Appositive relative clauses (ARCs) are typically claimed to express *not-at-issue* content, i.e. content that is perceived as secondary to the main point of the utterance (see Chierchia & McConnell-Ginet 2000, Potts 2005, a.o.). In this talk, I argue that ARCs are not conventionally specified as not-at-issue (contra AnderBois/Brasoveanu/Henderson 2010) but rather their discourse status depends on whether the context set update they propose is introduced before or after the context set update associated with the main clause. This claim is motivated by the observation that ARCs are not-at-issue only when they appear sentence-medially; when they occur sentence-finally, they can be at-issue (note the contrast in (1)-(2)).

(1) A: Edna, who is a fearless leader, started the descent.  
   B: # No, she isn’t. (She is a coward.)

(2) A: Jack invited Edna, who is a fearless leader.  
   B: No, she isn’t. (She is a coward.)

The account is fleshed out in an update semantics in which formulas can be interpreted *without* restricting the context set. Restricting the context set requires an instruction in the object language and is effected only if the hearer does not object to what has been said. The leading idea is that in (1) the appositive proposal is automatically accepted and only the main clause proposal is at-issue. In (2), the appositive proposal can be introduced either before or after the main proposal, thus allowing for the possibility that either proposal is at-issue.