Corrigendum

Morton, A. A solution to the donkey sentence problem. *Analysis* 75(3): 554–557.

Several of the formulas in my paper, 'A solution to the donkey sentence problem', mishandle the case in which the predicate G has a null extension (I am grateful to Thomas Ede Zimmermann for pointing this out to me). The purpose of this note is to correct my mistake, in a way that suggests a better formulation of the general case.

The analysis of the 'n gun' case should be

$$\forall x_1 \ldots \forall x_n (\forall z\,(Gz \equiv (z = x_1 \vee \ldots \vee z = x_n)) \supset (Fx_1 \vee \ldots \vee Fx_n))$$

with a biconditional where I had a conditional. Otherwise, when there are no Gs, the sentence is true only when everything is an F. Similarly for the two-gun case.

In the general case with no restriction on cardinality, the formula I gave has obviously wrong truth conditions when G is empty. Fixing this we can make it an instance of a two-parameter generalized quantifier, with l and u as lower and upper bounds for the size of the set of Gs:

$$\forall S\,((l \leq |S| \leq u \,\&\, \forall z\,(z \varepsilon S \equiv Gz)) \supset \exists g\,(g \varepsilon S \,\&\, Fg))$$

For the gun example the appropriate value for l is 1 and for u is $\aleph_0$ (1 because it is 'a gun' and $\aleph_0$ because I doubt that anyone anywhere has more than denumerably many guns). This formulation makes the resemblance between the Geach quantifier and the 'threshold' quantifiers mentioned in the paper more obvious.

Adam Morton
University of British Columbia
adam.morton@ubc.ca

Analysis Vol 76 | Number 4 | October 2016 | pp. 445–445 doi:10.1093/analys/anw012