environments respectively in ROf (see also (36b) below for short questions with overt C), which is compatible with Bošković’s tacit assumption that a language may lack a strong \(+ wh\) in C (and, therefore, obligatory fronting/Superiority) in short-distance/null C matrix questions (like French/Serbo-Croatian) and have such a strong \(+ wh\) C in overt C, embedded and long-distance contexts, but not vice-versa, i.e., obligatory fronting/Superiority in null C/short matrix questions also entails such effects in the latter contexts.

(28) Embedded questions \(ROf\)

a. As terume pios tinan iđe.
   HORT.PRT see.1PL who.NOM who.ACC.HUM see.PAST.3SG
   ‘Let us see who saw whom.’

b. Eyo tši ksero pios tinan endže.
   I.NOM NEG know.1SG who.NOM who.ACC.HUM bring.PAST.3SG
   ‘I don’t know who brought whom.’

c. *Eyo tši ksero tinan pios endže.
   I.NOM NEG know.1SG who.ACC who.NOM bring.PAST.3SG
   ‘I don’t know who brought whom.’

d. *Eyo tši ksero pion kitapın pion patši
   I.NOM NEG know.1SG what.ACC book.ACC which girl.NOM
   (D-linked)
   bring.PAST.3SG
   ‘I don’t know which girl brought which book.’
(29)  Long distance (multiple) \(wh\)-questions
\[ROf\]
Tinan pote ipes iões?
who.ACC.HUM when say.PAST.2SG see.PAST.2SG
‘Whom did you say you saw when?’

Finally, when more than one/all fronted \(wh\)-phrases are D-linked (in which case they obligatorily give rise to pair-list readings), then Superiority effects are suspended/cancelled altogether – consider (23c), (24b), and (28d) above. On the contrary a genuinely/aggressively non-D-linked \(wh\)-element can never be the leftmost fronted phrase (30):

(30)  \(ROf\)
a.  Pion peðan doxna endžes?
which.ACC boy.ACC what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
‘What did you bring to which boy?’
b.  *Doxna \{pion peðan / pote\} endžes?
what.ACC which.ACC boy.ACC when bring.PAST.2SG

3.2 Nano-variation in Pontic Greek \(wh\)-fronting

Turning our attention now to nano-variation within the Pontic Greek varieties, namely ROF and TPG (see Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012 for other Romeyka varieties; and Sitaridou 2014 for a phylogenetic tree of the Pontic Greek language group), we note, first, that there are strongly grammaticalised [+–human] restrictions in ROF (31) and (33), whereas these are absent from TPG (32) and (34). In the latter, the \(p\)-series and the \(t/d\)-series mainly mark case distinctions (\(p\): nominative, \(t/d\): accusative, in animates), not [+–human], as in the former:

(31)  \(ROf\)
a.  Tinan ayapas?
who.ACC.HUM love.2SG
‘Whom do you love?’
b.  –Ayapo ton tširi = m.
love.1SG the.ACC father.ACC = my
‘I love my father.’

(32)  \(TPG\)
a.  –Tinan ayapas?
who.ACC love.2SG
‘Whom do you love?’
b.  –Ton kiri = m ayapo.
the.ACC father.ACC = my love.1SG
‘I love my father.’

(33)  \(ROf\)
a.  –Pion ayapas?
what.ACC love.2SG
‘What do you love?’
b.  –Ayapo ta za.
love.1SG the.ACC animals.ACC
‘I love the animals.’
(34) \( TPG \)

a. – Tinan ayapas?
   what.ACC.HUM love.2SG
   ‘What do you love?’

b. – Ta vudæ ayapo.
   the.ACC cows.ACC love.1SG
   ‘I love cows.’

For a more detailed summary of the distribution and reshuffling of \([+/–human]/[+/–animate]\) distinctions in the Pontic Greek varieties, also including genuinely non-D-linked elements, and abstracting away from the (minimal) differences between singular and plural, consider Table 3 (the differences between the two varieties with respect to the distribution of \(p\)- and \(t\)- are marked in bold). This picture is also consistent with \([+/–human]\) restrictions found in the Pontic Greek Case system (see also Drettas 1997).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pontic Greek Variety</th>
<th>Case</th>
<th>+Human</th>
<th>–Human</th>
<th>–Animate</th>
<th>Non-D-linked</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROf</strong></td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>pios/tš pion do –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>tìnан pion do doxna/doyna</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>tinōs tinōs pion –</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPG</strong></td>
<td>Nom</td>
<td>pios Pios do do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>tinan tinan do do</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gen</td>
<td>tinōs tinōs pion do/pion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3: \(± human/± animate\) distinctions in wh-elements across Pontic Greek varieties.

Second, in ROf we observe the presence of the Turkish interrogative particle \(mI\) (though without vowel harmony) in ROf in: (i) indirect questions (35a) where however it seems to be optional, as shown in (35b) (see Dawkins 1910: 127, 287; 1916: 624; Papadopoulos 1955: 172; 1961: 45; Tombaidis 1988: 67 for Pontic Greek; and Bağrıaçık 2013 for Cappadocian); (ii) direct questions of total ignorance, as shown in (35c–c’). Crucially, this interrogative particle is completely absent from TPG (36):

(35) \( ROf \)

a. – Esi ekseris mi pios tinan ayapai?
   you.NOM know.2SG INTER.PRT who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3SG
   ‘Do you know who loves whom?’

b. Esi ekseris pios tinan endže?
   you.NOM know.2SG who.NOM who.ACC.HUM bring.PAST.3SG
   ‘Do you know who brought whom?’

c. O Alis tin Aiše ayapa mi?
   the.NOM Alis.NOM the.ACC Ayše.ACC love.3SG INTER.PRT
   ‘Does Alis love Ayše?’

c’. Tšain mi ayapas?
   tea.ACC INTER.PRT love.2SG
   ‘Do you like tea?’

d. *Pios tinan ayapai mi?
   who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3SG INTER.PRT
   ‘Who loves whom?’

(36) \( TPG \)

a. Esi ekseris pios tinan ayapa?
   you.NOM know.2SG who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3SG
   ‘Do you know who loves whom?’
b. O Yuras ayapa tin Anasta?
   the.NOM Yuras.NOM love.3SG the.ACC Anasta.ACC
   ‘Does Yuras love Anasta?’

Third, although TPG exhibits MWF in most contexts, it also allows optional *in situ* placement of the lower *wh*-phrase (37) and, therefore, contrasts with ROF where MWF is always obligatory. The optionality, albeit *prima facie* striking, is most likely a case of competing grammars, namely a TPG grammar with systematic MWF and a SMG without one. The existence of competing grammars seems to receive confirmation from other works (Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012; Sitaridou & Kaltsa 2014) which reached the conclusion that the TPG informants’ judgments were severely affected by SMG, indicating that we are dealing either with heritage speakers (in the sense of Silva-Corvalán 2003) of TPG or with attrited TPG-speakers because of interference of SMG. However, it appears that MWF in TPG is an option only when there is at most one *wh*-word of the *t/d*-series, i.e. when the rest or all of them are of the *p*-series.

(37) TPG
a. Pios tinan efilise?
   who.NOM who.ACC kiss.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who kissed whom?’
b. Pios efilise tinan?
   who.NOM kiss.PAST.3SG who.ACC
   ‘Who kissed whom?’
c. Pios me/mo tinan er0en?
   who.NOM with who.ACC/with who.ACC come.PAST.3SG
   ‘Who came with whom?’
d. Pios er0en me/mo tinan?
   who.NOM come.PAST.3SG with who.ACC/with who.ACC
   ‘Who came with whom?’

Furthermore, when any of the rest is non-D-linked (hence not from the *p*-series, in which only the nominative form can be non-D-linked), it has to be replaced by a form also used as a non-interrogative indefinite pronoun, in fact like *wh*-words in Mandarin (cf. Huang 1982) and *wh*-words in Classical Greek (cf. Mathieu & Sitaridou 2005, i.a.) and in ROF as in (38). So, for instance, the relevant form in (38a) is: (i) marked with a *ka*-morpheme preceding the interrogative pronoun (*ka + tinan*), arguably lack a strong *[wh]-feature*, and thus may only appear *in situ*. Thus, in (38) any optionality is cancelled and instead *wh*-in situ is the only option for the prepositional indirect object *wh*-phrase. This sharply contrasts with ROF where MWF trivially obtains in the same context (as seen in (17) above); (ii) a prepositional indirect object rather than an accusative form, cf. *tinan* ‘whom’ which is the form one would expect in ROF. This is because ROF does not allow prepositional indirect objects, unlike TPG (see Michelioudakis 2011; Michelioudakis & Sitaridou 2012).

(38) TPG
a. Do endžes se katinan?
   what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG to someone.ACC
   ‘What did you bring to whom?’
b. *Do se katinan endžes?
   what.ACC to someone.ACC bring.PAST.2SG
c. *Se katinan endžes do?
   to someone.ACC bring.PAST.2SG what.ACC
Also, in the absence of non-nominative p-words that do not take NP complements, it seems that TPG may employ demonstrative pronouns as substitutes for D-linked NP-less wh-phrases, as in (39c) (for the link between demonstratives and wh-elements, see Diessel 2003). The same holds for ROf, as shown in (39f). However: (i) TPG allows them only in situ (39b) whereas in ROf they have to be preverbal; and (ii) in line with the syntax of double-object constructions TPG allows indirect object PPs, the underlying c-command relationship being direct object > PP (Michelioudakis 2011), but like ROf it also has accusative indirect objects, even though again tinan is not allowed in the presence of another non-D-linked accusative: so, we observe that tinan ‘whom’ is not preferred as the accusative case-marked indirect object (39a) or inside a PP c-commanded by a non-D-linked direct object (39b), and, instead, may be replaced by aton ‘him’ (39c), when non-linked, a strategy also compatible with doubling (39e), cf. (resumptive) clitic doubling with D-linked wh-phrases in ROf; and (iii) in TPG in multiple wh-questioning of a double object, i.e. double accusative, construction, do is replaced by kat ‘(something)’ as shown in (39d).

\[(39)\]

\begin{align*}
\text{TPG} \\
\text{a.} & \quad \text{*Do endžen tinan?} \\
& \quad \text{what.ACC bring.PAST.3SG who.ACC} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{*Pios kat’ endžen se tinan?} \\
& \quad \text{who.NOM something.ACC bring.PAST.3SG to who.ACC} \\
\text{c.} & \quad \text{Do endžes aton?} \\
& \quad \text{what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG him} \\
& \quad \text{‘What did you bring to which one of them?’} \\
\text{d.} & \quad \text{Pios kat’ endžen aton (=D-linked)?} \\
& \quad \text{who.NOM something.ACC bring.PAST.3SG him} \\
& \quad \text{‘Who brought what to whom (=D-linked)?’} \\
\text{e.} & \quad \text{Aton pios eferen = aton (=D-linked)?} \\
& \quad \text{who.ACC who.NOM bring.PAST.3SG = him.CL}\footnote{For an analysis of the pronominal –aton as a weak or (en)clitic pronoun, see Michelioudakis and Sitaridou 2012, and Chatzikyriakidis 2010.} \\
& \quad \text{‘Who brought whom/which one of them (=D-linked)?’} \\
\text{ROf} \\
\text{f.} & \quad \text{Atenan/atonan doxna eðotšes?} \\
& \quad \text{her/him what.ACC give.PAST.2SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘What did you give to whom?’}
\end{align*}

Crucially, tinan ‘whom’ becomes possible again in TPG when there is a wh-element of the p-series, such as another D-linked wh-phrase as in (40a), whereas, in its D-linked form, it usually goes back to the prepositional form (se pion peðan ‘to which boy’ rather than pion peðan ‘which boy’) – compare (40b) and the barely grammatical (40c); interestingly the bare (= pronominal) D-linked form is fine in the IO-DO order in (40e).

\[(40)\]

\begin{align*}
\text{TPG} \\
\text{a.} & \quad \text{Pion fain tinan eðeces?} \\
& \quad \text{which.ACC food.ACC who.ACC give.PAST.2SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘What food did you give to whom?’} \\
\text{b.} & \quad \text{Pion fain se pion peðan eðeces?} \\
& \quad \text{which.ACC food.ACC to which.ACC boy.ACC give.PAST.2SG} \\
& \quad \text{‘What food did you give to which boy?’}
\end{align*}
c. ?Pion fain pion patšin eðeces?
   which.ACC food.ACC which.ACC woman.ACC give.PAST.2SG
   ‘What food did you give to which woman?’

d. Pion patši pion fain eðeces?
   which.ACC girl.ACC which.ACC food.ACC give.PAST.2SG
   ‘What food did you give to which girl?’

e. Pios kat’ engen aton (=D-linked)?
   who.NOM something.ACC bring.PAST.3SG him
   ‘Who brought what for whom (=D-linked)?’

Regarding D-linked wh-phrases of the p-series potentially taking NP complements, we observe that in TPG, when pios, the subject interrogative pronoun (which may be either D-linked or non-D-linked), co-occurs with a D-linked wh-phrase, only pios ‘who’ moves, whereas the D-linked wh-phrase stays in situ (41c)– which as already said is possible due to interference of the SMG pattern:

\[(41) \quad \text{TPG}\]
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. } \text{Aðaceka pola faia in, pola ŋariões in.} \\
\text{here many.NOM foods.NOM be.3PL many.NOM women.NOM be.3PL} \\
\text{‘Here there are many foods, there are many women.’} \\
\text{b. } ?\text{Pion fain pios epiken?} \\
\text{which.ACC food.ACC who.NOM make.PAST.3SG} \\
\text{c. } \text{Pios epiken pion fain?} \\
\text{who.NOM make.PAST.3SG which.ACC food.ACC} \\
\text{‘Who made what food?’} \\
\text{d. } \text{To xavits epik=ato eyo, to kartoflin} \\
\text{the.ACC pudding.ACC make.PAST.1SG = it.ACC I.NOM the.ACC potato.ACC} \\
\text{epicen = ato i Paresa, to pirox epicen = ato} \\
\text{make.PAST.3SG = it.ACC the.NOM Paresa.NOM the dumpling.ACC made.3SG} \\
\text{i Kleona.} \\
\text{the.NOM Kleona.NOM} \\
\text{‘I made the pudding, Paresa made the potato dish, Kleona made the dumpling.’} \\
\end{array}\]

Also, when there are two D-linked wh-phrases in TPG: (i) a subject wh-D-linked phrase always precedes any other D-linked phrase (42a); (ii) they both have to be obligatorily fronted (42a–c); and (iii) exhibit weak superiority effects (42b):

\[(42) \quad \text{TPG}\]
\[\begin{array}{ll}
\text{a. } \text{Pios ŋari pion fain epicen?} \\
\text{who.NOM woman.NOM which.ACC food.ACC make.PAST.3SG} \\
\text{‘Which woman made what food?’} \\
\text{b. } ?\text{Pion fain pion patšin eðeces?} \\
\text{which.ACC food.ACC which.ACC woman.ACC give.PAST.2SG} \\
\text{‘What food did you give to which woman?’} \\
\text{c. } \text{Pion patši pion fain eðeces?} \\
\text{which.ACC woman.ACC which.ACC food.ACC give.PAST.2SG} \\
\text{‘What food did you give to which woman?’} \\
\end{array}\]

Moreover, a direct object D-linked wh-phrase always precedes a bare non-D-linked wh-phrase (43a) or prepositional indirect object D-linked wh-phrase (43b).
(43)  
TPG
a. Pion fain  tinan  eðeces?
which.ACC food.ACC who.ACC give.PAST.2SG
‘What food did you give to whom?’
b. Pion  fain se pion  peðan  eðeces?
which.ACC food.ACC to who.ACC boy.ACC give.PAST.2SG
‘What food did you give to which boy?’

Finally, bare non-D-linked wh-words of the t/d-series may only precede bare D-linked wh-words but are always preceded by wh + NP phrases with p-words (44):

(44)
TPG
a. Do  endžes  aton  (=D-linked)?
what.ACC bring.PAST.2SG him
‘What did you bring to whom (=D-linked)?’
b. Pios  peðas  do  endžen?
which.NOM boy.NOM what.ACC bring.PAST.3SG
‘Which boy brought what?’
c. *Do  pios  peðas  endžen?
what.ACC who.ACC boy.ACC bring.PAST.3SG

To sum up, as far as superiority/ordering effects are concerned, TPG appears to exhibit strong superiority effects when both/all wh-phrases are non-D-linked, while in the presence of a D-linked phrase with a p-word the following patterns seem to hold: (i) strong superiority effects if a D-linked phrase co-occurs with a bare/non-complemented wh-word of the p-series, namely pios ‘who’; (ii) superiority is suspended with two (or more) wh + NP phrases, like in ROF and, in fact, SMG; (iii) when co-occurring with non-D-linked phrases of the t/d-series, phrases with p-words always precede. More generally, it was shown that although both TPG and ROF exhibit MWF superficially, the former shows a considerable degree of optionality, possibly due to contact with SMG. In the analysis which follows we mainly focus on the ROF data, while the way certain distinctions and patterns got reshuffled in TPG may shed further light on what seems to constitute a distinct and consistent type in the typology of multiple questions.

4 Recasting the existing MWF typology

In this section we present our proposal which consists of: (i) the postulation of a fourth type of a MWF language given that ROF is different from all other MWF languages as well as of fourth non-MWF one, namely SMG; (ii) deriving the fourth type from the interaction of focus with wh-syntax.

4.1 A fourth type

As a first step we need to establish whether ROF can fit under the existing MWF typology or whether ROF is different from other known types of MWF. To assess this, consider Table 4 which presents the properties for each type of known MWF languages as well as what we have already demonstrated for ROF in section 3.1:

According to Table 4, it becomes clear that, although Bulgarian would be the closest MWF language to which ROF aligns (45)–(46), still ROF does not pattern perfectly with Bulgarian because of two differences. First, in ROF, a D-linked wh-phrase can move even above non-D-linked wh-subject, e.g. a pios-subject (47), whereas the same is not possible over a kof-subject in Bulgarian (see Krapova 2002; Jaeger 2004), as shown in (48):
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(45) **Bulgarian**
*Kakvo koj kupuva*  
what who.NOM buy.3SG  
‘Who buys what?’

(46) **ROf**
*Tinan pios efilise?*  
who.ACC.HUM who.NOM kissed.3SG  
‘Who kissed whom?’

(47) **ROf**
a. *pion faš pios epitšen = æ=?*  
which food who.NOM made.3SG = it  
‘Who made what food?’
b. *pios pion faš epitšen?*  
who.NOM which food.ACC made.3SG

(48) **Bulgarian** (Krapova & Cinque 2008)
a. *?Koja studentka koj šte izpita?*  
which student who will examine.3SG  
b. *Koj koja studentka šte izpita?*  
who which student will examine.3SG  
‘Who will examine which student?’

Second, like other MWF languages, ROf also allows single pair readings, but unlike many of these languages (e.g. Serbo-Croatian, Russian, Polish, Romanian, see Bošković 2002), these readings (like all constructions with exclusively non-D-linked wh-phrases) are characterised by strict Superiority effects ((49) and (50) vs. (51)).

(49) **Context:**

ROf [+Superiority, + single-pair]  
/Eyo ekusa is kat’ aṣorasen/  
I.NOM hear.PAST.1SG one something.ACC buy.PAST.3SG  
amanuṣ egporesa evrini {pios doxna}  
but NEG can.PAST.1SG find.out.INF {who what}  
ROf [-Superiority, + single-pair]  
/ {*doxna pios} aṣorasen/  
/ {*what who} buy.PAST.3SG  
‘I heard someone bought something but I couldn’t find out who bought what.’

Table 4: Romeyka against the existing MWF typology.
Given these differences, the theoretical assumptions that derive MWF of the Bulgarian type, namely movement of one, the highest, \textit{wh}-phrase to Spec-C followed by (potentially multiple/unordered) focus movement, would make at least two wrong predictions in the case of ROf. Therefore, ROf indeed seems to instantiate a distinct type of MWF. Crucially though, such a solution appears to be challenging for the existing typology since the postulation of another MWF type would create a gap in the otherwise symmetric pairing between MWF and their non-MWF counterparts. It follows that the crucial question is whether ROf can be found to correspond to any known non-MWF language, since such a finding would offer further motivation for expanding the existing MWF typology. We argue that there is such a language: ROf, in fact, correlates with SMG. In what follows we show that SMG is not like any other non-MWF languages, for instance English, and that, while multiple questions with more than two \textit{wh}-phrases in ROf differ from those of other MWF languages, in fact they match the behaviour of their counterparts in SMG. Our arguments are as follows.

First, in SMG, Superiority is sensitive to D-linking and (see also Anagnostopoulou 2003 for the original observation), whereas in English this is not the case (52d–e) and (53d–e):

(50) \textit{Polish} \ [-Superiority, + single-pair] (from Bošković 2002)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Kto co kupił?
    \textit{Who bought what'}
  \item b. Co kto kupił?
    \textit{What was bought and by who'}
\end{itemize}

(51) \textit{Romanian} \ [+ Superiority, – single-pair] (from Bošković 2002)

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Cine ce a cumpărat?
    \textit{Who bought what'}
  \item b. * Ce cine a cumpărat?
    \textit{What was bought and by who'}
\end{itemize}

Context A: There was a murder and inspector Montalbano wants his assistant to find out who witnessed the incident and what they saw.

(52) \textit{SMG}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Context A: There was a murder and inspector Montalbano wants his assistant to find out who witnessed the incident and what they saw.
    \textit{SMG}
  \item b. Q: Ma嵯e: pjos iሱ ti?
    learn.IMP who.NOM see.PAST.3SG what.ACC
  \item c. * Ma嵯e: ti iሱ pços?
    learn.IMP what.ACC see.PAST.3SG who.NOM
    \textit{Find out who saw what’}
  \item d. Who saw what?
  \item e. * What did who see?
\end{itemize}

Context B: Mary, Jane and Bill were asked to cook one dish each for a dinner party. So, we ended up having lasagne, mousaka and Beijing duck. Everything was great, but I am wondering:

(53) \textit{D-linked}

\begin{itemize}
  \item a. Context B: Mary, Jane and Bill were asked to cook one dish each for a dinner party. So, we ended up having lasagne, mousaka and Beijing duck. Everything was great, but I am wondering:
    \textit{D-linked}
  \item b. Q: Telika pcọs majiepse ti?
    finally who.NOM cook.PAST.3SG what.ACC
\end{itemize}
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Second, in SMG, an ‘in situ’ wh-element is not really in situ. As Sinopoulou (2008) convincingly shows, the in situ wh-phrases in Greek multiple questions precede all vP-internal constituents regardless of D-linking, as shown in (54)–(56):

(54) **SMG**

Pote ayorase (?*o Janis) ti (o Janis)?
when buy.PAST.3SG the.NOM Janis.NOM what.ACC the.NOM Janis.NOM
‘When did Janis buy what?’

(55) **SMG**

Pote doulepse (?*i Anna) pu (i Anna)?
when work.PAST.3SG the.NOM Anna.NOM where the.NOM Anna.NOM
‘When did Anna work where?’

(56) **SMG**

Pços iše (?*tin tenia) pu (tin tenia)?
who.NOM watch.PAST.3SG the.ACC movie.ACC where the.ACC movie.ACC
‘Where did who watch the movie?’

Crucially, in English we observe that the low wh-phrase has to follow all vP-internal constituents, as shown in (57):

(57) **Who saw (‘where) the movie (where)?**

Third, like ROf, SMG exhibits Superiority effects even beyond the second highest wh-phrase (58) (see Şener 2006; 2010 for similar effects in Turkish):

(58) **SMG**

a. Pços ayorase ti pu?
who.NOM buy.PAST.3SG what.ACC where
‘Who bought what where?’

b. ?* Pços ayorase pu ti?
who.NOM buy.PAST.3SG where what.ACC
‘Who bought where what?’

Examples like (59) show that ROf aligns with SMG (58):

(59) **ROf**

Pios doxna putšeka ayorase?
who.NOM what.ACC where.there buy.PAST.3SG
‘Who bought where what?’

Therefore, on the basis of the above argumentation, SMG and ROf may constitute a fourth non-MWF/MWF pair given that neither SMG is like English nor is ROf like Bulgarian. According to Bošković (2002), MWF languages exhibit Superiority effects, where the corresponding non-MWF languages require wh-movement. If we disregard the precise target of what Bošković calls ‘wh-movement’ (i.e. whether this is a unique C [+wh] Position or not), then there is a clear parallelism between SMG and ROf: (i) in SMG, all wh-phrases necessarily move, even echoic ones (which, at most, are moved to the left periphery);
in ROf, all wh-phrases are fronted, even echoic ones (25); (ii) in SMG, Superiority is sensitive to D-linking, i.e. D-linked wh-phrases in multiple questions tend to stay low, no matter how high their base position is; in ROf, D-linked wh-phrases are fronted, but are not subject to Superiority; (iii) single-pair questions in SMG require fronting of the highest wh-phrase; likewise, in ROf single-pair questions obey Superiority. This would lead us to revise the existing wh-typology, as shown in Table 5, so that it includes a fourth pair, namely ROf-SMG. Their equivalence lies in that: (a) nothing is really left in situ; and (b) all wh-movement is sensitive to Superiority, except when a wh-phrase is D-linked:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-MWF</th>
<th>MWF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>Russian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French</td>
<td>Serbo-Croatian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>Bulgarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMG</td>
<td>Romeyka</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Four types of wh-languages.

More specifically, we put forward the proposal that in both dialectal groups, namely SMG and Pontic Greek, all phrases which are inherently (narrowly) focused necessarily move to designated peripheral positions. Sinopoulou’s (2008) analysis relies on the assumption that ‘in situ’ wh-phrases actually move to the low/vP-periphery (see Belletti 2004), in fact, to the same position that postverbal foci move to (60):

(60) ROf
    Efílese (*tin Aiše) o Alis
    kiss.PAST.3SG the.ACC Ayše.ACC Alis.NOM (tin Aiše).
    the.ACC Ayše.ACC
    ‘Alis kissed Ayše.’

An important prediction of our analysis is then that in ROf the Focus position in the low periphery above the low vP should be unavailable. The prediction is indeed borne out for ROf (for the same claim in Pontic Greek see Sitardou & Kaltsa 2014). First, consider the unavailability of focus below the verb in ROf (61), i.e. anywhere but the leftmost position:

(61) ROf
    a. – Pios erže?
       who.NOM come.PAST.3SG
       ‘Who came?’
    ROf
    b. – O Mehtes erže.
       the.NOM Mehtes.NOM come.PAST3.SG
       ‘Mehmetis came.’
    ROf – for a few speakers only
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b'. – Erȕe o Mehmetis.
    come.PAST.3SG the.NOM Mehmetis.NOM
    ‘Mehmetis came.’
    SMG

c. – Irȕe o Mehmet.
    come.PAST.3SG the.NOM Mehmet.NOM
    ‘Mehmet came.’

(63) ROf

a. – Opse pios epie?
    yesterday who.NOM leave.PAST.3SG
    ‘Who left yesterday?’
    ROf

b. – Opse o adelfo=m epie.
    yesterday the.NOM brother.NOM = my leave.PAST.3SG
    ‘Yesterday my brother left.’
    SMG

c. – Xȕes efije o adelfos mu.
    yesterday leave.PAST.3SG the.NOM brother.NOM my
    ‘Yesterday my brother left.’

If the existence/activation of the low periphery is indeed subject to parametric variation, then a crucial difference between SMG and ROf/TPG is the availability of a vP-periphery in the former but not in the latter.

4.2 Focus and wh-syntax in the fourth type

The patterns observed challenge Bošković’s (2002; 2007) account superficially, but do not contradict the main insights and the essence of his analysis. On the contrary, the proposal we put forth is a natural extension of this line of thought. Let us first briefly present Bošković’s original proposal, especially his (2007) technical implementation. For Bošković, what differentiates MWF with Superiority from MWF without Superiority is the availability of movement to Spec-C in the former but not in the latter. All movement of wh-phrases that is not movement to Spec-C is focus-movement. Thus, while C is an Attract-1 head, in Bošković’s terms, which attracts just the highest wh-phrase, Focus is an Attract-all head attracting all wh-phrases available to the same position, hence no specific order of movements ‘is preferred by Economy’ (Bošković 2007: 6). Furthermore, adopting Hagstrom’s (1998) semantics of questions, Bošković (2007) assumes that single-pair (SP) readings with two wh-phrases obtain when both of them are in the scope of a Q morpheme, an existential quantifier over choice functions, which is merged right below CP. Movement to Spec-C across Q in this position gives rise to a Relativised Minimality violation (64).

(64) a. [SP reading]
    *WH_i C Q [t_i wh]

b. [PL reading]
    WH_i C [t_i wh + Q]

test

In cases of movement to Spec-C, then, SP readings are blocked and the interrogative interpretation is made available through merging Q directly with a wh-phrase not moving to Spec-C, giving rise to pair-list (PL) readings only. An empirical generalisation following from this, then, is that MWF with Superiority effects should always be incompatible with SP readings, and this is exactly why our findings are apparently paradoxical with respect to this sort of analysis.
The ROf data do not contradict the idea that Superiority is associated with an Attract-1 head, they only challenge the idea that C may be the only such head. We propose that languages of the fourth type in the typology of multiple questions are characterised by the availability of two Focus heads, rather than one, the higher of which (at least) has an Attract-1 feature. ROf and SMG (i) pattern together by sharing an extra focus head attracting certain types of focused elements, most notably new information foci, and (ii) differ in placing it in the high and the low periphery respectively. The availability of new information focus in the left periphery, possibly being the left peripheral projection that immediately dominates TP, has been independently shown to be the case in TPG (see Sitaridou & Kaltsa 2014) so it may well be so in the case of its closest cognate, namely ROf (see also Neocleous, in prep.). While new-info Focus in ROf/TPG is arguably lower than the Attract-1 Foc⁰ which attracts the highest wh-phrase, new-info Focus in SMG is arguably the same head that attracts wh-phrases to the vP-periphery (see above).

Note that apart from the higher of the two Focus-related heads, it is also likely that the new-info Focus head too has an Attract-1 feature. In the case of SMG at least, Superiority effects arise even between the second and the third wh-phrase (65) indicating that, of the non-left-peripheral wh-phrases, one is attracted by low Focus, while the other one is probably left in situ (66). If new-info Focus is responsible for this Superiority effect, then it is probably the highest projection of the vP-periphery and arguably the left periphery of ROf/TPG is the mirror image of the SMG vP-periphery.

(65) **SMG**

a. Pços filise pça(n) pote?
   who.NOM kiss.PAST.3SG who.FEM.ACC when
   ‘Who kissed whom when?’

b. *Pços filise pote pça(n)?
   who.NOM kiss.PAST.3SG when who.FEM.ACC

(66) Pçon iôe pu (*pote) o Yanis (?pote)?
   who.ACC see.PAST.3SG where when the.NOM Yanis.NOM when
   ‘Who did John see where (and) when?’

The availability (in different positions) of an additional Attract-1 Focus head in both ROf and SMG is the first main tenet of our proposal, the other two being (a) wh-fronting as Focus-movement in both languages, but also (b) the availability of wh-movement to Spec-C in matrix questions in ROf but not in SMG. We will discuss and motivate these additional assumptions in turn.

Like in ROf (and unlike in English), in SMG too, wh-fronting in multiple questions does not necessarily result in pair-list interpretations, but is also compatible with single-pair readings, as the use of a multiple question in a context such as the one in (67) suggests:

(67) Context: I am the manager in a store in a small village where the sales are going down the hill and therefore I monitor them closely. I popped in the loo but I caught someone out of the corner of my eye exiting the shop and holding a bag, but I was unable to recognise him even though I know everyone in the village. So, I approach the shop assistant and ask:

**SMG**

Ti sinevi? Pços ayórase ti?
what.ACC happen.PAST.3SG who.NOM buy.PAST.3SG what.ACC
‘What happened? Who bought what?’
This is in fact compatible with the proposal put forth in Tsimpli (1995) and Alexopoulou & Baltazani (2012: 22–23) that “the wh-item in direct questions moves like a focused item, i.e. it undergoes focus-movement, rather than wh-movement” with “the latter taking place only in indirect questions”. Evidence for this distinction comes from the fact that in matrix/direct questions the wh-item is the only focused element, hence the only element that can be associated with sentential stress, while in indirect questions there can also be another focused item, e.g. the rightmost constituent Eleni ‘Helen’ in (68), and sentential stress is aligned with it.5

(68) SMG (from Alexopoulou & Baltazani 2012: 22–23)
   a. Direct question:
      me PÇON\F1 xorepse i Eleni /*i ELENI] ~\_ CC
      with who.ACC dance.PAST.3SG the.NOM Eleni.NOM the.NOM Eleni.NOM
      ‘Who did Eleni dance with?’
   b. Indirect question:
      Rotisa [me pçon\F1 xorepse\F1 i ELENI\F1] ~\_ CC
      I-asked with who.ACC danced.3SG the Eleni.NOM
      ‘I asked who Eleni danced with.’

If we assume that, like SMG, ROF possesses a new-info Focus projection for Focus-movement of wh-phrases, alongside (and below) the Attract-1(leftmost) Focus head we proposed above, then we straightforwardly derive multiple fronting with Superiority effects, but still potentially in the scope of Q (cf. 64), i.e. compatible with a single-pair interpretation. ROF simply places in its left periphery the two Focus projections that host wh-items in SMG.

In Tsimpli’s (1995) original analysis, in direct questions the wh-item moves to the Specifier of a Focus Phrase (FP) at the left periphery while indirect questions involve ordinary wh-movement to Spec-CP. While we take the first half of the proposal to be necessarily true, as it also matches the interpretational facts illustrated in (67), we take (68b) to suggest that wh-phrases may move to Spec-CP in indirect questions, while this is impossible in direct ones. Nevertheless, single-pair interpretations are also available in indirect questions, as e.g. the question in (67) can easily be embedded, presupposing the same context as above, and banning the presence of another focused phrase within the embedded CP (69).

(69) SMG
   Ton rotisa [pços ayorase ti]
   and ask.PAST.1SG who.NOM bring.PAST.3SG what.ACC
   ‘I asked him who bought what.’

Therefore, indirect questions in SMG only activate the Spec-CP position when sentential focus is aligned with a lower constituent. Notably, in this case, the stressed constituent cannot undergo Focus-movement (70),6 which also explains the unavailability of multiple wh-fronting in indirect questions in SMG.

---

5 CC stands for Büring’s (2008) “Context Connect”, an operator which links the focused element (that bears the same index) to an antecedent which is a member of the set of propositions/alternatives triggered by focus. In sentences with multiple (/second occurrence) focus, it indicates which focused element gives rise to alternatives that define the appropriate context for such an utterance (only utterances which entail a member of the set of alternatives are appropriate context).

6 According to Roussou (2000), focalization is also possible to the left of a ([+wh]) C; this is marginally more acceptable than (69), but interestingly enough it apparently constitutes one of those few cases that
We now turn to the properties of C\(^{+wh}\) in ROf, which lead us to assume that \(wh\)-movement to Spec-C is possible, though not obligatory, even beyond indirect \(wh\)-questions. We first discuss how ROF is like SMG as far as indirect questions are concerned. Recall that in ROF, but not in TPG, interrogatives may feature an optional \(ml\) morpheme. We tentatively take this to be a fusional morpheme realising a \([+wh]\) C head packaged with Hagstrom’s Q morpheme. We observe that \(ml\) is optional in indirect questions and then compatible with single pair readings, as it surfaces to the left of both \(wh\)-phrases and therefore scopes over them both. While it is optional in embedded interrogatives, it is obligatory in direct/matrix questions of total ignorance. It is clearly a phonological clitic, as it always requires a phonological host to its left. In embedded interrogatives this can be the matrix verb as in (71a), while in matrix questions it attaches to anything moved into the left periphery (e.g., 71b), with the exception of \(wh\)-phrases. If our hypothesis about \(ml\) realizing C + Q is on the right track, then the fact that it is never crossed by a \(wh\)-phrase is correctly ruled out as a Relativised Minimality violation, as in (64a).

(71)  
\(ROf\)

a. Esi ekseris mi pios tinan ayapai.  
You know.2SG INTER.PRT who.SG.NOM who.SG.ACC loves  
‘You know who loves whom.’

b. Tšain mi ayapas?  
tea.ACC INTER.PRT love.2SG  
‘Do you like tea?’

Given that \(ml\) is obligatory in order to form yes/no questions, it is clear that C is present and active in direct questions in ROF, and we think that it is in principle available in direct \(wh\)-questions too. \(Wh\)-phrases, then, unlike in SMG, may move to Spec-C, but do not have to, as the availability of single pair readings indicates. Independent evidence for the availability of \(wh\)-movement to Spec-C seems to come from the fact that ROF allows for \(wh\)-(sub)extraction out of DPs and stranding of the restriction of a \(wh\)-phrase (72) (which is impossible in SMG, see Mathieu & Sitaridou 2004); the extracted PP must be in Spec-CP, if Bošković (2007: 6) is right in speculating that “the restriction of a \(wh\)-phrase cannot be stranded under non-\(wh\)-fronting, i.e. focus movement, so that [such examples] then must involve real \(wh\)-movement”.\(^7\)

(72)  
\(ROf\)

a. [Aso pion xorion] θelis [leftokaræ t₁]?  
from.the.ACC which.ACC village.ACC want.2SG hazelnut.ACC.PL  
‘From which village do you want hazelnuts?’

\(^7\) Note that, if this is correct, then the implication is that \(wh\)-movement to Spec-CP must be available alongside multiple Focus-fronting also in the Slavic languages that allow MWF with single pair readings (and without Superiority) and left-branch extractions at the same time. Presumably, this can be formalised in terms of the strength of the \([+wh]\) feature in C. As an anonymous reviewer points out, “the possibility of sluicing can [also] be taken as a confirmation of this, see Stjepanović (1999) in this respect”, while Stjepanović (2010) discusses “interesting interactions between left-branch extraction and the availability of different readings in questions”.
b. [Asopion memlecetin]i θelis/eçis [araban t]?
from.the.ACC which.ACC country.ACC want.2SG/have.2SG car.ACC
‘From which country do you want/have a car?’

Then, we have a straightforward way to account for Superiority effects beyond the first two fronted wh-phrases in ROf (27a). When this happens the highest two wh-phrases are attracted by two Attract-1 heads, namely a [+wh] C and the highest Focus head. The former head guarantees that the highest wh-phrase will surface in the leftmost position, while the latter guarantees that the highest of the remaining wh-phrases will surface in the second position. To recapitulate, the three core analytical claims that account for ROf and SMG as a pair in a potential typology of MWF/non-MWF pairs are the following (summarised in Table 6):

(a) they both have a Focus head attracting new information foci and wh-phrases; in ROf it is part of the CP-periphery, while in SMG it is in the low/vP-periphery;
(b) in SMG, wh-fronting is focus-fronting; this Focus projection exists in ROf too, as an Attract-1 head, alongside the aforementioned (new information) Focus head;
(c) wh-fronting can be wh-movement to Spec-CP in embedded questions but not in matrix/direct questions in SMG; in ROf, wh-movement is possible but not obligatory in both types of interrogative clauses.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ROF</th>
<th>SMG</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New information</td>
<td>CP-periphery</td>
<td>Low periphery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attract-1 Focus</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wh-fronting as focus</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>wh-movement to Spec-CP</td>
<td>Possible</td>
<td>Possible in indirect questions only</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6: The fourth MWF type and its non-MWF counterpart.

Schematically, then, a partial representation of the left periphery of ROf is as in (73) (see also Grohmann 2003 for two focus positions in the CP-periphery), which essentially matches the representation of the left periphery as independently proposed in Sitaridou & Kaltsa (2014: 23) for TPG:

(73) \[ CP\ C_{[+Q=\text{m}]/[+\text{wh}]=\text{Attract-1}} [\text{FocusP} \ Foc^0_{\text{Attract-1}} ] [\text{FocusP} \ Foc^0_{\text{new info}}] \cdots \]

As for the asymmetry between non-D-linked and D-linked wh-phrases with regards to Superiority (see 25–26, as well as (29d) above), it would be reasonable to argue that D-linked wh-phrases are in fact wh-topics (in the spirit of Grohmann 2006), which simply target

---

8 Sitaridou & Kaltsa (2014: 23) propose the following hierarchy of projections for the left periphery of TPG: TopicP ... ContrastP ... (TopicP) ... InfoFocP ... TP. There is suggestive evidence that in ROf too new information foci and contrastive elements, e.g. contrastive topics, can co-occur in the left periphery, with the latter preceding the former (and with contrastive foci competing for the same position as contrastive topics). So, e.g. in (i) the subjects are contrastive topics and objects are new information foci, and they are both preverbal (i.e. pre-TP), with the former preceding the latter. In (ii), where objects are old information and contrastive, while subjects are new information foci, objects precede subjects:

(i) (Neocleous in prep.: 14)
Q: {What did Alis and Mehmetis buy?}
\[
[\text{a\'lis}_\text{C-Top} [\text{enan bon t\'o\'o\'i} \_\text{Foc} e\'\text{piren},
\text{Alis.NOM a.ACC trousers.ACC buy.PAST.3SG}
[\text{o m\'eh\'metis}_\text{C-Top} [\text{enan g\'a\'za\'cin}_\text{Foc} e\'\text{piren},
\text{the.NOM Mehmetis.NOM a.ACC vest.ACC buy.PAST.3SG}
\text{‘Alis bought trousers, Mehmetis bought a vest.’}
\]

(ii) (Neocleous in prep.: 14)
Q: {Who bought the trousers and the vest?}
\[
[\text{to pon t\'o\'o\'i} \_\text{C-Top} [\text{a\'lis}_\text{Foc} e\'\text{piren},
\text{the.ACC trousers.ACC Alis.NOM buy.PAST.3SG}
[\text{a\'ma  to g\'a\'za\'cin}_\text{C-Top} [\text{o m\'eh\'metis}_\text{Foc} e\'\text{piren},
\text{but the.ACC vest.ACC the.NOM Mehmetis.NOM buy.PAST.3SG}
\]
different peripheral positions, namely Topic positions, which are known to be possible above Focus projections, in both peripheries. Such a Topic position would be an Attract-all head, allowing for movement of any D-linked wh-phrases in any order, i.e. without any Superiority effects (74). Compelling evidence from this comes from the fact that D-linked wh-phrases in ROf license resumptive clitics even in short-distance matrix questions (cf. (23a), (24b) and (47a)).

(74) \[ \text{CP} C_{+Q/ [+wh]} = \text{Attract-1} \text{[Topic]} \text{Attract-all} \text{[Focus] Foc}_{-1} \text{[new info]} \]

Note that even in SMG, when a wh-phrase is clearly D-linked, although ungrammatical in most cases (75a), clitic resumption is possible or even favoured “in particular contexts, e.g. quiz questions, rhetorical questions, etc.” (Skopeteas 2014: 8), cf. (75b-c).

(75) **SMG** (from Skopeteas 2014: 8)

a. pÇON (*ton) sinadise o Yanis?
   who.ACC him.CL meet.PAST.3SG the Yanis.NOM
   ‘Who did Janis meet?’

b. ?des afta ta vivlia. Pes=mu,
   look.IMPER.2SG this.ACC.PL the.ACC book.ACC.PL tell.IMPER.2SG = me
   pço apo afta to aporiptis edelos?
   which.ACC of them it.ACC.CL reject.2SG completely
   ‘Look at these books. Tell me, which one would you refuse to read?’

c. (retrieved from the web, 11.4.2012 in Skopeteas 2014: 9)
   PÇON IPURYO ådipaði akoma ce o kaðreptis?
   who.ACC minister.ACC him.CL dislike.3SG even and the.NOM mirror.NOM
   ‘Which minister is such that even the mirror dislikes him?’

So, as already noted, ROf is a MWF language in which both non-D-linked and D-linked (and, in fact, even echoic) wh-phrases are obligatorily fronted. Even though this is not to be found in MWF languages of the Slavic type, Basque also exhibits a strikingly similar behaviour with respect to D-linked and echoic wh-phrases (Reglero 2003; 2004). In fact, in Basque wh-topics occupy the leftmost position, and among them “the highest wh-phrase is attracted first” (Reglero 2004: 29), while any wh-foci would have to appear below with no Superiority effects. Reglero also proposes a head with a [Topic] feature attracting wh-topics, though she assigns an Attract-1 property to it, to capture the ordering facts. This same head carries an Attract-all discourse feature, which then attracts both wh-topics and wh-foci in any order. This pattern clearly parallels the ROF pattern we attempted to derive above and, at the same time, is its reverse: in ROF what we could call wh-foci, in Reglero’s terms, are strictly ordered/move in an order-preserving fashion, while wh-topics are freely ordered. This was captured as the result of an Attract-1 Focus\textsubscript{new info} head attracting the highest wh-focus and an Attract-all Topic head. It seems reasonable to assume that this Attract-1 Focus\textsubscript{new info} head is only available in VO languages, such as ROF and SMG, while focus-movement of new information foci is probably not (need not be) an option in consistently and overtly OV languages, i.e. in languages where preverbal complements are unmarked, such as Basque. Then this straightforwardly predicts that Basque may afford to have an Attract-1 Topic feature, but not an Attract-1 discourse feature for any other wh-phrase.

Finally, separating an Attract-all Topic projection from an Attract-1 [ + wh] C has the interesting consequence of making even the TPG facts fall into place, with only one additional assumption, putting aside cases of in situ, which are clearly either due to SMG interference or continuation of the ancestral state, i.e. Hellenistic or Medieval Greek. In
ROf, all D-linked wh-phrases/wh-topics must precede non-D-linked ones, in any order, as a result of an Attract-all Topic head above the two Focus projections. In TPG, however, even though Superiority effects are also suspended with more than one D-linked phrase, in the presence of a non-D-linked wh-phrase alongside (at least) one D-linked phrase, apparent Superiority effects arise, as we saw in the end of section 3.2 above. In fact, given the reshuffling of the morphological paradigm in TPG, it is only non-D-linked wh-items of the p-series that must precede D-linked wh-phrases. These facts cannot of course be captured in terms of just a head responsible for Superiority, namely an Attract-1 Focus, below Topic. Arguably, whatever precedes D-linked wh-phrases is in Spec-CP. Therefore, TPG has preserved wh-movement to Spec-CP in direct questions, as in ROf, the difference being that it obligatorily attracts wh-items of the p-series. Recall that in ROF p-items are used for wh+NP phrases, otherwise /p/ is a marker of [-human]. In TPG, outside [wh+NP] phrases, the t/p distinction corresponds to case distinctions only and does not distinguish [+human] from [-human]. The t series is morphologically and etymologically closer to indefinite pronouns, which may also be used as wh-items under focalisation. Thus, by losing its association with [-human], /p-/ may have been reanalysed as a purely interrogative/+wh marker, which can only be checked under overt movement to a [+wh] C, when not D-linked. Under this additional assumption, TPG has an underlying representation of its left periphery (see also Sitaridou & Kaltsa 2014), which is identical to the one of ROF (73).

In sum, everything that differentiates TPG from ROF is ultimately derivable from a reanalysis affecting the features of a subset of the wh-paradigm, rather than the features of any functional heads. Also, another point of variation concerns the lexicalisation of C[+Q]. The fact that all variation is about individual lexical items and not even intentionally definable sets/classes of lexical items justifies our characterisation of the variation observed as ‘nano-variation’ (compatible with the definition of ‘nano-parametric’ variation in Roberts 2012).

5 Conclusion
In this article we have discussed the formation of wh-questions in different little-discussed varieties of Greek, for which we have shown that there is significant micro- and nano-variation. In particular, we discussed Pontic Greek varieties, especially Romeyka, which exhibit MWF, in sharp contrast to SMG. On the basis of strong empirical evidence from Romeyka, it was claimed that Bošković’s (2002) typology has to be expanded to a fourth pair, namely SMG/Romeyka (and TPG to varying degrees), and we proposed a constrained theory to account for the observed patterns. To account for the differences between the two members of the pair, we put forth the potentially far-reaching proposal that the availability of peripheral positions and their activation in the left or low periphery may be a point of parametric variation. Then, we proposed that, still complying with Bošković’s (2007) theory of Attract-1/all, certain Focus heads can be Attract-1, thus deriving the compatibility of Superiority with single pair readings. Finally, we have presented some speculations about a potential correlation between word order/head directionality in the clausal domain and the kind of information structure-related head (e.g. Topic vs. Focus) that can take on an Attract-1 feature.

List of Abbreviations

1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, ACC = accusative case, cl = clitic, DAT = dative case, FEM = feminine, FUT = future tense, GEN = genitive case, HORT = hortative, HUM = human, IMP = imperative, INF = infinitive, INTER = inter-
rogative, MWF = multiple wh-fronting, NEG = negation marker, NOM = nominative case, PAST = past tense, PL = plural number, PNP = perfective aspect, nonpast tense, PRT = particle, ROF = Romeyka of Of, SG = singular number, SMG = Standard Modern Greek, SUBJ = subjunctive, TPG = Thessaloniki Pontic Greek
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