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Although Bangla is “SOV”, the position of the complement clause and the complementiser is exactly as in English:

1. John knew [XP that mother come-will]

However, if the whole of the complement clause is moved to a pre-verbal position, then curiously the Comp can no longer remain in the initial position of XP:

2. John [XP mother that come-will] knew

As far as I can tell, this is not a common occurrence in the languages of the world. Two possible merely descriptive, therefore naïve, views are as in A and B:

A. Once something within the XP is re-arranged, the clause as a whole must also move.

This is supported by the simple fact that the complement clause cannot remain in-situ (here, post-verbal) if the Comp is not initial:

3. *John knew [XP mother that come-will]

B. Once the clause moves, the Comp cannot remain in the initial position.

This is supported by the following where a Comp-initial complement is not acceptable in the pre-verbal position:

4. *John [XP that mother come-will] knew

Although, A and B seem comparable there is a real difference. Given that derivation proceeds by phases (Chomsky 1998:20 and Chomsky, 1999:10) or in a multiple spell out fashion, it is unlikely that after the complement CP has been spelled out and moved, its internal structure can be tampered with, suggesting that option A (as shown in (5a)) is the favored option.
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The question remains of how the exactly the geometry of the construction is derived. In fact, a combination of available syntactic operations allow its derivation. If *Tuck-in* (as in (6), derived from Richards 1997) is enforced on Remnant Movement, the combination will have the desired effect of inverting the precedence relation between, say, a and b in (7).

(6) *Tuck-in*

Later XP movement target inner specifiers, i.e., they tuck in.

(7)

```
  P
  b
  Q  P
  t1
  Q a b 1 Q 2 Q
  t2
```

At the same time, this derivation has a curious property. *Tuck-in* as originally conceived by Richards preserves the c-command relation between the elements involved. By contrast, in this derivation, *Tuck-in* achieves a very different effect.
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