



FUTURE REFERENCE IN PORTUGUESE: THE CASE FOR A VOLITIVE PERIPHRAISIS

FUTURO EM PORTUGUÊS: ESTUDO SOBRE A PERÍFRASE VOLITIVA

Mariana Gonçalves da Costa¹

Lais Lima de Souza²

RESUMO

O presente trabalho visa investigar as ocorrências de [*querer* + verbo no infinitivo] na língua portuguesa e suas implicações em comparação com [*ir* + verbo no infinitivo], duas construções que expressam futuridade. Com base na noção exposta por Bybee e Pagliuca (1987) de que o conceito de desejo seria uma das fontes lexicais mais comuns de marcadores de futuro, a ideia explorada no artigo é a de que existe uma associação entre volição e futuridade feita pelos falantes do português. Sob a perspectiva teórica da Linguística Funcional-Cognitiva e da Gramática de Construções, o estudo analisa usos da construção [*querer* + verbo no infinitivo] por falantes de português como construção indicadora de futuro. Considera-se que a construção licencie múltiplos usos que, então, podem ser acionados pelo falante durante a situação comunicacional. Nesse sentido, este artigo traz contribuições para pesquisas sobre perífrase verbal e futuro do ponto de vista da Gramática de Construções.

PALAVRAS-CHAVE: Verbos volitivos; Futuridade; Futuro perifrástico; Linguística Funcional-Cognitiva; Gramática de Construções.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this paper is to investigate the occurrences of [*querer* + verb in infinitive] in Portuguese and its implications in comparison to [*ir* + verb in infinitive], two constructions that express futurity. Based on the notion exposed by Bybee and Pagliuca (1987) that the concept of desire is one of the most common lexical sources of future markers, we propose that there is an association between volition and futurity made by speakers of Portuguese. The study draws on theoretical underpinnings of Usage Based-Linguistics and Construction Grammar to explore uses of [*querer* + verb in the infinitive] by Portuguese speakers as a construction that indicates future reference. We argue that this construction licenses multiple uses that can be activated by the speaker during the communicative situation. This paper contributes to research on verbal periphrasis and future reference from a Construction Grammar point of view.

KEYWORDS: Volitive verbs; Futurity; Periphrastic future; Cognitive-Functional Linguistics; Construction Grammar.

1 Graduating student in Languages: Portuguese/English at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro and PIBIC/CNPq scholar, marianag.costa@gmail.com.

2 Graduating student in Languages: Portuguese/English at the Federal University of Rio de Janeiro and PIBIC/CNPq scholar, llais@ufrj.br.

Introduction

This paper discusses the process of grammatical constructionalization of the volitive verb *querer* in the present tense followed by a verb in the infinitive [*querer* + verb in infinitive] in Portuguese. We understand that [*querer* + verb in infinitive] projects notions of futurity through the idea of intentionality. We argue that the future reference does not come from the verb *querer* but from the construction as a whole. Our objective is to look into occurrences of this construction and its implications in comparison to [*ir* + verb in infinitive], a well-established periphrasis for future tense marking in Portuguese, in order to investigate the variation between these two constructions for future reference.

Based on the theoretical underpinnings of Functional-Cognitive Linguistics and Construction Grammar, the study centers on a corpus-based investigation to shed light on the factors that could possibly motivate the activation of each construction, as well as their formal and functional attributes. Our sample consists of data from both Brazilian Portuguese ($\cong 85\%$) and European Portuguese ($\cong 15\%$) extracted from the corpus “Portuguese Web 2011” available through the software *Sketch Engine*, as well as data collected from the social media platform *Twitter*.

As most studies on volitive verbs as future markers in Brazilian Portuguese have been developed within the framework of grammaticalization, this paper aims to contribute to the ongoing discussion covering cross-linguistic patterns in the development of grammatical markers of futurity within the perspective of Construction Grammar. We believe that by analyzing the phenomenon at the construction level we can identify patterns that better explain the productivity of the volitive verb *querer* in periphrastic position in Portuguese.

After this brief introduction, the paper is divided into five parts. Section 1 presents an overview of future references in Portuguese, elucidating the case for a volitive periphrasis that expresses future within the perspective of Construction Grammar. Sections 2 and 3 provide some insights regarding the study’s corpora and methodology. We discuss our results in Section 4 and present our final considerations afterward.

Future reference in Portuguese

The study of future reference is a rich field of analysis in linguistics due to the multitude of different resources used by languages to locate events after the moment of speech. According to Bybee, Perkins & Pagliuca (1994), since the speaker cannot directly access future events as concrete facts, future reference tends to involve hypotheses, desires, and projections, and usually requires the speaker’s perspective on the strength of that prediction attributed by the modality. Unlike past and present references, future reference often takes place metaphorically, which allows different forms of metaphorical expression of future to occur in the same language. Many studies have tried to account for the description of the future tense in present-day Portuguese

(GIBBON, 2014; SZCZEŚNIAK, 2017; SANTOS, 2019; COSTA, SOUZA & MACHADO-VIEIRA, 2020), pointing that throughout the historical course of the language there have been multiple co-occurring future forms, both in oral and written language.

Currently, the expression of future in Brazilian Portuguese (BP) is mostly³ associated with two structures, a synthetic and an analytic one. Prescriptive grammars, nonetheless, tend to ignore the different expressions of future and only provide records of the synthetic future (BRAGANÇA, 2008). The synthetic future is composed of a temporal morpheme attached to the infinitive form of the verb (“eu falarei”). Also referred to as morphological future, it is recognized as the standard future marking by grammarians and many books of language instruction. Consequently, it is a conservative variant, associated with written and polished language. Meanwhile, the analytical future is periphrastically expressed by the verb *ir* in the present tense followed by a verb in the infinitive (“eu vou falar”). This periphrastic verb form of future is regarded as colloquial language and largely associated with spoken Portuguese and informal register. Considering that movement verbs tend to display features of polysemy, overlapping the notions of time and space, the verb of movement *ir* (“to go”) in the periphrastic future has its sense of movement in physical space metaphorically abstracted into the idea of movement in time.

This duplication of future forms can also be found in other languages. In a seminal study focused on Romance languages, Fleischman (1982) highlights that “go-futures”, that is, complex verb structures composed of the ‘go’ verb with an infinitive, are present in many speech varieties of Romance languages. The author argues that the existence of several devices for the expression of future is related to the speaker’s search for new ways to indicate modal and aspectual meanings via use. That is why future reference can be conveyed through a multitude of different strategies, leading to a cyclical alternation between analytic and synthetic verb forms that happen simultaneously in the evolutionary process of future marking.

This is the case of Portuguese with the periphrasis [*ir* + verb in infinitive], which has long been recognized by linguistic studies as a productive expression of future in spoken BP (BRAGANÇA, 2008; GIBBON, 2014). Additionally, studies on the variable expression of verbal future in journalistic writing have found evidence that the morphological future is losing presence in specific contexts in favor of the periphrastic future, which is progressively more frequent in written language (OLIVEIRA, 2012; ARAÚJO & ANDRADE, 2018).

However, apart from the structures of future reference above mentioned, when we come across the language used in everyday communication, it is possible to notice utterances in which speakers of Portuguese seem to associate volition and future. This association is expressed in

3 Previous studies on future time reference have shown that Brazilian Portuguese yields plenty of ways to express the future. In addition to the ones mentioned here, there are also certain uses of the present tense and the - now rare - periphrasis [*haver de* + infinitive], to point a few others.

the construction [*querer* + verb in the infinitive], with the verb *querer* occurring in periphrastic position, as seen in the examples below:

- (a) Eu quero conversar com você.
I want to talk to you.
- (b) Acho que meu computador está querendo pifar.
I think my computer wants to break.
- (c) Ela está doente e querendo vomitar.
She is sick and wants to vomit.
- (d) Quero operar a garganta até o final do ano.
I want to undergo throat surgery by the end of the year.
- (e) A criança está com sono e quer dormir.
The kid is sleepy and wants to sleep.

Overall, the concept of volition is extremely similar to desire, although they differ in the degree of likelihood of action. Volition, as a semantic-functional (and cognitive) domain, can be defined as an act of will (OLIVEIRA & PRATA, 2020, p. 118), and would be positioned further along a continuum that begins with the speaker's will until the actual realization of the desired act. Volition goes beyond a mental process, also encompassing an actional process that will depend on factors such as "controllability, subjectivity, performativity, factuality and the potentization of the volitional event" (OLIVEIRA & PRATA, 2020, p. 118). Such factors will influence the degree of epistemic certainty attributed by the speaker to the event in question. As noted by Bybee & Pagliuca (1987), verbs that indicate desire and verbs of movement account for the two most common sources of future markers. Heine, Claudi & Hünnemeyer (1991) state that volitional verbs are prone to change towards a series of grammatical functions. In that sense, volition seems to be related to the idea of an intent that is projected into the future, as can be noted in (1), which is reinforced by the subsequent use of the verb "pretender" (to intend).

- (1) adoro o rbd ja tenho ate ingresso para os tres primeiros shows sou viciada em rebelde
quero ir em todos os shows **pretendo** ir conhecer o Alfonso no show do texas no eua.
*I love RBD I already have my ticket to the first three concerts I am addicted to RBD I
want to go to every concert I **intend** to meet Alfonso at the concert in the USA, Texas.*

Metaphorical expressions of future with *querer* derive from the association between the future action and the underlying actionality of volitional verbs. There is an association between the desired event and the actual occurrence of that event through the notion of intentionality. As such, intentionality is recognized as one of the main cognitive pathways for future expression in many languages (BYBEE, PERKINS & PAGLIUCA, 1994).

If, on the one hand, the theoretical perspective of grammaticalization perceives this process as a movement in which a lexical item loses its lexical meaning as it acquires grammatical function, on the other hand, in the perspective of grammatical constructionalization, such process is perceived at the level of the construction. Thus, the linguistic context is of key importance to determine the meaning. Santos (2015, p. 23) affirms that when considering contextual, linguistic, and extralinguistic elements, the use of *querer* in BP as an auxiliary verb is not a mark of future expression, but an indication — it implies futurity. In that sense, the future is not marked by the verb *querer* but by the whole construction along with extralinguistic information. This affirmation can only be confirmed through methods that look precisely at the construction level instead of only at the lexical level. That is to say that it is not the verb *querer* that is interpreted as gaining grammatical properties but the whole construction. This helps to understand that the verb will not necessarily lose its lexical meaning in order to attain the grammatical function.

By understanding the phenomenon as grammatical constructionalization, we argue that the construction selects or emphasizes the lexical meaning of intention that is already present in the verb *querer* and may or may not also select the lexical meaning of desire. Therefore, we can perceive the phenomenon as several constructions that select different properties of the verb instead of several different verbs in different stages of grammaticalization co-existing in a language. This also opens room for interpretations of data that do not place the instances in a binary representation of either intention or desire allowing for the recognition of both meanings within the same example.

Corpora

The data analyzed in this study were collected from two different sources: the social media *Twitter* and the corpus “Portuguese Web 2011” available through the software *Sketch Engine*⁴.

The first part of our corpus contains data from everyday language shared on *Twitter*. On this microblogging platform, users post text messages known as “tweets” with very few restrictions and no possibility to edit the posts. It is possible to collect a corpus of tweets by using *Twitter* API, which allows certain arrangements for the search, such as choosing the language in which the posts were written. However, collecting data from *Twitter* can be very limited as the platform does not support regular expressions, restricting the gathering of data. Additionally, as *Twitter* is an enormous corpus constantly growing and changing, we are not able to measure it in the same way we measure a stable and traditional corpus.

For this research, a major concern that we have in mind is to seek ways to record occurrences in order to understand their frequency. We wanted the examples within the corpus

⁴ More information about the corpus can be found in <https://www.sketchengine.eu/pttnten-portuguese-corpus/>.

to be selected randomly, without limiting entries of each construction. As we intended to apply the collocation analysis, we conducted a new data gathering on a different platform. This time we opted for *Sketch Engine* due to the possibility of easily recreating the study along with the benefits of using regular expressions and a thoroughly annotated corpus. Therefore, it was the most suitable option for the objectives we had in mind.

Although both corpora were contemplated in our qualitative analysis, only the data gathered through *Sketch Engine* was part of our quantitative analysis. In the following section, we further discuss the method of corpus data analysis that was used in this investigation, known as collocation analysis.

Collocation analysis

Considering that our objective is to investigate the phenomenon at the level of the construction, we opted for applying the collocation analysis, as it is a method of collocational analysis that takes into consideration the constructional meaning (HILPERT, 2008). This type of analysis allows the identification of co-occurring lexical material by measuring their strength of association. As a result, an item that is more frequent in the corpus will not interfere with the result as the analysis is based on its expected frequency. Authors such as Gries et al. (2005 *apud* Hilpert, 2008, p. 3) argue that the speaker performance tends to be more influenced by collocational strength than by raw frequency, so an approach based on collocational strength may offer a more reliable view of the psychological reality.

Along with the qualitative analysis, the collocation analysis can assist grammatical description as it allows an objective approach to the meaning of a construction and determines the degree of attraction or restriction of a lexical item to a slot in the construction (STEFANOWITSCH & GRIES, 2003). The concept behind the analysis is that the meaning of construction is reflected in the lexical items that can occur in its slots. As we intend to describe the differences between the behavior of the future construction [*querer* + verb in the infinitive] and the most common future construction in Brazilian Portuguese [*ir* + verb in the infinitive], we opted for the distinctive collexeme analysis, as it measures the association between lexemes and pairs of alternating constructions to identify which construction the item favors (STEFANOWITSCH & GRIES, 2005, p. 9). We applied the distinctive collexeme analysis to the 35 most frequent verbs in our data and employed the R-package *collocations*, developed by the linguist Susanne Flach (2021), which uses log-likelihood as the association method.

Another important decision was to use an item-based approach instead of the corpus-based. Our data was first gathered on Twitter, therefore, we did not have access to the whole corpus as a unit due to the constant flow of new tweets. In fact, a corpus-based approach would be better aligned to the theory of Construction Grammar as all the occurrences should be considered as constructions. We aim to further apply the corpus-based approach to compare with our current results as we are now able to do so as our new data was collected from *Sketch Engine*. However,

we emphasize that our current results should not be discarded as studies have shown that there is little difference in the results when using the item-based approach (STEFANOWITSCH & GRIES, 2005).

Santos (2019) argues that the future expression with *querer* comes from the idea that an action is desired by the subject of the sentence. Thus, it is projected to the future, and the prediction is implicit in the intention of the subject. For this reason, we can expect a difference in the distribution of collexemes according to their positive or negative values (more or less desirable) and according to the agency licensed by the verb. Because of that, we would not expect uses of the construction referring to situations that cannot be controlled by the subject of the clause as these types of events would not match the notion of intention.

Results

In tweets, the most frequent use of the verb *querer* was for invitations (2), a type of data that was not found in *Sketch Engine*. This was an expected outcome since the corpus “Portuguese Web 2011” does not contain many instances of interactions. We argue that cases of invitation can carry hints of futurity but they are better located in a margin between desire and intention than as a prediction (GIBBON, 2014, p. 39). As Gibbon (2014) explains, not every form that expresses futurity would be included in the functional domain of the future, and examples like this are located precisely in this area.

- (2) Alguém **quer jogar** Among Us?
Does anyone want to play Among Us?

Although invitations can also be expressed by the construction [*ir* + verb in the infinitive], we did not encounter this type of use in our data. The alternation between the constructions appeared more clearly concerning the difference in the degree of certainty regarding the realization of the event. As we can see in (3) and (4), the future reference with *querer* indicates an uncertain intention while the future reference with *ir* indicates a more confident intention.

- (3) P.G. – **Quero entrar** no curso de Medicina Veterinária. E agora, a curto prazo, **quero tirar** um curso de Inglês, no Verão e pretendo continuar o meu trabalho [...]
P.G. - I want to enroll in the veterinary medicine course. And now, in the short-term, I want to enroll in an English course, in the summer, and I intend to continue my job [...]
- (4) li o que não queria, **vou ficar** quietinha pra não arranjar briga com ele
I read what I didn't want to, I will be quiet so that I don't get into an argument with him

One of the selected parameters of analysis was the distribution of adverbs of time. Some studies, such as Santos (2019), argue that adverbial phrases (along with other lexical elements) can be used to achieve a sense of predictability. Our data presented a similar behavior in the application of this resource in both constructions.

(5) @USER **Quer ir** amanhã ?

@USER Do you **want to go** tomorrow?

(6) tirei umas fotos pra marca de uma amiga e acho que **vou postar** amanhã mesmo pq não to me segurando.

*I took some pictures to tag a friend and I think I **will post** them tomorrow because I can't contain myself.*

As volitional events imply a degree of epistemic certainty on the part of the speaker regarding the occurrence of the event, the temporal marker can indicate future reference not only by locating the event in a certain space of the timeline but also by assigning a greater degree of certainty of realization. Thus, uses with temporal markers are more likely to activate the degree of intentionality present in *querer*, indicating that potential action is greater.

Initially, we considered the example “A pergunta que não quer calar”, a common expression in Brazilian Portuguese, as an instance of the future value pointed out by Szcześniak (2017)⁵. The basis of this interpretation relied on the fact that “a pergunta” (the question) is an inanimate subject, and, therefore, does not allow the interpretation of desire.

(7) Tá certo que em todas as quatro ocasiões eu tava bebum, mas a pergunta que não **quer calar**, o problema é comigo ou com a minha namorada?

*It is true that I was drunk in all four occasions, but the question that **does not want to shut up**, the problem is with myself or with my girlfriend?*

We then encountered new instances of the use of the negative with the verb *querer* in tweets, such as “O wi-fi que não quer funcionar” (the wi-fi does not want to work) and “O instagram não quer enviar o story” (instagram does not want to send the story). These examples indicate the same type of circumstances, however, it was clear that they did not imply the future occurrence of the situation but its persistence in the present moment.

(8) Já fiz tanto storys pra Amanda mas meu Instagram não **quer sair** desse bug dele.

*I have already recorded so many stories to Amanda but my Instagram **does not want to get out of this bug**.*

⁵ This interpretation along with a brief explanation of how we got to this conclusion is available in Costa, Souza & Machado-Vieira (2020).

We considered the possibility of anthropomorphization, used in this context to denote the idea of stubbornness by the inanimate subject when refusing to do what the speaker expects⁶. However, even though we are able to identify the personification of the inanimate subject, we can see a clear difference between the use of the verb *querer* in comparison with other verbs that would also give the idea of a stubborn subject. If the speaker opted for the verb “negar” (to deny), for instance, the sentence would indeed convey the anthropomorphization of the inanimate subject but it would not carry the same syntactic characteristics present in the construction [negative + *querer* + verb in the infinitive].

After long discussions, we noticed that the verbs that occupy the slot in the construction are punctual (send, function, shut up), but when they appear in this construction, the situation is portrayed in such a way that the [-punctual] property of the verb *querer* creates an expansion of the event. In this sense, *querer* seems to act in a non-deictic way, as it modifies the internal structure of the situation (in this case, expanding it) and does not necessarily mark its location in time. We believe that the construction is used to modify the aspect of the sentence as it indicates the persistence of the event but not the location of the event in a timeline. We can verify this argument by changing the tense of the sentences. By doing so, we can easily locate the event at a different time without losing the characteristics of the construction. In this case, the interpretation of the possible recurrence of the event in the future comes from the aspectual property that creates the expansion of the event by modifying the telicity.

The margins of what constitutes or does not constitute predictions in constructions with verbs of desire are less stable and categorical than the ones with verbs of movement since there is more room for negotiation. The lexical meaning that attributes the idea of intention seems to be less fixed than the lexical meaning that attributes future with verbs of movement.

These examples also support our argument that the future reference does not come from the verb *querer* but from the construction as a whole. In order to provide better descriptions of the interaction of the adverb “não” with the construction, we need to gather more data with this type of occurrence as well as data with different adverbs interacting with the auxiliary verb *querer*. It is worth noting that we did not analyze instances of intervenient elements between the auxiliary and main verbs, and, because of that, examples with the adverbs “muito” (so/a lot) and “pouco” (a little) are not part of our analyzed data.

Regarding our hypothesis of collocational distribution, the following table contains the first ten lines of the distinctive collostructional analysis. It shows the most attracted collexemes, from the highest collostructional strength to the lowest.

⁶ We thank professor Szcześniak for assisting us with the development of a better explanation for this use of the verb *querer*.

Item	Construction	Log-likelihood
dizer (say)	[querer_Inf]	340821,1296
saber (know)	[querer_Inf]	121345,0511
ir (go)	[querer_Inf]	35653,89124
acontecer (happen)	[ir_Inf]	30495,06805
ter (have)	[ir_Inf]	29527,65759
ser (be)	[ir_Inf]	22308,33391
querer (want)	[ir_Inf]	14230,79112
poder (can)	[ir_Inf]	13723,86776
ficar (stay/become)	[ir_Inf]	9875,535708
ver (see)	[querer_Inf]	8769,466194
continuar (continue)	[ir_Inf]	8465,341766
começar (begin)	[ir_Inf]	7255,638425
procurar (search)	[ir_Inf]	7021,902325
receber (get)	[ir_Inf]	7002,145407
apresentar (present)	[ir_Inf]	5147,623334
ocorrer (occur)	[ir_Inf]	5044,910604
estar (be)	[ir_Inf]	4503,954827
dar (give)	[ir_Inf]	3524,258361
mostrar (show)	[querer_Inf]	2035,806527
fazer (make)	[querer_Inf]	1696,053169
aprender (learn)	[querer_Inf]	1538,718439
deixar (let)	[querer_Inf]	1258,254897
trabalhar (work)	[ir_Inf]	588,091453
morrer (die)	[ir_Inf]	528,594516
vir (come)	[querer_Inf]	294,152347
passar (wander)	[ir_Inf]	276,909161
seguir (follow)	[querer_Inf]	266,855802
reinventar (reinvent)	[querer_Inf]	173,081202
tornar (become)	[querer_Inf]	131,918002
aumentar (increase)	[ir_Inf]	110,685209
assistir (watch)	[ir_Inf]	84,834007
entrar (get in)	[ir_Inf]	21,893998
participar (participate)	[ir_Inf]	15,085521
falar (talk)	[ir_Inf]	7,143865
ler (read)	[querer_Inf]	1,613362

Table: Distinctive Collexeme Analysis - highest to lowest collostructional strength.

As can be noted in the table above, we were not able to identify any distributive tendency regarding the positive or negative connotation of the verb in the collostructional analysis. The most frequent verbs in the constructions were either neutral or part of a complex predicate in which their connotation depended on the construction as a whole. Although the verb “morrer” (*die*) was attracted to the construction [*ir* + verb in the infinitive], the same verb was often found in the construction with *querer*.

- (09) @USER ala ela **quer morrer!** Se tu fizer isso eu tenho meus isqueiro.
@USER look she wants to die! If you do it I have my matches.

Besides, as mentioned by Costa, Souza & Machado-Vieira (2020), we can identify three instances of lexical constructionalization with the verb *querer*:

- (10) “@USER MAS OQ ISSO **QUER DIZER** VEI TU JA EH ASSIM quer dizer em partes”;
“@USER but what **does it want to say** dude you are already like that, I mean, somehow”
- (11) “gente, não é engraçado como popularmente falamos sardinhas ao invés de sardazinhas, **quer dizer**, não existe um diminutivo correto pra sardas, mas sardazinhas seria o mais certo. Mas é engraçado como sempre usam sardinhas”;
“guys, it is not funny how we publicly say ‘sardinhas’ instead of ‘sardazinhas’, **I want to say**, there is no correct diminutive to freckles, but ‘sardazinhas’ would be the most correct one. But it is funny how everybody say ‘sardinhas’”
- (12) “@USER @USER @USER **Quer saber**, esquece. Meu tempo é mais valioso que isso”.
@user @user @user **Want to know**, forget it. My time is more valuable than this.

Although the collostructional analysis supported our initial claim that these verbs were attracted to the construction with *querer*, we still need to isolate these examples to analyze the future construction [*querer* + verb in the infinitive] without any interference. We can classify these constructions as lexical constructionalizations due to non-compositional meaning from the expressions.

We opted for grouping the verbs into semantic classes to look for distributional patterns, as proposed by Gilquin (2015). A large number of the verbs attracted to the construction with *ir* are non-volitional verbs, which can be defined as verbs that do not depend on the subject’s will (GILQUIN, 2015, p. 9), such as “acontecer” (*happen*), “ter” (*have*), “ser” (*be*), “querer” (*want*), “poder” (*can*), and “ficar” (*stay/become*). On the other hand, a large number of verbs attracted to the construction with *querer* are volitional verbs, such as “mostrar” (*show*), “fazer” (*make*), “aprender” (*learn*), “deixar” (*let*), “ler” (*read*), and “seguir” (*follow*). This distribution is aligned with the cognitive path of future reference with verbs of desire as the metaphorical reference is established from the subject’s intention. This semantic class is also directly related to agency.

Although the preference for volitional verbs by the future construction [*querer* + verb in the infinitive] was somehow predictable, the preference for non-volitional verbs in the main verb slot may indicate that the future construction [*ir* + verb in the infinitive] is preferred for strong predictions of the future. To better illustrate, the two instances below relate to intention: the first one represents an uncertain intention while the second one represents a more confident intention. This could also indicate a difference in the distance of the event in relation to the moment of utterance, however, this hypothesis still requires further investigation.

- (13) @USER completamente/ não se pressione a descobrir onde **quer chegar**, tá tudo bem não saber pra onde ir, querido
 @USER *completely/ do not push yourself to find out where you **want to reach**, it is ok to not know where to go, dear*
- (14) Cheguei do cross, dar um 10 e ir para academia, **vou chegar** voando no final do ano
*I got home from crossfit, I will wait 10 minutes and go to the gym, I **will reach** the end of the year flying.*

Final considerations

The main purpose of this paper was to analyze the use of the construction [*querer* + verb in the infinitive] as a future reference considering the perspective of grammatical constructionalization. We conducted this analysis through qualitative and quantitative methods, including the colostruational analysis of distinctive collexemes. The study is situated within usage based-linguistics and construction grammar theoretical postulations.

The results of the analysis displayed several uses of the construction [*querer* + verb in infinitive] as a marker of intentionality and future. Our findings indicate that native speakers of Portuguese recognize the construction as a possible resource for future reference. The analysis sample and the discussion offered in this article allow us to verify that constructions with verbs of desire are situated in an ambiguous area allowing uses that trigger different parts and levels of their lexical meaning. Consequently, speakers are able to frame their predictions with a less categorical tone than what would be possible with future constructions with verbs of movement, such as *ir*.

Overall, the results of the colostruational analysis indicated the lexical constructionalization previously identified in Costa, Souza & Machado-Vieira (2020) and a distribution tendency regarding the volitional or non-volitional characteristics of the main verb. Volitional verbs, that is, verbs that indicate events that depend on the subject's will, showed a preference for the construction with *querer* whereas non-volitional verbs were attracted to the construction with *ir*. There was no significant distributional difference according to positive/negative values of the verb. We aim to further investigate the results of the colostruational analysis to identify

patterns that may have been overlooked. Further, we also aim to estimate the p-value of the collostructional analysis as a test of significance.

With this work, we intend to contribute to a greater understanding of the periphrasis [*querer* + verb in infinitive] in Portuguese under the scope of a functional and constructionist approach. We hope that the points tackled in this research encourage more studies to look into the behavior of the construction [*querer* + verb in infinitive] and the implications of its expression.

References

- ARAÚJO, Jussara; ANDRADE, Silvana. A expressão de futuridade em periódicos manauaras. Miguilim – *Revista Eletrônica do Netlli*, Crato, v. 7, n. 1, p. 26-38, jan-abr. 2018.
- BRAGANÇA, Marcela Langa Lacerda. *A gramaticalização do verbo IR e a variação de formas para expressar o futuro do presente: uma fotografia capixaba*. 2008. 146f. Dissertação (Mestrado em Estudos Linguísticos) - Centro de Ciências Humanas e Naturais, Universidade Federal do Espírito Santo, Vitória, 2008.
- BYBEE, Joan; PERKINS, Revere; PAGLIUCA, William. *The evolution of grammar: tense, aspect and modality in the languages of the world*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1994.
- BYBEE, Joan; PAGLIUCA, William. The evolution of future meaning. In Ramat, A. G.; Carruba, O.; Bernini, G. (Eds.). *Papers from the 7th International Conference on Historical Linguistics*. Amsterdam, 1987.
- COSTA, Mariana Gonçalves; SOUZA, Lais Lima; MACHADO-VIEIRA, Marcia dos Santos. Construções de futuro com verbos volitivos no português do Brasil: querer + verbo no infinitivo. In: Maria Maura Cezario; Karen Sampaio Alonso; Dennis Castanheira. (Org.). *Linguística Baseada no Uso: explorando métodos, construindo caminhos*. 1ed. Rio de Janeiro: RioBooks, 2020, p. 31-49.
- FLACH, Susanne. *Collostructions: An R Implementation for the Family of Collostructional Methods*. v. 0.2.0, 2021. Disponível em: <https://sfla.ch/> Acesso em: 19 mar. 2021.
- FLEISCHMAN, Suzanne. *The Future in thought and language - Diachronic evidence from Romance*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1982.
- GIBBON, Adriana de Oliveira. *Trajetória de gramaticalização da perífrase ir (presente) + infinitivo no domínio funcional do futuro: análise sincrônica e diacrônica em amostras de fala e escrita gaúchas*. Tese (Doutorado) - Programa de Pós Graduação em Linguística, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2014. Disponível em: <https://repositorio.ufsc.br/bitstream/handle/123456789/194025/PLLG0628-T.pdf?sequence=-1&isAllowed=y> Acesso em 31 mai. 2022.

GILQUIN, Gaëtanelle. *Contrastive collostructional analysis: Causative constructions in English and French*. *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* v. 63.3, p. 253-272, out. 2015.

HEINE, Bernd; CLAUDI, Ulrike; HÜNNEMEYER, Friederike. *Grammaticalization: a conceptual framework*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1991.

HILPERT, Martin. *Germanic Future Constructions: A Usage-Based Approach to Language Change*. Amsterdam: John Benjamins, 2008.

OLIVEIRA, André Silva; PRATA, Nadja Paulino Pessoa. Os aspectos semântico-funcionais da volição. *Revista do GELNE*, Natal, v. 22 - n. 2: p. 118-130, 2020.

OLIVEIRA, Josane Moreira. A expressão do futuro verbal na escrita jornalística baiana. *Revista Linguística*, Rio de Janeiro, n. 1, jun. 2012.

SANTOS, Valéria Cunha. *Intenção e desejo: os usos de querer com implicaturas de futuridade*. 2015. 133 f. Dissertação (Mestrado) - Curso de Linguística, Universidade Federal de Santa Catarina, Florianópolis, 2015.

SANTOS, Valéria Cunha. *Implicaturas de futuridade em usos de querer + infinitivo em PB: interpretação temporal do ato de fala a partir do aspecto e da modalidade*, 2019. Disponível em: <http://www.periodicos.letras.ufmg.br/index.php/relin/article/view/14249>

SZCZEŚNIAK, Konrad. É um não querer mais que bem querer: Gramaticalização de conceitos volitivos. In: *Revista de Estudos Linguísticos da Universidade do Porto*. v. 12, p. 179-200, 2017.

STEFANOWITSCH, Anatol; GRIES, Stefan Th. Collostructions: investigating the interaction of words and constructions. *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics*, 8:2, p. 209-243, 2003.

STEFANOWITSCH, Anatol; GRIES, Stefan Th. Covarying collexemes. *Corpus Linguistics and Linguistic Theory* 1. v.1, p. 1-43, 2005.