p. 262: Because we’re skipping the first parts of the chapter on movement, let me just translate a couple of things here. “The operation Move selects α and raises it, targeting K, where α and K are categories constructed from one or more lexical items.” That is to say, we’re moving α to K (either to a specifier of K or perhaps to head-adjoin to K). The “target” of movement is the head into whose domain the moving thing is going. Also, you can read “categories” here as “syntactic objects” or “sub-trees” or “constituents”.

p. 262ff. The way Chomsky thinks about this is that a lexical item is a bundle of features (say, [nominal], [Nom case], etc.). We’ve seen that syntax seems to operate based on requirements like “Case must be checked.” If Case is just a property of a lexical item (a feature, that is), then it makes sense that what would satisfy the “Case must be checked” requirement is if the [Nom case] feature were moved up into a local relation with the head that can check Case (say, AgrS). However, since we see that in the syntax whole words and even whole phrases move, there must be something wrong with just moving a feature. Chomsky’s idea here is that if you pull a feature out of a lexical item and put it somewhere else in the tree, when the phonology gets ahold of this lexical item to try to pronounce, it finds that there is a “hole” in it. The solution is “pied piping”—that is, you move the feature up to T, but then you’ve got a noun phrase with a hole in it. So you move the noun phrase up to SpecTP (as close as you can move it to T), which puts the feature and its original lexical item close enough together that they can now be successfully pronounced.

p. 297: The MLC is the Minimal Link Condition, which says that chain links (movements) must be as short as possible. In section 5.6, Chomsky reformulates how we think of movement, which allows a sort of simpler way to think about the “Shortness” requirement. So, rather than saying that, for example, DP moves to SpecTP, we say instead that T is attracting a DP. Also: “FF[F]” means the bundle of formal features on a lexical item, which includes F, the feature being attracted.

Section 10.1 kind of “rocked the linguistics world” a bit. Saved until the very end of the book (and the lecture series it was based on), Chomsky proposes that, despite the fact that everything for the past seven years had made heavy use of Agreement projections (AgrS, AgrO, etc.) in describing the syntactic facts of language, agreement projections have no place in a minimalist theory. Of course, saying they shouldn’t be there doesn’t solve the problem of how to analyze everything that used to require them. The idea is that rather than having something like (1), we have something like (2), where vP has two specifiers:

```
(1)        (2)
  AgrOP    vP
     Objj   Subj
          AgrO'  v'  v
           vP  t1  tj
             Subj  v'
```

Section 3. This is in a sense a lot like Kayne’s program—here, we are trying to eliminate X-bar theory as a set of stipulations and “derive” it from simpler, and hopefully independently necessary things. Kayne tried to derive X-bar theory from the fact that language has to be pronounced (in a linear order). Chomsky does something similar, although his motivations are based on the simplification of the tree-building operations.

pp. 247–249. Don’t concentrate too hard on this stuff about terms and adjunction, you can get the idea without it.