

The mirror within the mirror (Ellen Brandner, Stuttgart)

The paper discusses the mirror effect, McDaniel et al (2015), i.e. that subject extraction within a clause is preferred over object extraction but that the situation is reversed with extractions across a clause boundary. It will focus on the interaction between the production/parsing aspect and the linguistic ecosystem. The observation is that the German dialect Alemannic uses two different strategies for long extractions: one is parallel to English (and Standard German) where the complementizer *dass* (that) introduces the embedded clause; the other strategy is based on relative clause formation – where this language uses a specialized particle (*wo*) see Brandner & Bucheli-Berger (2018). These strategies differ when it comes to the distribution of resumptive pronouns: they are highly preferred for subjects with *dass*-clauses but virtually impossible with the *wo*-strategy. This contrasts with object-extractions with a nearly complementary distribution, lending further empirical support to the mirror asymmetry. However, the difference concerning the resumptives with subject-extractions cannot be solely due to parsing/production – as the distance between filler and gap are the same in the *dass*- and *wo*-clauses. Thus, the morpho-syntactic environment overrides the parsing/production by prohibiting the insertion of a subject resumptive – just like in 'normal' relative clauses, cf. McCloskey (1990) who treats this as an anti-locality effect. But note that this cannot be the correct explanation in case of extractions. Another possibility to explain the preference for the gap would again come closer to parsing/production – namely *parallelism*: with a subject-relative, the predicate of the relative clause has the same structure as the predicate of a 'usual main clause', i.e. the VP without the subject – whereas with an object-relative, it must be first construed by taking the subject and the VP (with the missing argument) as the semantic predicate of the extracted object. Concerning the *dass*-extractions, it will be argued that these are proleptic constructions and that the gap in these cases is due to the Avoid Pronoun Principle – and not to a syntactic gap.