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How is meaning encoded in “secondary” modalities, e.g., via gestures, facial expressions, intonation?
Recent literature focused on projection of **non-conventionalized gestures** (Ebert & Ebert 2014; Hunter 2018; Schlenker 2018a, a.o.):

1. Lea might bring her dog **LARGE**.
   - Lea's dog is large.
2. Zoe might shoot at the target **LONGBOW**.
   - If Zoe shoots, she'll shoot a longbow.

Common assumption: *modality-specific rules for projection* Schlenker 2018b:
- Whether they are "internal" or "external" ("eliminable" or not)
- Whether they co-occur with something in a more primary modality

E.g., gestures in (1) are "external" and co-speech "cosuppositions".
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Recent literature focused on projection of non-conventionalized gestures (Ebert & Ebert 2014; Hunter 2018; Schlenker 2018a, a.o.):

(1) a. Lea might bring her dog LARGE.  
   → Lea’s dog is large.

b. Zoe might shoot at the target LONGBOW.  
   → If Zoe shoots, she’ll shoot a longbow.

**Common assumption:** modality-specific rules for projection

**Schlenker 2018b:** predict if/how “iconic enrichments” project from:
- whether they are “internal” or “external” (“eliminable” or not)
- whether they co-occur w/something in a more primary modality

E.g., gestures in (1) are “external” and co-speech → “cosuppositions”
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Super-linguistic approach (Esipova 2019):

- the same principles guide projection in all modalities → no need for modality-specific typologies of projection patterns
- but to see this, we need to:
  - treat secondary modality expressions as first class citizens at all levels of representation
  - expand our empirical scope by looking at a wider range of meanings expressed in secondary modalities
Case study 1: conventionalized gestures

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the diverse projection behavior of conventionalized gestures:

(2) If you bring a semanticist CRAZY, I’ll fight with them.

(3) Kim is bringing her friend AIR-QUOTES.

(4) If a friend of mine wins FINGERS-CROSSED, I’ll be happy.
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Case study 1: conventionalized gestures

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the **diverse projection behavior of conventionalized gestures**:

- **Subsective modifiers (project pragmatically when non-restricting):**

  (2) If you bring a semanticist_{CRAZY}, I’ll fight with them.

- **Non-subsective modifiers (truth-conditionally non-vacuous):**

  (3) Kim is bringing her friend_{AIR-QUOTES}.

- **Supplements (project conventionally):**

  (4) If a friend of mine wins_{FINGERS-CROSSED}, I’ll be happy.
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Case study 2: degree modifiers cross-modally

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the cross-modal similarities among degree modifiers (all are truth-conditionally non-vacuous by default):

- primary modality degree modifiers:

(5) The movie was \{very, truly, surprisingly, damn\} good.

- intonational degree modifiers:

(6) The movie was good_{DEG-INT}.

- facial expressions as degree modifiers:

(7) The movie was \_THUMBS-UP^{OO}.
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Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:

- more theoretical background for the super-linguistic approach
- phonetic/phonological properties of DEG-INT
- the role of iconicity
- and to see more silly pictures of me.
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Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:
- more theoretical background for the super-linguistic approach
- phonetic/phonological properties of *DEG-INT*
- the role of iconicity
— and to see more silly pictures of me.


