In a resumptive pronoun construction, the “gap” position is not a gap; instead, it is filled by a pronoun.

(1) נְכַרְתֶּה

.א. הַמשֶרֶךְ שֶׁהֹמַרְנֵינָתָהּ שֶׁמֶה (אָותָי) עַל הַמָּדֵךְ.
.ב. הַמשֶרֶךְ שֶׁהוֹנַגֵּנֶתָהּ מַגִּים.
.ג. הַמשֶרֶךְ שֶׁהוֹנַגֵּנֶתָהּוֹוֹוֹ מַגִּים. עַל.
.ד. הַמֶשֶרֶךְ שֶׁרֹאִיָּיתָהּ אֶת אַבּוֹ הַשֶּׁפֶּבַּבֶּבוֹ אָותָי.

(2) Irish

a. an ghirseach a- r ghoid na siogá í the girl COMP- PAST stole the fairies her ‘the girl that the fairies stole away’

b. Céacu ceann a bhfuil dúil agat ann? which one COMP is liking at you in it ‘Which one do you like?’

c. Is tú a bhfuil an deallramh maith ort. COP.PRES you COMP is the appearance good on 2SG ‘It is you that looks well.’

(3) Swedish

a. Vilket konto vet inte varje investerare om det ger bra ränta? which account knows not every investor if it gives good interest ‘Which account does every investor not remember if (it) gives good interest?’

b. Det var den fången som läkarna inte kunde avgöra om han it was that prisoner that doctors.DEF not could decide if he verkliga var sjuk really was ill ‘This is the prisoner that the doctors couldn’t determine if (he) really was ill.’

Resumptive pronouns are most commonly found in relative clauses (although not only; as shown above for Irish and Swedish), and typological studies recognize the use of resumptive pronouns as one possible “relativization strategy.” From the perspective of LFG as well, resumptive pronouns are not a problem. One can either associate with them a mechanism for establishing multifunctionality (as proposed by Falk 2002) or allow multifunctionality to be expressed at the semantic/referential level of representation as an alternative to f-structure (Asudeh 2004).

For a displacement view of wh constructions, on the other hand, resumptive pronouns are problematic. If the wh element has been “displaced” from its “underlying” position, what is a pronoun doing there?
It wouldn’t do to analyze the resumptive pronoun as a “pronounced gap”: it has referential properties of pronouns. Note the ambiguity of (2a) and the lack of ambiguity of (2b), and compare it with (3a) and (3b).

(2)  
(a) דן לא ימצא את האישה שעוה שמחה.  
(b) דן לא ימצא את האישה שמחה אשתה.

(3)  
(a) דן מחפש אישה.  
(b) דן מחפש אישה. גם רם מחפש אישה.

Also note the following contrast (# means “grammatical for some speakers”):

(4)  
(a) עם מי נפגשת?  
(b) מי נפגשת איתה?  
(c) #איזה סטודנט נפגשת איתה?

Another problem with treating resumptive pronouns as pronounced gaps is that can occur in islands.

(5)  
(a) ראותי את הילד שעוה בידיה את האישה שאוהבת אתיה.  
(b) ראותי את הילד שעוה בידיה את האישה שאוהבת אתיה.

In fact, even in languages like English which do not really have a resumptive pronoun construction, pronouns can be used to rescue sentences which would otherwise be ungrammatical because of an island violation. (This phenomenon is sometimes referred to as involving an “intrusive pronoun”.)

(6)  
(a) *This is the student that I wonder if is planning to write a seminar paper.  
(b) ??This is the student that I wonder if she is planning to write a seminar paper.

Resumptive pronoun constructions show that syntactic theory has to accept the possibility of placing elements in fronted positions without displacing them from somewhere else. In this way, they undermine the conceptual basis of the displacement analysis of \(wh\) constructions.

**LFG references on resumptive pronouns**


http://cslipublications.stanford.edu/LFG/7/lfg02.html