Paraguayan Guaraní (PG) is a language that overtly encodes person but not tense in its verbal inflection. The question arises of how PG locates events in time. According to Tonhauser (2011), PG does not have phonologically non-overt tenses; rather temporal reference is determined by aspectual morphemes, temporal adverbials or, in their absence, purely contextually. Temporal reference in PG can also be constrained by some of its evidential markers. We address the interaction of evidentiality and temporality in PG, focusing on three markers ra’e, raka’e and kuri, and we specifically focus on the syntactic structure behind the interpretation. Velázquez-Castillo (V-C) (2009) suggests that the temporal properties follow from the spatial deictic relations between speaker and the information source. Here we argue that while ra’e’s temporal properties may indeed be derived from its evidential properties, the past meaning contributed by kuri and raka’e is lexically encoded, in conjunction with a deictic meaning. We propose a syntactic representation of evidentiality (cf. Speas 2004) through a learning event (L-Ev) head. While we recognize that the entire evidential interpretation cannot be derived from morpho-syntactic features, we suggest that an agreement mechanism relates person features (Author, Participant) to spatio-temporal (Proximate) features contributed by the evidential morphemes, constraining the type of evidential interpretation derived (in the spirit of Faller 2004).

1. Ra’e has the following properties (A and B are also discussed by V-C to appear). A: Ra’e is an indirect/mirative evidential: the prejacent proposition (i.e., the asserted content without ra’e) is new information for the attitude holder, Att-H, (speaker in matrix clause). Att-H acquires this new (unexpected) information from someone else or infers it from some immediate event. B: Ra’e does not bear on the time of the described event, but, on the time of the learning event (L-Ev), anchored at/close to speech time. C: Ra’e can appear in questions, but without interrogative flip (no perspectival shift). D: Ra’e can appear inside the complement of an attitude verb and it updates the propositional knowledge of the matrix subject - the attitude holder (i.e. there is an obligatory evidential shift). E: Ra’e functions as a focus marker. It can appear in different parts of the IP, marking the constituent left-adjacent to it as the focus of the sentence, i.e. the new information part that triggers the update of Att-H’s propositional knowledge.

(1) [(i) Att-H enters the room and see’s K.’s hat on the table. (ii) Att-H opens the door and sees K.]
   a. Kalo o-u ra’e
   b. Kalo ra’o u
   Kalo 3SG-come ra’e (focus on event)  Kalo ra’e 3SG-come (focus on subject)
   ‘Kalo has come, I take it’ / ‘Kalo, I see, has come’

(2) [Maria entered the kitchen and found a broken dish]
   Maria o-porandu Luisa-pei mava-pa ra’e o-joka tembiporu.
   Maria 3SG-ask Luisa-DOM who-INT ra’e 3SG-broke dish
   ‘Maria asks Luisa who was it that broke the dish’ (Maria’s inference/surprise)

(3) [Maria entered the kitchen and found a broken dish. She knew that Kalo had been around.]
   Maria he’i Luisa-pei Kalo ra’e o-joka-ha-gue tembiporu
   Maria 3sg.say Luisa-IO Kalo ra’e 3sg-break-SUB-PST dish
   ‘Maria said it was Kalo who broke the dish’ (Maria’s inference/surprise)

Along with Speas (2004), we assume the Speech (or more generally the Att(itude)-h(older)) Center is represented in the upper layer of the clause, followed by a L-Ev (on the semantic relevance of L-Ev in the grammar of evidentiality, see Chung 2007, Lee 2013, Smirnova 2013, Koev 2016). Ra’e is generated attached to the focused part of the sentence and it adjoins at LF to L-Ev, thus imposing its own selectional properties. Ra’e requires that the subject of L-Ev (a pro bound by Att-H) be +Participant: it is compatible with both reportative evidence, where pro is an addressee in the L-Ev, and with inferential evidence, where pro is the author in L-Ev. The formal feature +Part(icipant) on L-Ev is grammatically associated with a
+Prox(imate) interpretation of a relation between Att-H and L-Ev, both on the spatial and the temporal dimension. Since pro is bound to Att-H, the latter is also +Prox, with the resulting interpretation that L-Ev is spatially and temporally close to the evaluation event, and in particular, its temporal parameter Eval-t.

(4) \[ CP \ [ pro_{Att-H} \ [ pro_{Eval-T} \ [ \[ Evid \ [ pro_{PART} \ L-Ev \] ra’e] \ [ ip \ [ \ldots \ [ x].\text{ra’e} \ldots. \] ] \] \] \] +prox +prox

(5) a. \[ [L-Ev] = \lambda_{p_{st}} \lambda_{x} \exists e_{v} \ [ \text{learning-event}(e) \ & \ & x \ & \text{acquires evidence for } p \ & \text{in } e] \]

b. pro_{Eval-T} proximate to learning event

2. **Kuri and Raka’e**. Unlike ra’e, these morphemes impose restrictions on the temporality of the described event (past with respect to the Eval-T), but not on that of L-Ev. Kuri appears with recent past events and raka’e with remote past events. While kuri is compatible with both direct and reportative contexts, raka’e is associated with reportative evidence. We suggest that kuri and raka’e are temporal IP-level markers that encode past tense. Semantically, they combine with a predicate of times, contributed by an aspectual projection (Tonhauser 2011). Furthermore, kuri and raka’e are associated at LF with a spatiotemporal projection above IP (called STemp); kuri selects a STemp specified as +Prox and raka’e imposes a STemp specified as –Prox/remote. We propose, in the spirit of Faller (2004), that the evidential restriction on raka’e follows derivatively from its associated –Prox (remote) STemp specification. More specifically, it imposes a remote/distal temporal relation with respect to the described past event and, derivatively, between it and the Att-H along the spatial dimension (both physically and cognitively). In the case of kuri, +Prox imposes temporal closeness with respect to the described past event, and derivatively, between it and the Att-H along the cognitive-spatial dimension, which makes it a natural candidate to encode “validational” (i.e. certainty) force, as in variants that disallow the combination of kuri with epistemic modals that weaken such certainty (V-C 2009).

(6) a. \[ CP \ [ pro_{Att-H} \ [ pro_{Eval-T} \ [ \ [ \text{STemp}-kuri] \ [ ip \ [ \ldots \ [ x].\text{kuri} \ldots. \] ] \] \] \] +Prox

b. \[ CP \ [ pro_{Att-H} \ [ pro_{Eval-T} \ [ \ [ \text{STemp}-raka’e] \ [ ip \ [ \ldots \ [ x].\text{raka’e} \ldots. \] ] \] \] –Prox (remote) \]

Time-permitting, we will discuss data on the distribution of ra’e and kuri/raka’e in conditionals that supports the above structural proposal, where kuri and raka’e are structurally lower than ra’e at LF; cf. (4) and (6).
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