Last week you've made changes to the transformations.pl file to get the skolem form for 'every man loved some woman .', and along the commented lines you've put there two things you asked for:

Task(1): Allan 20/04/2017. Make sortQStack do something interesting.

Done, but need to get the scope scoring right for all the possible specifiers that we could have in a stack. For now we have:

```
scope(the, 0.0).
scope(some, 3.0).
scope(tense(past,-),3.0).
scope(every, 3.1).
Q1:to be extended
```

Q2: The has the highest scope, what about other referentials that we've turned into a form of 'the'- pronounes, proper nouns and + tenses?

So for the example you placed in the comments;

parseOne('the man loved some woman .', X), doItAll(X,NF),pretty(NF), qff(NF,
QFF), pretty(QFF). We get:

```
Before sortQStack:
exists(A,
       (tense(past, A)
         & exists(B,
                  the((C :: {(man>):noun,C}),
                      exists(D,
                              (((woman>):noun , D)
                                & ((at , A,B)
                                    & (((love>ed : verb)
                                         & (dobj,D & subject,C)),
                                       B))))))))
(tense(past, [sk0])
  & the((A :: {(man>):noun,A}),
        (((woman>):noun , [sk2])
          & ((at , [sk0],[sk1])
              & (((love>ed):verb , [sk1])
                  & ((dobj,[sk2], [sk1])
                      & (subject,A , [sk1])))))))
After sortQStack:
the((A :: {(man>):noun,A}),
    exists(B,
           exists(C,
                  (((woman>):noun , C)
                    & exists(D,
                              (tense(past, D)
                                & ((at , D,B)
                                    & (((love>ed : verb)
                                         & (dobj,C & subject,A)),
                                       B))))))))
```

```
the((A :: {(man>):noun,A}),
    (((woman>):noun , [sk1])
    & (tense(past, [sk2])
    & ((at , [sk2],[sk0])
    & (((love>ed):verb , [sk0])
    & ((dobj,[sk1] , [sk0])
    & (subject,A , [sk0])))))))
```

## Q3: Is that the right from you've wanted?

Task(2): we haven't dealt with the auxiliaries properly.

Not done yet; quite tricky. The current **collectAuxs** deals with lists and now since we are calling **fixConjunctions** before rep3, **collectAuxs** should be fixed to deal with whatever structure returns **fixConjunctions**.

Q4: When you changed rep3 you made + tenses introduce a some quantifier in the stack, why? Aren't they supposed to be introducing a referential ones; 'the'?

rep3(spec(Tense,L0), (at, V, E) & (L2, E), VARSO,[[Tense:V], [some:E] |VARS1]) : Tense=tense(\_,+),
 !,
 collectAuxs(L0,L1),
 rep3(L1, L2, VARSO,VARS1).