

**SCILLS 3 • Pázmány Péter Katolikus Egyetem • Piliscsaba • Hungary • 24–28 August 2013**  
**Marcel den Dikken • Issues in the syntax of specificational copular sentences and (pseudo)clefts**

**Session 4 • Semi-clefts** (based on work done with Mariana Santos de Resenes, on Brazilian Portuguese)

- the focus of this session is a construction that, on its face, looks a lot like a specificational pseudo-cleft but strikingly lacks the *wh*-operator that characterises SPCs
- this construction is usually referred to in the literature as the SEMI-CLEFT
- Ross (1999) notes that semi-clefts are found in Brazilian Portuguese ‘though apparently not in all varieties of Portuguese’; but it occurs in all known varieties of Brazilian Portuguese, and in European Portuguese as well (Costa & Duarte 2001); in addition, it is found in Latin-American Spanish (Colombian, Dominican, Ecuadorian, Panamanian, Venezuelan), though not in Iberian Spanish [primary literature: Wheeler 1982, Toribio 1992, 2002, Bosque 1999, Costa & Duarte 2001, Camacho 2006, Kato 2010, Mito 2006a,b, 2008, Kato & Mito 2012, and Resenes & Den Dikken 2012]
- semi-clefts share with SPCs their identificational focus effect
- the range of possible foci in semi-clefts is much the same as that in SPCs: objects, secondary predicates and subjects are fine; speaker-oriented adverbs are impossible; manner adverbs are variable

- (1) a. o João comprou *foi* um livro (Portuguese)  
the João bought was a book  
‘João bought a BOOK (and not something ELSE)’
- b. o João dançou *foi* na Portela  
the João danced was in.the Portela  
‘João danced at the PORTELA (and not somewhere ELSE)’
- c. telefonou *foi* o João  
called was the João  
‘JOÃO called (and not someone ELSE)’
- d. %o João discursou *foi* calmamente  
the João spoke was calmly
- e. \*o João saiu *foi* infelizmente  
the João left was unfortunately

- in the discussion to follow, I will concentrate on semi-clefts with SUBJECT FOCI, because these have two syntactic properties that are particularly revealing
- (a) transitivity restriction
- (b)  $\phi$ -feature agreement

- re: (a) an important restriction on such semi-clefts in Portuguese is the ban on transitive verbs
- the semi-cleft in (2) is uniformly impossible throughout the Portuguese-speaking world
  - the free inversion construction in (3) is grammatical in European Portuguese but not in Brazilian Portuguese
  - the SPC in (4) is grammatical for all speakers of Portuguese

- (2) \*leu o livro *foi* o João (Portuguese)  
read the book was the João
- (3) %leu o livro o João  
read the book the João
- (4) quem leu o livro *foi* o João  
who read the book was the João

- the contrast between (2) and (4) shows clearly that it is impossible to derive semi-clefts uniformly from SPCs
- but a monoclausal approach to (2) that assimilates it underlyingly to (3) will have to account for the fact that there are speakers who accept (3) yet reject (2)
- Resenes & Den Dikken (2012) explain the ungrammaticality of (2) on the basis of an approach to the ‘object of’ relation that they also exploit in their analysis of semi-clefts with object foci such as (1a)
- they take the ‘object of’ relation to be a PREDICATIONAL relation, with the object serving as the subject of the minimal VP, and the external argument as the subject of the predication formed by the minimal VP and the object

(5)  $[_{VP} \textit{o João} [_{v'} v [_{RP} \textit{um livro} [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR} [_{VP} \textit{comprou}]]]]]]]$

- based on (5), the semi-cleft in (1a) is derived by applying Predicate Inversion to the minimal VP: the VP predicate is raised to an A-position above the object, as in (6), contingent on phase-extending movement of the RELATOR, which is spelled out as the copula *foi*
- the analysis of (1a) thus draws an explicit parallel between this semi-cleft and copular inversion constructions of the type discussed in session 2, for which Den Dikken (2006) explains the obligatoriness of the copula along the same lines

(6)  $[_{VP} \textit{o João} [_{v'} v [_{FP} [_{VP} \textit{comprou}] [F+\textit{RELATOR}=\textit{foi} [_{RP} \textit{um livro} [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR} [_{VP} \textit{comprou}]]]]]]]]]]]$

- with (5) as the underlying representation for transitive verb phrases, we can also explain the ungrammaticality of (2)
- this is a semi-cleft with a subject focus — its derivation must, on a Predicate Inversion analysis, involve inversion of the predicate of the subject around the subject
- in a transitive clause, the predicate of the external argument is the RP in the complement of *v* — concretely, for (2), the underlying structure is (7), with the RP dominating *o livro leu* as the predicate of *eu*

(7)  $[_{VP} \textit{o João} [_{v'} v [_{RP} \textit{o livro} [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR} [_{VP} \textit{leu}]]]]]]]$

- there are two predicates in this structure: the minimal VP is the predicate of the object; the RP in the complement of *v* is the predicate of the subject
- we have already seen, in the discussion of (1a), that performing Predicate Inversion on the minimal VP predicate yields a grammatical semi-cleft output: (6)
- but performing Predicate Inversion on the predicate in the complement of *v* is impossible in (7): this predicate is itself a RELATOR phrase, and (for reasons that remain mostly obscure; this is one of the major outstanding explananda in generative syntax), RELATOR phrases (predications) are themselves ineligible for movement

(8)  $*[_{FP} [_{RP} \textit{o livro} [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR} [_{VP} \textit{leu}]]]] [F+v=\textit{fui} [_{VP} \textit{o João} [_{v'} v [_{RP} \textit{o livro} [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR} [_{VP} \textit{leu}]]]]]]]]]]]$

- when the verb is *intransitive*, subject-focus semi-clefts are grammatical — recall (1c)
- a monoclausal Predicate Inversion analysis is straightforwardly available for such semi-clefts: since there is no direct object, there is only a single predication relation established; *v* takes the minimal VP as its complement, which serves as the predicate of the external argument



re: (a) parallel with Locative Inversion

→ Coopmans (1989:729–30): Locative Inversion ‘only occurs in root clauses’ (and in clauses embedded under bridge verbs, well known for their ‘embedded root phenomena’)

(14) \*he regretted that down the stairs fell the baby

re: (b) full, unreduced pseudoclefts are fine in non-bridge environments: (14a) and (14b) have exactly the same status as their unembedded counterparts (see (11c,d)); embedding in non-bridge environments does not have any effect on their grammaticality

(14) c. a Maria sabe se quem telefonou fui eu (Portuguese)  
 the Maria knows if who called.3SG was.1SG I  
 d. a Maria sabe se quem telefonou foi eu  
 the Maria knows if who called.3SG was.3SG I

Q if a reduced SPC derivation along the lines of (12) is right for (10c) and (10d), why isn’t (10c) universally acceptable on a par with (11c)?

• whereas SPCs usually show a word-order alternation (15), semi-clefts do not (16)  
 → this word-order restriction holds also for reduced SPCs: (17)

(15) a. quem telefonou foi eu (Portuguese)  
 who called.3SG was.3SG I  
 b. eu foi quem telefonou  
 I was.3SG who called.3SG

(16) a. telefonei fui eu  
 called.1SG was.1SG I  
 b. \*eu fui telefonei  
 I was.1SG called.1SG

(17) a. telefonou foi eu  
 called.3SG was.3SG I  
 b. \*eu foi telefonou  
 I was.3SG called.3SG

→ reduced SPCs apparently belong to what Den Dikken, Meinunger & Wilder (2000) call ‘Type A’ SPCs, and what we have been referring to in this seminar as ‘TC SPCs’, i.e., question-answer pairs

(18)  $[_{TopP} [_{CP} \textit{what John ate}] [_{Top'} \textit{Top=was} [_{TP} (\textit{John ate}) a sandwich]]]$  (TC SPCs)

(19) a.  $[_{TP} a \textit{sandwich}_i [_{T'} T=\textit{was} [_{RP} t_i [_{R'} \textit{RELATOR} [_{FR} \textit{what John ate}]]]]]$  (PI SPCs)  
 b.  $[_{TP} [_{FR} \textit{what John ate}]_k [_{T'} T+\textit{RELATOR}=\textit{was} [_{RP} a \textit{sandwich} [_{R'} t_{REL} t_k]]]]]$

• besides word-order rigidity, a TC approach to reduced SPCs makes sense of the reduction process itself: ‘wh-drop’, which is available in questions (as in Dutch (21)) but not in free relatives (cf. (20))

(20) a. eu comi  $[_{FR} *(o \textit{que}) \textit{ele comeu}]$  (Portuguese) b. ik at  $*(\textit{wat}) \textit{hij at}$  (Dutch)  
 I ate the what he ate I ate what he ate  
 ‘I ate \*(what) he ate’



(23) [TopP [CP ~~quem~~ telefonou] [Top' foi [TP o João ~~telefonou~~]]]

- while nothing militates against an analysis along these lines for cases (such as (10c,d)) for which the signal makes it clear that it is the right analysis (because a monoclausal analysis would be incompatible with the facts), for cases for which a monoclausal analysis is perfectly feasible a reduced TC SPC would seem to be ‘overkill’
- TC SPCs are generally resorted to only if PI SPCs are not a possibility; *a fortiori*, a *reduced* TC SPC parse should truly be a last resort
- the reduced pseudocleft strategy cannot be exploited as a blanket licence to save semi-clefts that are ruled out on a monoclausal analysis
- this is important because the analysis would otherwise massively overgenerate, undoing many of the achievements of the monoclausal derivation — incl. the account of the transitivity restriction
- if a reduced pseudocleft derivation were readily available, there would be nothing to block the ungrammatical transitive semi-cleft with subject focus in (2), repeated below as (24a): the SPC in (4) (repeated as (24b)) is grammatical

(24) a. \*leu o livro *foi* o João (Portuguese)  
       read the book was the João  
       b. quem leu o livro *foi* o João  
       who read the book was the João

- the insight that the reduced pseudocleft derivation of semi-clefts involves *wh*-drop can begin to shed light on the limited availability of reduced pseudoclefts
- *wh*-drop questions in the Germanic languages are usually non-subject questions, and when they are subject questions, they seem to be subject to restrictions that to a certain extent mimic those found in Portuguese semi-clefts<sup>2</sup>

(25) a. (wie) belde er net? (Dutch)  
       who called there just  
       ‘who called just now?’  
       b. \*(wie) heeft dat boek gelezen?  
       who has that book read  
       c. (wie) heeft dát nou weer gedaan?  
       who has that DPRT DPRT done  
       ‘who on earth did that?’

- it seems unlikely that (25a) vs (25b) presents us with a profound *structural* contrast anchored in syntactic principles: in Dutch the ‘transitivity restriction’ on *wh*-drop is certainly not absolute — (25c) is fine (though presumably most natural as a rhetorical question and not as an information question)
- if, as the reduced TC SPC analysis leads one to believe, there is a link between the *wh*-drop facts in Dutch (25a,b) and the contrast between (24a) and (10d), we expect that there may be circumstances under which semi-clefts with transitive verbs come out grammatical as well

2 To my knowledge, no quantitative study of the distribution of *wh*-drop has ever been done. The text statement is based on my own native-speaker intuitions.

→ indeed, in some varieties of Latin-American Spanish, semi-clefts with transitive verbs and subject foci are grammatical (Camacho 2006:16)

- (26) a. compró los libros fue Pedro (varieties of Latin-American Spanish)  
 bought the books was Pedro  
 ‘it was Pedro who bought the books’  
 b. compró papas fue Juan  
 bought potatoes was Juan  
 ‘it was Juan who bought potatoes’

→ I suspect that the root of variation in the realm of transitive semi-clefts with a subject focus is similar to the variation (itself unclear) with respect to *wh*-drop of animate subjects in transitive questions

• one additional restriction will be necessary in order to avoid unwanted overgeneration of reduced pseudoclefts: we must block such an analysis for any and all semi-clefts featuring a *non-subject* as the focus

→ free access to a reduced pseudocleft analysis would make highly inaccurate predictions regarding  $\phi$ -feature agreement in semi-clefts with non-subject foci

→ in SPCs — even ones that are unambiguously TC SPCs — the copula can  $\phi$ -agree with a focus that does not serve the subject function in the *wh*-clause (as shown in (27))

→ but in semi-clefts, only *subject* foci can show  $\phi$ -feature agreement with the copula: (28) is impossible with  $\phi$ -agreement between the copula and the non-subject focus

- (27) a. o que o João comeu *foram* os doces (Portuguese)  
 what the João ate were.3PL the candies  
 b. ?o que que o João comeu *foram* os doces  
 what that the João ate were.3PL the candies

- (28) o João comeu {*foi*/\**foram*} os doces  
 the João ate was.3SG/were.3PL the candies

→ the monoclausal analysis of semi-clefts explains the ungrammaticality of (28) with plural *foram*  
 – finite T *must* establish an Agree relation with the unvalued  $\phi$ -features of the lexical head at the foot of the extended projection in its complement

–  $\phi$ -Agree must therefore reach down from T all the way to the lexical head (V) at the foot of the verbal extended projection

–  $\phi$ -probing is terminated as soon as T has found the lexical head of the extended projection in its complement

– in (6), repeated below, T probes down, finds V (which raises up to  $\nu$ ), values its  $\phi$ -features, and stops probing; the F+RELATOR complex cannot have any  $\phi$ -features valued against those of the subject, or, for that matter, the object (Romance has no object agreement)

- (6) [<sub>VP</sub> o João [<sub>V</sub>  $\nu$  [<sub>FP</sub> [<sub>VP</sub> *comprou*] [F+RELATOR=*foi*] [<sub>RP</sub> *um livro*] [<sub>R</sub> RELATOR [<sub>VP</sub> *comprou*]]]]]]]]

→ if we allowed a reduced pseudocleft parse as an alternative for semi-clefts with non-subject foci, we would fail to rule out *foram* in (28), in light of the well-formedness of (27)

Q why is a reduced pseudocleft derivation not available for semi-clefts with non-subject foci?

- Portuguese is not known to be a *wh*-drop language (the same is true for other Romance languages)
- take this to mean that Portuguese does not allow a silent *wh*-element to occupy SpecCP
- but this still leaves room, in principle, for a limited amount of *wh*-drop
  - the *wh*-constituent of highest-subject *wh*-questions is *in situ*, in the structural subject position and not in SpecCP (see the Vacuous Movement Hypothesis of Chomsky 1986)
  - in languages that have pro-drop, *wh*-drop in highest-subject *wh*-questions can be an instance of pro-drop — more specifically, pro-drop involving a *wh*-element in SpecTP
- all of the Romance languages that have semi-clefts are pro-drop, at least to a certain degree [Brazilian Portuguese is much less robustly pro-drop than its European ancestor, and both it and Dominican Spanish are well on their way to becoming non-pro-drop, but at least synchronically we still find a certain amount of pro-drop in these Romance varieties]
- $pro_{WH}$ -drop is available only in highest-subject cases<sup>3 4</sup>
- if *wh*-drop in SpecCP is not an option available for Romance, this correctly limits the reduced pseudocleft derivation precisely to such highest-subject cases

(29)  $[_{TopP} [_{TP} pro_{WH} telefonou] [_{Top'} Top=foi [_{TP} o João telefonou]]]$

- if this is on the right track, it provides one clue to why French does not allow semi-clefts: French cannot derive semi-clefts via the reduced pseudocleft strategy because it is not a pro-drop language
- this provides only one part of the answer to the typological question concerning the cross-linguistic distribution of semi-clefts [but it leaves unaccounted for the fact that Italian and Iberian Spanish, both robust pro-drop languages, lack reduced pseudoclefts]
- in addition, French *also* resists the *monoclausal* PI derivation of semi-clefts ‘proper’ — probably because French PI is quite generally restricted to proforms (cf. *l'état \*(c')est moi* ‘the state it is me’) [this still will not explain why, say, English or Italian does not have monoclausal semi-clefts]

#### APPENDIX: some notes on the nature of *wh*-drop

- there are three logical possibilities for analysing the silent *wh* in *wh*-drop constructions
  - (a) the *wh* is a regular *wh* in the syntax but fails to get a phonological matrix at PF (PF ellipsis)
  - (b) the *wh* is radically null, and either
    - (i) *pro*, or
    - (ii) PRO

*re:* (a) arguably, the *default* is deep (rather than surface) anaphora — a null pro-form (*pro* or PRO), with less structure than the surface anaphor (a syntactically fully developed but PF-silent constituent)

→ the existence of ellipsis constructions in which the ellipsis site contains a gap bound by something outside the ellipsis site (i.e., cases in which there is extraction from the ellipsis site) makes a compelling case for the existence of surface-empty ellipses which have full internal syntactic structure

3 Though pro-drop is available for all subjects (not just highest subjects) and for objects as well,  $pro_{WH}$  only occurs at the left edge of a clause: only then can it take scope over the clause; while *in situ wh*-elements can undergo LF movement to their scope position,  $pro_{WH}$  cannot because it is not lexically identifiable as an operator hence not LF-movable. The fact that  $pro_{WH}$  is not lexically identifiable as an operator probably also prevents it from participating in *wh*-absorption, ruling out multiple *wh*-questions with  $pro_{WH}$ .

4 In self-answering questions of the type found in TC SPCs, the value for the *wh*-element is provided within the confines of a single syntactic TOPIC-COMMENT structure. This, too, appears to be a requirement imposed on the distribution of  $pro_{WH}$ : Romance has no *wh*-drop across separate clauses in a discourse, not even in self-answering question-answer pairs.

- but in situations in which surface emptiness cannot be proven (i.e., in cases in which there is no argument to be made in favour of internal syntactic structure inside the elliptical element), the language user will assume that the empty category is a deep empty category
- for *wh*-drop, no case for surface emptiness as opposed to deep emptiness can be made: extraction from the dropped *wh*-constituent is obviously impossible (the *wh*-constituent in a pseudocleft is always a simple *wh*; subextraction from *ex situ wh*-constituents is generally very difficult)
- for *wh*-drop, for which no case for surface emptiness can be made, option (a) seems unsupportable

re: (b.i), the *pro* option

- for *wh*-drop in the *wh*-clause of reduced TC SPCs in Romance, it has emerged in the foregoing discussion that an approach to the null *wh* that treats it as *pro* has much to recommend it
- the distribution of *pro* in Romance, largely confined to subjects of finite clauses, handily reins in the distribution of reduced TC SPCs to cases with highest-subject foci
- the  $pro_{WH}$  in SpecTP is formally licensed by T's  $\phi$ -features (as is generally the case for *pro*-drop in Romance)
- the content-licensing requirement imposed on  $pro_{WH}$  can be satisfied in TC SPCs by the fact that an identifier for  $pro_{WH}$  is provided *within the same complex utterance*: the focus of the reduced pseudocleft provides the value for  $pro_{WH}$
- by imposing a locality restriction on the content-licensing of  $pro_{WH}$ , we can account for the fact that  $pro_{WH}$  is restricted in its distribution to TC SPCs and does not generalise to (highest-subject) *wh*-questions in general: a value for  $pro_{WH}$  must be provided within the complex utterance; only 'self-answering questions' (i.e., DMW-style TC SPCs) satisfy this requirement

NB once the empty *wh* is identified as being *pro* (rather than PRO), the content-licensing requirement follows immediately: we know from Rizzi (1986) and work in its wake that referential *pro* is, in general, subject to a formal licensing requirement *and* a content-licensing requirement; the formal licensing requirement is satisfied in reduced TC SPCs by the  $\phi$ -features of T; in Brazilian Portuguese T's  $\phi$ -features are insufficiently 'rich' to content-license *pro*; the content-licensing restriction is met by the presence in the same complex utterance of a focus that provides the value for *pro* [this leaves unaccounted for the fact that European Portuguese, whose  $\phi$ -features *are* 'rich' enough to content-license *pro*, does not allow *wh*-*pro*-drop outside reduced TC SPCs]

- Dutch cannot satisfy the formal licensing requirement imposed on *pro*, not even for a  $pro_{WH}$  in the structural subject position (SpecTP): Dutch is not a *pro*-drop language
- for *wh*-drop in Dutch, therefore, cannot be analysed with the aid of (b.i)
- but (b.ii) turns out to be a good fit for *wh*-drop in Dutch (and German as well; Dutch and German are probably alike when it comes to topic drop and *wh*-drop)

re: (b.ii), the PRO option

- the traditional p&p empty category PRO has a very restricted distribution: it occurs only in ungoverned environments (the 'PRO Theorem')
- this constraint makes PRO an excellent fit for the empty category in  $\bar{A}$ -dependencies without an overt operator, incl.
  - *tough*-movement constructions
  - infinitival relatives and finite *that*-relatives
  - parasitic gap constructions
- in all these constructions, the position occupied by the null operator is an ungoverned position
- a treatment of empty operators as PRO not only accounts for their positional distribution but also for the fact that empty operators are exclusively *nominal*

- assuming that the silent *wh*-element in Dutch *wh*-drop constructions is PRO accounts very well for the distribution of *wh*-drop in this language
- *wh*-drop is confined to *root* questions: embedded questions require an overt *wh*-operator (30)
  - *wh*-drop is generally confined to nominal categories: referential arguments and predicate nominals, as well as the locative *wh*-element *waar* (the [+WH] counterpart to *er/daar*, which has certain nominal characteristics in the Germanic languages, incl. the ability to satisfy the EPP *qua* ‘expletive’) (31)

- (30) a. (wat) kost me dat? (Dutch)  
 what costs me that  
 b. ik ben benieuwd \*(wat) me dat zal kosten  
 I am curious what me that will cost

- (31) a. (wat) heb je nou gedaan? argument (Dutch)  
 what have you now done  
 b. (wat) is dat nou? predicate nominal  
 what is that now  
 c. (waar) ben je geweest? locative  
 where are you been  
 d. ??(hoe) heb je dat gedaan? manner  
 how have you that done  
 e. \*(waarom) heb je dat gedaan? reason  
 why have you that done  
 f. \*(wanneer) ben je aangekomen? temporal  
 when are you arrived

- the PRO-based approach in all likelihood carries over directly to *topic drop*
- Dutch has argument drop in at least one other context: imperatives (Den Dikken 1992, ‘Empty operator movement in Dutch imperatives’; *Language and Cognition* 2, Groningen; 51–64)

- (32) a. leg die bal neer! (Dutch)  
 put that ball down  
 b. leg neer die bal!  
 put down that ball  
 c. leg neer!  
 put down

- I have argued in detail that in both (32b) and (32c) we are dealing with null operator (– PRO) movement of the object into a position in the left periphery (the specifier position of the MoodPhrase)
- one of the things this analysis captures is the fact that while direct objects can be dropped, indirect objects cannot — for the same reason *tough*-movement is universally impossible with indirect objects (see Den Dikken 1995, *Particles*, for an account, directly based on the PRO-based analysis of null operators)

- (33) a. stuur ’m op (dat boek)! (Dutch)  
 send him up that book  
 b. stuur ’t op (\*die kinderen)!  
 send it up those children

- (34) a. zulke boeken zijn leuk om (aan) kleine kinderen te geven (Dutch)  
 such books are nice/fun COMP to small children to give  
 b. kleine kinderen zijn leuk om zulke boeken \*(aan) te geven  
 small children are nice/fun COMP such books to give

- in light of the PRO-based account of *wh*-drop in Dutch proposed above, it will be interesting to examine how *wh*-drop behaves with regard to the ban on null operator movement of indirect objects in double object constructions
- to my ear, double object constructions do indeed resist *wh*-drop of the indirect object: (35b) is bad without *wie* included
- inclusion of *aan* ‘to’ introduces some interesting details which ultimately support the PRO-based account strongly
  - in an overt *wh*-movement construction, inclusion of *aan* in a ditransitive with movement of the Goal/Beneficiary forces the use of the R-word *waar*: as is well known, Dutch allows P-stranding only with R-words, which makes (35c) with non-R *wie* ungrammatical
  - *waar* does not accept a [+human] referent in questions; since book-giving usually benefits humans, that makes (35c) with *waar* anomalous
  - but interestingly, (35c) with *wh*-drop is grammatical [as we know independently, null operators can subextract from PP in Dutch; see the grammaticality of (34b) with *aan*]

- (35) a. (wat) heb je (aan) Marie gegeven? (Dutch)  
 what have you Marie given  
 b. \*(wie) heb je dat boek gegeven?  
 who have you that book given  
 c. (<sup>#</sup>waar/\*wie) heb je dat boek aan gegeven?

- the contrast between (35b) and (35c) is predicted by a PRO-based null operator movement analysis of *wh*-drop
- the parallels between *wh*-drop in questions and object drop in imperatives in Dutch supports the hypothesis that the silent *wh*-element in Dutch *wh*-drop constructions is PRO
- conclusion: *wh*-drop comes in at least two flavours, both involving a deep anaphor — a *pro* or PRO
- for *wh*-drop in Portuguese TC SPCs (semi-clefts *qua* reduced pseudoclefts), the *pro*<sub>WH</sub> analysis accounts for the highest-subject restriction (formal licensing) and for the fact that *wh*-drop is restricted to TC SPCs (content licensing)
- for *wh*-drop in Dutch, the PRO<sub>WH</sub> analysis accounts for the restriction to root clauses, the category restriction (nominal *wh*’s only), and the ban on indirect-object *wh*-drop