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Text

pg. 56, 22): Somehow it should be indicated that the left column contains pronouns and the right contains anaphors.

pg. 63, GPS5: Adjectives/Adverbs → Adjectives, Adverbs

pg. 77, example 23a. The AdvP above yellow should be an AdjP [IC]

pg. 98, last line: (74a) → (71a)
(74b) → (71b) [IC]

pg. 99, 2nd line below examples (72): (74a) → (72a)
(74b) → (72b) [IC]

pg. 99, *(74b): doesn’t make the intended point since “Very blue went to the store” is already ungrammatical without attempting coordination

also, the generalization apparently fails in some pretty simple cases, e.g. *He prepared dinner [carefully] and [with passion].

pg. 102, (84c) should read Panti-ri ni ka ngarrka-ngku wawarri. [IC]

pg. 110, GPS9: insert comma in “(that is, constituency tests)”

pg. 158, GPS2 instructions: nouns → NPs; noun → NP

pg. 158, GPS2, a)/b): The students have no idea what structure to draw for didn’t

pg. 158, GPS3: noun → NP

pg. 158, GPS4: “c-commanded by its binder (antecedent), and…condition principle that is…” (a binder by definition c-commands the coindexed element)

pg. 161, Challenge Problem Set 5: add the two sentences below to the example in d). (What’s given looks compatible with Principle B.)

d)  ii. John ye-mo eʔi.
   John 3SG(=him)-mother saw
   “John; saw his, *i; mother.”

   iii. *ye-zha shèeti.
   3SG(=him)-son ate
   “His son ate.”
pg. 171: Why not use uncontroversial adverbs rather than *bright* and *dull*, which could easily be Adj in an Adj-Adj compound.

pg. 171, (31): clowns → circus performers

pg. 175, 67): this cannot cover (66a), which has a nonphrasal spec (D). Same problem is repeated on pg. 184.


pg. 198, 1st para: “every head has at least an X, X’, and XP on top of it” is false in (142) because D does not project DP

pg. 199 (and many other places), (143b): parenthesizing ZP is unnecessary and would license vacuous X-bar recursion. Remove parentheses from all adjunct rules.

pg. 231: (11b) belongs in (12) since it uses the same verb as (12a), meaning change of possession. And 11c) also doesn’t seem to involve a Goal: in what metaphorical sense does an evil thought move towards Dave? Didn’t it originate inside his head?

pg. 233, 5th line from the bottom of the page: missing period (should be “in (19). The other …”) [IC]

pg. 234, middle of the page: insert capitalized word: “They take the output rules, and throw away any OUTPUTS that don’t mean …” [IC]

pg. 235, example numbers in text: [IC]

(22) → (24)
(23) → (25)
(24) → (26)

pg. 240, iii): “…under some definitions must be capable of volition”—for textbook purposes shouldn’t that be part of the definition? Is it really not true of all definitions of Agent?

pg. 240, xviii): “A lexical item is has an entry…”: (the whole entry could contain lots of stuff beyond the ‘head word’)

pg. 248, e’): *imf* → *IMF*

pg. 276, above 74): “negation selects for a bare verb” is falsified by examples like *I am not leaving*.

pg. 286, CPS7: “All of the partitive-taking quantifiers also take *DPs*” → NPs [IC]

pg. 296, tree in (14), under lower DP triangle insert “de pommes”

pg. 311, last two sentences: The null T morphemes have to select NegP to get sentences like *Otto is not eating*, as is shown in the gray box on the next page.
pg. 312, A) and B): The presence of O in these diagnostics means they cannot be used in intransitive sentences, e.g., the examples in GPS1 on the facing page; “O” should be parenthesized.

pg. 321 d),e): said → says (in gloss and translation)

pg. 325, 6c) delete “+FINITE”: the tree on the next page shows likely taking a nonfinite CP (where the same correction to the theta-grid is required).

pg. 348, GPS2, 1): since DP is head-initial and VP is head final, there is no setting that applies to the language as a whole.

pg. 351, GPS8: “(like c, d, and f)” → “(like d and f)”

pg. 351, fn.7: NP → DP

pg. 354, tree: Affix hopping is never treated as lowering in this book.

pg. 370, last paragraph: “…in the (b) examples, they are part of the VP” → “…in the (b) examples, they are part of the DP”

pgs. 503–4. All the examples in section 3.2.3 are misnumbered. [IC]

(22) → (26)
(23) → (27)
(24) → (28)
(25) → (29)
Workbook

Several pages have no page number (e.g., 29, 30, 31, 32, 64, 69…)

pg 17: Under WBE6 f), delete “…nor”—it is not a possible answer.

pg. 27: students should disregard the last tree—we do NOT want to say ‘old’ can become an adverb, and I don’t think it makes sense to predicate “very old” of the adjective banana

pg. 29, just below b): trashy novels → in the bath

pg. 35, tree 2): delete stray “NP”

pg. 46, WBE2 first sentence: “noun” → “NP”

pg. 49, WBE3: b) and e): himself → myself

pg. 50: WBE5, b) binding domain should include “that” if it’s supposed to be a CP, as in c), but in fact “CP” has not been introduced yet, so for students, fixes should be
b) CP → TP
   c) Binding domain: delete initial that
      Also, a typo:
      c) antecedent and Binding domain: Alicia → Trevor

pg. 55, WBE7 d): Ignore. [There is no possible tree structure for WBE4 d) given the phrase structure rules in Chapter 6; specifically, V’ → V’ NP is not permitted.]

pg. 56, WBE9 c): Ignore. [There is no possible tree structure for this sentence given the phrase structure rules in Chapter 6; specifically, V’ → V AdjP is not permitted.]

pg. 62, middle tree should be labeled “c)”.

pg. 63, WBE7c: under the second PP, there should be a P’ (not P) branching to P and NP

pg. 69, f) The PP from that …vendor is a complement according to the do-so test, so it should be under the same V’ as bought and NP; the higher V’ should be deleted.

pg. 69, WBE10 a): Mistake 1: “The PP is drawn in as a specifier (on the right). It should be daughter of N’ and sister to N’, which makes it an adjunct.”

pg. 83: you and she should be Ds, not Ns; lowest T head is misaligned

pg. 85, WBE3 Instructions: “table” → “house”

pg. 95: WBE4, Part 1 instructions: last sentence should read: “Assume that like the and a in English, un and une require [+count] nouns.” (The definites in both languages are compatible with mass nouns.)
pg. 96, WBE6: “sentences” → “clauses”

pg. 103, WBE12 e): according to the scheme in the text, $do_{aux}$ should be $do_{neg}$

pg. 110: fn2, 3: “Merriman” → “Merrifield”

pg. 112, trees (1) and (3): main verb forms do not match those in the question.

pg. 124: “seems” should be a V, not an Adj

pp. 134–5: *where* in f) and *why* in g) & h) (twice) should be either PPs or AdvPs—no such thing as AP in the text

pg. 137: *sinn* → *sibh*

pg. 162: Badness of b) in WBE3 & especially WBE5 is irrelevant since *able* never takes a *that*-CP to begin with

pg. 163: I don’t think the matrix subject should be originating in spec of *be*; the subscript on the PRO DP should be i, not m

pg. 166: in lower clause the AgrO’ node is missing its bar; Fiona-DP should have subscript m