1. The Bangla je puzzle

The problem: Placement of the finite complementizer je depends on the position of its embedded clause.

- Embedded clause is postverbal; je is initial.
  - (1) Jon jane [je] ma (*je) o’sudh (*je) kheyeche
  - John knows [that mother that medicine that ate] ‘John knows that mother took medicine.’
- Embedded clause is preverbal; je surfaces after at least one phrase.
  - (2) Jon [ (*je) ma (je) o’sudh (je) kheyeche] jane
  - Jon [that mother that medicine that ate] knows John
  - ‘John knows that mother took medicine.’

Variation in je’s placement is challenging to purely syntactic (Bhattacharya 2001, B&D 2014) or prosodic accounts.

Main claims: [1] Both initial and non-initial orders of je are syntactically derived. [2] Prosodic constraints influence word order through copy spell-out.

2. Topic, focus, and non-initial je

In preverbal CPs, phrases preceding je are typically topicalized or focused (Bhattacharya 2001).

- Definite objects are freely fronted before je.
  - (4) Jon [chatro du-to-ke (je) dadhubai dekheche] bollo
  - Jon student 2-CL-ACC that grandfather saw said
  - ‘John said that grandfather saw the two students.’
- Quantified phrases can front only with contrastive focus.
  - (5) Jon [KAU-KE (je) dadhubai dekheche-nil] bollo
  - Jon anyone-ACC that grandfather saw-NEG said
  - ‘John said that grandfather didn’t see ANYONE.’
- Subjects before je do not need to be topicalized or focused; the pattern is not purely discourse-driven (cf. B&D 2014).
  - (6) Jon [kew (je) ase-nil] bollo
  - Jon anyone that come-perf-NEG said
  - ‘John said that nobody came.’

3. The Bangla left periphery

The patterning of je is derived by a lower copy spell-out analysis (Franks 1998, B&óšković 2001) in an extended CP structure (Rizzi 1997).

- In all embedded clauses, je leaves copies in the Fin and Force heads, deriving its specification as [+finite] and [+decl].

\[
\text{Initial je: spell-out in Force.}
\]

\[
\text{Non-initial je: spell-out in Fin, XP(s) moved to TopP/FoCP}
\]

- Linear order is determined by which copy is pronounced.

4. Prosodic factors in copy spell-out

Embedded clauses are prosodified differently based on their position (diagnostics of Khan 2008).

- Postverbal CPs are pragmatically neutral, and do not form their own intonational phrases.
  - Postverbal embedded clause
    \[
    [\text{CP} \ 	ext{Subj} \ V \ [\text{CP} \ ... \ ]] \to \text{t-Phrasing}
    \]
- Preverbal CPs are topicalized or focused (S&B 2003) and form separate intonational phrases.
  - Sentence-medial embedded clause
    \[
    [\text{CP} \ 	ext{Subj} \ [\text{CP} \ ... \ ] \ V] \to \text{t-Phrasing}
    \]

Lower copy spell-out prevents the pronunciation of je at the edge of an intonational phrase.

- Vowel lengthening patterns show that je is a stray syllable and does not form a Prosodic Word.
- All possible prosodifications of je violate STRONG-START (Selkirk 2011) at an intonational phrase edge.

Proposal: Prosodic requirements compete with syntactic linearization constraints in an OT grammar.

- Lower copy spell-out results from the ranking: STRONGrStt((d/INTP) >> HIGHESTCOPY).

5. Conclusion

- The extended clausal periphery successfully accounts for variation in complementizer placement.
- The interaction of syntactic and prosodic constraints derives word order variation (Lópëz 2009, Effner 2012).
- Closer analysis of syntax-prosody correspondence can shed light on puzzling variation in syntax.