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Introduction
(1) Hay **toda** agua en el baño.

‘There’s water over the whole bathroom floor.’
• Completive *todo* in Rioplatense Spanish is available in

**Existentials**

(2) Hay *todo polvo* en la mesa.

‘There is dust all over the table.’

**Possessive sentences**

(3) Juan tiene *toda arena* en el pelo.

‘Juan has sand all in his hair.’

(4) Tenés *todo chocolate* en la cara.

‘You have chocolate all over your face.’
• It is not available in other environments.

(5) *Juan tomó toda leche.
Juan drink.PST.3SG all.F.SG milk.F.SG
‘Juan drank the milk completely.’

(6) *María está lavando toda lechuga.
María be.PRS.3SG washing all.F.SG lettuce.F.SG
‘María is washing the lettuce completely/thoroughly.’

(7) *Pedro pintó toda pared.
Pedro paint.PST.3SG all.F.SG wall.F.SG
‘Pedro painted the wall completely.’
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Hypothesis 1

*Todo* makes up a nominal constituent with the higher noun.

(8) Hay [SC [QP **toda agua**] [PP en [el baño]]].
Evaluating Hypothesis 1

(8) Hay $[\text{sc} \, [\text{qp toda agua}] \, [\text{pp en [el baño]}]]$.

- **Agreement**
  
  *Toda* agrees in gender and number with *agua*.

- **Interpretation**
  
  The interpretation of (1) is not ‘all (of) the water.’

- **Constituency**
  
  *Toda agua* cannot be an answer to a *qué* question.

(9) A: ¿Qué hay en el baño?  
   ‘What is there in the bathroom?’

   B: *Toda agua.*  
   ‘All water.’
Evaluating Hypothesis 1 \textit{con’t}

- **Toda agua** vs. **mucha agua**

\begin{equation}
\text{(10) Hay } \text{mucha agua} \text{ en el baño.}
\end{equation}

‘There’s a lot of water on the bathroom floor.’

- **Interpretation**

\textit{Mucha} quantifies over \textit{agua}.

- **Constituency**

\textit{Mucha agua} \textbf{can} be an answer to a \textit{qué} question.

\begin{equation}
\text{(11) A: } \text{¿Qué hay en el baño?} \quad \text{B: } \text{Mucha agua.}
\end{equation}

‘What is there in the bathroom?’ ‘A lot of water.’
Evaluating Hypothesis 1 con’t

(8) Hay $[_{SC} [_{QP} toda agua] [_{PP} en [el baño]]].$

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 1 cannot be right.
Questions

(i) What element is todo quantifying over in these sentences? (i.e. What element is it semantically related to?)

(ii) What syntactic position does todo occupy in the structure?

(iii) If todo does not make up a nominal constituent with the noun (e.g. agua ‘water.F.SG’ in Hay toda agua en el baño), how does it come to agree with it?
Hypothesis 2

*Todo* makes up a nominal constituent with the lower noun.

(12) Hay [**toda**] agua en [____ **el baño**].

‘splits’
Evaluating Hypothesis 2

(12) Hay [toda] agua en [___ el baño].

‘split’

• Agreement

Under (12) we expect agreement between todo and the lower nominal (*todo agua), contrary to what we find.

(13) *Hay toda barro en [la cocina].

‘There’s mud over the whole kitchen floor.’

[Cf. todo barro]
Evaluating Hypothesis 2 con’t

- **Interpretation I**

(14) a. Tenés **todo** chocolate entre los 
have.PRS.2SG all.M.SG chocolate.M.SG between the.M.PL 
bolsillos de la camisa. 
pockets.M.PL of the.F.SG shirt.F.SG

b. #Tenés chocolate entre **todos** los 
have.PRS.2SG chocolate.M.SG between all.M.PL the.M.PL 
bolsillos de la camisa. 
pockets.M.PL of the.F.SG shirt.F.SG
‘There’s chocolate all between the pockets of your shirt.’
Evaluating Hypothesis 2 con’t

- **Interpretation II**

  (15) a. Tenés **todo** chocolate al lado de/cerca de
  have.PRS.2SG all.M.SG chocolate.M.SG to.the side of/ near of
  the.F.SG tie.F.SG

  b. #Tenés chocolate al lado de/cerca de **toda**
  have.PRS.2SG chocolate.M.SG to.the side of/ near of all.F.SG
  the.F.SG tie.F.SG

  ‘A space next to/near your tie is completely covered with chocolate.’
Evaluating Hypothesis 2 *con’t*

- **Constituency**
  
  The *todo* + nominal string can be clefted and coordinated.

  (16) **Juan** tiene [*todo chocolate*] y [*toda crema*] en las manos.
  ‘Juan has chocolate and cream all over his hands.’ (Lit. ‘Juan has all chocolate and all cream on his hands.’)

  (17) **Es todo chocolate** que Juan tiene en las manos, no toda crema.
  ‘It is chocolate that Juan has all over his hands, not cream.’
  (Lit. ‘It is all chocolate that Juan has on his hands not all cream.’)
Evaluating Hypothesis 2 *con’t*

(12) Hay [**toda**] agua en [____ el baño].

‘split’

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>• Agreement</th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Interpretation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Constituency</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Hypothesis 2** cannot be right.
A brief detour: Quantifier and adverb *all/todo*

- *All*: ‘the totality of the members in a set’/ ‘the totality of the parts of a whole’

  (18)a. The students are **all** tall.
  b. That house is **all** white.

- *All*: ‘completely’

  (19)a. John is **all** upset.
  b. I am **all** alone.
A brief detour: Quantifier and adverb *all*/*todo* con’t

• ‘Totality’ *all* can appear with stage-level and individual-level predicates.

(20) a. The students are *all* tall.  
   b. The students are *all* upset.

• ‘Compleative’ *all* is only possible with stage-level predicates.

(21) a. #John is *all* tall.  
   b. John is *all* upset.
Hypothesis 3

Todo quantifies over silent SPACE.

(22) Hay [sc [np agua] [pp en [dp todo THE SPACE [pp OF el baño]]].
Toward an analysis: 3 hypotheses

(23)
Evaluating Hypothesis 3

(22) Hay \([_{SC} \text{NP agua}] \,[_{PP} \text{en} \,_{DP} \text{todo} \, \text{THE SPACE} \,[_{PP} \text{OF el baño}]]\).

- **Agreement**

  Expectations: (i) *Todo* should agree with silent SPACE
  (ii) *Todo* should not agree with any nominal at all
  (iii) *Todo* should agree with the lower nominal

  **Wrong prediction** made by (i) and (ii)

(24) *Hay todo agua en la cocina.

  **Wrong prediction** made by (iii)

(25) *Hay toda barro en la cocina.
Evaluating Hypothesis 3 con’t

(22) Hay [sc [np agua] [pp en [dp todo THE SPACE [pp OF el baño]].

• Interpretation
  ‘There is water in the whole space of the bathroom.’

• Constituency
  It does not follow from (20) why toda agua can be clefted and coordinated with another string.
Evaluating Hypothesis 3 con’t

(22) Hay $[_{sc} [_{np} agua]] [_{pp} en [_{dp} todo] THE SPACE [_{pp} OF el baño]].$

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Agreement</strong></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpretation</strong></td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Constituency</strong></td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hypothesis 3 cannot be right.
Interim summary

(1) Hay toda agua en el baño.

- *Todo* is not quantifying over the higher noun (*agua*) [HYPOTHESIS 1]
- *Todo* is not quantifying over the lower noun (*bathroom*) [HYPOTHESIS 2]
- *Todo* is not quantifying over a silent noun (SPACE) [HYPOTHESIS 3]

Conclusion: *Todo* is not quantifying over a noun.
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The structure of existential sentences

The structure we have been assuming so far

(26)

```
TP
   pro
   T'
   T
   hay_i
   VP
   V
   t_i
   SC
   NP
   agua
   PP
   en el baño
```
The structure of existential sentences con’t


(27) There is **whiskey** in the jar.

• The **coda** (in the jar) is **not** the main predicate.

• The **pivot** (whiskey) is.

• Existentials have an **implicit argument**.

• The value of the **implicit argument** is determined by context or by contextual modifiers expressed by the **coda** (in the jar).
Proposal

Todo is the modifier of a PP headed by silent WITH.
(28) Structure for *Hay toda agua en el baño*
Evaluating the proposal

(29) Hay $_{sc}$ $_{dp}$ THE/A SPACE $_{pp}$ en el baño$] [_{pp}$ toda $] [_{pp}$ WITH $] [_{np}$ agua$]$.]

• Agreement

• Question 1: Can adverbs agree in Spanish?
• Question 2: Can toda agree with agua in the structure in (29)?
Evaluating the proposal con’t

(29) Hay [SC [DP THE/A SPACE [PP en el baño]] [PP toda [PP WITH [NP agua]]]].

• Agreement

• Question 1: Can adverbs agree in Spanish? Yes.

(30) María está media aburrida.
    María be.PRS.3SG half.F.SG bored.F.SG
    ‘María is a little bit bored.’

(31) Sus chistes son bastante graciosos.
    his.PL jokes.PL be.PRS.3PL quite.a.lot.PL funny.M.PL
    ‘His jokes are considerabley funny.’
Evaluating the proposal con’t

(29) Hay [SC [DP THE/A SPACE [PP en el baño]] [PP toda [PP WITH [NP agua]]]].

- Agreement

- Question 2: Can toda agree with agua in the structure in (29)? Yes.
Evaluating the proposal \textit{con’t}

Gallego & Uriagereka 2016

(32) \textit{Dialectal Spanish}

Dijo que se \underline{hablaron} con las autoridades.

\textsc{say.PST.3SG} that \textsc{SE talk.PST.3PL} with the.\textsc{PL authorities.PL}  

‘He said that the authorities were talked to.’

(33)  

\begin{verbatim}
TP
   se  T'
   T   VP
      V   PP
         P   P
            PP
               DP
                  las autoridades
                 \hspace{2cm} \textit{hablaron} \hspace{1cm} \textit{con}_i \hspace{1cm} t_i
\end{verbatim}
Evaluating the proposal con’t

(29) Hay $[_{SC} [_{DP} THE/A SPACE [_{PP} en el baño]] [_{PP} toda [_{PP} WITH [_{NP} agua]]]]$.

• Agreement

(34)
Evaluating the proposal *con’t*

(29) Hay \[\text{SC } [\text{DP THE/A SPACE } [\text{pp en el baño}] [\text{pp toda } [\text{pp WITH } [\text{NP agua}]]]]\].

- **Interpretation**
  We predicate of a surface (that of the bathroom floor) that is completely covered with a substance/mass (water).
Evaluating the proposal con’t

(29) Hay \[ \text{THE/A SPACE [pp en el baño]}\] [pp toda [pp WITH [np agua]]].

- **Constituency**

  *Toda agua* is a PP. This is why it cannot be an answer to a *qué* question, but it can be clefted and coordinated with another string.

(35) A: ¿Qué hay en el baño?
  ‘What is there in the bathroom?’
  B: *Toda agua
  ‘All water.’

A: ¿Qué cocinaste?
  ‘What did you cook?’
  B: *En el horno/*con manteca
  ‘in the oven’/ ‘with butter’
Evaluating the proposal con’t

(29) Hay \[_{SC \ [_{DP \ THE/A \ SPACE \ [_{pp \ en \ el \ baño]} \ [_{pp \ toda \ [_{pp \ WITH \ [_{NP \ agua]}]}\]}]}\].

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>✓</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agreement</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpretation</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Constituency</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposal can account for the agreement, interpretation and constituency of *Hay toda agua en el baño*. 
Further evidence in favor of silent SPACE

The justification for the presence of silent SPACE came mainly from interpretation.

(36) Tenés todo chocolate al lado de/cerca de la corbata.

‘A space next to/near your tie is completely covered with chocolate.’

However, an element can be notionally present without it being syntactically present.
Further evidence in favor of silent SPACE

Liquid or water in (37)

(37) Juan washed the car.

Consider (38) from Condoradvi & Gawron 1996.

(38) Every man who bet on the Superbowl won it.

\[ \text{it} = \text{the Superbowl} \]
\[ \text{it} \neq \text{the bet} \]
Further evidence in favor of silent SPACE

**Hypothesis**

If we can refer to strings like *THE/A SPACE en el baño* with a pronoun, we would have evidence that there is a silent noun in this structure.
Further evidence in favor of silent SPACE

(39) Había toda agua en la cocina pero ya lo sequé.

‘There was water over the whole kitchen floor but I already dried it up.’

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{agua} &= \text{water. F.SG} \\
\text{cocina} &= \text{kitchen. F.SG} \\
\text{lo} &= \text{M.SG}
\end{align*}
\]
Further evidence in favor of silent SPACE

(40) Tenés toda sangre entre los ojos, no te have.PRS.2SG all.F.SG blood.F.SG between the.M.PL eyes.M.PL not CLDAT
lo toques.
M.SG touch.PRES.SBJV.2SG
‘The/a space between your eyes is completely covered with blood, don’t touch!’

sangre = blood.F.SG
ojos = eyes.M.PL
lo = M.SG
Further evidence in favor of silent SPACE

(41) #Puse (la) lavandina entre las canillas, no put.PST.1SG the.F.SG bleach.F.SG between the.F.PL taps.F.PL not lo toques. it.M.SG touch.PRES.SBJV.2SG
‘I put bleach between the taps, don’t touch!’

lavandina = bleach. F.SG
canillas = taps.F.PL
lo = M.SG
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Three aspects of variation between Rioplatense Spanish and Peninsular Spanish

• Variation I: Agreement

• Variation II: Prepositions

• Variation III: Distribution of completive *todo*
**Variation I: Agreement**

(42) a. Juan tiene **toda arena** en el pelo.  
    b. Juan tiene **todo arena** en el pelo.  
    ‘Juan has sand all in his hair.’

(43) a. María tenía **todas picaduras** en la espalda.  
    b. María tenía **todo picaduras** en la espalda.  
    ‘María had mosquito bites all over her back.’

- If *todo* is an adverb akin to *completely* this is not unexpected.

- In Spanish, adverbs display quite a lot of variation with respect to the agreement patterns they allow.
Variation I: Agreement *con’t*

(44) a. María está medio aburrida. [No Agreement]  
   b. María está media aburrida. [Agreement]  
   ‘María is a little bit bored.’

(45) a. Sus chistes son bastante graciosos. [No Agreement]  
   b. Sus chistes son bastante graciosos. [Agreement]  
   ‘His jokes are considerably funny.’
Variation I: Agreement *con’t*

**TWO SCENARIOS**

A. Speakers of Peninsular Spanish don’t have adverbs that agree.

B. In non-agreeing (PS) grammars, WITH fails to incorporate.
Variation II: Prepositions

(46) Juan tiene todo de arena en la cabeza.
    ‘Juan has sand all over his head.’

    [*RS, ✓ PS]

- Con/de alternation: Locative alternation

(47) a. Juan cargó heno en el carro.
    ‘Juan loaded hay onto the truck.’

    [Theme object]

b. Juan cargó el carro {con/ de} heno.
    ‘Juan loaded the car with hay.’

    [Location object]
    (Mateu, 2002:207)
Variation II: Prepositions con’t

(48) a. Juan cargó el carro con heno.  
   b. Juan cargó el carro de heno.  
   ‘Juan loaded de car with hay.’

Hypothesis

The absence of the de variant in the locative alternation is linked to the absence of the de variant in the todo construction.

• Some evidence that this may be on the right track.

(49) a. ?Tenés todo con chocolate en la cara.  
     b. Tenés todo de chocolate en la cara.
Variation III: Distribution of completive *todo*

(50) a. Juan tiene *todo barro* en la cabeza.  
    ‘Juan has mud all over his head.’  
    [✓ RS, ✓ PS]

    b. Hay *todo barro* en el baño.  
    ‘There’s mud over the whole bathroom (floor).’  
    [✓ RS, *PS]

Hypothesis

Existentials in RS and PS are structurally distinct. Existentials in RS are possessive WITH structures; existentials in PS are not.
Variation III: Distribution of completive *todo con’t*

- A contrast along these lines is found in **European** vs. **Brazilian Portuguese**.

(51) a. *Nesta fruta há moitas sementes.* [EP]
   b. *Nesta fruta há muitos caroços.* [BP]
   ‘In this fruit there are many seeds.’ (Franco & Lorusso 2018:53)

(52) a. *Esta fruta tem moitas sementes.* [EP]
   b. *Esta fruta tem muitos caroços.* [BP]
   ‘This fruit has many seeds.’

   b. *Tem muitos caroços nessa fruta.* [BP]
   ‘In this fruit there are many seeds.’ (Franco & Lorusso 2018:53)
Variation III: Distribution of completive *todo con’t*

- **Rioplatense Spanish** is like **Brazilian Portuguese** in having a single WITH possessive structure for both *tener* ‘have’ sentences and existential sentences (despite the different verbs used: *haber* vs. *tener*).

- **Peninsular Spanish** patterns with **European Portuguese** in keeping possessives and existentials distinct.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rioplatense Spanish</th>
<th>Peninsular Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brazilian Portuguese</td>
<td>European Portuguese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Implications

- In the structure proposed the possessor is the subject (of a small clause) and the possessum is a complement (of the silent P WITH).

- This goes against the tradition that claims that all possessive constructions are derived from a single underlying structure like the one in (55).

(54)  
\[ \text{Possessor} \quad \text{Possessum} \]

*Levinson (2011)

(55)  
\[ \text{Possessum} \quad \text{Possessor} \]

Freeze 1992, den Dikken 1995
Future research: Completive *all* in English

- Speakers of some varieties of English (e.g. Australian, Irish, and British English) allow sentence like those in (56).

(56) a. There’s *all* water behind me.
   b. There’s *all* blood in the bed.
   c. There’s *all* mud in my special wedding shoes.
   d. There’s *all* sand in my hair!
   e. The bath had *all* sand and dirt in it!
Conclusion

• We discussed sentences like *Hay toda agua en el baño*.

• We proposed the **analysis below:**
  \[ \text{[SC [A/THE SPACE [PP en el baño] [PP todo [PP WITH agua]]]]} \]

• We showed how this analysis accounts for the **interpretation**, **constituency**, and **agreement pattern** of the construction.

• We discussed **three aspects of variation** between RS and PS: agreement, prepositions, distribution of completive *todo*.

• We reviewed the theoretical consequences of the analysis for the syntax of possession.

• **Future work:** *John has all sand in his hair!*