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Our talk

- We briefly introduce our analysis method for information structure and discourse structure in corpus data, which provides rules for the pragmatic identification of QUDs;

- we provide a new QUD-based definition of non-at-issue material which facilitates its identification in corpus data;

- we discuss its relation to existing characterizations of non-at-issueness in the literature;

- we suggest an extension of the family of non-at-issue phenomena by new or rarely-discussed examples.
Our assumptions about discourse

- Discourse is hierarchically organized in the form of a **discourse tree** consisting of **elementary discourse units** (Hobbs 1985; Polanyi 1988; Mann and Thompson 1987; Asher and Lascarides 2003).

- Discourse structure is based on **QUDs** (or topics) (Carlson 1983; von Stutterheim and Klein 1989; Van Kuppevelt 1995; Roberts 2012; Büring 2003; Beaver and Clark 2008; Onea 2016).
  
  - For any assertion there is an implicit QUD that determines which of its parts are **focused** or **backgrounded**, and which ones are **unrelated** to the QUD.
  
  - A question node may stand in an **entailment relation** to its parent question but **need not** (contra Roberts 2012).
  
  - Questions may be **anaphorically dependent** on previous material (so called **feeders**), cf. Van Kuppevelt (1995); Onea (2016); Velleman and Beaver (2016); Riester (t.a.)
Our approach  *(Riester, Brunetti and De Kuthy, submitted)*

- Reconstruct the QUDs of a text on the basis of **explicit pragmatic constraints**.
- Compact tree representation (**QUD trees**, Riester t.a.):
  - Non-terminal nodes are current QUDs at their respective position.
  - Terminal elements are the assertions of the text, and represent an answer to their QUD.
QUD principles

**Q-A-Congruence**

*QUDs must be answerable by the assertion(s) that they immediately dominate.*

**Q-Givenness**

*Implicit QUDs can only consist of given (or highly salient) material.*

derived from Schwarzschild (1999)

**Maximize Q-Anaphoricity**

*Implicit QUDs should contain as much given material as possible.*

derived from Schwarzschild (1999); Büring (2008)

**Parallelism**

*The background of a QUD with two or more parallel answers consists of the (semantically) common material of the answers, potentially violating Q-Givenness.*
Linking QUDs and information structure

- **Focus (F):** that part of an assertion that answers the current QUD (obligatory)
- **Background:** the part of an assertion which is already mentioned in the current QUD (optional)
- **Focus domain (∼):** combination of focus and background
- **(Aboutness) Topic (T):** referential entity in the background
- **Non-at-issue (nai) material:** to be defined!

(1) \(Q_8: \) {What did these people tell the reporter they wanted to do?}
> A8’: [[These individuals]_T \([- \text{and these are acting government officials}]_nai \[- \text{they}]_T \text{ said [they]}_T \text{ would be happy, they would love [to put a bullet in my head]}_F \]_∼
Contrastive topic (CT) *(Büring 2003)*

- The instantiation of a **variable within the background**, which signals the existence of a superquestion-subquestion structure.
  - CTs are backgrounded w.r.t. the subquestion and focal with respect to the superquestion.

(2) $A_0$: In many countries, as in America too the agencies like the NSA are not allowed to spy within their own borders on their own people.

$Q_1$: {*Who can spy on whom?*}
  - $Q_{1.1}$: {*Who can the Brits spy on?*}
    - $A_{1.1}$: So $[[\text{the Brits}]_{CT}$, for example, $[\text{they}]_{T}$ can spy on $[\text{everybody but the Brits}]_{F}$~
    - $Q_{1.2}$: {*Who can the NSA spy on?*}
    - $A_{1.2}$: but $[[\text{the NSA}]_{CT}$ can conduct surveillance $[\text{in England}]_{F}$~
An example (section from annotated text)

> > > > Q7: \{How was grandpa’s health during his last years?\}
> > > > A7: and all I can say is that [hisT condition was [extremely bad]F during his last years]~.
> > > > Q7.1: \{How bad was his condition?\}
> > > > A7.1: [[He]T literally suffocated]F.~
> > > Q4.1.2: \{What about occupational safety nowadays?\}
> > > Q4.1.2.1: The number of what has massively decreased due to occupational safety measures?
> > > > A4.1.2.1: and [it is [due to the numerous measures in the past 40 years called occupational safety measures and workplace regulations]T – that’s indeed how they are called – that, Thank God, the numbers of [casualties]F]~
> > > > A4.1.2.1": [[injuries]F]~
> > > > A4.1.2.1": and [[accidents]F has decreased massively]F.~

A4: And, therefore, [[these safety measures and the workplace regulation bill]T are [something very valuable]F]~.

Q8: \{What is Nahles’s reaction to different attitudes regarding the bill?\}
> Q8.1: \{What does she do if someone is upset about minor issues?\}
> > A8.1: [If someone is [upset because of some lockers]CT, oh well, then I would be [the last person unwilling to discuss a compromise]F.]~
Corresponding QUD tree

Guidelines:
http://www.ims.uni-stuttgart.de/institut/mitarbeiter/arndt/

Annotated so far:
- French radio conversation (45 min.)
- Parisian French interview (47 min.)
- German radio interviews (10 x 10 min.)
- (English) Interview with E. Snowden (various sections)
- Conversation in Sumbawa (Austronesian) (20 min.)
Identifying non-at-issue material

**NON-AT-ISSUE EXPRESSION**

An expression X whose denotation is discourse-new and which is embedded in an assertion A is **non-at-issue** with respect to the current QUD Q iff **X is optional with respect to Q,**

- where optional means that under deletion of X, A is still an answer to Q.
NAI material vs. NAI content

- Note that we make no claims about abstract propositions (e.g. potential projective content), here.

- We claim that optionality is a **sufficient** condition for detecting triggers of non-at-issue **content**, but not a **necessary** one.

- Presumably, all of our examples represent triggers of **conventional implicatures**, (or "class B" contents, Tonhauser et al. 2013).
  - Contents categorized as **presuppositions** (alternative presupposition of *too*, pre-state of *stop* etc.) are not linguistically realized within the current assertion, and their triggers often overlap with either focus or background.
Identifying non-at-issue material

Given our definition, the following expressions tend to be classified as non-at-issue material:

- **Appositions, non-restrictive relative clauses, parentheticals, speaker-oriented expressions**
  - "(...) the constructions are united in contributing discourse-new, speaker-oriented entailments – CIs." (Potts 2003, 12)

- **Expressions describing the speaker’s source of and confidence in the truth of the main proposition (evidentials)**
  - cf. Simons’s (2007) analysis of evidentials as not the main point of the utterance, where the main point is seen as an answer to a question.

- **Temporal, spatial, manner, concessive, conditional, etc. adjunct phrases and clauses.**
Non-at-issue material: Evidentials

(3) $Q_{13}$: Vous aviez quel âge?

‘How old were you?’

$A_{13}$: $[[j']_T [\text{devais}]_{nai} \ \text{avoir} \ [\text{dans les six ans}]}_F \sim [j'\text{pense}]_{nai}$

‘$[[l]_T [\text{must}]_{nai} \ \text{have been} \ [\text{about six}]}_F \sim [l \text{think}]_{nai}$’
Non-at-issue material: Speaker-oriented expressions

(4) \( Q_5: \) \{What has changed because of the measures?\}

> \( A_5: \) [[dadurch]\(_T\) sind [Gott sei Dank]\(_nai\) [die Anzahl der Toten massiv zurückgegangen]\(_F\).]\( \sim \)

‘[Because of [that]\(_T\) – [Thank God]\(_nai\) – [the number of casualties has massively decreased.]\(_F\).]\( \sim \)’
Non-at-issue material: Parentheticals

(5) Q₈: {What did these people tell the reporter that they wanted to do?}
> A₈: [[These individuals]ₜ — [and these are acting government officials]ₙₐᵢ — [they]ₜ said [they]ₜ would be happy, they would love [to put a bullet in my head]ₖ]~
Non-at-issue material: Adverbial adjuncts

(6) $Q_{60}: \{What \, does \, the \, speaker \, appreciate \, about \, the \, chancellor?\}$

$A_{60}: [[Ich]_T \, begrüße, \, dass \, [sie]_T \, [zusammen \, mit \, Frankreich]_{nai} \, [eine \, europäische \, Initiative \, ergriffen \, hat, \, das \, Abkommen \, von \, Minsk \, mit \, neuem \, Leben \, zu \, füllen.]_F \}$

‘[[I]_T \, appreciate \, that \, [she]_T \, [has \, taken, \, [together \, with \, France]_{nai} , \, a \, European \, initiative \, to \, fill \, the \, Minsk \, II \, deal \, with \, new \, life]_F . \}’

(7) $Q_{20}: \{What \, did \, the \, political \, class \, do?\}$

$A_{20}: [[\text{Instead \, of \, circling \, around \, the \, public \, and \, protecting \, their \, rights}]_{nai} \, [[\text{the \, political \, class}]_T \, [circled \, around \, the \, security \, state]}_F \}$
NAI diagnostics: the case of appositives

- Appositives (like other triggers of CIs) do not exhibit a Strong Contextual Felicity Constraint (Tonhauser et al. 2013)
  - i.e., the context in which they are uttered need not (in fact: should not) entail their meaning.

- (The content of) an appositive projects, although it is not presuppositional (Chierchia and McConnell-Ginet 1990).
  - Appositives pass the Family-of-Sentences Diagnostic for Projection:

  \[(8)\]
  a. **NEG** My grandfather, who has a white beard, doesn’t live far away.
  b. **QUEST** Have you already asked your grandfather, who has a white beard?
  c. **COND** If my grandfather, who has a white beard, doesn’t work tomorrow, we’ll visit him.
  d. **MOD** It is possible that my grandfather, who has a white beard, will let you take his picture.

  (Tonhauser et al. 2013, 87)
Applying NAI diagnostics to adverbial adjuncts

(9) Q₅: \{What about these rallies?\}

> A₅: \[[Eine]_T \text{ musste } [\text{vergangenen Montag}]_{nai} \text{ sogar } [\text{abgesagt werden.}]_F \]

\('[\text{Last Monday,}]_{nai} \text{ [[one of them]}_T \text{ even } [\text{had to be cancelled}]}_F \)\text{.}’

Assertion: A rally had to be cancelled.
Adjunct content: The cancellation was on Monday.

(10) a. NEG It is not true that one, on Monday, had to be cancelled.

b. QUEST Did one, on Monday, have to be cancelled?

c. MOD Probably one, on Monday, had to be cancelled.

d. COND If one, on Monday, had to be cancelled, people will have stayed at home.

● The adjunct content seems to fail the tests.
● If the main event is negated or put into question, adjunct modifiers become pointless.
Applying NAI diagnostics to adjunct clauses

(11) Q₃: \{What is the debate on linguistic policy about?\}
> A₃: [[Bien que les règles statutaires définissent des langues officielles]ₙₐᵢ][[un monolinguisme de fait s’impose.]]ₘ₉

‘Although statutory rules define the official languages, monolingualism is in fact establishing itself.’

Assertion: Monolingualism is in fact establishing itself.
Adjunct content: Statutory rules define the official languages.

(12)

a. NEG It is not true that, although statutory rules define the official languages, monolingualism is in fact establishing itself.

b. QUEST Is monolingualism, although statutory rules define the official languages, in fact establishing itself?

c. MOD Probably, although statutory rules define the official languages, monolingualism is in fact establishing itself.

d. COND If, although statutory rules define the official languages, monolingualism is in fact establishing itself, then we don’t need interpreters anymore.

● In this case, the content of the adjunct clause projects (but only because it is independent of the main point).
Adjuncts and projection

- It seems difficult to maintain that adjuncts are generally projective.

- The more an adjunct depends on the event or state being negated or questioned, the more difficult it is to apply projection tests.

- It is legitimate to question whether projection tests are a useful criterion for (non-)at-issueness, in these cases.

→ We therefore argue in favor of a definition of non-at-issueness relative to the QUD.
Adjuncts are part-time non-at-issue triggers

- Focussed adjuncts are very at-issue.

(13)  $Q_{51}$: \{Where do we need hospice facilities?\}


‘[[We]$_T$ need [these facilities]$_T$ [in every corner of our country]$_F$.]’

- Backgrounded adjunct:


‘it to us took two years’

$Q_{33}$: \{What happened to you during these two years?\}

> $A_{33}$: [en deux ans on [nous]$_T$ [avait fait d’autres propositions]$_F$]

‘in two years we received other offers’
Non-at-issue material becoming at-issue

• Contrastive Topic

(15) A₁₅: I: [The greatest fear I have", [and I quote you]ₙₐᵢ, ["regarding the disclosures]ₙₐᵢ is [nothing will change.]ₕ ]~
Q₁₆: {What about the risk that nothing will change?}
> Q₁₆.₁: {What was that risk, at the time you said that?}
> > A₁₆.₁: [[That]ₜ was [one of your greatest concerns]ₕ [at the time]ₜ ]
> Q₁₆.₂: {What about this risk in the meantime?}
> > A₁₆.₂: but [in the meantime]ₜ [there is a vivid discussion about the situation with the NSA]ₕ ]~
NAI material in discourse structure

NAI material introduces a subquestion that is anaphorically dependent on some part (background or focus) of the at-issue assertion.

(16) Q₈:  {What did these people tell the reporter that they wanted to do?}
> A₈:  [[These individuals]ₜ – [and these are acting government officials]ₙₐᵢ – [they]ₜ said [they]ₜ would be happy, they would love [to put a bullet in my head]ₕ]~

(17) Q₈:  {What did these people tell the reporter that they wanted to do?}
> A₈:  [[These individuals,]ₜ [they]ₜ said [they]ₜ would be happy, they would love [to put a bullet in my head]ₕ]~
> Q₉:  {Who are these people?}
> > A₉:  and [[these]ₜ are [acting government officials]ₕ]~
Conclusion

- We presented a combined analysis method of discourse and information structure in naturally occurring data,
  - using QUDs as a hinge between the two.

- The formulation of QUDs is guided by pragmatic principles (Q-A-Congruence, Q-Givenness, Maximize-Q-Anaphoricity, Parallelism).

- QUDs define the information structure.

- Also, non-at-issue material (CI triggers) is defined relative to the QUD.

- Under this definition, adjuncts can be at-issue or non-at-issue.
Questions?
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An example annotation

Q1: *What was Snowden’s role in the debate?*
   > A1’: I: [[You]\_\text{T} [started] \_\text{F} [this debate] \_\text{T},]~
   > A1”: [[Edward Snowden]\_\text{T} is [in the meantime] \text{nai} [a household name for the whistleblower in the age of the internet] \_\text{F}.]~

Q2: *What did Snowden do until last summer?*
   > A2’: [[You]\_\text{T} [were working] \_\text{F} [until last summer] \_\text{T} [for the NSA] \_\text{F} ]~
   > A2”: and [[during this time]\_\text{T} [you] \_\text{T} [secretly] \text{nai} [collected thousands of confidential documents] \_\text{F}]~.

> Q3: What was the decisive moment {?}
> Q4: or was there a long period of time or something happening, {?}
> Q5: why did you do this?

> > Q5.1: *What was the decisive moment for collecting thousands of confidential documents?*
> > A5.1: [I would say] \text{nai} [sort of [the breaking point] \_\text{T} is [seeing the Director of National Intelligence, [James Clapper,] \text{nai} directly lie under oath to Congress] \_\text{F}]~.
An example annotation

> > > **Q6:** \{ *What about the intelligence community after this?* \}
> > > > **A6:** \[ [There’s no saving]_F \] [an intelligence community that believes it can lie to the public and the legislators]_T \]

> > > > **Q7:** \{ *What should the legislators be able to do with the intelligence community?* \}
> > > > > **A7’:** \[ [[who] need to be able to [trust]_F [it]_T ] \]
> > > > > **A7”:** and \[ [[regulate]_F [its]_T [actions]_F ] \]

> > > **Q8:** \{ *How did the experience effect Snowden?* \}
> > > > **A8:** \[ [[Seeing that]_T really meant for [me]_T [there was no going back]_F .] \]

> > > **Q5.1.1:** \{ *The decisive moment for collecting thousands of confidential documents was the realization that WHO was going to do this?* \}
> > > > **A5.1.1:** Beyond that, \[ [[it]_T was the creeping realisation that [no one else]_F was going to do [this]_T .] \]

> **A5:** \[ [[The public had a right to know]_F about [these programs]_T .] \]
An example annotation

> Q9: {The public had a right to know that which the government is doing in WHAT relation to the public?}
> > A9’: [[The public]$_T$ had a right to know that which the government is doing [in]$_F$ [its]$_T$ [name]$_F$],
> > A9”: and [that which the government is doing [against]$_F$ the public],

> > Q10: {What permission did we have to do what with which of these things?}
> > > Q10.1: {What permission did we have to do what with neither of these things?}
> > > > A10.1’: but [[neither]$_{CT}$ of [these things]$_T$ [we]$_T$ were allowed [to discuss]$_F$],
> > > > A10.1”: [[we]$_T$ were allowed [to know]$_F$],

> > > Q11: {Who was prohibited of doing what with these programs?}
> > > Q11.1: {What were the elected representatives prohibited of doing with these programs?}
> > > > A11.1’: even [[the wider body of our elected representatives]$_{CT}$ were prohibited from [knowing]$_F$],
> > > > A11.1”: or [[discussing]$_F$ [these programs]$_T$],

> > > > Q12: {What about these prohibitions?}
> > > > > A12: and [[that's]$_T$ [a dangerous thing]$_F$].
An example QUD tree
Beaver et al. (2017) on at-isueness

Definition (At-issueness:)
A proposition expressed by a constituent is *at-issue if it contributes to the ordinary semantics of the clause in which it is located* (i.e. it has Obligatory Local Effect), and *entails that some possible answer to the QUD is false*; otherwise the proposition is *not at-issue*. 
Diagnoses

OLE test:

- Evidentials: not applicable
- Expressives: not applicable/ NO???
- Appositions: NO???
  - I believe that the director, James Clapper, lied to Congress
- Parentheticals: OK
  - I believe that these individuals - and these are government officials - want to murder me.
- Other adjunct types: OK???
  - What did Mary’s grandfather do?
  - Mary thinks that her grandfather, at the time, worked in the mines.
  - Mary thinks that her grandfather, in 1954, worked in the mines.
  - John believes that if you do it carefully, no one will never know
Diagnostics

Projection tests:

- Evidentials: Non applicable
- Expressives: OK
- Appositions: Ok
  - I believe that the director, James Clapper, lied to Congress
- Parentheticals: OK
  - I believe that these individuals - and these are government officials - want to murder me.
- Other adjunct types:
  - What
NAI diagnostics on adjuncts

(18) **Interrogative:** Est-ce que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les apprivoie?
Does the child, by his imitation game, make them his own?

**Negation:** Ce n’est pas vrai que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les apprivoie.
It’s not true that the child, by his imitation game, makes them his own.

**Epistemic modal:** Il est possible que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les apprivoie.
It is possible that the child, by his imitation game, makes them his own.

**OLE:** Je crois que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les apprivoie.
I believe that the child, by his imitation game, makes them his own.
NAI diagnostics on adjuncts

(19)  > > Q_{14}: What needs to be done, given that the child makes signs at an early age?
       > > > A_{14}: [[il suffit juste de]_{nai} [lui]_{T} [en]_{T} [montrer d’autres]_{F}]~
       ‘it is sufficient to show him more’
       > > > Q_{15}: For the child to do what with such other signs?
       > > > > A_{15'}: [pour que [par son jeu d’imitation]_{nai} [il]_{T} [se les approprie]_{F}]~
       ‘so that by his imitation game he makes them his own’

(20) Interrogative: Est-ce que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les approprie?
     Does the child, by his imitation game, make them his own?
     Negation: Ce n’est pas vrai que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les approprie.
            It’s not true that the child, by his imitation game, makes them his own.
     Epistemic modal: Il est possible que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les approprie.
            It is possible that the child, by his imitation game, makes them his own.
     OLE: Je crois que l’enfant, par son jeu d’imitation, se les approprie.
            I believe that the child, by his imitation game, makes them his own
NAI diagnostics on adjuncts

(21) \( > Q_3^{22} \): et vous avez euh vous êtes restés longtemps sur la liste d’attente ou... pour toi ça a été rapide pas rapide à ton avis ça

‘and you stayed a long time in the waiting list or... for you was that fast or not fast, in your opinion’

\( > A^{32}_3 \): [euh bah [j’pense que] \( nai \) [par rapport à beaucoup d’gens] \( nai \) [[ça] \( T \) [a été un peu rapide] \( F \) ~

‘well I think that compared to many people that has been rather fast’

(22) **Epistemic modal**: Il est possible que, par rapport à beaucoup de gens, ça a été rapide.

‘It is possible that, compared to many people, it’s been fast.’

**Interrogative**: Est-ce que, par rapport à beaucoup de gens, ça a été rapide?

‘Was it fast, compared to many people?’

**Negation**: Ça n’a pas, par rapport à beaucoup de gens, été rapide.

‘It was not fast, compared to many people.’

**OLE**: Je pense que, par rapport à beaucoup de gens, ça a été un peu rapide.

‘I think that, compared to many people, that has been rather fast’
NAI diagnostics on evidentials

(23) \[ \text{Q}_{13} : \{ \text{What happened to you instead?} \} \]
> \[ \text{A}_{13} : \text{But } [\text{fortunately}]_{nai} [[\text{you}]]_{T} [\text{are still alive with us}]_{F} \]

(24) \[ \text{OLE: } \text{non appl.} : \text{??John believes that fortunately you are still alive with us.} \]
\[ \text{Interrogative: } \text{non appl.} : \text{??Is Snowden fortunately still alive with us?} \]
\[ \text{Epistemic modal: } \text{non appl.} : \text{??It is possible that Snowden is fortunately still alive with us.} \]
\[ \text{Negation: } \text{But he is not fortunately still alive with us} \]
NAI material as an answer to a sub-question

NAI material introduces a sub-question that is anaphorically dependent on some part (background or focus) of the at-issue assertion.

(25) Q₂: {What did Snowden do until last summer?}
   > A₂': [[You]ₜ [were working]ₕ [until last summer]ₜ [for the NSA]ₕ]~
   > A₂'': and [[during this time]ₜ [you]ₜ [secretly]ₙₜ [collected thousands of

(26) Q₂: What did Snowden do until last summer?
   > Q₂ₐ: How did he do it?
NAI material as an answer to an *explicit* sub-question

(27) \(Q_8:\) \{*What did these people tell the reporter that they wanted to do with Snowden?*\}

\(A_8:\) \[[\text{These individuals}]_T \text{ – [and these are acting government officials]}_{\text{nai}} \text{ – [they]}_T \text{ said [they]}_T \text{ would be happy, they would love [to put a bullet in]}_F \text{ my [head]}_F \text{ ]},\)

\(A_8^\prime:\) \[[\text{to poison}]_F \text{ [me]}_T \text{ ] } \sim \text{ [as I was returning from the grocery store]}_{\text{nai}}\)

\(A_8^\prime\prime:\) \[[\text{have}]_F \text{ [me]}_T \text{ [die]}_F \text{ ] } \sim \text{ [in the shower]}_{\text{nai}}\)

(28) \(A_8^\prime\prime:\) \[[\text{to poison}]_F \text{ [me]}_T \text{ ] } \sim \)

\(Q_9:\) \{*When would they want to poison Snowden?*\}

\(A_9:\) \[[\text{as [I]}_T \text{ [was returning from the grocery store]}_F \text{ ] } \sim\)

\(A_8^\prime\prime:\) \[[\text{have}]_F \text{ [me]}_T \text{ [die]}_F \text{ ] } \sim\)

\(Q_{10}:\) \{*Where would they have him die?*\}

\(A_{10}:\) \[[\text{in the shower}]_F \text{ ] } \sim\)
Adjuncts as part-time NAI triggers

(29) \( Q_2: \) \{What did Snowden do until last summer?\}

> \( A_2': \) [[You] \( T \) [were working] \( F \) [until last summer] \( T \) [for the NSA] \( F \)]~

> \( A_2'': \) and [[during this time] \( T \) [you] \( T \) [secretly] \( nai \) [collected thousands of confidential documents] \( F \)]~.

(30) > \( Q_{32}: \) et vous avez euh vous êtes restés longtemps sur la liste

and you stayed a long time in the waiting list or...

d’attente ou... pour toi ça a été rapide pas rapide à ton avis ça

for you was that fast or not fast, in your opinion

> > \( A_{32}: \) [euh bah [j’pense que] \( nai \) [par rapport à beaucoup d’gens] \( nai \]

well I think that compared to many people

[[ça] \( T \) [a été un peu rapide] \( F \) ~

that has been rather fast