

## THURSDAY INTERDISCIPLINARY COLLOQUIUM

Thursday 15/01/2026

16:15-17:45

Webb 103

Yael Greenberg, Bar Ilan University

### ***Another*, exclusivity and alternatives**

English *another* is analyzed in Thomas 2011 as *an+other*, where, following Kamp 2001, *other* has an entry along the lines of (1) (where  $y^*$  is a contextually salient individual and  $\otimes$  is 'overlap'):

- (1)  $\lambda P. \lambda x: P(y^*). P(x) \wedge \neg x \otimes y^*$

This entry can account for the properties of *another* in (2):

- (2) (Context: A tells B about several students of his. Later on B asks about John)

A1: *He is another student of mine*

A2: *He is not another student of mine*

(i) He is not a student of mine, OR

(ii) He is one of the students of mine that I was talking about earlier.

(I.e. negation targets either  $P(x)$  or  $\neg x \otimes y^*$ )

The focus of this talk is a use of English *another* illustrated in the attested examples in (3)-(4):

- (3) *"Today was an incredible victory," explained Marquez. "You can say 'oh another victory at Sachsenring' but it's not another victory; every year I have more pressure, every year it's more difficult – especially this year. We had the whole weekend in dry conditions, It was very, very tough"*
- (4) *This is not another movie about the Civil War. It does not gloss over the ugly parts and does not make the tender parts too pretty.*

I show that this use of *another* differs from the well-studied use in (2) in both interpretation and projective properties under negation, namely the fact that, unlike what is seen in (2A2), in (3) and (4) neither  $P(x)$ , nor  $\neg x \otimes y^*$  seem to be targeted by negation.

To capture these properties I propose an analysis where the new use of *another* involve an exclusive operator (EXC), which can be covert, as in (3)-(4), or overt (with *just / merely*), and which, following Coppock & Beaver 2014, presupposes  $\text{MIN}(p)$  (an alternative which is at least as strong as  $p$  is true, and asserts  $\text{MAX}(p)$  (stronger alternatives are false). The crucial step in the proposal is taking the focus associate of EXC to be *other* (in *another*). Given this step, and taking the main contribution of *other* to be non-overlap ( $\neg x \otimes y^*$  in (1)), the interesting question is what counts as the alternatives which are stronger than  $p$  in sentences like (3)-(4). I propose an answer which, in addition to deriving the basic interpretation and projectivity properties of the new use of *other*, can correctly predict several additional properties (e.g. constraints on the modified noun, subjectivity and evaluativity).

I end by discussing issues and questions that the data and the proposal raise, regarding (a) cross linguistic variations in expressing the non-overlap relation with this construction (e.g. Hebrew and Russian incrementals *od / esche*) (b) the nature of the covert EXC in (3)-(4), compared to another (?), well-studied covert exclusive, namely *exh* (e.g. Chierchia et al 2011), and (c) a comparison of (*not*) *just another* with (*not*) *just any*.

Click [here](#) to see the colloquium program.