

A New Semantics for Group Nouns

Hazel Pearson

Harvard University

1. Introduction

Group nouns such as *committee*, *family*, *bunch (of flowers)*, *pile (of dishes)*,¹ etc. exhibit behaviors that seem to pull us in opposing directions. As various researchers have noted (Landman 1989, Barker 1992, Schwarzschild 1996), certain of their properties suggest that they denote atoms (elements of the ontology that lack proper parts), while others suggest that they denote pluralities (outputs of the sum formation operation). The approaches to the semantics of group nouns that have been proposed in earlier work fall into three classes: (i) those that assign group nouns a plural denotation (Munn 1998, Elbourne 1999), whereby a group noun DP² denotes in a context *c* the set of the group's members at *c*; (ii) those that assign group nouns an atomic denotation (Barker 1992, Schwarzschild 1996); (iii) those that construe a group noun denotation as a peculiar class of entity in its own right – a group or 'upsum' (Landman 1989), a singleton set whose member is the plurality from which the group is formed. There are of course conceptual reasons to be dissatisfied with each of these approaches: the first makes it necessary to postulate higher-order pluralities in order to account for the possibility of pluralising groups (see Schwarzschild 1996 for arguments against appeal to higher order pluralities in general); the second requires stipulation of a membership function in order to capture the relationship between a group and its members; the third augments the ontology. To these objections this paper adds two empirical ones. We show that contrary to what has been assumed in previous work (Barker 1992, Schwarzschild 1996), there are two classes of group nouns which we term 'committee nouns' and 'collection nouns', each of which requires a different semantics. Additionally, we offer novel data that suggest that committee nouns are inherently intensional – a departure from the focus on extensional properties found in earlier work. Finally, we propose a new semantics for committee nouns that can account for both previously discussed data and the empirical observations contributed by this paper.

2. The singular behavior of group nouns

Our first step in describing the puzzle is to consider the data that seem to suggest that group noun DPs denote atoms rather than pluralities. Schwarzschild (1996) points out that if group nouns had a plural denotation, we should expect total predicate sharing between, for example, *the committee* and *the members of the committee*, and between *that bunch of flowers*, and *those flowers*. That is, the (a) and (b) sentences in each of (1-4) should be truth conditionally equivalent, contrary to what we find.

- (1) a. The committee was founded in 1911.
b. # The members of the committee were founded in 1911.
- (2) a. The deck of cards has a card missing.
b. # Those cards have a card missing.

* For helpful discussions I am grateful to C. Barker, G. Carlson, L. Champollion, I. Heim, P. Jenks, M. Khan, M. Krifka, C. Mayr, P. Pietroski, J. Romoli, U. Sauerland, S-J. Shin, G. Thoms, G. Tsoulas, K. von Heusinger, E. Zweig and especially Gennaro Chierchia. Previous versions of this and related work were presented in classes at Harvard and at EC05 2009 and ICLCE3. Special thanks to the audience and organizers of WCCFL 28.

¹ Intuitively, a group noun is a noun that that is true of collections of individuals. Barker (1992) defines group nouns as nouns that combine with a plural (but not a singular) *of*-phrase as in *deck of cards*, *committee of students*.

² I use the term 'group noun DP' to refer to a DP containing a group noun. Its denotation is of argumental type.

Given standard assumptions, the highest determiner in a partitive DP is a function whose argument is the set denoted by the determiner's complement. For convenience, we shall also assume that partitive *of* denotes a function whose argument is an individual and which returns the set of atomic proper parts of that individual (Barker 1998). In other words, the highest determiner in a partitive DP quantifies over the atomic proper parts of the individual denoted by the embedded DP.

(8a) invites us to consider what happens when a noun with an atomic denotation occurs within a partitive. Since atoms lack proper parts, embedding a noun with an atomic denotation in a partitive DP yields a mass interpretation. We follow Chierchia (2010) in assuming that a mass noun denotation is vague with respect to its atomic proper parts. In (8a), for example, the semantics underdetermines what counts as an atomic proper part of (the stuff making up) the wall, whereas in (8b) anything that is an atomic proper part of *the bricks in the wall* is a brick in the wall; consequently, the situations in which (8a) is true are a proper superset of those in which (8b) is true. If, for example, half of every brick had been painted yellow, (8a) would be true and (8b) false. With this in mind, compare (9a) and (9b).

- (9) a. Half of the committee had been painted yellow.
b. Half of the members of the committee had been painted yellow.

If *the committee* had an atomic denotation, we should expect there to be more verifying situations for (9a) than (9b). This is not what we find. If every member of the committee is painted yellow up to her waist, (9a), like (9b), is false. So *half* in (9a) quantifies over the members of the committee.

(9) suggests that the atomic proper parts of a group noun DP are its members. What of groups of groups? Suppose a certain university has a department of linguistics and philosophy, which in turn consists of the linguistics division and the philosophy division. Might *the department of linguistics and philosophy* denote a plural individual of cardinality two, rather than the set of individuals at that university who are either linguists or philosophers? (10) suggests a negative answer.

- (10) # Both of the department (of linguistics and philosophy) voted in favor of the proposal.

In (10), the duality presupposition of *both* is not met; when a group noun occurs in a partitive, quantification is over the plurality of individuals who are members of the group, not the plurality of sub-groups making up the group. *Contra* Landman (1989), the extra-linguistic information that a particular group consists of several sub-groups appears not to be preserved in the semantics.

Morphosyntactic properties of partitive DPs containing group nouns provide further evidence of group nouns behaving like pluralities. Firstly, the partitive DP may be headed by a count determiner.³

- (11) a. Three of the committee came to the meeting.
b. Several of the family objected to Bill marrying Mary.
c. Many of the present cabinet will have to resign.

Moreover, when we select a determiner that may combine with either singulars or plurals, partitive DPs containing group nouns license plural agreement, in all dialects of English (12). In this respect, group nouns behave like plurals (13) but unlike singulars. Note that even DPs denoting atomic entities with a salient part-whole structure are intolerant of plural agreement in this environment (14).

- (12) a. Most of the committee have objections to the proposal.
b. Half of the family are doctors.
- (13) a. Most of the committee members have objections to the proposal.
b. Half of the members of the family are doctors.
- (14) a. *Most of the cake were eaten.
b. *Half of the book are (chapters) about semantics.

In sum, a group noun embedded in a partitive behaves like a plurality rather than an atom.

³ I suspect that (11a-c) are better for BE/CE speakers, but I have not yet investigated this systematically.

4. The puzzle is not only about number

While earlier work has typically focussed on the question of the number of a group noun denotation, in this section we introduce new data involving individual level predicates (ILPs) and quantificational adverbs. As is well known, typically these do not co-occur (15a). Yet when the subject of (15a) is replaced with a group noun DP (15b), the sentence is improved.

- (15) a. # John always has big feet.
 b. The Pearson family always has big feet.

Intuitively, (15b) means, ‘For every generation *g* of the Pearson family, the members of *g* have big feet’. We shall propose a semantics for group nouns that accounts for the contrast between (15a) and (15b).⁴ But first we have a little more to do to set the scene. In section 5, we provide arguments for distinguishing two different classes of group nouns.

5. Not all group nouns are created equal

Not all of the properties discussed in this paper apply to all group nouns. For instance, not all group nouns can serve as arguments of collective (16), distributive (17), or reciprocal (18) predicates.

- (16) a. *The bunch of flowers looks nice together.
 b. *The pile of dishes belongs together.
- (17) a. The bunch of flowers costs 50c. (≠ The flowers each costs 50c.)
 b. The group of statues is round. (≠ The statues are each round.)
- (18) a. The list of books is similar. (≠ The books on the list are similar to one another.)
 b. *The heap of papers is equally interesting. (≠ The papers in the heap are equally interesting.)

Moreover, plural agreement in BE and CE is only available with certain group nouns; the data in (19) represent BE/CE judgments. Barker (1992) characterizes the group nouns that license plural agreement as those that are true of groups with human members, such as *family*, and *committee*. In effect, he stipulates an animacy condition on the agreement mechanism for the relevant dialects.

- (19) a. *The bunch of flowers are tall.
 b. *The pile of dishes are touching each other.
 c. *The group of statues resemble themselves.

Not all group nouns exhibit plural-like behavior within partitive DPs either. Notice, for example, that there are more verifying situations for (20a) than (20b).

- (20) a. Half of the bunch of flowers had been painted yellow.
 b. Half of the flowers had been painted yellow.

Secondly, not all group nouns can occur in a partitive DP headed by a count determiner.

- (21) a. *Three of the bunch of flowers had died.
 b. *Several of the deck of cards had gone missing.
 c. *Many of the pile of dishes needed to be washed.

Additionally, plural agreement is illicit with partitive DPs containing certain group nouns.

⁴ I assume that *the Pearson family* is a proper name, not a definite description. The contrast between (15a) and (15b) is not merely due to the definite article: it remains when *the Pearson family* is replaced by *Committee A*.

- (22) a. *Half of the bunch of flowers are dead.
 b. *Most of the deck of cards are torn.
 c. *Hardly any of the pile of dishes have been washed.

Finally, the ability to be subject of an ILP modified by *always* does not extend to all group nouns.⁵

- (23) *That bunch of flowers is always tall.

Whereas the limited range of group nouns licensing plural agreement in BE and CE had been noted in earlier work, the other differences discussed in this section had not previously been observed as far as I am aware. The fact that across the various tests it is the same nouns whose behavior diverges from that discussed in sections 3 and 4 is reason to suspect that the animacy requirement on plural agreement in BE and CE is not accidental; rather, it reflects the fact that, contrary to what has been supposed in earlier work, we are dealing with two classes of group noun, each of which has a different semantics. Those group nouns which do not exhibit plural-like behavior and cannot be subjects of ILPs modified by *always* can be characterized as involving no notion of membership; for this reason, the bare plural in the *of*-phrase following these group nouns typically names an inanimate kind. Let's call group nouns with these properties 'collection nouns'. We shall use the term 'committee nouns' for those group nouns that are well behaved with respect to the properties described in the previous sections. Comparison of the data discussed in sections 3 and 4 with that introduced in this section confirms that committee nouns are true of groups with animate members. To sum up: committee nouns license both atomic and plural predication, permit plural agreement in BE and CE, exhibit plural-like behavior in partitive constructions, and can be subjects of sentences of form 'DP always ILP'. By contrast, collection nouns license only atomic predication and singular agreement in all English dialects, behave like atoms in partitive constructions, and cannot be subjects of sentences of form 'DP always ILP'. The remainder of this paper is devoted to proposing a semantics for committee nouns.⁶

6. A semantics for committee nouns

Our point of departure is the question of what explains the contrast between (15a, b). We assume a standard semantics for quantificational adverbs (Lewis 1975); the truth conditions for (15) are in (24).

- (24) a. $\text{Always}_{x,s}[\text{John}(x,s)] [\text{has-big-feet}(x,s)]$
 b. $\text{Always}_{x,s}[\text{the-Pearson-family}(x,s)] [\text{has-big-feet}(x,s)]$

In (24), *always* is treated as an unselective binder which quantifies over pairs of individuals and indices (world-time pairs). (24a) might be paraphrased as, 'for every pair consisting of an individual x and an index s such that x is the extension of 'John' in s , x has big feet in s ', and (24b) as, 'for every pair of individuals x and indices s such that x is the extension of 'the Pearson family' in s , x has big feet in s '. Suppose that the reason why ILPs modified by *always* typically cannot be predicated of subjects that are rigid designators is that the resulting sentence implicates that the predicate might have been true of the subject at one time but false at another.⁷ This contradicts common knowledge: being a permanent property, the property of having big feet, if it applies to an individual at a time t , always applies to that individual. As is well known, this problem is circumvented if the subject has a different extension at different indices: we illustrate this with an example where the subject is given by a definite description (25a), and one where it is a bare plural (25b).

- (25) a. The president of the USA always has big feet. b. Elephants always have big feet.

⁵ (23) and (15b) are not a true minimal pair: bunches of flowers are not referred to by proper names. Replacing *that* with *the* improves (23), but for independent reasons involving the semantics of the definite article.

⁶ For a possible treatment of collection nouns, see Pearson (Ms.).

⁷ See Magri (2009) for an account of how this implicature arises.

Since ‘the president of the USA’ and ‘elephants’ can have different extensions at different indices,⁸ (25a-b) do not require that *has big feet* apply to the same individual across different times and the offending implicature is absent. We propose that the same is true of group noun DPs; like definite descriptions and bare plurals, they are individual concepts, type $\langle s, e \rangle$. For example, *the Pearson family* is a function from an index s to the members of the Pearson family at s . This proposal makes capital out of the observation that the same committee or family can have different members at different times; this property of committee nouns is not captured by earlier accounts that have a purely extensional flavor. Let’s see how the idea can be implemented in the semantics.

A committee noun proper name denotes a certain function from indices to individuals (26).

- (26) $\llbracket \text{The Bush family} \rrbracket_{\langle s, e \rangle} =$
 $[s_1 \rightarrow \{\text{George H.W., George W.}\}, s_2 \rightarrow \{\text{George H.W., Barbara}\}, s_3 \rightarrow \{\text{George W., Laura}\}, \dots]$

The type assigned to committee nouns themselves is also inherently intensional: they are interpreted as predicates of individual concepts, type $\langle se, t \rangle$. A committee noun denotes the set of functions from an index s to the set of individuals who form a committee at s (27).⁹ Determiners compose with the NP in the usual way; for example $\llbracket \text{this committee} \rrbracket$ will be of type $\langle s, e \rangle$.¹⁰

- (27) $\llbracket \text{committee} \rrbracket_{\langle se, t \rangle} = \{\lambda s: \exists x_{\langle s, e \rangle} \exists Y_c (x \text{ is a committee at } s \ \& \ \forall y (y \in Y \Leftrightarrow y \text{ is a member of } x \text{ at } s)). Y\}$

Our proposal accommodates the ability of group nouns to combine with both atomic and plural predicates. On our view, a group noun DP has a singular intension and plural extension. An atomic predicate taking a group noun DP as its argument is predicated of the intension; plural predicates are predicate of the extension. Just as kind level predicates such as *be extinct* combine directly with the kind, and hence are of type $\langle se, t \rangle$, so atomic predicates such as *be founded in 1911* are of type $\langle se, t \rangle$.

We shall locate the source of plural predication in the semantics of plural predication itself, for which we employ the rule stated in Schwarzschild (1996).

- (28) a. **Plural VP rule:** If α is a singular VP with translation α' , then for any index i , $\text{Part}(\text{Cov}_i)(\alpha')$ is a translation for the corresponding plural VP.
 b. **Part_{DEF}:** Let α and β be variables whose values are object language expressions of type $\langle e, t \rangle$ and let u, v be variables whose values are entities in D^* [= the set consisting of D (the set of all atoms in the domain) and all sets of subsets of D]. For all α, β, u :
 $u \in \llbracket \text{Part}(\beta)(\alpha) \rrbracket$ if and only if $\forall v [(v \in \llbracket \beta \rrbracket \wedge v \subseteq u) \rightarrow v \in \llbracket \alpha \rrbracket]$
 c. **Cover:** C covers A iff: (1) C is a set of subsets of A ; (2) Every member of A belongs to some set in C ; (3) \emptyset is not in C .

Suppose we want to determine the truth conditions for *Committee A is tall*. Given (28a), the translation of *tall* is $\text{Part}(\text{Cov}_i)(\text{tall})$. Assuming that in (28b) the universal quantification over elements of a cover is non-vacuous, a suitable argument for $\text{Part}(\text{Cov}_i)(\text{tall})$ will be such that proper subsets of it can be identified. That is, only pluralities are suitable arguments for it. The extension of a group noun DP will have this property. (29) illustrates this by giving sample truth conditions for *Committee A is tall*.

- (29) a. $\llbracket \text{Committee A is tall} \rrbracket^{s, g} = 1$ iff $\llbracket \text{Committee A} \rrbracket(s) \in \text{Part}(\text{Cov}_i)(\text{tall})$
 b. Suppose that at s , the members of Committee A are John, Bill, Tom and Mary.
 Then $\llbracket \text{Committee A} \rrbracket(s) = \{j, b, t, m\}$
 c. Suppose $\llbracket \text{Cov}_i \rrbracket^{s, g} = \{\{j\}, \{b\}, \{t\}, \{m\}\}$

⁸ I assume that bare plurals and expressions of form *Det kind of NP* denote kinds, and that these are of type $\langle s, e \rangle$. See Carlson (1977) and Chierchia (1998).

⁹ We have taken a liberty with the λ -notation in (27): the λ -term does not describe a unique function – rightly so, since there may be more than one committee, each of which would correspond to a different function. Hence the set given in (27) is not a singleton. See Krifka (2009) for a similar treatment of configurational entities like *outfit*.

¹⁰ A type adjustment for the determiner is of course required here; this is just the same adjustment as is involved when a determiner takes *kind of NP* as its complement.

- d. $\llbracket \text{Committee A} \rrbracket(s) \in \text{Part}(\text{Cov}_v)(\text{tall})$ iff
 $\forall v[(v \in \{\{j\}, \{b\}, \{t\}, \{m\}\} \wedge v \subseteq \{j, b, t, m\})^{11} \rightarrow v \in \llbracket \text{tall} \rrbracket]$ iff $\text{tall}(j), \text{tall}(b), \text{tall}(t) \ \& \ \text{tall}(m)$

We have seen that our semantics accounts for the ability of group noun DPs to combine with both atomic and plural predicates. In the next section, we discuss further consequences of the proposal.

7. Consequences

Coordinating constituents of different types can lead to degraded results; compare (30a) and (30b).

- (30) a. ?? Dogs $\llbracket \text{are widespread} \rrbracket_{\langle \text{se}, t \rangle}$ and $\llbracket \text{are ruining my garden} \rrbracket_{\langle \text{et} \rangle}$.
 b. $\llbracket \text{Dogs are widespread} \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \text{they are ruining my garden} \rrbracket$.

An advantage of our account is that it correctly predicts that coordinating an atomic and plural predicate where the subject is a committee noun DP is similarly dispreferred.

- (31) a. ?? The committee $\llbracket \text{was founded in 1911} \rrbracket_{\langle \text{se}, t \rangle}$ and $\llbracket \text{gathered in the hall today} \rrbracket_{\langle \text{et} \rangle}$.
 b. $\llbracket \text{The committee was founded in 1911} \rrbracket$ and $\llbracket \text{they gathered in the hall today} \rrbracket$.

Another advantage is that we are now in a position to account for the ability of group nouns to be predicated of plural subjects (32).¹²

- (32) John and Mary are a good team.

Suppose one thinks that the predicate *good team* denotes a set of groups – elements of the domain distinct from atoms and pluralities. One might conclude that in (32), *John and Mary* denotes a group rather than a plurality, so that a conjunction such as this is ambiguous. The alternative is to take (32) as evidence that group nouns are true of pluralities. This is the more appealing option: it avoids unnecessary ambiguity. Our proposal makes it possible to refine this analysis: group nouns are not true of pluralities *per se*, but of functions from indices to pluralities. (32) is true if and only if the plurality consisting of John and Mary is in the extension of *a good team*. We assume a view of predicate nominals based on choice functions (Winter 2001). Here are the truth conditions of (32).

- (33) $\llbracket \text{32} \rrbracket(s) = \exists f[\text{CH}(f) \ \& \ f(\llbracket \text{good-team} \rrbracket)(s) = \{j, m\}]$

8. Possible objections

An intensional treatment for group nouns was dismissed by Barker (1992), who argued that it would wrongly predict predicate sharing between *the committee* and *the members of the committee* with an extensional predicate like *meet*. For example, (34) ought to be a contradiction, but it is not.

- (34) The committee first met in 1990 but its members had met some years earlier.

In response, we would suggest that *meet* is ambiguous; what we have in (34) is one occurrence of each of two homophonous items. The *meet* that occurs in the first clause means roughly ‘hold a meeting’; that which we find in the second clause means ‘get to know one another’. Only the latter ‘meet’ requires a plural subject; the former one does not, and as such can be predicated of the intension of *the committee*. Two observations support this view: firstly, the two meanings are expressed by distinct lexical items in various languages; in German, for example, the reciprocal predicate *sich treffen* can only be used to describe an event of people meeting, not one of holding a meeting. Secondly, if we replace the subject of (34) with a committee noun DP that denotes a group not typically associated with holding meetings, the possibility of interpreting the two occurrences of *meet*

¹¹ We assume, with Schwarzschild, that Quine’s generalization ($\{a\} = a$) holds.

¹² See Schwarzschild (1996: 178-182) for a discussion of the issues at stake here.

differently evaporates and we have predicate sharing – and hence a contradiction – after all (35). We conclude that the data involving *meet* do not present a challenge to the view that committee nouns are inherently intensional items.

(35) # The family first met in 1990 but its members had met some years earlier.

Another way of objecting is to offer data suggesting that collection nouns can in fact combine with plural predicates, thereby undermining our view that committee and collection nouns have a distinct semantics. Indeed, perhaps one reason why the distinction between the two classes was not noticed before is that there appear to be cases where a collection noun DP can combine with a plural predicate (36); see for example Schwarzschild (1996) for discussion.

(36) a. The deck of cards was held together by a rubber band.
b. The bunch of flowers was assembled by a talented florist.

We respond to this challenge by building on an argument from Schwarzschild (1996). Schwarzschild attempted to defend his view that group noun DPs denote atoms by arguing that apparently ‘plural’ predicates can combine with an atomic individual as long as this individual has a salient part-whole structure. For the predicates employed in (36) this seems the right way to go: given world knowledge that IKEA furniture comes in pieces, the sentences in (36) are acceptable.

(37) a. The IKEA bookcase was held together by a rubber band.
b. The IKEA bookcase was assembled by a talented carpenter.

We disagree with Schwarzschild, however, that this line of argument can save the view that all group nouns denote atoms. There are predicates that can combine with committee nouns, but not with singulars that have a salient part-whole structure.¹³

(38) a. ?? The IKEA bookcase gathered/assembled/came together in the hall.
b. The books gathered/assembled/came together in the hall.

These are precisely the predicates that combine with committee noun but not collection noun DPs. It seems that we must distinguish two classes of predicate: part-whole predicates like 2-place *assemble* whose (first) argument must have a salient part-whole structure, and plurality seeking predicates like 1-place *assemble* whose argument must be a plurality.¹⁴ Here are some sample lexical entries.

(39) a. $\llbracket \text{assemble}_{2\text{-place}} \rrbracket^c = \lambda x \lambda y: \exists Z (Z \text{ is salient in } c \ \& \ \forall z (z \in Z \leftrightarrow z <_{\text{PART}X} \text{ in } c)). y \text{ assembles } x$
b. $\llbracket \text{assemble}_{1\text{-place}} \rrbracket^c = \lambda x: |x| > 1. x \text{ assembles}$

The data in (36) teach us only that part-whole predicates can combine with collections. They therefore pose no threat to our division between collection and committee nouns.

9. Conclusion

We have revisited some familiar data concerning group nouns, and added some new observations of our own. Careful consideration of both led us to conclude that, contrary to what was assumed in earlier work, group nouns are not a homogenous category, but fall into two classes, each of which demands its own semantics. We provided a semantics for committee nouns, arguing that their behavior is best accounted for by treating them as denoting predicates of individual concepts.

¹³ (38b) is in fact somewhat degraded: *gather*, *assemble*, etc. appear to select for animate subjects. That this is orthogonal to the present discussion can be seen by noticing that in a world in which books and (parts of) bookcases are animate (38b) is perfect, while (38a) is unacceptable. In general, it seems that collective predicates select for animate subjects; it is beyond the scope of the present paper to speculate on why this should be.

¹⁴ The data discussed suggest that typically, part-whole predicates are 2-place, and collective predicates 1-place. I leave it to future work to determine how robust this generalization is and to identify the reason for it.

Our proposal highlights a previously unnoticed parallel between committee nouns and kind terms. This parallel should not be taken to suggest that committee nouns and kind terms have an identical semantics, any more than kind terms and definite descriptions do. Rather, that all three are treated in terms of individual concepts leads us to expect that they will exhibit both revealing similarities and interesting differences. Yet there does seem to be something special about the relationship between committees and kinds. Just as the set of instances of a kind may vary from index to index, so may the set of members of a committee. There may be indices at which there are no instances of a kind, or there is only one, and there may be indices at which a committee has no members, or has only one; however, there must be at least one index at which there is a plurality of instances of the kind, and there must be an index at which the committee has more than one member. The similarities are striking, but let me close by mentioning three differences between kind terms and committee nouns. Carlson (1977) proposed that where a bare plural is subject of an episodic predicate such as *bark*, it is not predicated directly of the kind itself, but rather of a stage of the kind. (40a) is true just in case some subset of the totality of instances of the dog-kind are barking. (40b), on the other hand, requires that all of the members of the family be barking. It seems that whereas a stage of a kind is a subset of all the instances of that kind, a stage of a committee is the whole set of members of that committee. Secondly, group noun DPs can be embedded in partitives, but kind-denoting terms cannot (41). Finally, BE and CE fail to license plural agreement when the subject is of form *that kind of NP* (42).

- (40) a. Dogs are barking.
 b. The family is barking.

(41) *Two thirds of this kind of beans/wine. (Ionin, Matushansky and Ruys 2005)

(42) *That kind of animal are ruining my garden.

These data set the limits on how far to take the analogy between group nouns and kind terms. Just what is responsible for the differences between these items is a matter for another day. I hope at least to have convinced the reader that it is fruitful to investigate the semantics of committee nouns through the lens of the semantics of kind terms; it seems reasonable to hope that the reverse might also be true.

References

- Barker, Chris (1992). Group Terms in English: Representing Groups as Atoms. *Journal of Semantics* 9, 69-93.
- Barker, Chris (1998). Partitives, Double Genitives, and Anti-uniqueness. *Natural Language and Linguistic Theory* 16, 679-717.
- Carlson, Greg (1977). A unified analysis of the English Bare Plural. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 1, 413-457.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (1998). Reference to kinds across languages. *Natural Language Semantics* 6(4), 339-405.
- Chierchia, Gennaro (2010). Mass nouns, vagueness and semantic variation. *Synthese* 174, 99-149.
- Elbourne, Paul (1999). Some Correlations between Semantic Plurality and Quantifier Scope. *Proceedings of NELS* 29, 81-92.
- Ionin, Tania, Ora Matushansky & E. G. Ruys (2006). Parts of Speech: Towards a Unified Semantics for Partitives. *Proceedings of NELS* 36, 357-370.
- Krifka, Manfred (2009). Counting Configurations. *Proceedings of Sinn und Bedeutung* 13, 309-324.
- Landman, Fred (1989). Groups I and II. *Linguistics and Philosophy* 12, 559-605 & 723-744.
- Lewis, David (1975). Adverbs of quantification. Portner, Paul & Barbara Hall Partee (eds.). *Formal semantics: the essential readings*. Oxford: Blackwell. 178-188.
- Magri, Giorgio (2009). A theory of individual-level predicates based on blind mandatory scalar implicatures. *Natural Language Semantics* 17, 245-297.
- Munn, Alan (1998). First conjunct agreement: against a clausal analysis. *Linguistic Inquiry* 30(4), 643-668.
- Pearson, Hazel. Towards a Semantics for Group Nouns. Ms., Harvard University.
- Quirk, Randolph, Sidney Greenbaum, Geoffrey Leech & Jan Svartvik (1985). *A comprehensive grammar of the English Language*. London & New York: Longman.
- Schwarzschild, Roger (1996). *Pluralities*. Kluwer, The Netherlands.
- Winter, Yoad. (2001). *Flexibility Principles in Boolean Semantics*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Proceedings of the 28th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics

edited by Mary Byram Washburn,
Katherine McKinney-Bock, Erika Varis,
Ann Sawyer, and Barbara Tomaszewicz

Cascadilla Proceedings Project Somerville, MA 2011

Copyright information

Proceedings of the 28th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics
© 2011 Cascadilla Proceedings Project, Somerville, MA. All rights reserved

ISBN 978-1-57473-441-6 library binding

A copyright notice for each paper is located at the bottom of the first page of the paper.
Reprints for course packs can be authorized by Cascadilla Proceedings Project.

Ordering information

Orders for the library binding edition are handled by Cascadilla Press.
To place an order, go to www.lingref.com or contact:

Cascadilla Press, P.O. Box 440355, Somerville, MA 02144, USA
phone: 1-617-776-2370, fax: 1-617-776-2271, sales@cascadilla.com

Web access and citation information

This entire proceedings can also be viewed on the web at www.lingref.com. Each paper has a unique document # which can be added to citations to facilitate access. The document # should not replace the full citation.

This paper can be cited as:

Pearson, Hazel. 2011. A New Semantics for Group Nouns. In *Proceedings of the 28th West Coast Conference on Formal Linguistics*, ed. Mary Byram Washburn et al., 160-168. Somerville, MA: Cascadilla Proceedings Project. www.lingref.com, document #2448.