Exercise 3 (Due by May 16)

1. Consider the following sentence:

   (1) Peter forbade Mary to meet Kim in the park.

   (a) Raise or control? Argue for one of them!

   Solution:

   Given a semantic representation for (1) such as the following predicate argument structure (omitting the modifier “in the park”):

   \[
   \text{forbid}(\text{Peter, Mary, meet}(\text{Mary, Kim}))
   \]

   we can argue for **object control** on the bases of the following criteria:

   - no ECM: “forbade” only assigns case to its semantic arguments.
   - PRO: both “forbade” and “meet” have “Mary” as an semantic argument (argument sharing). Since “meet” does not assign case to “Mary”, a PRO-NP (without case) is in subject position.
   - semantic role: Since “forbade” assigns semantic role to its NP-object, no expletive elements can be raised. Therefore, the sentence “Peter forbade it to be disorder after a revolution.” is (at least) odd.
   - no small clauses: the sentence “Peter forbade Kim among the candidates” is not well-formed.

   (b) Give the elementary trees of an FTAG \( G \) that derives (1), along the lines of the examples presented in the lecture. Assume the elementary tree for “in the park” to have the following shape:

   ![Diagram](image)

   Solution:
(c) Give the derived tree and the derivation tree for (1), according to G.

Solution:
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