

The interpretation of *alos* ‘other’ in Modern Greek

Building on previous work for *other* in English (Heim et. al., Culicover & Jackendoff 1995, Kamp 2001, Thomas 2011, see also Lechner 2010 for MG), I suggest that *alos* is an anaphoric element, which takes as its internal argument a silent pronoun and establishes a non-identity relation between its antecedent and the argument of its sister NP.

(1) $[[alos]] = \lambda x_c. \lambda P_{\langle ct \rangle}. \lambda y. P(y) \wedge x_c \neq y$ [Kamp 2001, Thomas 2011]

Presupposition: $P(x_c)$

However, previous analyses do not explain the fact that depending on the environment it appears in, *other* gives rise to different inferences regarding the contextual antecedent as revealed in (2) in the given context.

Context: Nick and Ana are students in a cinematography school. Nick is the kind of student that likes to take initiative, sometimes following the assignments and doing even more, or sometimes ignoring them. So Ana tells Mary “Yesterday, we had to watch Psycho...”

- (2) a. ...Nick watched some other movie.” → Inference A: *Nick didn’t watch Psycho*
b. ...Nick didn’t watch any other movie.” → Inference B: *Nick watched Psycho*

None of the inferences in (2a-b) are derivable from (1). I argue that the inferences are best explained as a special case of Contextual Implicatures that arise under Focus marking (Rooth 1992, Fox & Katzir 2011, Chierchia et. al. 2012). Moreover, following Uegaki (2013), I explain why CT-marked *alos* as opposed to F-marked *alos* only gives rise to Ignorance Implicatures regarding the salient antecedent.

Having presented an analysis for the derivation of the Implicatures when *alos* ‘other’ is F/CT-marked, I present cases in which *alos* is intonationally ‘unmarked’. For example, the yes/no question in (3) gives rise to an additive inference that the speaker knows that *Nick has already watched one (or more) movie(s)*.

- (3) *ide kamja ali tenia o Nikos?*
see any other movie the Nick
‘Did Nick see any other movie?’ → Nick has watched at least one movie.

I will show that the inference derived in (3) it is not an Implicature and that under the right context this inference is not derived. The alleged inference that arises when (3) is uttered out of context is due to anaphora resolution of the silent pronoun. In particular, it can only be resolved as an e-type pronoun whose description roughly corresponds to *the movie that Nick has seen*.

The discussion will conclude with some open questions about *alos* appearing in some other environments as in (4)-(5):

- (4) Donca was talking to some (other) phonologist.
(5) Which other movie did Nick watch?

The sentence in (5) gives rise to a strong inference that cannot be cancelled that *Nick has watched at least one movie*. In (4) *other* seems to contribute to the interpretation of S by triggering an Implicated Presupposition in the spirit of Sauerland's 2006 proposal.