A Note on English *else*

Richard S. Kayne
New York University

August, 2021

As is well-known, English *else* occurs in:
(1) something else; anything else; nothing else; everything else
(2) somebody else; anybody else; nobody else; everybody else
(3) someone else; anyone else; noone else; everyone else
(4) somewhere else; anywhere else; nowhere else; everywhere else
(5) someplace else; anyplace else; noplace else; everyplace else[1]
(6) what else; who else; where else; when else; how else; why else
Also well-known is the fact that none of these can be pluralized, e.g.:[2]
(7) *somethings else; *anybodies else; *noones else; *someplaces else
This even holds for the following:
(8) somewheres else; anywheres else; nowheres else
These exist in a certain non-standard English as apparent equivalents of *somewhere else*, *anywhere else, nowhere else*,[3] but seem clearly not to be plural.

In (1)-(5), *else* is preceded by a word containing an initial determiner (*some, any, no, every*)[4] followed by one of the following: *thing, body, one, where, place*. Of these five, *thing, body* and *place* are readily taken to be monomorphemic nouns (that have special behavior here).[5] The same is not true of *where*, which is readily seen as bimorphemic

———————————————

[1]Payne and Huddleston (2002, 423) report that the series with -*place* (even without *else*) is limited to American English.
[2]Cf. Quirk et al. (1985, 378). If the -*s* of *sometimes* is the plural -*s*, then we expect:
  i) We go there sometimes (*else).
[3]On the other hand, the following is not possible:
  i) *Wheres else did you go?
as if this non-standard -*s* needs to be accompanied by an overt determiner.
[4]In need of explanation is the fact, noted by McCawley (1988a, 439) and Culicover and Jackendoff (2005, 400n), that alongside *somewhere else*, one does not have (and I agree):
  i) *somehow else
despite *somehow* being possible. (Example (i) is accepted, though, by some speakers.) Perhaps closely related to (i) is:
  ii) *somewhat else
despite *somewhat* being possible. Cf. perhaps:
  iii) That remains something (*else) of a mystery.
[5]Leu (2005, 149) takes them not to be nouns, but rather to be indefinite-pronoun-restrictors (IPR-Rs). But it may still be that IPR-Rs are a subtype of N, necessarily so if Kayne (2008a) is on the right track in taking there to be only one basic categorial distinction, in effect that between N and V.

(*wh+ere*)[6] and is arguably trimorphemic (*wh+e+re*). The trimorphemic character of *where* comes into view when one compares it with the related items *here* and *there*. While *there* rhymes with *where*, *here* does not. Plausibly, the medial *-e-* of *here* is a separate morpheme bearing a first person feature. If so, the medial *-e-* of *there* and *where* is itself very likely to be a separate morpheme (that does not bear a first person feature). (This differential decomposition of *here* and *there* can be taken to underpin the fact that English has expletive *there*, but no comparable expletive *here*.[7])

     More central to this paper are instances of *else* that do not have the 'determiner-X-*else*' form of (1)-(5), e.g.:

   (9) We have little else to report.
   (10) We don't have much else to report.

On the one hand, *little* and *much* may well have a quite different status from *some, any, no,* and *every.* But the heart of this paper lies in a noun question. The proposal that I would like to make is:

   (11) All instances of English *else* are accompanied by a noun.

    For (9) and (10), the more specific proposal is:

   (12) *Else* in *little else* and *much else* is accompanied by silent THING.[8]

(I will be using capitals to indicate silence.) Thus we have:[9]

   (13) little/much THING else

    The proposal concerning THING in (12)/(13) is supported by the following consideration. Examples (9) and (10) are very close in both interpretation and form to:

   (14) We have nothing much else to report.

Similarly, the next two sentences are very close to each other:

   (15) Not much else has been happening around here for a while.
   (16) Nothing much else has been happening around here for a while.

Since (14) and (16) contain overt *-thing*,[10] they increase the plausibility of taking silent THING to be present in (9), (10) and (15).

_____

[6]Cf. Chomsky (1957, sect. 7.2, note 2).
[7]See Kayne (2008b, sect.9; 2010a) and Noonan (2017, note 24).
[8]On *little* and *much*, cf. Kayne (2005a; 2007a). On THING in French, cf. Kayne and Pollock (2010).

    There may well be a silent N present (in addition to pronounced *thing, body*) even in cases like *something else*, *nobody else*, as Leu (2005, 151) proposes.
[9]Strictly speaking, THING may have moved up to the left of *little/much* - cf. Kayne (2006).
[10]An interesting challenge that remains is to understand the contrast between:
   i) Not much of anything's happening around here these days.
and
   ii) *Much of nothing's happening around here these days.
As well as the following contrasts:
   iii) Nothing much/*little is happening.
   iv) Nothing/*Something much is happening.
   v) Nobody ?much/*many was at the party.
with (v) perhaps related to:
   vi) Nobody was/*were at the party.

The proposal in (12)/(13) is in addition supported by the fact that (9), (10) and (15) have no counterparts in the plural, exactly as in (7):[11]

(17) *We have few else to add to the list.
(18) *We don't have many else to add to the list.[12]
(19) *Not many else have been coming to the talks.

That *little else* and *much else* are not paralleled by *few else* or *many else* is due, from the perspective of (12)/(13), to the fact that the silent THING of (12)/(13) shares the non-pluralizable property of its overt counterpart *-thing* seen in *somethings else* et al.

We can note in passing the contrast between (17)-(19) and the following, without *else*:

(20) Of the many candidates, few will be put on the long shortlist.
(21) Unfortunately, they can't put very many on the long shortlist.
(22) For some reason, not many have been coming to those talks.

In (20)-(22), *few* and *many* are accompanied by a silent noun that is plural. This silent plural noun is understood to have an antecedent, which in (20) is overt. A silent plural noun is impossible in (17)-(19) because the presence of *else* in (17)-(19) brings into play (12), which imposes THING, which is not pluralizable, as seen in (7).[13] Since (20)-(22) lack *else*, they are not subject to (12) and hence not limited to THING.

Also covered by (11) are cases like:[14]

(23) You'd better sign the report. Or else they will.

Here there is no (overt) determiner-like element at all, nor any visible noun accompanying *else*. The presence, then, of a silent noun (though not of a silent determiner) is implied by (11). As to what that silent noun might be a counterpart of, we can bring into the picture:

(24) You'd better sign the report. Otherwise they will.

with *otherwise* in (24) feeling extremely close in interpretation to *(or) else* in (23).[15] Since *else* and *other* are themselves quite close to each other (in ways that I won't be

_____

[11]Cf. also:
  i) *Some else are worth reading.
  ii) *If any else show up,...
  iii) *None else are worth reading.
  iv) *Numerous else showed up.
  v) *Three else are on the table.
[12]The impossibility of *many else* was noted by Culicover and Jackendoff (2005, 401n).
[13]Note that (the limited) *all else* in:
  i) When all else seems/*seem hopeless,...
is singular, thus with an analysis like:
  ii) all THING else
relevant to which is the fact that Danish has *alting* (cf. Allan et al. (2000, 70)), and Swedish and Norwegian have *allting* (cf. Holmes and Hinchliffe (2013, sect. 3.9.8.4) and Strandskogen and Strandskogen (1989, 129)).
[14]Some English allows *else* here without *or*.
[15]Some English allows *elsewise*.

pursuing in this paper),[16] the natural proposal is that (23) contains a silent counterpart of the -*wise* of (24):

   (25) You'd better sign the report. Or else WISE they will.
(To be compatible with (11), WISE must either be a (silent) noun or contain one.[17])

    The cooccurence of *else* with *where* in (4) (and (6) and (8)) requires, given (11), that *else* in all those cases be accompanied by a noun, which might be the -*re* subpart of *where*. Alternatively, if no subpart of *where* is a noun, there might, in (4) (and (6) and (8)) be a silent noun present. That silent noun might be PLACE, as in:[18]

   (26) somewhere PLACE else

    The same reasoning applies to (3), with *one* rather than *where*. That is, in *someone else* et al. there must, by virtue of (11), be a noun present. Since I have argued elsewhere[19] that *one* is, in all its occurrences in English, a (complex) determiner rather than a noun, it must now be the case that *one* contains a noun as a subpart, or more likely that we have something like:

   (27) someone PERSON else

    Also falling under (11) are the wh-word cases of (6), each of which must now contain a noun, either an overt noun or a silent one. Take for example, *why else*. Either *why* itself must be a noun (extremely unlikely given its *wh-* subpart*)*, or its -*y* subpart must be a noun, or (most likely) there must be a silent noun, as in:[20]

   (28) why REASON else

————————————————

[16]Also set aside here is the anaphoric character associated with *else*, on which see McCawley (1988a, 374) and Culicover and Jackendoff (2005, chap. 11); as well as the question of the relation between *something else* and *something heavy*, for indirectly relevant discussion of which, see Larson and Marušič (2004), Marušič and Žaucer (2009) and Cinque (2010, sect. 5.5).

    The fact that *else* is found with interrogative wh-words (and with wh-words in *ever*-type free relatives), but not in non-*ever* free relatives (as pointed out by C.L. Baker (1970, 199)):
  i) We didn't eat what (*else) they cooked for us.
 or in ordinary headed relatives (as noted by McCawley (1988a, 456):
  ii) We like the people who (*else) you introduced us to.
 might be due to THING being incompatible with the latter two, in the relevant cases. (On the link between interrogatives and *ever*-type free relatives, cf. Lin (1996).) (On the appearance of THING in some headed relatives, cf. Kayne (2021).)
[17]A possible relation between -*wise*/WISE and *way(s)* needs to be looked into.
[18]See Kayne (2007b, (23)).
[19]See Kayne (2017). Payne and Huddleston (2002, 423) take -*body* and -*one* to be in general equivalent, but that is not 100% true, given:
  i) He's a real nobody/*noone.
  ii) They're just a bunch of nobodies/*noones.
The following contrast needs to be understood:
  iii) *He's a real nobody else.
  iv) You should give him a little something else for his birthday.
[20]Cf. Katz and Postal (1964, 92).

Compared to the six wh-words seen to be compatible with a following *else* in (6), *elsewhere* is the lone example of *else*+wh-word:[21]

(29) *elsewho; *elsewhat; *elsewhen; *elsehow; *elsewhy

Despite its isolated character (which is in need of explanation), *elsewhere* falls under (11), almost certainly with a result close to (26), plausibly as in:[22]

(30) elsewhere PLACE

Else, via (11), requires a noun to be present. At the same time, (11) does not imply that just any noun will do. And as is well-known, ordinary lexical nouns are incompatible with *else*, in cases like:[23]

(31) *You should read some book else.

(32) *No linguist else bothered to attend the talk.

(33) *We don't have time to go to every city else.

Of interest here is the fact that alongside the examples with *thing, body, place* given earlier in (1), (2) and (5), *else* is also found in:

(34) There's not a whole lot else left to discuss.

(35) You've left a good deal else to do for tomorrow, haven't you?

(36) Fortunately, there's just a little bit else left to do.

(37) Fortunately, there's lots else to do around here.

The presence of 'indefinite article + adjective' preceding *lot, deal* and *bit* in (34)-(36) is striking insofar as the indefinite article cannot appear parallel to (1)-(5), even in the clearest cases of nouns:[24]

(38) *athing else; *abody else; *aplace else

Part of the answer to why (34)-(36) contrast with (38) might lie with the adjective (*whole, good, little*) found in the former set, but that can't be the whole story (even setting aside (37)) since the addition of an adjective to (38) doesn't make (38) acceptable:

(39) *a good thing else; *a little body else; *a fine place else

Also relevant must be the similarity between (34)-(37) and (9)/(10). Just as *little else* and *much else* in (9)/(10) have the analysis given earlier and repeated here:

(40) little/much THING else

————————————————————

[21]Older English may have been more generous here. Note also:

i) *elseplace

The contrast with *elsewhere* recalls *someplaces else* vs. (non-standard) *somewheres else*, perhaps due to *place* (but not *where*) being a noun.

[22]It remains to be seen what exactly blocks:

i) *someelsewhere; *anyelsewhere; *noelsewhere; *everyelsewhere

and what exactly prevents:

ii) *Elsewhere did you go?

[23]The (online) *OED (else,* A, 1, b) has comparable examples possible in earlier English.

[24]Better is:

i) ?There's not a thing else we can do.

I have also heard *?one thing else.*

so might (34)-(37) be thought of as:[25]

(41) a whole lot THING else; a good deal THING else; a little bit THING else; lots THING else

The proposal in (11), to the effect that all instances of English *else* must be accompanied by a noun, leads to the postulation of silent THING (or PLACE or REASON) in a range of cases, as discussed. It is natural to ask why (11) should hold. A possible answer is that (11) is just a subcase of a more general requirement that all arguments must be built on a noun, whether pronounced or unpronounced.[26]

References:
Allan, R., P. Holmes and T. Lundskær-Nielsen (2000) *Danish: An Essential Grammar*, Routledge, London.
Baker, C.L. (1970) "Notes on the Description of English Questions: The Role of an Abstract Question Morpheme," *Foundations of Language*, 6, 197-219.
Chomsky, N. (1957) *Syntactic Structures*, Mouton & Co., The Hague.
Cinque, G. (2010) *The Syntax of Adjectives. A Comparative Study,* The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
Culicover, P.W. and R. Jackendoff (2005) *Simpler Syntax*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
Holmes, P. and I. Hinchliffe (2013) *Swedish. A Comprehensive Grammar, third edition*, Routledge, London.
Katz, J.J. and P.M. Postal (1964) *An Integrated Theory of Linguistic Descriptions*, The MIT Press, Cambridge, Mass.
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. (2006) "On Parameters and on Principles of Pronunciation", in H. Broekhuis, N. Corver, R. Huybregts, U. Kleinhenz and J. Koster (eds.) *Organizing*

---

[25]A logically possible alternative might be to take *lot(s), deal* and *bit* to themselves meet the noun-requirement imposed on *else* by (11). Though if one is needed, a more likely alternative might be to replace THING in this set of examples with STUFF, thinking of examples like:

i) There's not a (whole) lot of stuff left to do.

which is quite close to:

ii) There's nothing much left to do.

with overt *-thing*.

[26]The case of *or else*, which I proposed relating to *otherwise*, probably then indicates that *otherwise* is the argument of a silent P. On silent/deleted Ps, see McCawley (1988b) and references cited there.

Arguments that appear to be sentential must be associated then with some N.

Note that the text statement does not imply the more specific statement that arguments are projections of N, which in fact they cannot be, if Kayne (2008a) is on the right track.

Grammar. Linguistic Studies in Honor of Henk van Riemsdijk, Mouton de Gruyter, Berlin, 289-299 (reprinted in Kayne (2010b)).

Kayne, R.S. (2007a) "*Several*, *Few* and *Many*", *Lingua*, 117, 832-858 (reprinted in Kayne (2010)).

Kayne, R.S. (2007b) "A Short Note on *where* vs. *place*", in R. Maschi, N. Penello and P. Rizzolatti (eds.) *Miscellanea di Studi Linguistici offerti a Laura Vanelli da amici e allievi padovani*, Forum, Udine, 245-257 (reprinted in Kayne (2010b)).

Kayne, R.S. (2008a) "Antisymmetry and the Lexicon," *Linguistic Variation Yearbook*, 8, 1-31 (also in A.M. di Sciullo and C. Boeckx (eds.) *The Biolinguistic Enterprise: New Perspectives on the Evolution and Nature of the Human Language Faculty*, Oxford University Press, London, 329-353 (2011)) (reprinted in Kayne 2010b).

Kayne, R.S. (2008b) "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 (2010b)).

Kayne, R.S. (2010a) "Why Isn't *This* a Complementizer?", in Kayne (2010b) (also in P. Svenonius (ed.) (2014) *Functional Structure from Top to Toe*, Oxford University Press, New York).

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

Kayne, R.S. (2017) "English *One* and *Ones* as Complex Determiners" in G. Sengupta, S. Sircar, M.G. Raman and R. Balusu (eds.) *Perspectives on the Architecture and Acquisition of Syntax. Essays in Honor of R. Amritavalli*, Springer Nature, Singapore, 77-114 (reprinted in Kayne (2019)).

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

Kayne, R.S. (2021) "On Complementizers and Relative Pronouns in Germanic vs. Romance" in S. Wolfe and C. Meklenborg (eds.) *Continuity and Variation in Germanic and Romance*, Oxford University Press, Oxford, 404-421.

Kayne, R.S. and J.-Y. Pollock (2010) "Notes on French and English Demonstratives," in J.-W. Zwart and M. de Vries (eds.) *Structure Preserved: Studies in Syntax for Jan Koster*, John Benjamins, Amsterdam, 215-228 (reprinted in Kayne (2019)).

Larson, R.K. and F. Marušič (2004) "On Indefinite Pronoun Structures with APs: Reply to Kishimoto," *Linguistic Inquiry*, 35, 268-287.

Leu, T. (2005) "Something invisible in English," *UPenn Working Papers in Linguistics* 11.1 (*Proceedings of PLC 28*), p.143-155.

Lin, J.-W. (1996) *Polarity Licensing and Wh-phrase Quantification in Chinese*, PhD dissertation, University of Massachussets, Amherst.

Marušič and Žaucer (2009) "Two strategies for combining adjectives with indefinite pronouns," in A. Schardl, M. Walkow, and M. Abdurrahman (eds.) *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Annual Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society*, Amherst, Mass., 135-148.

McCawley, J.D. (1988a) *The Syntactic Phenomena of English, second edition*, The University of Chicago Press, Chicago.

McCawley, J.D. (1988b) "Adverbial NPs: Bare or Clad in See-Through Garb?," *Language*, 64, 583-590.

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.

Payne, J. and R. Huddleston (2002) "Nouns and Noun Phrases," in R. Huddleston and
     G.K. Pullum (eds.) *The Cambridge Grammar of the English Language*, Cambridge
     University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom, 323-523.
Quirk, R., S. Greenbaum, G. Leech and J. Svartvik (1985) *A Comprehensive Grammar
     of the English Language*, Longman, London.
Strandskogen, A.-B. and R. Strandskogen (1989) *Norwegian: An Essential Grammar,
     second edition*, Routledge, London.