What is missing in Montague grammar?

Anna Pietryga, Opole University
apap@vp.pl

Gottfried Leibniz proposed the famous *Lingua characteristica* to provide an easy to learn way of reaching and exchanging knowledge. His purpose was similar to that of creating *Esperanto* by Ludwig Zamenhof, *lingua mentalis* by Anna Wierzbicka or the *universal second language* by Elmer Hankes, to mention just a few of Leibniz' followers (in order of declining popularity). The method used by Leibniz was similar to that of contemporary logicians, who take advantage of their predecessors' achievements even when they show the impossibility of performing some of their noble ideas, including Leibniz' own, i.e. the calculating of every calculable result.

The Montague grammar was intended to present the natural language as a formal one, due to the mathematical skill of the author, who considered – as one of his papers' title says – "English as a formal language". A page of this text, multiplied, is the handout. For those who are not acquainted with the theory, the copies will provide the opportunity to get the basic idea of Montague program and for everybody in the audience they will help to follow my lecture.

When we speak of the missing parts, we usually also mean the whole. In my opinion the main problem in the logical program which Montague launched is its lack of coherence. I do not intend to diminish the work of the author nor the impact and influence his grammar still exerts. I just want to say (and show) that his project is bound to fail if we want to accept Montague words and the frame of his grammar. The inconsistencies I have mentioned concern:

1. the relation between the Montague theory and his practice (i.e. Montague declarations and his grammar),
2. the surprising way Montague reads (or omits) some fragments of Alfred Tarski's writings.