

Errata for Chaves & Putnam's 2020 *Unbounded Dependency Constructions: theoretical and experimental perspectives*,
Oxford Surveys in Syntax and Morphology 10,
Oxford University Press.

- **Page 11:** Boeckx (2008, ch. 3) should have read Boeckx (2012, ch. 3).
- **Pages 12 & 163:** Steedman (2002, 59–66) should have read Steedman (2001, 59–66).
- **Page 60, footnote 3:** (...) *but so it its unextracted counterpart* (...) should have read: (...) *but so is its unextracted counterpart* (...)
- **Page 85:** in example (99c) *There are people in this world_i* (...) the subscript *i* should have been added to the word *people* rather than to the word *world*.
- **Page 89:** Examples 112c and 112d should be removed, as they are not relevant.
- **Page 108:** in the first sentence of example (166d) replace ‘B:’ with ‘A:’.
- **Page 110:** in example (174) there is a string ‘*arrow* → *hit(x, y)*’ which should have read: ‘*arrow(x)* → *hit(x, y)*’
- **Page 131:** (...) *by matching but uninterpretable features* should have read *by matching uninterpretable features*
- **Page 150:** (...) *In order to progress into lower zones of Marr’s description level* (...) should have read: (...) *In order to progress into lower levels of description* (...)
- **Page 154:** (...) *and argues that phases* (...) should have read: *and argue that phases* (...)
- **Page 159:** *You made more mistakes_i than Robin made* _ is missing a subscript: *You made more mistakes_i than Robin made* __{*i*}
- **Page 164:** (...) *the former are lists in GAP* (...) should have read: (...) *the former are listed in GAP* (...)
- **Page 166, ft.3:** (*Sag et al., 2003, ch. 7*) should have read: *Sag et al. (2003, ch. 7)*
- **Page 182, footnote 11:** (...) *amounts to appending ‘⊕’ to RESTR lists.* (...) should have read (...) *amounts to appending RESTR lists.* (...)
- **Page 187:** (...) *the possessive is NP is not extractable.* (...) should have read (...) *the possessive is NP is not extractable. See Runner et al. (2006) for relevant evidence that reflexive binding to possessors involves binding-theory-exempt logophors.*
- **Page 196:** (...) *predicts the Element Constraint discussed in §3.2* (...) should have read: (...) *predicts the Conjoint Constraint discussed in §3.2* (...)
- **Page 228:** On footnote 6, the string *typo graphical* should have read *typographical*.
- **Page 232:** (...) *SE = 0.039* (...) should have read (...) *SD = 0.039* (...)
- **Page 240:** (...) *must be important relevant enough* (...) should have read: (...) *must be important or relevant enough* (...)
- **Page 244:** (...) *feature specify which individuals* (...) should have read: (...) *features specify which individuals* (...)
- **Page 244:** in Figure 7.1 the value of the feature FOCUS should have been ‘⟨⟩’.
- **Page 245:** (...) *such as lack or auxiliary inversion* (...) should have read (...) *such as lack of auxiliary inversion* (...).
- **Page 257:** the sentence (...) *for movement-based accounts.* has an extra period at the end.