

## Issues in Recursive Prosody

Junko Ito and Armin Mester  
University of California, Santa Cruz  
ito@ucsc.edu, mester@ucsc.edu

This talk investigates the question under which conditions, if at all, unbounded nesting arises in prosodic structure. In the words of Pinker & Jackendoff (2005: 203), "[r]ecursion refers to a procedure that calls itself, or to a constituent that contains a constituent of the same kind." Only the second conception matters to us here—there is no autonomous procedure of "phonological phrase building" that calls on itself. Rather, phonological phrases arise through a general syntax-prosody mapping procedure, and recursive structure arises only in response to syntactic structure that needs to be mapped. If recursion exists at lower prosodic levels that are not strictly interface-grounded, such as foot structure, this might be different. Specific issues to be addressed include the following:

- Which kinds of syntactic/morphological configurations give rise to recursive prosody?
- What are the empirical characteristics of directly  $\phi$ -attached vs.  $\omega$ -adjoined functional elements? This question will be investigated with the help of evidence from English and German.
- Is prosodic recursion ever truly unbounded? Evidence from the Mayan language Kaqchitel (Bennett 2018) bears on this question.
- Types of prosodic recursion: For a prosodic category  $\kappa$ , besides the unbalanced (adjunction) type  $\kappa \rightarrow \kappa + x$ ,  $\kappa \rightarrow x + \kappa$ , is there also the balanced type  $\kappa \rightarrow \kappa + \kappa$ ? Evidence from Japanese and Danish (Ito and Mester 2015) will be discussed.
- Are there effects of recursive prosodic structure in prosodic morphology? Relevant evidence is found in Japanese and Yokuts (Guekguezian 2017).
- Are there other kinds of prosodic recursion—recursion below the  $\omega$ -level, and not motivated by syntax or morphology? Besides recursive  $\sigma$ -structure (rarely mentioned, but see van der Hulst 2010), the central issue here is the existence of recursive feet (argued for in Martínez-Paricio and Kager 2015). Our discussion is likely to remain inconclusive. *Pro*: Ternary stress systems receive a principled analysis. *Con*: Many potential cases have other analyses without recursive feet.

### References:

- Bennett, Ryan. 2018. Recursive prosodic words in Kaqchikel (Mayan). *Glossa: a journal of general linguistics* 3(1): 67. 1–33, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.5334/gjgl.550>.
- Ito, Junko, and Armin Mester. 2015. The perfect prosodic word in Danish. *Nordic Journal of Linguistics* 38(1). 5–36. Doi:10.1017/S0332586515000049.
- Guekguezian, Peter Ara. 2017. Templates as the interaction of recursive word structure and prosodic well-formedness. *Phonology* 34(1). 81–120. doi:10.1017/S0952675717000045.
- Jackendoff, Ray, and Steven Pinker. 2005. The nature of the language faculty and its implications for evolution of language (reply to Fitch, Hauser, and Chomsky). *Cognition* 97(2). 211–225. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2005.04.006>.
- Martínez-Paricio, Violeta, and René Kager. 2015. The binary-to-ternary rhythmic continuum in stress typology: layered feet and non-intervention constraints. *Phonology* 32(3). 459–504. doi:10.1017/S0952675715000287.
- van der Hulst, Harry. 2010. A note on recursion in phonology. In Harry van der Hulst, ed. *Recursion and human language*. pp. 301–342. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110219258.299>.