

ISAT 1st edition

Suggested corrections, clarifications, etc.

Carson Schütze¹

June 2015

Location	Target	Correction/Suggestion/Comment/Query
CH 2		
p.10	(list of modals)	<i>must</i> is missing
	Modals (v or M)	v can only be puzzling at this point, and I don't think either of these labels is ever used for modals in a tree later
	Neg/Aff	Would be clearer to present these as two separate categories, showing which words belong to each. Might be better to omit <i>no</i> altogether, since it does not distribute like the other three.
	complementary distribution...either one of the words may occur but not both simultaneously	This contradicts the standard definition of complementary distribution (given on p.54), which says 'in an environment where X can occur, Y cannot, and vice versa', and which entails nothing about sequential occurrence of X and Y.
	list of Auxiliaries	the caveat "some instances of" should apply to all three verbs here
	Auxiliaries (V)	Using the same symbol as for verb seems to imply that V is both an open and a closed class category, which could be confusing.
	<i>That too is a word!</i>	<i>That is TOO a word!</i>
p.10, fn.1	p. 291	p. 262
p.19	that once that we	that once we
pp.21–23	(properties of affixes)	The claims would be clearer, especially for non-native speakers, if morpheme boundaries within stems were indicated when relevant, e.g. <i>suit-or-al</i> , <i>relat-ion-al</i> , <i>except-ion-al</i> , <i>may-or-al</i> (but what's the root?), <i>realiz-at-ion</i> , <i>rel-at-ion</i> (but what's the root?), <i>spec-(i)al-ize</i>
p.22	natur-al	Is it being suggested that <i>natur</i> contains <i>-or</i> ? If not, relevance unclear.
p.22	modern-ism	does not seem to contain one of the four listed affixes; is this meant to exemplify suffixation to a root?

¹ Vrinda Chidambaram shared a few suggestions and confirmed a few judgments.

	“select roots only in certain categories”	Is <i>librari</i> claimed to be a root?
	ditto	Are these category lists meant to be exhaustive? E.g., <i>colloquialism</i> appears to involve an Adj base that is probably complex
	instens-ify	intens-ify
p.23	robber-y	surely the root is <i>rob</i>
	resid-ence-y (usually a noun)	can this ever be an Adj? Why can't this be the N-forming -y?
p.24	(trees)	what happened to the <i>de</i> -?
p.25	following set of trees	no trees are evident
	mobiles, which can be flattened out on a page	surprising since flattening a mobile is precisely the metaphor Chomsky has used to describe what spell-out does to unordered structures from narrow syntax. (This is mentioned on p.132.) If the angles of attachment of the branches of the mobile are fixed and leaves go straight down, I think crossing lines cannot be created.
p.26	circumfixes consist of a string of morphemes, all in a sisterhood relation	confusing: parts of a circumfix are not adjacent on the surface, hence not a string; furthermore, if they are sisters then a circumfixed word would presumably have to have a ternary-branching structure, e.g. [[ge-][holf][-en]], which is claimed not to exist five lines below. This whole paragraph would be greatly helped by examples.
p.28	writer club address list	ungrammatical, must be <i>writers club address list</i>
	part supplier	intuition less clear due to phonology, but I think it's gotta be <i>parts supplier</i> , as given on next page
p.29	The head of a constituent...of the constituent	<i>constituent</i> seems not to have been introduced
	Tisch Lampe	would have to be spelled <i>Tischlampe</i>
	acts as a satellite	not clear how metaphor applies
	right-hand element determines the basic semantic properties of the compound	not obvious for <i>babysit</i> on previous page
p.30	it is difficult to determine their category	Unclear at this point why they <u>must</u> have a category: so far it has not been claimed that suffixes do (e.g. trees p. 24); that comes at the bottom of this page

	prefixes do not seem to change the category	Perhaps worth a footnote to acknowledge apparent exceptions, e.g. <i>en-rage</i> , <i>en-slave</i> , whose exceptionality is only hinted at when they are mentioned on p.37 (but comes back in Ch. 12)
	(list of <i>un-</i> words)	stem missing at end of line
	under-	Students may wonder whether <i>under</i> isn't a P forming a compound; <i>undercoat</i> is not a familiar word to me, but seems like it could have both structures (with different stress patterns), i.e. 'to put a coating under something' or 'to insufficiently coat something' (plus of course a noun reading, cf. <i>under-garment</i>). <i>under-go</i> and <i>under-expose</i> seem to involve different senses/structures.
p.31	- <i>er</i> is a noun	Some students are confused about how to reconcile this with the statement on p.11 that categories are defined by their distribution. For example, (this) <i>-er</i> demands a verb to its immediate left, but no free noun has such a requirement and many free nouns are incompatible with this environment; all free nouns are compatible with an A to their immediate left but this <i>-er</i> is not; etc. Heads have been defined as <u>determining</u> the category of the word, and this would still be true even if they did not <u>bear</u> that category, so it is not clear what forces this treatment.
p.32	As we have done before, we can combine these two representations into one	Superficially, this does not resemble the way representations have been combined up to this point.
p.34	prediction: no affixes that attach only to verb roots should be able...	This appears to contradict the claim on p.27 that affixes cannot look inside their sisters: e.g., to block <i>father-age</i> we need to see the whole structure [_V [_N father] e]: but <i>-age</i> should only see the V shell, not what's inside; <i>e</i> would not be its sister
	*father-ful	The proposed generalization does not explain the nonexistence of this word, given that <i>-ful</i> can attach to nouns (<i>effortful</i>); same problem for <i>father-al</i> , <i>father-y</i>
	we predict that such [zero-derived] verbs should not behave differently from non-converted verbs. And, indeed, they never do.	Directly contradicts the data at the top of the page, where zero-derived verbs do behave differently.
p.35	(meaning of <i>buttering</i>): the converse is not possible	Not so clear: in construction one speaks of "back-buttering a tile", which involves mortar or thinset, not butter; it seems to mean 'spread in the manner that butter is/can be spread'; arguably 'to butter' adverbializes the noun root

	if nouns were derived from verbs	Intended seems to be: “if <u>particular</u> nouns like <i>father</i> , <i>saddle</i> , <i>hammer</i> were derived from verbs” [so as not to imply that nouns can never be derived from verbs]
	[these] nouns should not be roots...we just saw	I cannot find examples showing <i>father</i> etc. taking root-selecting affixes, but see next comment
	root-selecting affixes	This term is confusingly ambiguous: does it mean affixes that CAN select roots or ones that MUST select (only) roots? The logic of the sentence seems to require the latter sense, but I could not find any discussion of an affix with that property.
	tree	the triangle notation has not been introduced, and isn't really needed until p. 65
p.36	recursion	the examples <i>re-re-do</i> and <i>denationalization...</i> could be misleadingly construed as showing that recursion necessarily involves multiple instances of the very same affix; an example like <i>nationalism</i> illustrates the more general case of [N ... [N
p.37	heads select for the category of the element they combine with	Does this apply to heads of compounds? E.g., <i>rain coat</i> vs. <i>overcoat</i> vs. <i>redcoat</i> ?
p.38	(1)(ii)	missing example
p.40, (6)	requires that W not to be non-adjacent	requires W to be non-adjacent
	(same question)	I cannot figure out what the intended answers are here. If c-selection need not be local, need there be any structural relation at all between the selector and selectee? If so, what? If not, possible answers for (a) would be <i>un-deny-ity-able</i> , <i>able-ity-deny-un</i> , <i>ity-deny-un-able</i> , <i>able-un-ity-deny</i> , ...
CH 3		
p.47	Constituent (definition)	Students are puzzled by this, since the meaning of “speakers can manipulate as a single chunk” is obscure: what counts as a manipulation? How could we tell when it involves more than one chunk?
	grouping all the words or morphemes ^ as daughters of a single mother node	suggest inserting “(and nothing else)”

p.50	<i>pit vs. bit</i>	In the context of trying to disentangle <i>pit[s]</i> vs. <i>rug[z]</i> , this minimal pair does <u>not</u> show that “initial consonant quality plays no role”; it would be perfectly compatible with the sonorant/obstruent property of the initial sound governing the allomorphy.
p.51	there are several constituents, namely <i>nation...</i>	but also <i>-al</i> , <i>-ize</i> , and <i>-ation</i>
p.52	in the second (ill-formed) tree, the non-constituent <i>nation+ize</i> cannot be realized as a continuous string.	This is potentially confusing: in the ill-formed diagram the intent is that <i>nation+ize</i> <u>would</u> be a continuous string: the problem is that this outcome could only be achieved by allowing crossing branches. The point is that in the <u>good</u> tree, <i>nation+ize</i> is not a continuous string.
	substitution should preserve truth values (across <u>contexts of evaluation</u> , that is, non-accidentally)	Without a nontrivial definition of the underlined expression, this seems blatantly false for (2): e.g. in a context where <i>on your desk</i> is not part of the linguistic or perceptual context, replacing it with <i>there</i> will not preserve the truth conditions, let alone the truth value.
p.53	T label on <i>will</i>	contradicts the category for <i>will</i> listed on p.10
	tree	contradicts claim (3e) that <i>your desk</i> is a constituent
	(4a)	<i>Bill</i> has not been shown to (and does not) intersubstitute with the other three expressions, so no evidence for this has yet been provided.
	three relevant nodes [2 nd last line]	there are only two
p.55	<i>on your desk, there, in the red coat</i> belong to the same category	This is surprising, since <i>there</i> cannot substitute for <i>in the red coat</i> in (10a,c), as noted on p.56; the apparent swappability rests on the lexical ambiguity of <i>in</i> ; in fact, <i>in the red coat</i> is not a constituent in the tree on p.53, so the fact that it has become one in the tree on p.55 does not follow from a substitution of PP for Z.
	(11a)	the attempted substitution blatantly cannot preserve truth value or conditions across contexts
	tree	fails to reflect conclusion on bottom p.53 that <i>coat</i> is an NP

p.56	the reasoning leading to it is not sound	It might be helpful to isolate which part of the reasoning was unsound. Since it was already stated on p.54 that swappability entails no conclusions, we presumably did not reason from that to anything. The error was apparently the statement “By the same reasoning” below ex. (10), since the prior reasoning involved two phrases being substitutable by the same single word, precisely what was not established for the two (alleged) PPs. In a sense, the reasoning relied on an empirical claim that had not been established, but wasn’t inherently unsound.
	(15) & (16)	Again, do not preserve truth value or conditions so it is unclear why they are being entertained.
p.57	ways in which substitution may fail as a constituency test...(17)	Since the test was defined on p.50 as replacing a <u>substring</u> , this is by definition not an instance of the substitution test. The subsequent discussion of general validity is therefore not motivated.
	a priori we would like to say no	It would help to clarify whether the definition on p.47 (“a string that speakers...”) assumed that strings are contiguous, in which case a priori we <u>must</u> say no, or whether we are now departing from that initial definition. On p.58, contiguity seems to be explicitly part of the definition.
	Quite generally then, if substitutability depends on a particular lexical item, we should be very cautious	Hard to interpret, given that there is generally only one lexical item that can perform the substitutions we have seen. Perhaps clarified by inserting “being substituted for” or “in the original sentence”
	substitution with <i>one</i> or <i>ones</i>	<i>ones</i> has not been illustrated; perhaps worth pointing out (e.g. on p.60) that it violates the desideratum from p.50 of monomorphemicity
	that is, have the same truth value	value → conditions
p.59, bottom	b, g	Students may wonder what the rules of the game are here, since the strings including the struck-through material are ungrammatical. Ditto (25a,b) on p.60.
p.60	as we have discussed earlier	Not clear which discussion is referred to.
	NP ellipsis examples	In what sense do these conform to the requirement on p.58 that the crossed out parts are necessarily understood?
p.61	Within <i>these, those</i> strings that could be replaced by <i>one</i> earlier	Within these, those strings that could be replaced by <i>ones</i> earlier
	the italicized sentence	(26a)

	(speakers who accept) it	(26b)
	(26)	for consistency, <i>car</i> → <i>coat</i> ; would also help if the VPs matched the tree below
	tree	Having established that <i>red carpets</i> is an NP, we could probably infer that <i>red coat</i> is too at this point.
	grey box	The fact that ellipsis and <i>do so</i> substitution can target the same string <u>in one particular sentence</u> does not license the conclusion that they operate on the same category. For instance, this example would be consistent with <i>do so</i> targeting V' and ellipsis targeting VP.
p.64	VP'	VP
p.65	(38b, c) and below	boy on → boy in
	Conj	on p.10 this category was “Coord”
p.66	2nd tree	missing label T above <i>will</i>
	There are three ways	I presume the intended third way is quinary branching (three conjuncts as sisters)? But that does not fit the schema at the top of the page.
	The underlined element ^ is	in the (b) examples
p.69	Constituency here just means “behave ... observing.”	Confusing, since the claim about topicalization above translates as the seemingly vacuous ‘Topicalization can only affect things that behave as a unit with respect to topicalization.’
	DP, PP, VP, NP	delete NP
p.70	this conclusion will be reached by other means	It might be helpful to forward-reference where this discussion can be found.
p.71	It BE be that AC	Not compatible with (59b, d), (60b): need to add <i>who</i> and <i>which</i> as alternatives to <i>that</i>
p.72	(as opposed to <i>who</i> , <i>where</i> , etc.)	While I can believe that (68b) is degraded for some speakers, I would be surprised if that extends to cases like <i>Where John lives is (in) Los Angeles</i> , i.e. a pure locational as opposed to destinational use.
	(69a)	Mary → John
	A(djectivals), P (APs)	Adjectival Phrases (APs)
	(73c)	Cannot be derived by the schema at the bottom of this page; suggest omitting this example, since (75b) illustrates after the required schema is introduced under i. on p.73

	inverted pseudocleft schema	worth explicitly stating the VP version: B BE what A DO C
p.75	(88)	use of <i>that</i> with human antecedent is degraded for many speakers
p.78	Movement summary	CP was illustrated for Topicalization and Pseudoclefting; there was no discussion of what category/ies Heavy Shift applies to
pp.79,80	trees	Why is <i>will</i> now labeled Modal when earlier in the chapter it was T?
p.81	(3) (1) (ii, iii)	There seems no reason not to keep using <i>Bill's bicycle</i>
p.82	(6) (iib)...examples in (iv)	examples in (4)
p.84–5	(7)	two instances of (viii), two instances of a and b in (4)
		“left and right daughter of ‘s’”: not sure what was intended
CH 4		
p.88	trees	T label missing over <i>will</i>
p.91	This is what we called complementary distribution	see note re: p.10
p.92, grey box	[C] determines the internal structure of the CP	It does not appear that this property has been illustrated, in fact all CPs we have seen to this point have the same internal structure, viz. [C TP].
p.93	This shows that <i>for</i> takes ...as its sister	antecedent of “this” is unclear: the coordination test in (33) tells us nothing about the relationship between preceding material and the conjoined constituents.
	...and forms a constituent	only (31) provides evidence for that
	...distribution of other CPs	(30)–(32) show its distribution is <u>consistent</u> with that of CPs, but they are equally consistent with the underlined string being a DP. Distinguishing these requires an environment like “John is excited {that.../for.../*DP}.
	the following tree for (30), similar to the tree for (9) that is displayed here	delete “that is displayed here” or precede with comma
	tree	T' labels are missing, though they appeared in the tree for (9)
p.94	(35b)	will [^] / [^] *to

p.96	complementizers care about...what the tense is	...what the type of tense (+ or -) is
	(47b,48b)	highly degraded, since winning is generally not a matter of choice
p.96, box	<i>hope</i> selects a -tense T	or a +tense T
	certain verbs do not care about the tense...	This can't be an argument against selection, since the same is true of certain complementizers, e.g. <i>whether</i> , as just noted.
p.97	V/C/T chart	Confusing, in that individual rows are not single lexical entries: <i>see</i> selects <i>that</i> , <i>that</i> selects +tense, but the point of the previous page was precisely that a V does not select properties of T. Further confusion: there appear to be two different lexical entries for <i>that</i> : "+tense" and "will +T". Particularly confusing since the second appears to be listed under <i>ask</i> , but for many speakers <i>ask</i> + <i>that</i> must be followed by a subjunctive and is concomitantly ungrammatical followed by <i>will</i> .
p.97	<i>whether</i> with +wh... because [it] begins with "wh"	This makes it sound like orthography justifies morphosyntactic features.
p.98	entry for <i>whether</i>	Why is +wh not listed here?
	"the head C does not...TPs"	Not clear what point is being made: even if no complementizer cared about +/-tense I think we would still be justified in calling its complement a TP.
p.98, grey box	Heads are word-level categories	Not clear in what sense this is an empirical claim: in ch.2 we saw cases of T, N, V that were bound morphemes. Are there any categories that cannot be syntactic heads? I.e. what is not included in the ellipsis points?
	(iv)	Not clear how to interpret this as stating more than (iii): in particular, it is not true that if X is the head of a constituent Y it cannot also be the head of some other constituent Z
p.101	(1) (vi)	Given the parenthesis, apparently the intended conclusion is that <i>to</i> is <u>not</u> a T?
p.102	(5) (1a)	Isn't [+tense] redundant with "select finite +tense TP complement"?
	(6) (2c)	go ^to^ Europe

CH 5		
p.107	“complements of V ...V.”	In ch.4 nothing was said about complements being required by the head, moreover “complement” was defined with respect to sisterhood, so it seems odd here to take complementhood as justification for sisterhood.
p.108	(8c)	This is a total * without parenthetical intonation.
p.109, top right box	(10), 3rd example & text below	This would be more helpful if it were more explicit, e.g., “The third version violates the expectation stated above, but since the second does not, the third is plausibly a case of Heavy NP shift (cf. §x.x). The ordering principle holds for examples that do not involve movement.”
p.109	(12c)	I cannot think of a situation describable by this sentence.
p.110	“The reader is invited...tests:”	This sets up the expectation that the semantic and syntactic notions of complement will align, but in most of these examples they do not.
	if X in an	if X is an
	“it is possible...an adjunct”	I think the implication goes in the opposite direction: If you can say “it was/took place X” then X is an adjunct. Even putting aside statives there seem to be lots of adjuncts that cannot occur in this construction, e.g. manner adverbials.
p.112	box	I find none of these cases convincing. “John ate his shoes” is simply a physical impossibility unless the shoes were made of bread, chocolate, etc.; in such a context, object omission is fine for me. “John knows” need not have an implicit proposition as complement, an embedded interrogative is also fine. “John asked” is compatible with asking for the check. On the other hand, “John told” is NOT compatible with a canonical object for <i>tell</i> like “a story” or “Mary”, regardless of context: it can only mean “John tattled.” And “criticize” is fine as an intransitive in a habitual context, while “need” is marginal at best, though it is not clear that the former implies more about its complement than the latter.
	“It is easy...only certain verbs or verb phrases...adjuncts.”	The examples do not illustrate this point; as the text notes, <u>any</u> agentive verb (phrase) can take an instrumental adjunct, this is <u>not</u> a property of individual verbs or verb phrases, unlike e.g. the difference between <i>put</i> and <i>place/position/etc.</i> with respect to obligatoriness of PP.
p.115	‘s selects a subject DP which must be in the genitive case	So the conclusion is that <i>Bill</i> by itself can be genitive?

p.115	when the NP complement of D is absent or elided	In what sense does this apply to (57)? What NP is missing/elided after <i>Bill's</i> ?
	(list of spell-outs)	should “[my] + ‘s” actually be [I] or [me] + ‘s?
	“first person [singular] genitive pronoun is irregular... [my]+’s”	But not only that one: strict composition would yield <i>hises, itses, whoses</i> . Also, since <i>my</i> itself is something plus ‘s, the last line on the page suggests an underlying structure <i>me + ‘s + ‘s</i> . I think what we want is <i>me + ‘s</i> → <i>my</i> / __ NP(pronounced) <i>mine</i> elsewhere
p.116	chart	genitive: <i>it</i> → <i>its</i>
p.117	N complements and NP adjuncts	clearer: “complements to N and adjuncts to NP”
p.118	box	Again, the implication seems to be the reverse: If one can say <i>it/he is X</i> then X is an adjunct (as hinted below).
p.119	(75)	Use of square brackets seems inconsistent: in b-e, h, i they identify the complement of P, but in f, g they do not.
p.120	the latter “c-selects” and the former “modifies”	exchange “latter” and “former”
pp.120–1	table	Students have been confused by the changes in notation between this table and the one on p.98.
p.122	tables	why is <i>of</i> optional for <i>student</i> but obligatory for <i>proud</i> ?
CH 6		
p.130	each morpheme is the head of itself	This doesn’t make (1d) “obviously true”, it makes it tautological. Surely the intent was for this to be a substantive claim?
p.132	Two level hypothesis	I do not see how this is consistent with adjunction structures like the one at the bottom of the page: why aren’t there three projections of X here?
p.133	(a, b, c, d)	I don’t think (c) can possibly convey the same information as (a, b, d): the latter all indicate <i>book</i> has no complement or specifier, but (c) could be part of a larger structure in which it does.
p.134	box	This is exceedingly confusing: I thought (b) and (c) were conventional abbreviations for the “real” structures (that’s what the main text next to the box says), such that HP <u>always</u> contains H'. If so, then applying the definitions to these abbreviated diagrams makes no sense, and there is nothing “at stake”.

p.135	where we make a claim about some books in general	delete “in general”
	(7)	If it were true that <i>dams</i> cannot be generic, the sentence should be completely synonymous with <i>Beavers build some dams</i> (which is quite odd), but intuitively it isn't. It seems to get a third, kind, reading.
	“must contain at least a (silent) NP, since Ds always select NPs.”	How did we establish that Ds always select NPs? (Fn. 4 on p.222 suggests that the issue is not settled.)
	[-T]	[-tense]
p.138	Table 6.1	I don't think “AdvP” or “DegP” have been introduced at this point, and students may wonder why their heads do not appear as columns of the chart.
p.139	Wh-movement	The “?” on answers c & d is a total “*” for me.
p.141	Possessor	missing underscore on 3rd <i>Susan</i>
p.143	entries for <i>prefer</i>	<i>prefer</i> does not take PP themes in general, only those with subjects; in general it takes DP themes, nowhere mentioned. Similarly, <i>consider</i> & <i>find</i> do not take APs in general. But since the presence of a subject is not a property of the head of these constituents, it should not be selectable-for, so the facts seem uncapturable.
	ditto	The changes in notation vis-à-vis p.122 are potentially confusing.
p.143, box	subjects are c-selected (or...subcategorized)	Directly contradicts grey box on p.121.
ditto	this information is in fact redundant: knowing what the verb is is sufficient to predict the category of its subject	How so? There are certainly verbs that can take either DP or CP as subject, and perhaps those are a semantically definable class, but if we don't lists these categories we have no place to note what theta roles they can bear.
p.144	entry for <i>send</i>	I think the intent was (PP[to]/DP) _{goal} but this would mean that arguments separated by a comma are <u>not</u> thereby assigned a linear order, leaving one to wonder where that information is encoded.
p.145	entries for <i>proud, sad</i>	This is now the fourth different notation for a PP headed by a particular preposition: we've seen “ <i>of</i> -PP”, “PP[<i>of</i>]”, “P(<i>of</i>)”, and now PP _{<i>of</i>} .
	2nd entry for <i>proud</i>	both arguments should be marked optional

	1st set of entries for C	Previous instances of these entries never looked like this: a column seems to have been added for the sole purpose of noting that it is redundant, but its meaning was never explained. Meanwhile, <i>whether</i> has lost its +wh feature again.
	(27)	This is not a minimal pair.
	Cs always take a TP complement...being a C	But where/how can this fact be encoded, if not in the lexical entries of particular Cs? Do we need lexical redundancy rules?
p.146	entries for T	-s is missing
	ditto	Isn't it also a property of all bound Ts that they (morphologically) select V, so by the same logic this should also be omitted? But again, where else could that information reside?
pp.146-7	fundamental requirement the Projection Principle	As stated it seems like a tautology: If something didn't need to be satisfied we wouldn't ascribe it as a property of a lexical item.
p.148	2 nd tree	Students ask what the difference is between "DP[nom]" here and DP _{nom} two pages back.
p.148	(33c)	Are we really saying adjuncts are selected? Previous discussion seemed to be leaning in the opposite direction, viz. they select for their modifiees.
p.152	Figure 6.2	I do not understand the contents of the bottom box: The first bracketed string seems to show a head combining with two complements to form an X-bar; the second seems to show a head + complement forming a complex head, to which D is added as a specifier, though it has no X-bar sister. Should the bracket label A in the second structure be A'?
CH 7		
p.161	def'n of C-command	This will entail that sisters do <u>not</u> c-command each other, since domination was not defined as reflexive on p.120. The text below makes that explicit ("...the relation between X and anything <u>under</u> a sister of X").
	2nd tree	content of Num is missing; ditto p.164. Students have been puzzled why Num appears here but not in any preceding trees.
p.167	(43a)	perfect for me
	(45b)	delete "boys"
p.171	there is at least one c-commanding antecedent DP.	delete "antecedent"

p.173	smallest XP containing a DP c-commanding the anaphor which has a subject	Ambiguous modifier attachments; clearer: “smallest XP that has a subject and contains a DP that c-commands the anaphor”
p.174	These strings are good if there is no coindexing.	Many students miss the consequence of this: (81–83) and (85) as written ARE violations of binding theory and should be starred. They just happen to be homophonous with grammatical sentences with some other indexing.
p.176	(97b)	The generality of this example is debatable. For one thing, there is a potential collective reading under which everyone has the same home town, where the judgment seems to improve. Moreover, the uniqueness of the town-mayor relation seems to matter—compare A teacher in every UCLA student’s hometown wrote to him. Variable binding seems fine here.
p.180, Dogrib	ex.	Wrong symbol in word for 3.ate.
	When it has an antecedent, it must be disjoint from it	in what sense could something disjoint in reference from a DP be its antecedent? (“antecedent” does not seem to be formally defined in the chapter)
CH 8		
p.192	tree on left	delete “?” from T
p.193	derived structure of T-to-V	This raises so many questions for the students, I wonder if it is worth it just to save the full generality of the RHHR. The resulting tree seems to violate X-bar theory (path from VP to its head includes something that isn’t a projection of X). It seems to violate the projection principle (V no longer takes its required DP sister, the lower two Ts no longer have their required VP sister). It seems to violate the theta criterion (DP’s sister has no role to assign to it). Much of what the students have learned to this point seems to be being thrown out the window.
	grey box	The two paragraphs seem to contradict each other. The first says “syntactic trees do show some kind of crossing lines” while the second says “neither of [the trees] has crossing lines”. The attempt to state what movement does in these terms fails unless one can figure out what “this kind of crossing” refers to. I think everything would be clearer if the box were eliminated and the transformation were described as “reordering” elements.
	(8d, 9d)	For me, deaccenting can <u>not</u> be preceded by a pause, except on an afterthought reading.

p.194	1 st line	“Confirm this with”: antecedent of “this” is obscure. The comment beneath (10), “the elided VP is shared”, is also obscure: the shared element appears not to be elided at all.
p.195	tree	This appears to violate statement k) on p.132 that adjuncts are phrasal constituents. I don’t see what harm it would do to just draw the NegP.
p.196	first line	“modal verbs” seems to contradict the fact that modals have been placed under T all along. It also seems to make the wrong prediction for (14), because there would be a VP headed by <i>will</i> that ellipsis could target.
	(15)–(17)	For most speakers at least one of the options is degraded.
	tree	delete “the”
p.197	final paragraph	It needs to be argued that modals have tensed <u>forms</u> , given that they take neither <i>-s</i> nor <i>-ed</i> . Stating that they require a +tense T will overgenerate, and requires positing a 3sg null T not heretofore motivated.
	last line	If modals are marked as requiring a [+tense] T sister, I don’t think that “ <u>As a result</u> they must always undergo V to T”: why couldn’t T lower to them? This property, as with auxiliaries, requires an independent explanation.
p.198	1 st paragraph	How does the presence of a single T per clause (not sentence) block the possibility of two modals: wouldn’t they both have a +tense T sister in the following structure: [[can _v][[will _v][+tense _T] _T] _T
p.199	“the auxiliary moves to this +q C: <u>this means</u> that...+q C is an affix”	From what principle does it follow that if A moves to B (A and B heads) B must be an affix? Isn’t that contradicted by T-to-V? Is there implicit intermediate reasoning that says ‘if A moves to B <u>one of them</u> must be an affix [which remains unmotivated], and <i>will</i> clearly isn’t an affix, so by process of elimination B must be the affix’?
p.200	top tree	Should there be struckthrough copies of <i>have</i> and <i>Pres</i> ? Why are we using <i>Pres</i> here when <i>have</i> was sister to <i>-s</i> 3 pages back?
	derivation	Step 5 shows an affix moving to another affix, even though <i>-ed</i> ’s need for a V sister and a host word is not satisfied by this movement, nor is +q C’s need for a host. Moreover, this creates a complex head [[-ed _T][+q _C] _C] which is mysteriously not present in the final tree.
	bottom tree	lower <i>-ed</i> should be struckthrough

p.201	1 st paragraph	This discussion seems to presuppose a system that has either look-ahead or filtering (crashing derivations), but neither is made explicit, so it reads as if invoking a deus ex machina.
	This type of head movement is prohibited quite generally.	Unclear what counts as “this type”: a head skipping over a trace/copy of itself? Better to be explicit: “head movement skipping over a head position.”
p.201	the indefinite or the generic silent Ds we saw...are only compatible with plural count nouns	One of them was described as the silent counterpart of <i>some</i> , which obviously is compatible with mass nouns; that seems to be true of the silent generic D as well (as is noted in the footnote on the subsequent page).
	bottom of pg. examples	delete square bracket preceding NUMBER in 1 st ; more generally I’m unclear on what “NUMBER” is meant to indicate here: the linear position of the Number head before lowering? Since the actual affix is shown already lowered (except for the “balloons” examples), maybe a struckthrough -s would be more transparent? Also, the example with “many” suggests that the sentence introducing the examples should be “ <u>Number-sensitive expressions</u> presumably enter...”
p.202	just above grey box	the sequence “Num N-PL” is again confusing: clearer would be [Num N-PL]
	grey box	(14) is not the intended example number
	ditto	stating that [-count] Num is [-plural] seems to contradict the previous page: “no number at all (i.e. mass nouns).”
	right below grey box	“using the function of the D to indicate a silent head” is confusing since D accompanies the nonsilent <i>the</i> and <i>each</i> . Why not use <i>e_{gen}</i> and <i>e_{indef}</i> ? Also, it would be clearer if all instances of Num were vertically aligned. And then in order not to confuse the features of the D with what it selects for, perhaps add value(s) for [def] for GEN and <i>each</i> ?
	number head entries	Why use privative features here when [±plural] was just introduced? Also, why is the silent singular not an affix: do we need to prevent it from undergoing Num-to-N for some reason? Also, why not stick with orthography for the plural, as was done for 3sg -s?
	tree	-s should be struckthrough in its base position
p.203	2 nd para	I think it would make life easier for instructors if, after what’s there, you chose one option (arbitrarily) and drew the tree for it, as a model for the students.
	(30)–(32)	The theory obviously predicts the possibility of “these ones”, so why not show it?

	Distribution of tensed...	“in T”: close paren should move to after <i>have</i> ; add <i>must</i> to list of modals
p.204	...may suggest that it is.	antecedents of ellipsis and <i>it</i> unclear
p.205	1 st paragraph	I don’t think students will even see what the puzzle is, unless you add “when the antecedent is in a different tense/aspect”.
	Alternatives A & B	As noted earlier, B violates X-bar theory, so I’m not sure why it is on the table, and why a NegP adjunct isn’t.
p.206	2 nd line	Has “remnant” been defined?
	below (34)	“this also holds... <i>be</i> ”. Unclear what property “this” refers to, but probably the claim is meant to be restricted to <u>finite</u> <i>have</i> and <i>be</i> ?
	next paragraph	“Under alternative B, no problem arises” seems to ignore the fact that not all VPs can have sentential negation as an adjunct, and which ones can does not depend on the head of the VP at all, so selection seems incapable of enforcing this.
p.207	<i>Time makes itself elapse</i>	This seems as impossible to me as the starred example, as does the third example.
	the embedded verb selects its subject (<i>itself</i>)	I don’t know what sense of “select” could be applicable here.
p.208	40–41	It seems odd to discuss this contrast in the context of weather <i>it</i> (having noted on the previous page that it is different from pleonastic <i>it</i>), when in fact the property is much more general: “Mary persuaded it...” will always be ungrammatical unless <i>it</i> refers to something animate. “Mary expected it...” is possible with all kinds of <i>it</i> . The same point would be made by “Mary expected/*persuaded the rock to hit Bill”, so the selectional properties of weather predicates are a red herring for the students.
	§8.4.3	remove asterisk from “they saw Bill”
	(43b)	should probably have either “?” or “%”: I’m not sure if people who don’t have <i>whom</i> in their lexicon still feel a strong contrast with (42b)
p.209	tree	strike through lower copy of <i>be</i>
p.210	below S3	“apart from the preposed object” → “apart from the absence of the preposed object”
	2 nd last line	delete “it” before asterisk
p.211	top tree	strike through lower <i>-ed</i>
	bottom tree	put +q on at least one of the DP copies?

p.214	tree (and ones on subsequent pages)	To make the instructor's life easier, please label the heads within complex heads, like <i>seem-s</i>
p.215	+finite T (twice)	→ +tense T
p.216	need not be stated in the lexical entry [for <i>-ed</i>]	But then where IS it stated? Likewise, re fn.3, where can properties of a feature value (+tense) be encoded?
p.216	box	“*It seems to time elapse...”: since VPISH still isn't introduced, the expected outcome would be “*It seems time to elapse...”
p.217	tree	change grey font to strikethrough on <i>be</i>
p.220	(90)	Somewhat degraded for me.
p.221	satisfy...a head [in the landing site of movement]	I think the bracketed PP was meant to modify <i>satisfy</i> , but parsing principles very strongly favor construing it as modifying <i>head</i> , which yields the wrong reading.
p.211	Def'n of Move	“...moves...to a <u>subject position</u> ” will not allow for head movement
p.225	lexical requirements are met by (underlying) adjacent constituents	So EPP and +WH are not lexical requirements? Is there some other kind?
p.226	below trees	“rightmost structures...selection is satisfied (more) locally”. I don't know what that could mean. I also don't know how it could be assessed without filling in the details of the triangles.
p.226	below trees	<p>“the only analytical option...that the leftmost trees are derived by a reordering process, i.e. by Move.” This statement is ambiguous, having a reading that's too weak and another that is arguably too strong. The weak reading simply says Move is involved in generating the left-hand structures, but in fact Move is involved in generating any finite sentence, so who cares. The strong reading says the left trees are derived by applying Move <u>to the right trees</u>, but that seems too strong: we would need countercyclic movement to change anything inside TP. (But this reading seems to be presupposed by the last sentence: “[left trees] should be allowed only if [right trees] are”.)</p> <p>A more plausible claim would be that the left trees are derived by more applications of Move than the right trees, starting from a common underlying structure. But I still don't think that is “the only analytical option” for these cases: e.g., RNR could be backward-licensed DP ellipsis, gapping could be two instances of constituent (head) ellipsis (T and V), etc.</p>

p.226	following paragraph	<p>“not every substring can be directly treated as a constituent” is trivially true as stated, so I imagine the intent was something like “not every substring that appears to pass a constituency test can be...”, though on p.228 it is asserted that passing a test definitionally entails constituenthood (which seems too strong to me, but that’s a separate issue).</p> <p>Either way, pseudogapping does not seem a relevant example, since it (prima facie) does not involve a substring at all. It might suggest something else, viz. not every bunch of stuff that undergoes a grammatical operation can be directly treated as a constituent (but again, p.228 contradicts that).</p>
p.227	box	<p>In (94a) should <i>will</i> be struck through?</p> <p>In b–d, the typesetting is confusing. Bracketing (and making strike-through lines non-continuous) would make clearer the difference between movement and in-situ ellipsis, e.g. Mary took advantage of Susan, and Bill [took advantage] [of John] of John.</p>
p.228	re: (99),(100)	<p>“The first structure is supported by clefting...the second by VP ellipsis”. I find these statements misleading, because unlike the cases just discussed on p.226, it is NOT true that either of these tests yields results <u>incompatible</u> with the other structure (e.g., “John will hit the man with binoculars and I will too”; “It is the man that I will hit with binoculars.”)</p>
p.229	line below (104)	<i>will hit</i> → <i>will push</i>
	para below (105)	<p>“<i>will push</i> is a constituent, as demonstrated by gapping”, in light of the box on p.227, points out a fundamental issue that is being glossed over. In the tree for gapping it is not true that “will hit” is a constituent (in the traditional sense of ‘complete subtree’ at least); rather, “will John hit the man” is a constituent, three of whose words are being pronounced elsewhere; or putting it another way, the string <i>will hit</i> shows a behavioral property of a constituent because it represents the pronounced pieces of a genuine constituent that contains more stuff.</p> <p>When this is made explicit, gapping obviously fails to motivate subtrees like “will go” on p.226. This seems nothing like the situation in (99) vs. (100), where the differences in constituency exist prior to any movement, have truth-conditional correlates, and the apparent constituents do not contain any (relevant) silent material.</p>
p.229	fn.6	Actually this has already been contradicted by much simpler cases, on pp. 59–60.

p.229	(106)	<p>This sentence wouldn't be expected to be grammatical even if both structures were present simultaneously: the first half does not contain an antecedent of the form [T' will [VP rob DP]], so ellipsis of a structure of that form is not licensed in the second half.</p> <p>I'm also not convinced the generalization is correct. With the right prosody the following seems OK to me:</p> <p>A: Do you think anyone is going to buy an expensive watch while we're in Switzerland?</p> <p>B: Buy a ROLEX, JOHN probably will, and MARY a PATEK PHILIPPE.</p>
p.231	3 rd para	<p>“raising categories: these are categories that <u>trigger</u> raising to subject...<i>seem, be, have</i>”: I think the intent was “allow for” rather than “trigger”, since the text immediately goes on to imply that (+tense) T always triggers movement to its subject.</p>
p.231	4 th -5 th para	<p>Quite confusing: it invokes “cases of actual non-local selection”, while the point all along has been that selection is <u>always</u> local at some stage of the derivation. If we're actually talking about “apparent” non-local selection, then it seems our theoretical commitment is to find an explanation in terms of actual local selection. But whether that explanation will involve movement (as opposed to, say, Control) seems like an empirical issue, not a terminological one.</p>
p.233	(4) (2) (iii)	<p>“see the previous exercise” presumably refers to exercise (2), not (3); but are you asking for exactly the same structure to be drawn again? Or is it significant that <i>just</i> is attached in a different place now?</p>
	(4) (3) (iii)	<p>“principles could vary for individual languages” seems too vague to yield an answer: e.g., does ‘vary’ mean ‘be present vs. absent’, or ‘be internally parameterized’ or...</p>
p.235	(7) (1)	d & i should be asterisked
p.236	(9) (iii)	244 → 218
pp.236–7	(11)	8.5.2 → 8.3.4 [3 instances]
p.237	(12)	“right hand rule” → “right hand head rule”
	(12) (1e)	English translation should be “She doesn't bake the cake”
CH 9		
p.239	1 st para	234 → 210

p.243	(18) and tree	the movement of PRO has not been motivated (issue recurs multiple times)
p.244	box	might be more perspicuous if <i>pro</i> appeared in the Romance sentences
pp.244–5	trees	Why are the boxed domains different, if PRO does move as indicated? (Same issue on p.247)
p.247	last para	“singly boxed TP” → “singly boxed VP” “doubly boxed TP” → “doubly boxed VP”
p.248	“Section 9.3 below”	We are already in section 9.3
p.249	box, (36b)	This doesn’t make the point, because <i>their</i> is readily used as a gender-neutral singular, plus <i>team</i> can antecede a plural possessive.
p.251	(48)	“John believes Bill to have slept” does not illustrate the property “Allow <i>that</i> -CP”.
	(49)	Object control verbs do not require sentient subjects, e.g. <i>The storm/threat convinced Bill to stay home</i> , and when animate the subject is an agent, not an experiencer. (Latter is correctly noted on following page.)
	(49), last point	believes → convinced
p.252	lexical entries:	<i>convince</i> does not appear in the chart above and is in the same class as <i>persuade</i> . Also, it is potentially confusing that “CP[e] _{theme} ” is being used for two different silent complementizers that must be independently selectable-for (finite vs. infinitival).
p.253	fn5	I am very curious what the evidence is for the gerunds, particularly since the alternation is also found in subjects of copulas. Is there a reference that could be included?
p.254	(55)	I don’t see how this example provides evidence that <i>believe</i> and <i>expect</i> take different kinds of complements, since <i>believe</i> is not illustrated at all, but if it were, it would also be ungrammatical in the frame (55a).
p.255	box	(9.5.3a) → (55a) [twice]; first sentence below (57) is mangled.

		<p>I think bringing <i>expect</i> into this discussion is bound to cause confusion, since it has homophones in three different classes (w-type subject control, ECM, and object control). It is not true in general that <i>expect</i> disallows <i>for</i>: this is obscured in (58b) because <i>expect</i> + perfective infinitive is highly degraded even with subject control, i.e. the PRO version of (58b) is ?* or *.</p> <p>Fixing that, it is perfect to say “John expects (for) his friends to be treated well.”</p> <p>The <i>tough</i>-movement facts are also tricky: I find “It is hard to believe Bill to have won” pretty bad, and I also find “For Bill to have won is hard to believe” bad, which leads to no conclusion whatsoever for me. One would have to find a good baseline before attempting <i>tough</i>-movement.</p>
	discussion of (56)	There seems to be a step of the logic being left implicit: Have we seen an independent explanation for why raising out of CP is not possible, or are we just using “takes infinitival CP” as another name for the diacritic “disallows raising”?
CH 10		
p.260	(2)	Can a <i>why</i> question ever be answered with an AdvP? Conversely, since it is generally answered with a CP, why don’t we call it that?
	(4)	The tree for degree adjuncts appears to violate X-bar theory: adjuncts must be phrases, not heads.
p.261	(6)	Fails to illustrate the claim immediately above: needs something like e_{+q} under C, otherwise it appears that <i>will</i> is a +q C. Also, why is the subject stopping off in spec of <i>be</i> ?
p.262	final bullet	Students are left wondering how to draw trees containing <i>whether</i> , since they cannot figure out what the base position of <i>either</i> would have been (since it can’t actually appear in the statement). They also wonder why <i>whether</i> blocks T-to-C, if it isn’t in C.
p.263	box	“We will return to (ii) later in Section 10.6”—I could not find any discussion of this in that section.
p.269	last para	(5) → (36)
p.270	box	Given the definition of “unboundedness” on the previous page, it is just as true of A-movement.
	(38c)	Why does the trace of <i>why</i> intervene between <i>wonder</i> and its complement?
p.270	above (45)	[+wh] → [-wh]

p.271	(47)	Isn't the disjunction redundant? +q C will be present whenever there is a wh-phrase in Spec-CP.
p.272	(52)–(54)	b examples should be asterisked
p.273	bottom	The initial statement of the adjunct island condition is not equivalent to the statement in (62): the latter stipulates the presence of a CP, allowing for extraction out of an adjunct that doesn't contain a CP. I'm not sure how the empirical chips fall, but consistency would be preferable.
p.275	(68)	trace of upstairs VP-internal subject should be subscripted k
p.276	(72)	The string is ambiguous between noun-complement and relative clause type CNPC, because of the noun <i>reason</i> and the silent operator. Why not make it unambiguously the latter?
p.277	(76c)	should be asterisked
p.279		(88) and the text above it should appear after (89) and the text above it, i.e., first illustrate the constraint then illustrate the exception to it.
p.281	(47)	The notation “[+q _{wh}]” is unfamiliar.
p.281	(77, 79)	What motivates the switch from “No element...” to “A DP...”? This seems to wrongly predict that we are allowed to extract non-DPs, e.g. *Of whom did a picture <i>t</i> upset Mary? which in fact is worse than the DP extraction.
p.282	below figure	front → top
p.283	just above (94)	violation → condition
	(94)	Acc. to p.260 (2), the labels of <i>where</i> and its trace should be PP, not AdvP
p.284	below (95)	“CP3 [is] an adjunct island” is inaccurate given the statement of the constraint back in (62): the PP is the adjunct island
p.286	grey box	Claim is inconsistent with earlier use of head lowering (affix hopping).
p.287	above (103)	“the movement requirement can be coded...optionally have one”. But this will not enforce successive cyclicity, it will only allow it.
	above (104)	“the star position”: there are no stars in (95, 96)
p.292	(123)	Either b should be asterisked, or “not” should be deleted from the preceding description.
	(124a)	delete second <i>all</i>

	sentence below (124)	The data show that wh-movement CAN be successive-cyclic, but not that it MUST.
	(126), (127)	These do not illustrate the fact that the range of adjunct islands has been broadened: these already fell under the old version. The newly-subsumed cases are the three unnumbered ones below.
	Temporal adjunct PP ex.	Does not generalize: “What exam did Sue throw up right before?” is fine.
p.294	(128)	lower instances of T should be struckthrough
	just below	“T too far from V...trigger..dummy <i>do</i> ”: How far is too far, exactly?
p.299	(147b)	Sharply ungrammatical unless prepended with “As for”.
p.302	(8) (iv)	(1) → (2)
p.300	figure puzzle	The answer doesn’t work for me: assuming the 3D drawing is showing us a long left side and a short front, it will not have the given side view; other assumptions don’t seem to work either.
CH 11		
p.306	middle of page	I disagree with the judgment on sentence a: double focus seems possible for me
p.307	(9)	will [^] only put [^] pepper
p.307	tree	Violates X-bar schema: adjunct must be a phrase; ditto tree next page
p.308	box	I and most of my students find “John talked to only Mary” perfect; the <i>of</i> example can also be ameliorated
p.309	above (19)	I do not think <i>any</i> is a determiner in (19), why not just delete “determiner”?
p.311	(27c)	Falsifies (23) since <i>only</i> does not c-command out of the subject
p.312	(30d)	We have not established that raising infinitives have an EPP requirement, so it would be simpler to put the trace in its base position. Also, it is worth noting that the negative experiencer <i>*shouldn’t*</i> c-command out of its PP, but (30c) suggests that somehow it does.
	§11.3.1	“check how constituent structure tests support” the DP adjunction structure: I don’t think they do, e.g. *All they will read books. *It is the children who I like all. etc.

	box	For me (31) can perfectly well mean (32).
	box, below (33)	(33) → (31)
p.313	(34)	student(s) → children [twice]
	(36b)	insert PRO after <i>all</i>
p.314	(40a-c)	These are all bad, because “John said he wanted to visit Mary to his mother” is bad: PP must precede clause unless latter is a direct quote.
p.316	below (50)	“We conclude that the trace of an anaphor is not an anaphor”. (50) can’t show this since its trace is not a trace of an anaphor, but rather of a wh-DP that contains an anaphor.
p.320	Crossover constraints	1) There is no antecedent for the crucial “it” in “it binds”: reword as “A wh-phrase cannot Wh-move across 2) As written the condition is vacuous: before the wh-movement happens, the wh-phrase can’t bind the relevant pronoun because it doesn’t c-command it. A better wording could say something like “A wh-phrase cannot wh-move across...to a position whence it would bind that pronoun.”
	para below (76)	Claim that wh-movement cannot feed binding must be qualified in light of earlier discussion of ambiguity in cases like “Which picture of himself does Bill think Fred hates?”, where binding by the upstairs subject was claimed to be fed by movement of the wh-phrase to the lower Spec-CP. For consistency with both phenomena the constraint would have to say something like “Wh-movement cannot create new opportunities for the moving phrase to act as a binder (while it may create new opportunities for the moving phrase to act as a bindee).” However, even this seems to have exceptions, e.g. “Who _i did you say [t was a liar] before you met him _i ?, with the before-clause construed upstairs.
p.322	(94)	is ambiguous, given two “it”s and two potential antecedents. But I believe the intended reading is exactly (93b), so I don’t see why this is being treated as something new/different.
p.323	lower tree	I don’t understand why this wrong tree is being presented or why a student might be expected to assume this structure, since the other tree on the very same page, like umpteen before, shows the subject as VP-internal.

p.324	under tree	“If we are allowed... would not constitute an exception to the converse.” The number of semantic negations in this sentence makes it extraordinarily hard to understand. How about the following: “...this case would not provide a reason to adopt (93c), because it would be consistent with the stronger claim “If B can be in the scope of A, A c-commands B”. Even better, present the converse as an explicit hypothesis alongside (93) and then refer to it by number.
p.328	(6) (5d)	Icelandic for ‘the speech’ is misspelled; (6d) contains the correct spelling.
	(6) (6)	glosses are misaligned: <i>til að</i> together glosses as ‘to’ (and in b, <i>að</i> should be separated from the following verb).
p.330	(8) (7)	Antwort → Antwort
	(8)	jedenden → jemandem
	(9)	jedenden → jemanden
CH 12		
p.346	(48)	strikethroughs are misplaced
p.348	(52)	ditto
p.359	1 st para	(105) → (107); (107) → (105); <i>open</i> → <i>close</i> [twice]; <i>open</i> → <i>closed</i> [last line]
p.360	(112)	two highest VPs should be vPs
p.361	(116,117b)	I don’t see how the account would yield these restitutive meanings: the lower VP in each case describes a state (X having Y, X being at Y), so it is that state that should have been true before, but the change of state should <u>not</u> have occurred before, because CAUS is outside the lower VP. E.g., in (117b) “I put it there yesterday” → “it was there yesterday”. But <i>give</i> doesn’t seem to have the meaning predicted by the analysis: ‘give John a book again’ should fit a scenario where John had a book in the past, without anyone necessarily having given it to him, but by my intuition it cannot.
p.363	above (118)	It seems confusing to switch from <i>believe</i> to <i>allege</i> , since <i>allege</i> seems NOT to assign accusative case (being one of the <i>wager</i> -class verbs)
p.364	(121)	FWIW, this is ungrammatical for me even though I accept (119)
	(122b)	himself_i → himself_j
	(123)	Only conceivable for me with pitch accent on <i>him</i> accompanied by pointing to the referent.

	(124b)	Perfect for me.
p. 365	main paragraph	“This is no longer surprising...composition.” But on this new view it IS totally surprising that <i>en-</i> is the ONLY exception to the RHR.
		“structure of syntactic phrases (head initial) but morphological properties (no determiners).” Is something missing before the second parenthesis—morphological properties of what? “The contrast between English and French is striking”—what contrast? English compounds don’t have determiners inside them either. Which items are free in one language and bound in the other?
p.370	under projection 25	inevitable → inevitably
CH 13		
p.378	Practice box	The “caveat” would be more helpful if it explained what other reading reciprocals can have that should be <u>avoided</u> .
p.381	1 st para	“whether or not an anaphor triggers...agreement on T”: but (14) says such sentences are ungrammatical, so it is impossible to determine whether they would contain agreement or not; the intent seems to be “whether or not DPs in the position of the anaphor trigger...”
	(17b, c)	importatete → importate
p.383	(21b, 22b)	every head trace it contains → every head trace the XP contains
	(22), 1 st line	delete final “and”
	3 rd last line	“(written V above)” → “(written \forall above)”
p.385	(26)	higher set of V projections should be v projections; lowest V should be struckthrough; <i>expect</i> should be dominated by V+v
	discussion below (27)	Perhaps worth mentioning that <i>them</i> is moving into what has heretofore always been a theta-position
p.386	(29)	lowest V should be struckthrough
	last line before Practice	<i>himself</i> → <i>herself</i>

pp.388–9	(32, 33), following paragraph, following table	<p>I could not follow what was going on here:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I don't know what the rightmost column in the table refers to. • “within the domain of tense” has not been defined, but apparently must not mean the same as “Tense Domain” on the previous page, since the infinitival clause seems to count. • should “elements without <i>selv</i>” be “pronouns without <i>selv</i>”? • why is the binding requirement given for <i>selv</i> in the table (“smallest XP”) different from that given in the immediately preceding text (“the domain of tense”)? • “smallest XP” is not one of the options listed as possible domains on p. 387—is there an implicit “that contains a subject” in every instance? • anti-subject orientation needs more explanation for <i>ham</i>: does it mean that the only thing it must not be <u>locally</u> bound by is a subject? Does it mean the only thing it can be non-locally bound by is a non-subject? Does Princ. B apply normally to it?
p.389	13.5.2, 1 st para	<i>ser</i> → <i>sér</i>
p.390	2 nd line	non-commander → non-c-commander
	(35a)	“to” should be aligned under “að”
	para above (36)	“can even be implicit:” invites the expectation that one of the examples will illustrate this, but they don't
	(36b)	glosses are misaligned
	(36c) translation	showed → show
p.391	(37b)	move “-subj” from Icelandic to gloss line
	text above (38)	perhaps worth noting that since 3sg is the default (nonagreeing) form of the verb, one cannot see the crucial agreement difference being discussed
	(38a, b)	verb form should be “líki”
	(38a)	vid → við
	(38a,b)	embedded object in translation should be “her(self)” (Sigga is a woman's name)
	text above (39)	<i>ser</i> → <i>sér</i>
	(39a) Icelandic	‘was’ → þætti; ‘fond’ → vænt
	(39a) gloss	selfi → self _i
	(39b) gloss	Joni → Jon _i ; selfi → self _i
p.392	(41, 42)	why is “him” parenthesized but “ta” is not?
	(43)	why is “ta” parenthesized but “him” is not?

	text above (44)	antecedent must ^be^ a subject
	(44)	why is “ta” parenthesized but “him” is absent? Also, “self?s” seems to be a typo, and <i>de</i> is missing a gloss
p.393	1 st para	“in question was Lisi himself” → “... Zhangsan...”
	text below (49)	move “does not” into first bullet
p.395	(57)	translation is not a grammatical English sentence; could it be rendered as “persuade one of the useful fact that...” or “the utility of the fact that...”?
	text above (58)	“it must be indefinite”— “it” could refer to <i>soi</i> or to its antecedent, and I suppose they must match in (in)definiteness so this isn’t actually ambiguous, but it is certainly confusing; For those who don’t know French it might be worth pointing out that definite <i>on</i> means ‘we’ while indefinite <i>on</i> means ‘one’
p. 396	(61)	should there be a “#” in front of this?
p.397	(62)	clearly degraded for me
p.401	(3) (5)	Johni → John _i
CH 14		
p.406	(15d)	index on <i>why</i> should probably be <i>j</i> , but this introduces the confound that the sentence may be a superiority violation
	(17d), (20d)	independently violate Superiority
p.409	(33)	is not ruled out by (32), since (32) mentions <i>that</i> , not any pronounced C
p.410	above (38)	“there cannot be an overt wh-relative pronoun if the phrase in Spec-CP is a simple wh-DP”—confusing, because the relative pronoun <i>is</i> the thing that would be in Spec-CP. Also, (38a,b) are already ruled out as doubly-filled comp violations, so they can’t illustrate some other violation. c & d are the relevant bad examples, but to motivate the specificity of the constraint we need a good example where the Spec-CP contains a non-DP, e.g. a knife with which to cut bread
p.411	(44)	This is not representative of idiom chunks in general; indeed, there is no reason to think ‘make headway’ is an idiom at all. Compare *Bill is aware of the substantial shit that hit the fan yesterday. *Bill ignored the bucket that the old man kicked.

p.412	(47a)	ungrammatical as written; I must have <i>who</i> in place of <i>that</i> ; the degradation is milder with the inanimate in b.
p.412	(49)	I believe [NP _i <i>e</i>] should be deleted, the DP should be indexed <i>j</i> , and the complement of <i>about</i> should be DP, not NP
p.413	(58)	Shouldn't there be traces in lower CP specs to satisfy Subjacency? Also, I think OP _i is missing from (58b)
p.414	(62)	Why are the relative clauses adjoined as non-restrictives?
	(63a)	This sounds surprisingly good, and becomes almost perfect if <i>still</i> is inserted before <i>enjoy</i> . (some sort of parsing illusion??)
	(64)	I'm not sure these examples show anything, since the purported 'source' without raising is ungrammatical to begin with: *It is easy [TP [for me to sell this idea] to annoy everyone].
p.417	(82)	I get no contrast: both are out, because I don't like bare left dislocated DPs that aren't subjects. But of course I accept "As for John, when did you see him?" and reject the counterpart; this seems uninformative however.
	under 2 nd tree	(65) → (66)
p.418	(85)	not necessarily a free relative; a clear example would be We scheduled the party for [when the boss was out of town].
INDEX		
	p.447	Culter → Cutler
	p.453	Hoskulder → Höskuldur