

Preliminary thoughts on the internal syntax of *jeder* ‘every’

Thomas Leu, Yale University

Background German has the distributive universal quantifier *jeder* ‘every’ (1a), and the anti-distributive quantifier *jeweils* ‘each’ (1b). (*Weil* is a functional nominal related to *Weile* ‘while’.) Despite their similarity in terms of meaning and partial similarity in form, the two elements (traditionally conceived of as lexical items) have not received a unified analysis. I show that, looked at the right way, *jeweils* and the *je* in *jeder* are in complementary distribution, which suggests a unification. Taking furthermore into account a number of striking analogies to other determiners/quantifiers in terms of morphosyntactic behavior, I propose that *jeder* contains *jeweils*, with silent *WEILS*. In other words, *jeder* is really *je-WEILS-der*.

Complementarity To avoid confusion, let us note the distinction between adnominal *jeweils* (1b) and adverbial *jeweils* (2), cf. Zimmermann (2002). Of interest here is adnominal *jeweils*. Adnominal *jeweils* (1b) allows *weils* to remain silent; forms a constituent with a noun phrase (the DistShare); and imposes syntacto-semantic restrictions on two clause mates (the DistKey *the 3 boys* and the “modifyee” *two books* in (1b)). The DistKey must provide a partitionable set (Balusu, 2006). Zimmermann (2002) maintains that the modifyee must be a quantified **indefinite** noun phrase (3a), i.e. it cannot be a **definite** noun phrases (3b) (nor a bare nominal). However, this view, I claim, is misguided. Rather, I propose, *jeweils* can also modify a definite, and if it does the result is *je-der* ‘every’ (4), where *WEILS* must remain silent.

Genealogy The proposal is immediately plausible from a genealogical perspective in that in other Germanic languages the distributive anti-quantifier (*each, elk, hver* for English, Dutch, Icelandic) has a formally identical distributive quantifier counterpart *each, elk, hver* (Zimmermann, 2002).

Determiners/quantifiers I will show that the present proposal allows us to assimilate the morphosyntactic properties/distribution of *jewel-* to those of other Germanic determiners/quantifiers, on the view on determiners proposed in Leu (2008a). Specifically, I will outline the parallels with Germanic *was für* ((7), cf. Leu (2008b); Vangnes (2008)), and with definite determiners (8-9), cf. Leu (2008a), with regard to the components and the derivational options exhibited by these determiners, notably the existence of an adjectival variant in *ig* (5), alternating with a variant without *ig* (6), the (syntactic) presence of a genitival functional nominal (7) which is sometimes silent (6); the movement to the left edge (8-9); and the containment of the definite marker and strong adjectival agreement AGRA (8b) etc. The fact that the inflection on *jed-er* is that of an adjective, rather than a definite article (10), strongly supports this analogy (cf. (10a) and (8b)).

DistKey The restrictor (i.e. DistKey) of the distributive universal *je* is provided by the nominal anaphor *weil* whose value is established in the course of the derivation (Zimmermann, 2002). If *jeweils* modifies an indefinite (1b) the DistKey is identified by a (different) clause mate, which must provide a partitionable set (Balusu, 2006). If *jeWEILS* modifies a definite (1a), the DistKey is identified by the modifyee *Mensch*. It is important to note that the DistKey antecedent in (1a) is not *der Mensch*, but only the predicate *Mensch* (rendered by *weil* as the set of minimal human situations, arriving at a meaning for *jeder* as paraphrased in (11)). This supports a movement analysis of *jeWEILS* (cf. 9). The intriguing fact that +/-definiteness co-varies with the DistKey/DistShare role of the modifyee will be noted and set aside for post-talk discussion.

Conclusion A view on German *jeder* as the definite variant of adnominal *jeweils* is called for on the grounds of their respective form, meaning, and distribution, and supported by the ensuing morphosyntactic analogies to other determiners/quantifiers and by its fitting in with the general Germanic pattern. Furthermore it pushes a better informed approach to important questions regarding definiteness and quantification, on the one hand, and syntactic position and interpretation (both at LF and at PF) on the other.

- (1) a. **Jeder** Mensch ist sterblich. German
every human is mortal
b. Die drei Jungen haben gerade **je(weils)** zwei Bücher gekauft.
the three boys have just each two books bought
‘The three boys just bought two books each.’
- (2) Adverbial *jeweils*: Hans hat **je*(weils)** gelacht.
Hans has each.time laughed, i.e. Hans laughed at every relevant occasion.
- (3) Drei Jungen haben gerade **je(weils)** ...
three boys have just each
a. ... ein Buch / zwei Bücher / verschiedene Bücher gekauft.
one book / two books / different books bought (cf. Barker (2007))
b. * ... das Buch / die Bücher gekauft
the book / the books bought
- (4) Drei Jungen haben **jeWEILSdes** Buch gekauft.
three boys have every book bought
- (5) a. Ä [was für]-ig-ä wi wotsch? Swiss German
a what for-ADJ-AGRA wine want.you
b. der [jeweil]-ig-e Sieger German
the each.time-ADJ-WK winner
- (6) Was für SLAGS zwei büächr mömmer läsä? (cf. (1b)) Swiss German
what for two books must.we read
- (7) Hva for slag-s bok har du lest. (cf. genitival -s in *weil-s* in (1b)) Norwegian
what for sort-GEN book have you read
- (8) a. d-i bäidä verwandtä spiler Swiss German
the-AGRA both related players
b. [bäid]-i t_{baid} (#verwandtä) spiler
both-AGRA (related) players
- (9) a. den herre klokka Coll. Norwegian
the here.INFL watch.DEF “this watch”
b. Ek het [hier]-die t_{hier} huis gebou. Afrikaans
I have here-the house built “I built this house.”
- (10) a. jed-i rosä b. ä schön-i rosä c. d rosä Swiss German
every-AGRA rose a pretty-AGRA rose the rose
- (11) jeWEILSder Mensch is sterblich = For each cell in a natural partition of the set of humans into minimal human-situations *s*, the human in *s* is mortal.