

We can make the same distinction with adjectives. When *clever* is used non-restrictively, we may be able to split it off with the help of ' \wedge ':

My clever husband has found a tax loophole that saves us £5000. 18.8

[my husband is clever \wedge my husband has found a tax loophole that saves us £5000].

Karel is a clever boy. 18.9

[Karel is clever \wedge Karel is a boy]

When it is used restrictively, no such analysis is possible:

The clever twin was always teasing her dim-witted sister. 18.10

NOT: [the twin was clever \wedge the twin was always teasing her dim-witted sister]

Even when we find an adjective in a non-restrictive posture, we may be unable to split it off with ' \wedge ', because the meaning requires it to stay attached to a particular noun. For example:

Arturo is a famous pianist. 18.11

NOT: [Arturo is famous \wedge Arturo is a pianist]

(The second sentence is true if, for example, the pianist Arturo is famous only as a female impersonator.)

You are a perfect stranger. 18.12

NOT: [you are perfect \wedge you are a stranger]

The company car was a small compensation. 18.13

NOT: [the company car was small \wedge company car was a compensation]

Amaryllis is my daughter. 18.14

NOT: [Amaryllis is mine \wedge Amaryllis is a daughter]

Exercise 18B. Which of these sentences can be analysed by means of ' \wedge '?

1. Stavros is a so-called radical.
2. Stavros is a former radical.
3. The thoroughly pleasant evening concluded with a waltz.

4. Their next encounter was more restrained.
5. Her aunt, who from her earliest youth Had kept a strict regard for Truth, Attempted to believe Matilda.
6. The animal that you saw was probably a fox.
7. Marianne is a teacher, who should have known better.
8. Britain, once a superpower, is now seeking a new role.
9. I can see Don growing into a bespectacled pedant.

Some arbiters of English style recommend using *which* or *who* in non-restrictive phrases and *that* in restrictive ones. Others say that one should use *that* only for inanimate objects. English has never followed either of these rules, either in conversation or in high written style. There seem to be just two safe generalizations: in written English the comma rule that distinguished 18.5 from 18.7 is well established, and in written and spoken English the use of *that* in non-restrictive phrases is much less common today than it was in Shakespeare's time. Beyond these you must rely on your common sense – as always in logical analysis.

19. Analysis of Complex Sentences

We wish to rewrite the following sentence using truth-functors:

This female bearded reedling has no black marks underneath, and its head is tawny. 19.1

There are an *and* and a *no* to contend with. Two translations suggest themselves:

[¬this female bearded reedling has black marks underneath \wedge this female bearded reedling has a tawny head] 19.2

¬[this female bearded reedling has black marks underneath \wedge this female bearded reedling has a tawny head] 19.3

(19.2) is right and (19.3) is wrong. Why?