How does cross-linguistic variation in linguistic structure affect children’s acquisition of early number word meanings? We tested this question by investigating number word learning in two unrelated languages that feature a tripartite singular-dual-plural distinction: Slovenian and Saudi Arabic. We found that learning dual morphology affects children’s acquisition of the number word two in both languages, relative to English. Children who knew the meaning of two were surprisingly frequent in the dual languages, relative to English. Furthermore, Slovenian children were faster to learn two than children learning English, despite being less-competent counters. Finally, in both Slovenian and Saudi Arabic, comprehension of the dual was correlated with knowledge of two and higher number words.

Significance

Languages vary in how they grammatically mark number (e.g., in nouns, verbs, and so forth). We test the effects of this variability on learning number words—for example, one, two, three—by investigating children learning Slovenian and Saudi Arabic, which have singular-plural marking, but also dual marking (for sets of two). We find that learning the dual is associated with faster learning of the meaning of two than in any previously studied language, even when accompanied by less experience with counting. We conclude that although exposure to counting is important to learning number word meanings, hearing number words used outside of these routines—in the quantificational structures of language—may also be highly important in early acquisition.
words (8). In support of this hypothesis, children learning English are significantly faster to learn the meaning of the word one than are children learning languages that lack obligatory singular and plural marking, such as Japanese and Chinese (11, 12).

These previous studies are consistent with the thesis that the morphology and syntax of language encode content that is relevant to acquiring early number words, and that differences in exposure to these structures affect the rate of number word learning both within and across languages. However, the evidence for this conclusion is controversial. Within-language correlations between the acquisition of quantifiers and number words may exist not because of a specific causal relation between the two, but because children who are rapid language learners are more advanced learners across the board. Similarly, cross-linguistic differences in the rate of number word learning, although correlated with differences in grammatical structure, may also be because of other linguistic or cultural differences that are not measured in these studies (e.g., variability in children’s exposure to number words). Although languages like Japanese and English differ with respect to singular-plural marking, they also differ in many other ways that might cause differences in number word learning that are not specific to the word one (11). More generally, although these studies provide compelling correlational data, they do not yet support the strong claim that learning the meanings of early number words (e.g., one, two, and three) is facilitated by grammatical marking of number.

In the present study, we tested this idea by studying the acquisition of two languages that feature distinctive number morphology: Slovenian, a Slavic language, and Saudi Arabic, a Semitic language. Although many languages, like English, make only a distinction between singular and plural forms, Slovenian and Saudi Arabic make a finer distinction between singular, dual, and plural (13). Thus, these languages grammatically mark reference to sets of two, regardless of whether numerals are explicitly used. In Slovenian, a noun like button can occur in the singular (gumb), the dual (gumbi) or the plural (gumbi). In addition, agreement over differences in grammatical structure, may also be because of other linguistic or cultural differences that are not measured in these studies (e.g., variability in children’s exposure to number words). Although languages like Japanese and English differ with respect to singular-plural marking, they also differ in many other ways that might cause differences in number word learning that are not specific to the word one (11). More generally, although these studies provide compelling correlational data, they do not yet support the strong claim that learning the meanings of early number words (e.g., one, two, and three) is facilitated by grammatical marking of number.

In Slovenian, a noun like button can occur in the singular (gumb), the dual (gumbi) or the plural (gumbi). In addition, agreement over differences in grammatical structure, may also be because of other linguistic or cultural differences that are not measured in these studies (e.g., variability in children’s exposure to number words). Although languages like Japanese and English differ with respect to singular-plural marking, they also differ in many other ways that might cause differences in number word learning that are not specific to the word one (11). More generally, although these studies provide compelling correlational data, they do not yet support the strong claim that learning the meanings of early number words (e.g., one, two, and three) is facilitated by grammatical marking of number.

In the present study, we tested this idea by studying the acquisition of two languages that feature distinctive number morphology: Slovenian, a Slavic language, and Saudi Arabic, a Semitic language. Although many languages, like English, make only a distinction between singular and plural forms, Slovenian and Saudi Arabic make a finer distinction between singular, dual, and plural (13). Thus, these languages grammatically mark reference to sets of two, regardless of whether numerals are explicitly used. In Slovenian, a noun like button can occur in the singular (gumb), the dual (gumbi) or the plural (gumbi). In addition, agreement over differences in grammatical structure, may also be because of other linguistic or cultural differences that are not measured in these studies (e.g., variability in children’s exposure to number words). Although languages like Japanese and English differ with respect to singular-plural marking, they also differ in many other ways that might cause differences in number word learning that are not specific to the word one (11). More generally, although these studies provide compelling correlational data, they do not yet support the strong claim that learning the meanings of early number words (e.g., one, two, and three) is facilitated by grammatical marking of number.

In Slovenian, a noun like button can occur in the singular (gumb), the dual (gumbi) or the plural (gumbi). In addition, agreement over differences in grammatical structure, may also be because of other linguistic or cultural differences that are not measured in these studies (e.g., variability in children’s exposure to number words). Although languages like Japanese and English differ with respect to singular-plural marking, they also differ in many other ways that might cause differences in number word learning that are not specific to the word one (11). More generally, although these studies provide compelling correlational data, they do not yet support the strong claim that learning the meanings of early number words (e.g., one, two, and three) is facilitated by grammatical marking of number.

In the present study, we tested this idea by studying the acquisition of two languages that feature distinctive number morphology: Slovenian, a Slavic language, and Saudi Arabic, a Semitic language. Although many languages, like English, make only a distinction between singular and plural forms, Slovenian and Saudi Arabic make a finer distinction between singular, dual, and plural (13). Thus, these languages grammatically mark reference to sets of two, regardless of whether numerals are explicitly used. In Slovenian, a noun like button can occur in the singular (gumb), the dual (gumbi) or the plural (gumbi). In addition, agreement over differences in grammatical structure, may also be because of other linguistic or cultural differences that are not measured in these studies (e.g., variability in children’s exposure to number words). Although languages like Japanese and English differ with respect to singular-plural marking, they also differ in many other ways that might cause differences in number word learning that are not specific to the word one (11). More generally, although these studies provide compelling correlational data, they do not yet support the strong claim that learning the meanings of early number words (e.g., one, two, and three) is facilitated by grammatical marking of number.
The second reason that two-knowers were more frequent in Slovenian was that Slovenian children were faster to become two-knowers than English children, despite the fact that they had much weaker knowledge of counting. The percentage of children who knew the meaning of at least two was higher in Slovenian (S) than in English (E) for 24- to 30-mo-olds (S = 41%; E = 0%), and 30- to 36-mo-olds (S = 50%; E = 9%), but less so in 36- to 42-mo-olds (S = 88%; E = 80%), and older children. An analysis that predicted being at least a two-knowers found significant effects of language (B = 2.64, P < 0.001), age (B = 0.249, P < 0.0001), and counting ability (B = 0.197, P = 0.034). In addition, language remained a significant predictor of knowing at least two when excluding children over 35 mo of age (B = 3.64, P < 0.013), showing that the effect was not driven by greater numbers of two-knowers at older ages. Finally, an analysis that predicted being at least a three-knowers revealed no effect of language (B = 0.176, P = 0.753), despite showing significant effects of age (B = 0.113, P = 0.003) and counting ability (B = 0.208, P < 0.001), suggesting that speaking Slovenian was specifically associated with learning two more quickly, but not three. Instead, age and counting ability were the best predictors of knowing higher-number words.

To further probe the generality of these effects, we next compared our findings with data from Russian, Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese. First, we considered data from Russian, originally collected by Sarnecka et al. (12). Russian is interesting because it is a Slavic language like Slovenian, and thus has very similar number morphology. Critically, although Russian has a singular-plural distinction and like Slovenian has different declension patterns vs. dual morphology. Still, it was possible to ask whether two-knowers were overall more frequent in Saudi Arabic.

In the first analysis (Fig. 1), which predicted children’s status as two-knowers, a comparison of English and Slovenian children found significant effects of language (B = 1.34, P = 0.004), counting ability (B = -0.11, P = 0.019), and a marginally significant effect of age (B = 0.056, P = 0.073). Here and elsewhere in the report, likelihood-ratio tests revealed the same pattern of results. The language effect reflected a much higher frequency of two-knowers in Slovenian (49%) compared with English (11%). Surprisingly, this was true for each age group: 2-y-olds (42% vs. 4%); 3-y-olds (58% vs. 20%); and 4-y-olds (44% vs. 8%). A parallel analysis comparing English and Saudi Arabic children also found a significant effect of language (B = 1.24, P = 0.006), and a marginally significant effect of age (B = -0.07, P = 0.052). Again, there was a dramatically higher frequency of two-knowers in Saudi Arabic (41%) compared with English (11%), which was again true for each age group separately: 3-y-olds (49% vs. 20%) and 4-y-olds (23% vs. 8%). In this comparison, the same pattern of results was found whether English 2-y-olds were included in the analysis or whether instead they were excluded, such that only 3- and 4-y-olds were compared (as in the analysis presented here). Finally, there was no difference in the frequency of two-knowers between Saudi Arabic and Slovenian (B = -0.45, P = 0.243), and no effect of age (B = -0.06, P = 0.098).

For Slovenian, two factors explain why two-knowers were so frequent relative to English. First, in the analysis just presented, the likelihood of being a two-knowers was negatively correlated with counting ability, suggesting that poor counters got stuck as two-knowers and better counters progressed to higher-knower levels. As shown in Fig. 2, there were very important differences in counting ability between groups. Slovenian children were substantially poorer counters than English children, especially at older ages. For example, at 54 mo Slovenian children counted as high as English children who were a year younger. In a model predicting highest count, we found an effect of language (B = -9.06, P < 0.0001), an effect of age (B = 0.75, P < 0.0001), and interaction between language and age (B = -0.86, P < 0.001). This relatively poor counting ability likely reflects a smaller emphasis on explicitly training children to count in Slovenia, relative to in the United States, and thus less exposure to number words overall. Such a difference in exposure might explain why, despite being faster to acquire two (as we show below), Slovenian children are not faster to learn the meanings of higher number words.

Fig. 1. Frequency of non-, one-, two-, three-, four-, and CP-knowers in (A) English, (B) Slovenian, and (C) Saudi Arabic children aged 24-60 mo.

Fig. 2. Highest number counted by English and Slovenian children, for children aged 24-60 mo.
for different numerals, it does not have a dual form (13). Thus, Russian is a near-perfect control case for evaluating the Slovenian data. We compared Slovenian and Russian in a model that included age as a factor, but not highest count, because no comparable open-ended measure of counting was available for Russian (Supporting Information). We found that Slovenian children (49%) were significantly more likely to be two-knowers than Russian children (25%; \( B = -1.00, SE = 0.43, P = 0.019 \)). We next compared Russian to Saudi Arabic (41% two-knowers). Here, although ages were sampled very differently across language groups in a way that likely exaggerated the proportion two-knowers in Russian (see Supporting Information for details), we found a marginally significant difference between the groups (\( B = -0.94, SE = 0.50, P = 0.059 \)). Finally, we compared the dual languages to our own previously published Japanese data (9% two-knowers; total \( n = 104 \)) and to new Mandarin Chinese data (11% two-knowers; total \( n = 79 \)), where ages were comparable to Slovenian, and found that two-knowers were much less frequent in these languages, relative to the dual languages (Slovenian vs. Japanese: \( B = -2.28, SE = 0.43, P < 0.0001 \); Slovenian vs. Mandarin: \( B = -1.97, SE = 0.43, P < 0.0001 \); Saudi vs. Japanese: \( B = -2.17, SE = 0.45, P < 0.0001 \); and Saudi vs. Mandarin: \( B = -2.09, SE = 0.49, P < 0.0001 \)). These analyses thus confirm that the frequency of two-knowers in Slovenian and Saudi Arabic is highly unusual, and not found in any previously studied language.

**Morphology Tasks.** Our hypothesis is that learning dual morphology facilitates acquiring the meaning of *two*. Thus, our next analyses tested whether comprehension of dual morphology was associated with learning the meaning of *two*. Such a correlation is not strictly required by the hypothesis that dual morphology facilitates number word learning. For example, dual learning might be complete before children receive significant exposure to number words, and yet might still facilitate number word learning. This scenario would result in no correlation. Still, the presence of a correlation would lend credence to the idea that the large differences in knower level distribution between languages are not coincidental, and instead are related to the variable of interest (i.e., dual knowledge).

We conducted three analyses for each test of dual comprehension. First, we compared dual comprehension in pre-two-knowers (children who are nonknowers or one-knowers) and children who knew the meaning of at least two (two-, three-, four-, and CP-knowers). Second, we compared pre-two-knowers to two-knowers. Finally, we compared two-knowers to post-two-knowers (three-, four-, and CP-knowers), where no particular relationship was expected (on the hypothesis that benefits of learning the dual are specific to two). All analyses were Wilcoxon/Kruskal–Wallis rank sums tests, although two-tailed \( t \) tests found similar results. For all morphology tasks we focus on results for dual trials, and report singular-plural data in the Supporting Information. It is important to note that performance on dual trials was often related to performance on the plural, in particular, because responses for the two were nonindependent. For example, consistently labeling sets of two with the dual would by necessity increase plural performance by precluding the possibility of using the plural to label sets of two. Thus, although we focus attention here to the dual, ultimately acquiring the dual must be considered one part of a broader mastery of the morphological paradigm.

**Give-M.** Children were asked to give quantities with sentences that featured singular, dual, or plural morphology. For the dual, only responses of *two* were considered correct. A set of analyses comparing dual knowledge across knower levels (Fig. 3) found a large and significant difference between children who knew at least two and those who did not (\( P = 0.0004 \)), as well as a large difference between pre-two-knowers and two-knowers (\( P = 0.002 \)), but no significant difference between two-knowers and post-two-knowers (\( P = 0.371 \)). These data suggest that knowledge of morphology—and especially the dual and plural forms—is related to acquiring the meaning of the word *two*.

**What's-on-this-Card?** For the WOC task, we conducted two main analyses to test the relationship between knower level and acquisition of morphology. First, for children who uttered the word *two*, we asked whether they used the appropriate dual agreement on the noun that labeled the set (independent of whether two things were actually on the card), and thus whether the response was correct in relation to the set. We found that when children used the word *two* to label sets [either because they were in the Number Prompt condition, or because they did so spontaneously (Supporting Information)], they almost always used dual marking on the noun that accompanied the numeral, regardless of knower level: nonknowers (89%), one-knowers (88%), two-knowers (84%), three- and four-knowers (100%), and CP-knowers (97%). This finding suggests that even before knowing the meaning of *two*, at least some children are able to use *two* with correct dual agreement on the noun, a prerequisite for using this agreement to guide number word learning.

Our second analysis (Fig. 3) tested the degree to which children at different knower levels used the dual for sets of two objects. When children were presented with a set of two, correct use of the dual differed significantly between those who knew the meaning of at least *two* and those who did not (\( P = 0.008 \)). In addition, there was a difference between pre-two-knowers and two-knowers (\( P = 0.017 \), but not between two-knowers and post-two-knowers (\( P = 0.592 \)). Thus, as in the Give-M tasks, we found that acquiring the meaning of *two* was significantly associated with increased comprehension of the dual.
Forced-Choice Morphology. This task, given to Saudi children, also tested how learning dual morphology was related to learning two (for singular-plural data, see Supporting Information). Children saw one card on each trial that depicted three arrays with one, two, or five objects (not always in the order). In a request that had singular, dual, or plural marking they were asked to point to a set.

On dual trials (Fig. 3) we found a significant difference between children who knew the meaning of at least two and those who did not (P = 0.0003). This result stemmed from a marginally significant difference between pre-two-knowers and two-knowers (P = 0.078), and a significant difference between two-knowers and post-two-knowers (P = 0.0006). Critically, by the time children became two-knowers, they pointed to the correct set in response to dual requests 71% of the time, which was significantly greater than chance (P = 0.002). Thus, as in Slovenian, we found that dual knowledge was associated with knower level, although results for Saudi Arabic were not as robust as those for Slovenian. This weaker effect may be because of the absence of 2-y-olds in this study. However, another reason may be that the forced-choice task differed from the Slovenian tasks in a way that is known to mask competence in studies of English singular-plural comprehension (16). Specifically, on dual trials both the dual card and the plural card contained at least two items. Thus, on these trials either choice is technically correct if children restrict attention to a subset of two items, because both a set of two and a set of five contain two items, consistent with the dual. A secondary analysis revealed that when children made errors on singular trials these errors were randomly distributed between the remaining two-item (54%) and five-item (46%) cards (X̄² = 0.974, P = 0.324). However, when children made errors on dual trials, they were made significantly more to five-item (63%) than to one-item (37%) cards (X̄² = 5.003, P = 0.025). This finding shows that these children had some nonsingular meaning for the dual—and possibly a dual meaning—but leaves open the possibility that they interpreted it as a plural. However, a subset of children almost certainly had a dual interpretation when they incorrectly chose sets of five: seven Saudi children pointed specifically to a subset of an array (i.e., to two items) on at least one dual trial. Although these ambiguous choices were not included in our analysis (and had no effect if included, regardless of how they were coted), it is likely that other children also intended subsets of arrays when pointing, leading us to underestimate comprehension of the dual on some trials. Critically, independent of this detail, we found that in Saudi Arabic, as in Slovenian, comprehension of the dual was robust by the time children became two-knowers, and was strongly associated with knowing the meaning of at least two.

Discussion

In a study of two dual languages, we found that grammatical morphology can affect the acquisition of early number word meanings, resulting in striking cross-linguistic differences in number word learning. In both Slovenian and Saudi Arabic—two unrelated languages in completely different cultural contexts—two-knowers were surprisingly frequent, relative to English. In addition, in the dual languages, comprehension of two was associated with knowledge of dual number marking. Additional analyses in Slovenian, for which we had 2-y-old children and a measure of counting ability, found a significantly earlier acquisition of two, relative to English, but no advantage for learning higher words. Whereas learning dual morphology appears to have speeded the acquisition of words up to two, counting ability and age were the best predictors of acquiring larger numbers. In fact, the likelihood of becoming a two-knowers was negatively correlated with counting ability, suggesting that Slovenian children were fast to acquire two, but got stuck as two-knowers because of their relative lack of exposure to number words. Finally, differences were also found when comparing Slovenian and Saudi data to data from Russian, Japanese, and Mandarin Chinese. Thus, we find that the frequency of two-knowers in Slovenian and Saudi Arabic is very unusual, and unlike any language previously studied.

These results show that when concepts like “dual” are made explicit in the morpho-syntax of a language, the acquisition of corresponding number word meanings is facilitated. This conclusion is consistent with the broader thesis that hearing number words used in informative grammatical structures speeds the acquisition of their meanings (17–19). Consequently, our data lend support to the idea that previously reported differences between English and Japanese (8, 11, 12), for example, are indeed driven by cross-linguistic differences in grammatical number (e.g., the availability of singular-plural marking only in English). More generally, our data suggest that although frequent exposure to counting is likely important to learning number word meanings, hearing number words used outside of the context of the quantificational structures of language—may also be highly important in early acquisition. Future studies should investigate this possibility by testing how, within a given language, learning is affected by training that emphasizes the use of number words in informative grammatical structures.

Several questions are left open by this study. First, although a natural conclusion to draw from our data is that number morphology can affect the acquisition of number word meanings directly, it is also possible that a less-direct relationship exists between the formal systems. For example, it is possible that acquiring the dual speeded the acquisition of number words it involves because it provides a new concept, “twoness,” the general availability of which speeds the independent acquisition of the word two (10). This result, like a more direct syntactic bootstrapping account, would also predict the correlated emergence of two and the dual. Second, although our data suggest that morphological forms like the dual encode concepts similar to meanings of number words like two, we have not addressed how such concepts might arise in the first place. It is possible that the acquisition of morphology and number words both depend on a single conceptual change (which in Slovenian language previously studied.

For example, becoming a CP-knowers, and learning how counting is independent of a counting system (8, 13, 20). Critically, learning two, and three appears to be a necessary step to understanding counting and more advanced mathematical knowledge. However, children appear unable to learn words that encode sets of five or more—whether number words or grammatical morphology—in the absence of counting (14, 20). These facts suggest that grammatical cues to number are most important to learning the meanings of early number words, like one, two, and three, and that distinct processes govern later number word learning. For example, becoming a CP-knowers, and learning how counting is used to enumerate sets larger than four, involves acquiring knowledge that lies beyond the scope of natural language morphology (see refs. 18–20 for discussion). Although grammatical structures may play an important role in getting number word learning off the ground, they are not sufficient for acquiring mathematical knowledge, which emerges later in development (21).

In sum, we found that grammatical morphology can facilitate the acquisition of early number word meanings, resulting in dramatic cross-linguistic differences. Although being trained to use a count list is an important part of number word learning, at the earliest stages children are also strongly affected by hearing number words used in naturalistic speech, particularly if their language features rich cues to number. These data suggest that acquiring number words—basic building blocks of early mathematical learning—is importantly affected by the structures with which they are used in speech, and thus by differences in the
grammatical expression of number across individual children, and cross-linguistically.

Materials and Methods

Experiment 1. Participants. Slovenian children included 71 2-, 3-, and 4-y-olds (mean age = 3.3 y), tested in Ljubljana, Slovenia. All were native speakers of Central Slovenian. There were 28 2-y-olds, (2;1–2;11 y, mean = 2.6 y), 26 3-y-olds, (3;0–3;11, mean = 3;4 y), and 17 4-y-olds (4;0–4;9, mean = 4;2 y). Of these children, 68 successfully completed the Give-N task, and were included in analyses. English children included 79 2-, 3-, and 4-y-olds (mean = 3.6 y), tested in San Diego, CA. There were 26 2-y-olds, (2;1–2;9 y, mean = 2;5 y), 29 3-y-olds, (3;1–3;11 y, mean = 3;7 y), and 24 4-y-olds (4;0–4;11y, mean = 4;5 y). Children gave verbal assent, and caregivers gave signed consent. Recruitment and experimental procedures were approved by the UCSD Human Research Protection Program.

Slovenian children were tested in their school by a female experimenter who spoke Central Slovenian. Each child completed all four tasks (WOC, Give-N, Give-M, Highest Count) in order in one session. Two additional tests of pragmatic reasoning were administered on a separate day (Supporting Information). Testing took ~30 min. For computer tasks, audio was pre-recorded by a native speaker of Central Slovenian. For all other tasks, the experimenter gave verbal instructions. English children were tested in their school or the laboratory by a female experimenter who spoke English. Sixty-two Slovenian children and 72 English children completed the Highest Count tasks, which were included in all analyses. Children who did not complete the Highest Count task were included in all analyses that did not consider counting a factor.

Give-N. Children were given 10 objects and were asked to give n items (where n = 1–10), and to tell the experimenter when they were done. The experimenter requested n without a noun to avoid number agreement: “Can you put n in the red circle?” (see Supporting Information for translations). Once the child was done, the experimenter asked, “Is that n?” If the child gave an incorrect number, they were asked, “Can you count and make sure?” Children were asked for each n three times, in pseudorandom order. Children were classified as n-knowers for the largest number for which: (i) they provided n items two-thirds of the time when asked for n, and (ii) on two-thirds of the trials for which they gave n, they did so for the number n (21). WOC. Warm-up trials tested if children could name the four types of objects used during test: paintbrushes, buttons, balloons, and drums. The children were shown one card at a time and asked, “Can you tell me what’s on this card?” If they didn’t respond, the experimenter asked, “Can you say it?” Where X was the singular form. Once the child had named the objects, the experiment began. The children were shown images of one, two, three, five, or eight items on each card. Each item type was presented on five trials, once for each set size. On each trial, the experimenter asked, “What’s on this card?” There were two trial orders. Half of children were assigned to a Number condition, half to a No-Number condition. In the Number condition, children were prompted to use number words: the experimenter gave feedback on the first trial, after the child saw one object: for example, “That’s right, that’s one drum.” On later trials, if the child used a number word, they were prompted with, “How many?” If they used a number word but no noun, they were prompted: for example, “Two what?” In the No-Number condition, there was no prompt, and most children did not use number words as a result.

Regardless of condition, all trials on which children used number words were used in analyses that tested use of morphology with numbers. Give-M. Children were shown 10 buttons and asked to place a quantity into a box, using the singular (gumb) dual (gumba), or plural (gumbe), four times each. Children told the experimenter when they were done. Sixty-five children completed this task. Of these, all but nine completed all trials. These nine completed at least six trials (two for each ending) and were therefore included in analyses. Give-N. Children were asked to count as high as they could. If they did not respond they were prompted by the experimenter, who said, “...” (with rising intonation). The child’s highest count was the largest number reached before making an error. In both the Slovenian and English samples seven children refused to count.

Experiment 2. Participants. The Saudi sample included 84 3- and 4-y-olds (mean = 3.9 y), tested in Riyadh, Saudi Arabia. All children were native speakers of Saudi Arabic. There were 57 3-y-olds, (3;0–3;11 y, mean = 3.6 y), and 27 4-y-olds (4;1–4;6 y, mean = 4;4 y). All children provided verbal assent, and caregivers gave signed consent. Recruitment and experimental procedures were approved by the UCL Research Ethics Committee.

Children were tested in their school by a female native speaker in a session lasting 10–20 min. Each child completed the two tasks (Give-N; forced-choice morphology). Task order was randomized between subjects.

Give-N. Children were shown 25 small balls and asked to put n items in a bowl (where n = 1, 2, 3, 4, or 5), and to count aloud. In a warm-up trial, the experimenter placed six balls one at a time in the bowl, counting aloud. Instructions were given without a noun, “Can you give me n?” to avoid number-marking cues (see Supporting Information for translation). When children did not respond they were prompted by the experimenter, said, “Can you make sure that this is n?” to allow one correction. Children were asked for each n three times, in one of two pseudorandom orders. Forced-choice morphology. Children were presented one training card followed by 12 test cards. Each card depicted three arrays (one, two, or five objects) of the same type (cars, chairs, trees, or spoons). For each type of thing there were three tokens, which varied across trials. The location of the singular, dual, and plural sets on the cards also varied across trials. For familiarization, children saw a card with three sets of balls (one, two, or five), and the experimenter used the number-inflected noun (ball, dual-ball, ball-plural) while pointing to each set (for translations, see Supporting Information). Each number-inflected noun was then repeated, but this time the child was asked to point and was given feedback if needed. The experimenter then moved to the test trials. Children saw one card at a time and were asked, “Can you show me the picture of car-dual?”
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