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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Although English is commonly known as a non pro drop language, this phenomenon is rather attested in certain special registers of English. English speakers regularly drop subjects in many informal circumstances, such as in Colloquial Speech, Diaries and Note-taking, but non-overt arguments seem to be a general possibility in a variety of formal contexts too, such as Instructional Registers, Telegrams, Newspaper Headlines.

In this paper I will focus my attention on the syntactic and pragmatic properties of non-overt subjects and objects in the Instructional Register.

In Chapter 1, I will first hint at the principles and parameters of the Universal Grammar and, in particular, at the pro-drop and object-drop parameters. Then, by means of syntactic tests, I will try to prove that instructions exhibit imperative sentences rather than infinitives, since they present the same morphology in English, i.e. the bare stem of the verb without any overt inflectional endings.

In Chapter 2, since imperatives normally lack an overt subjects, I will demonstrate that the features relevant for the interpretation of the subject are not associated with the verb itself, but with a subject syntactically represented, though phonetically null. I will also try to determine the identity of non-overt subjects and what the syntactic representation of imperatives may look like.

In Chapter 3, on the basis of empirical data provided by some cookbooks, cosmetics instructions and user’s manuals, I will illustrate that the Recipe Object Drop is a phenomenon which is cross-linguistically very common. Looking at the properties of non-overt objects and at the constraints on their distribution, I will investigate on what property enables non-über objects to appear in this register and how such a structure could be syntactically represented.

Finally, in Chapter 4, I will make a comparison between the structures of recipes and instructions of English, Italian and Spanish.
1.1 The comparative approach: Principles and Parameters of the Universal Grammar

The goal of the recent comparative approach is to make explicit which properties are language-specific and which are universal, that is, common to all human languages. The aim is to find out what can vary across languages and what is constant.

A speaker’s knowledge of his language is represented as an internalized grammar which generates sentences of that language. Such internalized property makes the speaker able to judge the acceptability of any expression in his language, from a phonological, morphological, syntactic and semantic point of view.

Thus, linguists wonder how this knowledge is acquired: some of them proposed that knowledge is gained simply on the basis of the linguistic data to which a native speaker is exposed, called positive evidence. But as soon as we come to face the problem of negative evidence this theory need to be revised. Negative evidence represents all those data which are not provided by the triggering experience. Then, how can a speaker decide whether the absence of those data is due to their unacceptability or they are simply rare for being stylistically marked? In order to overcome this problem, Noam Chomsky argued for the hypothesis that language acquisition contains two interacting components: the triggering experience (linguistic exposure) and the Language Acquisition Device (LAD) or Universal Grammar (UG), which is an innate, cognitive capacity of all human species that facilitates and constrains language learning. Universal Grammar contains two components which specifies what can vary and what remains constant across languages:

- **Principles** are predetermined and rigidly fixed. They are part of the cognitive capacity and do not have to be acquired. Finally they prevent a child from making false generalizations that simple exposure may lead to.

- **Parameters**, on the other hand, are language-specific and concern those properties of language that vary cross-linguistically. Exposure enables a child to fix the setting of parameters belonging to his/her own language.

The syntactic properties with respect to which languages vary are not isolated but they organize themselves into clusters, which are quite stable across languages. A cluster puts together all those properties co-occurring in the positive setting of a parameter. For instance, languages exhibiting a positive setting of the *pro*-drop parameter, will also share...
the following properties: rich AGRs; non-overt pronoun subjects; no overt expletives; post-verbal definite subjects; extraction from [Spec, AGRsP] across overt material in the adjacent CP domain (cf. Haegeman 1999).

1.2 The pro-drop parameter

One of the most important parametric variation between languages is the pro-drop parameter, which distinguishes languages that admit non-overt argument pronouns in finite clauses from those that always require overt pronominal argument.

The inflectional paradigm of a language determines the availability of non-overt arguments, since, according to the Empty Category Principle, non-overt categories must be identified and only a rich AGR-morphology allows pro to be interpreted.

Following Chomsky’s (1989) terms, we can assume that there exist two types of agreement, strong and weak, and that there is a relationship between strong agreement and the possibility of having a null subject (cf. Speas 1995).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strong Agreement</th>
<th>Weak Agreement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Italian</strong></td>
<td><strong>Spanish</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Io mangi-o</td>
<td>Yo com-o</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tu mangi</td>
<td>Tú com-es</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egli mangi-a</td>
<td>Él com-e</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Noi mangi-amo</td>
<td>Nosotros com-emos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voi mangi-ate</td>
<td>Vosotros com-éis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Essi mangi-ano</td>
<td>Ellos com-en</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

English differs from languages such as Italian and Spanish with respect to the richness of its AGR-morphology: in Italian and Spanish the inflection of the verb distinguishes all six persons, while English presents only one morphological distinction corresponding to the -s ending of the [3rd] person singular. In spite of this theory, there is clear evidence which entails a positive setting of the pro-drop parameter in particular
English registers and styles\textsuperscript{1}. In fact, as Horsey (1998) argued, subjects of finite clauses are very common to drop in Diaries, Note-taking, Colloquial Speech and Instructional Registers, where even object-drop is frequently attested. This evidence suggests that an English native speaker owns two different internalized grammars: one is applied in formal contexts and rules the pro-drop parameter out; the other is activated in informal and instructional registers and permits a positive setting of the parameter in question.

Many hypothesis and theories have been written about exceptional null arguments of English. For what concerns non-overt subjects in Diaries and informal speech, one of their most striking properties is that only subjects that are discourse topics can be omitted (usually [1\textsuperscript{st}] person singular in diaries). They do not occur in subordinate clauses nor they co-occur with wh-movement, with overt argument topicalization or with preposed material. Since all the elements which prevent null subjects to appear target positions which normally governs the subject ([Spec, IP]), it is thus worth affirming that, in special registers, non-overt subjects must occupy the leftmost position of the clause. The referent of the null subject must be recoverable from the context, since there are no available antecedents in its binding domain. This leads us to propose some form of topicalisation of the non-overt subject. Since topicalisation is analysed as involving movement to a pre-sentential A’-position, and wh-traces are left by elements which also undergo movement to an A’-position, Haegeman assumes that non-overt subjects in diary sentences are wh-traces of topicalised non-overt topic operators. Then, Haegeman proposes that there is only one pre-sentential A’-position available for wh-movement, [Spec, CP]. This explains why the \textit{ec} is not compatible with an overt topic or with wh-movement, both of which requiring movement to the same position as the \textit{ec}. Similarly the \textit{ec} cannot occur with yes-no questions if we assume that these constructions have a non-overt wh-operator in [Spec, CP].

However, two problems come along with Haegeman’s analysis: if the non-overt subject is the trace of a null topic operator, there is no reason why the phenomenon

\begin{table}
\begin{tabular}{|l|c|c|c|}
\hline
 & Pro-drop language & English & English special registers \\
\hline
Rich AGRs & yes & no & no \\
Null subject & yes & no & yes \\
Overt expletive & no & yes & yes \\
Post-verbal subject & yes & no & no \\
Subject extraction across C[-WH] & yes & no & no \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{1} Special registers and pro-drop properties:

(Haegeman, L. & Guéron, J. (1999), English Grammar )
should be restricted to subjects. Moreover, the non-overt subjects in diaries not always have a null-topic interpretation. Indeed, there are examples of null quasi-argument and null expletive subjects and such elements cannot be topicalized.

The constraints on non-overt subjects in special registers of English can be accounted for by examining the properties of the CP projection. In fact, as Sigurðsson and Maling (2007) write, “the context-linking features of the CP domain enter into two-directional matching relations, one with clause internal elements (that may or may not be spelled-out) and one with clause-external topics and/or participants of the speech event (as in imperatives). Context-linking is thus a ‘transitive’ matching relation (where A ↔ B reads ‘A is matched by B’ or ‘B is interpreted in relation to A’):

Context ↔ CP features ↔ IP-internal elements

On this understanding, all referential argument drop is subject to one of two types of restrictions:

a. context-linking only, or
b. context-linking and some kind of clause-internal restriction

As mentioned above, Agr-linking is the best known type of clause-internal restriction on null-arguments, common for subject drop, less common for object drop. However, null-arguments in many languages are subject to another much more salient clause-internal condition or restriction. We refer to this condition as the Empty Left Edge Condition, ELEC: The left edge of a clause containing a silent referential argument must be phonetically empty."

As we will see in the next chapters, the object drop in the instructional register of English, is also subject to the Empty Left Edge Condition. At first glance, one could argue that non-overt objects co-occur with empty subjects, because they are associated with imperative structures (which, in turn, lack a phonological subject). However, in Chapter 3, I will provide evidence suggesting that it is the imperative no-subject property that enables non-overt objects to appear. In addition, as Sigurðsson and Maling (2007) point out, in languages like French, which permit overt subjects in imperative clauses, as soon as subjects show up, non-overt objects are no longer acceptable:

(1) (*Vous) Prenez trois oeufs. (*Vous) déposez __ dans un bol. (*Vous) battez __ doucement. (take three eggs. you break __ into a bowl. you beat __ gently).
1.3 The object-drop parameter

Objects of transitive verbs may, in many languages, be omitted freely, even though no clitic or object agreement marker identifies the null object. According to Cole (1987), on the basis of evidence from a variety of languages, we can group natural languages into four types with regard to the possibility of non-overt objects: those not permitting either null pronominal or null variable objects (such as English); those permitting null variable objects but not null pronominal objects (such as Mandarin and Portuguese); those permitting null pronominal objects but not null variable objects (such as Imbabura Quechua); and those permitting both null pronominal and null variable objects (such as Korean and Thai). Then Cole argues that the full range of possibilities with respect to null objects in natural language is determined by the interaction between two parameters: one determining whether null pronominal objects are possible, the second whether null variable objects occur. In addition, Keller and Lapata (1998) noted that languages such as European and Brazilian Portuguese and Quiteño Spanish (Suñer and Yépez 1988) license null objects only for definite NPs, whereas European Spanish, Modern Greek (Dimitriadis 1994a,b) and Bulgarian license object drop only for indefinite NPs.

English belongs to those languages which do not exhibit positive setting of the object-drop parameter. However, on the basis of evidence from French, Haegeman (1999) noted that there is no direct correlation between the availability of subject pro and that of object pro. In fact, French does not have subject pro but it does have object pro. Thus, she argues that subject and object drop correspond to two distinct parameters of the Universal Grammar. The former is permitted by a rich subject-verb agreement, while the latter is licensed by the presence of the object-verb agreement. As the following examples demonstrate, non-overt object pronouns are syntactically active in Italian (2a,d) and Spanish (2b,e), as they control the subjects of infinitival clauses and bind reflexives. Whereas in English the object position cannot be filled by a non-overt pronoun (2c,f).

(2) (a) La sua reazione induce ec_i [ PRO_i a pensare che sia colpevole].
(b) Todo lleva ec_i [ PRO_i a pensar que tú tienes razón].
(c) *This reaction leads (people)/ec_i [ PRO_i to conclude that he is not innocent].
(d) La buona musica riconcilia ec_i con se stessi_i .
(e) La buena musica reconcilia ec_i a uno mismo_i .
(f) * Good music reconciles ec_i with oneself_i .
This evidence led Haegeman to infer that Italian presents a positive setting of the object-drop parameter, assuming that, by analogy, the object pro undergoes object shift to a projection governing VP, in order to be identified by object agreement (AGR0). Despite this, I would lay particular stress on the fact that, differently from subject pro, non-overt objects systematically have an arbitrary reading, i.e. “la gente in generale”. On the contrary, in Italian and Spanish, the range of interpretation of the objects is restricted by means of the insertion of pronouns undergoing object shift (3).

(3) (a) La sua reazione mi/lo/ci porta [PROi a pensare che…]
(b) Todo me/lo/nos lleva [PROi a pensar que…]

We can thus suggest that AGR0 is associated with arbitrary features which identify the non-overt objects in [Spec,AGR0]. English, instead, is said to lack an object-verb agreement which triggers a positive setting of the object-drop parameter. Nevertheless, there is a particular register of English which drops definite object pronouns very commonly, i.e. the instructional register. The consideration in Chapter 3 will lead us to a reinterpretation of important aspects of register variation and the grammar of English. But let us first try to define the nature of the recipes/instructions typical constructions.

1.4 On the typical construction of English instructional registers

It is commonly said that English instructional registers exhibit imperative sentences. Since imperatives present the same morphology of infinitives, i.e. the bare stem of the verb without any overt inflectional endings, syntactic tests are needed in order to find out whether we are dealing with an imperative or an infinitive. Evidence that verbs in instructions are not infinitives are provided here.

First of all, if we establish that the PRO subject of an infinitive is referentially dependent on the NP controlling it in embedded clauses (4a,b) and that it receives an arbitrary interpretation when there are no controlling elements, as in (4c,d), we should be able to give an arbitrary interpretation to non-overt subjects in instructions too. On the contrary, it is clear that the subject of the verbs in instructions refers to the addressee of
the texts, i.e. you, leading us to the conclusion that instructional non-overt subjects are not comparable with PRO subjects of infinitive clauses. However, this argument crashes if we follow Haegeman & Guèron (1999:36) in assuming that PRO in (4c,d) is understood either as having arbitrary reference or as referring to a contextually salient referent (us, you).

(4) (a) I promised John [PRO\textsubscript{arb} to buy a new bicycle].
(b) I asked John [PRO\textsubscript{arb} to buy a new bicycle].
(c) [Whether PRO\textsubscript{arb} to buy a new bicycle] is an important question.
(d) [PRO\textsubscript{arb} to buy a new bicycle] is very important.

In order to overcome this problem, I would propose an analysis that arises from the observation of a pragmatic parallelism between instructions and “orders”/“exhortations”. In the latter case we find imperative clauses indeed, where, differing from English finite clauses, the subject is not realized, unless it is focalized or used contrastively\textsuperscript{2}. Though, the exclusive occurrence of [2\textsuperscript{nd} person reflexive anaphors, in (5), states that an underlying you occupies the imperative subject position (cf. Giusti 2003). The syntactic analysis is developed in Chapter 2.

(5) (a) \textit{Behave} yourself\textsubscript{i} / yourselves\textsubscript{i} / *myself\textsubscript{i} / *herself\textsubscript{i} / *themselves\textsubscript{i}.
(b) (If your diet's only purpose is to help you finally achieve six-pack abs) \textit{Provide} yourself\textsubscript{i} with additional motivators.\textsuperscript{3}
(c) \textit{Don’t} lie to yourself\textsubscript{i}.
(d) \textit{Don’t} kid yourselves\textsubscript{i}.

Differently from English, the rich morphology of Italian and Spanish verbal system, put us in a much better position to recognize which verbal mood we are dealing with in every context. In Chapter 4, I will make a comparison between English on the one hand and Italian and Spanish on the other, with respect to their language specific choice of the verbal mood and the occurrence of non-overt objects in instructions.

\textsuperscript{2} “YOU close the door, please, and YOU open the window!”
\textsuperscript{3} As in “Start a healthy new diet today - and stick with it for a lifetime”, Men's Health. Adam Campbell.
CHAPTER 2

ON THE IDENTITY OF NON-OVERT SUBJECTS IN IMPERATIVES

2.1 Introduction

As I inferred in the previous chapter, the instructional register normally exhibits imperative clauses, whose function is that of adding a requirement to someone’s to-do list (cf. Portner & Zanuttini 2003). Hence non-overt subjects are a general possibility in recipes/instructions for the very nature of its typical clauses. In fact, one of the most salient properties of imperatives is the lack of a prototypical subject. We should more appropriately say that imperatives may occur with or without a lexical subject (6) (though the range of lexical subjects that can occur is somewhat restricted⁴), but the instructional register normally lacks overt subjects (7).

(6) (a) You give it to me!
    (b) __ Give it to me!

(7) (a) __ Clean garlic and __ chop fine.                              (TC p.121)
    (b) __ Peel and __ boil the potatoes.                           (TC p.220)

⁴ As Rupp (1999) notes, “in addition to the [2nd] person pronoun you which is most frequently used, other subjects permitted include quantifiers and indefinite [3rd] person DPs (such nobody, someone, and phrases introduced by whoever), partitive expressions with you and demonstratives (e.g. the tallest of you and those in the front row), bare noun plurals (for instance, students and kids, which may be modified by you), certain definite nominal phrases (like the boy in the corner), and proper nouns (names)”.

(a) Nobody move!
(b) Someone call a doctor!
(c) Whoever took the money return it immediately!
(d) The tallest of you sit at the back!
(e) Those in the front row stop giggling!
(f) (You) truckdrivers keep to the right!
(g) (New) students sign up at the front door!
(h) The boy in the corner stand up!
(i) Chris stand by the door and Shirley watch the window!
(c) After about 5 minutes, __ uncover and __ carefully turn the onions. (TC p.209)
(d) When mussels have cooled, __ remove them from their shells and __ save their liquid together with the pan juices. (TC p. 121)

On the other hand, [1st] and [3rd] person pronouns and, in general, referential noun phrase (which are not used contrastively), are normally excluded from imperatives (8). This restriction is due to the fact that we use an imperative clause to talk to the addressee and not about him or her.

(8)  (a) *We / *I close that window!
     (b) *He / *They step away from the car!
     (c) *A man come here!

An in-depth analysis of the range of possible imperative subjects would be far beyond the scope of this work, which is instead meant to focus on the instructional contexts. However, instances belonging to contexts other than recipes and instructions will be inevitably included in my research in order to determine the identity of imperative non-overt subjects and what the syntactic representation may look like.

2.2 The syntax of imperative non-overt subjects

First of all, I will provide some evidence which proves that apparently ‘subjectless’ imperatives contain syntactically active non-overt subjects.

Following Rupp (1999), one of the main theoretical arguments in favour of a non-overt subject is that one is needed in order to satisfy the requirement of Chomsky’s (1981) Extended Projection Principle (EPP) that every clausal structure must have a subject.

As Rupp adds, “most treatments of imperatives in generative grammar have assumed that there is an underlying you which gets deleted in the derivation but is assigned the particular interpretation of addressee”. However, this theory has been largely criticized within minimalism, because the minimalist framework does not allow elements which play a role at LF to be deleted from a structure (cf. Chomsky 1989). Successively, the ‘You-deletion’ theory has been ruled out by the fact that subjects other than you are also attested in imperatives. However, I will later make some assumptions which imply
that the covert subject of imperatives can never be interpreted as anything else but you ([2\textsuperscript{nd}}] person). Nevertheless, following Beukema and Coopmans (1989), one might argue that the features relevant for this interpretation are associated with the verb itself (9a), rather than being linked to an empty subject (9b). The contrast is illustrated by the following structures, where \textit{imp} represents whatever features are associated with an imperative verb.

\begin{equation}
(9) \begin{align*}
(a) & \quad [\textsc{vp} \quad \textsc{v} \quad \textsc{np}] \\
& \quad [+\textit{imp}] \\
(b) & \quad [\textsc{ip} \quad \textsc{np} \quad \textsc{i} \quad [\textsc{vp} \quad \textsc{v} \quad \textsc{np}] \\
& \quad [+\textit{imp}] 
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

In light of this, we need to address the problem of determining whether the [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person features (or whatever features relevant for the interpretation of the addressee) are associated with the verb itself or rather are they linked to an empty (but syntactically represented) subject.

There are many properties which require the non-overt subject to be syntactically represented, leading us to prefer an underlying structure such that in (9b). In order to show this, I will follow Heageman (1994) (in Horsey 1998) in comparing the imperative \textit{ec} with the understood external argument in passive sentences, which is taken to be both phonetically and syntactically unrepresented, unless it appears in an optional \textit{by}-phrase.

Let us look at these properties one by one.

An \textit{ec} is assigned the external $\theta$-role of the verb:

\begin{equation}
(10) \begin{align*}
(a) & \quad \textit{ec} \quad \text{open the door} \\
(b) & \quad \text{The door was opened (by ec)}
\end{align*}
\end{equation}

In (10a) the argument structure of the verb \textit{open} requires two arguments: an AGENT of the activity and a THEME/PATIENT undergoing the action.

The distinct participant roles attributed to the arguments of the clause are referred to as \textit{thematic roles} or \textit{theta-roles}. Because of all theta-roles which are associated with a verb must be realized in the sentence and because of the one-to-one relation between thematic
roles and arguments\textsuperscript{5}, we conclude that in (10a) there is an empty category which is assigned the external $\theta$-role of the verb, i.e. the agent. On the other hand, the true null argument in passive (10b) is not assigned any $\theta$-role of the verb, since the internal argument has become the subject NP and the external argument, the AGENT/EXPERIENCER, can be expressed optionally in the structure by means of an adjunct, referred to as by-phrase. When the external argument of passives is implicit, it can be semantically interpreted from the context, but, as we will see next, it is not syntactically represented.

An ec can bind reflexive anaphors and reciprocal:

\begin{align*}
(11) & \quad \text{(a) Behave yourself!} \\
& \quad \text{(b) Don’t hurt each other!} \\
& \quad \text{(c) * The joke was told (by ec) to himself.}
\end{align*}

Another property which states that the external role is syntactically projected is that it can bind reflexive anaphors (11a) and reciprocals (11b). By their very nature, reflexives depend on another NP in the sentence for their interpretation, hence we cannot admit it to occur by itself in (11c). For the interpretation of reflexives, we have to appeal to the Principle A of the Binding Theory (cf. Chomsky 1981), according to which, an anaphor (reflexive, reciprocal) is referentially dependent and must be locally A-bound. Hence the locality conditions on binding intervene: the binding domain of a reflexive, that is the domain in which it must be bound by an antecedent, is delimited by the first c-commanding subject. According to this, yourself would seem to lack an available antecedent. Therefore, in order to not violate the Theory of Interpretation of Reflexives, we might postulate an empty, though syntactically represented, category before the verb, which is in a clause-mate relation with the reflexive.

On the other hand, implicit external arguments of passives do not normally act as such binders. The ungrammaticality of (11c) is due to the lack of an antecedent for the reflexive themselves which matches it in terms of its grammatical features of person,

\textsuperscript{5} \textit{Theta-criterion:}

a. Each argument must be associated with one and only one theta-role.

b. Each theta-role must be associated with one and only one argument.
number and gender. Again we conclude that a null by-phrase element is not syntactically represented in passives.

Similarly, following Horsey (1998), only a syntactically active external argument can control the understood subject (PRO) of a without-adjunct clause (cf. Beukema & Coopmans 1989). In addition, I found the same evidence in before-adjunct clauses and other subordinate clauses (so far in my research, I have only come across temporal subordinates), where covert understood subjects trigger null auxiliary verbs too, as is shown in (12e-h):

(12) General orders:
   (a) pro; do that [without PRO; hurting yourself;].
   (b) pro; look at this [without PRO; touching it].
   (c) pro; hoover the carpet [without PRO; raising too much dust], please.

Recipes and Instructions:
   (d) pro; place bread in oven. pro; Toast [without PRO; burning ec].
   (e) pro; do not operate cleaner in bare feet or [when PRO; (are) wearing open toe shoes or Sandals].
   (f) Always pro; follow basic precautions, [when PRO; (are) using an electrical appliance].
   (g) pro; use extra care [when PRO; cleaning on stairs].
   (h) pro; slide control to “Hard” to turn brush roll OFF [when PRO; cleaning bare floors].

(Hoover’s cleaner owner’s manual)

The grammaticality of the imperative constructions in (12) suggests that the external θ-roles of the verbs do, look, hoover, place, toast, operate, follow, use and slide are syntactically present; they can serve as the controllers of the understood subject in the corresponding without-clauses.

In (13) further instances, taken from Rupp’s paper, lend additional empirical support to the analysis of non-overt subjects as syntactically represented in imperative clauses (cf. Zwicky 1988 and Potsdam 1996).

(13) (a) Don’t be caught speeding! (PASSIVE)
       [Don’t e; be [caught t; speeding]!]
   (b) Just appear t to be sick when your wife comes in! (RAISING)
   (c) Come t quickly! (UNACCUSATIVE)
(d) Stop *t* writing when the bell rings! (VTA)

(e) Don’t forget to check the locks before going home! (SUBJECT CONTROL)

Don’t *e* forget to check the locks [PRO, before going home]!

This evidence, though not conclusive, leads us to choose (9b) as our initial syntactic analysis for the constructions under discussion.

In this paper, I will try to delineate my own interpretation of the matter, considering some of the most significant analysis developed so far.

First of all, I suggest that the pragmatic component plays a crucial role in the interpretation of imperative non-overt subjects. I agree with Platzack & Rosengren (1998) (cf. Rupp 1999) in assuming that imperative clauses do not talk *about* the subject, rather they talk *to* the subject (i.e. the addressee). Following this view, it is the addressee who plays the external *θ*-role of the verb, since it is the entity who is supposed to perform the action expressed by the imperative. Thus we can conclude that addressee and subject coincide in imperative constructions. Moreover, in instructional registers the addressee is contextually restricted since it is personified by the reader of the recipes/instructions.

2.3 The identity of imperative non-overt subjects

Once the existence of an imperative covert subject is established, we need to address the problem of determining its identity. First, let us briefly examine the standard typologies of empty categories, which “can be divided into those that are created by movement (DP-traces, wh-traces) and those that are base-generated in argument positions via merger (PRO and *pro*)” (Rupp 1999).

DP-traces are the easiest option to exclude, as they require identification by an antecedent in a c-commanding argument position. A similar line of reasoning might be set up for Wh-traces, since there is clearly no Wh-antecedent in the imperative construction.

According to the Government-Binding theory, *pro* occurs in languages whose inflectional system is able to assign it nominative case, whereas PRO is taken to be the non-overt subject of infinitival clauses, which either is caseless or it receives the minimal case associated with non-finite clauses. PRO is controlled by the matrix subject, otherwise it is assigned an arbitrary interpretation.
Following Haegeman (1999), all null arguments must be identified by means of co-indexing with another element in or outside their own clause, or else they must be assigned an arbitrary index. In fact, the Principle of Full Interpretation requires that all symbol of the structure, empty categories included, be integrated in the interpretation of the sentence. Null arguments must be recovered in their content to become interpretable at Logical Form.

Little pro and PRO are subject to different identification mechanisms: pro is identified by the rich inflectional agreement (of languages such as Italian, Spanish, French and so on), whereas the controlled PRO is identified by the closest c-commanding antecedent and, in the absence of a controller, it is given a default arbitrary reading. Then, given the uniform [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person interpretation of imperative subjects, as long as the subject position is governed by an antecedent other than you, PRO will be excluded. According to Beukema and Coopmans (1989), we can only decide if PRO is a possible candidate if we can determine the featural structure of INFL in imperatives, since only a tensed INFL node acts as a governor for the subject position, while a [-Tense] INFL does not. (cf. Chomsky, 1981). The ungrammaticality of (14) suggests that INFL is specified as [-Tense], given the lack of tense opposition.

(14) (a) * Gave it to me, please.
     (b) * Have called the police, for God’s sake.

If INFL is [-Tense], PRO could be a possible candidate for the subject position in the structure in (9b). However, the fact that this NP position can also be filled by a lexical item (15) leads us to exclude a PRO-analysis, since PRO and overt NPs are in complementary distribution, as (16) shows.

(15) (a) Open the door!
     (b) YOU open the door!

(16) (a) [CP [IP PRO to buy these books]] is important.
     *John
     (b) [CP For [IP John to buy these books]] would be surprising.
     *PRO
Another reason for imperative covert subject not to be analysed as PRO is provided by Potsdam (1996), who argues that “control can be obligatory only if PRO is c-commanded by its controller. Otherwise (i.e. in the absence of a suitable controller), it may be assigned its index through arbitrary indexing”, as illustrated in (17).

(17) (a) To go into hospital can be very frightening.
    \[\text{[PRO}_{arb}\text{ to go into hospital]}\text{ can be very frightening.}\]

The contrast between the examples in (18a,b) illustrates the fact that the imperative covert subject cannot receive an arbitrary interpretation, ruling out a PRO-analysis (cf. Potsdam).

(18) (a) To restrain one’s feelings is often stupid.
    \[\text{[PRO}_{arb}\text{ to restrain one’s feelings]}\text{ is often stupid.}\]
(b) Don’t restrain your / *one’s feelings!

(c) Be quiet! Will you?
(d) *Be quiet! Will I/she/we/they?

In addition, tag questions evidence that the empty subject in imperatives has not an arbitrary interpretation, but corresponds to the [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person pronoun (18c,d).

However, as Rupp (1999) suggests, “one could argue that PRO has an obligatory [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person addressee interpretation in imperatives due to their semantics/pragmatics. (…) Still, the fact that PRO is never Case-marked nominative unequivocally excludes the possibility that imperative clauses contain a PRO-subject” (cf. Zhang 1990).

For what concerns the pro-interpretation, most linguists concluded that such empty category does not fit the subject position of imperatives for the following reasons. Non-overt categories must be identified and only rich AGR-morphology allows pro to be interpreted. English differs from pro-drop languages, like Italian and Spanish, with respect to the richness of its AGR-morphology. In pro-drop languages, the non-overt subject, pro, moves from its base position [Spec, VP] to the canonical subject position and enters into a specifier-head relation with AGR. This ensure that its nominal features are identified by rich agreement and, in this position, pro is assigned nominative case.
Since English presents a weak agreement morphology, the only feasible proposal would be that “subjectless” imperatives universally have pro as subject and that the identification features are inherent in this structure.

I agree with Potsdam (1996) in attributing a semantic method of identification of pro. He says that “pro can uniformly be identified as the addressee simply because the notion of ‘addressee’ constitutes part of the meaning of an imperative that the addressee bring about an event”. Potsdam’s proposal seems to me plausible and able to provide a credible account of the possibility of pro in imperatives. Nevertheless, Rupp raised reasonable doubts about why we should interpret pro as ‘you’, rather than ‘everybody’, ruling out the imposed coindexing in the example below.

(19) Everybody, take out their books!
   *After that, pro, write down their names!

I account for such a problem by attributing an idiosyncratic inflectional structure to English imperatives: though poorly inflected, English would show an imperative inflection specified with a [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person feature which imposes a you-interpretation to the non-overt subject. This assumption is supported by the observation that [1\textsuperscript{st}] person NPs are strictly ungrammatical as subjects of imperative clauses (“a fact that - as Rupp says - cannot solely be attributed to semantic/pragmatic factors given the existence of hortative [1\textsuperscript{st}] person let’s-constructions”) and the only limited availability of grammatically [3\textsuperscript{rd}] person subjects (which will be given a different explication in my analysis), as the following example from Rupp shows.

(20) Everybody take out their books!
    After that, write down your, / their, / *their names!
    _ After that, pro, (you) write down your, / their, names!
    _ *After that, pro, (everybody) write down their, names!

The impossibility of a [3\textsuperscript{rd}] person binding relation in (20) demonstrates that the sole referential index that pro can receive is [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person. Since imperatives are the only structures permitting pro subjects in English, we can then infer that they are the unique clause type in English whose Inflection is constantly associated with [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person feature specification.
In addition, the belief that an underlying you occupies the subject position of imperatives is supported by the exclusive occurrence of [2nd] person reflexive anaphors (21), which also provide a reliable cue for identifying whether the subject is singular or plural. However, we cannot appeal to this evidence in recipes and instructions, since reflexive constructions are extremely rare if not impossible to be found in those contexts, where usually the object position is filled by ingredients or items salient in the instructions, as we will see in Chapter 3.

(21) (a) €ci Behave yourselfi / yourselvesi / *myselfi / *herselfi / *themselvesi.
(b) (If your diet's only purpose is to help you finally achieve six-pack abs)
   €ci Provide yourselfi with additional motivators.
(c) €ci Don’t lie to yourselfi.
(d) €ci Don’t kid yourselvesi.

I agree with Rupp (1999) in suggesting that imperatives allow for the covert subject pro because the [2nd] person feature can be recovered from the Agr head, by virtue of it being a distinct and the only feature available in the imperative verbal paradigm.

(22)
The proposed approach makes the correct prediction that the null argument is obligatorily understood as \textit{you} ([2^{nd}] person). Moreover, [1^{st}] and [3^{rd}] person pronouns are rigidly unacceptable in imperative subject position because they do not carry any semantic content other than person specification, which in this case prevent them to occur in a [2^{nd}] person features position (23).

(23)  
(a) *I / *We grab the rope!  
(b) *He / *They shout the door!

Assuming the representation in (22) to be correct, we need to face the case in which imperatives present overt subjects other than \textit{You}.

Some linguists, as Portner (2004), think that imperative overt subjects are instances of vocative phrases (considered very similar to sentence topics), which may overtly represent the addressee in every clause type:

(24)  
(a) John, you may be interested in this. (declarative)  
(b) Maria, what’s that on your nose? (wh-question)  
(c) Susan, did John finish the illustrations? (yes/no-question)  
(d) Kids, Anna play the piano and Kristin turn pages for her! (imperative)  
(e) Test takers, no one touch your pencils! (imperative)

As the examples above show, vocatives need not correspond to an argument, whereas in imperatives they must correspond to the subject, since the vocative refers to the addressee and the subject must refer to, overlap with, or quantify over the set of addressees. Thus, in sentences like (24d,e) we cannot consider the subjects Anna, Kristin and no one as vocatives, since they indeed co-occur with the real vocatives Kids and Test takers. But Portner distinguished two types of vocatives on the ground of their pragmatic contribution (cf. Zwicky 1974):

1. \textbf{Calls} (designed to catch the addressee’s attention)  
2. \textbf{Addresses} (which maintain or emphasize the contact between speaker and addressee)
Portner infers that imperative subjects are instances of the second kind, where vocatives and subjects coincide with the entity of the addressee.

Despite this last assumption, I diverge from such a proposal which gives a vocative or topic interpretation to the subject of imperatives. I would rather suggest a different analysis for those “apparently” imperative constructions which present subjects other than you. I base my assumption on a comparison between a poorly inflected language, like English, and some pro-drop languages, like Italian and Spanish, which present a rich agreement morphology that differentiates all six persons of the verbal paradigm, tense and mood.

Those languages have a distinct verbal paradigm for imperatives that only has forms for [2\text{nd}] person, both singular and plural, which represents the addressee of the order, suggestion or exhortation.

(25)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Italian</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[2\text{nd}] p. singular</td>
<td>Lascia</td>
<td>Aggiungi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[2\text{nd}] p. plural</td>
<td>Lasciate</td>
<td>Aggiungete</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As soon as an addressee other than you is evoked, Italian (26) and Spanish (27) substitute the imperative with the so called “hortative subjunctive”.

(26) (a) Qualcuno/Chi è più vicino risponda al telefono!
(b) (Che) nessuno si muova!
(c) I più alti si siedano dietro!
(d) Filippo chiuda la porta e Riccardo chiuda la finestra!

(27) (a) ¡(Que) alguien/ el más cercano conteste al telefono!
(b) ¡(Que) nadie se mueva!
(c) ¡Los más altos (que) se sienten detrás!
(d) ¡(que) Felipe cierre la puerta y Ricardo cierre la ventana!

I would justify this mood alternation suggesting that imperatives do not admit a subject other than you since they are associated with [2\text{nd}] person features only. Therefore [1\text{st}] and [3\text{rd}] person subjects need a different construction to be ordered/exhorted to.
The weak inflectional morphology of English causes imperative and subjunctive mood to have both the same form: the bare stem of the verb, with non-overt inflectional endings at all (28). This fact prevents us from having empirical evidence of which mood we are dealing with (i.e. imperative or subjunctive?). According to Mauck, Pak, Portner and Zanuttini (2004b), since the verbal paradigm for imperatives is invariably associated with [2nd] person forms and subject-verb agreement is obligatory in any language, imperatives can only have [2nd] person subjects, and thus they obligatorily refer to the addressee, following the English pattern of having addressee and subject coincide. It follows that English imperative clauses with [3rd] person subjects employ a verbal form from the subjunctive paradigm.

(28) Verb: to be / to cut

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Imperative</th>
<th>Subjunctive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st p. singular</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd p. singular</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd p. singular</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1st p. plural</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd p. plural</td>
<td>be</td>
<td>cut</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd p. plural</td>
<td>∅</td>
<td>∅</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The fact that the subjects in the examples below only bind [3rd] person anaphors shows that they are not vocatives, since vocatives can only bind [2nd] person anaphors6 and, what’s more, they can co-occur with a vocative, as in (29d), where Jane, Michael and Rebecca are individuals picked out from the set of the addressees the vocative refers to.

(29) (a) Everybody take their coat off!
(b) Kate shut her mouth!
(c) Who knows the answer raise his hand!
(d) Kids, Jane hang up her coat, Michael put away his lunch box, and Rebecca pick up the toys!

(Mauck, Pak, Portner and Zanuttini 2004b)

---

6 See Mauck and Zanuttini (2004) for further elucidations.
Despite our last claim, we come across many instances of imperatives where [3rd] person subjects bind [2nd] person reflexives.

(30)  (a) (New) students present yourselves
      (b) World shut your mouth!
      (c) Kids, Jane hang up your coat, Michael put away your lunch box, and Rebecca pick up the toys!

According to Mauck, Pak, Portner and Zanuttini (2004a), “the literature on imperatives generally points out that, in addition to null subjects and overt [2nd] person subjects, quantificational and non-quantificational subjects are also possible in English imperative clauses, as illustrated in (30) above and (31-32) below. Despite the [3rd] person properties exhibited by these examples, it is clear from their pragmatic meaning that an addressee is involved; in particular, these subjects quantify over a set of addressees. Furthermore, while these subjects obligatorily bind [3rd] person pronouns and anaphors in other clause types, such as declaratives (31a)-(32a), they can bind [2nd] person in imperatives”, suggesting that the addressee is somehow represented in the syntax:

(31)  (a) Everyone raised their/*your hand. (declarative)
      (b) Everyone raise your hand! (imperative)

(32)  (a) Students, someone should raise their/his/*your hand. (declarative)
      (b) Students, someone raise your hand! (imperative)

Finally, while in other clause types the tag question obligatorily shows a [3rd] person subject, in imperatives the tags trigger [2nd] person subject, again suggesting that the addressee is syntactically relevant:

(33)  (a) Everyone raised their hand, didn’t they/*you? (declarative)
      (b) Everyone raise your hand, won’t *they/you? (imperative)

I would account for the presence of [3rd] person subjects in imperatives by proposing that, in this clause type, AgrP is governed by a particular projection, labelled
AddresseeP, which merges when an addressee other than you is evoked and imposes interpretative restrictions on the [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person subject. As Mauck and Zanuttini (2004) write, “though such a projection is not unique to imperatives, it is only in imperatives that it imposes interpretive restrictions on the subject. This is because it is only in this clause type that it semantically binds a variable in the subject position” (pro within the present analysis), in light of a view of a subject-addressee coincidence.

Moreover, for the cases in which overt non-quantificational subjects appear in English imperatives, I would propose that the noun phrase picks out an individual or a set of individuals from the set of addressees that are implicitly expressed by the [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person non-overt subject. In fact, we can note that referential subjects are used contrastively in imperatives: usually, by means of restrictive phrases or clauses, the addressee is restricted to those individuals who share certain features, in contrast to those who do not (34a). In addition, as Mauck, Pak, Portner and Zanuttini (2004a) point out, names require a contrastive stress and a special “list intonation” (34b).

(34) (a) Passengers with tickets go to their seats, passengers without come to the desk.
(b) Jane hang up your coat, Michael put away your lunch box, and Rebecca pick up the toys!

On the basis of my last assumption, I give the updated structure in (35), where the subject pro is assigned [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person features by means of its specifier-head relation with Agr; and, simultaneously, the reference of pro is restricted by virtue of being coindexed with the material in the governing [Spec, AddresseeP].

In light of such predictions, we are able to admit the following Generalization on imperative subjects in our analysis:

\textit{UG contains a principle requiring an imperative subject to refer to, or quantify over, an addressee, a group of addressees, or a group containing the addressee(s). An imperative subject must have an agentive thematic role.}\textsuperscript{7}

\textsuperscript{7} From Mauck, Pak, Portner and Zanuttini (2004b)
(35) Everyone raise your hand.

Assuming this structure to be correct, how can we explain the fact that, as (36) shows, the addressee cannot co-occur with the overt realization of the imperative pro (i.e. you)?

(36) (a) Everybody (*you) raise your right hand and repeat after me: Chip implants are a good idea!

(b) Nobody (*you) move! (We’re here for your money)

I suggest four possible lines of reasoning. The first one considers you, when overt, to be realized in [Spec, AddresseeP], putting it in a complementary distribution with other overt NP addressees. This assumption would make the prediction that pro does not alternate with overt pronouns in imperatives, but pronouns are just instances of
addresseeP activation. Otherwise, we could admit that overt NP subjects in imperatives are focalized elements that target the specifier of a Focus projection. Following Haegeman’s (1999) Split-CP hypothesis, according to which the functional projection CP must be analysed into a number of discrete functional projections, like TopP and FocP, we can account for the ungrammaticality in (36) by assuming that AddresseeP is part of CP and it is in complementary distribution with FocP.

Following another line of reasoning, we could assimilate imperatives to causative verbs, which express the idea of someone causing something to take place and have their typical formation as “Have or get + Noun Phrase + Past Participle”. We use the causative when we do not carry out an action ourselves, but we are responsible for the action being performed. Hence, a causative verb attributes a particular θ-role to its external argument: the CAUSA θ-role. We could similarly postulate that in imperatives there is a Mood Phrase with [+imperative] features which assigns an Addressee θ-role to its external argument in [Spec, MoodP]. Such projection assigns [2nd] person features to its external argument and blocks any upward further projections in the clause. This fact would also explains why we never find imperatives in embedded contexts.
The fourth line of reasoning I suggest, is illustrated in (37). In this case, I assume that the AddresseeP does not govern IP, as in (35), but it rather targets the specifier of AgrP, entering into a specifier-head relation with Agr.

(37)

```
AgrP
  \   / \\
 Addr.  Agr'  \\
    /   \\
  everyone

Agr
  \   / \\
[2nd p]  TP
    /   \\
 Spec  T'

[present tense]
T
  \   / \\
Spec  VP
    /   \\
  t

[imp]
V
  \   / \\
Spec  NP
    /   \\
  raise  your hand
```

In conclusion, I consider the last two structures I suggested to be the most likely candidates for imperative constructions. Nevertheless, I leave this issue for following studies.
CHAPTER 3

NON-OVERT OBJECTS IN ENGLISH RECIPES

3.1 Introduction

As previously discussed, English belongs to those languages which do not exhibit a positive setting of the object-drop parameter. Despite this, English Instructional registers differ from other varieties that are commonly studied (e.g. narrative, formal and informal speech, note-taking, etc.) in showing the phenomenon of empty categories as direct objects. As the following examples illustrate, the Recipe Object Drop is a phenomenon which is cross-linguistically very common and it has been studied among a wide range of languages such as Hungarian, French, German, Icelandic and Swedish. However, Portuguese (38f) differs from the majority of European languages in that it exhibits an overt clitic object pronoun (e.g. -os) whereas other languages normally drop the direct object (38a-e).

\[(38)\]

(a) Put the gnocchi in salted boiling water and as soon as they surface drain __
    and dress __ with a sauce. (English)
(b) Versare gli gnocchi in acqua salata bollente, scolare __ appena affiorano in
    superficie e condire__. (Italian)
(c) Verter los gnocchi en agua salada hirviendo, escurrir ___ en cuanto suban a
    la superficie y condimentar__. (Spanish)
(d) Die Gnocchi in kochendes Salzwasser geben, sobald sie an die
    Wasseroberfläche steigen, abgießen __ und anrichten __. (German)
(e) Plonger les gnocchi dans de l’eau salée portée à ébullition, égouter ___ dès
    qu’ils remontent à la surface et assaisonner __. (French)
(f) Cozinhe os gnocchetti em água salgada a fever, escorra-os assim que
    subirem à superfície e tempere-os. (Portuguese)

8 From “Gnocchetti di patate di Giovanni Rana” cooking instructions.
The verb forms of recipes and instructions, at least in European languages, are typically either infinitive or imperative. More constructions may be used in recipe contexts in many languages (passives, subjunctives, etc.), but these are irrelevant with respect to my actual purpose. The table in (39) shows the Recipe Object Drop variation in some European languages as Sigurðsson and Maling (2007) discerned:

\[
\begin{array}{|c|l|l|}
\hline
& \text{ok IMP} & \text{*IMP} \\
\hline \text{ok INF} & \text{French, Polish, some Italian varieties} & \text{Czech, many or most German varieties, Dutch, many or most Italian and Spanish varieties} \\
\hline \text{*INF} & \text{Finnish, Hungarian, Russian, Serbo-Croatian, Slovenian, Danish, Norwegian, Swedish, Icelandic} & \text{Catalan, some Italian, Spanish and German varieties} \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

It is found that stylistic, semantic, and discourse factors are the most important in the phenomenon, with syntax and morphology playing relatively minor roles. Furthermore, these non-overt objects pattern like overt pronouns, and have in fact replaced overt pronouns over time.

The first goal of this chapter is to examine this phenomenon, looking at the properties of non-overt objects and the constraints on their distribution. To this aim, I will mainly develop my investigation on the base of empirical data provided by some English cookbooks\(^{10}\), foodstuffs and cosmetics instructions\(^{11}\) and user’s manuals\(^{12}\). Then, I will briefly present Haegeman’s (1987), Massam and Roberge (1989) and Bender’s (1999) analysis and explore their consequences for syntactic analysis. Finally, I will present an alternative analysis for object drop in this special register.

---


\(^{12}\) Such as, Hoover’s cleaner owner’s manual.
3.2 The syntax of non-overt objects in recipes and instructions

As Haegeman (1987) first noted, the phenomenon has nothing to do with the process of indefinite object drop, whereby a transitive verb may lack an object, with an indefinite object being understood (40). In fact, only a limited set of verbs, which are lexically governed, shows this phenomenon. “Thus verbs which are closely related in their semantics, such as eat and devour, contrast in their ability to undergo indefinite object drop” (41) (cf. Horsey, 1998).

(40) (a) They are eating.
    (b) She is painting.
    (c) Bill is drinking.

(41) (a) I am eating __
    (b) * I am devouring __

On the other hand, there does not seem to be any lexical constraint on verbs occurring with non-overt objects in recipes. However, I should more appropriately point out that, as Massam and Roberge (1989) say, “there are only few limitations on which verbs may appear with an empty object. The construction allows both “affecting” (42) and “non-affecting” verbs (43). However null objects are not permitted either with perception verbs (44) or with “psych” verbs such as like (45), even though the same sentence is permitted with the similar (presumably nonpsych) verb enjoy.”

(42) (a) Clean garlic and chop __ fine. (TC p.155)
    (b) Clean onion, cut __ into thin slices. (TC p.71)

(43) (a) Remove __ from oven and leave __ on one side temporarily. (EuC p.19)
    (b) Toss __ well and taste __. (TC p.218)

(44) Put pan over high heat and add water. *See/Hear __ boil before adding other ingredients. (Massam and Roberge 1989)

(45) Serve __ with parsley garnish. Enjoy/Like __ as a main dish or as a side dish. (Massam and Roberge 1989)
The referent of the empty object is prominent in the discourse or physically present, but it never corresponds to an indefinite. Moreover, as we will see next, recipe non-overt objects (RNOs) include some properties which implied indefinite objects do not share. We can thus postulate that the null object we are dealing with is not an understood indefinite object.

In order to examine the syntax of non-overt objects in recipes and instructions we must first define whether there is indeed an empty category, syntactically represented even though phonetically null, in the constructions under consideration.

First of all, as Massam and Roberge (1989) noted, the distinction at the interpretive level between the following examples in (46), containing the same clause (“eat quickly”), could only be explained by postulating an empty category in (46b) but not in (46a). Hence, in (46a) the transitive verb eat is used with an indefinite object being understood, whereas in (46b) the object of eat is far from having an indefinite interpretation, referring indeed to the topic of the recipe (“cookies”).

(46) (a) Eat quickly! (we’re in a rush)
    (b) Remove cookies from oven. Eat ec quickly. (before they cool)

Further support for RNOs occupying a structural position is found in the fact that an ec can serve as an antecedent of a reflexive, as the example in (47) demonstrates.

(47) (a) Take a crepe. Cover one half with the jam. Fold __ over onto itself and sprinkle with sugar. (Massam and Roberge 1989)

Lastly, the following examples show how RNOs can also control PRO (48a,b,c), while in other contexts such a construction would lead the sentence to ungrammaticality (48d,e,f). As stated in Chapter 2, controlled PRO is identified by the closest c-commanding antecedent, otherwise, it has an arbitrary interpretation. In these examples, we note that PRO receives a specific interpretation (in (48a) PRO clearly refers to the mixture) rather than an arbitrary reference. Thus we are led to assume an empty category in object position controlling PRO.
(48)  (a) Allow the dough/ec [PRO to rest for 30 minutes] (TC p.248)
(b) Into another bowl, beat milk and pudding on low for 2 minutes, on high for 2 minutes. Let ec [PRO stand 3 minutes].
(c) Add the meat, allow ec [PRO to brown on all sides]. (TC p. 71)
(d) *My parents wouldn’t allow (me) [PRO to go to the party] (DCE p.38)
(e) *What led (him) [PRO to kill his wife?] (DCE p.912)
(f) *Let (me) [PRO help you with those bags]. (DCE p.924)

As the examples in (49) show, RNOs may appear unmodified (as does the final null object in (49a,b)) or with adjunct small clause modifiers (49c,d,e), but they may not appear in argument small clauses (49f).

(49)  (a) Soak mushrooms … wash __ and clean __ well. (TC p.70)
(b) Stir __, cook __ for another 10 minutes. (TC p.71)
(c) Add 7-UP and pour into a mold or small square dish. Chill __ until firm.
(d) Serve __ at room temperature or chilled.
(e) Serve __ warm.
(f) Cook __ covered for another 15 minutes. (TC p.221)
(f) Boil noodles. *Consider/*Judge/*Assume __ cooked when soft. (M&R 1989)

Given this evidence, there is a need for assuming that the RNO is syntactically represented. On the other hand, we see that, while in (50a) the adjunct small clause dressed in black could modify either that famous artist or women, in (50b) it can only modify the subject of the main clause. That means that, differing from RNOs, the understood indefinite object of paints cannot appear modified by small clauses.

(50)  (a) In general [that famous artist], paints [women], [PRO dressed in black]
(b) In general [that famous artist], paints [ec?], [PRO dressed in black]

(Haegeman 1987b: 237)

Once we have defined that RNOs are syntactically active, it is now worth investigating their identity and what the syntactic representation of such constructions may look like.

But let us first look at the constrains on RNOs distribution.
One of the most striking properties of RNOs is that they occur only in sentences without an overt subject, such as imperatives. However, as Horsey (1998) points out, it is unclear whether the important factor which allows RNO to be licensed is the imperative nature or the no-subject nature of such constructions. However, even in those languages where imperatives allow overt subjects, as soon as subjects show up, non-over objects are no longer acceptable. This is illustrated in (51)-(52) for English and French:

(51)  Take three eggs. (*You) beat __ well while someone else mixes the flour and the butter.

(52)  (*Vous) prenez trois oeufs. (*Vous) déposez __ dans un bol. (*Vous) battez __ doucement. (take three eggs. you break __ into a bowl. you beat __ gently).

(Sigurðsson and Maling 2007)

In light of this evidence, we can assume that it is the null-subject aspect which is crucial and we are able to propose an empty subject condition on non-overt objects. I will return to this matter later on, investigating what structure should be assigned to imperative clauses in recipes and instructions.

Although Massam and Roberge (1989) write that the distribution of RNOs is also subject to a locality constraint (53), I would rather take the examples as an instance of no-subject requirement on RNOs distribution. In fact, in both cases, the verb governing the object presents an overt subject. Then, as they point out, “RNOs may not appear under Exceptional Case Marking verbs”. (54a-b) suggest that the ec must receive a θ-role from its governing verb but “RNOs are barred after nonstrictly subcategorized prepositions” (55).

(53)  (a) Take cookies from oven. Expect your children to eat them/*ec immediately.

(b) Ask a friend with experience to make it/*ec for you, and watch. (TC p.231)

(54)  (a) Boil noodles.*Consider/*Judge/*Assume __ cooked when soft. (M&R 1989)

(b) Put cake in oven. *Expect __ to be done half an hour later. (M&R 1989)

(55)  (a) Make a Gorgonzola sauce and cover the gnocchi with it/*ec.

(b) Grate Parmesan cheese. Then sprinkle lasagne with it/*ec.
Finally, non-overt objects are not found in double object constructions (56) and they appear to license parasitic gaps (57), though it is not clear yet whether the second gap is simply another instance of a RNO.

(56)  
(a) Take cookies from oven. Give your guests these cookies/*ec immediately.  
(b) Find the children. Give them/*ec the cookies immediately.  
(M&R 1989)

(57)  
(a) Allow __ to mature about 3 days before cutting __ .  
(b) Add oil slowly to the yolks. Beat __ well in order to incorporate __ .  
(c) Cook __ 2 minutes without browning __ .  
(EuC p.215)

Given the assumption that RNOs must be syntactically represented, it is now worth investigating their nature.

Recall how we classified the typologies of empty categories in chapter two. Empty categories can be divided into those that are created by movement (DP-traces, variables) and those that are base-generated in argument positions via merger (PRO and pro).

PRO and pro are easily excluded as possible RNOs. In fact, the former was taken to be the non-overt subject of non-finite clauses; it was restricted to ungoverned and hence Caseless positions and it does not alternate with an overt NP. The latter cannot occur in object position in the absence of an identifying clitic or verb-object agreement in English (cf. Cole 1987). Massam and Roberge (1989) suggested two possible lines of analysis. They first consider RNO to be a variable, bound by zero-topic. The fact that RNOs only appear in very well defined contexts supports this view. However, it is difficult to provide empirical support for such an account. For instance, the absence of a lexical subject makes it impossible to apply crossover tests. This analysis would also account for the presence of parasitic gaps, as in (57). Second, they consider the RNO to be a sort of NP-trace (a trace bound by an element in an A-position), whose binder would be a null discourse topic in subject position. They justify this account by appealing to a view of imperatives according to which the subject position in not obligatorily filled with a [2nd] person empty pronoun, since it is available to be filled by a discourse topic. I would diverge from such an account, recalling what I suggested in the previous chapter, where I provided some evidence proving that apparently ‘subjectless’ imperatives always contain syntactically active non-overt subjects. Moreover, this analysis would leave unexplained the parasitic gap structures in (57).
3.3 The relationship of context to register

In this section, I first account for the distribution of RNOs by stressing the fact that it has something to do with non-linguistic context. In fact, non-overt object noun phrase are generally not permitted in Core English. However they are allowed in certain contexts, like the instructional one. To explain this, I appeal to Bender’s (1999) research about a particular issue that linguists have been widely discussing about: the relation between context and register. Most previous syntactic work on register assumes that contexts exist independent of people and the linguistic component that reflects them.

Haegeman (1987) proposes that multiple registers are generated by multiple grammars with different parameter settings. That is, that register variation is an instance of language-internal parametric variation dependent on context. She argues that RNOs are empty categories or, more precisely, topic-linked traces, which have similar properties to wh-traces.

On the other hand, Culy (1996) provides an account of the semantic type, which answers to the problem of the restricted distribution of null objects in English. He says that “the regularities of registers…should not be expressed in the grammar per se, but in a separate component regulating the use of language – a sort of user’s manual”. “If the usage rules do not allow for the discourse binding in a particular context (or register), then the use of the null argument will be infelicitous.” Thus, he states that every verb is associated with variables in its lexical entry\(^{13}\). Such variables realize thematic roles and grammatical functions associated with the verb. If variables are realized overtly, they will be linked to the semantics of that noun phrase, otherwise they will remain free variables in the semantics. The user’s manual then specifies what to do with free variables. For instance, as Culy writes, “if the context is a recipe, then interpret free variables in the semantics like third person pronouns”. Otherwise, if user’s manual has no rule for interpreting free variables in the implied context, then their use is ungrammatical. (cf. Bender 1999).

\(^{13}\) verb: mix

subcategorization:

\[
\text{NP : } \begin{cases} \text{SUBJ} & x \\ \text{AGT} & \text{NP : } \begin{cases} \text{OBJ} & y \\ \text{TH} & \end{cases} \end{cases}
\]

semantics: “\(\text{mix } (x, y)\)”

[Culy 1996:113]
I would support Bender’s view (1999), which draws on work by Hudson (1996), in arguing for monolingual speakers to have a single grammar with social information integrated in the grammar itself and which regulates its use. Thus, she writes that, “language has a constitutive relation to three dimensions of social reality: identity, context of utterance, and the content of the utterance. […] In the case of a recipe, it is perhaps the current context that is most obviously constructed by the linguistic choices. That is, a recipe is a *recipe* and not a description of how someone made a meal on a certain day or a poem or anything else…” (Bender 1999:7). However, the three dimensions of social reality are interrelated and speakers never use their linguistic competence without affecting all of them.

In recent years, an important thread of sociolinguistic research has concerned itself with the relationship between context and register. Even though Culy supports the belief that the relevant aspects of the context exist before the linguistic process, as Bender points out, recent anthropological and sociolinguistic studies have been widely arguing that linguistic activity also plays a role in constituting the context. This matter is far beyond the present purposes, though. However, it is hard to understand the linguistic resource of RNOs if we do not investigate the context they are associated with. In light of the latest assumption, we can say that a null object is part of the construction of whatever context exhibits it, that is, null objects only appear in certain registers because they help constituting those registers.

Below, I propose Bender’s sketch of how the social value (for each of the three dimensions) about null objects in recipes and other instructional writings might be (1999:8).

(58) **Social situation**: The giving of instructions, from one in authority to one who has chosen some product. The product may something to use (medicine) or something to make (recipe).

**Identity of speaker**: One in authority. In the case of cookbooks, the authority is that of a good cook. In the case of a product packing, the authors are faceless and the authority, in some cases, becomes that of the disembodied voice of truth.

**Situation described**: The use or production of the product described is constructed as requiring care – it must be done just so, or something will go wrong.
3.4 The syntactic representation of instructional clauses

In light of the analysis I discussed above and recalling my own theory about imperative structures, I will try to develop a personal interpretation of the RNO constructions.

I agree with Haegeman’s analysis (1987) about the topic-linked trace identity of RNOs. As the following example illustrate, the null object in this register is always identified with the discourse topic, that in some cases corresponds to the topic of the recipe/instruction, in others, to an entity salient in the context of the utterance. In (59) non-overt objects referring to the recipe topic (Herring Salad) are marked as ec1, whereas the ones referring to the locally salient topic are marked as ec2.

(59) Sillsallad

(Herring Salad)_t

.........

1. Fillet herring. Soak ec2_t 12 hours in several changes of cold water.
2. Drain ec2_t. Chop ec2_t finely. Put ec2_t into bowl.
3. Very finely chop [potatoes, beetroot, cucumber, peeled apple and peeled onion]. Add ec2_t to herring.
4. Whisk together [vinegar, water, sugar and pepper to taste]_k.
5. Add ec2_k to herring mixture. Stir ec1_t gently to mix, taking care not to mash up ingredients.
6. Cover ec1_t and chill ec1_t thoroughly for minimum of 3 hours.
7. Before serving ec1_t, mound ec1_t neatly on to a platter. Garnish ec1_t with wedges of hard-boiled eggs and parsley or dill.
8. Accompany ec1_t with a bowl of soured cream.

I also noted that ec2 is always immediately preceded by the sentence containing the NP which identify it. We could, hence, postulate that the preceding sentence fixes the discourse topic of the following sentence. At this point, one could argue that, in (60a), the non-overt object of stir and cook is identified with the preceding NP ketchup. But, for the sake of common sense, we would rather refer the object of such verb to the recipe topic (i.e. mussel omelet). Analogously, in (60b) it is not the sauce what is supposed to be served, but the giant shrimp, topic of the recipe.
(60)  (a) Add ketchup, stir *ec1*, cook *ec1* (the omelet) for another few minutes.
(b) When the sauce has acquired a sticky consistency, serve *ec1* (giant shrimp).

Therefore, we could make the following generalization. When the topic is not pragmatically or lexically recoverable from the immediately preceding clause, it must be identified with the recipe topic.

In light of this, I would also agree with Heageman, in attributing the difference between the instructional register and other registers (which do not exhibit null objects) to a divergent setting of the parameter that states whether a language is topic prominent or subject prominent. “‘Core’ English is subject prominent while recipe English is topic prominent”. Such difference could be accounted for by proposing that people have knowledge of certain social contexts as “crystallized” entities which go with specific linguistic formulae. Although language contributes constituting the context even in this case, the speakers perform invoking such a crystallized context and recognizing the linguistic behaviour it entails (cf. Bender).

Now, I will first hint at the occurrence of object drop in Dutch imperatives (topic developed by Visser (1996) and then, I will suggest an instructional context specific analysis of objectless imperative constructions.

In Dutch imperatives14 (simple or infinitival), not only the subject, but also the Direct Object (DO) can be omitted or dislocated in the right edge of the clause (61). By contrast, a prepositional object can be left out in infinitival imperatives (62) but not in the simple imperative variant, unless the particle *maar* is inserted (63).

(61)  Maak (die opdracht) af! / Maak *e*; af die opdracht,! (SIMPLE IMP.)
(Die opdracht) afmaken! / Afmaken die opdracht! (INF. IMP.)
(= Finish that assignment!)

(62)  Niet aantrekken (die opmerking)! (INF. IMP.)
(= Don’t take that remark seriously!)

---

14 I would like to thank Michael Fick for his contribution as a Dutch native speaker.
Moreover, in Dutch, non-overt objects also occur in declaratives but only if nothing precedes the verb. According to Visser, Huang (1984) accounts for such a phenomenon by saying that in declaratives the empty element is a zero topic in SpecCP, explaining also why the object cannot be dropped in embedded and in interrogative clauses.

I note a similarity between object drop in Dutch imperatives and English recipes in that, in both contexts, the referent of the empty object is prominent in the discourse and *ec* can alternate with overt pronoun anaphors. In addition, the same constraints apply to both contexts: The DO cannot be an indefinite (in recipe context, moreover, null-objects are generally acceptable under strong deixis, referring to objects present in the real world situation of the utterance). Object drop obeys island and clause boundedness constraints. But the most significant properties they share are the no-subject requirement and the non-occurrence of object drop in double object constructions (dative-object in Dutch).

Den Dikken (1992) analyzes object drop in Dutch imperatives as the result of empty operator movement to the A’-position of a Mood&Modality Phrase, licensed by imperative mood. Thus, he takes the empty imperative subject to be licensed by the imperative verb (cf. Visser 1996).

In light of this, I would suggest a somewhat similar analysis which proposes different properties associated with the “crystallized” context of recipes/instructions. Recall the structure (35) for imperative clauses I proposed in Chapter 2.

I would here update such a structure arguing that in recipes there never appear subjects other that [2nd] person ones. For this reason, I suggest that, in instructional registers, the AddresseeP is restricted in its reference to the reader of the implied writing; therefore, it could be replaced by a recipe-specific Reader Phrase (ReaderP) which is always associated with [2nd] person features.

Having established that covert objects in imperatives refer to the discourse (recipe) or locally salient topic, I agree with Haegeman’s analysis which proposes that imperative sentences with non-overt objects involve movement of a non-overt topic operator to a pre-sentential A’-position, [Spec, TopP], binding a variable in its original
position. However, as Horsey (1998) writes, Rizzi (1994) observes that only traces bound by a genuine quantifier are variables, which can be found in ordinary operator-variable constructions such as questions\(^{15}\). Instead, traces bound by non-quantificational empty operator are not variables, but *null constant*\(^{16}\). Lasnik & Stowell (1991) also observed that null operators differ from ordinary operator-variables in that the latter involve quantification ranging over a possibly non-singleton set, but the former has its reference fixed to that of the antecedent. They also supported this theory by means of weak and strong crossover tests, which, instead, are not useful for the current scope, since there are no empirical data about questions or embedded clauses in recipes. However, I agree with Rizzi’s analysis, on the ground of the interpretation of RNOs. As I have previously assumed for recipes, the preceding sentence fixes the discourse topic of the following sentence, otherwise, the RNO must be identified with the recipe topic. In light of this, following Rizzi’s terms, I can infer that RNOs are indeed null constants bound by non-quantificational null topic operators in [Spec, TopP], see (64).

\(^{15}\) Operator-variable construction: “Peter wonders who, to please \(t\)”.

Empty operator-null constant construction: “Peter is easy Op, to please \(t\)”.

\(^{16}\) The null constant is a non-variable R-expression, which can be considered a null epithet or more generally a null definite description. (Horsey, 1998)
(64)  (Drain potatoes). Mash __ finely. (EuC p.184)

With regard to the interpretation of non-overt objects, I agree with Cummins and Roberge (2003) in noticing that null objects focus attention on the activity expressed (or, in this case, suggested/ordered) by the verb.
CHAPTER 4

A POSSIBLE EXTENSION TO ROMANCE LANGUAGES: SPANISH AND ITALIAN

4.1 An overview of the Spanish and Italian Instructional Register

In chapter 1.4, we postulated that English instructional registers exhibit imperative sentences. Since imperatives present the same morphology of infinitives in English, syntactic tests were needed in order to provide evidence that the verb in instructions is not an infinitive.

Differently from English, the rich morphology of Italian and Spanish verbal system put us in a much better position to recognize which verbal mood we are dealing with in every context.

Although imperatives are used in the same way and with the same purposes in both English, Spanish and Italian, these Romance languages do not exhibit 2nd person singular imperatives in the register in question, preferring other special formulae to them.

(65) (a) Mondare, lavare e sgocciolare le fragole. (…)
(b) Immergere la busta sigillata in acqua bollente. (…) Servire ben caldo.
(c) Applicare il latte sul viso, massaggiare per meglio sciogliere il trucco, poi asciugare con un batuffolo di cotone.
(d) Assumere il farmaco a stomaco pieno. Non superare le dosi di 50 gocce 3 volte al giorno.
(e) Somministrare con cautela nei soggetti con insufficienza renale o epatica.
(f) Verter los gnocchi en agua salada hirviendo, escurrir en cuanto suban a la superficie y condimentar.
(g) Llevar las claras a punto de nieve. Agregar de a poco el azucar, la levadura, harina y las yemas. Mezclar bien y formar una masa homogenea. (…) Estirar y rellenar con crema pastelera.
(h) Aplicar después de la limpiadora y el tónico.
As the examples in (65) illustrate, in both Spanish and Italian, the instructional register typically exhibits infinitive sentences. However, Italian recipes mostly exhibit [2nd] person plural imperatives, as we will see later on. Moreover, Spanish and Italian diverge in showing the former (hortative) subjunctive clauses and the latter imperative clauses, besides infinitive sentences.

I would account for this variation by appealing to a fundamental field of linguistics, i.e. pragmatics. According to pragmatic theories, any individual possessing a minimal real-world knowledge, is able to assign a social value to any linguistic expression and to associate it with an extralinguistic meaning, in order to pick the most suitable words for every particular situation, time or purpose. Therefore, from a pragmatic point of view, imperatives are cross-linguistically associated with a strong way of imposing one’s will on the addressee of the order/request, unless they are used in a very informal context. Nevertheless, even in that context, an idiomatic expression of politeness, like please, is required in order to mitigate the imperative mood. For this reason, when people want somebody to do something, they substitute imperatives with rhetoric questions, like those in (66b,d,f,h), whose function is not that of asking if the addressee is in a position to do something, but rather that of requesting him/her to do something (cf. Giusti 2003). Note the different social effect produced by the compared constructions in (66) among English, Spanish, Italian and German.

(66) (a) Close the door, (please).
    (b) Can/Could you close the door, please?
    (c) Cierra la puerta, (por favor).
    (d) Puedes/puede cerrar la puerta, por favor?
    (e) Chiudi la porta, (per piacere).
    (f) Puoi/può chiudere la porta, per favore?
    (g) Schließ die Tür, (bitte).
    (h) Kanst du/Können Sie die Tür schließen, bitte?

17 (65) (a) “Torta allo yogurt” directions – Cameo.
(b) “Cotechino Modena” – Casa Modena.
(c) “latte detergente Hydra Confort” – L’Oréal Paris
(d) “Moment 200, Gocce” - Angelini
(e) “Tachipirina” - Angelini
(f) “Gnocchetti di patate di Giovanni Rana” cooking instructions.
(g) “Brazo gitano” (www.recetas.com)
(h) “Seaweed daily shine control moisture cream” - The Body Shop
The register of English Instructions has some properties that set it apart from other types of usage or registers. In fact, it is interesting to note that, although the social features associated to imperative clauses, these are pragmatically related to this particular register of English, without any negative connotation being perceived by the addressee.

We could also account for this fact by looking at how Portner (2004) classifies clause types. He says that “each major clause type is associated with a component of the discourse context, and these components are sets of semantic values, differentiated by type”:

(i) Declaratives are associated with the **Common Ground**, a set of propositions.
(ii) Interrogatives are associated with a **Question Set**, a set of sets of propositions.
(iii) Imperatives are associated with the addressee’s **To-do List**.

A To-do List is a set of properties assigned to the participants in the conversation. Thus, since recipes and instructions consist, indeed, in a list of suggestions on how to make something or how to use a product, English recipes and instructions exhibit imperative clauses as their typical constructions, as we have been discussing in Chapter 1 and 2.

But let now move to a more in-depth investigation on such cross-linguistic variations.

Italian recipes and instructions hardly show [2nd] person singular imperatives. From the evidence in (67), I can infer that they are almost exclusively confined to very informal instructions, like those expressed by vocal speech, or taking place in popular magazines or writings designed to target a child audience. This assumption is illustrated by some examples that I found in sections of comic-strip magazines, such as “Topolino” and “Minnie & Company”. Note that in (67e) a further means of expressing instructions in Italian appears: [2nd] person singular of the present indicative.

(67)  
(a) *Lessa* le castagne, *pelale*, e *mettile* sul fuoco in una padella…  
(b) *Prendi* le uova e *separa* gli albumi dai tuorli.  
(c) *Lava* bene i petali dei fiori, *asciugali*, *mettili* in una ciotolina.  
(d) *Appoggia* la sagoma sulle carte colorate e *ritaglia* le varie carte.  
(e) *Tieni* l’uncinetto orizzontalmente, *afferri* il filo che *trattieni* con la mano sinistra e lo *ritiri* attraverso l’anello sull’uncinetto, estraendo una nuova maglia.
Also in fashion magazines, such as “Glamour”, [2nd] person singular imperatives are often attested in recipes. The examples from Spanish papers of “Glamour” illustrate this.

(68) (a) Pon arroz y pescado sobre una lámina de alga nori, haz un rollito y corta __ en rodajas.
(b) Corta el pescado y colócalo sobre el arroz (...)
(c) Aprieta __ firmemente y enrolla el alga (...)

Moreover, I have found that [2nd] person singular imperatives appear in culinary web sites too (69)\textsuperscript{19}, since the informal atmosphere is one of the inherent characteristics of this medium, where everybody can contribute inserting, in this case, their own recipes or cooking tips. However, as the examples show, the phenomenon of object-drop is, in this context, not so common as in traditional cookbooks and other instructions. We could argue that it is exclusively used when referring to “il tutto” (“the whole”) rather than to a particular topicalized ingredient.

(69) (a) Porta ad ebollizione una pentola con acqua. (...) Trita lo scalogno e fallo soffriggere con il burro e l’olio, salalo leggermente e bagna __ con il vino. Fai evaporare __ (...) e cuoci __ per pochi istanti. (...) aggiungi ora il prosciutto tagliato a listarelle, poco pepe, mescola __ e spegni il fuoco.
(b) Trita la cipolla e mettila nella padella con un po’ di olio e comincia a rosolarla (…) Alle verdure unisci la carne, insaporisci __ fino a che la carne è diventata di colore più chiaro. Spruzza __ col vino, fai evaporare __ (...) Accompagna __ con un generoso bicchiere di merlot trentino.

Returning to the typical expressions of instructional registers, we note that [2nd] person plural are the only imperatives which appear in Italian, (70)\textsuperscript{20}. I would explain this by suggesting that the addressee of recipes is interpreted as ranging over a plurality of persons over the time and space; as if the recipe writer contemplates not only the current reader of the recipe, but rather the whole range of potential users, i.e. an auditory

\textsuperscript{19} (69) (a) “Paglia e fieno con prosciutto e piselli” (www.ricettedintorni.net/ricette/primi-piatti_398)
(b) “Cuori di lasagne al ragù delicato” (www.ricettedintorni.net/ricette/primi-piatti_372)
\textsuperscript{20} (70) (d) “Crostata di cipolle alsaziana” - Ricette pratiche, i piatti unici, Editoriale Del Drago, p.37.
(e) Uncle Ben’s - 8 tortillas
(f) Preparato per “Riso alla Cantonese” – Suzi Wan.
widening across time and space. On the contrary, in Spanish, the hortative subjunctives are usually [2nd] person singular (see the examples in (71)21).

(70) (a) Preparate la pasta frolla. Mettete la farina sul tavolo e cominciate a impastarla. (CD, p.890)
(b) Cospargete i crostini con un po’ di salsa (…) passate in forno per alcuni minuti. (CD, p.67)
(c) Distribuite la salsa e guarnite ___ con rondelle di cetrioli. (T&S, p.38)
(d) Pelate le cipolle e tagliatele a fette molto sottili.
(e) Farcite le Tortillas, piegatele a semicerchio e scaldatele in forno o in padella.
(f) Versate 350 ml d’acqua in una pentola. Portate ___ ad ebollizione.

(71) (a) Cierna con la ayuda del colador el harina junto con el polvo de hornear. Mezcle ___ con la sal y el agua.
(b) Prepare la pasta: corte la mantequilla en cuadritos, vierta la harina y una pizca de sal en un molde, incorpore la mantequilla y mezcle ___ con los dedos hasta que aparezca miga de pan.
(c) Mantenga la temperatura ambiente entre 45 y 90 grados (F) durante la aplicación del producto. (…) Ponga una base primaria solamente en las juntas empastadas con American Clay Sanded Primer y deje secar esta primera base.

In this regard, I took into consideration the recipe-giving in television programmes, such as “La prova del cuoco”. In this context, however, impersonal constructions are preferred to plural imperatives, as the examples in (72) show, (“La prova del cuoco” 01-03-2007).

(72) (a) Cavolo nero, appena scottato e grondante d’acqua, si pone sulle fette di pane arrostito. Poi si condisce con del sale e pepe e si mangia così com’è.
(b) La zucca si fa bollire, si emulsiona con olio e senape e succo di limone.
(c) Le braccioline si battono e si passano nella farina, nell’uovo e nel sesamo. Si frigono in olio non eccessivamente caldo. (…) Si contorna con questa maionese.

21 (71) (a) “Chicharrón de harina” (http://bibliotecadigital.conevyt.org.mx)
(b) “Flan de aguacate y requesón” (www.almunecar.info/gastronomia/recetasdeaguacatepostres.html)
(c) Técnicas generales de aplicación de “American Clay Sanded Primer”
Moreover, I also found impersonal constructions in a book reporting ancient venetian recipes, called “Cento antiche ricette di cucina veneziana”, which leads us to suppose that this was one of the ancient ways to give instructions.

(73) (a) Si nettino le sardelle, si lavino e si asciughino. (p. 20)
(b) Si mettano a cuocere i piselli…si aggiunga un pezzetto di burro. (p. 37)
(c) Si bagni per dieci o dodici ore lo stoccafisso (…) Lo si tagli (…). (p. 47)
(d) Si pelino le melanzane e si mondino dei semi. (p. 80)

4.2 Non-overt objects in Spanish and Italian Recipes and Instructions

For what concerns RNOs in Italian and Spanish, we can notice that they often alternate with overt clitic pronouns, (74).

(74) (a) Cuocete i funghi a parte e prima, perchè richiedono più tempo. Insaporiteli in burro e olio. (CD, p.659)
(b) Spelate, pulite e tagliate l’anguilla a pezzi. Mettetela a marinare (…).
(c) Aggiungete l’anguilla sgocciolata. Bagnatela col vino, lasciatelo evaporare (…) Bagnate ___ con un po’ d’acqua. (CD p. 466)
(e) Limpiar los caracoles. Dejarlos a la sombra en un lugar donde corra aire (http://www.recetas.com/receta-de-Caracoles-dulces-y-picantes-2154.html)

However, non-overt objects are still very common in Italian and Spanish Instructional registers. As (75) shows, they appear in all the contexts we have been dealing with previously: in [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person plural imperatives (75a,b) of cookbooks; in [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person singular imperatives of culinary web sites (75c) and comic-strip magazines (75d); in imperative sentences of cosmetics (75e) and medicine (75f) instructions.
(75)  (a) Appoggiate ogni bistecca sul crostone. Accompagnate con salsa bearnese. (CD p.578)
(b) Cospargete i crostini con un po’ di salsa (...) passate in forno per alcuni minuti. (CD p.67)
(c) Alle verdure unisci la carne, insaporisci fino a che la carne è diventata di colore più chiaro. Spruzza col vino, fai evaporare (...)
(d) Stendi la pasta preparata. Fai cuocere per dieci minuti, togli e lascia raffreddare. (M&co n.19)
(e) Applicare dopo il detergente e il tonico.
(f) Tenere fuori dalla portata dei bambini. Somministrare con cautela nei soggetti con insufficienza renale o epatica.
(g) Diluir la harina en la leche. Mezclar bien.

(www.recetas.com/receta-de-Sufle-de-queso-2078.html)
(h) Limpiaar, pelar y cortar los calabines y las patatas. Hervir con una pizca de sal. Pasar a una batidora junto con los quesos y la nata. Batir y conservar en el refrigerador.

(www.recetas.com/receta-de-Crema-de-calabacines-de-concha-2095.html)
(i) Cierna con la ayuda del colador el harina junto con el polvo de hornear. Mezcle con la sal y el agua.
(j) Aplicar después de la limpiadora y el tónico.

So far in my research, I noted that the distribution of non-overt objects in recipes is not subject to any regularity. In fact, differently from English, in Italian and Spanish recipes we come across many clitic pronouns which alternate with their covert counterpart on the basis of no clear rules. For instance, while one could argue that in (74a,d) the second clause needs to make the object pronoun explicit because an adjunct clause separates it from its antecedent (“i funghi”), (74b,c,e) make this assumption fail. From these examples we can notice that one of the most striking properties of Italian and Spanish RNOs is that they mostly refer to the topic of the recipe/instruction, rather than to a locally salient topic. On the other hand, we saw in Chapter 3 that English exhibits many RNOs which are bound by an antecedent in the preceding sentence for their interpretation. Hence, we were also able to make the generalization about RNOs interpretation which is here repeated: *When the topic is not pragmatically or lexically recoverable from the immediately preceding clause, it must be identified with the recipe topic.*
CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, I offered an analysis of a linguistic phenomenon which sets Instructional Registers apart from other usages of English: the occurrence of non-overt subjects and objects. Having stated that imperatives normally lack an overt subject, I first demonstrated that the features relevant for the interpretation of the subject are not associated with the verb itself, but with a subject syntactically represented, though phonetically null. Then, I tried to determine the identity of non-overt subjects and what the syntactic representation of imperatives may look like. Although English is commonly known as a non-pro-drop language, I followed Rupp (1999) in inferring that the subject position of imperatives is occupied by pro, because its [2nd] person feature, by virtue of being the only feature available in the imperative verbal paradigm, can be recovered from the Agr head. Thus, I accounted for the cases in which [3rd] person subjects appear, by proposing that a particular projection, labelled AddresseeP, merges when an addressee other than you is evoked. The noun phrase hence picks out an individual or a set of individuals from the set of addressees that are implicitly expressed by the [2nd] person non-overt subject. However, I proposed that, in the instructional register, the AddresseeP could be replaced by a recipe-specific Reader Phrase associated with [2nd] person features only.

In Chapter 3, on the basis of empirical data provided by some cookbooks, cosmetics instructions and user’s manuals, I illustrated that the Recipe Object Drop is a phenomenon which is cross-linguistically very common. Looking at the properties of non-overt objects and the constraints on their distribution, I assumed that it is the imperative no-subject property that enables non-over objects to appear. Moreover, I pointed out that the phenomenon has nothing to do with the process of indefinite object drop, whereby a transitive verb may lack an object, with an indefinite object being understood. In fact, the referent of the empty object is prominent in the discourse or physically present. On the basis of evidence from recipes I could make the following generalization. When the topic is not pragmatically or lexically recoverable from the immediately preceding clause, it must be identified with the recipe topic. Some more theoretical questions remain as to the nature of RNOs and their syntactic representation. However, I followed Rizzi’s (1994) analysis, in assuming that RNOs are null constants bound by non-quantificational null topic operators in [Spec, TopP].
Finally, in Chapter 4, I proposed a comparison between the instructional registers of English, Italian and Spanish. We could note that non-overt objects are very common in Italian and Spanish too, though these are normally non-object-drop languages. I also showed that, diverging from English, the instructional register of Spanish and Italian tipically exhibits infinitive sentences. However, Italian recipes often exhibit [2\textsuperscript{nd}] person plural imperatives, whereas hortative subjunctive clauses are very common in Spanish recipes.
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