Chapter 11, Problem 2: Santa Claus

A. Because that lexical entry requires three arguments (*there*, another NP, and a predicative phrase) and only two arguments appear in (i): *there* and the NP *a Santa Claus*.

B. We have postulated a new type for this lexeme, without showing how that type fits into the type hierarchy. A full analysis should capture the similarties between *new-exist-be-lxm* and *exist-be-lxm* on the one hand, and between *new-exist-be-lxm* and *tv-lxm* on the other. In addition, the agreement facts for this lexical entry are probably similar to those disucessed in Problem 1 and should probably receive similar treatment.

$$
\left\langle \text{be} \,,\;
\begin{bmatrix}
\textit{new-exist-be-lxm} \\[4pt]
\text{ARG-ST} \quad \left\langle
\begin{bmatrix} \text{NP} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \text{FORM} & \text{there} \end{bmatrix} \end{bmatrix} ,\; \text{NP}_i \right\rangle \\[10pt]
\text{SEM} \quad
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{INDEX} & s \\[4pt]
\text{RESTR} & \left\langle
\begin{bmatrix}
\text{RELN} & \text{exist} \\
\text{SIT} & s \\
\text{ARG} & i
\end{bmatrix} \right\rangle
\end{bmatrix}
\end{bmatrix}
\right\rangle
$$

C. Yes, the lexical entry given in Part B can be used for sentences like (ii) because *a book on the table* can be analyzed as single NP. This means that with the addition of the lexical entry given in Part B, these sentences become ambiguous according to our grammar.