Similarly, *szál* 'thread' is normally incompatible with the noun *ember* 'person' (1420a), but just in case the number can be considered to be contextually very low, the combination is fine. Note that (1420b) also shows that the numeral can be other than *egy* 'one' in case the used number is a low number in the context.

(1420) a. *száz szál ember
hundred thread man
Intended meaning: 'a hundred men'

b. Három szál ember lézeng a téren.
three thread man idle.3Sg the square.Sup
'Merely three people are idling on the square.'

Further frequently used phrases involving the exceptional use of *szál* 'thread' are shown in (1421).

(1421) a. egy szál gitárral, egy szál harisnyában / ingben / semmiben
one thread guitar.Ins one thread stocking.Ine / shirt.Ine / nothing.Ine
'with a single guitar, wearing [just stockings] / [just a shirt] / nothing'

b. Gond egy szál se!
problem one thread neither
'No problem!'

The fact that it is precisely with *szem* 'eye' and *szál* 'thread' that the selectional restrictions between the classifier and the noun can be suspended in the context of a low numeral is quite possibly related to the meanings of these classifiers. Both *szem* 'eye' and *szál* 'thread' express that a dimension of the object they categorize can be considered to be small: with *szem* 'eye' this is the diameter, while with *szál* 'thread' this is the width of the object. It is therefore expected that if any classifiers have a distinguished role in expressions of minimal or contextually very low quantity, then it will be these two classifiers.

2.7. Bibliographical notes *(Gábor Alberti, Anikó Csirmaz, Éva Dékány, Judit Farkas, Judit Kleiber, Veronika Szabó, Bernadett Szőke, Bálint Tóth and Anita Viszket)*

As we have followed the method of permanently inserting references in the main text of the subsections of the chapter, our only task here is to highlight the main points.

Of the questions of complementation, discussed in section 2.1, the topic (of the mere status) of postnominal complement zone of nouns is a highly contentious issue in the Hungarian generative literature (Szabolcsi and Laczkó 1992, É. Kiss 2000, Alberti and Medve 2002/2005). Our discussion of the topic is essentially based on Alberti, Farkas and Szabó (2015). As for the topic of distinguishing arguments from adjuncts, Komlósy's (1992, 1994) classification has served as a point of departure (in particular, in the case of the concept of *optional* arguments), together with Laczkó's (2000a) and Rákosi's (2009) argumentations on *conceptual arguments, quasi-arguments* or *thematic adjuncts*. In practice, we have essentially adapted the

test types proposed in the corresponding section of *SoD-NP* (2.2) and proposed two further tests, which are based on the inclination of arguments of nouns for taking internal and/or external scope (see Farkas, Szabó and Alberti 2015: subsection 4.2). On further potential tests to distinguish arguments from adjuncts and/or to measure degree of argumenthood, see Rákosi (2014b: 27–28, 48, 149, 180).

In section 2.2 on modification, Szabolcsi (1992, 1994), Szabolcsi and Laczkó (1992), Bartos (2000b) and É. Kiss (2002) serve as a basis for the discussion of the two prenominal possessor positions, while attributivized oblique-case-marked satellites and the order of attributives are described on the basis of Laczkó (1995, 2000a) and Kenesei, Vago and Fenyvesi (1998), respectively. Also the existence of a pre-D non-possessor zone is argued for (see also Farkas and Alberti 2016), on the basis of similar proposals by Giusti (1996) and Roehrs (2013) towards the universal existence of a noun-phrase-internal pre-D operator layer. In connection with possessive constructions, such hot topics of the Hungarian generative literature are demonstrated as the relationship between (in)alienability and different allomorphs of the possessedness suffix *-(j)A* (Kiefer 1985, 2000b, Elekfi 2000, Den Dikken 2015, Alberti and Farkas 2015), and between possession and determination (Fokos 1960, 1963, É. Kiss 1999, Bartos 2000b).

In section 2.3 the differences between close and loose appositive constructions were introduced on the basis of the international literature (Burton-Roberts 1975, Molitor 1979, Lasersohn 1986, Acuña-Fariña 1996, 1999; Huddleston and Pullum 2002, Keizer 2005, Potts 2005, Lekakou and Szendrői 2007) because the traditional Hungarian grammars (Tompa 1962, Rácz 1968, A. Jászó 1991, Keszler 2000, Keszler and Lengyel 2002) do not differentiate these constructions. Seven subtypes of the close appositive construction were distinguished following and completing the subtypes of Keizer (2005). The subtypes of loose apposition are based on Szőke (2015a, b) following Heringa (2012). The agreement between the predicate and the loose appositive construction (occurring as subject or object) was introduced by observations of Szőke (2015b).

The international literature on classifiers (see section 2.4) is rather extensive, and there have been a number of attempts at creating different systems of categorization (Aikhenvald (2003), Borer (2005), Beckwith (2007), Zhang (2013), to name a few). However, in the Hungarian literature classifiers have received relatively little attention. The most exhaustive discussion of classifiers is Dékány (2011) and Dékány and Csirmaz (2014). Schvarcz (2014) deals with the semantic description of classifier construction, her findings are presented in subsection 2.4.3.3. Discussion on partitive constructions (subsection 2.4.5) can be found in Chisarik (2002).

In section 2.5, the universal features of articles regarding their core meaning, definiteness, specificity and distributivity were introduced on the basis of the international literature (Barwise and Cooper 1981, Heim 1982, and Alexiadou *et al.* 2007). The most detailed examination of Hungarian-specific issues about the syntax and semantics of determiners and vocative constructions can be found in Szabolcsi and Laczkó (1992). The main concept of genericity was discussed on the basis of Carlson and Pelletier (1995), and Alexiadou at al. (2007); the notion of "kind" was introduced based on Chierchia (1998); and finally, Hungarian generics were

examined using Farkas and de Swart (2009). Hungarian bare nouns are mentioned on numerous occasions in the literature, but mostly as the clear example of a non-specific noun phrase. An overview specifically about bare nouns can be found in Kiefer (1990-91). Kiefer argues that bare nouns are lexically determined in the majority of cases, and incorporate into the verb, forming a complex predicate, but nonetheless gives the first thorough survey of the phenomenon. Kiefer's line of reasoning is also taken up by Bende-Farkas (2001), according to whom bare nouns can neither be modified by attributive adjectives, nor adverbials. Maleczki (1992, 1995) discusses bare nouns from a semantic perspective. Egedi (2014) gives an overview of Hungarian articles and demonstratives from a language-historical point of view. About the deictic uses of demonstratives see Levinson (2004).

In section 2.6 we discussed numerals and quantifiers. Most of the previous work on quantification has been carried out in formal semantics. Bach *et al.* (1995), for instance, presents a large number of studies on quantification in various languages. Since the 1980s much of the research on quantification has been carried out within the theory of generalized quantifiers, as developed by Barwise and Cooper (1981). For a general introduction, see, for instance, Partee *et al.* (1990: ch. 14). The distinction between weak and strong determiners was first made by Milsark (1974, 1977) in a number of studies on the English existential construction and the definiteness effect. For more extensive discussions of the expletive construction and the definiteness effect in English and Dutch see Reuland (1983), Bennis (1986) and the papers collected in Reuland & Ter Meulen (1989). Other relevant discussions can be found in Diesing (1992); De Hoop (1995), who deals with the weak-strong indefinites. A recent, comprehensive review of the literature on the English expletive construction and the definiteness effect can be found in Hartmann (2008). The syntactic position of numerals and quantifiers within the Hungarian DP, the restriction on the co-occurrence of numerals/quantifiers and the plural marker, as well as the verbal agreement elicited by quantified expressions has been investigated in Bartos (1999: ch. 2.1). Hungarian quantifiers have recently been examined in detail from a descriptive point of view in Csirmaz and Szabolcsi (2012). The relevant theoretical literature on Hungarian quantifiers is very extensive, and it mostly focuses on issues about quantifier position in the clause and scope. Some of the works that serve as an overview and introduction include Hunyadi (1986), Szabolcsi (1997, 2010, 2015), É. Kiss (2006b), and Csirmaz (2009). Hunyadi (1986) and Szabolcsi (1997) study the effect of surface order and intonation on quantifier scope. Szabolcsi (2010) summarizes work on quantification since the 1970s, and examines cross-linguistic data to probe into theoretical issues of quantification, while Szabolcsi (2015) investigates the compositional semantics of quantifier words. É. Kiss (2006b) focuses on the interpretation of numeral+noun sequences as well as the question of why certain quantifiers have to, while others cannot appear in the focus position of the sentence. Csirmaz (2009) is a detailed study of A-quantification. Further influential theoretical work on quantification includes Brody and Szabolcsi (2003), Surányi (2006a), Olsvay (2006), Bende-Farkas (2009), and É. Kiss (2010).