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ABSTRACT: This article investigates the Kadiwéu reportative evidential word one in interaction with tense in main and embedded clauses. The data in this paper come from elicitation and from narratives collected at different times since the 1990’s. The facts show that there is a restriction in co-occurrence between future tense and the quotative relational only in embedded clauses. Otherwise, the reportative evidential can co-occur with a future tense marker. Moreover, this work investigates the syntactic position of the reportative evidential examining its placement in relation to negative markers and complementizers. Negation offers strong evidence that the evidential one is at the sentential level, since it interacts syntactically and morphologically with negation. Kadiwéu is a language from the Chaco area, located between Paraguay, Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia. It belongs to the Guaiquiruan linguistic family.
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1. Introduction

Some analyses maintain that evidential markers take part in temporal relations. That is, according to this view, it takes the time of the acquisition of the evidence as evaluation time, and situates the described event in relation to the time the information was acquired. Smirnova (2016), for instance, argues that evidentials order the event reference time with respect to the time of acquisition of information, differing from Indicative Tenses that establish an order relative to the speech time. But others researchers question whether they have indeed a tense component (see, for instance, Rivero; Arregi and Salanova 2017; Pancheva and Zubizarretta 2019).

This paper shows that the relation between the Kadiwéu evidential word one and tense is different regarding whether the sentence is main or embedded; that is, the evidential word analyzed shows a temporal component in embedded clauses only. Furthermore, this paper assumes the generative framework of analysis and investigates whether the functional word one is at the IP (Inflectional Phrase) or at the CP (Complementizer Phrase) level of the syntactic structure. This paper attempts to show that the evidential word position within the sentence has an impact with its relation to tense.

Kadiwéu is an endangered language from the Chaco area, located between Paraguay, Argentina, Brazil, and Bolivia. It belongs to the Guaiquiruan linguistic family.
and is spoken by less than 500 people in the State of Mato Grosso do Sul, Brazil. The Guaikurúan language family has two branches: (a) the Guaikurúan Branch, which includes Kadiwéu; and (b) the Southern Branch, which comprises three other languages: Toba, Pilagá, and Mocovi, all spoken in Argentina and Paraguay (Ceria and Sandalo 1995). Within the Guaikurúan languages, evidential markers were also reported in Toba (Carpio and González 2017). In Brazil, evidentials are common in the Amazonian Vaupés River region, in Western Brazil (see Aikhenvald 1984). Although Kadiwéu is in the western area of this country, it is not an Amazonian language, but a language from the southern part of South America.

The data in this paper come from elicitation in the Alves de Barros village, near Bodoquena, Mato Grosso do Sul, from narratives collected at different times throughout my research since the 1990’s, and from published sources, including the Kadiwéu Bible (2012) translated by native speakers (https://www.scriptureearth.org/data/kbc/PDF/00-WNTkbc-web.pdf), which has been used to complete missing paradigms.¹

The Kadiwéu narratives that support this study are in the Tycho Brahe Platform at the University of Campinas, Brazil (https://www.tycho.iel.unicamp.br/browser/catalog/C12).

The Kadiwéu Corpus is composed of original narratives, and it contains audio and transcribed sentences annotated for part of speech (POS) and morphemes, with translations in Portuguese and English. The data that contain the evidential one come mainly from 13 narratives that have been used for the analysis presented here.

The transcription and translation of the narratives in the corpus, including the translation of the Bible examples, were done with the help of native speakers.²

The remaining of this section introduces some information on the word one crucial to understand the investigation on reportative evidentiality in Kadiwéu.

The reportative evidential one expresses that the speaker is not expressing his/her own cognitive material but information acquired orally (Couto 2018).

A sentence with a reportative evidential, in Kadiwéu, differs from quotation speech and it is used in context where there is no verifiable source of the oral information. It is used in main or in embedded clauses, and it is translated here as ‘it has been said that’.³,⁴,⁵

¹ The data without a source were collected via elicitation with Hilário Silva, a native speaker of Kadiwéu, to whom I am grateful.
² The narratives used in this study were transcribed with the help of Reinaldo Silva and Hilário Silva, and were translated word by word by Hilário Silva. I am very grateful to them. Hilário Silva and Vanda Pires are currently involved in the elaboration of the Kadiwéu corpus, which is still under development.
³ Functional categories undergo vowel harmony across an intervenient /G/. /G/ is phonetically a uvular fricative between vowels. Irregular verbs are glosses by person without hyphen and in capital letters. I will use Kadiwéu orthography (Griffths 2002), except for voiced uvular stops that I use G rather than g. Irregular verbs are marked by person number and root without boundaries.
⁴ In Portuguese, the language used for the data elicitation, one is translated as “diz que”. Note that there is no tense information, as opposed to its translation to English.
⁵ A list of the abbreviations used follows: APPL = applicative, C = complementizer, CL = numeral classifier, CND = conditional mood, CNEG = negative complementizer, DIM = diminutive, DIR = directional, EV = evidential word, F = feminine, HON = honorific, INV = inverse alignment/voice marker, M = masculine, OBJ = object, PL = plural, POSS = possessive, PRO = pronoun, REL = relative clause marker, SUBJ = subject, T = tense/aspect, V = valency morpheme, WH = wh-interrogative word, 1 = first person, 2 = second person, 3 = third person, 1PLOBJ = first plural object (although Kadiwéu has discontinuous morphemes for person and plural, this is not the case for the first plural object (see Nevins and Sandalo (2011), and Sandalo (2023) for discussion), 1PLPOSS = first plural possessive, 1PLPRO = first plural pronoun.
The evidential *one* cannot ever be used for direct or indirect speech. The verb *to say* instead occurs in quotation speech:

(3) ee ejigo jawi  
    ee ejigo j-awi  
    3SAY AUX 1SUBJ-hunt  
    ‘He said: I will hunt’

(4) ee me ejigo jawi  
    ee me ejigo j-awi  
    3SAY C AUX 1SUBJ-hunt  
    ‘He said that I will hunt’

The verb *to say* can co-occur with the evidential word *one*; that is, they are not in complementary distribution. So, example (5) has a reportative evidential plus a direct speech structure.

(5) onee icoa Goneleegiwa: ejigo jawi  
    one+ee icoa Goneleegiwa ejigo j-awi  
    EV+3SAY CL man 1GO 1SUBJ-hunt  
    ‘It has been said that the man said: I will hunt.’

The evidential *one* is always speaker oriented in main or in embedded clauses since it always refers to the fact that the source of the information to the speaker is oral. There is no evidential mark for visual evidence in Kadiwéu; in other words, there is just a two-way distinction between direct (unmarked) vs indirect (marked by *one*) evidence. Couto (2018) also identifies negative evidentially and a negative mirative evidential in her analysis, but I consider them as *one* plus a negative operator or plus a negative complementizer merged together, as discussed later.

Section 2 offers a description of main and embedded clauses in Kadiwéu. Section 3 compares sentences with the reportative evidential and reportative sentences that contain a ‘to say’ verb to show that *one* is not a verb but a functional word. Section 4 investigates the relation of one and tense in main and embedded clauses. And, finally, section 5 investigates the syntactic position of *one* via its placement in relation with negation and complementizers.
2. A brief description of main and embedded clauses in Kadiwéu

The verb in main and embedded clauses is marked by person in Kadiwéu. Kadiwéu verbs agree with person according to a person hierarchy as follows. The verb is marked by the subject if it is intransitive or if the internal argument is a third person. If the object is a first or second person, there is a hierarchy: 1PLOBJ>2>1>3 (Nevins and Sandalo 2011). There is also a split intransitive system: inergative verbs are marked by a subject agreement prefix, whereas unaccusative, reflexive, and antipassive verbs are marked by an intransitive subject agreement prefix (Sandalo 2009). Additionally, there are certain unaccusative verbs that are marked by an object agreement prefix (Nevins and Sandalo 2011).

Person markers are prefixes, whereas number markers are suffixes, except for the pluralizer of a third person argument, which is a prefix, and for the marker for the first-person plural object which is a portmanteau of person and number (see Nevins and Sandalo 2011). Notice, however, that Sandalo (2023) identifies person and number in Kadiwéu as circumfixes since the person suffix and the number suffix always refer to the same argument and they cannot be separated. The situation is quite different for the other Guaiakuruan languages, like in Mocoví, in which the prefix and the suffix refer to different arguments and the markers are, in fact, a prefix plus a suffix.

The verb is also marked by an inverse morpheme if the object is a first or second person or if the subject is inactive/unaccusative (see Nevins and Sandalo 2011 for discussion). Sena (2016) argues that the inverse morpheme in Kadiwéu is also used with third person arguments if the subject is outranked regarding discourse topicality.

The constituent order is SOV if the object is a first or second person (Sandalo 2009, 2023). If the object is a third person, word order is quite free, but SVO is frequent (Sandalo 1997). Kadiwéu is a numeral classifier language, and therefore, bare nouns can be understood as plural (Sandalo and Michelioudakis 2016; Sandalo 2020).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject (transitive)</th>
<th>Subject (intransitive)</th>
<th>Object</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1sg j-</td>
<td>i-</td>
<td>i-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2sg a-...i</td>
<td>a-...i</td>
<td>Ga-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3sg y- ~ w-</td>
<td>y- ~ w-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1pl j-...Ga</td>
<td>i-...Ga</td>
<td>Go-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2pl a-...i</td>
<td>a-...i</td>
<td>Ga-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3pl o-...y</td>
<td>o-...y</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tense/aspect is marked by functional words in main clauses (6). According to Griffiths and Griffiths (1976), Kadiwéu has the following aspect markers: jaG ‘perfective’, and baanaGa ‘imperfective’. I add the tense marker domaGa ‘prospective future’, analyzed as a verb by Griffiths & Griffiths. This word, however, is never inflected and therefore it is not a verb since all verbs, including auxiliaries, are inflected by person.

In embedded clauses, according to Sandalo (1997), tense appears adjoined to the left of a complementizer (7), or it is fused with the complementizer if the embedded clause
is an adjunct clause (as in examples 8-9, but see additional discussion later). Main clauses not marked by tense are interpreted as present or recent past tense.\(^6\)\(^7\)

(6) \[ja \ jemaa \ Exabigo\]
\[jaG \ j-emaan \ Exabigo\]
\[T \ 1SUBJ-love/want \ Exabigo\]
‘I have loved Exabigo.’

(7) \[yemaa \ jame \ yeloadi \ negediogo\]
\[y-emaan \ jaG-me \ y-eloadi \ negediogo\]
\[3SUBJ-love/want \ T-C \ 3SUBJ-kill \ jaguar\]
‘He wishes that he had killed a jaguar/jaguars.’

(8) \[alawini \ naGa \ dopitedice\]
\[a-alawin-i \ naGa \ d-opi-te-tice\]
\[2SUBJ-pay.attention-PL \ C \ (PAST) \ INV-go-HON-DIR\]
‘Pay attention that he has returned’

(9) \[jigaalatece \ nigaanigipi \ nige \ jiwidatiogi\]
\[j-igala-tece \ niga-nigi-pi \ nige \ ji-wida-tiogi\]
\[1SUBJ-follow-DIR \ child-DIM-PL \ C \ (FUTURE) \ 1SUBJ-get-3PL\]
‘I follow the children in order to reach them’

Embedded clauses are quite evident, since they are all marked by complementizers, except for adverbial IPs (which roughly corresponds to the gerundive in languages like English or Portuguese).

Complement clauses --- that is, clauses that function as direct objects --- are introduced by the complementizer \(me\) obligatorily (10-11), as previously shown in Sandalo (1997).\(^8\)

(10) \[Ana \ yemaa \ me \ Maria \ dabaqenaGa\]
\[Ana \ y-emaan \ me \ Maria \ d-ababaken-aGan\]
\[Ana \ 3SUBJ-want \ C \ Maria \ INV-do.laundry-V\]
‘Ann wants that Mary does the laundry’

(11) \[Ana \ ee \ me \ Maria \ dabaqenaGa\]
\[Ana \ ee \ me \ Maria \ d-ababaken-aGan\]
\[Ana \ 3SAY \ C \ Maria \ INV-do.laundry-V\]
‘Ann says that Mary does the laundry’

The complementizer \(me\) is also used for control. Control structures are those in which either the subject of the main clause is also the (semantic) subject of the subordinate clause, or the object of the main clause is also the (semantic) subject of the subordinate clause.

---

\(^6\) In Sandalo (2009), the tense morpheme \(jaG\) is analyzed as an adverb, but Sandalo (1997) analyzes it as a completive aspect marker, an analysis I maintain here, since it is a functional word. As such, it undergoes the same phonological rule as any other functional word, for instance, the deletion of final /G/ before consonants and glides. Lexical words do not undergo this phonological process.

\(^7\) In Kadiwéu, sonorants are deleted in lexical word final position (see example 7, 8 for instance), and obstruent consonants are deleted in functional word-final position and before a consonant.

\(^8\) Some verbs are irregular and undergo suppletion rather than the addition of person affixes as mentioned before. The verb to say is such a case. This is its full paradigm: \(eji\) ‘I say’, \(eni\) ‘you say’, \(ee\) ‘he/she says, \(ejinaGa\) ‘we say’.
clause. An example of the first type of control is in (12), and (13) is an example of the second type.

(12) oyatita napalite me oylojoGo o-y-ati-ta napalite me o-y-lojoGo PL-3SUBJ-use-3APPL machete C PL-3SUBJ-pound
‘They use machete to pound it’

(13) Pedro eeta Ecode me dinoojete domoojia Pedro ee-ta Ecode me d-noojete domoojia Pedro 3SAY-3APPL Ecode C INV-buy car ‘Pedro tells Ecode to buy a car’

Additionally, the complementizer *me* appears in subject topicalization and *wh*-questions. Complementizer *me* stacking is possible, as shown in (14), if there are two or more topics. In spite of the translation, there is no relative clause in (14); relative clauses are introduced by the complementizer *ane* (Griffiths 1987).

(14) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)

ica noko me daGaxa me dataka
i-ca noko me daGaxa me d-ataka
M-CL day C lots C INV-miss
‘This day in which, a lot, he missed him’

(15) is an example of a *wh*-question. The co-occurrence of *wh*-words with a complementizer is common across languages (cf. Portuguese)

(15) igame me ecode ajowa iwaalepodi nadi?
igame me ecode a-jo-wa iwaalo-epodi Ø-nadi
where C Ecode F-CL-PL woman-PL 3SUBJ-see
‘Where Ecode has seen those women?’

Adverbial clauses are introduced by *nige* and *naGa*. The complementizers *nige* and *naGa* bear tense: *naGa* is past-tense (16) and *nige* is future (17), as shown by the minimal pair below:

(16) Pedro yatemati Ecode naGa yoe diimigi
Pedro y-atemati Ecode naGa y-oen diimigi
Pedro 3SUBJ-tell Ecode C 3SUBJ-build house
‘Pedro told/tells Ecode (the date) when he built a house/houses.’

(17) Maria yatemati Ecode nige yoe Pedro diimigi
Maria y-atemati Ecode nige y-oen Pedro diimigi
Maria 3 SUBJ-tell Ecode C 3SUBJ-build Pedro house
‘Maria told/tells Ecode (the date) when she will build a house.’

Kadiwéu has two different negation markers for main and embedded clauses. One is *aG*- which attaches to the verb of the main clause and has scope over the main clause exclusively (18). The second negative marker, *daGa*, follows a complementizer and has scope over the subordinate clause (20) (Sandalo 1997).
(18) Pedro ayemaa me dawii
Pedro aG-y-emaa me d-awii
Pedro NEG-3SUBJ-love/want C INV-hunt
‘Pedro does not want to hunt’

(19) Pedro eeta Ecode me daGa dinoojeteta domoojia
Pedro ee-ta Ecode me daGa d-noojete-ta domoojia
Pedro 3SAY-3APPL Ecode C NEG INV-buy-3APPL car
‘Pedro told/tells Ecode not to buy a car for him’

In order to negate the main clause and the subordinate clause, both aG and daGa must be used, as seen in example (20) and as previously discussed in Sandalo (1997). Negation is therefore another piece of evidence for the classification of a sentence as main or embedded, since main clauses take aG-, whereas embedded clauses take daGa.9

(20) Pedro aGeeta Ecode me daGa dinoojeteta domoojia
Pedro aG-ee-ta Ecode me daGa d-oojete-ta domoojia
Pedro NEG-3SAY-APPL Ecode C NEG INV-buy-3APPL car
‘Pedro did not say to Ecode not to buy a car.’

The differences between main and embedded clauses discussed in the present section will be important to understand the differences of the quotation structures discussed in section 3 and the relation between tense in main and embedded clauses in section 4.

3. Quotation: direct and indirect speech vs. reportative evidentiality

Kadiwéu grammatically marks indirect speech and direct speech, as well as having a reportative evidential.

Indirect speech includes the fully inflected verb to say and an embedded clause headed by the complementizer me (21). Direct quotation also includes the verb to say, but there is no embedding (22):10

Indirect speech
(21) ee me daGa emii
ee me daGa emii
3SAY C NEG 2GO
‘She/he said that you should not go’

Direct speech
(22) ee eGemii
ee aG-emii
3say NEG-2go
‘She/he said: don’t go.’

Recall that Kadiwéu has two kinds of negative markers: one used in main clauses, and another used in embedded clauses. Therefore, the different negative markers in (22) and (23) is additional evidence that indirect quotation involves embedding, whereas direct quotation does not. Main and embedded clauses are quite evident in Kadiwéu.

9 daGa may be irrealis.
10 The verb to go is irregular: ejigo ‘I go’, emii ‘you go’, igo ‘he/she goes, eniGa ‘we go’.
The word *one* is not a verb, since verbs, including auxiliaries in Kadiwéu, are always inflected for person in main and embedded clauses as mentioned before. The word *one* has been interpreted as an indirect evidential by Couto (2018). More specifically, I analyze it as a reportative evidential. That is, it is an evidential that signals that someone else, although someone unspecified, is the source of the statement made.

Below is an example of a sentence with *one* from a narrative in the Kadiwéu Corpus that tells how the ancient Kadiwéu soldiers used to kill enemies. It is an oral narrative without a verifiable source. The usage of *one* in Kadiwéu narratives is quite frequent, and, in this study, the data are all from narratives, but it can be used outside a narrative if the source of the information is unknown and not verifiable according to the native speaker consulted. But it quite difficult to elicit it via experimentation.

(23) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)

```
one oyatita waca loladi me oyoke
one o-y-at-ta waca l-oladi me o-y-oke
EV PL-3SUBJ-use-3APPL cow 3POSS-leather C PL-3SUBJ-choke
```

‘It has been said that they used to employ a cow’s piece of leather to choke (people)’

4. The evidential *one* and tense

4.1 In main clauses

As mentioned before, Kadiwéu has the following tense markers: *domaGa* ‘prospective future. And the following aspect markers: *jaG* ‘perfective’, and *baanaGa* ‘imperfective’. The aspect markers occur before tense:

(24) Kadiwéu Bible

```
ja domaGa Gadilakiiticetiwaji
jaG domaGa Ga-d-ilakiitice-tiwiawi
ASP T 2OBJ-be.good-PL
micataGa nalokodeGecajo baanaGa domaGa dinigaanye
me+i+ca+taGa nalokodeGecajo baanaGa domaGa d-inigaanye
C+M-CL-APPL runner ASP T INV-win
```

‘You were about to be good like a runner about to win’

The evidential morpheme *one* precedes aspect and tense. In the data in (26-27) *one* occurs before the prospective future *domaGa*.

(25) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)

```
one domaGa yacakoGo me yelowadi
one domaGa y-acakoGo me y-elowadi
EV T 3SUBJ-hit C 3SUBJ-kill
```

‘It has been said that he was about to hit to kill.’

---

11 An example of an auxiliary verb is as follows. The verb *to go* can be used as a main or auxiliary verb.

```
ejigo jawii
nejigo j-awii
I GO 1SUBJ-hunt
I will hunt
```

This is the only case in which tense is marked by an auxiliary verb in Kadiwéu, and it may be an influence from Portuguese.
(26) Kadiwéu Bible
Herodes one domaGa lowooGo me i-wi anigota Pedro
Herodes one domaGa l-owooGo me i-wi a-nigo-ta Pedro
Herodes EV T 3POSS-plan C 3-SEE 2SUBJ-kill-APPL Pedro
‘It has been said that Herodes’ thoughts were about to see and kill you Pedro’

There follows a sentence with the aspect marker jaG ‘perfective’. Note the aspect marker jaG and one fuse together frequently, but they can also occur separately as in (28) in more careful speech:

(27) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)
jona lowooGo me yeloadi aniwa lodawa
jonaG l-owooGo me y-elowadi a-ni-wa l-odawa
T+EV 3POSS-thought C 3SUBJ-kill F-CL-PL 3POSS-wife
‘It has been said that his thoughts were to kill his wife’

The example (29) was given by a native speaker when asked whether jaG and one could be unfused.

(28) one jaG lowooGo me yeloadi aniwa lodawa
one jaG l-owooGo me y-elowadi a-ni-wa l-odawa
EV T 3POSS-thought C 3SUBJ-kill F-CL-PL 3POSS-wife
‘It has been said that his thoughts were to kill his wife’

In main clauses, therefore, the evidential word precedes aspect and tense and it can co-occur with a future tense marker. Tense and aspect maintain parallel interpretations in evidential and nonevidential contexts in main clauses. Thus, it seems that the evidential one carries no tense meaning. The situation is not quite the same in embedded clauses, however. Next section explores the reportative evidential one in embedded clauses.

4.2 In embedded clauses

The data below show that the evidential one occurs after a complementizer. The evidential is speaker oriented again and it means that information in the embedded clause was acquired by the speaker orally (not visually) but there is no verifiable source. Examples (29) shows the complementizer me co-occurring with one, and (30-31) shows one with the complementizer naGa:

Kadiwéu Bible

(29) ee mone aneotedoGoji lionigi
ee mone aneotedoGoji l-io-nigi
3say C+EV God 3POSS-son-DIM
‘He said that it has been said that he is the son of God.’

(30) noGone noove lakata
naGa+one noove l-akata
C+EV 9 3POSS-time
‘When, it has been said that, it was nine o’clock…’
Nevertheless, not all the complementizers can co-occur with one. The evidential one can occur with the complementizer me and naGa, but it does not co-occur with the future complementizer nige according to the Kadiwéu native speakers consulted. Moreover, the corpora (Kadiwéu Corpus and the Bible) have no occurrence of one and nige. So, the evidential one could not be added to sentence (32a) from the Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform). If this is added, the sentence results in a contradiction according to consultants:

The sentence in (32b) containing an evidential word, according to a consultant, could be instead a sentence without a complementizer:

Faller (2006: 16) claims that “if an evidential can scope under tense, we expect it to receive its time reference from it. If it scopes over tense, we expect its time reference to be indeterminate”. The latter is the case of Kadiwéu main clauses: the time when the information is acquired is indeterminate and the event time interpretation in the sentence does not seem to come at all from the evidential word. In the case of embedded clauses, tense is in the complementizer and it scopes over the evidential. Thus, the fact that nige and one cannot co-occur is evidence that one has a tense/aspect nature. Smirnova (2016), as mentioned before, argues that evidentials order the event reference time with respect to the time of acquisition of information. The evidential refers to information acquired in the past still valid in the present, and it is incompatible, therefore, with future events.

The sections below examine some of the distributional properties of one in a sentence. The question is whether this functional word is at the CP or IP level of the sentence. An investigation of its distribution can shed light on its grammatical position within a clause.
5. The syntactic position of the functional word *one*

5.1 The evidential word *one* and negation

If there is no tense word, the negative morpheme *aG*- attaches to the verb in a main clause. If there is an evidential, however, the evidential plus the negative morpheme will fuse together, and negation takes wide scope. Example (34) has two sentences with the reportative evidential *one*, the negative operator being in the second sentence. Note that there is a tense marker in the first sentence (prospective future), but, in the second sentence, there is no tense marker because recent past/present is unmarked in Kadiwéu.\(^\text{12}\)

(34) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)

\begin{verbatim}
one domageete alati ii one alati acowa iwaalo
one domaga+ee-te a-alati-i aG+one Ø-alati a-ca-wa iwaalo
ev T+3SAY-3APPL 2SUBJ-move-PL NEG+EV 3SUBJ-move F-CL-PL woman
\end{verbatim}

‘it has been said that he (the husband) is about to say to her: move. It has been said that the woman has not moved.

Example (34) is from a narrative about a woman who would turn into a jaguar (*negedioli* ‘jaguar woman’). It is a mythological narrative and the source of the facts told about this jaguar woman are all unknown and have been seen by no one, thus, the frequent use of *one*. Still, it is an oral narrative and, therefore, all the knowledge comes from an indeterminate oral source.

The negation marker, the evidential *one*, and the verb can also form a single cluster.

(35) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)

\begin{verbatim}
pida naGajowa lodawa me elodi aoneGewote libodigi
pida naG-a-jo-wa l-odawa me Ø-elodi aG-one-ewote libodigi
conj C-F-CL-PL 3POSS-wife C 3SUBJ-ran NEG-EV-make 3POSS-notice
\end{verbatim}

‘But when his wife was the one to ran away, it has been said that she hasn’t given any notice.’

It is possible, however, to separate the negative and evidential cluster from the verb as seen in (36), but the negation plus evidential cluster is inseparable.

A clarification about the syntactic structure of (36) is necessary, since there is an occurrence of the complementizers *naGa* and *me* together in the same clause. Kadiwéu, like Danish, allows complementizer stacking. So, in an adverbial CP that contains a topicalized subject, the complementizer *nige/naGa* can co-occur with the complementizer *me* as in (36). Therefore, in (36), there is an adverbial embedded clause that contains a topicalized subject.

Recall that *one* is higher than tense. One may question the order of tense and negation. Negation precedes tense (37). That is, when tense is present, negation does not attach to the verb, but occurs before tense in an independent functional word:

\[^\text{12}\] In Portuguese, the reportative evidential with negation is translated by “diz que não”. The translation to Portuguese of this utterance is ‘*Diz que ele (o marido) ia dizer para ela: mude de lugar. Diz que não mudou a mulher*’.
Negation offers strong evidence that the evidential *one* is at the sentential level (IP), since it interacts and fuses with negation. There is no occurrence in the corpus of a negation-plus-evidential plus another negation operator attached to the verb. There is no case of double negation.

The next section provides additional evidence for the claim that *one* is at the sentence level.

5.2 The evidential *one*, conditionals, and complementizers

The evidential *one* occurs after a complementizer when it appears in an embedded clause as seen. This means that the information in the embedded clause is unverifiable. And *one* appears after the conditional word *baGa*:

(38) Kadiwéu Corpus (Tycho Brahe Platform)

ica waca baGa one yoniciwadi aliciagi apolicaGanaGa
i-ca waca baGa one yoniciwadi aGliciagi apolicanaGa
M-CL cow COND EV strong NEG-like horse
eliodi loyaGagi
iliodi l-oyaGagi
much 3POSS-burden
‘If (it has been said that) a cow is strong, it wouldn’t be like a horse in its burden’

(39) Kadiwéu Bible

pida elitidi lolacidi baGa one eniteloco iiGo anele
pida eledi-di l-olagi-di baGa one y-ani-teloco iiGo anele+ele
but other-PL 3POSS-seed-PL COND EV 3SUBJ-fall-APPL soil C+good
‘But if (it has been said that) some seeds have fallen on soil that is good...’

Note that the nominal phrase referring to the subject of the clause is dislocated to the left of the conditional marker, indicating that the conditional is a functional head that can bear a nominal phrase in its specifier. Since Kadiwéu has different complementizers, I assume that the conditional word is also a complementizer.

This section shows that *one* can be embedded in complement clauses and conditional clauses. This is additional evidence that *one* is at the sentential level (IP).

5.3 The evidential *one* and the negative conditional

Kadiwéu has a negative morpheme *ade* that introduces negative conditional clauses, which has not been reported previously in the Kadiwéu literature, but is frequent in narratives. Since it introduces embedded conditional clauses, I also analyze it as a complementizer.
"Lord be our help, if not we die!"

"Take care! If not, he kills her!"

"It has been said, surprisingly, that this woman cannot give milk"

"In times plenty of water, we ride on cows. It has been said, surprisingly, that they do not sink."

This is the only case in which the evidential merges with a complementizer. Departing from a generative point of view, the evidential seems to undergo displacement to the CP (head movement to CNEG), and a new mirative meaning is introduced. Again, there is no case of a double negative when atone is present. Further research is necessary, however, to investigate whether there is indeed displacement to the CP or whether this is a distinct evidential word as postulated by Couto (2018).

6. Final Remarks

In Kadiwéu, a language spoken in Brazil from the Guaikuruan language, has a situation in which the quotative evidential one is higher than tense in main clauses but lower than tense in embedded clauses since, in this case, the complementizer is tensed. This is a special case to investigate the relation between evidentiality and tense.
This work shows that the quotative evidential *one* is a functional category seated within IP. Therefore, it is under the scope of tensed complementizers. Since the evidential word *one* cannot occur with a future complementizer, it means that there is a restriction between future tense and the relational word only if tense scopes over the evidential.

As mentioned before, Faller (2006 :16) claims that “if an evidential can scope under tense, we expect it to receive its time reference from it. If it scopes over tense, we expect its time reference to be indeterminate”. Kadiwéu offers strong support to this claim.

Sandalo (2023) argues that external and internal arguments can be fronted to a TP specifier position in Kadiwéu, as it happens with the object in a passive clause. Unlike passives, however, the clause has two syntactic arguments in TP specifiers. The multiple specifier situation, according to Sandalo (2023), generates the language agreement alignment and hierarchy. The presence of the evidential and the tense head in TP may be involved in the possibility of the language hierarchical alignment and agreement. It deserves further investigation.
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