

March 1, 2018

Dear Nathan, dear Rick,

Thank you for your comments on our manuscript. We have now revised the manuscript and have uploaded the new version. In the remainder of this letter we provide details on how we have addressed the comments: Nathan's comments are in black and our responses are in blue.

Kind regards,

Judith, Judith and David

Nathan's comments (Page numbers refer to manuscript page numbers.)

p.1, abstract: "...entailment-canceling operator..."

I found this terminology awkward at first (to me it suggests the odd notion that the *role* of the operators in question is to cancel entailments). But it's clear enough and I can't think of a helpful alternative to suggest...

OK. We note that the term 'entailment-canceling operator' seems to be pretty widely used in the literature on projective content (and not just by our team). Similarly to, e.g., 'downward entailing operator', we take the expression to merely capture a property of these expressions, not a role.

p.1, abstract: "It has long been observed that projective content varies in how projective it is (e.g., Karttunen 1971; Simons 2001; Abusch 2010)"

maybe unpack this -- in particular to explain what gradability/variability in projectiveness is, if it's possible to do so very briefly, in order to make the abstract maximally accessible.

The quoted passage reminds the reader of a property of projective content that is well-established, as shown by the literature we are citing. Readers who are unfamiliar with what these and other authors have claimed are introduced to these claims on p.2, in the context of examples (3) and (4). Our interpretation of how variable projectivity is to be understood is found on p.4.

p.2: examples seem to be reversed -- 3a is discover, 3b regret.

Thank you very much for catching this! Fixed.

p.2: "Karttunen (1971) pointed out that the content of the complement of *regret* in (3a) is more projective than the content of the complement of *discover* in (3b)"

(By the way, is it really clear out of the blue that there's any difference? To my ear, both imply the complement. If so maybe say instead, "Karttunen claimed..."?)

We have not collected judgments on the projectivity of the content of the clausal complement of *regret*, but our experiment 1a shows that the content of the clausal complement of *discover* is less projective than that of the emotive predicate *be annoyed*. This finding seems to confirm Karttunen's intuitions. To clarify that that what is reported here are Karttunen's intuitions, we have changed *pointed out* to *suggested*.

p.10: “Figure 1: A sample (at-issueness) trial in Exp. 1”

It might be helpful for the reader if a 'certain that' trial could be folded into this figure, too.

Thank you for this suggestion. We have updated the figure caption as follows: “A sample at-issueness trial in Exp. 1. In the corresponding projectivity trial, participants were asked ‘Is Michelle certain that Martha has a new BMW?’”.

p.32: “Since the default is not overridden in the utterances in our experiments...”

To play devil's advocate, do we actually know that? In the relevant cases, might participants be inferring that the relevant projective meanings are not (to be) considered part of the common ground? I guess the same applies to the discussion of Gazdar above.

The theories we engage with here have posited that the default (global accommodation) is overridden to avoid contradiction, un informativity or problems with binding. Global accommodation of the content of the clausal complements of our experiment stimuli would not result in contradiction of that content with the context, in un informativity or in problems with binding. As a consequence, the theories we engage with here predict that the default is not overridden. We of course welcome other ways of accounting for our experimental findings, but it is difficult to engage with as-yet-unstated principles of local accommodation.

p.32: “. Abrusa’n (2016), however, did not apply this mechanism to *stop* and argued that the pre-state implication of *stop* “cannot be suspended that easily” (p.193). In our Exp. 1a, the pre-state implication of *stop* was significantly less projective than the content of the complement of the emotive ‘factive’ *be annoyed* and indistinguishable from the content of the complement of the cognitive change of state verb *discover*. In short, our findings about the pre-state implication of *stop* do not appear to be fully predicted by Abrusa’n’s analyses.”

I had trouble understanding the force of this claim. Is it her analysis at heart, or certain (ancillary) assumptions she makes about 'stop' which she may have made specifically to account for (what she took to be) the data. See previous highlighted sentence. It may be useful to clarify this (important) point.

We agree that this passage wasn’t very clear, in particular because the referent of “this mechanism” is misleading. We have changed the beginning of the passage as follows:

“Abrusa’n (2016), however, did not consider how focus, the discourse context or at-issueness could suspend the pre-state implication of *stop* because she assumed that the pre-state implication “cannot be suspended that easily” (p.193). Contrary to this assumption, the pre-state implication of *stop* was significantly less projective in our Exp. 1a than the content of the complement of the emotive ‘factive’ *be annoyed* and indistinguishable from the content of the complement of the cognitive change of state verb *discover*. “

p.33: “(22) f...”

consider removing this? similarly in (23)

Thank you for pointing out this out. We have removed it and changed the titles of (22) and (23) to include “Examples of...”.