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1. Introduction

The cartographic study on syntactic structures of languages advocated by Rizzi (1997) among others has received much attention, and a considerable number of studies have been made on various languages over the past decade. Endo (2007) may be the first systematic study on the information structure in Japanese under this approach. Despite the fact that Japanese has been discussed since the early days of generative grammar, we must say that a detailed picture of the CP system in this language had not been given before. To give a full-grained CP structure in Japanese is an important aim of this book, but moreover, by analyzing Japanese, he also shows that the (revised) Relativized Minimality (henceforth, RM), which his study is based on, is an effective strategy not only for syntax but also for other systems of grammar (morpho-syntax, morpho-phonemics, and so on).

The most interesting arguments in the book among others are those on the adequacy of the feature-based RM for Japanese and on the syntax of sentence-final particles in Japanese. This review concentrates on them and offers some remarks on theoretical contributions this book will make to Japanese linguistics. The two key points of the following discussion are summarized in (1).

* I wish to express my gratitude to Hiroki Maezawa for proofreading the manuscript and giving a number of helpful comments and suggestions. And my thanks are also due to Jeff Singal, who proofread the manuscript and corrected some expressions.
(1) a. Feature-Based RM: Feature types rather than chain types (A/A′/X₀) are relevant.
b. Freezing Effects: Subject positions (SubjP) play a crucial role.

2. The Feature-based RM and the Intervention Effects in Japanese

Endo (2007) classifies features into four types (Argumental/Quantification/Modifier/Topic), and using this classification he investigates the Intervention Effects in several constructions in Japanese in chapters 3–6. The syntactic patterns discussed in the four chapters are as follows:

(2) a. … Quant(ifier) … wh … (Chapter 3)
b. … Topic … Topic … (Chapter 4)
c. … [CP … wh …]-(case particle) … Q … (Chapter 5)
d. … [adverbial …]-nominative case particle … XP … (Chapter 6)

For lack of space, we discuss each case briefly, using the following simple patterns.

(3) a. X … Z[a] … Y[a] Y-to-X movement over Z is blocked.
b. X … Z[b] … Y[a] Y-to-X movement over Z is allowed.
c. X … Z[a][b] … Y[a] Y-to-X movement over Z is blocked.
d. X … Z[b] … Y[a][b] Y-to-X movement over Z is allowed.

The intervention effect is predicted by the types and the number of the feature(s) that the intervener Z and the moved element Y have. When both Z and Y have exactly the same type of feature(s) as in (3a), the movement of Y is blocked, while when they have different features as in (3b), it is allowed. When the set of features of Z is a proper subset of the set of features of Y as in (3c), the movement of Y is blocked (subclass formation strategy (Endo (2007: 24))), whereas the movement is allowed when Y has a feature that is not shared by Z as in (3d).

What is notable here is the point in (1a). Endo argues that the distinction between spec and head is not relevant to RM, and supports it by facts about Japanese information structure (see (ibid.: Sec. 2.6)). This is a crucial point related to the arguments in chapters 5–6. Let us look, for example, at the discussion in chapter 5 on the intervention effect caused by adjunction of a case-marker to a CP complement exemplifying (2c).
Note that (a) is a matrix yes/no interrogative reading while (b) is a matrix wh-interrogative reading. Endo notes that both readings (a) and (b) are available to the sentence in (4) if the additional accusative case marker \( o \) is not adjoined to the complement CP, while (b) is not available any longer if the \( o \) is adjoined.\(^1\) If his argument is on the right track, it follows that whether \( nani \) in the embedded CP can be extracted into the main clause or not depends on the appearance of the additional case-marker.\(^2\) Endo explains this fact as follows, on the assumption that a CP is generally not case-marked. An additional case-marker adjoined to a CP brings about an additional semantic cost because it is a marked operation by economy considerations. In other words, the extra particle has “the semantic effect of focalizing the embedded clause” (ibid.: 96). While Japanese has the designated particle for topic (i.e. \( wa \)), it has no designated particle for informational focus. Given that the topic particle is a default and more economical, the additional particle may carry an informational focus feature rather than a topic feature (ibid.: 98). Thus it follows that both the \( o \) adjoined to \( nani \) and that adjoined to the embedded clause have quantificational features. (Note that both foci and interrogatives fall in the Quantificational group.) Consequently the additional case-marker brings about the intervention effect, blocking the movement of \( nani \). If this reasoning is correct, the case in (4) should belong to the pattern in (3a) ([a] being a quantificational feature). By contrast, if the extra case-marker is not added, a matrix wh-interrogative reading (i.e. the (4b) reading) is yielded since there is no inter-

---

\(^1\) The discussion in the text is based on the observations made by Kobayashi (2000). An anonymous reviewer pointed out that almost all of his/her informants reported that they find (4) can be construed as a matrix wh-question (especially when \( nani \) has a focus stress). This report is totally inconsistent with Kobayashi’s (2000). I also find that (4) can be understood both as a matrix yes/no question and as a matrix wh-question, though I still think the (4a) reading is more preferable for the sentence with the extra \( o \).

\(^2\) The element moved is actually an Op corresponding to \( nani \). Cf. Watanabe (1992a, b).
vener Z with the same feature.

What is troublesome is that Japanese has cases where extraction of a *wh-*phrase from the CP with an extra case-marker adjoined is allowed contrary to the case just discussed: the pattern in (3d). For instance, this happens if the relevant *wh-*phrase has appeared in the previous discourse and is D-linked.³ Let us examine the example with *dono* ‘which’ in (5). Compare (5) with (4).

(5) … \[CP \ldots \text{*wh*} [+Quant][+Top] \ldots \text{]}-Case particle [+Quant (focus)] … Q …

John-wa [Mary-ga *dono hon*-o katta ka] \(-o\)

John-Top Mary-Nom which book-Acc bought Q Acc

sirabe-teiru-no?

investigate-Prog-Q

‘Which book is John investigating whether Mary bought?’

(ibid.: 103)

Suppose that the *wh-*phrase *dono* has a topic feature and forms a topic chain rather than a quantificational one in this case. Then it follows that the case-marker on CP, as a focus marker, is not an intervener. Note that a *wh-*phrase is an XP while a case particle is an X⁰. As Rizzi’s (1990) RM is based on the A/A’/X⁰-distinction, it cannot predict these facts. The discussion above suggests that it is the feature type rather than the categorial distinction that is important for RM.

One question needs to be raised before closing this section. In the cases in (4) and (5), is *ka* ‘Q,’ which perhaps holds a quantificational feature, an intervener for *nani-o* in (4) and *dono-hon-o* in (5) in the embedded clause? If the argument on the case in (5) is correct, there would be no problem with (5) as *dono-hon-o* is assigned a topic feature while *ka* may be assigned a quantificational feature. In (4), however, both *nani-o* and *ka* still seem to be assigned the same quantificational feature. If so, extraction of *nani-o* would always be blocked, predicting that the (4a) interpretation is never allowed. This, therefore, is inconsistent with Endo’s (2007) and Kobayashi’s (2000) arguments on the interpretation of (4). Endo’s discussion relevant to (4) and (5) does not refer to the property of the *ka* in question. As one of the attractive points in Endo (2007) is a syntactic analysis of particles in Japanese as seen below, its qualification as an intervener would require fully detailed discussion.

3. The Subject Criterion: The Syntactic Position of Subjects and the Function of Sentence-Final Particles in Japanese

The most remarkable claim made by Endo (2007) is the one on the subject phrase (SubjP) and the function of sentence-final particles in Japanese (Ch. 8). SubjP is a projection that has received much attention recently. Although it has so far been assumed that the EPP is to be satisfied by the subject raising to TP-Spec, it has been claimed recently that there is a criterion for the subject (but not for the object) to satisfy, based on the asymmetry in movement between the subject and the object. The feature relevant to the criterion in question is the EPP, which needs to be satisfied in SubjP. (Rizzi (2006) supposes that SubjP is a functional projection above TP.) The notion of criterion presupposes that the condition to be satisfied in some XP triggers movement of an element to the very XP, and consequently implies that once the criterion has been satisfied, the moved element will not move any more. This is called the freezing effect (see Rizzi (2006, 2009), Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007)).

Endo proposes the fourfold classification of the elements which can satisfy the EPP in (6): 4

(6) EPP/Subject Criterion
   a. by an XP    topic-marked XP
      nominal XP
   b. by a head    discourse-related head
      non-discourse-related head

In English and French, the EPP is satisfied by an XP (e.g. DP) while in Greek and Spanish, it is by a head (Endo (2007: 169)). Turning to Japanese, Endo observes that Japanese utilizes the first and the third strategies in (6). 5 One important claim that Endo makes is that the EPP is satisfied not only by an XP but also by a head, X0. This leads to the interesting discussion on sentence-final particles in chapter 8.

Let us look at the difference between the topic and the subject in de-

---

4 The classification in (6) is a revision of the proposal in Alexiadou and Anagnostopoulou (1998).
5 Endo (2007: 168–170) does not discuss the second strategy in (6), i.e., satisfaction of the EPP by a nominal XP (i.e. DP) but just notes that a DP satisfies the EPP as well in the chart in his (29) (p. 170). If SubjP is not associated with D-linking as Rizzi (2006) notes, it is expected easily that an ordinary [+aboutness, −D-linked] subject satisfies the EPP in general. But we will ignore this issue.
tail. First of all, following Rizzi (2006), Endo adopts the notion of ‘aboutness,’ which is based on the assumption that some argument is needed as a clue to start the event description. This is the common property shared by both the topic and the subject. The aboutness relation is widely attested in Japanese. It is familiar that the topic-comment relation in Japanese sometimes holds with no thematic relation. In (7), for example, the topic-marked DP in the sentence-initial position is not in a thematic relation with the predicate. Nevertheless, it serves as the topic of the sentence and the rest serves as the comment about the topic.

(7) Zitu-wa ziko-ga atte, …
   actually accident-Nom there.was …
   ‘Actually, there was an accident, …’ (Endo (2007: 171, fn. 9))

As is the case with the topic, the subject will be a starting point of the event description as well, and therefore it is +aboutness.

On the other hand, there is a difference between the topic and the subject in terms of whether they are D-linked or not. The topic is +D-linked while the subject is −D-linked as the latter does not always represent old information like the former.

On these assumptions Endo (following Rizzi) defines the topic as [+aboutness, +D-linked] while the subject as [+aboutness, −D-linked]. (Rizzi (2006) notes, furthermore, that SubjP is not associated with D-linking but with aboutness.) Interestingly, Endo observes that if a discourse-related head satisfies the EPP, it is predicted that even a [−aboutness, −D-linked] XP may satisfy the EPP if it is suffixed by a [+aboutness] head. This prediction is borne out by (8).

(8) Ling Lunch-nara, zen’in-ga beeguru-o tabe-mas-en(yo)
   Ling-lunch-Prt all-Nom bagel-Acc eat-Polite-Neg(Prt)
   ‘At Ling Lunch, all did not eat bagels’ (all>Neg, Neg>all)

(ibid.: 172)

Nara is considered as a conditional topic particle in Onoue (2004). A nara-phrase serves as the starting point of the event description as well as the topic and the subject discussed above.6 Based on Onoue’s observation, Endo considers it as an aboutness particle. Furthermore, following Miyagawa (2001), he assumes that the EPP can be satisfied by some ele-

---

6 Onoue (2004) observes that this is true of some topic-related particles other than wa, including tara ‘speaking of,’ tte ‘talking about,’ and desuga (concessive topic). See Endo (2007: Sec. 8.3.1).
ment other than the subject and when it is, the subject remains within vP (Endo (2007: 170)). Endo claims that in (8) it is the nara-phrase that satisfies the EPP. Hence the interpretation of Neg>all is allowed.

Along the same lines, Endo demonstrates that sentence-final particles in Japanese are also involved in the satisfaction of the EPP. The particles to be considered are wa (speech act), sa (epistemic modal), yo (evaluative modal), ne and its variants (evidential modal), zo and its variant (speech act), and ka/no (question), which are divided into two groups: those that can satisfy EPP (sa, ne, yo, ka/no) and those that cannot (wa, zo). The division is based on whether each particle may be suffixed to the nominalizer no or not. No (with the nominal feature [N]) is a realization of Fin and satisfies the EPP of SubjP right under FinP under the head-head relation (ibid.: 189f., Rizzi and Shlonsky (2007)). However, as the [N] feature of Fin is uninterpretable (henceforth, [−N]), it must be licensed by something else like a sentence-final particle. As illustrated in (9), yo, ne, and sa can suffix to no whereas wa, ze, and zo cannot, which suggests that the former group has a nominal feature.

(9) a. John-ga ki-ta no yo/ne/sa
   John-Nom come-Past nominal C Prt
b. *John-ga ki-ta no wa/ze/zo
   John-Nom come-Past nominal C Prt
   ‘John came’ (ibid.: 65)

Yo, ne, and sa move into the functional head right above Fin from their base position under TP (according to Cinque’s hierarchy) (ibid.: 189), and in turn license Fin’s [−N] feature under the head-head relation. The configurations before/after the particle movement are illustrated below. See the detailed illustrations based on Endo’s (1997: 189f.) rough illustrations (70)–(73).

(10) a. … [Fin no [−N] [SubjP EPP [TP … yo, ne, sa … [vP subj …
b. … yo, ne, sa … no [−N] [SubjP EPP [TP … tyo, ne, sa … [vP subj …
c. … [Fin yo, ne, sa+no [−N] [SubjP EPP [TP … tyo, ne, sa … [vP subj …
d. … [Fin … no [−N]+yo, ne, sa [SubjP EPP [TP … tyo, ne, sa … [vP subj …

First, a sentence-final particle raises into some higher position (see (10a, b)). However, Endo does not identify exactly where the landing site of the particles is, just saying ‘the local domain of the nominal Fin head,’ (ibid.) which might refer to the head right above Fin. Since each particle is supposed to be a head, it is likely as well that it adjoins to Fin-head via the head-to-head movement. (The two possibilities are illustrated in (10c) and (10d), respectively.) Instead of pursuing this line, however, Endo appeals
to the snow-balling derivation advocated by Cinque (2004) to produce the correct linear order of the particles, no and the clause, i.e., to derive the ‘… clause … no … yo, ne, sa’ order from the ‘… yo, ne, sa … no … clause …’ order. Though which side of Fin-head the particle adjoins to must be made clear, we may not need to appeal to the controversial strategy.

Let us return to Endo’s major claim that a sentence-final particle can satisfy the EPP. Endo demonstrates that it can by using the scope relation between Neg and all. I use yo and zo as the representative of the two particle groups. Consider (11a, b). The availability of the interpretation of Neg>all in (11a) indicates that the subject stays in vP.

(11) a. Zen’in-ga pizza-o tabe-nai -yo all-Nom pizza-Acc eat-Neg Prt
   ‘All would not eat pizza’ (Neg>all, all>Neg) (ibid.: 181)

b. Zen’in-ga pizza-o tabe-nai -ze/zo all-Nom pizza-Acc eat-Neg Prt
   ‘All did not eat pizza’ (all>Neg, *Neg>all) (ibid.: 185)

Based on the (im)possibility of the Neg>all interpretation, he concludes that yo in (11a) may satisfy the EPP for the subject while ze/zo in (11b) cannot. Given this observation, it would follow that some sentence-final particles in Japanese help out in satisfying the EPP. However, it seems to me that the Neg>all interpretation is also available for (11b) though the all>Neg interpretation is admittedly more preferable to the Neg>all interpretation. Thus, it might not be safe to draw the above conclusion based on the contrast in (11).

4. The Horizon of the Study of Japanese Syntax: Conclusion

We have discussed Endo’s (2007) two remarkable arguments, pointing out some problems with them. The final section gives a bird-eye view of the horizon of the study of Japanese under the cartographic approach.

Under this approach, to identify the functional category that licenses a certain element is a primary task, which will lead to a full-grained cartography of a language. For this very reason the landing site for sentence-final particles (discussed in the previous section) must be identified. In Rizzi’s (1997) CP structure, FocP (or TopP) stands right above FinP. If the sentence-final particles bear a discourse-related property as Endo claims, TopP, for example, may be a possible candidate for their landing site. Or should another brand-new functional category be proposed between the topic-focus system and FinP?
Moreover, even if it is plausible that some particles play an important role in satisfying the EPP, they do so only in an indirect way as seen in (10b): the raised particle licenses $[-N]$ on the nominal Fin, which in turn satisfies the EPP in SubjP through the head-head relation in each case. This reasoning does not seem to constitute sufficient support for the proposed function of the relevant particles.

Next, if the existence of SubjP is demonstrated in languages, it seems necessary to reconsider the function served by T, because it has been accepted that TP-Spec is the final landing site for the subject. Putting aside the EPP, T (or Agr) still Agrees with the subject, but it may follow that TP-Spec is just an intermediate landing site for the subject on the way to SubjP where the freezing effect is observed under Endo’s (2007) system.

Chomsky (2005) proposes the feature inheritance from C to T. Is his proposal available in Endo’s system? Under Chomsky’s proposal, it is necessary to discuss from which functional category (Force, Fin, or something else in the CP domain) the relevant feature is inherited. (Or, as an alternative, doesn’t such an inheritance take place when the subject raises?) Anyway, it seems that T does not play a traditional role for the subject in the sense that TP-Spec is not the final landing for the subject under Endo’s (2007) approach. We should reconsider the function of SubjP and TP.

As discussed above, Endo (2007) has given a number of insights into the cartography of Japanese. It is particularly significant as a pioneering study on the syntactic function of Japanese particles displaying various possibilities to be investigated in future.
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