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Conveyed information can be of different status

Pieces of information of different status stem from only one channel, i.e. speech

- at-issue/non-at-issue debate
  (Grice 1975, Potts 2005, Anderbois et al. 2015, Koev 2013, ...)

Or from different channels, i.e. gesture vs. speech

- Information status of gesture information
  (Ebert & Ebert 2014, Ebert 2017, Schlenker 2016, Schlenker t.a., Esipova 2017)
general view

• whenever there are pieces of information from different dimensions or channels, they compete for the at-issue status
• there are certain defaults, but these can be overridden
• there are operators and other systematic means to shift information from one dimension to the other
• appositives are generally not-at-issue

• the status of gestures depends on their temporal alignment with speech (i.e. availability of a competitor)
  – stand-alone gesture $\rightarrow$ at-issue
  – co-speech gesture $\rightarrow$ not-at-issue

• certain dimension shifters (such as demonstratives and mimics) explicitly make not-at-issue information at-issue

• dimension shifting is meaningful and results in semantically distinguishable readings; this accounts for the semantics of demonstratives and the attributive-referential distinction
classical case:
two dimensions within speech

- Core phenomena:
  1. **expressives** like *damn* (or 'mixed items' like *cur*)
     
     *Jessica brought her damn dog with her.*

  2. **supplements** like appositive relative clauses (ARCS) or appositive NPs (NAs)
     
     *Lance Armstrong, who was a world class cyclist, started his career at the age of 12.* (ARC)

     *Lance Armstrong, a world class cyclist, started his career at the age of 12.* (NA)

- bring in information that is not at issue at the time of utterance, but sneaked in as ‘secondary’ information
- information is not for disposition, non-negotiable
properties of non-at-issue material

- Non-at-issue material does not enter truth conditions as straight-forwardly as at-issue material (Potts 2005)
  - Truth value not influenced by false non-at-issue material
  - Material cannot be denied directly in discourse

- Non-at-issue material projects (Potts 2005)
  - It cannot be the target of modal operators like negation

- Non-at-issue material can be ignored in ellipsis (Potts et al. 2009)
appositives
at-issue and non-at-issue interpretations
Lance Armstrong, a world class cyclist, started his career at the age of 12.

Direct denial response:
#That's not true! He wasn't a world class cyclist, he was a world class trumpeter.

Discourse interrupting protest:
Hey, wait a minute! He actually he was a world class trumpeter, not a cyclist.
with appositive

It is not true that Lance Armstrong, a world class cyclist, started his career at the age of 12.

Negation elaboration:

#He was a world class trumpeter.

with main clause VP

It is not true that Lance Armstrong, a world class cyclist, started his career at the age of 12.

Negation elaboration:

He started with about 16.
ellipses

- Expressive content can be ignored under ellipsis \( (\text{Potts et al. 2009}) \)
  
  \begin{itemize}
  \item A: *I saw your f***ing dog in the park.*
  \item B: *No, you didn’t — you couldn’t have. The poor thing passed away last week.*
  \end{itemize}

- Holds also for appositive content:
  
  \begin{itemize}
  \item A: *I met Peter, the best trumpeter in town, for lunch.*
  \item B: *Last week, I did, too. – But I don't think, he is such a great trumpeter.*
  \end{itemize}
at-issue appositives

- But some appositives *can* apparently be at-issue
  (AnderBois et al. 2015; Koev 2013; Syrett & Koev 2014)

- Direct denial is possible with sentence-final ARCs

  A: He took care of his husband, who had prostate cancer.
  B: No, he had lung cancer.

  A: His husband, who had prostate cancer, was being treated at the
     Dominican Hospital.
  B: ??No, he had lung cancer.
Some appositives seem to be interpretable in the scope of modal operators, i.e. they do not project (Wang et al. 2006; Nouwen 2014)

- Appositive *one*-modifiers (a subtype of NAs) often do not project:
  
  *If a professor, a famous one, publishes a book, he will make a lot of money.*

  *Mary wants to marry an Italian, a rich one.*
at-issue appositives

Question: why are appositives at-issue in these cases?

- AnderBois et al. 2015:
  appositives enjoy a “broader range of possible interpretations, behaving in many respects as though they were conjunctions rather than true appositives”

- Syrett & Koev 2014:
  "we propose to account for the shifting status of ARCs [...] by assuming that ARCs can compete with main clauses for at-issue status (that is, either is in principle a candidate for at-issue status), and by relating the ordering of the appositive assertion and the main clause assertion to the overall flow of discourse" (my emphasis)
at-issue appositives

- Syrett & Koev (2014):
  - all appositives (both NAs and ARCs) and main clauses introduce independent assertions
  - in principle, either can be at issue – they compete
  - the proposition that is processed last is at issue
  - ARCs can be attached to either the anchor or the root node
  - recency of assertion exerts an effect on its at-issue status

*the symphony hired my friend* $[_{DP} Sophie [_{CP} who is a classical violinist ]]$ $[_{CP_1} the symphony hired my friend Sophie ]$ $[_{CP_2} who is a classical violinist ]$
Koev (2013) hypothesizes that one-"appositives" are in fact not appositive constructions but a special kind of restricting modifier (cf. Nouwen 2014).
gradual at-issueness

competition for information status
A new thought on competition: \textit{gradual at-issueness}

\begin{quote}
"The more stand-alone a piece of information, the more likely it is at-issue."
\end{quote}

- Supposed to include information from different channels, i.e. speech, gesture, mimics, ...
- Emphasizes aspects of temporal occurrence
- Occurrence at right periphery & finiteness are "stand-alone" features for appositives
Denial Examples (response: Nein, DER hieß LOUIS Armstrong!)

- completely out:

  Lance Armstrong, der virtuose Trompeter, hatte Hodenkrebs.

  Lance Armstrong, der ein virtuoser Trompeter war, hatte Hodenkrebs.

- better:

  Zu den Prominenten, die an Hodenkrebs erkrankten, gehörte zum Beispiel auch Lance Armstrong, der virtuose Trompeter.

- even better:

  Zu den Prominenten, die an Hodenkrebs erkrankten, gehörte zum Beispiel auch Lance Armstrong, der ein virtuoser Trompeter war.
Denial Examples (response: *No, HE was called LOUIS Armstrong!*)

- **completely out:**

  Lance Armstrong, *the virtuosic trumpeter*, suffered from prostate cancer.
  
  Lance Armstrong, *who was a virtuosic trumpeter*, suffered from prostate cancer.

- **better:**

  Among the celebrities who suffered from prostate cancer we also find Lance Armstrong, *the virtuosic trumpeter*.

- **even better:**

  Among the celebrities who suffered from prostate cancer we also find Lance Armstrong, *who was a virtuosic trumpeter*. 
Ellipsis Examples (follow-up: Peter auch – allerdings mit dem Flugzeug.)

- ok:
  
  *Paul fliegt heute, übrigens mit dem Hubschrauber, nach Wien.*

- worse:
  
  *Paul ist heute nach Wien geflogen, übrigens mit dem Hubschrauber.*

- even worse:
  
  *Paul ist heute nach Wien geflogen, übrigens ist er mit dem Hubschrauber geflogen.*
Ellipsis Examples (follow-up: Peter, too – but he will fly by plain.)

- **ok:**
  
  *Paul will fly, by helicopter by the way, to Vienna.*

- **worse:**
  
  *Paul will fly to Vienna, by helicopter by the way.*

- **even worse:**
  
  *Paul will fly to Vienna, he will fly by helicopter by the way.*
Showing the same with gestures instead of appositives
gradual at-issueness

Denial Examples (response: *Nein, DER hieß LOUIS Armstrong!*)

- completely out: *[Lance Armstrong]* hatte Hodenkrebs.

- slightly better (?):
  
  Zu den Prominenten, die an Hodenkrebs erkrankten, gehörte zum Beispiel auch *[Lance Armstrong]*.

- even better:
  
  Zu den Prominenten, die an Hodenkrebs erkrankten, gehörte zum Beispiel auch Lance Armstrong.

- and even better:
  
  Zu den Prominenten, die an Hodenkrebs erkrankten, gehörte zum Beispiel auch Lance Armstrong. [...pause...]

gradual at-issueness
gradual at-issueness (engl)

Denial Examples (response: No, HE was called LOUIS Armstrong!)

- completely out: [Lance Armstrong] suffered from prostate cancer.

- slightly better (?):
  Among the celebrities who suffered from prostate cancer we also find [Lance Armstrong].

- even better:
  Among the celebrities who suffered from prostate cancer we also find Lance Armstrong.

- and even better:
  Among the celebrities who suffered from prostate cancer we also find Lance Armstrong. [...pause...]
Ellipsis examples (follow-up: Das Flugzeug auch.)

- ok:
  \[\text{Der Hubschrauber [startet] gleich.}\]

- slightly worse (?):
  \[\text{Der Hubschrauber ist schon [gestartet].}\]

- even worse:
  \[\text{Der Hubschrauber ist schon gestartet.}\]

- even worse (?):
  \[\text{Der Hubschrauber ist schon gestartet. [pause]}\]

Gradual at-issueness: ellipsis

cf. Schlenker & Chemla (2016)
Ellipsis examples (follow-up: *The plane, too.*)

- ok:
  
  \[ \text{The helicopter will [take off] soon.} \]

- slightly worse (?):
  
  \[ \text{The helicopter already [took off].} \]

- even worse:
  
  \[ \text{The helicopter already took off.} \]

- even worse (?):
  
  \[ \text{The helicopter already took off. [pause]} \]

---

cf. Schlenker & Chemla (2016)
Gradual at-issueness:

"The more stand-alone a piece of information, the more likely it is at-issue."

Emphasizes aspects of temporal alignment:

- Temporal coincidence → strong competition → clear at-issue/non-at-issue distribution
- Temporal proximity → facultative competition

In this view:
a sentence-medial appositive "occurs" at the same time as its anchor, like a simultaneous gesture ('comma' intonation).
gestures

at-issue and non-at-issue interpretations
gesture types

- Gesture:
  communicative movements of hands and arms
  transporting emotions, intentions, and thoughts

- Types of Gestures:
  - Iconic gestures
  - Pointing gestures
  - Emblematic gestures
  - Metaphoric gestures
  - Regulators
  - Beats
gesture types

with respect to temporal alignment with speech

pre-speech  pro-speech  co-speech  post-speech
the SaGA corpus

- Bielefeld Speech-and-Gesture-Alignment (SaGA) corpus of project B1 *Speech-gesture-alignment* of the SFB 673 *Alignment in Communication* (Lücking et. al 2013)
co-speech gesture

It is on a [grey base made of concrete]^{ic-g}.
Three meters high. And on it, there are [red tubes]^{ic-g}.
Gesture information adds semantic content to the utterance.

'Gesture and speech work together to convey one thought' (cf. McNeill 1992, Kendon 1980)
post-speech gesture

With one round tower. [ ]+ic-g With one round...
post-speech gesture

Such a curve. [ ]$_{+ic-g}$ [I went along there]$_{+ic-g}$. 
More specifically, [on the righthandside, there will be (such) a pillar ]^{iC-g}. It doesn't fit the townscape at all.
We also find pro-speech gestures (Ladewig 2012, Ebert 2014, Schlenker & Chemla 2016, Schlenker 2017)

A: *Have you met Paul recently?*

B: (shakes head)

*Can you pass me the [ iconic 'shape' gesture ]?*

*Yesterday, we went [ ].*
co- vs. pro-speech gestures

Literature:

- Schlenker & Chemla (2016) show that co-speech gestures can be ignored under ellipsis, which sets them apart from pro-speech gestures.

  a. This helicopter will soon [take off], and this plane will too.

  b. #This helicopter will soon TAKE-OFF-ROTATING_, and this plane will too.

- co-speech-gestures are usually not at issue (Ebert & Ebert 2014, Schlenker 2016), pro-speech gestures are usually at issue (Ebert 2014, Schlenker & Chemla 2016, Schlenker t.a., cf. Ladewig 2012).

- fits the idea of gradual at-issueness
temporal alignment and at-issueness

- pre-speech
  - at issue
  - (?)
- pro-speech
  - at-issue
- co-speech
  - not at-issue
- post-speech
  - more distant
  - more likely to be at-issue
co-speech gestures

2 views
meaning of co-speech gestures

I brought [a bottle of water] to the talk.

Conveys roughly the same meaning as:
Cornelia brought a **big** bottle of water to the talk.
contribution of gesture vs. speech

I brought [a bottle of water] to the talk.

At-issue: semantic content of the speech signal

The speaker brought a bottle of water to the talk

Non-at-issue: 'semantic content' of the gesture (roughly):

The bottle is big
2 views

- Gestures contribute non-at-issue information by default
  
  Ebert & Ebert 2014:
  - co-speech gestures behave like **appositives**, which are not at-issue (e.g. Potts 2005)
  - Formal approach fleshed out on basis of AnderBois et al.'s (2015) approach to appositives

  Schlenker 2016:
  - co-speech gestures behave **like a special kind of presupposition**, i.e. like cosuppositions
co-speech gestures are like appositives: direct denial

**speech & gesture**

*I brought [a bottle of water].*

Direct denial response:

#That's not true! You actually brought a small bottle.

Discourse interrupting protest:

*Hey, wait a minute! Actually, the bottle is not as big.*

**speech only**

*I brought a big bottle of water.*

Direct denial response:

*That's not true! You actually brought a small bottle.*
Ebert & Ebert 2014

co-speech gestures are like appositives: projection

speech & gesture

I did not bring [a bottle of water] to the talk.

Negation elaboration:

#A small one is enough for me.

speech only

I did not bring a big bottle of water to the talk.

Negation elaboration:

A small one is enough for me.
argues that co-speech gestures do not behave like supplements, but rather like a special kind of presupposition, i.e. like cosuppositions

An expression $p$ with a co-occurring gesture with content $g$ comes with the requirement that it holds that $p$ entails $g$

a. *John [helped] his son.*
   entails:
   John helped his son by lifting him.

b. *John didn’t [help] his son.*
   entail:
   If John (had) helped his son, he would have done so by lifting him.

c. *Did John [help] his son?*
Schlenker vs. Ebert & Ebert

- Presuppositions carry old, appositives new information by default
- Gestures should contribute old information in Schlenker's approach and new information in Ebert & Ebert's in the general case
- Kendon (1980), Lücking (2013): gestures can never be redundant because they are concrete – they always add something
Some discussion in Schlenker (2016)

Yesterday John bought (i) LARGE_ [a bottle of beer]. / (ii) a bottle of beer, which was LARGE_ this large. I thought he'd drink it over dinner last night. But this morning, he brought

a. (#) LARGE_ [his bottle of beer] to the workshop!

b. (#) his bottle of beer, which was LARGE_ this large, to the workshop!

Co-speech gesture seem at least degraded when they carry old content
Schlenker vs. Ebert & Ebert

- In positive environments, same entailment in Ebert & Ebert's (2014) and Schlenker's (2016) approach.

*I brought [a bottle of beer].*

- Asserted: Cornelia brought a bottle of beer.
- Presupposed: If Cornelia brought a bottle it was a big bottle.
- Entailed: Cornelia brought a big bottle of water.
Schlenker vs. Ebert & Ebert

- **Schlenker (2016):** in negative environments, co-speech gestures also receive a presuppositional interpretation.

  *I did not bring [a bottle of beer].*

  **Asserted:** Cornelia did not bring a bottle of beer
  **Presupposed:** If Cornelia had brought a bottle it would have been a big bottle

- **Ebert & Ebert (2014):** odd or interpreted as the gesture associating with the NP (concept-related reading): the speaker takes beer bottles to be that big by default
Schlenker vs. Ebert & Ebert

- Further differences:

  *It is unlikely that Cornelia will bring [a bottle of beer].*

  **Asserted:** It is unlikely that Cornelia will bring a bottle of beer
  **Presupposed:** When Cornelia brings a bottle of beer, it is usually a big bottle

  *No linguist will bring [a bottle of beer].*

  **Asserted:** No linguist will bring a bottle of beer
  **Presupposed:** When a linguist brings a bottle of beer, it is usually a big bottle
Schlenker vs. Ebert & Ebert

- Schlenker (2016): At-issue readings are derivable via local accommodation, because they are weak triggers, but in particular in contrastive contexts (cf. Esipova 2017)

  I did not bring [a bottle], I brought [a bottle].
Ebert & Ebert (2014): at-issue readings are generally not possible (cf. projection with negation)...

... EXCEPT with certain mimics (raising eyebrows, ...) and an eye-catching gesture

*I did not bring [a bottle], I brought [a bottle].*
Schlenker vs. Ebert & Ebert

Schlenker (2016):

1. co-speech gestures are ok also in downward-entailing contexts and trigger a conditional interpretation
2. at-issue readings are generally available whenever local accommodation is possible

Ebert & Ebert (2014):

1. co-speech gestures are degraded in downward-entailing contexts; sometimes concept-related reading with just the NP is possible
2. at-issue readings are generally not available, only with very special means that make the gesture at-issue
post-speech gestures

2 views
co-speech gestures receive a presuppositional interpretation and post-speech gestures a supplemental one

**co-speech:**

Some philosopher brought [a bottle of beer].

↔ cosupposition: some philosopher brought a big bottle of beer

**post-speech:**

Some philosopher brought a bottle of beer.

↔ supplement: some philosopher brought a bottle of beer, which was big.
co-speech gestures receive a presuppositional interpretation and post-speech gestures a supplemental one

co-speech:

No philosopher brought [a bottle of beer].

↔ cosupposition: if a philosopher brings a big bottle of beer, it will be big.

post-speech:

#No philosopher brought a bottle of beer.

↔ supplement: #No philosopher brought a bottle of beer, which was big.
an alternative proposal

- co-speech gestures receive a supplemental interpretation (Ebert & Ebert 2014)

- in the spirit of gradual at-issueness, post-speech gestures can
  - either behave like co-speech gestures (supplements)
    ➔ not at-issue
    ➔ function like (right-dislocated) appositives
  - or like stand-alone pro-speech gestures (independent assertions)
    ➔ at-issue
    ➔ serve to clarify a property of the speech DR
  (cf. Averitseva-Klisch's view on afterthoughts: clarify reference)
co-speech:

*Some philosopher brought [a bottle of beer].*

⇍ supplement: *some philosopher brought a bottle of beer, which was big.*

post-speech:

*Some philosopher brought a bottle of beer.*

⇍ supplement: *Some philosopher brought a bottle of beer, which was big.*

⇍ assertion: *Some philosopher brought a bottle of beer, This bottle was big.*
an alternative proposal

cospeech:

No philosopher brought [a bottle of beer].

→ supplement: No philosopher brought a bottle of beer, which was big

postspeech:

No philosopher brought a bottle of beer.

→ supplement: No philosopher brought a bottle of beer, which was big

→ assertion: No philosopher brought a bottle of beer. This bottle was big.
an alternative proposal

- Complex example where anaphoric reference is possible (although it shouldn't be 😊):

  *It's not true that no philosopher brought a bottle of beer.*
  
  *It was / they were quite large, in fact.*

- Also the post-speech gesture gets better in such contexts:

  *It's not true that no philosopher brought a bottle of beer.*

Thanks to Philippe Schlenker (p.c.) for providing me with this example.
co-speech gesture not-at-issue:


B: *#Nein, das kann nicht sein! Halsketten findet sie spießig!*

post-speech gesture at-issue:

A: *Maria hatte angekündigt, sich wertvollen Schmuck kaufen zu wollen. Und heute habe ich sie tatsächlich mit einem teuren Teil herumlaufen sehen.*

B: *Nein, das kann nicht sein! Halsketten findet sie spießig!*
further evidence (engl.)

- co-speech gesture not-at-issue:

  A: Maria announced that she wanted to buy expensive jewelry. And today I actually saw her [with a fancy piece] running around in town.

  B: #No, that is not possible! She hates necklets.

- post-speech gesture at-issue:

  A: Maria announced that she wanted to buy expensive jewelry. And today I actually saw her [with a fancy piece] running around in town.

  B: No, that is not possible! She hates necklets.
further evidence

- co-speech gesture inevitably projects:

  \[\text{Ich habe mir } \{\text{einen Hund}\} \text{ zugelegt.} \]
  \[\text{Ich möchte mir } \{\text{einen Hund}\} \text{ zulegen.}\]

- post-speech gesture does not necessarily project:

  \[\text{Ich habe mir einen Hund zugelegt.} \]
  \[\text{Ich möchte mir einen Hund zulegen.}\]

- cf. one-appositives:

  \[\text{Ich habe mir einen Hund zugelegt, einen kleinen.}\]
  \[\text{Ich möchte mir einen Hund zulegen, einen kleinen.}\]
further evidence

- co-speech gesture inevitably projects:
  
  Unser Haus hat Alufenster.
  

- post-speech gesture does not necessarily project:
  
  Unser Haus hat Alufenster.
  

- cf. one-appositives:
  
  Unser Haus hat Alufenster, runde.
  
further evidence (engl.)

- co-speech gesture inevitably projects:
  
  \[ I \text{ bought}[ \text{ a dog } ]. \]
  
  \( \text{small} \)
  
  \#I \text{ want to buy}[ \text{ a dog } ].
  
  \( \text{small} \)

- post-speech gesture does not necessarily project:
  
  \[ I \text{ bought a dog}. \]
  
  \( \text{small} \)
  
  \[ I \text{ want to buy a dog}. \]
  
  \( \text{small} \)

- cf. one-appositives:
  
  \[ I \text{ bought a dog, a small one}. \]
  
  \[ I \text{ want to buy a dog, a small one}. \]
further evidence

- post-speech gestures are not possible in all configurations
- tentatively: they are excluded whenever one-appositives would be excluded

#Ich würde mir niemals einen Hund zulegen.

#Ich würde mir niemals einen Hund zulegen.

- cf. one-appositives:

#Ich würde mir niemals einen Hund zulegen, einen kleinen.

#I would never buy a dog, a small one.
### co- vs. post-speech gestures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>co-speech gestures</th>
<th>post-speech gestures</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ebert &amp; Ebert (2014),</td>
<td>supplemental (like appositives),</td>
<td>supplemental (like appositives),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>this presentation</td>
<td>not-at-issue</td>
<td>not-at-issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schlenker (2016)</td>
<td>presuppositional, not-at-issue</td>
<td>asserted (clarify some aspect of the speech DR),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>at-issue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>supplemental (like appositives),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>not-at-issue</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
dimension shift & switch

demonstratives & the referential/attributive distinction
dimension shifters

Recall:

- Ebert & Ebert (2014): at-issue readings are generally not possible for co-speech gestures...
- ... EXCEPT with certain mimics (raising eyebrows, ...) and an eye-catching gesture

    I did not bring [a bottle], I brought [a bottle].

- mimics functions as dimension-shifter
dimension shifters

there are means to influence the competition for at-issueness in communication

they work as dimension-shifters that shift information from one (standardly assumed) dimension to another

Examples non-at-issue → at-issue:
- mimics – raising eyebrows, ...
- demonstratives – *ein* vs. *so ein* and *the* vs. *this*
- focus-marking/prosody/... ?

Examples at-issue → non-at-issue:
- 'comma' intonation
Shifting effect of demonstrative so

speech & gesture

Ich bringe niemals [eine Flasche Wasser] mit zu Vorträgen.

I never bring [a bottle of water] to talks.

Negation elaboration:

#Eine kleine reicht mir nämlich.
(A small one is enough for me.)

speech + so & gesture

Ich bringe niemals [SO eine Flasche Wasser] mit zu Vorträgen.

I never bring [a bottle of water like that] to talks.

Negation elaboration:

Eine kleine reicht mir nämlich.
(A small one is enough for me.)
Combined meaning contributions of speech and gesture (Ebert & Ebert, 2014):

\[ \exists x \land \text{bottle}_p(x) \]

\[ \exists z \land z = \text{SIM}_p^*(x, z) \]

\[ \exists z \land z = \text{SIM}_p^*(x, z) \land \text{bottle}_p(x) \land \text{bottle}_p^*(z) \]

\[ 
\]
combined meaning contributions of speech and gesture (Ebert & Ebert, 2014):

\[ \exists x \land \text{bottle}_p(x) \]

\[ \exists z \land z = \text{SIM}_p(x, z) \]

\[ \exists z \land z = \text{exemplification} \]

\[ \exists z \land z = \text{bottle}_{p^*}(z) \]
Mistaken identity cases (speaker's/semantic reference) (Kripke 1977 based on Linsky 1963)

Verbal concept at-issue/attributive interpretation/semantic referent:

A: *Her husband is kind to her.*

B: *No, he [= her husband] isn't.*

*The man you are referring to isn't her husband.* (Kripke 1977, p. 90)

Her husband (who is, by the way, identical to the object I'm pointing to) is kind to her.
Gestural concept at-issue/referential interpretation/speaker's referent:

A: Her husband is kind to her.

B: HE [= the man referred to by the speaker via gesture] is kind to her. But he isn't her husband. (Kripke 1977, p. 90, my emphasis)

This object (which is, by the way, her husband) is kind to her.
dimension switching

General idea (Ebert & Ebert, 2014):

*The big bottle*  \[ \xrightarrow{p} \]

\[ \text{big_bottle}_p(x) \]

\[ x = p^* z \]

\[ \text{at-issue verbal concept } x \]

\[ \text{attributive reading} \]

\[ \text{big_bottle}_{p^*}(x) \]

\[ x = p \ z \]

\[ \text{at-issue gesture concept } z \]

\[ \text{referential reading} \]

- Two distinct referential concepts: verbal *x* and (possibly covert) gestural *z*
- only one can be at-issue, the other must be non-at-issue

(cf. Gutzmann & McCready t.a.)
dimension switching

attributive reading

the bottle

\[ \text{bottle}_p(x) \]

\[ x = p^* z \]

bottle\(_p^*(z)\)


demonstrative reading

this bottle

\[ x = p z \]

\[ \text{bottle}_p(x) \]

\[ \text{bottle}_p^*(z) \]


due to at-issue identification

definite treated as a rigid
designator or name-like

(see Kaplan 1989a,b; Marti 2008)
summary

- pieces of information from one or across different channels of communication compete for at-issueness
- a prime example is the interplay of gestural information and speech, where speech usually wins over gesture
- stand-alone gestures don't face competition and are hence at-issue
- there are means to switch and shift information between dimensions
[Lance Armstrong, the famous trumpeter,] likes Spaghetti.
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