* 1. It is unclear whether she is feeding food to her cat, or whether she is feeding “her” (unknown) some cat food. Furthermore in the first case it is unclear whether the cat is her own, or owned by some other female person.
  2. It is unclear whether the seeing was done with one eye, or whether the man only had one eye. Additionally, it is possible (although unlikely) that she saw the man with one of something (unknown) eye (i.e., look at) something or someone.
  3. The seeing could have been done in the garden with the telescope, the queen could have been in the garden with the telescope, or the queen could have been in the garden and the seeing was done with the telescope. Furthermore, in the case that the seeing was done with the telescope, “with” could mean “using”, or “beside”.
  4. There is ambiguity between whether the rabbit knew the girl, or the rabbit knew that the caterpillar would help the girl, or the rabbit knew that the caterpillar would help the rabbit. All of these scenarios anthropomorphise animals, and so it is difficult to subconsciously reject any interpretations as significantly less likely than the others.
  5. The main clause can be simplified to “The twins laughed”, but the subject and the verb are separated to a large degree. This is compounded by the fact that the inner clause, which can be simplified to “the rabbit liked” has the same problem, with the subject and the verb being very far apart.
  6. The main clause can be simplified to “She shook the bottle up”, using the verb phrase “she shook up”. However the word “up” is very far away from the word “shook”, so by the time it is parsed it is difficult to recall the verb to which it related.
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