



Document 0305


[20305001]




[20305003]




[20305004]




[20305005]




[20305007]




[20305008]




[20305010]




[20305011]




[20305013]




[20305014]




[20305015]




[20305016]




[20305017]




[20305018]




[20305019]




[20305020]




[20305021]




[20305022]




[20305023]




[20305024]



[20305025]




[20305026]




[20305027]




[20305030]




[20305031]




[20305032]




[20305033]




[20305034]




[20305035]




[20305036]




[20305037]




[20305038]



[20305039]



[20305040]



Now Pinkerton's could become entangled in a protracted legal fracas with its former parent
time_n:x - _ v_modal-b-h v_idc-i-h v_e-u-p p-e-u-i q-i-h-h a-e-p a-e-p n-x p-e-u-i q-i-h-h a-e-p n_o-f-x-i

[illegible]

Figure 10: A semantic network for the sentence "We have previously had discussions with representatives of Pinkerton's Inc. concerning the sale of the company and we concluded that we did not have liability under the contract, " says American Brands". The network shows the hierarchical structure of the sentence, with nodes representing semantic roles (ARG1, ARG2, etc.) and their corresponding linguistic forms (We, have, previously, etc.).

And then there's the case of the missing gold watch.
 c:i-i-i c:i-i-i _ v_there:e-i q:i-h-h n_of:x-i _ q:i-h-h v:e-i-p n:x n:x

Figure 10: A sentence graph for the sentence "The lawsuit alleges that an inventory of Pinkerton's memorabilia was disclosed to one of the cardinals, one of the watchmen had not been forked over by American Brands." The graph shows the hierarchical structure of the sentence, with nodes representing grammatical functions and their corresponding words. The words are: The, lawsuit, alleges, that, an, inventory, of, Pinkerton's, memorabilia, was, disclosed, to, one, of, the, watchmen, had, not, been, forked, over, by, American, Brands. The graph is a directed acyclic graph (DAG) where nodes are labeled with grammatical functions and their corresponding words. The root node is the sentence itself, which branches into the subject (The lawsuit) and the predicate (alleges that...). The subject branches into the determiner (The) and the noun (lawsuit). The predicate branches into the verb (alleges) and the complement (that...). The complement branches into the object (an inventory) and the modifier (of). The object branches into the determiner (an) and the noun (inventory). The modifier branches into the preposition (of) and the noun (Pinkerton's). The noun branches into the proper noun (Pinkerton's) and the noun (memorabilia). The noun branches into the determiner (was) and the noun (disclosed). The noun branches into the preposition (to) and the noun (one). The noun branches into the determiner (one) and the noun (of). The noun branches into the determiner (the) and the noun (watchmen). The noun branches into the verb (had) and the noun (not). The noun branches into the verb (been) and the noun (forked). The noun branches into the preposition (over) and the noun (by). The noun branches into the noun (American) and the noun (Brands).

The company is also renewing its emphasis on investigations, particularly undercover investigations for corporations.

[illegible]

“ Their approach did n’t work ; mine is .
 - qi-h-h n-to:x-i - neg:e-h v:e-i-p - pron:x -