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Errata

The valence feature XCOMP is not necessary. An analysis that works without it has been implemented by me in the TRALE system and is described in Müller [2005, 2009]

- p. 35 The LEX feature plays a role similar to the MINIMAL feature of Muysken (1982), i.e. maximal projection is defined in terms of saturation and the value of LEX. This is not mentioned in the footnote on page 35, but in a later footnote on page 87. See also Müller [2005, 2009]

- p. 58 Accusativum cum Infinitivum → Accusativus cum Infinitivo

- p. 87 I did not mention that the LEX-value of intransitive verbs is left underspecified since they can appear both in coherent and in incoherent constructions.

- p. 109 The elements that are contained in the order domain of this phrase, i.e. es and lesen → and zu lesen.

- p. 121 “The verbs in (272)” should read “The verbs in (272) – (276)”

- p. 154 requires the embedded verb to have something in SUBJ → requires the embedded verb to have something in DA

- p. 164 The first two subsections deal with alternative object-to-subject-raising analyses and Sections 3.3.3 and 3.3.4 with control analyses. A more careful phrasing would be control-like analyses or coindexing analyses.

- p. 241 An unaccusative intransitive verb, i.e. a verb that has a designated argument and an empty SUBCAT list, is the input for this rule. should read as: An unergative intransitive verb, i.e. a verb that has a designated argument and exactly one element in the SUBCAT list, is the input for this rule.

- p. 294 example (689) is from taz 04.10.1999 not 10.04.1999

- p. 364 consist solely of an empty head and an empty noun → consist solely of an empty determiner and an empty noun

- p. 378 the specification of the DA value of th input verb is missing in the lexical rule.

- p. 399 entry (877) is not the verb initial version, but the general version.
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