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Problem and Proposal: In Minimalist Program (Chomsky 2001), movement is driven by Agree and the EPP feature on a head, e.g., C for a wh-word and T for a subject. Under such a framework, not much has been said about non-moving items that may still Agree with a relevant head; e.g., wh-in-situ’s. Furthermore, it misses the fact that a language without overt wh-movement typically marks the status of question at head C and/or with a particular intonation pattern (cf. Cheng 1991, Rizzi 1997). For example, Japanese wh-questions make use of the question (Q) particle *ka* at C and the rising intonation pattern as seen in (1). This fact makes a sharp contrast with wh-questions in English such as (2). In other words, a particular function, such as question, is expressed sometimes by overt morphological encoding on the head and sometimes by inducing the movement of an operator of the required kind to Spec. In this paper, taking this fact as a significant generalization and attempting to provide a uniform account for moved wh-words and wh-in-situ’s, I will propose the system (3), where the EPP is responsible for giving rise to an item at Spec as well as for marking Head overtly (cf. Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou 1998).

Consequences: The system (3) well accords with the alleged fact that there may not be a language that involves neither Spec-marking nor Head-marking for questions, which does not seem to be predicted in the system like Watanabe’s (1992), where ‘abstract’ wh-operator movement is allowed with no mention on the morpho-phonological status of Head C. Furthermore, (3) accounts for the absence of *ka* or the rising intonation in truncated wh-questions in Japanese seen in (4B). In contrast, the non-truncated version of (4B), (5), no wh-movement takes place and *ka* is required. This peculiar distribution of *ka* naturally follows from (3), with the assumption that a truncated wh-question is made up of only CP part. Thus, with the mandatory movement of a wh-item to CP-Spec in truncated wh-questions, the head C may not be marked at all.

Further Predications and Developments: Given (3), we obtain a quite interesting picture concerning the T-system of Japanese. Based on the facts in (6) and (7), noted in Hasegawa (1994), I will argue that the Mo‘also’-phrase takes up Spec of T, due to the EPP; a Mo-phrase always takes scope higher than negation, as seen in (6); a Mo-phrase does not ‘reconstruct’ and takes scope from where it actually takes place, as shown in (7). That is, a Mo-phras is like a wh-word in English and it is raised to Spec position in order to satisfy the EPP requirement (3b-i). This raises a question of where a Nominative Ga-phrase would takes place. Recently, Miyagawa (2001) argues a Ga-phrase as well as a scrambled Accusative O-phrase may satisfy the EPP of T, occupying TP-Spec, based on the data in which only the sentence initial phrase, either Ga or O, can take scope above negation and the non-initial one below negation. However, if the system (3) is on the right track, neither Ga-phrase nor scrambled O-phrase can be at TP-Spec. That is, (3) does not allow the same item, say a Ga-phrase, to be at either Spec or non-Spec position, provided that the Head T is not marked. Empirically, though relevant data are not presented here due to space limitation, I will show that Ga- and O-phrases, even if they are at sentence initial position, behave consistently differently from Mo-phrases, which are legitimate TP-Spec items; with respect to the scope interactions with negation and other quantifier items (cf. (6)); crossing (or intervention) effects with wh-questions and NPIs; the relevance of the subject condition, etc. Furthermore, the fact that Japanese children acquire Mo much earlier than Ga and O indicates (or at least is compatible with the scenario) that, given (3), the position of Mo facilitates how a child figures out the structure of Japanese. I will argue that a Ga-phrase is either under vP (a la Miyagawa) or at CP-Spec, but not at TP-Spec. We will speculate the matrix C system in terms of (3), as well as how (3) fares with the T system of English.
(1) Mary-ga nani-o kai-masi-ta ka.*\checkmark*/ 
M. -Nom what-Acc buy-polite-past Q
‘What did Mary buy?’

(2) a. What did Mary buy? ↘ ↗
   \*Mary bought what? ↘ ↗
   c. I wonder [what (*if) Mary bought].

(3) a. The EPP feature is given to a functional category, CP in particular (perhaps, TP only optionally).
   b. The EPP feature, which is uninterpretable, is to be deleted by one of the two ways; (i) or (ii).
   (i) Spec-marking: The Spec is occupied by a lexical item (i.e., movement into Spec).
   (ii) Head-marking: The head is encoded by a particular morpho-phonological marking.
   c. *Semantic Interpretation:* Once the EPP feature is deleted, the head becomes semantically activated
      and may Agree with an item in its interpretive domain; its Spec, its c-command domain, and itself.

   M. -Nom something-Acc buy-polite-past I.say hah what-Acc Q
   ‘Someone came,’ ‘Hah? What?’

(5) Mary-wa nani-o kai-masi-ta *(ka)?
   ‘What did Mary buy?’

(6) a. Hanako-ga susi-mo tabe-nakat-ta. also>not, *not>also
   H. -Nom sushi-Mo eat-Neg-past
   ‘Hanako also didn’t eat sushi (and there is something else she didn’t eat.)’
   b. Susi-mo zen’in-ga tabe-nakat-ta. also>not=all *not>also=all *not=all>also
   sushi-Mo all-Nom eat-Neg-past also>all>not (group reading on all)
   ‘All didn’t eat also sushi. (there is something else that everybody didn’t eat.)’

   H. -Nom T. -Nom the book-Mo read-past that say-past
   ‘Hanako said that Taro also read the book. (i.e., there is something else he read.’
   the book-Mo H. -Nom T. -Nom read-past that say-past
   ‘*the reading on (7a)’
   ‘Also about that book, Hanako said that Taro read it. (i.e., there is something else about which
   Hanako said that Taro read.’
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