

Towards a uniform super-linguistic
theory of projection
lightning talk

Maria Esipova
<http://esipova.net>

Princeton University

22nd Amsterdam Colloquium: Super Linguistics workshop, 12/20/2019

How is meaning encoded in **sGb^@ q%o\ b@ YXS**, e.g., via gestures, facial expressions, intonation?

Recent literature focused on projection of $\hat{b}^Q \hat{b}^f \hat{C}^z \hat{S}^Y - \hat{Y} C @$
 $LGsz \sim \hat{q} \hat{s}$ (Ebert & Ebert 2014; Hunter 2018; Schlenker 2018a, a.o.):

Recent literature focused on projection of ^b^Qb^fC^zS^Y C@
 Lsz~qS (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.

Recent literature focused on projection of $\text{b}^{\wedge} \text{Qb}^{\wedge} \text{fC}^{\wedge} \text{zS}^{\wedge} - \text{Y C} @$
 $\text{L Gsz} \sim \text{qS}$ (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.

; $\text{b} \setminus \setminus \text{b}^{\wedge} - \text{ss} \sim \setminus \text{ezS}^{\wedge}$ = modality-specific rules for projection

Recent literature focused on projection of $\text{b}^{\wedge} \text{q}^{\wedge} \text{b}^{\wedge} \text{f}^{\wedge} \text{z}^{\wedge} \text{s}^{\wedge} - \text{b}^{\wedge} \text{c}^{\wedge}$
 $\text{L}^{\wedge} \text{g}^{\wedge} \text{z}^{\wedge} \text{q}^{\wedge} \text{s}^{\wedge}$ (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.

; $\text{b}^{\wedge} \setminus \text{b}^{\wedge} - \text{ss}^{\wedge} \setminus \text{ez}^{\wedge} \text{s}^{\wedge}$ = modality-specific rules for projection

$\text{r}^{\wedge} \langle \text{p}^{\wedge} \text{c}^{\wedge} \text{w}^{\wedge} \text{q}^{\wedge} | \text{c}^{\wedge} \text{e}^{\wedge} \text{d}^{\wedge} \rangle$ = 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”

Super-~~YL-SZS~~ approach (Esipova 2019):

Super-~~YL-SZS~~ approach (Esipova 2019):

- the same principles guide projection in all modalities / no need for modality-specific typologies of projection patterns

Super-~~YL-SZS~~ 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:

Super-~~YL-SzS~~ 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

Super-~~YL-SzS~~ 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 $\text{@SjCqCedpCzSb}^{\wedge}$
 $4CP\text{-fSqbHkb}^{\wedge}fC^{\wedge}zSb^{\wedge}\text{-YS C@LCsz-qS}$

Case study 1: conventionalized gestures

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the 


- subsecutive modifiers (project pragmatically when non-restricting):

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

Case study 1: conventionalized gestures

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the $\text{[SjCqCedpCzSb^} \\ \text{4CP- fSqbHkb^ fC^zSb^ - S C@ LCsz-qS}$

- subsecutive modifiers (project pragmatically when non-restricting):

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

- non-subsecutive modifiers (truth-conditionally non-vacuous):

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

Case study 1: conventionalized gestures

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the 


- subsecutive modifiers (project pragmatically when non-restricting):

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

- non-subsecutive 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.

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the $\langle \text{pss} \rangle \text{ b@ Y sS } \text{Y} \text{q} \text{S} \text{s} - \setminus \text{b}^{\wedge} \text{L} @ \text{L} \text{q} \text{C} \setminus \text{b} \text{S} \text{C} \text{q} \text{s}$ (all are truth-conditionally non-vacuous by default):

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the $\langle \text{pss} \rangle \text{ b@ Y sS. SYqfSCs} - \setminus \text{b}^{\wedge} \text{L @CLqCC} \setminus \text{b@S Cqf}$ (all are truth-conditionally non-vacuous by default):

- primary modality degree modifiers:

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

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the $\langle \text{pss} \rangle$ b@ Y sS YqfSs - \ $\text{b}^{\wedge}\text{L}$ @LqC \ b@S Cq (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 $\text{good}_{\text{DEG-INT}}$.

Only a properly linguistic approach can capture the $\langle \text{pss} \rangle$ b@ Y sS YqfSs - \ $\text{b}^{\wedge}\text{L}$ @LqCC \ b@S Cq (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 $\text{good}_{\text{DEG-INT}}$.

- facial expressions as degree modifiers:

(7) The movie was $\overline{\text{THUMBS-UP}}^{\text{OO}}$.

Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:

Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:

- more theoretical background for the super-linguistic approach

Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:

- more theoretical background for the super-linguistic approach
- phonetic/phonological properties of *?BKQy*

Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:

- more theoretical background for the super-linguistic approach
- phonetic/phonological properties of *?BKQ y*
- the role of iconicity

Come to my poster to talk about, a.o.:

- more theoretical background for the super-linguistic approach
- phonetic/phonological properties of ?*BKQ* ~~y~~
- the role of iconicity

—and to see more silly pictures of me.

- Ebert, Cornelia & Christian Ebert. 2014. Gestures, demonstratives, and the attributive/referential distinction. Talk given at *Semantics and Philosophy in Europe (SPE 7)*, Berlin.
- Esipova, Maria. 2019. *Composition and projection in speech and gesture*: New York University dissertation. <https://ling.auf.net/lingbuzz/004676>.
- Hunter, Julie. 2018. Relating gesture to speech: reflections on the role of conditional presuppositions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1–16. doi:10.1007/s10988-018-9244-0.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2018a. Gesture projection and cosuppositions. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 41(3). 295–365. doi:10.1007/s10988-017-9225-8.
- Schlenker, Philippe. 2018b. Iconic pragmatics. *Natural Language & Linguistic Theory* 36(3). 877–936. doi:10.1007/s11049-017-9392-x.