**Effect of the prior**

Comprehenders consider **non-literal interpretations**
- Evidence from **garden-paths**: readers retain initial misinterpretations (Christianson et al., 2001)
- Also in **non-garden paths** (Ferreira, 2003)
- **Key finding**: the tendency to adopt non-literal interpretations is affected by **semantic plausibility** and **syntactic canonicality**

![Table]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>From the floor</th>
<th>From the table</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Did something fall to the floor?</td>
<td>No (literal interpretation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The package fell from the floor to the table.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Assumptions**
- **Read Sentence**
- **Infer Intention**
- **Did something fall to the floor?**

**Predictions**
1. Effect of the prior: % of noise inferences should be inversely related to plausibility and canonicality
2. # of string edits: noise operations with fewer string edits should permit more noise inferences
3. Exchange errors: % of noise inference should be higher for exchanges than active/passive constructions

**Discussion**
- Listeners consider exchange errors:

  The package fell from the floor to the table.

**Comprehenders’ noise model is structure-sensitive**

**Open questions:**
- Noise model vs. speaker model: are listeners’ inferences attuned to error frequencies? (cf. spoonerisms; e.g. Dell et al., 2000)
- Exchange what?

**Non-literal questions?**

- From the floor (Source) to the floor. (Goal)
- From the floor (Goal) to the table (Source)

**Fake data!**

**Noise Inference**

- **Gibson** et al. (2013): Noisy-channel approach

\[
p(S_1 | S_0) \propto p(S_0 | S_1) p(S_1)
\]

**Research Question**

As listeners generate alternatives, do they consider exchange errors?

**Methods**
- 2x2 design: plausibility x canonicality (estimated in separate norming studies)
- Dependent measure: % of literally correct answers

**Replication**

**Novel**
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