



- (4) a.  $\llbracket \text{meat} \rrbracket = [w_1 \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{🍖}_1 \vee \text{🍖}_2 \vee \text{🍖}, \text{🍖}_1 \vee \text{🍖}_2, \\ \text{🍖}_1 \vee \text{🍖}, \text{🍖}_2 \vee \text{🍖}, \text{🍖}_1, \text{🍖}_2, \text{🍖} \end{array} \right\}]$   
 b.  $\llbracket \text{meat} \rrbracket_{\text{CLS}} = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \text{🍖}_1, \text{🍖}_2, \text{🍖}_1 \vee \text{🍖}_2, \text{🍖} \}]$   
 c.  $\mathcal{R} = \{ \llbracket \text{pork} \rrbracket = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \text{🍖}_1, \text{🍖}_2, \text{🍖}_1 \vee \text{🍖}_2 \}], \llbracket \text{beef} \rrbracket = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \text{🍖} \}] \}$

(5) P is a property,  $\mathcal{R}$  a set of properties, D is the interpretation domain of instances and W is that of worlds of evaluation.  $\mathcal{R}$  spreads over P iff  $|\mathcal{R}| > 1$  and

- a. For every  $w \in W$  and  $d \in P_w$ , there is a  $Q \in \mathcal{R}$  such that  $d \in Q_w$   
 b. For every  $Q \in \mathcal{R}$ , there is a  $w \in W$  and  $d \in D$  such that  $d \in Q_w$

- (6) a.  $P = \llbracket \text{weapon} \rrbracket_{\text{CLS}} = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \text{🔪}, \text{🚀}_1, \text{🚀}_2 \}]$   
 b.  $\mathcal{R} = \{ \llbracket \text{knife} \rrbracket = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \text{🔪}, \text{🔪} \}], \llbracket \text{artillery} \rrbracket = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \text{🚀}_1, \text{🚀}_2, \text{🚀}_1 \vee \text{🚀}_2 \}] \}$

(7) N is a noun in language L whose intension is  $\llbracket N \rrbracket$ . N can count subkinds iff

- a.  $\llbracket N \rrbracket_{\text{CLS}}$  is spread over by a set of properties  $\mathcal{R}$  s.t.  
 b. every  $Q \in \mathcal{R}$  is named by a noun in L

Under (7), the different reference of singular count nouns in English versus Hungarian ([–cumulative] versus [+cumulative]) underlies the difference in the ability of OMNs to count subkinds. *Weapon* satisfies (7) thanks to nouns like the [–cumulative] *knife* and [+cumulative] *artillery* naming properties in a set ( $\mathcal{R}$ ) that spreads over  $\llbracket \text{weapon} \rrbracket_{\text{CLS}}$ , but a [+cumulative] noun can only satisfy (7) if every property in  $\mathcal{R}$  is named by a [+cumulative] noun. This is because [+cumulative] nouns range over plural sums of a single kind (e.g.  $\text{🔪}_1 \vee \text{🔪}_2$ ), but such sums are precluded from the extensions of [–cumulative] nouns (e.g. *knife*). Thus, *ammunitions* is bad in (1b) because English does not have enough [+cumulative] nouns to form a set that spreads over  $\llbracket \text{ammunition} \rrbracket_{\text{CLS}}$  (e.g. *hollow-point bullet* is [–cumulative]), but singular count nouns in Hungarian being [+cumulative] predicts that OMNs in this language should be able to count subkinds, as is borne out in our novel data.

**Discussion.** Models of countability make more accurate predictions if instance and subkind countability are independent (contra S&F 2016, 2018). That OMNs in Hungarian can count subkinds but not instances proves that subkind-countability does not entail instance-countability, and that human nouns like *student* can count instances but not subkinds proves independence. Our analysis predicts cross-linguistic diversity in subkind-countability given we argue it depends on conceptual well-foundedness, which for concepts named by [+cumulative] nouns depends on the language having enough [+cumulative] nouns to name subkinds.

Brisson, C. M. *Distributivity, maximality, and floating quantifiers*. Rutgers University dissertation. • Carlson, G. N. 1980. *Reference to kinds in English*. New York & London: Garland. • Carlson, Gregory N. 2010. Generics and concepts. In Francis Jeffrey Pelletier (ed.), *Kinds, things, and stuff: Mass terms and generics*, 16-35. New York: Oxford University Press. • Grimm, S. & B. Levin. 2017. Artifact nouns: Reference and countability. In A. Lamont & K. Tetzloff (eds.), *Proceedings of the North East Linguistic Society (NELS) 47*, 55-64. Amherst: GLSA. • Kay, P. 1971. Taxonomy and semantic contrast. *Language* 47(4). 866-887. • Rullmann, H. & A. You. 2006. General number and the semantics and pragmatics of indefinite bare nouns in Mandarin Chinese. In K. von Stechow & K. Turner (eds.), *Where semantics meets pragmatics*, 175-198. Amsterdam: Elsevier. • Sutton, P. R. & H. Filip. 2016. Counting in context: Count/mass variation and restrictions on coercion in collective artifact nouns. In M. Moroney, C. Little, J. Collard & D. Burgdorf (eds.), *Proceedings of SALT 26*, 350-370. • Sutton, P. R. & H. Filip. 2018. Restrictions on subkind coercion in superordinate object mass nouns. In R. Truswell, C. Cummins, C. Heycock, B. Rabern & H. Rohde (eds.), *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung 21*, 1195-213. University of Edinburgh.