Supplemental Results

Experiment 1: ERPs to Gestures

600 to 900 ms: For the gesture experiment, an analysis assessing on-going ERP effects beyond the N400 time window revealed a main effect of Gesture Congruency, $F(1,15) = 13.6$, $p < .05$, but not Gesture Type, $F = 2.8$, n.s. This outcome was qualified by an interaction between Gesture Congruency and Gesture Type, $F(1,15) = 5.2$, $p < .05$. Follow-up ANOVAs conducted separately within static and dynamic gestures revealed that dynamic gestures did not yield reliable congruency effects from 600 to 900 ms post-onset, $F = 1.7$, n.s. By contrast, incongruent static gesture trials elicited reliably more negative ERPs than their congruent counterparts up to the end of the epoch, most prominently over anterior electrode sites (Gesture Congruency main effect: $F(1,15) = 26.0$, $p < .05$; Gesture Congruency × Electrode Site: $F(28,420) = 4.25$, $p < .01$, $\varepsilon = .12$).

Experiment 2: ERPs to Object Photos

600 to 900 ms: For the object photo experiment, an analysis of ERPs measured between 600 and 900 ms post-stimulus revealed on-going sensitivity to image relatedness (Target Type main effect, $F(1, 15) = 19.1$, $p < .05$; Target Type × Electrodes Interaction, $F(56, 840) = 3.7$, $p < .05$, $\varepsilon = .09$). Unrelated trials continued to elicit more negative ERPs than related ones primarily over anterior right hemisphere electrode sites. Unidentifiable trials, however, were no longer reliably distinguished from unrelated ones, $F's < 1$, n.s.

Notably, these outcomes differ from those described by McPherson and Holcomb (1999), who report that after 600 ms post-stimulus, reliable differences were detectable in the

case of unidentifiable and unrelated images, but not related and unrelated ones. One likely factor contributing to these discrepancies is the considerably longer duration of time for which targets remained on the computer monitor in the present experiment (2.3 seconds) relative to 400 ms in McPherson and Holcomb's study. Presumably, this longer duration engendered more extensive semantic processing of unrelated items, thereby increasing differences between unrelated and related trials, and concomitantly reducing differences between unrelated and unidentifiable ones. It is also noteworthy that in both McPherson and Holcomb (1999) and Holcomb and McPherson (1994), participants were required to overtly classify targets according to binary dimensions of either relatedness or recognizability, whereas participants in the present study were instructed simply to attend to all picture stimuli.