PF Movement in Latin

Brian Agbayani & Chris Golston
California State University, Fresno

Discontinuous constituency has long been considered a key property of so-called 'non-configurational' languages (Hale 1983). Latin (considered to be such a language) has a process of focus fronting which commonly results in discontinuous constituents of quite striking forms, a phenomenon known as 'hyperbaton' in classical scholarship. This paper offers a new perspective on the origins of discontinuous constituent order in the historical data (and beyond). We argue here that hyperbaton in Latin results from movement at PF. The evidence for PF movement comes from three areas: (i) the movement affects phonological rather than syntactic constituents, (ii) it ignores a number of constraints on syntactic movement, and (iii) it is semantically vacuous.

Phonology: We show that hyperbaton moves *phonological* constituents to the edges of other *phonological* constituents, where these constituents are defined by the (right) edges of lexically headed XPs (Selkirk 1986, 1996). (1) shows a phonological word (ω) consisting of a preposition and an adjective fronted to the left of a verb. Crucially *ad communem* is not a syntactic constituent of any kind, though it is a phonological word. (2) shows a phonological phrase (φ) fronted past a preposition; again, the fronted material *compluribus aliis* is not a syntactic constituent, though it is a phonological constituent. **Syntax**: Hyperbaton ignores a number of established constraints on syntactic movement. Thus if (1) and (2) involve syntactic movement they would involve movement of non-constituents. (3) and (4) show hyperbaton's well-known insensitivity to the Left Branch Condition (Ross 1967). (5) and (6) exhibit insensitivity to the Adjunct Condition. (7), (8), and (9) exhibit insensitivity to the Coordinate Structure Constraint, the first with a full form conjunction *et,* the second with a clitic conjuction *=que,* the third with an extracted relative pronoun *quas.* (10) shows that hyperbaton is not syntactically clause-bounded (contra Devine & Stephens 2000, 2006). **Semantics**: Hyperbaton is sematically vacuous. Although movement has the pragmatic effect of focalization, bound anaphors may be displaced to the left of their antecedents yielding the radical reconstruction/ 'undoing effect' at LF, as shown in (11) and (12). This property differs from local scrambling in other languages (Saito 1985, 1989), where radical reconstruction is not exhibited (thus arguing for a different source for this movement in Latin).

Sensitivity to phonological structure and insensitivity to syntactic and semantic constraints are expected if hyperbaton results from movement at PF. But it is clearly problematic if hyperbaton is taken as movement within narrow syntax, as essentially argued for in Devine & Stephens 2006. We argue that their analysis fails to address why hyperbaton is insensitive to island- and binding-considerations and fails to account for the movement of phonological words and phrases that do not constitute syntactic constituents. Generative analyses of PP-splitting in modern Slavic (specifically Serbo-Croatian) can cover a subset of the Latin hyperbaton data, but fail to extend to the Latin data more generally. Thus, Franks & Progovac (1994) would analyze cases like (1) as rightward extraction of the NP followed by leftward movement of the PP remnant. Bašić (2004) proposes that NP moves leftward to the clausal middle field, followed by remnant PP movement to the clause periphery. Like D&S 2006, these approaches fail to explain why hyperbaton is semantically vacuous (11, 12) and insensitive to syntactic islands. Bošković (2005) proposes that adjectives move to a position c-commanding P, which then cliticizes onto the adjective prior to further leftward movement; but this will not generalize to (N, V, A) heads that are not clitics yet evince the same patterns as Ps in Latin. Crucially for the cliticization

analysis, adjectives may not extract alone, nor may P+N front stranding the (otherwise) intervening adjective. These cases are attested in Latin, as long as what has locally fronted forms (at least) a phonological word (13). This argues again for movement at PF.

(1) $(ad\ communem)_\omega$ afferre   fructum
        to common$_{nas}$ contribute$_{inf}$ fruit$_{nas}$
        'to contribute to the common good' (Cicero, *Pro Arch* 12)

(2) $(compluribus\ aliis)_\phi$ de   causis
        several$_{fap}$ other$_{fap}$ for   reason$_{fap}$
        'for *several other* reasons' (Caesar, *Bello Gallico* 5.54.5)

(3) *omnis*   expers   curae
        every$_{fgs}$ devoid   care$_{fgs}$
        'devoid of *every* care' (Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 1Praef4)

(4) *eas*   tenuisse   terras
        those$_{fap}$ took$_{inf}$ lands$_{fap}$
        'took *those* lands' (Livy, *Ab Urbe Condita* 1.1.3)

(5) *suo*   stare   *loco*
        their$_{ngp}$ stayed   place$_{ngp}$
        'they stayed in their position'   (Livy 9.37.3; DS 11)

(6) *pedes*   latas   quaternos
        feet$_{map}$ wide   four$_{map}$
        '*four* feet wide' (Cato 151.3; D&S 566)

(7) *sapientiae*   laudem   et   eloquentiae
        wisdom$_{fgs}$ reputation$_{mas}$ and   wisdom$_{fgs}$
        'a reputation for *wisdom* and eloquence' (Cicero, *de Oratione* 2.363)

(8) *Faesulas*   inter   Arretium=que
        Faesulae$_{fap}$ between   Arretium$_{nas}$=and
        'between *Faesulae* and Arretium' (Livy *22.3.3*)

(9) *quas*   inter   et   castra
        which$_{fap}$ between   and   camp$_{nap}$
        'between *which* and the camp' (Caesar, *Bello Gallico* 6.36)

(10) *id*   si   fierit
        that$_{nns}$ if   be$_{3sfut}$
        'If that should be' (Caesar, *Bello Gallico* 1.10)

(11) *se*   Milo   continuit
        self   Milo$_{mns}$ restrained$_{3s}$
        'Milo restrained *himself*' (Cicero, *Pro Milone* 15.40)

(12) quo   *se*   Catilina   inferebat
        where   self   Cataline$_{mns}$ carry.in$_{3s}$
        'where Catalina took himself' (Cicero, *Pro Sulla* 53)

(13) *in sinu*   semper et   complexu   meo
        in arm   always and   embrace   my
        'always in my arm(s) and my embrace' (Cicero, *Epistulae Ad Familiares* 14.4.3)