Unpronounced subjects
We have seen PRO, the subject of infinitives and gerunds:

1. I want [PRO to dance in the park]
2. [PRO dancing in the park] was a good idea
There are languages that have unpronounced subjects in tensed clauses. Obviously, English is not among those languages:

3. irθe
   came.3sg
   ‘he came’ or ‘she came’

4. *came

Languages like Greek, which permit this phenomenon are called “pro-drop” languages.
What is the status of this unpronounced subject in pro-drop languages? Is it PRO or something else? Something with the same or different properties from PRO?

Let’s follow the convention of calling the unpronounced subject in tensed clauses “little pro”, as opposed to “big PRO”.

What are the differences between pro and PRO?
-A Nominative NP can appear instead of pro. Not so for PRO:

5. i Katerina irθe
   the Katerina came.3sg
   ‘Katerina came’

6. *I hope he/l to come

7. *he to read this book would be great
-pro can refer to any individual as long as Binding Condition B is respected. That is, pro is not “controlled”. Not so for OC PRO.

8. i Katerina\textsubscript{k} nomizi oti pro\textsubscript{k/m} ir\textgamma e stin ora tis the K thinks that came on-the time her ‘Katerina\textsubscript{k} thinks that she\textsubscript{k/m} /he\textsubscript{m} came on time’

9. Katerina\textsubscript{k} wants [PRO\textsubscript{k/\*m} to leave]
-pro can yield sloppy or strict readings under ellipsis, exactly like pronouns. Not so OC PRO.

10. i Katerinaₖ nomizi oti proₖ/m irθe stin ora tis the K thinks that came on-the time her
ke i Maria episis and the Maria also
‘Katerinaₖ thinks that sheₖ came on time and Maria does too’
=...Maria thinks that Katerina came on time strict
...Maria thinks that Maria came on time sloppy
11. Sue$_i$ expects [PRO$_i$ to be on time] and Katie$_k$ does expect [PRO$_{k/*i}$ to be on time] too.

Sloppy
-pro can have both the bound variable and the strict reading with certain quantificational antecedents, unlike OC PRO, which can only have the BV reading:

12. Only Peter claimed [PRO to be the winner]

True in 13b, not in 13a.

13a. Peter claimed that he (Peter) won, Jane claimed that she (Jane) won and Roy claimed that he (Roy) won.
   b. Peter, Jane and Roy claimed that Peter won the game.
14. Mono i Katerina isxirisθike oti kerdise
   only the K claimed that won
   ‘Only Katerina claimed that she/he had won’

exactly like pronouns:

15. Only Peter claimed that he was the winner

strict reading of *he*:
Peter = Only x [x claimed Peter is the winner].

bound variable reading of *he*:
Peter = Only x [x claimed x is the winner].
-pro can be expletive. Not so PRO.

16. echi tria vivlia sto domatio
    has 3 books in-the room
    ‘There are 3 books in the room’

17. * to be 3 chairs in the room would be great
-pro is subject to WCO, PRO is not:

18. who \( \text{k} \) did \( [\text{PRO}_k \text{ washing the car}] \) upset \( t_k \)?

19. pion katigorise [i jineka me tin opia pro who accused [the woman with who chorepse danced Who \( \text{k} \) did [the woman with who he \( \text{k} \) danced] accuse \( t_k \)?
So:

pro differs from OC PRO in some ways and from both OC and NOC PRO in other ways.

And in all tests it behaves like a pronoun.

Plus, pro-drop languages have PRO as well. That is, the tests that we ran on English for the existence and behavior of PRO pattern the same way in pro-drop languages. This means that pro-drop languages have both pro and PRO.
So:

pro is a pronoun.

It is licensed in the subject position of tensed clauses in some languages. (This means it also gets Case.)

It is interpreted just like pronouns are (Condition B).