Introduction. Object mass nouns (OMNs) in English cannot count instances or subkinds (Sutton & Filip 2016, 2018; S&F), as shown in (1) with *ammunition*.

- (1) a. Two {bullets, #ammunitions, units of ammunition} fell on the floor.
 - b. Our two best-selling {bullets, #ammunitions, kinds of ammunition}

are hollow-point bullets and soft-point bullets.

S&F (2016, 2018) propose that overlap underlies both sorts of countability. This predicts that OMNs should not be able to count subkinds in any language. We put forth a novel analysis that draws from Carlson (1980:§6.1) and Grimm & Levin (2017) and accounts for novel data: OMNs in Hungarian can count subkinds (e.g. *ruházat* 'apparel', *üvegáru* 'glassware', *lőszer* 'ammunition'). The latter is shown in (2b).

(2) a.	Két	#(darab)	lősz	ert	számoltam.	
	Two	piece	ammunition.ACC		count.1SG.PST	
	'I counted two pieces of ammunition.'					
b	. Két	{golyót,	lőszert} ammunition.ACC}		nem	árulok:
	Two	{bullet.ACC,			not	sell.1SG
	üreges	golyókat	es	lágypontos	golyókat.	
	hollow.point	bullet.PL.ACC	and	soft.point	bullet.PL.ACC	
'I do not sell two (kinds of) {bullets, ammunitions}:						
	hollow-point bullets and soft-point bullets.					

Background. S&F (2016) argue that *kitchenware* cannot count units of kitchenware due to being unable to resolve overlap between units that can count as one (e.g. a mortar and pestle and the mortar). Similarly, in (2018) they argue that *furniture* cannot count kinds of furniture due to being unable to resolve overlap between kinds that can count as one (e.g. vanities and chairs). If the latter sort of overlap underlies the infelicity of *ammunitions* in (1b), then the Hungarian counterpart *lőszer* should behave the same, contra (2b).

Pertinent to our analysis is that bare singular count nouns range over pluralities in Hungarian but not English, as shown in (3). We interpret this as indicating that singular count nouns in Hungarian have cumulative reference (Rullmann & You 2006).

(3) Ez a két golyó golyó. 'These two bullets are {#bullet, bullets}.' this the two bullet bullet

Analysis. Our analysis appeals to the independently-motivated notions of spreading over and classified sub-property. The latter is needed to maintain that mass nouns like *meat* head a taxonomy in the sense of Kay (1971), where a kind is partitioned by a non-null set of subkinds. Sums of meat of multiple kinds (e.g. $\mathbb{Q}_1 \vee \mathbb{O}$) prevent partition from holding, e.g. \mathscr{R} in (4) does not partition [meat], but it does the classified sub-property [meat]_{CLS}.

The notion of spreading over is defined in (5) and illustrated in (6). It is akin to a cover except members of \mathscr{R} need not be sub-properties of P, and an extensional version features in Brisson's (1998:§3.2.3) account of the non-maximal reference of definite plurals.

Our novel principle of subkind-countability is in (7), which integrates Grimm & Levin's (2017) argument that a noun can count subkinds iff it heads a taxonomy with Carlson's (1980:§6.1) argument that a noun's denotation can range over subkinds only if there are other nouns in the language that name subkinds. Following Carlson's (2010:§4) assumption that nouns denote concepts, we conceive of (7) as a test for conceptual well-foundedness.

- $= [w_1 \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} & & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & & \\ & = [w_1 \rightarrow \left\{ \begin{array}{cccc} & & & & \\ & & & \\ & & & \\ & &$ (4) a. [[meat]]
 - b. [meat]_{CLS}
 - $= \{ [pork] = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ \otimes_1, \otimes_2, \otimes_1 \lor \otimes_2 \}], [beef] = [w_1 \rightarrow \{ @ \}] \}$ c. *R*
- (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 $Q \in \mathscr{R}$ such that $d \in Q_w$
 - b. For every $O \in \mathcal{R}$, there is a $w \in W$ and $d \in D$ such that $d \in O_w$
- (6) a. P = $\llbracket wapon \rrbracket_{CLS} = \llbracket w_1 \rightarrow \{ \bigvee, \bigotimes_{l} , \bigotimes_{l} , \bigotimes_{l} \} \end{bmatrix}$ b. $\mathscr{R} = \{\llbracket wife \rrbracket = \llbracket w_1 \rightarrow \{ \bigvee, \bigvee_{l} \} \}, \llbracket artillery \rrbracket = \llbracket w_1 \rightarrow \{ \bigotimes_{l} , \bigotimes_{l} , \bigotimes_{l} , \bigvee_{l} \} \}$
- (7) N is a noun in language L whose intension is [N]. N can count subkinds iff
 - a. $[N]_{CLS}$ 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 [weapon]_{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. $\sqrt{1}V$), 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 [ammunition]]_{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 Jeffry 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 Heusinger & 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.