

TYPOS

(2026/5/5)

CHAPTER 1

- **Ch. 1, p. 28, section 3.3., first paragraph, last line:**
In *B* is part of the background against was we (typically) consider *A*,
was should be *what*
- **Ch. 1, p. 29, ex. (38d):**
Ph.D. and linguistics should be replaced with *Ph.D. in linguistics*
- **Ch. 1, p. 29, 1st par, 2nd line from the top:**
quantifying determine should be *quantifying determiner*
- **Ch. 1, p. 31, 2nd par, 4th line from the top:**
as in (34) should be replaced with *as in (43a) and (43d)*
- **Ch. 1, p. 35, ex. (53a):**
[her]_l with index *l* should be replaced with *[her]_i* with index *i*

CHAPTER 2

- **Ch. 2, p. 66, first sentence on the second paragraph from the bottom:**
it should be *senses* (plural) rather than *sense* singular
Of course, it is conceivable to adopt Frege's distinction without being radical
*Fregean objectivists about what **senses** are.*

CHAPTER 3

- **Ch. 3, p. 122, exercise (2B):**
 $[\neg(P(x)\wedge Q(x))]$ should be $[\neg(P(x)\wedge Q(x))]$
- **Ch. 3, p. 124, (17a):**
 $V_1(j) = \text{Bond}$ should be replaced with $V_1(j) = \text{Pavarotti}$
- **Ch. 3, p. 124, last full paragraph, line 5:**
it should be **Pavarotti**, not **Pavorotti**
- **Ch. 3, p. 126, exercise (8):**
 $Q(x_3)/P(j)$ is not a possible formula since “/” is not a symbol of the formal language PC. You can replace it with any connective (\square , \vee , \rightarrow , \leftrightarrow), but negation (\neg).

- **Ch. 3, p. 126, example (21b):**

U should be U_1

- **Ch. 3, p. 126, example (21a):**

U should be U_1

- **Ch.3, p. 128, assignment function $g_1[[\text{Bond}/x_3]\text{Loren}/x_1]$:**

$$\begin{pmatrix} x_1 \rightarrow \text{Bond} \\ \dots \end{pmatrix} \text{ should be } \begin{pmatrix} x_1 \rightarrow \text{Loren} \\ \dots \end{pmatrix}$$

- **Ch.3, p. 128, 2nd par, 6th line from the bottom:**

$g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_2]\text{Loren}/x_3]$ should be $g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_1]\text{Loren}/x_3]$



- **Ch.3, p. 128, 2nd par, 5th line from the bottom:**

$g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_2]\text{Loren}/x_3]$ should be $g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_1]\text{Loren}/x_3]$



- **Ch.3, p. 128, 2nd par, bottom line:**

$g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_2]\text{Loren}/x_3]$ should be $g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_1]\text{Loren}/x_3]$



- **Ch.3, p. 128, 3rd line below example (22):**

hungry should be replaced with *boring*

- **Ch.3, p. 129, box, lines (c)-(g):**

all the instances of (the family of assignment functions of the kind) $g_1[u/x_1]$ should be replaced with the specific assignment function $g_1[\text{Bond}/x_1]$

- **Ch. 3., p. 129, 3rd line from the bottom:**

$\exists x_3$ should be $\exists x_2$.

- **Ch.3, p. 131, box, (b), (c), (e), and (f):**

$\langle g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_1]\text{Bond}/x_2](x_1), g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_1]\text{Bond}/x_2](x_1) \rangle$ should be $\langle g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_1]\text{Bond}/x_2](x_1), g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_1]\text{Bond}/x_2](x_2) \rangle$

- **Ch.3, p. 131-132, subboxes 1, 2, and 3:**


some u in U should be *some u' in U* to be consistent with line b at the top of the main box; it follows that:

$g_1[[\text{Bond}/x_1], u/x_2]$ in subbox 1, section (a) should be changed into $g_1[[\text{Bond}/x_1], u'/x_2]$

$g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_1], u/x_2]$ in subbox 2, section (a) should be changed into $g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_1], u'/x_2]$

$g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_1], u/x_2]$ in subbox 3, section (a) should be changed into $g_1[[\text{Pavaratti}/x_1], u'/x_2]$

- **Ch.3, p. 133, bottom line:**
 $g_1[[\text{Bond}/x_2]\text{Loren}/x_1]$ should be $g_1[[\text{Loren}/x_2]\text{Loren}/x_1]$
- **Ch.3, p. 137, ex. (28a):**
 $\llbracket \mathcal{S} \rrbracket^M = 1$ for every δ should be $\llbracket \delta \rrbracket^M = 1$ for every δ
- **Ch.3, p. 139:**
the second box (c): **From (c)** should be **From (b)**
- **Ch.3, p. 139:**
the second box (c): **(17d)** should be **(19d)**
- **Ch. 3, p. 142, ex. (36d):**
 $x < m$ should be $z < m$
- **Ch.3, p. 142, ex (36d):**
 $\dots \rightarrow x = y \vee y = y]$ should be $\dots \rightarrow [x = y \vee y = y]$
- **Ch.3, p. 142, 8th line below ex (36d):**
This does seems to be ... should be *This does seem to be ...*
- **Ch.3, p. 155, first line below ex (50):**
in the case of (59 a, b) should be *in the case of (50 a, b)*
- **Ch.3, p. 158, ex (56n):**
 $V_{dt} \rightarrow$ gives, **shows** should be $V_{dt} \rightarrow$ gives
[no interpretation is ever provided for “show” nor is it ever used in any examples]
- **Ch.3, p. 163, line (a) in the box:**
 $\llbracket (55b) \rrbracket^{M,g}$ should be $\llbracket (58b) \rrbracket^{M,g}$
- **Ch.3, p. 163, line (i) in the box:**
 $\llbracket 17 \rrbracket^{M,g}$ should be $\llbracket 7 \rrbracket^{M,g}$
- **Ch.3, p. 163, line (j) in the box:**
 $\llbracket (55b) \rrbracket^{M,g}$ should be $\llbracket (58b) \rrbracket^{M,g}$
- **Ch.3, p. 163, line (k) in the box:**
 $\llbracket (55b) \rrbracket^{M,g}$ should be $\llbracket (58b) \rrbracket^{M,g}$
- **Ch.3, p. 164, box 2, (f):**
 $\llbracket 7 \rrbracket^{M3,g3[[\text{Pa}/e3]\text{W\&P}/e2]\text{Lo}/e1} = 1$ iff $\langle \text{Pa}, \text{W\&P}, \text{Lo} \rangle$ should be
 $\llbracket 7 \rrbracket^{M3,g3[[\text{Bo}/e3]\text{Asp}/e2]\text{Lo}/e1} = 1$ iff $\langle \text{Bo}, \text{Asp}, \text{Lo} \rangle$
- **Ch.3, p. 164, box 2, (g):**
 $\llbracket 3 \rrbracket^{M3,g3[[\text{Pa}/e3]} = 1$ should be $\llbracket 3 \rrbracket^{M3,g3[[\text{Bo}/e3]} = 1$
- **Ch. 3, p. 167, first paragraph, second line:**
like (57d) should be *like (60d)* (there is no (57d)).
- **Ch.3, p. 169, last par, first line:**
(64a) should be *(65a)*

- **Ch.3, p. 171, line (a) in the box:**
 $\llbracket 2 \rrbracket^{M3,g3} = \llbracket 3 \rrbracket^{M3,g3}$ should be $\llbracket 2 \rrbracket^{M3,g3} \in \llbracket 3 \rrbracket^{M3,g3}$
- **Ch. 3, p. 171, line (g) in the box:**
 $\llbracket (64b) \rrbracket = 1$ should be $\llbracket (65b) \rrbracket = 1$.
- **Ch. 3, p. 173, right above ex. (72a):**
a man should be *a maniac*
- **Ch.3, p. 177, (81e):**
 $\forall y[\llbracket \text{donkey}(y) \wedge \text{own}(k,y) \rrbracket \text{beat}(k,y)]$
 should be replaced with
 $\forall y[\llbracket \text{donkey}(y) \wedge \text{own}(k,y) \rrbracket \rightarrow \text{beat}(k,y)]$

- **Ch.3, p. 185, 2nd par, first line:**
this problem by ~~to~~ requiring
 should be replaced with
this problem by requiring
- **Ch.3, p. 185, right above ex. (100a):**
sentences like (95b) should be replaced with *sentences like (100b)*
- **Ch.3, p. 193, Ex. 9:**
 NP --> no N
 NP --> not every N
should be replace with just:
 Det -> no, not every, every, some, the

CHAPTER 5

- **Ch. 5, p. 271, box, (b):**
 $V(m)$ should be $V_4(m)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 271, box, (b):**
 $V(P)$ should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 271, box, (c):**
 $V(m)$ should be $V_4(m)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 271, box, (c):**
 $V(P)$ should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, upper box, first line, in bold:**
The truth conditions of $\exists x \Box P(x)$ should be *The truth conditions of $\Box \exists x P(x)$*
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, upper box, (c):**
 $\llbracket u \rrbracket$ should be $\llbracket x \rrbracket$

- **Ch. 5, p. 272, upper box, (d):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, upper box, (e):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$ [two instances]
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, upper box, (f):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, lower box, (c):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, lower box, (d):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, smaller box inside lower box, (i):**
 $\llbracket \Box P(x) \rrbracket^{M^4, w'', i''', g^4[a/x]} = 0$ should be $\llbracket \Box P(x) \rrbracket^{M^4, w'', i''', g^4[a/x]} = 0$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, smaller box inside lower box, (i):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, smaller box inside lower box, (ii):**
 $\llbracket \Box P(x) \rrbracket^{M^4, w'', i''', g^4[b/x]} = 0$ should be $\llbracket \Box P(x) \rrbracket^{M^4, w'', i''', g^4[b/x]} = 0$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, smaller box inside lower box, (ii):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, smaller box inside lower box, (iii):**
 $\llbracket \Box P(x) \rrbracket^{M^4, w'', i''', g^4[c/x]} = 0$ should be $\llbracket \Box P(x) \rrbracket^{M^4, w'', i''', g^4[c/x]} = 0$
- **Ch. 5, p. 272, smaller box inside lower box, (iii):**
V(P) should be $V_4(P)$
- **Ch. 5, p. 273, Exercise 1, (12):**
 $\Box\Box P$ should be $\Box\Box P$ (P should not be in bold: it is a 1-place predicate, not the PAST operator)
- **Ch. 5, p. 284, last line before (36):**
sentence like (37a) two distinct LFs, namely (37b) and (37c)
should be
sentence like (36a) two distinct LFs, namely (36b) and (36c)
- **Ch. 5, p. 286, (38)a.:**
If A is lexical should be *If A is a lexical category* (otherwise it is confusing since lexical items like traces and pronouns are mentioned right after as of category A)
- **Ch. 5, p. 287, (40), line 5:**
 V_5 (*walk*) should be V_5 (*arrive*)
- **Ch. 5, p. 287, (40), line 5, matrix:**
the extension of the predicate at w' and I'' ($\{c\}$) should be $\{b\}$

- **Ch. 5, p. 288, exercise 3:**
the sentence should be evaluated with respect to M_5 , though the instructions never say it explicitly.
- **Ch. 5, p. 288, exercise 3, line 3:**
the two circumstances are identical, both $\langle w'', i''' \rangle$
- **Ch. 5, p. 289, 1st line of the last paragraph in the box:**
[[5]] should be [[6]]
- **Ch. 5, p. 293, 3rd line above example (49):**
(48a) should be (49a)
- **Ch. 5, p. 293, 2nd line above example (49):**
(48a) should be (49a)
- **Ch. 5, p. 293, line right above example (49):**
(48b) should be (49b)
- **Ch. 5, p. 305, line (d):**
[$_{TP}$ that Pavarotti is hungry] should be [$_{CP}$ that Pavarotti is hungry]

CHAPTER 7

- **Ch. 7, p. 393, (7), formula under the node D in the tree:**
[$K(x,w) \wedge \dots$] should be replaced with [$K(y,x) \vee \dots$]
- **Ch. 7, p. 394, Exercise 1, (3):**
 λz [[$K(x,y) \dots (j)$]](m) should be replaced with λx [λz [[$K(x,y) \dots (j)$]](m)]
- **Ch. 7, p. 395, Exercise 2, first line:**
formulas should be replaced with *expressions*
(none of the expressions in the exercise is a formula, but they are all predicates)
- **Ch. 7, p. 395, box, (i):**
 λ_x should be replaced with λx
- **Ch. 7, p. 397, Exercise 3, first line:**
formulas should be *expressions*
(none of the expressions in the exercise is a formula, but they are all predicates)
- **Ch. 7, p. 398, (17)a:**
 $\square[\lambda x [P(x)](m)]$ should be $\lambda x [\square P(x)](m)$
- **Ch. 7, p. 400, (20):**
 $\Rightarrow[_{TP} NP_i [S X e_i Y]]$ should be $\Rightarrow[_{TP} NP_i [S X e_i Y]]$
- **Ch. 7, p. 410, right after example (34):**
everybody in (34) should be *everybody in (33)*

- **Ch. 7, p. 412, right after examples in (40):**
In (35) should be *In (40a)*

CHAPTER 9

- **Ch. 9, p. 511, 8th line from the bottom:**
(see chapter 7, section 4) should be replaced with *(see chapter 7, section 3)*
- **Ch. 9, p. 512, 2nd line below ex. (27b):**
 “with the NP *every woman*” should be replaced with “with the NP *not every woman*”

APPENDIX

- **Appendix, p. 533, middle of the page:**
 The definition of tuples in terms of sets is not fully correct, since it leads to a contradiction. It says that $\langle a, b \rangle$ can be represented as $\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}$, and $\langle a, b, c \rangle$ as $\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}, \{a, b, c\}\}$. However, since repetition is allowed in tuples: $\langle a, a, a \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{a, a\}, \{a, a, a\}\} = \{\{a\}, \{a\}, \{a\}\} = \{\{a\}\}$, and $\langle a, a \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{a, a\}\} = \{\{a\}, \{a\}\} = \{\{a\}\}$, from which would follow that $\langle a, a, a \rangle = \langle a, a \rangle$, which is false. A better definition would be $\langle a \rangle = \{a\}$, $\langle a, b \rangle = \{\{a\}, \{\{a\}, b\}\}$, $\langle a, b, c \rangle = \{\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}, \{\{\{a\}, \{a, b\}\}, c\}\}$.