A Short Note on *other* and the Tension between Cartography and Antihomophony, with Special Reference to Silent Nouns*

Richard S. Kayne
New York University

August, 2021

1. Antihomophony

Johns (1992, 84) proposed that "Where morphemes are identical or similar in phonological properties, in the unmarked case, they are identical or similar in all lexical properties".[1] Embick (2003, 156) proposed that "Learners seek to avoid accidental homophony; absent evidence to the contrary, identities in form are treated as systematic". Without being aware at the time of either of these proposals, I made a fairly similar proposal barring accidental homophony in Kayne (2019, 137), conjecturing that "If X and Y are functional elements and are homophones, then X and Y cannot have the same spelling". This formulation took spelling of the alphabetic type to be a useful clue, did not make reference to acquisition, restricted the scope of the proposal to the functional part of the lexicon, and did not restrict the proposal to morphemes.

My use of the term 'elements' rather than 'morphemes' arose directly from the fact that in that paper I was discussing English *there* (and by extension its counterparts in other languages) and arguing that despite appearances all of the following involve the same *there*:
  (1) There's no solution to this problem.
  (2) Let's go there today.
  (3) thereby; therefore; therein; thereupon
  (4) Gimme that there book. (non-standard)
If antihomophony, in whatever exact guise, underlies the unity of *there* across these varying contexts, then antihomophony must not be limited to morphemes, insofar as *there* is with virtual certainty not a single morpheme, thinking of the relation between *there* and *where*, and of the parallel relation between *then* and *when*, which at the very least leads to taking *there* to be *th-+-ere*, with *th-* the morpheme that is also found in *this* and *the*.[2]

The present paper looks from an antihomophony perspective at *other*, which in English (and perhaps similarly for counterparts in other languages) is, like *there*,

―――――――――――――――――

[1]Cf. Postma's (1993, (23)) Naturalness Condition, as well as Bouchard (2009, 255).
[2]In fact, *there* may well be trimorphemic. While *there* rhymes with *where*, *here* does not. The medial *-e-* of *here* may be a separate morpheme bearing a first person feature. If so, the medial *-e-* of *there* (and *where*) is likely to be a separate morpheme (without a first person feature).

This differential decomposition of *here* and *there* arguably underpins the fact that English has expletive *there*, but no comparable expletive *here* - cf. Kayne (2008, sect.9) and Noonan (2017, note 24).

arguably not monomorphemic,[3] in particular if the compatibility of *other* (in some contexts) with a *than*-clause, as illustrated in:

   (5) Other than you, we have nobody to turn to.

indicates that the *-er* of *other* is the comparative *-er* of *taller* et al.[4]

2. Cartography

    Cinque (2015) has presented, from a cartographic perspective, evidence in favor of "the existence of two readings of 'other', associated with two distinct positions in the extended projection of the NP". In Italian, for example, both of the following are possible:

   (6) altri due libri di sintassi ('(an)other two books on syntax')[5]
   (7) due altri libri di sintassi

Cinque shows that these two possible relative orders of *altri* and numeral are not equivalent in interpretation. The order in (6) is in general associated with a 'token', rather than 'type', interpretation, and the order in (7) with a 'type', rather than 'token', interpretation. Cinque notes that, although this interpretive difference is not always very clear, it manifests itself clearly in certain cases, in which only one order is available, as in:

   (8) Dammi altri cinque minuti! '('give-me other five minutes!')
   (9) *?Dammi cinque altri minuti!

and, in reverse:

   (10) *Se sopravviveranno, saranno altri due individui. ('if they-survive, they-will-be other two individuals')
   (11) Se sopravviveranno, saranno due altri individui.

The deviance of (9) is due to 'minutes' not being readily compatible with the 'type'-interpretation; the deviance of (10), on the other hand, is due to the overall interpretation being one of 'type' and not one of 'token'.

    Cinque integrates these generalizations into a cartographic framework by taking the 'token'-interpretation of *altri* to correspond to derivations in which *altri* is externally merged within a NumeralP projection that is just below D. The 'type'-interpretation of *altri* goes, on the other hand, with derivations in which *altri* is externally merged lower within DP/NP than NumeralP. Cinque concludes with the general statement that there

----

[3]In a way that doesn't bear on the main points of this paper, the notion 'monomorphemic' needs in general to be aware of silent morphemes. (Nor would the main points of this paper be affected if *other* turned out to be monomorphemic.)

[4]And of *rather*, as noted by Huddleston (2002, 1128); cf. also Wood (2013). Comparative *-er* may itself be bimorphemic, sharing its *-e-* with superlative *-e+st*, with this decomposition suggested by the absence of this *-e-* in *best*, *worst*, *first*, *most*, *least*, *last,* and *next*. (Whether the *oth-* subpart of *other* is best understood as *o+th-* awaits further work.)

[5]Why English requires the indefinite article here:

  i) I just read another two books on syntax.
  ii) *I just read other two books on syntax.

remains to be understood.

are "two distinct (functional) categories 'other', located in two different positions of the extended projection of the noun phrase".

3. Antihomophony and cartography.

The idea that the language faculty allows for two distinct *other*s is not in the spirit of antihomophony, and would be essentially like saying that the four instances of *there* in (1)-(4) indicate that the language faculty allows for four distinct *there*s that happen to accidentally have the same phonology. The antihomophony position that I took on *there* in Kayne (2019, chap. 7) was, instead, that there is but one *there* that appears in all of (1)-(4). English *there* is compatible with (at least) four different syntactic environments. These environments are to one degree or another characterized by the presence of silent elements. For example, the *there* of (2) cooccurs with silent PLACE (capitals will indicate silence), and the *there* of (3) with THING. (The *there* of (1) is part of a remnant phrase containing silent material.)

Transposing to *other*, the position that I would like to take is that the language faculty allows only one *other*. The very real distinction between (what seem like) two sorts of *other* that Cinque has brought out is in part a difference in position, approximately of the sort he argues for. But it is exactly the same *other* in both cases. The key difference is that the higher *other* cooccurs with TOKEN,[6] the lower one with TYPE.

We can now minimally reinterpret Cinque's analysis as follows.[7] *Altri* in (6) and (8) has combined with TOKEN, and the phrase '*altri* TOKEN(S)'[8] is then externally merged within a NumeralP projection that is just below D. *Altri* in (7) and (11) has combined with TYPE, and the phrase '*altri* TYPE(S)' has externally merged lower within DP/NP than NumeralP.

Let me note in passing that postulating silent TYPE/KIND has other motivation, as can be seen from the following:[9]

(12) there is [the most beautiful KIND] house for sale...
(as in *There is the most beautiful house for sale...*)

(13) [the same KIND] eyes
(as in *John has the same eyes as his mother*)

(14) three different wine KIND s
(as in *We'll be having three different wines tonight*)

(15) ...blue one KIND CAR -s
(as in *I prefer red cars, but you prefer blue ones*)

————————————————

[6]On silent TOKEN, cf. Kayne (to appear).
[7]Both his original analysis and my reinterpretation lead one to expect that two instances of *other* could be seen in one (relatively simple) DP, and my English does allow fairly well:
   i) We'd like to have another two or three other kinds of wine
and even, with the interpretation of (i):
   ii) another two or three other wines
[8]On the possible systematic absence of plurality in silent nouns with no antecedent, cf. Kayne (2003).
[9]Cf. Kayne (2019, 149– 51, 233 n65).

The reinterpretation of Cinque's analysis that I am suggesting says in effect that the differing positions of *altri/other* are derivative from/parasitic on the differing positions of TOKEN and TYPE within a larger DP. If so, then no positional cartographic statement specific to *altri/other* is necessary at all, and we can take there to be a single *altri* in Italian and a single *other* in English.

That TOKEN and TYPE differ in such a way is suggested by an asymmetry that holds with respect to their pronounced counterparts *token* and *type*, as seen in:[10]

(16) These are two examples/tokens of a certain type/kind/sort of apple.

(17) *?These are two types/kinds/sorts of a certain example/token of apple

Ideally, the contrast between (16) and (17) will in turn not require a positional statement specific to *token* and *type*. Possibly, it will be assimilable to the contrast between *committee/set* and *member* illustrated by:

(18) a member of a committee/set

(19) *a commitee/set of a member

and to asymmetric part/whole relations more generally.

4. A bit more on silent nouns

Cinque (2015, 25) notes that unlike Italian and English, some languages, in the case of *other*, "realize the two readings through two distinct morphemes". From the perspective being pursued here, such languages might have one such morpheme specialized to cooccur with TOKEN and the other such morpheme with TYPE. That would in part recall the way in which English *few* is specialized to cooccur only with *number*/NUMBER.[11]

There remains the question whether in such languages the two distinct morphemes in question make exactly the same interpretive contribution. If they did, that would look like an instance of suppletive allomorphy.[12] Alternatively, one of the two might be more akin to English *different* and the other of the two more akin to English *other*.

5. Conclusion

The two readings of *other* that Cinque (2015) has individuated need not fall under a specific positional statement of the cartographic type. Rather, the two readings correspond to *other* merging with either TOKEN or TYPE.

* I am indebted to Carolina Fraga and to Edwin Williams for fruitful relevant discussion.

References:

Bouchard, D. (2009) "A solution to the conceptual problem of cartography," in J. van Craenenbroeck (ed.) *Alternatives to Cartography*, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 245-274.

———————————————

[10]On the question of how to choose between TOKEN and EXAMPLE, or between TYPE, KIND, and SORT, cf. Kayne (2014, sect. 14)) on EXPECTED, SUPPOSED, and MEANT.

[11]Cf. Kayne (2005a).

[12]Which would not be compatible with Collins and Kayne (2021).

Cinque, G. (2015) "A note on 'other'," in E. Brandner, A. Czypionka, C. Freitag & A. Trotzke (eds.), *Webschrift for Josef Bayer*, 22–27, https://ling.sprachwiss.uni-konstanz.de/pages/WebschriftBayer/2015/contents.html

Collins, C. and R.S. Kayne (2021) "Towards a Theory of Morphology as Syntax," lingbuzz/005693.

Embick, D. (2003) "Locality, Listedness and Morphological Identity," *Studia Linguistica*, 57, 143-169.

Huddleston, R. (2002) "Comparative Constructions," in R. Huddleston and G.K. Pullum (eds.) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1097-1170.

Johns, A. (1992) "Deriving Ergativity," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 23, 57-87.

Kayne, R.S. (2003) "Silent Years, Silent Hours", in L.-O. Delsing et al. (eds.) *Grammar in Focus. Festschrift for Christer Platzack. Volume 2*, Wallin and Dalholm, Lund, 209-226 (reprinted in Kayne (2005b)).

Kayne, R.S. (2005a) "On the Syntax of Quantity in English", in Kayne (2005b) (also in (2007) J. Bayer, T. Bhattacharya and M. T. Hany Babu (eds.), *Linguistic Theory and South-Asian Languages. Essays in Honour of K.A. Jayaseelan*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam.)

Kayne, R.S. (2005b) *Movement and Silence*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kayne, R.S. (2008) "Expletives, Datives, and the Tension between Morphology and Syntax" in T. Biberauer (ed.) *The Limits of Syntactic Variation*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 175-217 (reprinted in Kayne (2010)).

Kayne, R.S. (2010) *Comparisons and Contrasts*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kayne, R.S. (2014) "Comparative Syntax and English *Is To*", *Linguistic Analysis*, 39, 35-82 (reprinted in Kayne (2019)).

Kayne, R.S. (2019) *Questions of Syntax*, Oxford University Press, New York.

Kayne, R.S. (to appear) "A Note on the Tension between Silent Elements and Lexical Ambiguity, with Special Reference to Inalienable Possession," (lingbuzz/004894).

Noonan, M. (2017) "Dutch and German *r*-pronouns and P-stranding," in H. Newell, M. Noonan, G. Piggott, and L. deMena Travis (eds.) *The Structure of Words at the Interfaces*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 209-239.

Postma, G. (1993) "The Syntax of the Morphological Defectivity of *BE*," *HIL Manuscripts*, 3, 31-67.

Wood, J. (2013) "Parasitic participles in the syntax of verbal *rather*," *Lingua*, 137, 59-87.