Japanese allows utterances like (1) that consist of two or more phrases (XPs) but do not contain any predicate, as newspaper headlines, song titles, titles of books etc. I refer to utterances like (1) as Multi-Phrasal Predicateless Utterances (MPPLUs) and I call XPs that appear in MPPLUs Fragment XPs (FXPs). This paper studies the syntax of MPPLUs, focusing on ones that are used as song titles. The song titles that are discussed here are gleaned from J-Lyric.net (http://j-lyric.net) and Uta-Net (http://www.uta-net.com).

1. Suurou-kaibu-o moo ilk-kyuu (The title of a collection of short stories by Junji Yamagiwa) slow-curve-ACC again one-CLASSIFIER 'I throw a slow curve again.'

2a. Dareka-ge dareka-o (Words by Masarni Okui) (NP-geSUBJ-NP-O-DIRECTOBJ) someone-NOM someone-ACC 'Someone (thinks of) someone.'

2b. Dokoke-de anata-o (Words by Kumi Shoji) (NP-deLOCATION-NP-O-DIRECTOBJ) somewhere-in you-ACC 'There is a person who is always watching you somewhere.'

2c. Itsuka kitto sometime surely 'I (strongly) hope to sing a song for our future with you') some time.'

MPPLUs are not formed by randomly combining XPs. This point is shown by the behavior of direct objects with(out) the accusative marker -o and that of genitive left-branch modifiers (LBMs) of NPs. Let us first consider direct objects, focusing on MPPLUs that contain a direct object and a dative NP (i.e. a goal/location argument). For the space-reason, I take up only direct objects headed by eeru 'yell' or uta 'song' ((3)). I confine myself to examples in which the direct object and the dative NP are not separated by a punctuation mark like ‘,’ ‘.’ that corresponds to a prosodic break, in order to exclude the possibility of the bare direct object being a bare topic. With a dative NP being the first or a non-final FXP, the direct object can appear as the second or final FXP, whether the latter is marked with -o or not ((3a, b)). In (3a-i), I focus on the subtitle enclosed in wavy lines ‘~’. With a dative NP being the second or final FXP, the direct object can appear as the first or a non-final FXP if it is marked with -o but cannot if it is not marked with -o (3c, d). Examples like (3d) have not been attested and sound unacceptable. If MPPLUs were formed by randomly combining XPs, (3d) could be as acceptable as (3a-c), contrary to fact.

3a. i. Furee fureay fureay hooray hooray hooray! ~ [Kagayak-er-u [kimi-no mirai]-ni eeu-o~ hooray hooray hooray shine-SPOONTUNE-PRS you-GEN future-DAT yell-ACC (Words by Shigeru Mikii) (Lit.) . . . I send yell to your glorious future.' ii. Kimi-ni [kono uta]-o you-DAT this song-ACC 'I want to send) this song to you.'

3b. i. Eruu-ni eeru you-DAT this song-ACC 'I (send) yell to (your) smiling face.' ii. Kuchibiri-ni uta lip-DAT song 'Lit. (Let’s light) songs on our lips.'

3c. i. Eru-o kimi-ni [kono uta]-o you-DAT this song-ACC you-DAT 'I (send) this song to you.' ii. [Kono uta]-o anata-ni (Words by Miki Yoshikawa) you-DAT you-DAT 'I give) this song to you.'

3d. i. *Eruu eeo-ni (cf. (3b-i)) ii. *Uta kuchibiri-ni (cf. (3b-ii)) Let us now turn to genitive LBMs. A genitive LBMs without the N it modifies can appear as an FXP (44). In all the MPPLUs of this kind that have been found, the genitive LBMs as the final FXP: a genitive LBMs cannot appear as a non-final FXP. This point shows that MPPLUs are not results of random combination of FXPs too.

4a. Kimi-wa kanashimi-no you-TOP sadness-GEN 'You (are a person) of sadness (and peace of mind),'

4b. Kimi-wa boku-no (… welcome URATA NAOYA from AAA) you-TOP I-GEN (Words by TELA-C and Urata Naoya) 'You (are on) my (side)/You (are) my (all),'.

MPPLUs are based on the clausal structure that includes NegP, TP and CP. First, MPPLUs can contain negative polarity items ((5)), which shows that they can contain NegP. Second, MPPLUs can contain the deictic adverb *ashita* ((6)). On the assumption that *ashita* is licensed by present/non-past T (e.g. Ashita Ken-ga *ka-tuusenindsay*/*ki-tau*), (6) suggests that MPPLUs contain TP. Third, an MPPLU can contain a wh XP to get an interrogative reading (7)). Because wh-XPs in Japanese are licensed by an interrogative C, (7) shows that MPPLUs contain CP.

5. Ima-wa moo dare-mo you-TOP any more who-NP 'Now (I cannot love) anyone any more.'

6. Ashita, kimi-ni ai-o tomorrow you-DAT love-ACC 'I (will confess my) love to you tomorrow.'
An Analysis: I propose that MPPLUs can be derived in either of the two ways that are depicted in (8) and (9). The analysis (8) claims that an MPPLU involves a base-generated null predicate/verb \( \phi_{\text{null}} \) (and one or more null arguments) (Tang 2001). The analysis (9) claims that an MPPLU is derived by deletion that strands the FXP. As for the deletion in (9), I adopt what Mukai (2003) calls String-Deletion, which she proposes for the analysis of Verbless Conjunctions/Gapping in Japanese. Following Mukai (2003), I assume that String-Deletion is subject to the condition (10). Although there are mechanisms of deletion other than String-Deletion that have been proposed for one or another ellipsis construction in Japanese and that can be extended to MPPLUs (e.g. Abe and Nakao’s (2011) analysis of Verbless Conjunctions/Gapping and Akiyama’s (2014) analysis of Multiple Focus-Doubling), I do not try to tease them apart here, because MPPLUs do not offer any empirical basis on which to choose among them.

Let us show how the facts in (3–5) are accounted for by this analysis, beginning with (3d). I assume that the base position of the theme/direct object is lower than that of the goal/location. Accusative \(-o\) can be dropped when the object appears in its base-position, but it cannot be when the object is fronted (\((11)\)). Whether examples in (3d) are derived by (8) or by (9), the object is fronted and \(-o\) cannot be dropped (\((12)\)).

\[
\text{(11a)} \quad \text{Edo-ga dare-ni nani(-o) age-ta-no} \\
\text{Ed-\text{NOM}\text{who-DAT}\ \text{what-\text{ACC}}\ \text{give-PAST-Q} \ \text{‘Whom did Ed give what?’}}
\]

\[
\text{(11b)} \quad \text{Edo-ga nani*(-o) dare-ni age-ta-no} \\
\text{‘Whom does Ed give what?’}
\]

\[
\text{(12)} \quad \text{[clause FXP] FXP} \text{\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)} \text{[NP-\text{DIRECT-OBJECT} (\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)) NP-ni-\text{SUBJECT-OBJECT} (\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)) \text{\(\phi_{\text{null}}\))]} \\
\text{Let us now turn to genitive LBMs. Because (8) cannot by itself make a part of an argument/predicate NP unpronounced, (4) cannot be derived solely by (8). A genitive NP induces elision of the nominal proform \(-no\) that follows it (Hiraiwa 2015), which has been regarded as ellipsis of NPN’ and which can occur independently of the null predicate/deletion specific to MPPLUs. However, the proform \(-no\) (to be elided) is awkward when it should refer to a human entity or a highly abstract concept (like ‘migi’ ‘right’) (Hiraiwa 2015, note 10). Because the nominal to be modified by the genitive LBM in (4a) refers to a human entity, it can be said that (4a) does not involve the elided proform \(-no\). Judging from the lyrics of the relevant song, the nominal to be modified by the LBM in (4b) is \(\text{tonari} \ ‘\text{side’ or ‘subete} \ ‘\text{all}, both of which refer to abstract concepts. To my ear at least, these nouns cannot undergo replacement by \(-no\) (to be elided). Therefore, the Ns modified by the genitive FXP in (4) become unpronounced due to some process specific to MPPLUs. Since (8) cannot make a part of an argument/predicate NP unpronounced, (4) cannot be derived by (8). On the other hand, String-deletion (9) can derive (4): in order for a genitive LBM to be the final FXP, a continuous string consisting of an additional LBM (if there is any), the N modified by the genitive FXP and the predicate must be deleted ((13a)), which satisfies (10). In order for a genitive LBM to be a non-final FXP, discontinuous strings of terminal symbols must be deleted ((13b)), violating (10).

\[
\text{(13a)} \quad \text{[clause FXP [NP-\text{DIRECT-OBJECT} (\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)) \text{\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)) \text{\(\phi_{\text{null}}\))]} FXP]}
\]

\[
\text{(13b)} \quad \text{[FXP [NP-\text{DIRECT-OBJECT} (\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)) \text{\(\phi_{\text{null}}\)) \text{\(\phi_{\text{null}}\))] FXP]}
\]

Two Types of MPPLUs and the Necessity of Antecedents: I propose that the empty predicate in (8) is an instance of deep anaphora (Hankamer and Sag 1976) and thus does not require a linguistic antecedent. I propose that the deletion in (9), on the other hand, is an instance of surface anaphora, and thus requires a linguistic antecedent. It is natural to think that, for an MPPLU as a song title, its antecedent appears in the lyrics (if there is any). Then it is expected that an MPPLU derived by (8) need not have an antecedent in the lyrics but one derived by (9) must. Most MPPLUs consist of two or more arguments ((2a)), two or more adjuncts of the VP- or clause-level ((2c)), or combination thereof ((2b)). MPPLUs of this kind can be derived by (8) (or by (9)) and thus are predicted not to require antecedents. For example, I have found 7 MPPLUs as song titles that contain \(\text{earu} \ ‘\text{the direct object and another FXP that is an argument or a VP\-clause-level adjunct, but only 3 of them have clausal antecedents in the lyrics. Similarly, I have found 17 MPPLUs as song titles that contain \(\text{uta} \ ‘\text{as the direct object and another FXP that is an argument or a VP\-clause-level adjunct, and 6 of them lack clausal antecedents in the lyrics. These facts constitute the evidence that the empty predicate in (8) is an instance of deep anaphora. Finally, as argued above, an MPPLU with a genitive LBM (as an FXP) that modifies an unpronounced N that cannot be replaced by the proform \(-no\) can only be derived by clausal ellipsis (9). I have found 4 such MPPLUs as song titles. All of them have clausal antecedents in the lyrics, which are not reproduced here for the space-reason. The relevant MPPLUs are very few, but this fact can be expected if they involve an instance of surface anaphora.