

## ERRATUM

Friedman, Joyce, and Warren, David S.: (1978) 'A Parsing Method for Montague Grammars', *Linguistics and Philosophy* 2, 347-372.

On page 349, line 27, the sentence beginning "By examining" is incorrect. The claimed verification of Partee's example fails because two translations which we saw as different are in fact logically equivalent. The example purported to show the need for the CN-scope quantification rule but does not do so. The sentence *Every man such-that he has lost a pen such-that he doesn't find it will walk slowly* does have ten parses of which two use S15. But each of the two translations is logically equivalent to the translation of another parse without S15 in which the second relative clause attaches to *pen*.

The cause of our error was not the parses or their translations, which were correctly obtained by the computer programs, but a failure to notice the logical equivalence. Had the program reduced the translations to prenex normal form, the equivalent formulas would have been essentially identical. We were using the example to argue for the use of computer aids. The error reinforces both of the points we were trying to make: (1) the parser is useful, and (2) it doesn't take away the need for thinking.

Partee's original English sentence (60) has the relative *who* which restricts the second relative clause so that it cannot attach to *pen*. Ending the first relative clause with an adverb is one way within PTQ to keep the relative clause away from *pen*. The sentence *Every man such-that he has lost a pen voluntarily such-that he doesn't find it will walk slowly* has only four parses. The two without S15 have wide-scope *a pen* and narrow-scope *every man*; the two with S15 have wide-scope *every man* and narrow-scope *a pen*. They are not logically equivalent. A simpler form of the example is: *Every man such-that he loses a pen slowly such-that he finds it walks*.

University of Michigan

JOYCE FRIEDMAN  
DAVID S. WARREN