

**Final report\***  
(OTKA NF-73537)

**Project title:**

A Minimalist Approach to Syntactic Locality:  
A study of the division of labour of linguistic subsystems underlying syntactic locality effects

## **1 Introduction**

Locality properties of long-distance dependencies like syntactic displacements have been the object of continued research in transformational generative grammar, and remain so to the present day. The surprising empirical result that some of them can be stated in the appealingly general form of a syntactic ‘principle’ catalysed the development of the principle-based Government and Binding Theory (GB), which became the dominant generative approach of the 1980s. GB theory discovered and attempted to treat a large amount of disparate locality effects all within the syntactic component of grammar, with only partial success, however. Despite various attempts to further generalize and unify them, locality conditions retained a considerable degree of (formal and functional) arbitrariness, complexity and disparity.

The current restrictive transformational research paradigm, the Minimalist Program, which has evolved directly from GB theory, seeks to radically reduce the complexity involved in the various aspects of syntax proper, among them, the locality properties of movements and other dependencies. Against this background, the research strategy guiding our work on this project has been to avoid the postulation of any locality condition per se as part of syntactic theory, and instead reduce the locality effects under scrutiny to (i) the elementary properties of the syntactic computational system, including its quest to keep computational complexity to a minimum, and (ii) the division of labour between syntax and the interface subsystems, with special attention to semantics and information structure. Although our work in the frame of this project no doubt can only represent a small portion of this broad endeavour, we hope to have been able to make a strong case in its favour. In addition, since Hungarian has been one of the languages in the empirical focus of our research, we also hope that our work has brought the analysis of hitherto uncovered and lesser known properties of Hungarian to contribute to the advancement of current theories of grammar.

## **2 Local domains and syntactic computation**

We have proposed to treat several types of locality effects as purely syntactic in origin. In particular, without invoking any dedicated locality condition, we have

---

\* Numbers in square brackets identify publications/presentations in our final publications list. As the items recorded on the Fund's web interface may get displayed in a variety of orders, the designating number has been inserted between square brackets at the end of each entry. To make sure that the numbers refer to the items intended, a printout of the list is added at the end of the present report.

Due to limitations of the online interface, it is currently not possible to remove from this cumulative list any entries originating from earlier interim reports that have been superseded by more recent publications. In order to comply with the guidelines for preparing the final report, which require them to be eliminated, they have been overwritten as ‘xx’ and assigned 2013 as year of publication.

worked out analyses that reduce these effects to *elementary* properties of the syntactic computational system, including its quest to minimize computational complexity.

## **2.1 DP islands: Subject islands and object islands**

In the area of the opacity of subject noun phrases to subextraction, we examined both cross-linguistic and intra-linguistic aspects of relevant variation. Our analysis of the opacity behavior of different types of cyclic syntactic domains is crucially based on the quest of the derivational system to minimize local computational complexity (its ‘economy’) and a condition of semantic interpretability on the application of the *cyclic* mapping of syntactic representations to the interpretive components of grammar [9], [10]. We generalized this account of the selective opacity of subject phrases to object expressions [16], [17]. A revised and refined version of our account of DP islands appears as [36].

## **2.2 Syntactic head movement at the syntax/morphology interface**

In the domain of local head movement in morphosyntax, our research centered around the issue of how grammatical labour is divided between syntax and morphology (or syntax and the Lexicon). As a case study, we investigated how/to what extent a Distributed Morphology-based derivational morphosyntax can account for morphosyntactic properties of the causative construction. Evaluating lexicalist and syntactic (head-movement based) analyses of the causative construction, including its cross-linguistic variation, we put forward an anti-lexicalist, i.e., a purely syntactic, account of Hungarian external causatives [48].

In another case study, we argued extensively against the head-movement (head-incorporation) analysis of verbal particles in Hungarian. We proposed that their derivation involves two steps of phrasal movement, the first one targeting a vP-phase internal position, where the particle is semantically incorporated into a complex verbal predicate (rather than into the verb alone). Semantic incorporation has specific semantic and pragmatic conditions. The general restriction on movement is shown to apply: the base position of the raised locative element must be in the domain of its vP-internal (intermediate) landing site [14]. This analysis is developed further in [60].

Regarding the core locality properties of syntactic head movement, we explored a hybrid syntactalist/lexicalist approach. We devised a radically derivational syntactic model where the strict locality of the movement of morphosyntactically complex heads results from the nature of the cyclicity of the mapping to the interpretive components, and its interaction with principles of computational economy [3]. The approach is refined in [57].

We investigated further, at the level of microscopic details, the derivational approach to syntactic structure on which the latter result is based regarding the strict locality of head movement. We proposed to eliminate a key non-strictly local operation in the derivation, along with some redundancies in the mechanism, in favour of a better specified algorithm mapping syntactic relations to interface representations [38].

## **3 Division of labour between syntax, semantics, information structure and prosody**

Several locality effects in the scope of our investigations, as we have argued, obtain at the interfaces of syntax with semantic interpretation and/or information structure, and

via the latter may interact with the prosodic component as well. We analyzed these, without invoking any dedicated locality conditions, in terms of local domains of two different origins: (i) local domains arising in cyclic syntactic computation (viz. phases, which are themselves the result of the quest of the derivational mechanism to minimize computational complexity), as presented in Section 3.1 below; and (ii) local domains arising from the semantic interpretation that is mapped from syntactic representations, as summarized in Section 3.2 below.

### 3.1 Phase-bounded syntactic operations at the semantic interface

#### 3.1.1 Syntactic locality and quantifier scope interpretation

Regarding the issue of syntactic locality in quantifier scope interpretation, we examined how the scope of quantifiers depends on their type (cf. so-called counting operators like *few books* vs. distributive universal quantifiers like *every student*), grammatical functions (subject vs. object) and parametric syntactic properties of Hungarian vs. English.

Here we explored two alternative approaches. As both represent a significant improvement over earlier accounts offered in the literature in terms of empirical coverage, and they rest on different specific assumptions regarding the syntactic positions targeted by quantifier phrases, we developed both approaches in parallel, and also compared their merits and remaining shortcomings.

The first alternative is based on an iterated series of functional projections dedicated to different semantico-pragmatic classes of ‘operators’ (in the form of a RefP>DistP>CountP operator functional projection series, projected above each A-position in the clause). We formulated an empirical generalization that an operator X cannot take inverse scope over an operator Y if X is lower than Y in both the operator hierarchy and the argument hierarchy (for our purposes, subject>object). We proposed an explanation based on the hypothesis that the RefP>DistP>CountP operator series are locality domains. This means that operator (quantifier) movement cannot skip an operator series: an operator must move to the series immediately above the series containing it. Furthermore, we argued that in Hungarian, CountP must be present in every operator series, while in English it cannot appear in certain series, which follows from a language-specific parameter related to a morphological property of certain syntactic features. This can account for the fact that in English the scope of counting quantifiers like *few students* is series-bounded: they cannot get moved and take scope over the operator series above their A-position. We also capture that in Hungarian the scopal behaviour of counting quantifiers is less restricted than in English, but more restricted than that of distributive quantifiers. The results reached pursuing this line of research are presented in [52], as well as in a paper [51], and they are also worked into the manuscript of the PhD dissertation of a junior project member (the dissertation is at an advanced stage, submission for defense is expected in the Autumn semester of this year). This type of approach is also extended to the syntactic behaviour of focus in Udmurt [62], and to the interaction of focus and negation in Italian dialects [53].

The second, more conservative alternative is based on slightly different assumptions, which have wide-ranging effects on the analysis made available: it draws on the adjunction-based scope-taking operation of Quantifier Raising, and the option of reconstruction from A-positions to base positions. The strict restrictions imposed on the scope of counting operators, in comparison with distributive universals, are accounted for in terms of the non-quantificational status of counters

and in terms of a focus-related constraint on A-reconstruction. We reduced the detected subject/object asymmetries to hierarchical asymmetries in Case-positions for subjects and objects and the said constraint on A-reconstruction. The results, including an account of the relevant differences between Hungarian and English, form part of a defended habilitationsschrift by the Principal Investigator (DSc dissertation) [40].

### **3.1.2 Phases and adverbials at the syntax/semantics interface: Phase-bounded covert adverbial raising, covert scrambling and local domains in adverbial modification**

The role of phases as local domains is also relevant, as we have shown, to the syntax of adverbials, as well as argument scrambling in Hungarian. The similarities to and differences from the syntax of quantifier scope (based on the results summarized in the previous subsection) are also explored. The results are discussed in [4] and [19], as well as in two chapters of [40]. Argument scrambling (of an internal argument over another internal argument) was also investigated empirically in an acceptability rating study [42], [67].

We also examined some other aspects of the behaviour of local syntactic domains involved in adverbial modification, investigating data from Chinese. We uncovered in these modifying constructions two types of one and the same predicational structure, giving rise to a single phasal syntactic domain (corresponding to Den Dikken's Relator-phrase, syntactically licensing predication relations): one involving the predicate as a complement and one involving it as a specifier. This result was presented in [31].

### **3.1.3 Phasal domains, aspect and apparent incorporation**

We also explored the role of local syntactic domains in the computation of inner (i.e., situation) aspect and in complex predicate formation involving locative elements. As for the latter, our account of particle pseudo-incorporation (see Section 2.2 above) is developed further in [15]. A phase-based approach is put forward to treat an intricate pattern of syntactic alternations involving locative particles and lexical locative phrases, maintaining that head movement extends phasal domains. Based on this analysis, we argued further that crucial locality properties of serial verb constructions can be reduced to the phase-based locality of movement, in interaction with a choice in the structural 'size' of infinitival clauses. This is true not only of the so-called direct orders but also of the so-called roll-up orders of verbal sequences [13].

On account of the impact of pseudo-incorporated elements on aspectual interpretation, we investigated the ramifications of our analysis of Hungarian pseudo-incorporation, according to which the crucial movement step targets a vP-internal position, for the computation of situation aspect. Telicity-inducing elements, similarly to pseudo-incorporated elements, were found to be restricted to the domain of the vP-internal functional projection variously dubbed AspP or PredP. In our account, extended to a comparative analysis of aspectual verbs in Russian and English, we capitalized on the assumptions that in order for an element to contribute to situation aspect interpretation, it must establish a syntactic relation with the relevant aspectual functional projection, and that in terms of locality, vP-internal AspP (or PredP) is a phasal domain [66]. It is argued, again based on Russian and English, that the relevant local relation is the Agree relation, rather than movement [50].

## 3.2 Local domains created

### 3.2.1 Focus movement: syntax, semantics and prosody

Another track of our investigations of the division of labour between syntax, semantics and prosody concentrated on focus constructions. We performed four prosodic experiments to study the prosodic conditions that affect focus movement in Hungarian. We have found (i) a general correspondence between the prosodic Topic-Comment partition and syntactic structure, and (ii) special cases where the correspondence is overridden in some speakers' data if the context forces a partition elsewhere. Our prosodic production experiments (carried out together with Shinichiro Ishihara) have confirmed that (i) although it is leftward oriented, the position of default prosodic prominence is not necessarily the immediately pre-verbal position in Hungarian, often identified as the 'focus position,' and (ii) for a group of speakers there exist systematic mismatches between semantic focus and the element bearing prosodic prominence. We also examined (in broad focus contexts) the prosodic behaviour of 'verbal modifiers' of different types and phonological lengths, which linearly occupy the same immediately pre-verbal position as focus. Comparing the prosody of the immediately pre-verbal element in broad focus and narrow focus contexts, we found no significant differences. Our results are published in [61]. In follow-up work, we are extending the investigation to the realization of prosodic prominence on different types of post-verbal foci in order to find out about its interrelations with prosodic phrase structure.

We argue for the following overall picture for Hungarian focus movements, both overt and covert varieties [18], [55]: (i) the trigger for these movements is a semantic type mismatch, which is due to the identificational interpretation of the focus constituent; (ii) the Stress-Focus Correspondence requirement does not directly interfere with these syntactic movements, it merely regulates their overt or covert phonological realization. The domain for focus movement is not syntactically stable: it is determined by interpretability in terms of a matching of semantic types. It is due to this reason that focus movement in Hungarian is potentially unbounded. Further, overtly moved focus defines an opaque locality domain for covert focus movements in the same finite clause. This is explained as an indirect effect of Scope Transparency: a preference to match semantic scopes with relative surface order. Our results are published in [54], and are also integrated into [40]. By contrast, non-identificational focus does not undergo either overt or covert movement, even though it may be interpreted as pragmatically exhaustive. We argue that whether it is interpreted as exhaustive or as non-exhaustive is affected by the Question Under Discussion, and the availability of the identificational focus construction, which encodes exhaustivity in its semantic interpretation [56].

In two further subprojects on focus constructions, we investigated two cases of apparent locality violations incurred by syntactic dependencies. The first study concerned specificational pseudocleft constructions in Hungarian and German, in comparison with English. One family of approaches to such pseudocleft constructions is to assume a dependency between the gap in the *wh*-clause and the clefted element, which in some way or other, violated standard locality constraints. This is avoided in the Question-in-disguise approach to specificational pseudoclefts, developed for English. We demonstrated (in collaboration with Jutta Hartmann), however, that this latter analysis is not applicable to Hungarian and German. We argued in favour of a third alternative, dubbed the WYSIWYG approach, which we showed to be able to

account for the complex pattern of connectivity and anti-connectivity effects that we found in these two languages [65].

Another focus construction exhibiting an apparent violation of standardly assumed principles of locality involves backward control, with focus on the controlled noun phrase in the embedded CP. According to an analysis of this construction in Hungarian, it involves non-local (i.e., long distance) agreement across the embedded infinitival CP boundary. We argued, however, that there is no need to settle for non-local agreement: the construction is better analyzed as involving infinitival restructuring, which renders the dependency between the matrix verbal agreement features and the controlled noun phrase confined to a properly local syntactic domain, viz. a single phase [68].

### **3.2.2 Weak islands and clausal embedding**

#### **3.2.2.1 Factive islands: Syntax, semantics, information structure and prosody**

A central type of weak islands are created through factive clausal embedding. Examining the movement of operators from factive complement clauses, we have argued that neither the semantic property of factivity, nor the information structural status of ‘new’ vs ‘old’ is represented in the syntax of factive embedded clauses. Instead, we explored the hypothesis that clausal complements are differentiated in the syntax by the property of referentiality; while other concepts such as factivity play only an indirect role, and are not mapped directly onto (left peripheral) syntactic structure. In particular, non-referential clauses are semantically and syntactically more complex than referential ones, and referential clauses behave both externally and w.r.t. movement out of them like referential NPs [24].

Based on this approach, assuming that prosody is mapped from the syntactic representation, our expectation was that first, factivity will not affect prosody, and second, the ‘new’/‘old’ information status will affect factive and non-factive syntactic contexts equally. These predictions were verified in a prosodic experiment. Our prosodic experimental results supported our approach since no significant difference was found between factive and non-factive embedding constructions when other factors such as novelty of information and contrastive focus (in short, information structure) were kept constant. These results are published as [6] and [63]. We explored the syntactic and semantic consequences of the same hypothesis (in collaboration with Carlos de Cuba), including the relationship between referentiality, factivity and givenness [44], [25], [26], or the effect of the referentiality of an extraction domain on island effects and wh-scope marking [20], [43].

Further, we have applied an operator-movement based derivation of referentiality in clauses, and, by analogy, in referring expressions such as definite DPs, which are also (selectively) opaque to movement. The account is based on the observation that the referential phrases in question display intervention effects both in terms of phrase-internal movement (like topicalization or argument fronting in general) and long-distance movement (like wh-extraction, i.e. weak islandhood, or the so-called ‘low construal’ in multiple embedding constructions). The idea we pursue in several talks [34], [35] and in two papers [32], [33] (in collaboration with Liliane Haegeman) is that these ‘intervention’ effects are created by the movement of an event operator from the TP-domain into CP, and it is this operator movement that results in an ‘event relative’ interpretation in clauses that corresponds to the property of referentiality.

These results are also incorporated into the PhD dissertation of a junior member of the project [69]. The dissertation has been submitted for defense.

### **3.2.2.2 A semantic analysis of presuppositional, negative and wh-islands islands**

Investigating the role of semantics in weak islands, we proposed a new semantic account for presuppositional islands for *wh*-movement, which account we have shown to be extendable to negative islands as well. Our central claim is that these islands arise because they are predicted to lead to a contradiction at some level. Factive islands arise because manner and degree questions (but not questions about individuals) come with a presupposition that is contradictory. As no context can entail a contradictory set of propositions, these questions always lead to presupposition failure. We have also shown that the strength of the factive inference generated by a certain intervener correlates with the strength of the island that it creates. These results appear as [45].

In related work (in collaboration with Benjamin Spector), we account for the sensitivity of degree questions to negative islands, as well as for the fact that negative islands can be obviated by some properly placed modals. Drawing on the assumption that any question presupposes that it has a maximally informative answer, our approach derives negative island effects in degree questions from the fact that the relevant question, due to its meaning alone, can never have a maximally informative answer. These outcomes are published as [47].

Building on these results, we argued that the same approach based on a maximization failure can be extended to cover *wh*-islands that arise in degree questions. We showed that *wh*-islands with know-class predicates cannot receive a maximally informative true answer, and are thus unacceptable. *Wh*-islands with wonder-type predicates, on the other hand, are predicted to have a most informative true answer only in very special and unnatural contexts, which renders them pragmatically odd [46].

### **3.2.3 Intervention and apparent intervention effects**

#### **3.2.3.1 Focus in (apparent) intervention effects**

One type of locality effects, known as Beck effects, involve intervention by certain types of quantificational items between the pre- and post-movement positions of an element. The prominent ‘focus theory of Beck-intervention’ is semantic in nature, and it holds that interveners are all foci. According to the results of our investigations to test this conception based on data from Hungarian, as compared to Korean and German, some apparent Beck effects in Hungarian can be explained as focus intervention effects. Some other apparent cases of a Beck effect, however, are shown not to involve intervention at all. We also argue that it is not focus semantic values as such that trigger intervention effects. In some specific cases, a higher order semantic analysis is required. Our results have been included in [1], [2], [8], and [7].

#### **3.2.3.2 Immediate scope effects**

Finally, we put forward the claim that phenomena descriptively referred to as ‘stativizing negation’, ‘NPI *until*’ and ‘expletive negation’ can be reduced to a scope configuration between a durative adverbial and an operator that immediately scopes under it, such as negation, focus or a universal quantifier, without an intervening other scopal element. We first developed this conception in [21], [27], and [28]. The

approach was then further elaborated in [29], [30], [22], as well as in the paper in [64] and a chapter of the dissertation of a junior member of the project [68].

#### 4. **Other publications and presentations related to the project theme**

- We presented an outline of the research project in [5].
- The general theoretical framework that we have adopted for our project is reviewed for an international encyclopedia of linguistics in [39]. The specific theoretical framework on which our research has been based is also reviewed for the wider Hungarian professional audience in [11] and [12]. [39] is an encyclopedia entry on a key syntactic operation in that framework.
- Some of our findings in Sections 3.1.1 and 3.2.1 were incorporated in a series of lectures held at HUB, Brussels [41], and into two graduate courses at the linguistics graduate school of Pazmany University, Hungary.
- Our work on predicate doubling in Hungarian [23] showed that the predicate fronting movement is sensitive to the usual locality constraints on movement. We analyzed the dative case-marking on an apparently non-homogeneous class of predicative elements as the spellout of a PredP projection that is *not* dominated by Tense.
- [58] is a special journal issue edited by the project's Principal Investigator, dedicated to an overarching theme of the project, viz. the interaction of syntax with its interface components. The significance of this research area is elaborated in [59].
- [49] is a review of a book containing several chapters of direct relevance to the project's theme.

#### 5. **Other project activities**

- We organized three international events:
  - (1) The Second Budapest Generative Syntax Workshop (19 June 2009),
  - (2) Minimalist Approaches to Syntactic Locality (26-27 August 2009), and
  - (3) Workshop on Head Movement and Locality (28 August 2009);all at the Research Institute for Linguistics, HAS.
- We gave a number of talks both abroad and in Hungary that are not mentioned in the list of publications, as they have been superseded by our papers written on the same topics.



<b>PROJEKT ZÁRÓ BESZÁMOLÓ</b> <b>közlemények</b>		OTKA-azonosító: 73537	Típus: NF
		Szakmai jelentés:	
Vezető kutató: Surányi Balázs		Kutatóhely: (MTA Nyelvtudományi Intézet)	
Zsúri: NYE	Kezdet: 2008. 04. 01	Teljes kutatási időszak: 2008-04-01 - 2012-02-29	Főkönyviszám: 71130 Nyomtatás: 2012. 04. 23.

**NEM VÉGLEGESÍTETT VÁLTOZAT!!!**

Sorszám	Közleményjegyzék	Dokumentum típusa	Impakt faktor	OTKA támogatás feltüntetve?
1.	Bende-Farkas, Á: <b>Adverbs of quantification, it-clefts and Hungarian focus</b> , Handout of abstract accepted for oral presentation at the Focus at the Syntax-Semantics Interface workshop. 6-7 April 2008. University of Stuttgart. [1], 2008	absztrakt	-	igen
2.	Bende-Farkas, Á: <b>On the interaction of syntactic focus and it-clefts with adverbs of quantification</b> , Handout of abstract invited for an oral presentation at the SinFonija 1 Workshop. 10 October 2008. University of Nova Gorica, Slovenia. [2], 2008	absztrakt	-	igen
3.	Surányi, B: <b>The theory of head movement and cyclic Spell Out</b> , In: Hartmann J; Hegedus V; H van Riemsdijk. Sounds of Silence: Empty Elements in Syntax and Phonology. Elsevier, Amsterdam. 293-337. [3], 2008	könyvfejezet	-	nem
4.	Surányi, B: <b>Határozóosztályok és mondattartományok</b> , Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 105. [4], 2008	folyóiratcikk	-	nem
5.	Surányi, B; Ürögdi B: <b>A szintaktikai lokalitás minimalista megközelítésben (projektbemutató)</b> , Handout of accepted abstract for the conference A magyar nyelvészeti kutatások újabb eredményei. 23-24 május 2008, Kolozsvári Babes-Bolyai Egyetem. [5], 2008	absztrakt	-	igen
6.	Ürögdi B; Ishihara S: <b>The prosody and information structure of factive vs. non-factive embedding constructions: A case study on Hungarian</b> , Handout of abstract invited for an oral presentation at the Workshop on Information Structure, held at Univeristy of Potsdam, 12 December 2008 [6], 2008	absztrakt	-	igen
7.	Bende-Farkas, Á: <b>Are there Beck-effects in Hungarian?</b> , Submitted to Natural Language Semantics. [7], 2009	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
8.	Bende-Farkas, Á; Kamp H: <b>Negation and N-Words in Hungarian</b> , Handout of abstract for an oral presentation at the International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian 9. 30 August–1 September 2009, University of Debrecen [8], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
9.	Surányi, B: <b>Subject Islands: Cyclicity of Derivation and Intermediate Movement to Edges</b> , Proceedings of 38th Meeting of the North East Linguistic Society. GSLA, Amherst. 401-414. [9], 2009	konferenciaticikk	-	igen
10.	Surányi, B: <b>Subject and object islands and the Interpretability Condition on Transfer</b> , Handout of abstract for an oral presentation at the Third International Conference on the Linguistics of Contemporary English. 14-17 July 2009, University of London [10], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
11.	Surányi, B: <b>Probléma-eltolódások a chomskyánus nyelvelméletben: A generatív nyelvészet ma.</b> , Magyar Tudomány 170: 1052–1058. [11], 2009	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
12.	Surányi, B: <b>Probléma-eltolódások a generatív nyelvészetben: Mi minimális a minimalizmusban?</b> , Nyelvtudományi Közlemények 106: 135-141. [12], 2009	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
13.	Surányi, B.: <b>Verbal particles inside and outside vP.</b> , Acta Linguistica Hungarica 56. 201-249. [13], 2009	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
14.	Surányi, B.: <b>"Incorporated" locative adverbials in Hungarian.</b> , In: É. Kiss, Katalin (ed.) Adverbs and Adverbial Adjuncts at the Interfaces. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. [14], 2009	könyvfejezet	-	igen
15.	Surányi, B.: <b>Preverbs, Chain Reduction, and phases.</b> , In: Marcel den Dikken and Robert Vago (ed.) Approaches to Hungarian 11. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 217-250. [15], 2009	könyvfejezet	-	igen
16.	Surányi, B.: <b>Natures of cyclicity of derivation: Derivational DP islands.</b> , In: John Bailyn et al. (eds.) Proceedings of the Second Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Grammar. Novi Sad: University of Novi Sad. 74–90. [16], 2009	konferenciaticikk	-	igen
17.	Surányi, B.: <b>Cyclic derivation, and the opacity of subjects and objects.</b> , In: Peter Coopmans, Martin Everaert and Marijana Marelj (eds.) Promoting Interfaces. Utrecht: Utrecht Institute of Linguistics OTS. 465-478. [17], 2009	könyvfejezet	-	igen
18.	Surányi, B.: <b>Identificational focusing: Focus raising and stress-focus correspondence.</b> , In: Vincenzo Moscati and Emilio Servidio (eds.) Studies in Linguistics 2009(3). Siena: CISCL, University of Siena. 258–268. [18], 2009	konferenciaticikk	-	igen
19.	Surányi, B.: <b>Határozók és kvantorok a magyar mondat szerkezetben. A magyar „rugalmas” szörend.</b> , In: Maleczki, M; Németh T (eds) A mai magyar nyelv leírásának újabb	könyvfejezet	-	igen

	módszerei VII. Modellek, elméletek és elvek érvényessége a nyelvi adatok tükrében. Szeged. 33-66. [19], 2009			
20.	Ürögdi B; Cuba C de: <b>Clausal Expletives and the Referentiality of CP</b> , Handout of abstract for an oral presentation at 19th Colloquium on Generative Grammar. University of the Basque Country, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain. 1-3 April 2009. [20], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
21.	Ürögdi, B: <b>Temporal adverbial clauses with or without operator movement.</b> , In: K. É. Kiss (ed.) Adverbs and Adverbial Adjuncts at the Interfaces. Mouton: Berlin. 133-168. [21], 2009	könyvfejezet	-	igen
22.	Ürögdi, B: <b>A végpontjelölő időhatározói mellékmondatok szerkezete és értelmezése</b> , In: É. Kiss, Katalin and Hegedűs, Attila (eds), Nyelvelmélet és dialektológia. Páliscsaba, Pazmany University. 231-248. [22], 2009	konferenciacikk	-	igen
23.	Ürögdi, B: <b>Dative as predicate marker</b> , In: John Bailyn et al. (eds.) Proceedings of the Second Novi Sad Workshop on Generative Grammar. Novi Sad, University of Novi Sad. [23], 2009	konferenciacikk	-	igen
24.	Ürögdi, B; C. de Cuba: <b>Eliminating factivity from syntax: Sentential complements in Hungarian.</b> , In: M. den Dikken and R. M. Vago (eds.) Approaches to Hungarian 11. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 29-64. [24], 2009	könyvfejezet	-	igen
25.	Ürögdi, B; de Cuba, C: <b>Roots and Radicals: The Referentiality of CP.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to the Workshop on Root Phenomena. ZAS, Berlin [25], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
26.	Ürögdi, B; de Cuba, C: <b>Referentiality of CP.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to LSA Annual Meeting 2009, Baltimore [26], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
27.	Ürögdi, B; MacDonald, J: <b>Operators in the TP-domain and Aspectual Interpretation.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to the 19th Colloquium on Generative Grammar, Vitoria-Gasteiz, Spain. [27], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
28.	Ürögdi, B; MacDonald, J: <b>Against Stativizing Negation, Expletive Negation and NPI-until.</b> , Handout of abstract invited to the 2nd Budapest Generative Syntax Workshop, Budapest. Hungary [28], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
29.	Ürögdi, B; MacDonald, J: <b>Duratives, negation and reference time identification.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to the Chronos 9 conference. Paris, France [29], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
30.	Ürögdi, B; MacDonald, J: <b>Reducing 'stativizing negation' to an LF configuration.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to Sarajevo Linguistic Gathering 4 & Sinfonija 2. Sarajevo, BIH [30], 2009	absztrakt	-	igen
31.	Bartos, H: <b>Relators, adverbials, complements</b> , Joint Conference Abstracts of 18th Conf. of the International Association of Chinese Linguistics (IACL-18), Harvard University & NACCL-22, Harvard University [31], 2010	absztrakt	-	nem
32.	Haegeman, L; Ürögdi, B: <b>Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account</b> , Theoretical Linguistics 36: 111-152. [32], 2010	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
33.	Haegeman, L; Ürögdi, B: <b>Operator movement, referentiality and intervention.</b> , Theoretical Linguistics 36: 233-246. [33], 2010	folyóiratcikk	-	nem
34.	Haegeman, L; Ürögdi, B: <b>Referential CPs and DPs: An operator movement account.</b> , Handout for talk, GLOW Asia, Beijing, China. [34], 2010	egyéb	-	igen
35.	Haegeman, L; Ürögdi, B: <b>Op-movement in referential CPs and DPs.</b> , Handout for talk at conference Sinfonija 3, Novi Sad, Serbia. [35], 2010	egyéb	-	igen
36.	Surányi, B: <b>Subextraction from subjects and objects: Cyclicity and Freezing</b> , In: Vincent Torrens (ed.) Movement and Clitics. Cambridge: Cambridge Scholars. 64-84. [36], 2010	könyvfejezet	-	igen
37.	Surányi, B: <b>Toward a strongly derivational syntax</b> , In: Michael Putnam (ed.) Exploring Crash-Proof Grammars. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 167-212. [38], 2010	könyvfejezet	-	igen
38.	Surányi, B: <b>Principles and Parameters theory</b> , In: Patrick Colm Hogan (ed.) Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences. New York: Cambridge University Press. 666-669. [39], 2010	könyvfejezet	-	nem
39.	Surányi, B: <b>Merge</b> , In: Patrick Colm Hogan (ed.) Cambridge Encyclopedia of the Language Sciences. New York: Cambridge University Press. 482-483. [39], 2010	könyvfejezet	-	nem
40.	Surányi, B: <b>Freedom of Word Order and Domains for Movement: A flexible syntax of Hungarian.</b> , Habilitationschrift. RIL, Hungarian Academy of Sciences. [40], 2010	disszertáció	-	nem
41.	Surányi, B: <b>The flexibility of syntax: An interface perspective (on Hungarian)</b> , Handouts for six lectures, 7-10 June 2010, Center for Research in Syntax, Semantics and Phonology (CRISSP), Hogeschool-Universiteit Brussel (Belgium) [41], 2010	egyéb	-	igen
42.	Szalontai, Á: <b>A fully configurational analysis of the Hungarian vP</b> , Handout for talk, LingDok 14 (14th National Conference of Doctoral Students in Linguistics), Szeged. November 2010. [42], 2010	egyéb	-	igen
43.	Ürögdi, B: <b>Referentiality restrictions on the wh-expletive construction in Hungarian</b> , Handout for talk, The Syntax of Finno-Ugric Languages and Universal Grammar, Páliscsaba. August 2010. [43], 2010	egyéb	-	igen
44.	Ürögdi, B; de Cuba, C: <b>Clearing up the 'Facts' on Complementation.</b> , In: University of Pennsylvania Working Papers in Linguistics: Vol. 16: Iss. 1, Article 6. [44], 2010	konferenciacikk	-	igen

45.	Abrusán, M: <b>Presuppositional and negative islands: A semantic account</b> , Natural Language Semantics 19(3). 257–321. [45], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
46.	Abrusán, M: <b>Wh-islands in degree questions.</b> , Semantics and Pragmatics Volume 4, Article 5: 1–44. [46], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
47.	Abrusán, M; Spector, B: <b>A Semantics for Degree Questions Based on Intervals: Negative Islands and Their Obviation</b> , Journal of Semantics 28: 107–147. [47], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
48.	Bartos, H: <b>Hungarian external causatives: Monoclausal but bi-eventive</b> , In: Ringen, C. & T. Laczko (eds.), Approaches to Hungarian 12. John Benjamins, Amsterdam/Philadelphia. 1–38. [48], 2011	könyvfejezet	-	igen
49.	Gyarmathy, Zs; Szalontai, Á: <b>Marcel den Dikken-Robert M. Vago (eds): Approaches to Hungarian, Volume 11: Papers from the 2007 New York Conference. Book Review.</b> , Acta Linguistica Hungarica Vol. 58. Issue 4. 467-480. [49], 2011	egyéb	-	nem
50.	MacDonald, J: <b>The phrase structure of phase verbs.</b> , Acta Linguistica Hungarica 58.3: 261-276. [50], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
51.	Olsvay, Cs: <b>A lokalitás szerepe a lehetséges operátorhatókörök szintaktikai magyarázatában</b> , Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXIII: 377-414. [51], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
52.	Olsvay, Cs: <b>Inverse scope in Hungarian: A locality based approach to the relation of operator scope and grammatical functions</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to the International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian 2011. Lund, Sweden, August 2011. [52], 2011	absztrakt	-	igen
53.	Olsvay, Cs.: <b>Tagadás olasz dialektusokban: Létezik-e univerzális funkcionális hierarchia?</b> , Handout of a talk at Nyelvelmélet és Dialektológia Konferencia. Piliscsaba, Hungary. 15-16 November 2011. [53], 2011	absztrakt	-	igen
54.	Surányi, B: <b>Interface configurations: Identificational focus and the flexibility of syntax</b> , In: Ad Neeleman and Ivona Kucerova (eds.) Information Structure: Contrasts and Positions. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. 87-101. [54], 2011	könyvfejezet	-	igen
55.	Surányi, B: <b>An interface account of identificational focus movement</b> , In: Laczko, Tibor, and Catherine Ringen (eds.) Approaches to Hungarian 12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 163-208. [55], 2011	könyvfejezet	-	igen
56.	Surányi, B: <b>A szintaktikailag jelöletlen fókusz pragmatikája.</b> , Általános Nyelvészeti Tanulmányok XXIII. 281-313. [56], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
57.	Surányi, B: <b>Goal locative particles in Hungarian: Argument structure and movement chains.</b> , Handout of invited talk at Workshop on Spatial and Temporal Relations in LFG. Debrecen, Hungary. 1 April 2011. [57], 2011	absztrakt	-	igen
58.	Surányi, B (ed.): <b>Acta Linguistica Hungarica Vol. 58. Issue 3.</b> , Acta Linguistica Hungarica Vol. 58. Issue 3. [58], 2011	szerkesztett mű	-	nem
59.	Surányi, B.: <b>Syntax and its Interfaces: Transformational Generative Perspectives. Guest editor's note.</b> , Acta Linguistica Hungarica 58(3). 197-201. [59], 2011	egyéb	-	igen
60.	Surányi, B.: <b>Structural government effects in Hungarian locative incorporation.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to Explorations in Syntactic Government and Subcategorisation. Cambridge, UK. 31 August-3 September 2011. [60], 2011	absztrakt	-	igen
61.	Surányi, B; Ishihara, S; Schubö, F: <b>Syntax–Prosody Mapping, Topic–Comment Structure and Stress–Focus Correspondence in Hungarian.</b> , In: Gorka Elordieta Alcibar and Pilar Prieto (eds.) Prosody and Meaning. Berlin: Mouton/de Gruyter. [61], 2011	könyvfejezet	-	igen
62.	Tánczos, O; Surányi, B: <b>Iterated syntax and focus in Udmurt.</b> , Handout of abstract accepted to 10th International Conference on the Structure of Hungarian. Lund, Sweden. 25-28 August 2011. [62], 2011	absztrakt	-	igen
63.	Ürögdi, B; Ishihara, S: <b>The Syntax-Prosody Interface and Sentential Complementation in Hungarian</b> , In: Laczko, T. and C. Ringen (eds.) Approaches to Hungarian 12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. 63-84. [63], 2011	könyvfejezet	-	igen
64.	Ürögdi, B; MacDonald, J: <b>Against Stativizing Negation, Expletive Negation and NPI-until.</b> , submitted to Acta Linguistica Hungarica 58(3): 203-220. [64], 2011	folyóiratcikk	-	igen
65.	Hartmann, J; Hegedűs, V; Surányi, B: <b>Pseudoclefts in Hungarian and German (submitted)</b> , Brandtler, J; Molnar, V; Platzak, C. (eds) Approaches to Hungarian 12. Amsterdam: John Benjamins. [65], 2012	könyvfejezet	-	igen
66.	MacDonald, J: <b>Nouns affect aspect syntactically</b> , In: Proceedings of the 29th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Press. [66], 2012	konferenciacikk	-	igen
67.	Szalontai, Á: <b>On the configurationality of Hungarian Dative constructions: An experimental study.</b> , In: Surányi, B and Varga, D (eds.) Proceedings of the 1st Central-European Conference in Linguistics for Postgraduate Students. Pázmány University, Budapest. 294-317.[67], 2012	konferenciacikk	-	igen
68.	Szécseyi, K: <b>An LF-driven account of infinitival constructions with a nominative subject.</b> , Acta Linguistica Hungarica (submitted) [68], 2012	folyóiratcikk	-	igen

69.	Ürögdi, B: <b>Operator Movements in Embedded Clauses</b> , PhD dissertation, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest. [69], 2012	disszertáció	-	igen
70.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
71.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
72.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
73.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
74.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
75.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
76.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
77.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
78.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
79.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
80.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
81.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
82.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
83.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
84.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
85.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
86.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
87.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
88.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen
89.	xx: <b>xx</b> , xx, 2013	egyéb	-	igen