

- 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. 184, (106): “An XP...” → “A YP...” (spec need not match category of phrase it attaches in). Then “XP” → “YP” in fn. 67 to match.
- 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’): *impf* → IMPF
- 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, $V' \rightarrow V' NP$ 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, $V' \rightarrow V AdjP$ is not permitted.]

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

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*