Errata and typos in ‘Live fast, die young – the short life of Early Modern German auxiliary ellipsis’

Wanting to get the book printed with about three weeks less time than needed (my fault – or my optimism...), I overlooked a couple of things, and, embarrassingly, even I introduced mistakes into it in an attempt to comply with the committee’s comments.

**Just formatting errors**

p.11: 4th line from bottom: haben have → haben ‘have’
p.11: 2nd line from bottom: zu to → zu ‘to’
p.12: 5th line from bottom: ha- omission → ha- omission
p.37: the auxiliary hetten in (73) should be in bold face
p.58: 2nd paragraph under (22): should be indented

**Typos etc.**

p.17: missing word in the last sentence of the penultimate paragraph: “That is, they have a function similar to inflectional morphology, semantically forming a complex predicate with the main verb, than as independent verbs taking DP or CP complements.” → “That is, they have a function similar to inflectional morphology, semantically forming a complex predicate with the main verb, **rather** than as independent verbs taking DP or CP complements.”

p.37: the indices in tree (72) got mixed up: (the traces of) the verb in V, v and Mod should have a different index than the modal verb (j), e.g. k


p.43: last line: modell → model

p.55: fn.20 “Note also that those dialects of Norwegian that have both ha ‘have’ and vare ‘be’ as perfect auxiliaries, and therefore can form the perfect of the dynamic passive auxiliary bli ‘become’, allow for optionally ‘dropping’ the past participle of bli, blitt.” → “Note also that those dialects of Norwegian that have both ha ‘have’ and vare ‘be’ as perfect auxiliaries, and therefore can form the perfect of the dynamic passive auxiliary bli ‘become’ **with vare**, allow for optionally ‘dropping’ the past participle of bli, blitt.”

p.62: 2nd paragraph under (30): should somehow be introduced by **Fourth**
p.99: about → about

p.119: last paragraph: “Non-declarative clauses like questions are (M-)finite as well, but it cannot be maintained that the semantic function of their M-finiteness is making a validity claim as well.” → “Non-declarative clauses like questions are (M-)finite as well, but it cannot be maintained that the semantic function of their M-finiteness is making a validity claim.”

p.135: “It is well known that subjunctive mood in French occurs in the complements of negative, interrogative, doubting, subjective, potential and irrealis clauses, and is obligatory in preposed clauses like (38), taken from Wechsler (1990:233), thus all the contexts identified as non-assertive.” → “It is well known that subjunctive mood in French occurs in the complements of negative, interrogative, doubting, subjective, potential and irrealis clauses, and is obligatory in preposed clauses like (38a), taken from Wechsler (1990:233), thus all the contexts identified as non-assertive.”

My German English (very probably not exhaustive)

p.100: fn.42 Ebert is discussing → Ebert discusses
p.107: 1st line of 3.4.3.: The approach I will take is following a similar line .. → follows

Really embarrassing:

p.31/32: I should have deleted fn.41 when I followed a comment and put it into the main text..

p.34: Of course, example (64) is not a sein ‘be’-passive. I had an example there with an elliptic auxiliary and the justified comment was, how could i say it was in T if I cannot even see it. The sentence I pulled out of the corpus in the last minute however is not a sein ‘be’-passive at all. But I guess you get the idea anyway ... (blush blush blush)