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### Movement of phonological constituents has been proposed for

- **Latin hyperbaton**: phonological movement (Golston, 2010)
- **Classical Greek**: phonological movement (Golston, 2010)
- **Prosodic recursion**: proposed for Classical Greek (Agbayani & Golston, 2006)

#### Properties of phonological movement:

1. moves prosodic constituents (e.g., n, ω, φ)
2. is phonology-sensitive (e.g., OCP)
3. is syntax-blind (totally blind to syntactic constituency, islands, binding)

#### Analysis of phonological movement:

- (i-ii) movement takes place completely within the phonological component
- (iii) after syntactic constituency is gone and syntactic constraints are irrelevant

Latin has a process similar to that of Classical Greek traditionally known as hyperbaton fronts prominent (focused, topical) material (Devine & Stephens 2006)

#### Proposal: Latin hyperbaton is phonological movement

- **A.** phonology fronts φ and ω
- **B.** phonology is OCP-sensitive
- **C.** phonology is syntax-free; ignores syntactic constituency, islands, binding

#### Syntactic analyses (Devine & Stephens 2006, Powell 2010, run after η-(i-iii))

- **A'.** syntax should front X and XP, not φ and ω
- **B'.** syntax should be phonology-free and thus OCP-blind
- **C'.** syntax should respect syntactic constituency, islands, binding

### A. Hyperbaton fronts focal or topical (recursive) φ and ω in a Selkirkian tree

1. *ad communem* | *ad communem* | *ad communem*
   - to common | to common
   - ‘contribute to the common good’ (Cicero, Pro Ancha 12)

2. *equidem cum* | *magnus* | *in dolor* | *sulmo*
   - though with some | with great sorrow | when out of | which

3. *exul* | *lupercus* | *regatur* | *lucar*
   - ‘from the Lupercus’ | ruled | locus

#### Much evidence that function word (f) and content word (C) form a (recursive) φ

4. *dirae communia* | *fractum* | *in effectum*
   - to common | to common

5. *where motion is always a φ or ω, though it may be any syntactic category: N, V, A, Adv, P, D, Q, Neg, etc.

### B. Fronting of φ and ω is blocked by the OCP.

11. PP fronts in subordinate clauses regularly bring together a Complementizer and a Preposition

12. cum *ad* cum ex Thessalia Attola-que legati venientem
   - when to him from Thessaly Attolae-que legati venientem

13. cum *ad* cum L. Aemilius Caeso Fabius consul consul
   - so with L. Aemilius Caeso Fabius consul consul

14. PP fronting is always blocked when the Complementizer and Preposition are homophonous and adjacent

#### C. Hyperbaton ignores syntactic constituency, bounding, islands, and binding.

15. Hyperbaton is allowed if the Complementizer and Preposition are homophonous but non-adjacent

16. *cum* is never violated in Latin. The OCP appears to be an absolute filter on all syntactic and phonological outputs.

#### OCP-sensitivity is expected in phonology and morphology (Nevins 2012), not in syntax (Phonology-Free Syntax, Ockwell & Pullum 1986)

#### CONCLUSION: Latin hyperbaton has all of the expected traits of phonological movement (moving φ and ω, OCP-sensitive; syntax-blind) none of the expected traits of syntactic movement (moving X and XP, OCP-blind; syntax-sensitive) strongly suggesting that it involves phonological rather than syntactic movement