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An important component of understanding the meaning of a speaker’s utterance is identifying how the utterance was intended to contribute to the current topic of the discourse, i.e., identifying which utterance content is at-issue and which is not. Researchers employ a variety of diagnostics to distinguish at-issue and not-at-issue content, including versions of diagnostics that ask participants to choose or interpret assent/dissent responses, as in (1a), to judge what is being asked in a question like (1b), or to judge the acceptability of utterances like those in (1c); see, e.g., Amaral et al. 2007, Jayez 2009, Xue & Onea 2011, Tonhauser 2012, Destrue et al. 2015 and Syrett & Koev 2015.

(1)  a. A: Waldo stopped wearing a red and white striped shirt.
    B: Yes, that’s true. / No, that’s not true.
    b. Has Waldo stopped wearing a red and white striped shirt?
    c. Waldo stopped wearing a red and white striped shirt because {he was being made fun of / #loved the pattern}.

How is (not-)at-issue content formally characterized so that these diverse diagnostics can be taken to distinguish at-issue from not-at-issue content? In this talk, this question is addressed based on a formal characterization of at-issue content as ordinary semantic content that is relevant to the Question Under Discussion, as proposed in Beaver et al. 2017.