MULTIPLE WH-FRONTING ACROSS PONTIC GREEK VARIETIES[*]

DIMITRIS MICHELIOUDAKIS[a]
IOANNA SITARIDOU[b]
University of York[a] and University of Cambridge[a,b], Queens' College[b]

In this article we discuss some previously unknown dimensions of variation in the syntax of multiple questions in Pontic Greek varieties, focusing on novel data from Romeyka of Of and Pontic Greek as spoken in Northern Greece. In doing so, we revisit and revise the typology of multiple questions and multiple *wh*-fronting (MWF) in light of the Romeyka data. It is claimed that Bošković's (2002) typology has to be expanded to include (at least) a fourth pair, namely SMG/Romeyka (and TPG to varying degrees), since SMG is not exactly of the English type, nor does Romeyka correlate to the Bulgarian type. Our micro/nano-comparative data also revealed several other factors potentially subject to parametric variation (e.g. sensitivity of Superiority to D-linking, single-pair readings etc.) which might also yield new conceivable types of *wh*- and multiple *wh*-fronting.

1 Introduction

The aim of this article is twofold: (a) To discuss some previously unknown dimensions of variation in the syntax of multiple questions in Pontic Greek varieties, focusing on novel data from Romeyka (as spoken in Pontus, Turkey) and from another Pontic Greek variety (as spoken in northern Greece); (b) to revisit and revise the typology of multiple questions and multiple *wh*-fronting (MWF) in light of the Romeyka data.

According to Bošković's (2002) typology of *wh*-movement, there are apparently four language types (see also Simpson, 2000):

(a) No *wh*-phrase moves before Spell Out, i.e. all *wh*-phrases appear in their original/thematic positions (Chinese);
(b) One and only one *wh*-phrase moves before Spell Out, i.e. in multiple *wh*-questions only one *wh*-phrase appears in the left periphery (English);
(c) Movement of one *wh*-phrase is optional, i.e. at most one *wh*-phrase, if any, can appear in the left periphery in multiple *wh*-questions (French);
(d) Movement of all *wh*-phrases by Spell Out is obligatory, i.e. all *wh*-phrases obligatorily appear in the left periphery (Russian)

Standard Modern Greek (henceforth SMG), at least *prima facie*, behaves like English – a language of the second type according to the above-mentioned typology – since both English and SMG behave alike with regard to: (i) *wh*-in-situ in multiple questions, as shown in (1) and (2); and (ii) in terms of Superiority, as shown in (1) and (2):

(1)a. $[_{CP}$ Who$_i$ $[_{TP}$ t$_i$ brought what]]?

  b. *$[_{CP}$ Who$_i$ what$_k$ $[_{TP}$t$_i$brought t$_k$]]?

  c. *$[_{CP}$ What$_k$will $[_{TP}$who$_i$ bring t$_k$]]?

(2)a. Pços   efere   ti?
    who.NOM brought.3sg what.ACC
    'Who brought what?'   [SMG]

  b. *Pços   ti   efere?
    who.NOM what.ACC brought.3sg

  c. pços   filise   pçon?
    who.NOM kissed.3sg who.ACC
    'Who kissed whom?'

  d. ?*pçon   filise   pços?
      who.ACC kissed.3sg who.NOM

However, in the absence of almost any work on *wh*-formation across Greek dialects (but see Contossopoulos (1981) and Tsiplakou et al (2006) 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 fourth type, namely MWF languages, where all *wh*-phrases move (but see Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012:220 for a brief discussion). Consider (3) from the Romeyka variety of Of (henceforth ROf), as spoken in the region of Of in Turkey, and (4) from Pontic Greek (henceforth TPG), as spoken in Thessaloniki and Northern Greece but also elsewhere – note that both varieties belong to the Asian Minor Greek Group (see Sitaridou 2013):

(3)Tinan   doxna   eŋdžes?
   who.ACC.HUM what.ACC brought.2sg
   'What did you bring for whom?'   [ROf]

(4)Tinan   do   eferes?
   who.ACC.HUM what.ACC brought.2sg
   'What did you bring for whom?'   [TPG]

Crucially, Pontic Greek seems to exhibit Superiority effects (5), which show that multiple *wh-*movement is order-preserving, as e.g. in Bulgarian (6) (see Bošković, 1997), putting aside D-linked *wh*-phrases for the time being:

(5)a. Pios   tinan   aγapai?
      who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3sg
      'Who loves whom?'   [ROf]

   b. *Tinan   pios   aγapai?
      who.ACC.HUM who.NOM love.3sg

   c. Pios   tinan   aγapa?
      who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3sg
      'Who loves whom?'   [TPG]

   d. *Tinan   pios   aγapa?
      who.ACC.HUM who.NOM love.3sg
      (Michelioudakis and Sitaridou 2012:221)

(6)a. Koj   kogo   obia?
      who.NOM who.ACC love.3sg
      'Who loves whom?'   [Bulgarian]

   b. *Kogo   koj   obia?
      who.ACC who.NOM love.3sg

In this article, on the basis of the Romeyka data, we claim that, in line with Bošković's (2002) proposal, there is no reason for treating all MWF languages as one uniform type since MWF languages such as Bulgarian, Serbo-Croatian and Russian have distinct *wh*-fronting patterns. Romeyka/TPG MWF provides, in fact, further evidence for a distinct type of MWF language. Furthermore, Bošković's (2002) idea that each type of MWF language has its non-MWF counterpart is further reinforced by correlating/coupling the understudied Romeyka/Pontic MWF with a non-MWF, namely Standard Modern Greek.

The article is organised as follows. In section 2.1 we present our methodology whilst in section 2.2 micro-variation found across the Greek varieties is considered. In section 3.1 we analyse the *wh*-patterns attested in Romeyka and in section 3.2 we discuss nano-variation across the Pontic Greek varieties. In section 4 we put forward our analysis of MWF in Romeyka. We conclude our findings in section 5.

2 Micro-variation in Greek *wh*-fronting

The goal of this section is twofold: (a) to provide some necessary information on the methodology of data collection; (b) to discuss 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 TPG, two informants have been consulted, two females, one (67 years) and one female (55 years old) from Thessaloniki (although the 55 year old was born in Komotini) who have been exposed to Pontic Greek from birth; (b) as 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). In all cases, the data were elicited using a structured questionnaire on *wh*-formation and multiple *wh*-fronting comprising ca. 30 tokens (for more information regarding the field techniques employed, see Sitaridou, 2013).

2.2 Micro-variation in Greek *wh*-fronting

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 micro-variation between SMG and Pontic Greek includes different *wh*-words especially in ROf – consider Table 1:

wh-words	ROf	TPG	SMG
'when?'	*Pote?* When	*Pote?* When	*Pote?* When

'where/which place?'	*Pu merea/tšeka?*
	 where side/there
	 e.g.:
	 (i) Pote pu merea epies?
	    when where side went.2sg
	    'When and where did you you go?'
	 (ii) Pote motinan pu merea epies?
	    when with.who.ACC.HUM where side went.2sg
	    'When, where and with whom did you go?'
		Poθen merean/pion merean?
		 where side/which side
		 e.g.:
		 (v) Poθen merean epies pote?
		    where side went.2sg when
		    'When and where did you go?'
		 (vi) Pote me tinan se pion merean epies?
		    when with who.ACC.HUM to which side went.2sg
		    'When, where and with whom did you go?'
			Pu?
			 Where

'from where?'	*Apoxen?*
	 from.where
	 e.g.:
	 (iii) Apoxen erθes?
	    from.where came.2sg
		Poθen?
		 from.where
		 e.g.:
		 (vii) poθen erθes?
		    from.where came.2sg
			Apo pu?
			 from where

	'Where did you come from?' (iv) (pote) apoxen (pote) erθes? when from.where when came.2sg 'Where did you come from?'	'Where did you come from?' (viii) Poθen pote erθes? from.where when came.2sg 'When and from where did you come?'	
'How many?'	*Kaškiši/Kaškišus?* how.many.NOM.pl/ how.many.ACC.pl	*Pos' nomat/pos' nomats?* how.many person.NOM/how.many person.ACC.pl	*Posi/Posus?* how.many.NOM.pl/ how.many.ACC.pl
'with whom?'	*Motinan?* with.who.ACC.HUM	*Me tinan?* with who.ACC.HUM	*Me pçion?* with who.ACC

Table 1. *wh*-words in Pontic Greek and SMG

Second, in SMG, fronting of more than one *wh*-phrase is possible with the use of spurious coordinators (see Anagnostopoulou, 2003; Merchant, 2008 for Turkish), as shown in (7), whereas these are absent in Pontic Greek, as shown in (8):

(7) background: 'One student came and got a book out of your library'
   boris   na   mu pis [pços   ke ti] /[pjo (vivlio) kai pços   *(to)]
   can.2sg SUBJ.PRT me tell.2sg who.NOM and what/which (book) and who.NOM it
   pire?
   took.3sg
   'Can you tell me who took which book?'   [SMG]
   (adapted from Anagnostopoulou 2003:142)

(8) a. *Pios   tše tinan   efilise?
      who.NOM and who.ACC.HUM kissed.3sg
      'Who kissed whom?'   [ROf]

   b. *Pios   ce tinan   efilise?
      who.NOM and who.ACC.HUM kissed.3sg
      'Who kissed whom?'   [TPG]

Third, Pontic Greek lacks number/gender distinctions on the interrogative pronoun, i.e., there is no plural/gender form of 'who' (9), in sharp contrast to SMG (10). Instead, we observe that Pontic Greek either (i) uses the same form (underspecified) as in the singular; or (ii) uses alternative devices: (a) ROf uses a Turkish loanword to optionally mark plurality (9). However, it should be noted that the use of the morpheme *kaš(i)kisi* when used alone/not accompanying '*pios*' also expresses 'how many' and becomes obligatory in the accusative, as shown in (11) where, however, we also note the Greek inflection; and (b) TPG uses a periphrastic expression (9):

(9) a. Pios   erθen?
      who.NOM came.3sg
      'Who came?'   [ROf/TPG]

b. Pios   erθen?
   who.NOM came.3sg
   'Who (=many) came?'   [ROf]

c. Pios kaš(i)kisi erθen
   who NOM.PL came.3sg
   'Who (=many) came?'   [ROf]

d. Posi   nomat erθane?
   how.many.NOM.PL person came.3pl
   'Who (=many) came?'   [TPG]

(10) a. Pços   irθe?
      who.NOM.sg came.3sg
      'Who came?'   [SMG]

b. Pxi   irθan?
   who.NOM.pl came.3pl
   'Who (=many) came?'   [SMG]

(11) a. Esi   kaškišus   aγapas?
      you.NOM how.many love.2sg
      'How many/who (=many) do you love?'   [ROf]

b. Eγo   ekikišus aγapo.
   I.NOM two   love.1sg
   'I love two people.'

For a summary of the gender/number distinctions in Pontic Greek and SMG, consider Table 2:

Number	Case	ROf/TPG		SMG
Singular		**+Human**	**-Human**	
	Nom	Pios	pios/pion	pços
	Acc	Tinan	do/doxna[1] (ROf only)	pçon
			pion	
Plural	**Nom**	pios /pios kašikisi (ROf only)/ pios nomat (TPG only)	Pios	pçi
	Acc	Tinan	do/doxna (ROf only)	pça
			Pion	

Table 2. Number/gender distinctions on interrogatives in Pontic Greek and SMG

---

[1] The form *doxnan/doγna(n)* is also possible. The diachronic trajectory of *doxna* indicates amalgamation with an interrogative C-head '*na*'. Given the strictly synchronic goal of this article we leave this and other diachronic issues aside.

Third, Pontic Greek *do* is genuinely non-D-linked (12) as shown by its contrast to D-linked *pion fai* 'what (food)' (12). ROf *doxna* however, is aggressively non-D-linked (in the sense of Pesetsky's (1982) 'aggressively non-D-linked *wh*-phrases') as shown in (13), whereas Pontic Greek *do* is less so. For us 'aggressively non-D-linked' means that the answer cannot be a concrete action, but rather a more generic state of affairs, thus why *doxna* could never be selected with a verb such as "make" – compare (12) with (12). In other words, ROf has lexicalized the D-linking properties to the maximum. Crucially, in SMG this distinction does not hold, as shown in (14), since the same *wh*-word is used regardless of the D-linking properties:

(12) a. Esi   d'   epitšes?
        you.NOM what.ACC made.2sg
        'What did you make?'   [ROf]

      a'. ?*Doxna   epitšes?
           what.ACC made.2sg

      b. Pion   fai   epitše?
         which food.ACC made.3sg
         'Which food did she make?'

      c. Esi   do   fai   epitšes?
         you.NOM what food.ACC made.2sg
         'What food did you make?'

      d. Do   eɲɟen?
         what brought.3sg
         'What did he bring?'   [TPG]

      e. Pion   fai   epices?
         which food.ACC made.3sg
         'What food did she make?'

(13) a. –Esi   doxna   aɣapas?
         you.NOM what.ACC love.2sg
         'What do you love?'   [ROf]

      b. –Eɣo   aɣapo   to porpatima, to tšimiθin=emuneθe, to maireman…
          I.NOM love.1sg the walking   the sleep.INFIN.its   the cooking
          'I love walking, sleeping, cooking…'

      c. *Esi   doxna fai   epitšes?
         you.NOM what   food.ACC made.2sg
         'What food did you make?'

(14) a. Ti   forema   evales   telika?
       what dress.ACC wore.2sg finally
       'Which dress did you put on in the end?'   [SMG]

    b. –Ti   ekanes   telika?
       what made.2sg finally
       'What did you do in the end?'

    c. –Perpatisa, majirepsa ce kimiθika.
       walked.1sg cooked.1sg and slept.1sg
       'I walked, cooked and slept.'

3 *Wh*-patterns and nano-variation in Pontic Greek

In this section, we focus on: (a) a detailed description of all attested patterns in the syntax of multiple *wh*-phrases in ROf; and (b) the differences in the syntax of MWF between ROf and TPG.

3.1 *Wh*-patterns in Romeyka

The major empirical generalisations regarding the distribution of *wh*-items are: first, all *wh*-phrases move obligatorily to the left periphery where two (15) or more *wh*-phrases (16) can be fronted with no option to leave any *wh*-phrase *in situ*:

(15) a. Pios   tinan   eŋdže?
       who.NOM who.ACC.HUM brought.3sg
       'Who brought whom?   [ROf]

    b. *Pios   eŋdže   tinan?
       who.NOM brought.3sg who.ACC.HUM

    c. Tinan   doxna   eŋdžes?
       who.ACC.HUM what.ACC brought.2sg
       'What did you bring to whom?'

    d. *doxna   eŋdžes   tinan?
       what.ACC brought.2sg who.ACC.HUM

    e. Pios   motinan   erθe?
      who.NOM with.who.ACC.HUM came.3sg
      'Who came with whom?'

    f. *pios   erθe   motinan?
      who.NOM came.3sg with.who.ACC.HUM

(16) a. –Pios   tinan   doxna   eŋdže?
        who.NOM who.ACC.HUM what.ACC brought.2sg
        'Who brought what to whom?'   [ROf]

   b. –O Jusifis   tin Ilaidan   ɣalemin eŋdže.
       the Jusuf.NOM the Ilaidan.ACC pencil   brought.3SG
       'Jusuf brought Ilaidan a pencil.'

In the data considered so far, it is not clear if the ungrammatical options in (15) exemplify the unavailability of postverbal positions for (*wh-*) non-subjects, due to 'some degree' of OV^2 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 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 and German which are considered to be OV? We therefore need some diagnostic for discriminating between VO MWF languages and OV MWF languages. We assume that in an OV non-MWF language (17) should be possible, but not (18):

(17)   WH$_1$ XP WH$_2$ … V   [OV non-MWF language]

(18)   WH$_1$ WH$_2$ XP … V   [VO MWF language]

The prediction seems to be borne out by Latin which allows for the equivalent of (17) as in (19). German, which is also OV, exhibits no MWF of this sort either, as shown in (19), and Classical Greek, which also lacks MWF, instead exhibits *in situ* coordination or spurious coordination, as in (19):

(19) a. Quis   hoc quando faciet?
       who.NOM PRT when   make.3sg
       'Who made it and when did they do so?'   [Latin]

---

[2] Michelioudakis and Sitaridou (2012: 216-217) in a preliminary discussion of head directionality in Romeyka note that, apart from the DP which is head-final (ic) (as in TPG), there is clear indication that the VP is predominantly head-final as well (ia–b) without, however, excluding VO orders (for discussion of linear OV and its interaction with information structure see Sitaridou and Kaltsa, submitted):

  (i) a. škilon   exo.
      dog.ACC have.1sg
      'I have a dog.'   [ROf]
    b. O   Mehmetis   tin   Aiše   psomin   eðotšen.
      the.NOM Mehmet.NOM the.ACC Aiše.ACC bread.ACC gave.3sg
      'Mehmet gave bread to Aiše.'
    c. Tu   zu   to   ɣlitšin   pola aɣapo.
      the.GEN animal.GEN the.NOM milk.NOM lot   like.1sg
      'I like a lot the milk of the cow.   (Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012:216-217)

b. Wer   liebt   wen?
   who.NOM love.3sg who.ACC
   'Who loves whom?'   [German]

c. πόθεν καὶ τίνι τρόπῳ   Χρεμύλος   πεπλούτηκ'   ἐξαπίνης
   whence and what way.DAT Chremulus.NOM has.become.wealthy.3sg suddenly
   'Whence and in what way has Chremulus suddenly become wealthy?'
                                                             [Classical Greek]

   (*Aristophanes Plutus* 335)

On the other hand, in a VO language of the MWF type (18) is fine but not (17). The fact that, in ROf, (20) 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.

(20) a. *Tinan   esi   doxna   eŋdžes?
        who.ACC.HUM you.NOM what.ACC brought.2sg

     b. (Esi)   tinan   doxna   (esi)   eŋdžes ?
        you.NOM who.ACC.HUM what.ACC you.NOM brought.2sg
        'What did you bring to whom?'   [ROf]

Second, in ROf, even D-linked *wh*-phrases have to be fronted (21) in the same way as non-D linked *wh*-phrases do, as in (21), as the ungrammaticality of an *in situ* D-linked *wh*-phrase indicates in (21):

(21) a. Pion fai$_i$ pios   epitšenæ$_i$?
        which food.ACC who.NOM made.3sg.it
        'Who made what food?'   [ROf]

     b. *pios   epitšen   pion fai?
        who.NOM made.3sg which food.ACC

     c. Pion fai   pion patši   epitše?
        which food.ACC which woman.NOM made.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, just like (other) base-generated XPs, e.g. CLLD topics, and unlike non-referential/non-D-linked *wh*-phrases – consider (22):

(22) a. background: Aðatšeka pola faia   in,   pola patšiðæ   in
                    here   many foods.NOM are.3pl many women.NOM are.3pl
        'There are many dishes here, many women are here'   [ROf]

b. Q:Pion   fai$_i$(=D-linked) pios(=D-linked in the context) epitšen(-æ$_i$)?
    which food.ACC   who.NOM   made.3sg.it
  'Who made what food?'

c. A:To havitšin   epika   eɣo,   to kartoflin epitšen   i Aiše,
    the pudding.ACC made.1sg I.NOM the potato   made.3SG the Aise-NOM
  to seker-pare epitšen   i   Miriam
  the cake.ACC   made.3SG the Miriam.NOM
  'I made the pudding, Aise made the potato dish, Miriam made the cake.'

Fourth, *echo* questions too require *wh*-movement (23); therefore, there appears to be no *wh-in-situ* in ROf at all.

(23) Context A: 'Mehmet loves Aiše'
  a. Pios   tinan   aɣapai? (ok on both default and echo interpretation)
    who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3sg
    'Who loves whom?'   [ROf]

  b. *Pios   aɣapai   tinan? (*on both default and echo interpretation)
     who.NOM love.3sg who.ACC.HUM
    'Who loves whom?'

  Context B: 'Aise brought milk to Mehmet.'
  c. Tinan   doxna   eŋdžen?   Kala utš ekusa. (ok on echo interpretation)
    who.ACC.HUM what.ACC brought.3sg? well not heard.1sg
    'Who brought what? I didn't hear well enough.'

Fifth, with regard to Superiority effects in ROf, these are sensitive to D-linking. More specifically, when all fronted *wh*-phrases are non-D-linked, *wh*-fronting is strictly order preserving, as shown in (24):

(24) a. Pios   tinan   pote efilise?
      who.NOM who.ACC.HUM when kissed.3sg
      'Who kissed whom and when?'   [ROf]

  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 (24) 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 (25):

(25) Context: 'Mehmet brought many cows to Aiše'

    a. Q:Tinan   doxna   eŋdžes?   Kala utš ekusa.
       who.ACC.HUM what.ACC brought.2sg well not heard.1sg
       'What did you bring to whom? I didn't hear well enough.'   [Rof]
    b. Q:*Doxna   tinan   eŋdžes?   Kala utš ekusa.
       who.ACC what.ACC.HUM brought.2sg well not heard.1sg

Furthermore, (26) and (27) illustrate the possibility of having Superiority effects in embedded environments in Romeyka, 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), but not in either overt-C, embedded or long-distance contexts, and not vice-versa, i.e., obligatory fronting/Superiority in null-C/short matrix questions also entails such effects in the latter contexts.

(26) Embedded questions

    a. As   terume pios   tinan   iðe.
       HORT.PRT see.1pl who.NOM who.ACC.HUM saw.3sg
       'Let us see who saw whom.'   [ROf]

    b. Eɣo   tši ksero   pios   tinan   eŋdže.
       I.NOM not know.1sg who.NOM who.ACC.HUM brought.3sg
       'I don't know who brought whom.'

    c. Eɣo   tši ksero   pion kitapin   pios   eŋdže.
       I.NOM not know.1sg which book.ACC who.NOM brought.3sg
       'I don't know who brought which book.'

    d. Eɣo   tši ksero   pion kitapin   pion patši   eŋdže.
       I.NOM not know.1sg what book.ACC which girl.NOM brought.3sg
       'I don't know which girl brought which book.'

(27) Long distance (multiple) *wh*-questions

    Tinan   pote ipes   iðes?
    who.ACC.HUM when said.2sg saw.2sg
    'Whom did you say you saw when?'   [ROf]

Moreover, 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 (28):

(28) a. Pion peðan   doxna   eŋdžes?

    which boy.ACC what.ACC brought.3sg
    'Which boy brought what?'   [ROf]

    b. *Doxna   pion peðan   eŋdžes
      what.ACC which boy.ACC brought.3sg

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 (but see Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012 for other Romeyka varieties and Sitaridou 2013 for a phylogenetic tree of the Pontic Greek language group), we note, first, that there are strong grammaticalised +/-human restrictions in ROf (29) and (31), whereas these are absent from TPG (30) and (32):

(29) a. Tinan   aγapas?
    who.ACC.HUM love.2sg
    'Whom do you love?'   [ROf]

    b. –Aγapo   ton tširi=m
      love.1sg the father.ACC=my
      'I love my father'

(30) a. –Tinan   aγapas?
    who.ACC love.2sg
    'Whom do you love?'   [TPG]

    b. –Ton   kiri=m   aγapo.
      the.ACC father=my love.1sg
      'I love my father'

(31) a. –Pion aγapas?
    what.ACC love.2sg
    'What do you love?'   [ROf]

    b. –Aγapo   ta   za.
      love.1sg the cows.ACC
      'I love the cows'

(32) a.–Tinan aγapas?
    what.ACC.HUM love.2sg
    'What do you love?'   [TPG]

   b. –Ta vuðæ   aγapo.
      the cows.ACC love.1sg
      'I love cows.'

For a summary of the animacy distinctions in the Pontic Greek varieties, consider Table 3. This is consistent with +/- human restrictions found in the Romeyka Case system.[3]

Pontic Greek Variety	Case	+Human	-Human	-Animate	D-linked
ROf	Nom	Pios who.NOM.MASC.HUM	Pion what.NOM.NEUT	Do what.NOM.NEUT	Doxna what.NOM.NEUT
	Acc	Tinan who.ACC.MASC.HUM	Pion what.ACC.NEUT		
	Gen	Tinos	--		
TPG	Nom	Pios	pios	Do	Do
	Acc	Tinan	Tinan	Do	Do
	Gen	Tinos	--		

Table 3. ±human/±animate distinctions in *wh*-elements across Pontic Greek varieties

   Second, we observe the presence of Turkish interrogative particle *mI* in ROf (though without vowel harmony) in questions of total ignorance (33), although *mI* seems to be optional in (33). Crucially, this interrogative particle is completely absent from TPG (34):

---

[3] Alongside the agreement system ― according to which (targets) articles, adjectives, some numerals, participles, pronouns agree with the morphologically-assigned gender value of their controllers (masculine, feminine, neuter) ―, Pontic also exhibits a semantic agreement system (see Karatsareas 2011, forth.). The distribution of the two agreement systems is conditioned by the morphological and semantic properties of agreement controllers, *viz.* their morphologically-assigned gender value and the position their referents occupy on the Animacy Hierarchy as well as by the position agreement targets occupy on the Agreement Hierarchy. As shown below, human nouns, whose referents are found at the high end of the Animacy Hierarchy, trigger syntactic agreement on all kinds of agreement targets (ia). On the contrary, the overwhelming majority of targets controlled by low-end, inanimate nouns – which can be morphologically assigned to either the masculine or the feminine gender – appear in their neuter form to agree with the semantic properties of their controllers (ib). The singular forms of the definite article that agree with their controllers syntactically when immediately preceding them are the only exception (although close apposition cannot be excluded as an explanation) to this pattern that is otherwise found in all agreement domains, stretching from attributives within the NP to pronominal anaphora beyond it.
        (i) a. i   mikresa i   nifä   eton ki alo   poniresa
              the.F small.F the.F daughter-in-law.F was and more crafty.F
              'the younger daughter-in-law was even craftier' (Drettas 1997: 684)
           b. t'(o) asimenion o   mastrapas pali   kremete
              the.N silver.N   the.M tankard.M again hang.PASS.3sg
              'the silver tankard is hanging again' (Lianidis 2007 [1962]: 228)

(33) a. Esi   ekseris   mi   pios   tinan   aγapai?
      you.NOM know.2sg INTER.PRT who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3sg
      'Do you know who loves whom?'   [ROf]

    b. Esi   ekseris   pios   tinan   eŋdže?
      you.NOM know.2sg who.NOM who.ACC.HUM brought.3sg
      'Do you know who brought whom?'

(34) Esi   ekseris   pios   tinan   aγapa?
     you.NOM know.2sg who.NOM who.ACC.HUM love.3sg
     'Do you know who loves whom?'   [TPG]

Third and most interestingly, TPG shows optional MWF in the context of *who>whom* (35) and *who>with whom* (35) and, therefore, contrasts with ROf where MWF is obligatory. The optionality, albeit striking *prima facie*, is most likely a case of competing grammars, namely TPG and SMG. This observation seems to receive confirmation from other works (Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012; Sitaridou and Kaltsa, submitted) 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 Pontic Greek or with attrited TPG-speakers because of interference of SMG.

(35) a. Pios   tinan   efilise?
      who.NOM who.ACC kissed.3sg
      'Who kissed whom?'   [TPG]

    b. Pios   efilise   tinan?
      who.NOM kissed.3sg who.ACC
      'Who kissed whom?'

    c. Pios   me tinan   erθen?
      who.NOM with who.ACC came.3sg
      'Who came with whom?'

    d. Pios   erθen   me tinan?
      who.NOM came.3sg with who.ACC
      'Who came with whom?'

However, in (36) any optionality is cancelled and instead *wh-in situ* is the only option for the prepositional indirect object *wh*-phrase. This sharply contrasts with the ROf where MWF trivially obtains in the same context.

(36) a. Do   eŋɟes   se katinan?
      what.ACC brought.3sg to someone.ACC
      'What did you bring to whom?'   [TPG]

    b. *Do   se katinan   eŋɟes?
       what.ACC to someone.ACC brought.3sg

    c. *Se katinan   eŋɟes   do?
        to   someone.ACC brought.3sg what.ACC

Crucially, in ROf the equivalent of TPG (36) triggers MWF as seen in (15). Moreover, *tinan* 'whom' is not used – rather unsurprisingly given that ROf does not use prepositional indirect objects as TPG does (see Michelioudakis and Sitaridou, 2012). Further evidence that the difference in the syntax of double-object constructions influences MWF is demonstrated in (37) where we observe that *tinan* 'whom' is not preferred as the accusative case-marked indirect object and, instead, is replaced by *aton* 'him' (37), a strategy also compatible with doubling (37). Similarly, *do* is replaced by *kat* in *wh*-double object constructions in TPG (37).

    (37) a. *Do   eŋɟen   tinan?
              what.ACC brought.3sg who.ACC

        b. *Pios   kat'   eŋɟen   se tinan?
           who.NOM something brought.3sg to who.ACC

        c. Do   eŋɟes   aton?
           what.ACC brought.2sg him
           'What did you bring him'   [TPG]

        d. Pios   kat'   eŋɟen   aton (=D-linked)?
           who.NOM something brought.3sg him
           'Who brought it to whom (=D-linked) and what was it?'

        e. Aton   pios   eferen   aton (=D-linked)?
           who.ACC who.NOM brought.3sg him
           'Who brought whom (=D-linked)?'

Crucially, *tinan* 'whom' becomes possible again when there is another D-linked *wh*-phrase as in (38), whereas, in its D-linked form, it goes back to the prepositional form (*se pion peðan* 'to which boy' rather than *pion peðan* 'which boy') – compare (38) and the barely grammatical (38c); interestingly the bare D-linked form is fine in the IO-DO order in (38).

    (38) a. Pion   fain   tinan   eðeces?
            which.ACC food.ACC who.ACC gave.2sg
            'What food did you give to whom?'   [TPG]

        b. Pion   fain   se pion   peðan   eðeces?
           which.ACC food.ACC to which.ACC boy.ACC gave.2sg
           'What food did you give to which boy?'

c. ?Pion   fain   pion   patšin   eðeces?
   which.ACC food.ACC which.ACC woman.ACC gave.2sg
   'What food did you give to which woman?'

d. Pion   patši   pion   fain   eðeces?
   which.ACC girl.ACC which.ACC food.ACC gave.2sg
   'What food did you give to which girl?'

e. *Pios   kat'   engen   se tinan?
   who.NOM something brought.3sg to who.ACC

f. Pios   kat'   engen   aton (=D-linked)?
   who.NOM something brought.3sg him
   'Who brought what for whom (=D-linked)?'

Regarding D-linked *wh*-phrases, we observe: first, *pios* always moves in TPG and is the highest *wh*-phrase (39):

(39) a. ?Pion   fain   epiken   pios?
        which.ACC food.ACC made.3sg who.NOM
        'Who made what food?'   [TPG]

b. *To   fain   pios   epiken?
    the.ACC food.ACC who.NOM made.3sg

c. Pios   epiken   to   fain?
   who.NOM made.3sg the.ACC food.ACC
   'Who made the food?'

Second, in the presence of a D-linked *wh*-phrase, only *pios* 'who' moves whereas the D-linked *wh*-phrase stays *in situ* – resulting from interference of the SMG pattern:

(40) a. Aðaceka pola   faia   in,   pola   γariðes   in.

        here   many.NOM foods.NOM are.3pl many.NOM women.NOM are.3pl
        'Here there are many foods, there are many women'   [TPG]

b. ?Pion   fain   pios   epicen?
   which.ACC food.ACC who.NOM made.3sg

c. Pios   epicen   pion   fain?
   who.NOM made.3sg which.ACC food.ACC
   'Who made what food?'

d. To xavits   epik=ato eɣo,   to   kartoflin epicen=ato i   Paresa,
   the pudding.ACC made.1sg I.NOM the potato   made.3SG the Paresa.NOM
   to   pirox   epicen=ato i   Kleona.
   the dumpling.ACC made.3SG the Kleona.NOM
   'I made the pudding, Paresa made the potato dish, Kleona made the dumpling.'

Third, when there are two D-linked *wh*-phrases: (i) a subject *wh*-D-linked phrase always preceeds any other D-linked phrase (41); and (ii) they both have to be obligatorily fronted and albeit subtle the contrast in (41), they exhibit superiority effects:

(41) a. Pios   ɣari   pion   fain   epicen?
       who.NOM woman.NOM which.ACC food.ACC made.3sg
       'Which woman made what food?'   [TPG]

   b. ?Pion   fain   pion   patšin   eðeces?
       which.ACC food.ACC which.ACC woman.ACC gave.2sg
       'What food did you give to which woman?'

   c. Pion   patši   pion   fain   eðeces?
      which.ACC woman.ACC which.ACC food.ACC gave.2sg
      'What food did you give to which woman?'

Fourth, a direct object D-linked *wh*-phrase always preceeds a bare non-D-linked *wh*-phrase (42) or prepositional indirect object D-linked *wh*-phrase (42), but follows any bare indirect object D-linked *wh*-phrase (42):

(42) a. Pion   fain   tinan   eðeces?
       which.ACC food.ACC who.ACC gave.2sg
       'What food did you give to whom?'   [TPG]

   b. Pion   fain   se pion   peðan   eðeces?
      which.ACC food.ACC to who.ACC boy.ACC gave.2sg
      'What food did you give to which boy?'

   c. ?Pion   fain   pion   patši   eðeces?
       which.ACC food.ACC which.ACC woman.ACC gave.3sg
       'What food was given by which woman?'

   d. Pion   patši   pion   fain   eðeces?
      which.ACC woman.ACC which.ACC food.ACC gave.2sg
      'What food did you give to which woman?'

(43) a. Do   enɟes   aton (=D-linked)?
       what.ACC brought.2sg him
       'What did you bring to whom (=D-linked)?'   [TPG]

  b. Pios   peðas do eɲɟen?
   which.NOM boy.NOM what brought.3sg
   'Which boy brought what?'

  c. *Do   pios peðas eɲɟen?
   what.ACC who.ACC boy.ACC brought.3sg

To sum up, 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 focus on the Romeyka data.

4 Recasting existing MWF typology: Evidence from Romeyka

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. Towards this end, consider Table 4 which presents the properties for each type of known MWF languages as well as what we have already demonstrated for Romeyka in section 3:

Properties	Russian	Serbo-Croatian	Bulgarian	Romeyka
Superiority with Short-distance matrix, null C	No	No	Yes	Yes
Superiority with Long-distance/ Embedded/ Overt C	No	Yes	Yes	yes
Superiority with second-third etc. *wh*-phrases	No	No	No	Yes
Obligatory fronting of D-linked *wh*-phrases	No	No	No	Yes
Single-pair readings	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Superiority with single-pair readings	No	No	N/A	Yes

Table 4. Romeyka against the existing MWF typology

According to Table 4, it becomes clear that, although Bulgarian would be the closest MWF language to which ROf aligns (44)-(45), still ROf does not pattern perfectly with Bulgarian because first, in ROf, a D-linked *wh*-phrase can move over a *pios*-subject (47), whereas the same is not possible over a *koj*-subject in Bulgarian (see. Krapova, 2002 and Jaeger, 2004), as shown in (46):

(44) *Kakvo koj   kupuva
      what   who.NOM buy.3sg
      'Who buys what?'   [Bulgarian]

(45) *Tinan   pios   efilise?
       who.ACC.HUM who.NOM kissed.3sg
       'Who kissed whom?'   [ROf]

(46) a. *?Koja studentka koj šte izpita?
          which student   who will examine

     b. Koj koja studentka šte   izpita?
        who which student   will examine
        'Who will examine which student?'   [Bulgarian]
       (Krapova and Cinque 2008)

(47) a. pion fai$_i$ pios   epitšen   (-æ$_i$)?
         which food who.NOM made.3sg.it
         'Who made what food?'   [ROf]

     b. *pios   pion   fai   piosepitšen?
         who.NOM which food.ACC made.3sg

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 ((48) and (49) vs. (50)).

(48) Context: Eγo   ekusa   is kat'   aγorasen
                I.NOM heard.1sg one something bought.3sg
      ama utš eporesa   evrini   {pios doxna}
      but not could.1sg find-out.INFIN {who what}   [ROf, -Superiority, +single-pair]
      /{*doxna pios} aγorasen
      /{*what who} bought.3sg   [ROf, +Superiority, +single-pair]
      'I heard someone bought something but I couldn't find out who bought what'

(49) a. Kto co   kupił?   [Polish, -Superiority, +single-pair]
         who what bought
         'Who bought what?'

     b. Co   kto   kupił?
        what who bought
        'What was bought and by who?'
        (from Bošković, 2002)

(50) a. Cine ce   a   cumpărat?
     who what has.3sg bought
     'Who bought what?'   [Romanian, +Superiority, -single-pair]

   b. *Ce   cine a   cumpărat?
      what who has.3sg bought.3sg
      'What was bought and by who?'
      (from Bošković, 2002)

At this stage, we are led to postulate another type of MWF language in order to accommodate the ROf results. 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 claim that there is such a language: ROf, in fact, correlates with SMG. In what follows we argue that SMG is not like other non-MWF languages such as English. First, in SMG, Superiority is sensitive to D-linking:

(51) Context A: Simera to vradi   exume   na   pame se ena parti ke prepi
               today the evening have.1pl SUBJ.PRT go.1pl to a   party and must
     na   aɣorasume fajita i   pota ja na   ferume   mazi mas.
     SUBJ.PRT buy.1pl   foods and drinks for SUBJ.PRT bring.1pl with us
     'Tonight we have to go to a party and we need to buy food and drink to take along.'
                                                                        [SMG]

     Q: Mipos kseris   pços   θa   aɣorasi ti?   / ?*ti
        perhaps know.2sg who.NOM PRT.FUT buy.3sg what.ACC/   what.ACC
     θa   aɣorasi pços?
     PRT.FUT buy.3sg who.NOM
     'Do you know who will buy what? / ?*what will who buy?' (non-D-linked)
     Context B: Sto trapezi iparxun tria ðora ja ta jeneθlia mu, pu   mu ta
               on table   exist.3PL three gifts for the birthday mine which me them
     eferan   i   Maria,   o Janis   ce o Jorɣos: ena vivlio, ena
     brought.3sg The Maria.NOM the John.NOM and the George.NOM: one book, one
     CD ce   ena bluzaci.
     CD and one T-shirt
     'There are three presents on the table for my birthday, which were brought to me by Maria, John and George: a book, a CD and a T-shirt.'
     Q: Boris na   mu pis ti   aɣorase pços? (D-linked)
        can.2sg SUBJ.PRT me tell.2sg what.ACC bought.3sg who.NOM
     'Can you tell me who bought what (lit. 'what did who buy?')?'
     (from Anagnostopoulou, 2003:331)

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 (52) to (54):

(52) Pote aɣorase (?*o Janis)   ti   (o Janis)?

    when bought.3sg the Janis.NOM what.ACC the Janis.NOM
    'When did John buy what?'   [SMG]

(53) Pote doulepse (?*i Anna)   pu   (i Anna)?

    when worked.3sg the Anna.NOM where the Anna.NOM
    'When did Anna work where?'   [SMG]

(54) Pços   iðe   (?*tin tenia)   pu   (tin tenia)?

    who.NOM watched.3sg the movie.ACC where the movie.ACC
    'Where did who watch the movie?'   [SMG]

Crucially, in English we observe that the low *wh*-phrase has to follow all vP-internal constituents, as shown in (55):

(55) Who saw (*where) the movie (where)?

Third, like ROf, SMG exhibits Superiority effects even beyond the second highest *wh*-phrase (56):

(56) a. Pços aɣorase   ti   pu?
        who bought.3sg what where
        'Who bought what where?'   [SMG]

    b. ?*Pços aɣorase   pu   ti?
         who bought.3sg where what
        'Who bought where what?'

Importantly, on this occasion, ROf aligns with SMG (57):

(57) Pios   doxna   putšeka aɣorase?
     who.NOM what.ACC where   bought.3sg
     'Who bought where what?'   [ROf]

Therefore, on the basis of the above argumentation, SMG and ROf may constitute a fourth non-MWF/MWF pair. According to Bošković (2002), MWF languages exhibit Superiority effects, where their non-MWF languages require *wh*-movement. If we disregard the precise target of what Boskovic calls '*wh*-movement' (i.e. if this not a unique $C_{[+wh]}$ position), 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; (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:

Non-MWF	**MWF**
Chinese	Russian
French	Serbo-Croatian
English	Bulgarian
SMG	Romeyka

Table 5. Four types of *wh*-languages

On the strength of the ROf data we claim that Bošković's typology of three language counter-pairs, namely Bulgarian-English, Russian-Chinese, and Serbo-Croatian-French has to be extended to include a fourth pair, namely Romeyka-SMG. Their equivalence lies in that: (a) nothing is really left *in situ;* and (b) all *wh*-movement is sensitive to Superiority, except with D-linking. 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 (58):

(58) Filise   (TON JANI)   i   Maria   (*TON JANI)
    kissed.3sg the   Janis.ACC the Maria.NOM   the   Janis.ACC
    'Mary kissed JOHN.'
    [SMG]

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 Sitaridou and Kaltsa, submitted). Consider some of the diagnostics in (59) and (60):

(59) a. –Pios   erθe?
        who.NOM came.3sg
        'Who came?'   [ROf]

    b. –O   Mehmetis   erθe.
        the Mehmet.NOM came.3sg
        'Mehmet came'

    c. –Irθe   o   Mehmet.
        came.3sg the Mehmet.NOM
        'Mehmet came'   [SMG]

(60) a. –Opse   pios   epie?
         yesterday who.NOM left.3sg
         'Who left yesterday?'   [ROf]

     b. –Opse   o aðelfo=m   epie
         yesterday the brother.NOM=my left.3sg
         'Yesterday my brother left'

     c. –Xθes   efije   o aðelfos   mu.
         yesterday left.3sg the brother.NOM mine
         'Yesterday my brother left'   [SMG]

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

As for the asymmetry between non-D-linked and D-linked *wh*-phrases with regards to Superiority, it would be reasonable to argue that D-linked *wh*-phrases are in fact *wh*-topics (in the spirit of Grohmann, 2000, 2003, 2006), which simply target different peripheral positions, namely topic-positions, which are known to be possible both above and below projections, in both peripheries. Compelling evidence from this comes from the fact that D-linked *wh*-phrases in ROf may license resumptive clitics even in short-distance matrix questions (cf.(22)); but even in SMG, for some speakers, when a *wh*-phrase is clearly D-linked, although in general ungrammatical, clitic resumption in such contexts becomes slightly more tolerable:

(61) ?ðes   afta ta vivlia.   Pes=mu,   pço   vivlio to aporiptis
       look.IMPER.2sg these the books.ACC tell.IMPER.2sg=me which book it reject.2sg
       endelos?
       completely
       'Look at these books. Tell me, which one would you refuse to read?'   [SMG]

5 Conclusions

In this article we have discussed the formation of *wh*-questions in different diatopic 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 exhibits 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 include (at least) a fourth pair, namely SMG/Romeyka (and TPG to varying degrees) since neither SMG is exactly of the English type neither Romeyka of the Bulgarian one. Our micro/nano-comparative data also revealed several other factors that, potentially, could be subject to parametric variation (e.g. sensitivity of Superiority to D-linking, single-pair readings etc.) which might also yield new conceivable types of *wh*- and multiple *wh*-fronting.

References

Anagnostopoulou, Elena. 2003. *The Syntax of Ditransitives. Evidence from Clitics*. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Belletti, Adriana. 2004. Aspects of the low IP area. In *The structure of CP and IP. The cartography of syntactic structures*, Vol. 2, ed. Luigi Rizzi, 16-51. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bošković. Željko. 1997. Superiority effects with multiple *wh*-fronting in Serbo-Croatian. *Lingua* 102:1–20.

Bošković. Željko. 2002. On Multiple *Wh*-Fronting. *Linguistic Inquiry* 33 (3):351-383.

Contossopoulos, Nicolas G. 1981. *Διάλεκτοι και Ιδιώματα της Νέας Ελληνικής* [Dialects and Idioms of Modern Greek]. Athens: Grigoris, 3rd ed.

Drettas, Georges. 1997. *Aspects pontiques*. Paris: Association de recherches pluridisciplinaires.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2000. Prolific peripheries: a radical view from the left. PhD Dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2003. German is a multiple *wh*-fronting language. In *Multiple Wh-Fronting*, ed. Cedric Boeckx and Kleanthes Grohmann, 99-130. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Grohmann, Kleanthes K. 2006. Top issues in questions: topics-topicalization-topicalizability. In *Wh-Movement: Moving On*, ed. Lisa Lai-Shen Cheng and Norbert Corver, 249-288. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Jaeger, T. Florian. 2004. Topicality and Superiority in Bulgarian *wh*-questions. In *Preceedings of Formal Approaches to Slavic Linguistics 12: The Ottawa Meeting 2003*, ed. Olga Arnaudova, Wayles Browne, María Luisa Rivero and Danijela Stojanović, 207-228. Michigan: Slavic Publications.

Karatsareas, Petros. 2011. A Study of Cappadocian Greek Nominal Morphology from a Diachronic and Dialectological Perspective. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Cambridge.

Karatsareas, Petros. forth.. The development of gender agreement in Asia Minor Greek: the case of the Pontic branch. *Language Science*.

Krapova, Iliyana. 2002. On the Left Periphery of the Bulgarian Sentence. *University of Venice Working Papers in Linguistics*, Vol. 12:107-128.

Krapova, Iliyana and Guglielmo Cinque. 2008. On the order of *wh*-phrases in Bulgarian multiple *wh*-fronting. In *Formal Description of Slavic Languages: The Fifth Conference, Leipzig 2003*, ed. Gerhild Zybatow, Luka Szucsich, Uwe Junghanns and Roland Meyer, 318-336. Peter Lang: Frankfurt am Main.

Lianidis, Simos. 2007 [1962].Τα Παραμύθια του Ποντιακού Λαού. Athens: Epitropi Pontiakon Meleton.

Merchant, Jason. 2008. Spurious coordination in Vlach multiple *wh*-fronting. Paper presented at the Mid-America Linguistics Conference, 26-28 October 2008, University of Kansas. Kansas, KS.

Michelioudakis, Dimitris and Ioanna Sitaridou. 2012. Syntactic microvariation: Dative constructions in Greek. In *Datives in variation: a micro-comparative perspective*, ed. Ricardo Etxepare and Beatriz Fernández. Oxford: OUP. 212-255.

Pesetsky, David. 1982. Paths and Categories. Doctoral Dissertation, MIT, Cambridge, MA.

Silva-Corvalán, Carmen. 2003. Linguistic consequences of reduced input in bilingual first language acquisition. In *Linguistic Theory and Language Development in Hispanic*

Languages: Papers from the 5th Hispanic Linguistics Symposium and the 4th Conference on the Acquisition of Spanish and Portuguese, ed. Silvina Montrul and Francisco Ordóñez, 375–397. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press.

Simpson, Andrew. 2000. *Wh-Movement and the Theory of Feature-Checking*. John Benjamins.

Sinopoulou, Ourania. 2008. Multiple questions and apparent *wh*-in situ: evidence from Greek. In *Proceedings of ConSOLE XV*, ed. Sylvia Blaho, Camelia Constantinescu and Erik Schoorlemmer, 223-246.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2012. The null objects in Romeyka and the Turkish dialects of Trebizond: A case of reciprocal contact-induced change or internal conditioning?. Paper presented at the Second Workshop on Romeyka and Asia Minor Greek, 1 April 2012, Queens' College, Cambridge.

Sitaridou, Ioanna. 2013. Documentation and Revitalisation of Romeyka. In *Keeping Languages Alive: Language Endangerment: Documentation, Pedagogy and Revitalisation*, ed. Mari Jones and Sarah Ogilvie. Cambridge: CUP.

Sitaridou, Ioanna and Maria Kaltsa. submitted. Information structure in Pontic Greek. *Lingua*.

Tsiplakou, Stavroula, Phoevos Panagiotidis and Kleanthes K. Grohmann. 2006. Properties of Cypriot Greek *Wh*-Question Formation. In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Greek Linguistics*, ed. George Tsoulas. (available at http://icgl7.icte.uowm.gr/Tsiplaku-Panayotidis-Grohman.pdf)