
Concluding Remarks

In this book I have argued in favour of the following hypothesis: the left-most position of the C-layer is devoted to representation of the speaker's temporal and spatial coordinates. I have shown that this position is required both by the superordinate predicate and by the embedded verbal form.

In certain cases, as for instance in the dependencies involving a subjunctive in Italian, such a position is not required and the speaker's coordinates are not relevant, either syntactically or interpretively. An important argument in favour of the complex interactions between syntax and interpretation is constituted by the clauses depending from *ipotizzare* (hypothesize), where the representation of the speaker can still be there, giving raise to a typical pattern.

I also argued that in certain cases this *interface* position is overtly realized in Italian by means of a first person head, with epistemic value, namely, *credo* (I think). I proposed that the Italian imperfect indicative can also be analysed in the framework discussed here, providing insights into some anomalous distribution of the English past.

Following my proposal, certain structures, which have traditionally been considered problematic, such as the dependencies from future verbal forms and the narrative style called Free Indirect Discourse, do not have to be treated as special cases any more, because their properties follow from a simple manipulation of the value assigned to the speaker's coordinates. The syntax and the interpretive device remain exactly the same as in 'normal' cases.

The advantages of this hypothesis are twofold. On one side, it can explain several empirical observations, such as the occurrence of the Double Access Reading in certain contexts but not in others,

Complementizer Deletion phenomena in Italian, the distribution of the various kinds of temporal locutions, the properties of Chinese Long Distance anaphors, etc. It can also explain more specific facts. For instance, in Italian the DAR is mostly found with the indicative, but not with the subjunctive; the imperfect and the future-in-the-past exhibit anomalous behaviour; the dependencies from a main future and FID sentences apparently exhibit contradictory properties.

On the other, the hypothesis highlights an important point: the relation between the context and the syntax cannot be a one-way relation. The presence of the speaker's coordinates in C is determined by the syntax and conversely, their presence determines syntactic phenomena.

In other words, I have shown that in Italian certain predicates require an indicative or a subjunctive in their complement clause, defining a certain syntactic structure with respect to the Complementizer layer and consequently yielding a certain interpretation of the sentence with respect to the context.

Conversely, given a certain context, which might or might not be a literary one, a given syntax is fixed, with precise consequences for the usage of tenses, temporal locutions, pronouns, etc.

Independently of the specific implementation I propose in this work, I hope that the results of this particular way of thinking about the relationships between syntax and context might prove heuristically useful for further investigation in this fascinating empirical realm.