Article

Grammatical and Lexical Dialectal Variation in Spanish: The Case of *deísmo*

Edita Gutiérrez-Rodríguez [1] and Pilar Pérez-Ocón [2,*]

[1] Departamento Lengua Española y Teoría de la Literatura, Universidad Complutense de Madrid, 28040 Madrid, Spain; editagutierrez@ucm.es
[2] Departamento de Filología, Comunicación y Documentación, Universidad de Alcalá, 28801 Madrid, Spain
* Correspondence: mpilar.perez@uah.es

Abstract: *Deísmo* is a non-standard dialectal phenomenon consisting of the insertion of a non-required preposition *de* 'of' before a non-finite clause: *Me apetece (de) salir* 'I want to go out'. In most papers, *de* is analyzed as a defective complementizer that does not change the meaning of the sentence. However, *deísmo* has also been associated with a prospective meaning with some verbs, and *de* has been considered as a marker of evidentiality with visual perception verbs. In this paper, we provide a formal analysis for *deísmo* constructions, in which *de* is located in a projection below that occupied by *de* in *dequeísmo* constructions). Secondly, we will show the results of a questionnaire whose objective is to figure out if there is an evidential meaning associated with *deísmo*. For the questionnaire, we made a preliminary search in Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural (COSER) and in Spanish Web Corpus 2018 (Sketch Engine). From this, we selected the most frequent verbs with *deísmo* in Castilla-La Mancha (Spain). An examination of the results revealed that, on the one hand, *deísmo* is lexically associated with certain verbs, but not necessarily with all of the same semantic class; and on the other hand, that there is not an evidential meaning associated with *deísmo*.

Keywords: left periphery; *deísmo*; evidentiality; prepositional complementizer; infinitive clauses; dialectal variation

1. Introduction

Deísmo is a vernacular phenomenon of variation in the Spanish complementizer system that has received little attention in the linguistic literature (only in recent years, starting with Di Tullio (2011, 2012) and the seminal work of Camus (2013)), especially when compared to a partly parallel phenomenon such as *dequeísmo*.

As we will see in Section 2, *deísmo* consists of introducing the preposition *de* 'of' before infinitival complements of certain verbs (see example (1)). On the other hand, *dequeísmo* is the introduction of the preposition *de* 'of' before the sentential complement—with a finite verb and complementizer *que* 'that'—of a different group of verbs (see example (2)). Although sometimes it has been said that both phenomena are basically the same, we will maintain that the particle *de* occupies different positions in the two constructions:

(1) a. La vida me hace **de** llorar [CORPES]
         The life CL.DAT-make of cry.INF
         'Life makes me cry'.
     b. Resulta **de que** ahora el presidente es otro [CORPES]
         Turns out of that now the president is other
         'It turns out that the president is now a different one'.

The understanding of this construction, however, is very relevant in the framework of studies that in the last twenty years, starting with Rizzi (1997), have shown that the area traditionally assigned to conjunctions and wh-words, in the left sentence periphery, is more complex than initially thought.

The main goal of this paper is to find out whether the particle *de* 'of' that appears in the *deísmo* is a marker of indirect evidentiality, as has been proposed for equivalent constructions in other languages (*van* in Brabant Dutch) or for the form *de* that appears in *dequeísmo*. For this purpose, we use data from Castilla-La Mancha, a region where *deísmo* is a relatively widespread phenomenon in the spoken language. Section 2 offers a review of the syntactic characteristics of the construction with *deísmo* and proposes an analysis in which *de* is considered a complementizer that occupies a low position in the left sentence periphery, the same position that Italian *di* 'of' or Catalan *de* 'of' occupies before non-finite subordinate clauses. Section 3 reviews the studies on *deísmo* and the various proposals of the meaning of the form *de*: from being a complementizer without meaning, as most papers maintain, to having an evidential meaning (as proposed in Carrasco and Peinado (2022) for Spanish or in other languages for similar constructions). Finally, Section 4 presents the empirical study carried out mainly through two surveys, in which verbs of various lexical classes were presented in contexts of direct and indirect evidentiality. To choose the verbs for the first survey and ensure that they presented realizations with *deísmo*, we made an initial search in the oral interviews from the Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural (COSER), which allowed us to look for regional data. Secondly, based on the results of this questionnaire, we designed a second one. For this, we also made an additional search in another corpus that allows searching for regional data, in the newspapers of Castilla-La Mancha: Spanish Web 2018 (Sketch Engine) (2018). Although the number of speakers consulted is low, with 20 informants between the two surveys, the results show that the form *de* is not associated with any evidential meaning.

2. What Is *Deísmo*?

In this section[1] we establish the main properties of *deísmo*. In Section 2.1 we define this construction, which is a phenomenon of variation in the Spanish complementizer system; in Section 2.2 we explain what type of verbs appear more frequently with *de* 'of' in non-finite subordinate sentences. We will use this classification to prepare our questionnaire, which is presented in Section 4. Section 2.3 is dedicated to the syntactic nature of the particle *de*, and Section 2.4 to its position in the left periphery.

2.1. Definition of Deísmo

Deísmo is the apparition of the preposition *de* 'of' before non-finite sentences that are the object (2a) or the subject (2b) of a verb[2] that does not lexically require the preposition:

(2) a. Le propuse de encontrarnos en casa
         her.CL-propose of meet.INF at home
         'I proposed her to meet at home'.
     b. En el fondo le gusta de acompañar a Paco [CORPES]
         deep down CL.DAT-like of accompany.INF to Paco
         'Deep down he likes to accompany Paco'.

The preposition *de* is the standard way to introduce non-finite sentences in Italian, French or Catalan. Rizzi (1991, p. 516) claims that the preposition does not head a prepositional phrase in those examples, but is the complementizer of the non-finite subordinate, which is why the sentence can be pronominalized using an accusative pronoun (3b):[3]

(3) a. Credo di voler andare (it.)
         believe of want.INF go.INF
         'I think I want to go'.
     b. Lo credo (it.)
         CL.ACC believe
         'I believe it'.

2.2. Contexts of Deísmo. Types of Verbs

In this section we will see which type of verbs are more commonly found with *deísmo*. However, as Camus (2013, p. 24) indicates, there is a random split between *deísmo* and *non-deísmo* contexts, in the sense that not all the verbs that belong to one of the classes we will see in this section are constructed with *de* and thus there seems to be a kind of lexical selection among those semantic classes. For instance, inside the group of psychological verbs of affection, some of the verbs which are very frequent, such as *gustar* 'to like', are not frequently seen with *deísmo* in Castilla-La Mancha, but this same verb can appear with *de* in Andalucía, as the Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural (COSER) (Fernández-Ordóñez 2005) data show (see Table 1). We will see in the results of our questionnaires that there is also a lot of individual variation, because even among speakers from the same village that clearly have *deísmo*, not all of them use the preposition *de* with the same verbs of a semantic class (see Section 4).

Table 1. Occurrences of examples of *deísmo* with eleven verb classes in COSER.

Predicates	Castilla-La Mancha	Other Provinces	Total
Psychological predicates			
Apetecer 'to feel like'	0	1 Huesca, 1 Huelva	2
Costar 'to have a hard time'	0	1 Alicante, 1 Barcelona, 1 Valencia	3
Doler 'to hurt'	0	0	
Gustar 'to like'	1 Albacete, 2 Cuenca, 2 Toledo	1 Badajoz, 1 Córdoba, 1 El Hierro, 2 Granada, 1 Huelva, 1 Huesca, 1 Jaén, 1 Lérida, 1 Sevilla, 1 Teruel, 1 Valencia	16
Interesar 'to be interested', temer 'to be afraid'	0	0	
Predicates of occurrence			
Ocurrir 'to happen', suceder 'to happen'	0	0	
Tocar 'to be one's turn'	1 Cuenca, 1 Toledo	1 Ávila, 1 El Hierro, 1 Huesca, 2 La Coruña, 1 Palencia, 1 Teruel, 1 Zaragoza	10
Predicates of opportunity or convenience			
Convenir 'to be in one's best interest'	0	0	
Predicates of influence			
Aconsejar 'to advise', amenazar 'to threaten', permitir 'to permit', proponer 'to propose', recomendar 'to recommend', rogar 'to beg', solicitar 'to request', sugerir 'to suggest'	0	0	
Decir 'to tell'		2 Alicante, 1 Cantabria, 1 Huesca, 1 La Rioja, 1 Soria, 1 Valladolid	7
Mandar 'to tell'	5 Toledo	1 León	6
Ordenar 'to order'	0	2 Zamora, 1 Lugo	3
Pedir 'to ask'		1 Almería, 1 Murcia	2
Prohibir 'to forbid'	0	1 Tenerife	
Pseudoimpersonal predicates			
Hacer falta 'need'	0	1 Badajoz, 1 Málaga	2
Ser costumbre 'to be customary'	0	1 Guipúzcoa, 2 Madrid, 3 Navarra, 1 Palencia, 1 Segovia, 1 Zamora	9
Ser {necesario/una lástima} 'to be {necessary/a pity}'	0	0	

Table 1. *Cont.*

Predicates	Castilla-La Mancha	Other Provinces	Total
Predicates of intention			
Intentar 'to try'		1 Badajoz, 1 La Rioja, 1 Lugo, 1 Salamanca	4
Probar[4] 'to try'		1 Lérida	1
Propositional attitude predicates			
Considerar 'to consider', creer 'to believe', imaginar 'to imagine', saber 'to know'	0	0	
Pensar[5] 'to think'		1 Huelva, 1 Huesca, 1 Palencia, 1 Pontevedra, 1 Santa Cruz de Tenerife	5
Predicates of will			
Aceptar 'to accept', esperar 'to hope', preferir 'to prefer'	0	0	
Estar deseando 'to look forward to'	2 Albacete	1 Álava, 1 Burgos, 1 Córdoba, 1 Guipúzcoa, 1 Jaén, 1 Madrid, 1 Palencia, 2 Sevilla, 1 Valladolid, 1 Zamora	13
Necesitar 'to need'	0	1 Huelva, 1 Zaragoza	2
Querer 'to want'	1 Toledo	1, Huelva, 1 Lanzarote, 1 Málaga, 1 Palencia	5
Causative predicates			
Hacer 'to make'	1 Ciudad Real, 1 Toledo	1 Álava, 1 Cáceres, 1 Menorca, 1 Tenerife, 1 Zaragoza	7
Perception predicates[6]			
Ver 'to see'	1 Toledo	2 Badajoz, 1 Huelva, 1 Málaga, 2 Sevilla	7
Oír 'to hear'	0	1 Badajoz, 1 Barcelona	
Escuchar 'to listen'	0	0	
Auxiliary verbs[7]			
Poder 'can'	0	1 Córdoba, 1 Lérida	2
Soler 'used to'	0	1 Burgos, 2 Madrid, 1 Sevilla	4

Among all the classes below, the Standard Spanish structure without *de* is more common than the one with the preposition. The first five classes are the ones that have been described to appear more frequently with *deísmo* (Di Tullio 2011, p. 180; Camus 2013, sct. 3.2; De Benito and Pato 2015, p. 35; Gutiérrez-Rodríguez 2019, p. 96; Carrasco and Peinado 2022):

(a) Psychological predicates with an infinitive clause as subject: *apetecer* 'to feel like', *costar* 'to have a hard time', *doler* 'to hurt, to regret', *gustar* 'to like', *interesar* 'to be interested', etc.

(b) Predicates of occurrence with a subject infinitive clause: *ocurrir* 'to happen' *suceder* 'to happen', *tocar* 'to be one's turn', etc.

(c) Predicates of influence or conative verbs: *decir*[8] 'to ask', *mandar* 'to order', *pedir* 'to ask', *proponer* 'to suggest', *prohibir* 'to forbid', etc.

(d) Pseudoimpersonal constructions with copulative *ser* 'to be': *ser costumbre* 'to be customary'; *ser necesario* 'to be necessary', *ser una lástima* 'to be a pity', etc. Many of these constructions have a modal meaning, such as *ser necesario* 'to be necessary', *ser fácil* 'to be easy', etc.

(e) Predicates of intention: *intentar* 'to try', *probar* 'to try'.

(f) Propositional attitude predicates: *considerar* 'to consider', *creer* 'to believe', *pensar* 'to think', etc.

(g) Predicates of will. The verb *desear* 'to wish' accepts *of* only in the periphrasis *estar deseando* lit. 'to be wishing'.

(h) Causative predicates: the causative verb *hacer* 'to make' can take the preposition *of*, as in *Me hizo de cantar* 'he made me sing'.

(i) Perception verbs: *ver* 'to see', *escuchar* 'to listen', etc.

(j) Auxiliary verbs: *poder* 'can', *soler* 'to use to'.

In view of these classes, there does not seem to be a common meaning in the verb that explains the preposition *de* in *deísmo*, as we have seen that almost all classes of verbs that can take a non-finite sentence, can also take *de* (with all the lexical and individual variation due to the non-standard nature of the phenomenon).

2.3. The Particle de 'of' as a Complementizer

In this section, we will review the arguments that have been used to show that the segment *de* cannot be considered a subcategorized preposition that heads a prepositional phrase. Camus (2013) has already shown that *de* cannot be considered a preposition in *deísmo* constructions; in this section we will review his arguments.

If we compare the *de* from *deísmo* and the preposition *de* subcategorized using a verb, as in *olvidarse* 'to forget', we see that the syntactic behaviour of both elements is entirely different. The complement of the "real" preposition *de* can be a non-finite clause (4a), a finite clause headed by *que* 'that' (4b) or a noun phrase (4c) (Di Tullio 2012, p. 268; Camus 2013):

(4) a. Me olvidé de comprar el pan
         CL.1SG-forgot.PAST.1SG of buy.INF the bread
         'I forgot to buy the bread'.
     b. Me olvidé de que venía
         CL.1SG-forget.PAST.1SG of that come.PAST.3SG
         'I forgot that you were coming'.
     c. Me olvidé de tu cumpleaños
         CL.1SG-forget.PAST.1SG of your birthday
         'I forgot your birthday'.

In the case of *deísmo*, only the non-finite clause can appear with *de*. A neuter pronoun such as *eso* 'that' is impossible (5a), and a finite clause could be possible (5b) but it would be considered an example of *dequeísmo* (Di Tullio 2012, p. 268):

(5) a. *Nos pidió de eso
         CL.1PL.DAT-ask.PAST of that
         'He asked that'.
     b. Nos pidió de que vieras a su familia
         CL.1PL.DAT-ask.PAST of that you see his family
         'He asked to see his family'.

Furthermore, the non-finite sentence can be cliticized by the accusative clitic *lo* 'it', as any other sentential direct object:

(6) a. ¿Mirarás de averiguar esos datos? (Camus 2013, p. 16)
         have a look.FUT.2SG of find out.INF those figures
         'Will you try to find out those figures?'
     b. —Sí, lo miraré
         yes CL.3SG.N.AC-have a look.FUT.1SG
         '—Yes, I will try'.

In Spanish prepositional complements can never be cliticized using the accusative pronoun *lo: Depende de Juan* (Lit. depends of Juan)/*Lo depende*.

Another piece of evidence against the prepositional nature of *de* in *deísmo* structures is offered by its behaviour in pseudocleft sentences (Camus 2013, p. 18). The fronted phrase must include *de* if it refers to a subcategorized prepositional phrase (7a). However, if the *de* is not a real preposition, it does not have to appear in the fronted phrase (7b):

(7) a. De lo primero que me alegro es de hacer lo correcto ([Camus 2013](), p. 19)
of the first that CL.1sg-be happy.PRES.1SG is of do.INF that correct
'The first thing that makes me happy is doing the right thing'.
   b. Lo primero que no permito a mis hijos es de llegar tarde
The first that not allow.PRES.1SG to my children is of arrive.INF late
'The first thing I do not allow my children is to be late'.

In addition, the non-finite clause can be the subject with so-called pseudoimpersonal verbs of psychological affection such as *apetecer* 'to feel like', *pesar* 'to regret', among many others. All these verbs have a dative experimentizer and a subject that can be realized by a determiner phrase in agreement with the main verb, as in (8a), or as a clause (8b):

(8) a. Me duelen sus desplantes ([Camus 2013](), p. 19)
CL.1SG-hurt.PRES.3PL their rudeness.PL
'Their rudeness hurts me'.
   b. Me duele de no haberlo dicho a tiempo
CL.1SG-hurt.PRES.3SG of not have.INF-CL.3.N.AC say.PP on time
'I regret not having said it before'.

In (8a), *sus desplantes* agrees with the verb *duelen* because it is the subject of the clause; the non-finite clause in (8b) is also the subject. As there are not prepositional phrases in the subject position, we can affirm that *de no haberlo dicho a tiempo* in (8b) is not a prepositional phrase.

Finally, as we expect from a complementizer, *de* moves with the clause in the case of topicalization (9a), contrastive focus (9b) or right dislocation (9c) (examples from [Camus 2013](), p. 20):

(9) a. ¿Verdad que no les permites a tus hijos de llegar tarde?
true that not CL.3.PL.DAT-allow.PRES.2SG to your children of arrive.INF late
'You do not allow them to be late, do you?
—Eso es, de llegar tarde no se lo permito.
that is, of arrive.INF late not 3.CL.DAT-CL.3.N.AC allow.PRES.1SG
—That's true, that I do not allow it to them.'
   b. De gastar ese dinero le da vergüenza, no de tenerlo.
of spend.INF that money CL.3.DAT-give.PRES.3SG shame not of have.INF.CL.3SG.M.AC
'It's spending that money that embarrasses him, not to have it.'
   c. Esto mismo no permito, de llegar tarde.
this self not allow.PRES.1SG of arrive.INF late
'This I do not allow, to be late.'

To sum up, all this evidence shows that, in *deísmo* clauses, *de* is not a real preposition that heads a prepositional phrase; instead, it can be considered a complementizer, as we explain in the next paragraphs.

2.4. The Complementizer de 'of' and Its Position in the Left Periphery

We have seen that the sequence <*de* + infinitive clause> can be replaced by the accusative pronoun *lo*, as a *that* clause does. The more extended analysis is that the element *de* is not a real preposition but a prepositional complementizer ([Rizzi 1997]()). Hence, it does not head its own prepositional phrase. The segment *de* can be considered, as [Di Tullio](https://) ([2011](), [2012]()), [Camus]() ([2013]()) and [Gutiérrez-Rodríguez]() ([2019]()) proposed, an overt realization of the COMP node that heads the embedded infinitive clause. We detail below which position in the left periphery of the sentence the complementizer can occupy.

[Rizzi]() ([1997]()) and subsequent work assume that the left periphery is complex and contains different functional heads and their projections: two fixed components, with the heads of Force and Finiteness; and two components that are activated only if needed, the Topic Phrase and the Focus Phrase. The Force Phrase is responsible for the distinction

among types of clauses: declaratives, exclamatives, interrogatives, etc., while Finiteness contains the specification for finite and non-finite clauses:

(10)   Force P > TopP > FocP > FinP > TP

For Italian, Rizzi (1997, 2001) proposed that the complementizer *che* 'that' occupies the head of ForceP, while *di* 'of', which takes a non-finite clause, heads FinP. In Spanish, the complementizer *que* 'that' heads ForceP and thus precedes topics, as we can see in the examples in (11) from Brucart and Hernanz (2015, p. 92), where *que* precedes the topic (*la Traviata*):

(11) a.   El inspector cree que la Traviata, la Castafiore la cantó en París
            The policeman thinks that la Traviata, la Castafiori CL.FEM.SG-sing.PAST in Paris.
      b.   *El inspector cree la Traviata que la Castafiore la cantó en París
            The policeman thinks la Traviata that la Castafiori CL.FEM.SG-sing.PAST in Paris.

Rizzi claims that *di* in Italian occupies a lower position and heads FinP, as its position with respect to the topic (*il tuo libro* in the example below) shows:

(12) a.   Credo, il tuo libro, di apprezarlo molto (Rizzi 1997, p. 288)
            Think, the your book, of liking-CL.AC.M a lot
            'I think that I like your book a lot'.
      b.   *Credo di, il tuo libro, apprezarlo molto
            Think of, the your book, liking-CL.AC.M a lot.

Brucart and Hernanz (2015, p. 92) showed that the complementizer *de* in Catalan occupies the same position, lower than *que* 'that' in the complementizer system:

(13) a.   A la soprano li fa il.lusió, [Top La Traviata], <u>de</u> cantar-la al Liceu
            To the soprano CL.-do anticipation, la Traviata, of sing-CL.AC.FEM to the Liceu.
            'The soprano is looking forward to singing la Traviata in the Liceu'
      b.   *A la soprano li fa il.lusió <u>de</u>, [Top La Traviata], cantar-la al Liceu
            To the soprano CL.-do anticipation of, la Traviata, sing-CL.AC.FEM to the Liceu.

Following Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (Forthcoming), we propose that, in *deísmo* sentences, the segment *de* is a prepositional complementizer which occupies the lower functional head Fin. Although the data revealed some degree of inconsistency among speakers, probably due to normative pressure, most of the speakers agreed that topics precede *de* in *deísmo* sentences:[9]

(14) a.   Propuso, la película, de verla mañana
            Propose, the film.F.SG, of see.INF-CL.AC.F.SG tomorrow
            'He proposed to see the film tomorrow'.
      b.   ??/* Propuso de, la película, verla mañana.
(15) a.   Permitió, el libro, de leerlo más tarde
      b.   ??/* Permitió de, el libro, leerlo más tarde.

To sum up, we have seen that the segment *of* in *deísmo* is not a preposition that heads a prepositional phrase, but a complementizer in Fin, a head below the one where *that* originates, in the left periphery.

3. The Meaning of the Particle *de* 'of'

Our aim in this section is to investigate whether the segment *de* 'of' is a meaningless subordination marker in constructions with *deísmo* (as Gómez Torrego 1999, Camus 2013 and De Benito and Pato 2015 have argued), or whether it provides some kind of meaning (at least for some class of verbs). For example, it has been said that *de* has a prospective value with verbs of will, intention or influence (Di Tullio 2011): *Me propuso de ir al cine* 'He

suggested to me to go to the movies'. It has also been proposed that it is an evidential marker when combined with verbs of visual perception (Carrasco and Peinado 2022): *La vimos de bailar* 'We saw her dance'. On the other hand, the question of whether the particle *de* contributes any meaning to the construction with *deísmo* has been related to its value in the construction with *dequeísmo* (the use of *de* before finite clauses, as in *Creo de que hay tiempo suficiente* 'I believe there is enough time'). In the case of *dequeísmo*, these values range from stylistic factors, such as the desire to be more expressive or emphatic (e.g., in Náñez 1984 and De Mello 1995), to nuances related to epistemic modality, such as decreasing the speaker's commitment to the utterance (Bentivoglio and D'Introno 1977; Schwenter 1999; and Demonte and Soriano 2005, among others). Since our research focuses on finding out whether *de* contributes evidential value in *deísmo*, we will only refer in this section to proposals in which *de* is attributed a modal value in a broad sense as a marker of doubt, hearsay or, in general, weak speaker commitment, weak involvement or the introduction of a speaker personal perspective.

There are at least three reasons to conduct an investigation into whether *de* has evidential meaning in the construction with *deísmo*, that is, whether it encodes the source of knowledge of the information conveyed by the speaker. First, while *deísmo* and *dequeísmo* need not be coincident phenomena, the two have been related in the literature and feature an unselected particle *de* heading a subordinate sentence. Second, it has been proposed that some complementizers are indirect evidentiality markers (see Rooryck 2001): for example, *that* in English or *van* in Brabant Dutch (Van Craenenbroeck 2004); or certain uses of *que* in root sentences in Spanish (Demonte and Soriano 2014 and Sánchez López 2020, among others). Given that in Section 2 we have shown that the particle *de* is a complementizer, it makes sense to ask whether it encodes evidential or modal values. Third, as we will see in Section 3.2, Carrasco and Peinado (2022) have argued that the particle *de* is a morpheme of indirect evidentiality with verbs of visual perception, so it is plausible to investigate whether this value extends to other verb classes. In the following sections we will examine the relationship between evidentiality and complementizers in general (Section 3.1), and the relationship between evidentiality and the complementizer *de* in Spanish (Section 3.2).

3.1. Evidentiality and Variation in the Complementizer Phrase

According to Rooryck (2001), Aikhenvald (2018) and Sánchez López (2020), among the expressions (or grammatical strategies) that encode the source of information are complementizers. As we will see, at least *that* in English, *van* in Brabant Dutch and *de* in Spanish have been studied as complementizers encoding evidential values. Before studying these complementizers in Sections 3.1.2 and 3.2, let us digress briefly to see what is considered *evidentiality* and what the limits with the epistemic modality are.

3.1.1. Some Brief Notes on Evidentiality and Epistemic Modality

Evidentiality is a semantic-functional notion that encodes the source of knowledge of the information. In the sentence *I saw John arrive late*, the verb of perception encodes that the information comes from the speaker's visual experience, while in the example *Logically, John will be late*, the adverb presents the information as a reasoning; if we add a parenthetical expression, *According to my brother, John will be late*, the information is attributed to a person other than the speaker. Although the evidential meaning of these examples is indisputable, it is not clear that evidentiality is a grammatical category in languages such as English or Spanish, as tense or person are.[10] These languages lack markers that express evidentiality in a systematic way. On the other hand, it is also not clear that evidentiality and epistemic modality are distinct notions.

For the purposes of this paper and for the design of the questionnaires (see Appendices A and B), we will basically follow Aikhenvald's proposal on evidential values. As we will see in Section 4, for our research we create contexts of direct and indirect evidentiality. In contexts of direct evidentiality (16a,b), the speaker has first-hand information because he or she has seen it, heard it or participated in some way in the situation. In (16c,d) the

information has been obtained indirectly, but it is still personal because it comes from the speaker's own reasoning, which either deduces it from observed facts or assumes it using logical reasoning (e.g., based on cause-effect), general knowledge, etc. In (16e,f) the access to information is indirect and not personal; it is accessed by the words of other people; it is second-hand information.

(16)   Evidential values (adapted from Aikhenvald 2018, p. 13)
         FIRST-HAND INFORMATION (DIRECT AND PERSONAL)
   (a)   Visual: information acquired using sight.
   (b)   Non-visual sensory: obtained using other senses.[11]
         INDIRECT AND PERSONAL INFORMATION
   (c)   Inference: based on visible or tangible evidence or results.
   (d)   Assumption: information other than that obtained by tangible results; includes logical reasoning, assumptions or general knowledge.
         SECOND-HAND INFORMATION (INDIRECT AND NOT PERSONAL)
   (e)   Reported: information heard from another person without reference to the person who said it.
   (f)   Quotative: information heard from another person with reference to the authorship of the quoted source.

Regarding the limits between evidentiality and epistemic modality, there are authors who understand that they are distinct categories, despite the proximity between both notions. The evidentiality specifies the source of the information and epistemic modality, and the epistemic modality is reserved for grammatically encoding the degree of the speaker's commitment to the truth of the proposition (*Surely John knows* vs. *It is possible that John knows*). The issue, however, is not straightforward because the source of the information has effects for the speaker's commitment to the truth of the utterance. Let us illustrate this divergence with the examples in (17), taken from Fábregas (2020, p. 169):

(17) a.   Evidentemente, han entrado en casa cuando no estábamos
           'Evidently, they entered the house when we were not home'.
      b.   Según mi hermano, nos vas a llamar hoy
           'According to my brother, you are going to call us today'.

Both sentences have declarative modality, but they do not show the same degree of commitment of the speaker to the propositional content. With *evidentemente* 'evidently', the speaker considers that he/she has first-hand evidence to take the content of the proposition at face value. The expression *según mi hermano* 'according to my brother' indicates that the evidence comes from a secondary source and blames someone else for the commitment to the truth of the propositional content. In this last case, the speaker may not take the truth of the proposition for granted, as it shows the possibility of adding the expression *pero yo no lo creo* 'but I do not believe it' in (18a). Notice, however, that it is not possible to make the same claim in (18b), since it is paradoxical to deny what we believe to be self-evident.

(18) a.   Según mi hermano, nos vas a llamar hoy, pero yo no lo creo
           'According to my brother, you are going to call us today, but I do not believe it'.
      b.   #Evidentemente, han entrado en casa cuando no estábamos, pero yo no lo creo
           'Evidently, they entered when we were not home, but I do not believe it'.

What these data show is that evidentiality influences the degree of the speaker's commitment to the truthfulness of what is asserted in the declarative modality. As we will see in the next sections, many studies understand *evidentiality* in a broad sense that includes the speaker's commitment to what is asserted: the more direct the source of the information, the greater the speaker's commitment. For the purposes of our research in Section 4, we will understand *evidentiality* as the encoding of the speaker's source of information, but without losing sight of the close boundaries with epistemic modality.

3.1.2. Complementizers as Marks of Evidentiality

Let us recall that one of the purposes of our research is to find out whether the particle *de* 'of' in the construction with *deísmo* provides an evidential meaning. Since we have shown that *de* is a complementizer (see Section 2.2), it makes sense to ask whether other complementizers have been described from this perspective in other languages. We will analyze two cases: *that* in English and *van* in Brabant Dutch.

According to Van Gelderen (1999; taken from Rooryck (2001, p. 63)), the complementizer *that* has evidential value with verbs of language. In the example of (19), the presence of *that* implies general knowledge, i.e., that all the attendees knew that the wine was corked; however, the absence of the complementizer implies that the content of the subordinate sentence is John's opinion. For this reason, in the example of (19), it would be ungrammatical to dispense with *that* because the context attributes the information to the general knowledge of all the attendees:

(19)   They all looked at each other across the table, but none of them dared to say anything. There was an uncomfortable silence. Finally, John said *(that) the wine was corked.

Van Craenenbroeck (2004, p. 43) notes that the presence of *van* in front of non-finite clauses in the Brabant Dutch varieties is related to evidential nuances with different classes of verbs. With raising and epistemic verbs, the absence of *van* implies direct evidentiality, while its presence means indirect evidentiality. In (20) *van* denotes that the speaker has direct evidence of the truth of the proposition; for example, because he is seeing how Marie enjoys swimming. If *van* is elided the speaker claims that Marie enjoys swimming because the speaker has been told so or infers it somehow, but he or she could be wrong. It follows from this asymmetry that in (21) *van* cannot appear with an expression meaning direct evidence of the type *in mijn ogen* 'in my eyes'.

(20)   Marie schijnt (van) zwemmen plezant te vinden (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, p. 43)
Mary seems (of) swim (INF) agreeable to find
'Mary seems to enjoy swimming'.

(21)   In mijn ogen scheen hij (*van) zich gisteren te amuseren
in my eyes seemed he (of) himself yesterday to enjoy
'In my view he seemed to enjoy himself yesterday'.

With epistemic verbs (22), the presence of *van* also affects the meaning of the sentence. According to Van Craenenbroeck (2004, p. 44), when *van* is not present in the sentence, the speaker "is convinced that he can speak for everyone; he is convinced of the truth of the proposition expressed in the complement clause". The presence of *van*, on the contrary, introduces doubts about the truth expressed using the non-finite clause.[12]

(22)   Ik meen (van) voor iedereen te kunnen spreken (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, p. 44)
I believe (of) for everybody to can speak
'I believe I can speak for everyone.'

A final fact that demonstrates the evidential value of *van* in these varieties of Dutch is that this particle cannot appear with factive verbs, since they presuppose the truth of the complement. Note the difference implied by the change of the factive verb *to regret* for a non-factive verb such as *to think*: *John {regrets/thinks} that the door is open*. Only with the factive verb can we be certain that the door was open. This fact correctly predicts that in (23) the factive verb *blijken* 'to turn out' cannot be combined with the particle *van*, which is an indirect evidential marker of uncertainty.

(23)   Hij blijkt (*van) er niet bij betrokken te zijn (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, p. 48)
he turns.out (of) there not with involved to be
'It turns out he is not involved in it'.

Finally, it is interesting to draw attention to Van Craenenbroeck's hypothesis about the progressive loss of meaning of the particle *van*. According to this author, in Brabant Dutch the particle *van* has gone from being a spatial marker in the nominal domain to an aspectual or evidential marker in the verbal domain. The use as a spatial preposition still exists in examples such as *Jan komt van Brussel* 'John comes from Brussels' and the use as an evidential marker is the one we have reviewed in this section in the non-finite constructions. We will not go into the details of this, but both usages share what Van Craenenbroeck calls a *dissociation* reading that is in the original meaning of *van* 'away from'.

There is a third phase of loss of meaning of complementizer *van*. In the non-Brabant part of the southern Dutch area, the use of complementizer *van* is completely optional and this lexical item has neither evidential nor aspectual meaning. The summary of his proposal on *van* is as follows: "At first it was a mere preposition, then it started functioning as a complementizer but still retained its semantic features and finally, it lost those features and became a mere grammatical element" (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, p. 61).

Finally, the author extends the hypothesis to the complementizers of other languages and proposes to analyze French *de* and Italian *di* as grammaticalized variants (24). In this sense, the complementizer *de* in the constructions with *deísmo* in Spanish (25) would coincide with the mentioned languages, since it does not contribute any meaning, as we will demonstrate in Section 4.

(24) a. Jean a essayé de chanter (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, p. 63)
John has tried of sing (INF)
'John has tried to sing'.
     b. Gianni ha tentato di cantare
John has tried of sing (INF)
'John has tried to sing'.

(25) Juan ha intentado de cantar
Juan has tried of sing (INF)
'Juan ha intentado cantar'.

In short, some complementizers are not simple subordinating elements, but evidential marks in a broad sense: for example, in English *that* with the verbs of language implies general knowledge; and in Brabant Dutch *van* introduces evidential (information that is not first-hand) or epistemic (uncertainty) values. We will see in the following section that evidential values have also been attributed to the complement *de* 'of' in Spanish.

3.2. The Complementizer de 'of' as a Evidentiality Marker

As we advanced at the beginning of Section 3, *dequeísmo* has been explained as the encoding of an attenuating modal/evidential meaning (Bentivoglio and D'Introno 1977; García 1986; Schwenter 1999; Demonte and Soriano 2005; Guirado 2006; Del Moral 2008; RAE-ASALE 2009; and Gómez Molina 2011, among others). According to these authors, the presence of the particle *de* before a finite sentence adds a low commitment to the propositional content expressed using the subordinate clause headed with the complementizer *que* 'that'. In a similar direction as Van Craenenbroeck (2004) for *van* (see Section 3.1.2), some authors have related the original locative/source meaning of the preposition *de* to an interpretation of separation or distance with respect to the content of the subordinate clause in *dequeísmo* (García 1986, p. 50; Schwenter 1999, p. 76). In this respect, Del Moral (2008, p. 183) stated that there has been a "categorial reanalysis of Spanish preposition *de* as having extended its concrete prepositional use of spatial marker to an abstract modal marker in dequeísta clauses". Demonte and Soriano (2005) go a step further in the formal analysis of the complementizer *de* and place it as the head of an evidential phrase (see Section 2).

In Silva-Villar and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2012), some of the arguments put forward to defend the evidential character of the complement *de* in the construction with *dequeísmo* are questioned. Both the presumed frequency of non-first person subjects and the tendency

to use past tenses (as markers of distance or less engagement) have been challenged in a survey conducted by these authors. First, they did not find that the percentage of third-person-only *dequeístas* speakers was significant. Second, certain parameters, such as the discourse type or mode, can determine the choice of grammatical subject. Finally, *dequeísmo* in Modern Spanish occurs increasingly with verbs of cognition, and particularly when the subject of the main clause is the first person, according to the study carried out by Del Moral (2008, p. 191). The example of (26) is, in fact, a typical case of *dequeísmo*.

(26)   Yo creo de que [...] hay un tiempo para todo [CREA, oral]
        I believe of that [...] there.is a time for everything
        'I believe there is a time for everything'.

Finally, Silva-Villar and Gutiérrez-Rexach (2012) called into question other arguments that Demonte and Soriano (2005) have adduced to defend the attenuation evidential value of *dequeísmo*. Among other evidence, the incompatibility of *dequeísmo* with factive verbs or with verbs showing commitment by the speaker such as *garantizar* 'guarantee' and *jurar* 'swear'. However, the following data show that *dequeísmo* is possible with these verbs: *lo que hizo fue lamentar de que el presidente...* 'What he did was to regret that the president...; *Te garantizo de que cuando lo hayas hecho, ocurrirá algo mágico* 'I give you my word that when you have done it, something magic will happen' (Silva-Villar and Gutiérrez-Rexach 2012, p. 22).[13] Finally, if *de* checks the evidentiality feature, it is predicted that it will be incompatible with evidential adverbs occupying the same position. However, this prediction is not borne out, as shown in the following example: *Evidentemente de que las cifras que ellos hablan me parece que es imposible captar esa posibilidad para tanto recurso...* 'Evidently the numbers that they are talking about look to me as if it impossible to capture the possibility for so many resources...' (Silva-Villar and Gutiérrez-Rexach 2012, p. 20).

These brief notes on *dequeísmo* have served to question its evidential value and will also serve to focus the debate on whether the complementizer *de* has any meaning in the construction with *deísmo*. Camus (2013) points out that *dequeísmo* and *deísmo* are different phenomena and proof of this is precisely that the complementizer *de* in *deísmo* has no evidential meaning, unlike what some authors have proposed for *dequeísmo*. According to Camus (2013), neither the geographical areas in which both phenomena are observed nor the kinds of verbs that appear in both constructions coincide.[14] Although not all authors agree on whether the particle *de* has evidential value in *dequeísmo*, studying whether *deísmo* has this meaning may shed light on the relationship between both phenomena. For this reason, we will carry out our experiment in Section 4, in which we do not find a correlation between *deísmo* and evidential meaning. As we saw in Section 2, the preposition *de* could be considered a meaningless marker that introduces non-finite sentences, parallel to the one in the other Romance languages. In the remainder of this section, we will review what has been said about the meaning of *de* in *deísmo* constructions.

With regard to *deísmo*, it has been said that it is an expletive element without meaning (Camus 2013). According to De Benito and Pato (2015, p. 41), "*de* would have originally conveyed some kind of source meaning [...], but that, later on, the rapid increase in the use of *de* was possible because its very broad meaning favored its weakening and it eventually became a barely significant introductory particle to the infinitive, rather than a real contributor to the meaning of the sentence". As can be seen in this quote, these authors support a thesis that has also been defended by Van Craenenbroeck (2004) for *van* (see Section 3.1.2) and by Del Moral (2008) for *dequeísmo* (Section 3.2). In these two papers, the evidential meaning of *van* and *de* was related to the original locative/source meaning of these particles. Unlike these studies, De Benito and Pato (2015) did not see clearly that the particle *de* brings a general meaning to the present construction with *deísmo*.

Di Tullio (2012, 2022) attributed a prospective value to *deísmo* with volitional verbs (verbs of desire, influence, intention or proposal). The particle *de* brings out the future-oriented feature that these verbs usually express:

(27)   María propuso a su hermana de salir
        María suggested to her sister of go.out.INF
        'María suggested to her sister to go out'.

With verbs that have more than one meaning, such as *decir* 'to tell', *pensar* 'to think' and *probar* 'to try', *deísmo* forces the prospective reading, especially when it combines with process and actions infinitives (see notes 15, 16 and 21 for the interpretation of these verbs). When *de* is combined with *decir*, *pensar* and *probar*, these verbs change from being verbs of language and thought to volitional verbs. The verb *decir* comes to mean 'to propose', the verb *pensar* becomes synonymous with 'to plan' and the verb *probar* does not mean 'to demonstrate' but 'to try'. With verbs that are not volitional, the particle *de* does not seem to contribute any meaning, so that it cannot be asserted that *deísmo* inherently has a prospective meaning:

(28)   a.   Dijo de ir juntos
              said.PAST.3SG of go.INF together
              'He proposed to go together'.
        b.   Estaba pensando de llegar pronto
              was.PAST.1SG thinking of arrive.INF early
              'I was planning to arrive early'.
        c.   Probé de ir en coche
              tried.PAST.1SG of go.INF in car
              'I tried going by car'.

Finally, Carrasco and Peinado (2022) studied *deísmo* with verbs of visual perception. For these constructions, they proposed that the segment *de* is a morpheme that heads an evidential phrase. The authors related the type of complement that the verb *ver* 'to see' selectsto different meanings. When *ver* selects a nominal phrase or a non-finite verb (29a,b), the complements represent the objects of perception. The speaker reports what he/she has seen (*direct perception* or *non-epistemic*, according to the authors). In semantic terms, the complement in (29a) would be a first-order entity, a person, and in (29b) it is a second-order entity, an event (Carrasco and Peinado 2022, p. 85). However, in (29c), if the verb selects a finite clause, the speaker reports what he knows and conveys knowledge that has been acquired by sight (*indirect* or *epistemic perception*). The complement in (29c) is a third-order entity, i.e., a proposition, which reproduces a content of consciousness. The question is what is meant by the construction with *deísmo*: *Juan ha visto de llover* (Lit. Juan has seen of rain.INF). Formally, this example would seem to be closer to (29b); however, the authors claim that meaning is closer to (29c).

(29)   a.   Juan ha visto a María
              Juan has seen to María
              'Juan has seen María'.
        b.   Juan ha visto llover
              Juan has seen rain.INF
              'Juan has seen rain'.
        c.   Juan ha visto que llovía
              Juan has seen that rained
              'Juan saw that it was raining'.

A proof to defend their proposal was based on the contrasts in (30), which are examples adapted from Carrasco and Peinado (2022, p. 101). As we have just seen, the construction with *deísmo* (*Juan ha visto de llover*) and the construction with the finite clause (*Juan ha visto que llovía*) refer to states of consciousness, so that we could not attribute contradictory knowledge to the subject. Precisely for this reason, the example without *deísmo* (30a) is natural, but not the examples with *deísmo* and the finite clause (30b), according to the judgments of the speakers consulted by the authors. In (30b), we could not say that Juan knows that it is raining, because he has seen it, but he thinks that it is not raining.

(30) a. Juan ha visto llover, pero ha pensado que el vecino regaba sus plantas
'Juan saw it raining, but thought the neighbor was watering his plants'.
b. #Juan ha visto {que llovía/de llover}, pero ha pensado que el vecino regaba sus plantas
'Juan saw that it was raining, but he thought that the neighbor was watering his plants'.

The authors referred to "indirect perception" (with a finite clause or with *deísmo*), when the speaker conveys knowledge acquired by sight and not when the object of perception is presented (with a non-finite clause without *deísmo*). In the construction with *deísmo*, the visual experience is always direct, not inferred;[15] the *indirect* nature refers to the fact that what is presented is knowledge and not the object of perception. In their hypothesis, *de* is a morpheme that heads an evidential phrase and encodes this meaning of *indirect perception*. It is not known, however, to what extent this interpretation extends to other verbs that admit *deísmo* and are not verbs of perception. This is a question to be investigated.

The aim of Section 3, which we now close, has been to review what has been said about the meaning of *deísmo* in Spanish. For this purpose, we have reviewed in Section 3.1.2 a construction similar to *deísmo* in Brabant Dutch. In Section 3.2, we reviewed the possible meaning of the particle *de* in *deísmo* and *dequeísmo*. From Section 3, we can deduce that it is plausible to think that *deísmo* could convey some indirect evidential value, but the data provided in the various studies dealing with this question have been called into question. In the next section we will precisely carry out a survey to show whether *deísmo* has some evidential meaning.

4. Deísmo and Evidentiality: The Data

The aim of our study was to find out whether *deísmo*, a frequent phenomenon in the non-standard language of Castilla-La Mancha, carries an evidential meaning analogous to that which has been described, that is, on the one hand for phenomena similar to *deísmo* in other languages and, on the other hand, for *dequeísmo* or *deísmo* in Spanish (see Section 3).

The method we followed for our research was the following: First, starting from the list of frequent verbs with *deísmo* collected in the literature (see Section 2.2), we made an initial search in the Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural (COSER), which allowed us to look for regional data. Having observed the small number of realizations with *de* in interviews as long as those in COSER, and realizing the difficulty of obtaining the data in the right evidential contexts, we decided to use a questionnaire to obtain our data. We are aware of the limitations of using this type of data instead of examples of real use.

With the verbs chosen, we designed a preliminary questionnaire that was carried out by our contacts with eight informants from Castilla-La Mancha who have *deísmo* in their dialects. Secondly, based on the results of this questionnaire, we designed a second one. For this, we also made an additional search in another corpus that allows searching of regional data, in newspapers of Castilla-La Mancha: Spanish Web 2018 (Sketch Engine) (2018). On this occasion, we went to two towns in Castilla-La Mancha (Pozuelo de Calatrava and Pedro Muñoz) to conduct the questionnaire in person with twelve other informants. Since we were seeking to understand the meaning, if any, associated with the complementizer *de*, we needed, in addition to obtaining the speakers' responses to the questionnaire, to ask for clarification about the nuances of meaning associated with the construction.

As we will see in the following sections, obtaining data on *deísmo* entails some difficulties: First of all, it is mostly oral data that only occur in certain areas. This forced us to limit our searches to corpora including information on the region of origin of the speakers. Secondly, *deísmo* is a substandard phenomenon on which there is not much normative pressure and in which there is much variation among speakers, who alternate between standard constructions and constructions with *deísmo*. Third, there is no uniform geographical distribution of the verbs that may appear in the construction with *deísmo*. We know from the COSER study by De Benito and Pato (2015) of some villages[16] where speakers have been recorded, but this does not mean that *deísmo* is used by the majority of people or that there is a uniform solution in those localities. In our case, the way to make

sure that our informants were speakers with *deísmo* was to contact them through fellow linguists who knew them. This fact limited the number of informants, but we believe that the data collected serve to confirm that the complementizer is not an evidential marker in the construction.

4.1. Deísmo Data in Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural (COSER)

The first reason to look for examples of *deísmo* in COSER is that *deísmo* is a rural oral phenomenon and, therefore, examples would be expected to appear in this corpus. COSER is made up of recordings of the language spoken in rural areas of the Iberian Peninsula. It consists of long interviews that were obtained with the aim of offering a representative sample of the dialectal variety. The second reason is that, as opposed to other linguistic corpora, such as the Corpus de Referencia del Español Actual (CREA), the Corpus del Español del Siglo XXI (REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de Datos (CORPES) n.d.) and the Corpus del Español de Mark Davies (Davies 2016) in the COSER data can be selected by province.

The nature of *deísmo*, which is an oral, colloquial phenomenon belonging to a vernacular variety, makes it difficult to find data on the phenomenon in the corpora. This explains why, both in this article and in most of the previous works, the amount of data used is small and, therefore, there is not much quantitative analysis. As for the source of the data of the papers on *deísmo*, they either come from corpora (COSER and REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de Datos (CORPES) n.d.) or were elicited through surveys of native speakers of the *deísmo* variety. That is the case of Camus (2013) and Carrasco and Peinado (2022, which used grammaticality judgments from the introspection of native speakers of the variety. Neither article provided data on the number of speakers or examples consulted, nor performed quantitative analysis of the data.)

Based on the classification of Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (Forthcoming), the verbs we searched for in COSER are the verbs shown in the Table 1, grouped by lexical class. As shown in Table 1, we found no examples of some verbs in constructions with *deísmo* anywhere in Spain. With other verbs, there were examples, but not from Castilla-La Mancha. Finally, for some of these verbs we did obtain examples in this region; we marked the occurrences in brackets: *gustar* 'to like' (5), *tocar* 'to be one's turn' (2), *mandar* 'to order' (5), *estar deseando* 'to look forward to' (2), *querer* 'to want' (1), *hacer* 'to make' (2) and *ver* 'to see' (1).[17] When there were no constructions with *deísmo* with any of the verbs, it is indicated with the number 0. When there were examples, these are indicated with the exact number next to the province.[18] The last column shows the total number of constructions.

4.2. The First Questionnnaire

4.2.1. Design

We designed a first questionnaire with twenty questions, of which four were control questions (see Appendix A).[19] We passed this questionnaire to eight informants through our contacts. Since we were seeking to find out whether the particle *de* 'of' has evidential value, we created two contexts with the most frequent verb classes in the construction with *deísmo* (psychological, influence, intention and will). The verbs chosen were *aceptar* 'to accept', *apetecer* 'to feel like', *convenir* 'to be in one's best interest', *decir* 'to tell', *gustar* 'to like', *intentar* 'to try' and *proponer* 'to propose', all of which are very frequent verbs in everyday speech. In the survey, the seven verbs appeared in contexts of direct evidentiality (you have heard, you are seeing, you see, etc.), and indirect evidentiality (you have been told, apparently, you think that), as in the following example with the verb *intentar* 'to try':

(31) Question 8 (direct evidentiality) and question 3 (indirect evidentiality) of the first questionnaire:

8. Imagínate que estás en el salón con tu hijo y estás viendo cómo monta una estantería de IKEA. Dirías. . .

'Imagine that you are in the living room with your son and you are <u>watching</u> him assemble an IKEA shelf. Would you say. . .'

> Mi hijo está intentando de montar la estantería.
> 'My son is trying to assemble the bookshelf'
> Sí / No / No estoy seguro/a
> 'Yes / No / I am not sure'.

3. Te han dicho que tu hijo lleva toda la tarde arreglando la lavadora. Dirías. . .

You have been told that your son has been fixing the washing machine all afternoon. Would you say. . .'

> Mi hijo está intentando de arreglar la lavadora.
> 'My son is trying to fix the washing machine.'
> Sí / No / No estoy seguro/a
> 'Yes / No / I am not sure'.

In this first questionnaire with a small number of informants, we wanted to find out if there was *deísmo* with some verbs and if there was evidentiality in the construction. Our speakers, who are identified in the table with the letter H (Hablante 'speaker') and a number from 1 to 8, were consistent with their answers to the control questions, but we could not find patterns in the evidentiality values, nor was there much uniformity in the acceptance of the sentences with *deísmo*, as we will see when discussing the results in Section 4.2.3.

4.2.2. Results

Table 2 summarizes the results of the first questionnaire. The first column shows the verbs with their two contexts (direct and indirect evidentiality) and the number of the corresponding question in the questionnaire (see Appendix A). The other columns correspond to the possible answers: *Yes, I would say it* (Yes), *No, I would not say it* (No) and *Not sure* (NS). The answers of the eight speakers are coded H1 (Hablante 1 'speaker 1'), H2 (Hablante 2 'speaker 2'), H3 (Hablante 3 'speaker 3'), etc.

Table 2. Results of the first questionnaire ordered by verb in its evidential context.

Questions from the First Questionnaire Ordered by Verb	Answers According to Evidentiality		
	Yes	No	NS
1. A mi hijo le **gusta** de nadar (directa) 'My child likes to swim'	H2	H1 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8	
16. A mi vecino le **gusta** de ir a los toros (indirecta) 'My neighbor likes to go to the bullfights'	H1	H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8	
20. Le **gusta** de pasear todas las tardes (directa) 'He likes to go for a walk every afternoon'	H2 H3 H5 H6	H1 H4 H7 H8	
12. Le **gusta** de ir al Retiro todos los días (indirecta) 'He likes to go to the Retiro every day'	H1 H2 H5 H6	H3 H4 H7 H8	
8. Mi hijo está **intentando** de montar la estantería (directa) 'My son is trying to assemble the bookshelf'	H1 H3 H4 H5 H6	H7 H8	

Table 2. *Cont.*

Questions from the First Questionnaire Ordered by Verb	Answers According to Evidentiality		
	Yes	**No**	**NS**
3. Mi hijo está **intentando** de arreglar la lavadora (indirecta) 'My son is trying to fix the washing machine'	H1 H2 H5 H6 H8	H3 H4 H7	
18. Mi amigo ha **aceptado** de ir al cine (directa) 'My friend has agreed to go to the movies'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H6	H5 H7 H8	
4. Mi amigo ha **aceptado** de venir a mi boda (indirecta) 'My friend has agreed to come to my wedding'	H1 H4 H6 H7 H8	H2 H3 H5	
7. Le **apetece** de tirarse del tobogán (directa) 'He feels like going down the slide'	H1 H2 H4 H6	H3 H5 H7 H8	
19. Le **apetece** de irse a casa (indirecta) 'He wants to go home'	H1 H2 H3	H5 H6 H7 H8	H4
5. Es obvio que le **conviene** de ponerse a la sombra (directa) 'It's obvious that it's good for you to go to the shade'	H2 H4 H8	H1 H3 H5 H6 H7	
11. Por lo visto, **conviene** de vacunarse (indirecta) 'It seems to be a good idea to get vaccinated'	H2 H4 H3	H1 H5 H6 H7 H8	
10. Me **propuso** de ir al cine (directa) 'He suggested to me to go to the movies'	H3 H4 H5 H7	H1 H2 H6 H8	
15. Le **propuso** de ir al cine (indirecta) 'He suggested to her to go to the movies'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8		
2. Le ha **dicho** de ir con ella a hacer la compra (directa) 'He told her to go shopping with her'	H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8	H1	
17. Le ha **dicho** de ir con ella a hacer la compra (indirecta) 'He told her to go shopping with her'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H7 H8	H6	
13. Se **preocupa** de cuidar el jardín 'He takes care of the garden'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6		
14. Finalmente, se **libró** de examinarse otra vez 'Finally, he got out of taking another exam'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6		
6. Mi madre me **pidió** que fuera con ella 'My mother asked me to go with her'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6		
9. Ese libro, Juan no **le** ha leído todavía 'That book, John has not read it yet'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H5x H6		

Table 3 shows the results of the first questionnaire ordered by verb and speaker. In this table, the speaker appears with his/her age (in parentheses) in the first row. When a 0 appears in one of the boxes, it means that the speaker did not accept the preposition *de* 'of' with that verb. If 1 appears, it means that the speaker only accepted the preposition *de* in one of the contexts, marked as *ind* (indirect evidentiality) or *dir* (direct evidentiality). Finally, 2 means that the speaker accepted the preposition *de* in both contexts. The table also includes the total number of realizations of the verb with *deísmo* (in the last column on the right) and the total number of realizations with *deísmo* of each speaker (in the last row).

Table 3. Results of the first survey: number of realizations per verb and per speaker.

	H1 (59 age)	H2 (56)	H3 (25)	H4 (26)	H5 (26)	H6 (56)	H7 (14)	H8 (64)	Total per Verb
Gustar[20] 'to like'	1 ind	1 dir	0	0	0	0	0	0	**2**
Gustar 'to like'	1 ind	2	1 dir	0	2	2	0	0	**5**
Intentar 'to try'	2	2	1 dir	1 dir	2	2	0	1 ind	**7**
Aceptar 'to accept'	2	1 dir	1 dir	2	0	2	1 ind	1 ind	**7**
Apetecer 'to feel like'	2	2	1 ind	1 dir	0	1 dir	0	0	**5**
Convenir 'to be in one's best interest'	0	2	1 ind	2	0	0	0	1 dir	**4**
Proponer 'to propose'	1 ind	1 ind	2	2	2	1 ind	2	1 ind	**8**
Decir 'to tell'	1 ind	2	2	2	2	1 dir	2	2	**8**
Total per speaker	**10**	**13**	**9**	**10**	**8**	**9**	**5**	**6**	

To facilitate the discussion in Section 4.2.3, we have summarized in Table 4 the results of Table 2 on the relationship between the verb and its evidential value (leaving aside the details about the speaker).

Table 4. Summary of Table 2: verbs and evidential values.

	Direct Evidential Context		Indirect Evidential Context	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Gustar	5	11	5	11
Intentar	5	2	5	3
Aceptar	5	3	5	3
Apetecer	4	4	3	4
Convenir	3	5	3	5
Proponer	4	4	8	0
Decir	7	1	7	1

For the verb *gustar*, only five speakers accepted *de* in the context of direct evidentiality compared to 11. This is to be expected if *de* is a marker for indirect evidentiality. However, the same results were obtained in the context of indirect evidentiality, when we would expect more affirmative answers with *de*. Analyzing the rest of the verbs in the same way, we observed that in no case were more examples with *de* accepted in indirect evidentiality contexts, except with the verb *proponer* (and even with this verb, half of the speakers also accepted *de* in direct evidentiality contexts).

Regarding the age of the informants, although the low number of speakers makes it difficult to draw conclusions regarding this variable, data grouped by age are presented in Table 5 below.

Table 5. Results of the first survey by age.

AGE	Examples Accepted with *de*	Direct Evidentiality Contexts	Indirect Evidentiality Contexts
14–26 (H3, H4, H5, H7)	32	17	15
56–64 (H1, H2, H6, H8)	38	17	21
Total	70	34	36

In terms of age, there were eight speakers in this first survey, which can be grouped into two age bands. The younger speakers accepted 32 realizations with *de*, of which there was a majority in contexts of direct evidentiality, although the difference with contexts

of indirect evidentiality was small (17/15). In the case of older speakers, they accepted more realizations with *de*, which was to be expected, but again the difference with younger speakers in the total number of sentences with *de* was small (38/32). In this case, there were more examples of indirect evidentiality but, again, we believe that no consequences can be drawn from the small difference: 17 of direct evidentiality versus 21 of indirect evidentiality.

4.2.3. Discussion

As shown in the last column of Table 3, all the verbs chosen present *deísmo*. The verb that presented it to a lesser extent was *convenir* 'to be in one's best interest', which speakers accepted in very few sentences with *de*, and is why is it was suppressed in the second questionnaire (see Appendices A and B). The most frequently accepted verbs with *de* were *proponer* 'to propose' (included in the second questionnaire) and *decir*[21] 'to tell' (excluded from the second questionnaire), which all speakers accepted with *de* 'of'. We did not include *decir de* 'to tell' as a verb of influence ('to propose') in the second questionnaire because there was no version without *de* 'of' with this meaning: *Me dijo *(de) ir al cine* 'He told me to go to the cinema'. The structure with *de* is similar to the value it acquires when combined with the subjunctive (*Me dijo que fuéramos juntos* 'He told me to go together'). The other two verbs we kept in the second questionnaire were *gustar* 'to like' and *intentar* 'to try', both of which had sufficient realizations and are representative of the psychological and intention verb classes. On the other hand, we decided to exclude *aceptar* 'to accept' and *apetecer* 'to feel like', the former because we already had another verb of the same lexical class with more realizations (*proponer* 'to propose'), and the latter because we left *gustar* 'to like' as the representative of the class.

As for the speakers (see Table 3), all of them accepted sentences with *deísmo* but the youngest (H7) accepted fewer (5 out of a total of 16 examples), which was not surprising because younger age is associated with greater use of the standard and, therefore, less use of vernacular varieties. Even so, we find it remarkable that a 14-year-old speaker accepted sentences with *deísmo*, and also that it was accepted by the three speakers aged 25 and 26 (H3, H4 and H5), which shows a certain vitality of the phenomenon. Moreover, there was no correlation between the age of the speakers and the number of realizations with *deísmo* (see Table 5 and its discussion above).

Regarding evidentiality (see Tables 2 and 3), we believe that *de* 'of' can be considered a marker of evidentiality in a speaker if this preposition is accepted consistently either in contexts of direct evidentiality or indirect evidentiality. However, if the speaker accepted the preposition *de* in direct evidentiality contexts with some verbs and in indirect evidentiality contexts with others, *de* was not considered a marker of evidentiality. If the speaker accepted sentences with the preposition *de* in both contexts, we also deduced that it has no evidential value. The results regarding evidentiality were inconsistent in all cases, except in speaker 1 (and only for the verbs *decir* 'to tell', *gustar* 'to like' and *proponer* 'to propose'), who accepted the examples with *de* only in the contexts of indirect evidentiality (see Table 3). However, this same speaker accepted the preposition with three other verbs (*aceptar* 'accept', *apetecer* 'to feel like' and *intentar* 'to try') in both direct and indirect evidentiality contexts. In Table 3, the total count of realizations with *deísmo* offered 12 results with *de* with indirect evidentiality value and 10 with direct evidentiality value. Table 4 shows that none of the verbs, except perhaps *proponer*, had more realizations of *de* in contexts of indirect evidentiality. Our conclusion, from this first limited sample, was that the particle *de* cannot be considered a marker of evidentiality, direct or indirect.

In summary, from the first questionnaire we concluded that, although there is *deísmo*, there is also an enormous variation and instability in the judgments regarding the presence of the particle *de* with a verb. This questionnaire also served us to confirm that there was *deísmo* in Castilla-La Mancha, even with verbs discarded in the literature, such as *gustar* 'to like', *intentar* 'to try' and *convenir* 'to be in one's best interest' (Camus 2013, p. 24).

4.3. Study of Deísmo in Spanish Web 2018 (Sketch Engine) *(2018)*

To complete the data obtained in COSER, we performed the same search for verbs in the Spanish Web 2018 (Sketch Engine) (2018), which enables the creation of regional subcorpora using written press. The data appeared in the following newspapers of Castilla-La Mancha: latribunadetoledo.es; lanzadigital.com; latribunadealbacete.es (accessed on 1 August 2023). We only obtained examples of the following verbs: *gustar* 'to like' (2), *hacer* 'to make' (12), *intentar* 'to try' (7), *pensar* 'to think' (1), *permitir* 'to allow' (1), *proponer* 'to propose' (2), *querer* 'to want' (2), *tocar* 'to be one's turn' (2) and *ver* 'to see' (4). The fact that they appear in written language makes us think that they are frequent in spoken language and that is why we decided to carry out the second questionnaire including some of these verbs (see Appendix B). Of the verbs that we initially searched for in COSER, we did not find any examples of *mandar* 'to order', *convenir* 'to be in one's interest', *hacer falta* 'to need', *ser costumbre* 'be costumary', *prohibir* 'to forbid', *pedir* 'to ask', *ordenar* 'to order', *oír* 'to hear' or *escuchar* 'to listen'.

4.4. The Second Questionnnaire

4.4.1. Design

For the second survey we decided to go to two La Mancha towns where we knew there was *deísmo* (Pedro Muñoz and Pozuelo de Calatrava). In both of them we had contact persons who previously looked for the twelve speakers with *deísmo*. The interviews took place in an informal setting in the homes of the informants, so we were able to note many additional data and realizations during our conversation.[22]

Given that on this second occasion we were in charge of reading the questions to the informants and writing down their answers, we were sure that they were not answering randomly or unreflectively. In addition, by conducting the interviews in person, we were able to better control the responses of the speakers, from whom we could ask for clarifications. This allowed us to take notes of their comments and to record other cases of *deísmo* while we were conversing.[23]

We designed this twenty-question questionnaire with ten different verbs, each in a direct and indirect evidentiality context, just as we did in the first survey (see Appendix B). We chose one verb from each lexical class (see Section 2.1).[24] The lexical classes and predicates chosen were the following: psychological verbs, *gustar* 'to like'; verbs of occurrence, *tocar* 'to be one's turn'; verbs of intention, *intentar* 'to try'; verbs of thought, *pensar* 'to think'; verbs of influence, *proponer* 'to propose' and *mandar* 'to order'; verbs of will, *querer* 'to want'; and causative verbs, *hacer* 'to make'. In addition, we included two semantically impersonal predicates, *ser costumbre* 'to be customary' and *hacer falta* 'to need'.

In all cases, we chose either the most frequent verb with *deísmo* in the data we obtained, or the verb that had examples of *deísmo* in Castilla-La Mancha. From the first questionnaire we kept *gustar* 'to like', *intentar* 'to try' and *proponer* 'to propose'. All three verbs had given results with *deísmo* in the first questionnaire and in Sketch Engine. We eliminated *decir* because it was not clear whether it forms a construction with *deísmo* (see note 21) and *convenir* 'to be advisable' because it is the verb that fewer speakers accepted with *de* 'of' in the first survey and did not give results in Sketch Engine. In return, we introduced verbs to cover more lexical classes with *deísmo*, so that we significantly increased the type of predicates with respect to the first questionnaire.

In the questionnaire, we added a fourth option for negative answers: *I would not say it, but I have heard it* (see Appendix B). The first objective of this question was to understand the degree of dialectal awareness of the informant. The second objective was to examine whether in this environment it really is an unknown construction, because if the construction is used, it could be the case that the informant says he does not use it because he considers that the standard form is better.

4.4.2. Results

Following the same criteria we used for Table 1 of the first questionnaire, Table 6 summarizes the results of the second survey. The first column shows the verbs with their two contexts (direct and indirect evidentiality) and the number of the corresponding question in the questionnaire (see Appendix B). The other columns correspond to the possible answers: *Yes, I would say it (Yes); No, I would not say it (No); I would not say it, but I have heard it (Heard);* and *I am not sure (NS).* The responses of the twelve speakers are coded with H1 (Hablante 1 'speaker 1'), H2 (Hablante 2 'speaker 2'), H3 (Hablante 3 'speaker 3'), etc.

Table 6. Results of the second questionnaire ordered by verb in its evidential context.

Questions from the Second Questionnaire Sorted by Verb	Answers According to Evidentiality			
	Yes	**No**	**Heard**	**NS**
1. A mi hijo le gusta de nadar (directa) 'My son likes swimming'	H4	H1 H2 H3 H5 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H1 H2 H3 H6 H7	
12. Aunque nunca me lo he encontrado en el parque, me han dicho que le gusta de ir allí todos los días (indirecta) 'Although I have never met him in the park, I have been told that he likes to go there every day'	H1 H2 H4 H5 H7	H3 H6 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H6	
2. Mi madre le ha mandado de hacer los deberes (directa) 'My mother told him to do his homework'	H1	H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H2 H4 H5 H6	
17. A los niños les han mandado de ir con uniforme (indirecta) 'The children have been instructed to wear uniforms'	H1 H3 H8 H9 H10 H11	H2 H4 H5 H6 H7 H12		H4
8. Mi hijo está intentando de montar la estantería (directa) 'My son is trying to assemble the shelf'	H2 H7	H1 H3 H4 H5 H6 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H1 H6	
3. Mi hijo está intentando de arreglar la lavadora (indirecta) 'My son is trying to fix the washing machine'	H5 H7 H9 H11 H12	H1 H2 H3 H4 H6 H8 H10	H1 H2 H6	
6. Quiero de alquilar mi apartamento (directa) 'I want to rent my apartment'		H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H5 H6 H7	
4. Mi amigo quiere de vender el coche (indirecta) 'My friend wants to sell the car'		H1 H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H6	
5. Me ha tocado de ir a Burgos (directa) 'I had to go to Burgos'	H1	H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H2 H3 H5 H6	
7. Me ha tocado de sacar al perro (indirecta) 'I had to take the dog out'	H2 H6	H1 H3 H4 H5 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H3 H5 H12	
19. Estoy pensando de ir al norte este verano (directa) 'I am thinking of going north this summer'	H1 H3 H8 H10 H11	H2 H4 H6 H7 H9 H12	H7 H9	H5

Table 6. *Cont.*

Questions from the Second Questionnaire Sorted by Verb	Answers According to Evidentiality			
	Yes	No	Heard	NS
9. Mi hijo está pensando de casarse pronto (indirecta) 'My son is thinking of getting married soon'	H1 H3 H4 H5 H6 H7 H11	H2 H9 H10 H12	H2 H8 H10	H8
10. Luis me ha propuesto de ir al cine (directa) 'Luis asked me to go to the movies'	H1 H2 H3 H6 H7 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H4 H5		
15. Pedro le propuso de ir al cine a mi hija (indirecta) 'Pedro asked my daughter to go to the movies'	H1 H2 H3 H4 H7 H9 H10 H11	H5 H6 H8 H12	H8	
11. Hace falta de barrer el suelo (directa) 'Sweeping the floor is necessary'	H4 H6 H7	H1 H2 H3 H5 H8 H9 H10 H11 H12	H5	
13. Hace falta de regar las plantas (indirecta) 'Watering the plants is necessary'	H7 H9 H11	H2 H3 H4 H5 H6 H8 H10 H12	H1	H1
18. En mi casa era costumbre de comer pavo en Nochebuena (directa) 'In my house it was customary to eat turkey on Christmas Eve'	H1 H2 H4 H9 H11 H12	H3 H5 H6 H7 H8 H10	H5	
14. Antes era costumbre de regalar el vestido a la novia (indirecta) 'It used to be customary to give the dress to the bride as a gift'	H1 H2 H3 H9 H10 H11 H12	H4 H5 H6 H7 H8	H5 H6	
16. Ahora nos hacen de fichar todos los días (directa) 'Now they make us clock in every day'	H1 H6 H7 H9 H10 H11	H2 H3 H4 H5 H8 H12		
20. Nos van a hacer de entrar a las ocho todos los días (indirecta) 'They are going to make us come in at eight o'clock every day'	H1 H3 H4 H5 H6 H8 H9 H10 H11	H2 H7 H12	H12	

Table 7 shows the results of the second questionnaire ordered by verb and by speaker (H1, H2, H3...). In this table, the speaker appears with his/her age in the first row. When a 0 appears in one of the boxes, it means that the speaker did not accept *de* with that verb. If 1 appears, it means that the speaker only accepted the particle *de* in one of the contexts, indicated as *ind* (indirect evidentiality) or *dir* (direct evidentiality). Finally, 2 means that the speaker accepted *de* in both contexts. The table also includes the total number of realizations of the verb with *deísmo* (in the last column on the right) and the total number of realizations with *deísmo* for each speaker (in the last row).

Table 7. Results of the second questionnaire: realizations per verb and per speaker.

	H1 (57 age)	H2 (53)	H3 (26)	H4 (60)	H5 (73)	H6 (74)	H7 (64)	H8 (61)	H9 (63)	H10 (52)	H11 (51)	H12 (35)	Total per verb
Gustar 'to like'	1 ind	1 ind	0	2	1 dir	0	1 ind	0	0	0	0	0	**5**
Mandar 'to order'	2	0	1 ind	0	0	0	0	1 ind	1 ind	1 ind	1 ind	0	**6**
Intentar 'to try'	0	1 dir	0	0	1 ind	0	2	0	1 ind	0	1 ind	1 ind	**6**
Querer 'to want'	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	**0**
Tocar 'to be one's turn'	1 dir	1 ind	0	0	0	1 ind	0	0	0	0	0	0	**3**
Pensar 'to think'	2	0	2	1 ind	1 ind	1 ind	1 ind	1 dir	0	1 dir	2	0	**9**
Proponer 'to propose'	2	2	2	1 ind	0	1 dir	2	1 dir	2	2	2	1 dir	**11**
Hacer falta 'to be necessary'	0	0	0	1 dir	0	1 dir	2	0	1 dir	0	1 ind	0	**5**
Ser costumbre 'to be customary'	2	2	1 ind	1 dir	0	0	0	0	2	1 ind	2	2	**8**
Hacer 'to make'	2	0	1 ind	1 ind	1 ind	2	1 dir	1 ind	2	2	2	0	**10**
Total per speaker	12	7	7	7	4	6	9	4	9	7	11	4	

To facilitate the discussion in Section 4.4.3, we have summarized in Table 8 the results of Table 6 on the relationship between the verb and its evidential value (leaving aside the details about the speaker).

Table 8. Summary of Table 6: verbs and evidential values.

	Direct Evidential Context		Indirect Evidential Context	
	Yes	**No**	**Yes**	**No**
Gustar	1	11	5	7
Mandar	1	11	6	6
Intentar	2	10	5	7
Querer	0	12	0	12
Tocar	1	11	2	10
Pensar	5	6	7	4
Proponer	10	2	8	4
Hacer falta	3	8	6	6
Ser costumbre	6	6	7	5
Hacer	6	6	9	3
Total	35	83	55	64

The results of Table 8 indicate that with four verbs (*pensar*, *proponer*, *ser costumbre* and *hacer*) more examples were accepted with *de* in contexts of indirect evidentiality. However, those same verbs were also accepted with *de* quite a few times in contexts of direct evidentiality, so the results did not clearly show that *de* is a marker of indirect evidentiality even with these verbs. In particular, the verb *proponer* had more results with *de* in direct evidential contexts. For the rest of the verbs, all of them received less acceptance of *de* in an indirect evidential context, which we would not expect if *de* were a marker of indirect evidentiality.

Nevertheless, there was a difference in the total values, insofar as in the contexts of direct evidentiality there were 83 realizations without *de* versus 35 with *de*, which was to be expected if *de* is a marker of indirect evidentiality. On the other hand, we would expect that in the contexts of indirect evidentiality the numbers would be reversed, so that there would be more examples with *de* than without it, but this was not the case, since while 55 examples were considered acceptable with *de*, there were 64 results with *de* considered unacceptable. Thus, even if the presence of *de* was slightly higher in indirect evidentiality contexts, from those numbers we cannot deduce that *de* is a marker of this type of evidentiality. We will expand on this in the following discussion. Before discussing the results of all these tables in detail in the next section, we conclude with a summary by age, as we did for the first survey. However, in the second questionnaire, there were only two young informants, so these data should be taken with caution.

The speakers who accepted *de* the most were those between 50 and 60 years old, and although in the three age groups the preposition was accepted a little more in contexts of indirect evidentiality, the difference in acceptance was not large: there were 49 accepted cases in total for indirect evidentiality and 38 for direct evidentiality. On the other hand, the two youngest speakers showed less acceptance of sentences with the preposition *de* than the others, which is to be expected with a dialectal phenomenon, as discussed before.

4.4.3. Discussion of the Second Survey

With respect to the verbs that already appeared in the first survey (*gustar* 'to like', *intentar* 'to try' and *proponer* 'to propose'), it was confirmed in this second questionnaire (see Tables 6 and 7) that there is *deísmo* with all three verbs and that *proponer* is the one which is more accepted in sentences with *deísmo*. The verb *querer* 'to want' was the only one of all the verbs studied with zero results (see Table 7). In this second survey we included this verb firstly because of its frequency in general Spanish and secondly because it had the most realizations of the verbs of will in COSER (see Table 1), and it also had results in Sketch Engine (see Section 4.3). The final result with zero realizations in our second questionnaire seemed to confirm what Camus (2013, p. 24) pointed out for this verb in Castilla-La Mancha, in spite of the data we had previously obtained in the corpora[25] (Table 1 and Section 4.3). All the other verbs presented five or more realizations of *deísmo* in Table 7. Only the verb *tocar* 'to be one's turn' had three, but this verb was the one for which more speakers indicated the answer *I would not say it, but I heard it*, which makes us think that it is also a verb used in the *deísmo* construction. It was also confirmed that *deísmo* is frequent in the causative construction in Castilla-La Mancha (10 results in Table 7), as noted by Camus (2013).[26]

As for the informants (all of them speakers with *deísmo* according to our contacts), we confirmed that they all accept sentences with *deísmo*. Although the sample of informants was small (12), there seemed to be no relationship between *deísmo* and age (see *Results by age* in Table 9), although the two younger speakers accepted the presence of the preposition *de* on fewer occasions.

Table 9. Results of the second survey by age..

AGE	Examples Accepted with *de*	Direct Evidentiality Contexts	Indirect Evidentiality Contexts
26–35 (H3, H12)	11	4	7
50–60 (H1, H2, H4, H10, H11 H8)	44	20	24
61–75 (H5, H6, H7, H8, H9)	32	14	18
Total	87	38	49

Regarding evidentiality (see Tables 6 and 7), as in the first questionnaire, we considered *de* to be a marker of evidentiality only if this preposition was accepted either in contexts of direct evidentiality or indirect evidentiality. However, if the speaker accepted *de* in contexts of direct evidentiality with some verbs and in contexts of indirect evidentiality with others, *de* was not considered a marker of evidentiality. Finally, if the speaker accepted the particle in both contexts, it was not considered a marker of evidentiality either. The judgments of our speakers were not consistent, although there were two speakers (H3 and H11 in Table 7) who, when they choose only one option, it was the one of indirect evidentiality. However, these same speakers accepted the presence of *de* in both direct and indirect evidentiality contexts with other verbs.

One conclusion from our study is that the variation seems to be related to individual choices associated with specific verbs (rather than lexical classes) because there was a lot of variation among speakers, except with the verb *proponer* 'to propose' and the causative *hacer* 'to make'. What we do find remarkable is that the total count of the particle *de* in contexts of indirect evidentiality was double that of direct evidentiality (see Table 7). Despite this result, we believe that the conclusions of the first questionnaire, that there is no relationship between the presence of the preposition and evidentiality, can be confirmed.

5. Conclusions

In this paper we have analyzed in detail the construction with *deísmo* in Castilla-La Mancha. We proposed that *de* is a complementizer located in the head Fin in the left sentence periphery. The analysis of the data collected in the two surveys carried out showed that, firstly, there is great variability in the construction, since the speakers of the same town do not coincide neither in the verbs nor in the lexical classes in which they accept the particle *de* before the non-finite subordinate clause. Secondly, the data also showed that the complementizer *de* cannot be associated with an evidential meaning. Although the results of the two questionnaires indicate that the preposition *de* is not a marker of evidentiality, more data, preferably from real use, seem necessary to strengthen these conclusions.

Appendix A. First Questionnaire. Oral Language Survey[27]

Nombre
Lugar de nacimiento y de residencia
Edad

Estamos estudiando la lengua que usamos de todos los días, no el lenguaje formal o el lenguaje escrito. Por eso es importante que contestes con sinceridad si dirías estas frases

en un contexto informal 😊 Además de marcar una de las tres opciones (*Sí*, *No* o *No estoy seguro/a*), si necesitas aclarar algo puedes utilizar las dos líneas para escribir. Muchas gracias por tu colaboración.

'We are studying the language we use every day, not formal or written language. That is why it is important that you answer honestly if you would say these sentences in an informal context 😊 Besides marking one of the three options (*Yes*, *No* or *I am not sure*), if you need to clarify something you can use the two lines to write. Thank you very much for your collaboration.'

1. Imagínate que estás con tu familia en la piscina municipal, y estás viendo disfrutar a tu hijo en el agua. Dirías... A mi hijo le gusta de nadar. 'Imagine you are with your family at the municipal pool, and you are watching your child enjoy swimming. You would say... My child enjoys swimming.' Sí / No / No estoy seguro-a

2. Has oído a tu madre pedir a tu hermana que la acompañe a hacer la compra. Dirías... Le ha dicho de ir con ella a hacer la compra. 'You have heard your mother ask your sister to go shopping with her. You would say... She told her to go shopping with her.'

3. Te han dicho que tu hijo lleva toda la tarde arreglando la lavadora. Dirías... Mi hijo está intentando de arreglar la lavadora. 'You have been told that your son has been trying to fix the washing machine all afternoon. You would say... My son is trying to fix the washing machine.'

4. Te han dicho que un amigo podrá ir a tu boda, aunque él personalmente no te lo ha confirmado. Dirías... Mi amigo ha aceptado de venir a mi boda. 'You have been told that a friend will be able to come to your wedding, although he has not confirmed it personally. You would say... My friend has agreed to come to my wedding.'

5. Es verano, estáis esperando el autobús al sol y ves que hay una persona que se está mareando. Dirías... Es obvio que le conviene de ponerse a la sombra. 'It is summer, you are waiting for the bus in the sun and you see a person who is getting dizzy. You would say... It is obvious that it is in his best interest to get into the shade.'

6. Tu madre se va de viaje y no quiere ir sola, te ha pedido que la acompañes. Dirías... Mi madre me pidió que fuera con ella. 'Your mother is going on a trip and does not want to go alone, she has asked you to go with her. You would say... My mother asked me to go with her.'

7. Imagínate que estás viendo a tu sobrino en lo alto de un tobogán sonriendo y a punto de tirarse. Dirías... Le apetece de tirarse del tobogán. 'Imagine you are watching your nephew at the top of a slide smiling and about to jump off. You would say... He feels like going down the slide.'

8. Imagínate que estás en el salón con tu hijo y estás viendo cómo monta una estantería de IKEA. Dirías... Mi hijo está intentando de montar la estantería. 'Imagine you are in the living room with your child and you are watching him assemble an IKEA bookshelf. You would say... My son is trying to assemble the shelf.'

9. ¿Dirías alguna vez esta frase? Ese libro, Juan no le ha leído todavía. 'Would you ever say this sentence? That book, Juan has not read it yet.'

10. Te ha llamado un amigo y te ha dicho que fuerais al cine. Dirías... Me propuso de ir al cine. 'A friend called you and asked you to go to the movies. You would say... He asked me to go to the movies.'

11. En la televisión están saliendo todo el rato científicos diciendo que hay que vacunarse. Dirías... Por lo visto, conviene de vacunarse. 'On TV, scientists are always saying that you should get vaccinated. You would say... Apparently, it is convenient to get vaccinated.'

12. ¿Dirías alguna vez esta frase? Aunque nunca le veo pasar, le gusta de ir al Retiro todos los días. 'Would you ever say this sentence? Although I never see him pass by, he likes to go to the Retiro every day.'

13. Entras en el jardín de la casa de un amigo, está todo muy cuidado, las herramientas limpias, el césped cortado, etc. Dirías... Se preocupa de cuidar el jardín. 'You go into

the garden of a friend's house, everything is very well kept, the tools are clean, the lawn is mowed, etc. You would say... He takes care of the garden.'

14. Tienes un amigo que ha perdido todos los puntos y le habían dicho que tenía que repetir el examen de conducir, pero al final no tuvo que hacerlo. Dirías... Finalmente, se libró de examinarse otra vez. 'You have a friend who lost all his points and was told he had to take his driving test again, but in the end he did not have to. You would say... Finally, he was spared from having to take the test again.'

15. Te ha llamado un amigo y te ha contado que Pedro invitó al cine a tu hija. Dirías... Le propuso de ir al cine. 'A friend called you and told you that Pedro invited your daughter to the movies. You would say... He asked her to go to the movies.'

16. Te han dicho que tu vecino disfruta mucho en los toros, pero tú nunca has ido con él a la plaza. Dirías... A mi vecino le gusta de ir a los toros. 'You have been told that your neighbor enjoys bullfighting, but you have never been to the bullring with him. You would say... My neighbor likes to go to the bullfights.'

17. Tu hermana va a acompañar a tu madre a la compra, te sorprende porque a tu hermana no le gusta nada ir al super, así que crees que quizá tu madre se lo haya pedido. Dirías... Le ha dicho de ir con ella a hacer la compra. 'Your sister is going to accompany your mother to the grocery store, you are surprised because your sister does not like to go to the supermarket, so you think that maybe your mother has asked her to do it. You would say... She has told her to go with her to do the shopping.'

18. Imagínate que estás hablando por teléfono con un amigo y te dice que sí puede ir al cine contigo. Dirías... Mi amigo ha aceptado de ir al cine. 'Imagine you are talking to a friend on the phone and he says he can go to the movies with you. You would say... My friend has agreed to go to the movies.'

19. Imagínate que estás en una fiesta con un amigo, es tarde y tu amigo no para de mirar la hora. Dirías... Le apetece de irse a casa. 'Imagine you are at a party with a friend, it is late and your friend keeps looking at the time. You would say... He feels like going home.'

20. ¿Dirías alguna vez esta frase? Le gusta de pasear todas las tardes, siempre le veo pasar. 'Would you ever say this sentence? He likes to go for a walk every afternoon, I always see him passing by.'

Appendix B. Second Questionnaire. The Dialect of Castilla-La Mancha[28]

Nombre
Lugar de nacimiento y de residencia
Edad

Estamos estudiando la lengua que usamos de todos los días, no el lenguaje formal o el lenguaje escrito. Por eso es importante que contestes con sinceridad si dirías estas frases en un contexto informal ☺ ¡No te llevará más de 5 minutos!

'We are studying the language we use every day, not formal or written language. That's why it is important that you answer honestly if you would say these phrases in an informal context ☺ It will not take you more than 5 minutes!'

1. Estás con tu familia en la piscina municipal, y estás viendo cómo tu hijo disfruta nadando. En esa situación, dirías... A mi hijo le gusta de nadar. 'You are with your family at the municipal pool, and you are watching your child enjoy swimming. In that situation, you would say... My child enjoys swimming.' Sí / No / No estoy seguro-a /No lo diría, pero lo he oído

2. Has oído a tu madre decir a tu hermano que haga los deberes. En esa situación, dirías... Mi madre le ha mandado de hacer los deberes. 'You have heard your mother tell your brother to do his homework. In that situation, you would say... My mother told him to do his homework.'

3. Te han dicho que tu hijo lleva toda la tarde arreglando la lavadora, pero tú no has estado con él. En esa situación, dirías... Mi hijo está intentando de arreglar la lavadora.

'You have been told that your son has been fixing the washing machine all afternoon, but you have not been with him. In that situation, you would say... My son is trying to fix the washing machine.'

4. Te han dicho que un amigo vende su coche, aunque él personalmente no te lo ha confirmado. En esta situación dirías... Mi amigo quiere de vender el coche. 'You have been told that a friend is selling his car, although he has not personally confirmed this to you. In this situation you would say... My friend wants to sell the car.'

5. Eres militar y te han destinado a Burgos. En esta situación dirías... Me ha tocado de ir a Burgos. 'You are in the military and you have been assigned to Burgos. In this situation you would say... I had to go to Burgos.'

6. Este verano has decidido alquilar tu apartamento de la playa. En esta situación dirías... Quiero de alquilar mi apartamento. 'This summer you have decided to rent your beach apartment. In this situation you would say... I want to rent my apartment.'

7. Tus padres han repartido las tareas de la casa cuando tú no estabas y tu hermano te ha dicho que tienes que sacar al perro por las mañanas. En esta situación dirías... Me ha tocado de sacar al perro. 'Your parents have divided up the housework while you were away and your brother told you that you have to take the dog out in the mornings. In this situation you would say... It was my turn to take the dog out.'

8. Estás en el salón con tu hijo y estás viendo cómo monta una estantería de IKEA. En esta situación dirías... Mi hijo está intentando de montar la estantería. 'You are in the living room with your son and you are watching him assemble an IKEA bookshelf. In this situation you would say... My son is trying to assemble the bookshelf.'

9. No estás segura, pero crees que tu hijo quiere casarse pronto. En esa situación dirías... Mi hijo está pensando de casarse pronto. 'You are not sure, but you think your son wants to get married soon. In that situation you would say... My son is thinking of getting married soon.'

10. Te ha llamado tu amigo Luis y te he dicho si querías ir al cine. En esa situación dirías... Luis me ha propuesto de ir al cine. 'Your friend Luis called you and asked you if you wanted to go to the movies. In this situation you would say... Luis suggested going to the movies.'

11. Llegas a casa y el suelo está lleno de polvo. En esa situación dirías... Hace falta de barrer el suelo. 'You come home and the floor is full of dust. In that situation you would say... You need to sweep the floor.'

12. ¿Dirías alguna vez esta frase? Aunque nunca me lo he encontrado en el parque, me han dicho que le gusta de ir allí todos los días. 'Would you ever say this phrase? Although I have never met him in the park, I have been told that he likes to go there every day.'

13. Te ha dicho tu hermana que las plantas se están secando, aunque tú no lo has visto. En esa situación dirías... Hace falta de regar las plantas. 'Your sister has told you that the plants are drying out, although you have not seen it. In that situation you would say... You need to water the plants.'

14. Aunque tú no estás seguro, te han dicho que antes se solía regalar el vestido de la novia. En ese contexto dirías... Antes era costumbre de regalar el vestido a la novia. 'Although you are not sure, you have been told that it used to be customary to give the bride's dress as a gift. In that context you would say... It used to be customary to give the bride's dress as a gift.'

15. Te ha llamado un amigo y te ha contado que Pedro invitó al cine a tu hija. En esa situación dirías... Pedro le propuso de ir al cine a mi hija. 'A friend called you and told you that Pedro invited your daughter to the movies. In that situation you would say... Pedro asked my daughter to go to the movies.'

16. En el trabajo han puesto una máquina nueva y tenemos que fichar todos los días. En esa situación dirías... Ahora nos hacen de fichar todos los días. 'At work they have

        put in a new machine and we have to punch in every day. In that situation you would say... Now they make us punch in every day.'

17. Hoy no pudiste asistir a la reunión del colegio, pero una madre te ha dicho que ahora los niños tienen que ir de uniforme. En esa situación dirías... A los niños les han mandado de ir con uniforme. 'Today you could not attend the school meeting, but a mother told you that now the children have to wear uniforms. In that situation you would say... The children have been told to wear a uniform.'

18. En tu casa coméis siempre pavo el día de Nochebuena. En esa situación dirías... En mi casa es costumbre de comer pavo en Nochebuena. 'In your house you always eat turkey on Christmas Eve. In that situation you would say... In my house it is customary to eat turkey on Christmas Eve.'

19. No soporto el calor en verano, así que este año estás valorando alquilar un apartamento en Santander. En ese contexto dirías... Estoy pensando de ir al norte este verano. 'I cannot stand the heat in summer, so this year you are considering renting an apartment in Santander. In that context you would say... I am thinking of going north this summer.'

20. Un compañero te ha dicho que vais a tener que entrar al trabajo a las ocho todos los días, pero a ti te parece raro. En esa situación dirías... Nos van a hacer de entrar a las ocho todos los días. 'A colleague has told you that you are going to have to go to work at eight o'clock every day, but it seems strange to you. In that situation you would say... They are going to make us come in at eight o'clock every day.'

Notes

1. In this section, we are basically following the description of Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (Forthcoming).

2. *Deísmo* is also claimed to be found in the infinitive predicate of copular sentences (Gómez Torrego 1999, § 34.1.2.3), and the same structures are mentioned as cases of *dequeísmo* (*Su deseo es de {ir/que vayamos}*; Lit. 'Her desire is of {go/that we go}'). However, as Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (2019) shows, those are cases of inverse copular constructions; thus, the infinitival sentence is not the attribute, but the subject of the sentence.

3. The same happens in Catalan (*Proposo de fer-ho tot*; Lit. Suggest of do.INF-CL.ACC everything; 'I suggest to do everything') or in French (*J'essaye de tout faire*; Lit. I try. of everything do.INF; 'I try to do everything').

4. The verb *probar* 'to try' has two meanings according to Di Tullio (2022). When it combines with process and actions infinitives it has a prospective interpretation: *Probé de ir* 'I tried to go'. In this case the verb needs the preposition *a* 'to' to appear with an infinitive (*probé a ir/*probé ir*). When it combines with stative infinitives it means 'to prove': *La vacuna probó (de) ser efectiva* 'The vaccine proves to be effective'. In both cases the verb can appear in the *deísmo* construction.

5. According to Di Tullio (2022), the verb *pensar* 'to think' is polysemic. It has a prospective meaning when combined with infinitives of process and action (*Pensaba ir al cine* 'I was planning to go to the movies'). However, this verb has a simultaneity reading with an interpretation similar to the verb 'to believe' when combined with a stative infinitive (*Pensaba estar enamorado de ella* 'I thought I was in love with her'). In both readings the verb *pensar* can participate in the construction with *deísmo*. Our fundamental problem (and we also believe that of the articles on *deísmo*) is that the semantic verb classification is not always clear. On the one hand, verb classes overlap because the criteria to form them are of a different nature; for example, *dar miedo* 'to be afraid' is included in De Benito and Pato (2015) in the class of semantically impersonal constructions, but from the semantic point of view it is also a psychological verb. On the other hand, when a verb has different meanings, these can be associated with different semantic classes (as with *pensar*) or the different meanings can be associated with complements of a different nature (as happens with *probar*, among other verbs).

6. Although there are data on *deísmo* with *ver* 'to see' in Castilla-La Mancha, as has already been pointed out by Camus (2013), we have not included this class of verbs in our questionnaire because we believe they deserve a separate study, as they may indicate evidentiality lexically (although see the analysis of Carrasco and Peinado (2022)).

7. De Benito and Pato (2015, p. 38) point out that there is *deísmo* with verbal periphrasis. Given that we have not found examples in Castilla-La Mancha, and that Camus (2013, p. 25) points out that there is no *deísmo* with these verbs in this province, we decided to exclude periphrasis from our study. In any case, the presence of the particle *de* 'of' in the periphrases deserves an independent explanation, since the second verb does not head a subordinate (see Camus 2013, p. 24).

8. The verb *decir* is a communication verb with indicative, and a conative verb with subjunctive in the subordinate clause.

9. Data from Gutiérrez-Rodríguez (Forthcoming), from 12 native speakers of *deísmo* from Castilla-La Mancha (Spain). In the construction with *deísmo* that the authors have as native speakers (*Estar deseando de hacerlo*; Lit. to be willing of do it), we also

prefer the sentence with the topic before *de: Estoy deseando la película, de verla*, instead of *de* before the topic: *??Estoy deseando de la película verla*.

10   According to Aikhenvald (2004, 2018), evidentiality is a specific category only in evidential languages with systematic markers. Many languages of the world, such as Wintu, Tuyuca, Quechua, Turkish, Armenian, Bulgarian, Tibetan and Persian, among many others, have verbal morphemes (obligatory or optional) that refer to the source of the information. However, most European languages lack an evidential grammatical category. This other group of languages uses strategies (grammatical, lexical or phonetic) to express the source of information, but they are not typologically evidential languages.

11   In other classifications, cases in which the speaker describes "entities inaccessible to the senses, such as desires, intentions and mental states in general, that is, those situations in which sensory evidence is impossible [. . .] *I am thirsty; I want to leave; I know the solution to the problem*" are called *endophoric direct evidence* (Bermúdez 2005, p. 6).

12   The presence of *van* also introduces aspectual nuances with control verbs. In this case *van* introduces uncertainty about the realization of the state of affairs described in the sentence complement. In the example *Freddy probeert (van) den auto te repareren* 'Freddy tries to repair the car' (Van Craenenbroeck 2004, p. 45), the presence of *van* implies that the speaker doubts whether Freddy will be able to fix the car, whereas the sentence without *van* is quite neutral with respect to Freddy's success and acquires a reading in which the speaker is quite confident that Freddy will fix it.

13   At least with the verb *resultar* 'to turn out', there are many examples in the corpora: *y resulta de que tenían allí unas cabras* 'and it turns out that they had some goats there' (COSER).

14   There are formal similarities between the two constructions, since the main verb selects a sentence introduced by a *de* particle that is not required by this predicate. Some authors relate the two phenomena and even think that *deísmo* could be at the origin of *dequeísmo* (Náñez 1984; Gómez Torrego 1999, § 34.1.7.3; Perea Siller 2008).

15   Indirect perception is not, however, an inferential reading, which can occur in the finite sentence (28c). We can say that John has seen that it was raining, but he has not personally witnessed the rain if, for example, he has seen people coming in wet.

16   Based on COSER data, De Benito and Pato (2015, pp. 33–34) provide a list of towns from which the speakers interviewed come. In Castilla-La Mancha they point out the following localities in alphabetical order: Alcolea del Pinar (Guadalajara), Altarejos (Cuenca), Barrax (Albacete), Belmonte (Cuenca), Caleruela (Toledo), Cardenete (Cuenca), Casas de Juan Gil (Albacete), Casas del Río (Ciudad Real), Horcajo de Santiago (Cuenca), Higueruela (Albacete), La Nava de Ricomalillo (Toledo), Malagón (Ciudad Real), Navahermosa (Toledo), Porzuna (Ciudad Real), Povedilla (Albacete), Pulgar (Toledo), Ruidera (Ciudad Real), Tomelloso (Ciudad Real), Uclés (Cuenca), Valeria (Cuenca), Villaconejos de Trebeque (Cuenca), Yebra (Guadalajara) and Zulema (Albacete). The list of predicates consulted in De Benito and Pato (2015, p. 35) includes the following: *dejar/permitir* 'to let/allow', *ver* 'to see', *hacer* 'to make', *hacer falta* 'to need', *ser {costumbre/probable}* 'to be customary/probable', *gustar* 'to like', *dar {miedo/pena/reparo}* 'to be {afraid/sorry/reluctant}', *costar* 'to have a hard time', *poder* 'can', *querer* 'to want', *desear* 'to desire', *pensar* 'to think', *interesar* 'to be interested', *tocar* 'to be one's turn', *sentir* 'to hear', *conocer* 'to know', *ofrecer* 'to offer', *procurar* 'to attempt', *intentar* 'to try' and *soler* 'used to'. Unfortunately, the number of times each verb appears is not listed, so we made our own list and our own count of the occurrences of the most frequent verbs in the construction in order to design the questionnaire.

17   Many of the infinitives that appear in the construction are verbs of motion. The verb *ir* 'to go' appears with special frequency: *{le gusta/quiere} de ir* 'he {likes/wants} to go'.

18   The towns of Castilla-La Mancha are Liétor and Barrax (Albacete); Valeria and Villaconejos de Trabaque (Cuenca); La Nava de Ricomalillo, Caleruela and Pulgar (Toledo); Malagón (Ciudad Real).

19   There were four control sentences: two with prepositional complements in Spanish (*preocupar de* 'worry about' and *librarse de* 'get rid of'); one with the verb *pedir* 'to ask', which requires subordination without *de*; and one context of leísmo with an inanimate object, a phenomenon that does not occur in Castilla-La Mancha.

20   The verb *gustar* 'to like' is the most frequent verb in general Spanish among the psychological verbs. Camus (2013, p. 24) notes that there is no *deísmo* with this verb, but our COSER data (see Table 1) indicate that it is the most frequent verb with *deísmo* in Castilla-La Mancha and in the rest of Spain. Therefore, we decided to include two realizations (instead of one) to check if this verb really appears in the construction with deísmo. What is difficult to explain about this verb in the results of Table 3 is the contrast between the first pair, with hardly any realizations with *deísmo*, and the second, with more. It may have been influenced by the topicalization of the example of the first pair, but we cannot be sure of the correspondence. This difference between the results of the two pairs of realizations led us to think that it was not convenient to put four occurrences of one of the verbs as opposed to two of the other verbs. Finally, in the second questionnaire we decided to keep *gustar*, but we only left a couple of examples.

[21] However, there is a use of *decir* as a verb of communication with infinitive. With this verb, *deísmo* is possible, althoug very rare (Di Tullio 2022, e.g., 20f): *Y nunca dijo (de) amar la literatura como había de demostrarlo al final de su vida* 'And he never said he loved literature as he was to prove at the end of his life'. When *decir* is used as a verb of influence with the meaning 'to propose' (Di Tullio 2022, e.g., 21a: Alguien dijo de ir a comer una paella y bajamos a los merenderos de la Barceloneta 'Someone said to go eat paella and we went down to the picnic areas of Barceloneta'), the infinitive designates a dynamic event and the subject of the infinitive is controlled by the subject of the verb *decir*, by a dative or jointly by both. As a verb of communication, the infinitive has a perfective aspect (it either denotes a state lexically or denotes a state by its grammatical properties and appears as a compound infinitive or as a progressive periphrasis) and the subject is controlled only by the subject of the main verb.

[22] While one of the two interviewers was leading the conversation informally and asking the questions, the other, located a little further away, was taking down the answers and additional data. In this way, the informants did not see us taking notes on what they were saying and this allowed them to relax quite a bit in the conversation.

[23] During the interviews, we noted some realizations with *deísmo* of two interviewees: H1: *¿Tú no lo has oído de decir?* 'You haven't heard it said?'; H2: *No lo he oído de decir* 'I haven't heard it said'; *Cada vez les cuesta más de venir* 'It's getting harder and harder for them to come'; *No nos dejaron de irnos fuera* 'They did not let us go away'. On the other hand, when we asked if there were changes in meaning, the majority answered that there were none. Only on two occasions did they answer that they found differences: H1 in question 19 (*Estoy pensando de ir* 'I am thinking of going') answered that the judgment was less certain with *de*; and H3 in question 10 (*Me ha propuesto de ir* 'He proposed me to go') told us that with de there was more firmness in what was asserted. However, even these speakers noted that there was no difference when we asked them with other verbs.

[24] For the verbs of influence we left two, *proponer* 'to propose' and *mandar* 'order', because we knew that these verbs had quite a few realizations with *deísmo*. The verb *proponer* was the verb with the most realizations in the first questionnaire and in the COSER data the verb *mandar* had many realizations in Castilla-La Mancha.

[25] One of the problems we have faced in this work is the scarce presence of data of *deísmo* in the corpora. Although the choice of verbs for our surveys was based on corpus data, it has been shown by the results, such as those we have obtained with *querer*, that relying on corpus data in this type of substandard phenomenon has limitations.

[26] In contrast, Di Tullio (2022) points out that this construction is not found in American Spanish.

[27] We present the questionnaire as we passed it, we have only added the translation of the sentences after each one of them.

[28] We present the questionnaire as we passed it, we have only added the translation of the sentences after each one of them.

References

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2004. *Evidentiality*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Aikhenvald, Alexandra. 2018. Evidentiality: The framework. In *The Oxford Handbook of Evidentiality*. Edited by A. Aikhenvald. Oxford: Oxford University Press, pp. 1–55.

Bentivoglio, Paola, and Francesco D'Introno. 1977. Análisis sociolingüístico del dequeísmo en el habla de Caracas. *Boletín de la Academia Puertorriqueña de la lengua española* 4: 58–82.

Bermúdez, Fernando W. 2005. Evidencialidad: La codificación lingüística del punto de vista. Ph.D. dissertation, Stockholms Universitet, Stockholm, Sweden.

Brucart, José María, and María Luisa Hernanz. 2015. Las posiciones sintácticas. In *Perspectivas de Sintaxis Formal*. Edited by Ángel J. Gallego. Madrid: Akal, pp. 33–110.

Camus, Bruno. 2013. On *Deísmo*. Another Case of Variation in Spanish Complementation. *Catalan Journal of Linguistics* 12: 13–39. [CrossRef]

Carrasco, Ángeles, and Pilar Peinado. 2022. Propiedades sintácticas y semánticas de la construcción *ver de* + infinitivo. *Dialectologia* 28: 81–117.

Davies, Mark. 2016. Corpus del Español: Web/Dialects. Available online: http://www.corpusdelespanol.org/web-dial/ (accessed on 1 August 2023).

De Benito, Carlota, and Enrique Pato. 2015. On *de* + infinitive construction (*deísmo*) in Spanish. *Dialectologia* 5: 29–51.

De Mello, George. 1995. El dequeísmo en el español hablado contemporáneo: ¿un caso de independencia semántica? *Hispanic Linguistics* 6/7: 117–52.

Del Moral, Gabriel. 2008. Spanish *dequeísmo*: A case study of subjectification. *Nueva Revista de Lenguas Extranjeras* 10: 183–213.

Demonte, Violeta, and Olga Fernández Soriano. 2005. Features in Comp and Syntactic Variation: The Case of '(de)queísmo' in Spanish. *Lingua* 115: 1063–82. [CrossRef]

Demonte, Violeta, and Olga Fernández Soriano. 2014. Evidentiality and illocutionary force: Spanish matrix *que* at the syntax-pragmatics interface. In *Left sentence Peripheries in Spanish: Diachronic, Variationist and Comparative Perspectives*. Edited by Andreas Dufter and Álvaro S. Octavio de Toledo y Huerta. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 217–52.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2011. Infinitivos introducidos por *de. Cuadernos de la ALFAL* 3: 176–87.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2012. Oraciones completivas de infinitivo introducidas por *de* en el español moderno. In *Cum Corde et in Nova Grammatica: Estudios Ofrecidos a Guillermo Rojo*. Edited by Tomás E. Jiménez Juliá, Belén López Meirama, Victoria Vázquez Rozas, Alexandre Veiga Rodríguez and Guillermo Rojo Sánchez. A Coruña: Servicio de Publicaciones Universidade de Santiago de Compostela, pp. 265–76.

Di Tullio, Ángela. 2022. El deísmo: Diferencias dialectales en el léxico y la gramática. In *Universales Vernáculos en la Gramática del Español*. Edited by Ángela Di Tullio and Enrique Pato. Madrid: Vervuert, pp. 281–306.

Fábregas, Antonio. 2020. *Las Categorías Funcionales*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Fernández-Ordóñez, Inés, dir. 2005. Corpus Oral y Sonoro del Español Rural (COSER). Available online: http://www.corpusrural.es (accessed on 1 August 2023).

García, Érica. 1986. El fenómeno *(de)queísmo* desde una perspectiva dinámica del uso comunicativo de la lengua. In *Actas del II Congreso Internacional Sobre el Español de América*. Edited by José Moreno de Alba. México: UNAM, pp. 46–65.

Gómez Molina, José R. 2011. La preposición *de* como mecanismo comunicativo en las construcciones 'O/*de* + *que* + verbo en forma personal. *Oralia. Análisis del Discurso Oral* 14: 345–76. [CrossRef]

Gómez Torrego, Leonardo. 1999. La variación en las subordinadas sustantivas: Dequeísmo y queísmo. In *Gramática Descriptiva de la Lengua Española*. Directed by I. Bosque, and V. Demonte. Madrid: Espasa Calpe, pp. 2105–48.

Guirado, Kristel. 2006. Deixis preposicional en el habla de Caracas: Un análisis cuantitativo del (de)queísmo. *Boletín de Lingüística* 26: 130–56.

Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, Edita. 2019. Deísmo en oraciones copulativas identificativas. *Dialectologia* 23: 85–113.

Gutiérrez-Rodríguez, Edita. Forthcoming. Variation in the complementizer system: Deísmo, dequeísmo and queísmo. In *A Guide to Spanish Dialects: Descriptive and Theoretical Aspects of Linguistic Variation in the Hispanic World*. Edited by Ángel J. Gallego and Cristina Sánchez López. Oxford: Oxford University Press, *in press*.

Náñez, Emilio. 1984. Sobre dequeísmo. *Revista de Filología Románica* 11: 239–48.

Perea Siller, Francisco J. 2008. Deísmo, queísmo y dequeísmo. Entre la variación y los cambios lingüísticos. *Revista de Investigación Educativa* 3: 117–42.

RAE-ASALE. 2009. *Nueva Gramática de la Lengua Española*. Madrid: Espasa Calpe.

REAL ACADEMIA ESPAÑOLA: Banco de Datos (CORPES). n.d. Corpus del Español del Siglo XXI. Available online: https://webfrl.rae.es/CORPES/view/inicioExterno.view (accessed on 1 August 2023).

Rizzi, Luigi. 1991. Il sintagma preposizionale. In *Grande Grammatica Italiana di Consultazione*. Edited by L. Renzi. Il Mulino: Bologna, vol. I, pp. 507–31.

Rizzi, Luigi. 1997. The fine structure of left periphery. In *Elements of Grammar*. Edited by Liliane Haegeman. Dordrecht: Kluwer, pp. 281–336.

Rizzi, Luigi. 2001. On the Position 'Int(errogative)' in the Left Periphery of the Clause. In *Current Studies in Italian Syntax: Essays Offered to Lorenzo Renzi*. Edited by Guglielmo Cinque and Gianpaolo Salvi. Amsterdam: Elsevier, pp. 267–96.

Rooryck, Johan. 2001. Evidentiality II. *Glot International* 5: 161–68.

Sánchez López, Cristina. 2020. *Las Modalidades Oracionales*. Madrid: Síntesis.

Schwenter, Scott A. 1999. Evidentiality in Spanish morphosyntax: A reanalysis of *(de)queísmo*. In *Estudios de Variación Sintáctica*. Edited by María José Serrano. Madrid: Vervuert, pp. 65–87.

Silva-Villar, Luis, and Javier Gutiérrez-Rexach. 2012. Predication, complementation and the grammar of dequeísmo structures. In *Current Formal Aspects of Spanish Syntax and Semantics*. Edited by Melvin González-Rivera and Sandro Sessarego. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, pp. 8–41.

Spanish Web 2018 (Sketch Engine). 2018. Available online: https://www.sketchengine.eu/ (accessed on 1 August 2023).

Van Craenenbroeck, Jeroen. 2004. *Van* as a marker of dissociation: Microvariation in Dutch. In *Studies in Comparative Germanic Syntax*. Edited by Jan-Wouter Zwart and Werner Abraham. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, pp. 41–67.