Future from the fringes: the marking of future time reference in Züritüütsch

Balthasar Bickel

*Cognitive Anthropology Research Group Nijmegen
and Universität Zürich*

O. Preamble

Züritüütsch[1] is a Swiss German dialect spoken in the town of Zürich and its surroundings. Swiss German dialects generally lack a future marking device in the core of their grammars. There are, however, some phenomena in the periphery of Züritüütsch grammar that contribute to the coding of future time. Often, these phenomena are reminiscent of neighbouring dialects and languages (see Szadrowsky (1930: 114ff *et passim*) on High Allemanic dialects and Ebneter (1973, 1978) on Rhaeto-Romance and its neighbours). Züritüütsch itself has been described by Albert Weber (Weber 1987), who is, however, often deliberately normative.

My orthography is based on the system developed by Eugen Dieth (Dieth 1986). In this system the numerous sandhi rules are not applied. Therefore, what surfaces e.g. as ['ʋæmmər 'sæiʃ] is written *wän d mer säisch...* (literally 'if you^s me tell', i.e. 'if you^s tell me...'). In most syntactic environments, many words ending in a vowel receive a 'linking' /n/ or /r/ to avoid hiatus. Here, I follow the practice of the *Schweizerisches Idiotikon* and write a superscribed *n* or *r*, e.g. *ich schriibe^n de brief* [ix'ʃriːbədə 'briəf] 'I write the letter' and *ich schriibe^n en brief* [ix'ʃriːbənən 'briəf] 'I write a letter'.

1. Marking of future time reference

The verbal system of Züritüütsch shows a binary tense split with an equipollent opposition between Past and Non-Past.[2] Besides free temporal deixis (with *dän* 'then', *moorn* 'tomorrow', *bald* 'soon' etc.) the only productive way of marking future time reference is bound to copular constructions. They will be dealt with in section 17. The cognate of High German future auxiliary *werden*, marks inference or presumption when used with infinitives:

(1)   a.   *Er* **wììrt** **en** *Brief schriibe^n.*   [FTRQ: 1]
            he   EVID:3s   INDEFsM   letter   write
            'Presumably, he writes / will write a letter.'

For writing, Standard High German, which is acquired early in school, is used throughout non-Romance Switzerland. In oral form, this variety is ubiquitous in German and sometimes present in Swiss radio and television. Due to this diglossia,

there are many loan constructions affecting Züritüütsch. A particularly blended variety is found in official and pseudo-official speech, especially when it comes to political, military or economic matters. In such contexts, *wèèrde^n* is widely used as a future time marker:

(2) a. *Mer **wèèrded** öis   bémüe^n, d   Forderige^n*
        we   FUT:1p   we:ACC give_effort DEF:Fs demand:p
        vo dère^n Initiative^n z   erfüle^n.
        of DEM:DATsF initiative   INF fulfill
        'We'll do our best to meet the demands of this initiative.'

      b. *Öise^n Présidänt **wììrt** i^n dère^r Sa<u>ch</u> mit de^r*
        our:Ms president   FUT:3s in DEM:FsDAT issue with DEF:DATsF
        zueständige^n Amtsstell Kontakt uufnèè.
        competent   office   contact   up:take
        'Our president will contact the competent office in this issue.'

3. Intention and prediction

Intentional future can be expressed by means of *wele^n* 'to want':

(3)   *Ich **wott** en   Brief schriibe^n.*   [FTRQ: 5]
        I   want:1s INDEF:Ms letter   write
        'I am going to write a letter.'

This, of course, does not amount to saying that *wele^n* is a marker of intentional future. A *wele^n* clause can always refer to an unspecified time (which is naturally often placed in the future) or even to an impossible situation. A similar caveat holds for *müese^n* and *si<u>ch</u>er,* expressions that may be used to strongly assert prediction:

(4) a. *Dän **muesch** stèèrbe^n.*   [FTRQ: 11]
        then   have_to:2s die
        'Then you will die.'

      b. *Er vertwa<u>ch</u>et moorn   **si<u>ch</u>er** spaat.*   [FTRQ: 44]
        He wake_up:3s tomorrow surely   late
        'He will wake up late tomorrow.'

Semantically, however, the terms contain no element of prediction. *müese^n* refers to general obligation ('must, have to') and *si<u>ch</u>er* means 'surely'.

    The picture changes when it comes to phraseological expressions (idioms). Here, *wele^n* 'to want' marks prediction:

(5) a. *Mer **wänd** dän   luege^n·*
        we   want:1p then   look
        'We shall see'

b. ***I wott   der   dän!*** (sc. *äis   haueⁿ*)

    I want:1s   youˢDAT then   one:N   hit

    Used as a threat implying: 'If youˢ do this, I'll hit / scold youˢ.'

In these cases, a literal reading of *weleⁿ* is hard to get but certainly possible. No literal interpretation is available with the following. *wil* is an archaic form of *weleⁿ* and occurs virtually only in the phraseme (6)

(6)   ***I wil   em   s sägeⁿ / uusrichteⁿ.***

        I want:1s he:DAT it tell   deliver_a_message

        'I will tell him.'

Here, *wil* unambiguously marks intentional future time reference.

4. Degrees of certainty and scheduling

Neither degrees of certainty nor scheduling are reflected by the verbal tense system. For unintentionality, see section 17.

5. Future time reference and aspect

There is a periphrastic Progressive that is optionally used to represent situations that are perceived as imperfective, non-habitual and active. The construction is based on an infinitive introduced by *am* 'at:DEF:Ns' and syntactically incorporates objects. If objects have an article, they cannot be incorporated. Therefore, speakers have to resort to a two-nexus-construction with *draa sii* 'ANA:at BE' and an infinitive with the particle *z* (literally 'to'). With future time reference, no particular restrictions on the use of the Progressive can be observed, cf. Progressive (7a) vs. Non-Progressive (7b):

(7)   a. *Moorn **biⁿ** i wider **am   schaffeⁿ**.*

       tomorrow BE:1s I again   at:DEFsN work

       'Tomorow I will be working again.'

    b. *Moorn   **schaff** i wider.*

       tomorrow worke:1s I again

       'Tomorow I will work again.'

In (8), Progressive and Non-Progressive can be observed in the incidence scheme:

(8)   a. *Was   meinsch, was   **isch** din   Brüeder **am   macheⁿ***

       what   think:2s   what   BE:3s yourˢ:Ms brother   at:DEFsN make

       wän   mer aachömed?

       SUB we   arrive:1p

       'What do youˢ think yourˢ brother will be engaged in when we arrive?'

b. *Was   meinsch, was   **macht** din   Brüeder wän mer aachömed?*
  what   think:2s   what   make:3s   your[s]:Ms brother   SUB we   arrive:1p
  'How will your[s] brother react when we arrive?'

In (8a) the event in the subordinate clause occurs during the main clause event. In contrast, if the Pogressive is not used, the events appear contiguously sequenced. (Due to *post hoc ergo propter hoc*, the most natural interpretation of (8b) entails 'to react' as English translation of *mache[n]*.)

8 — 9. *Future time reference in linked clauses*

In Züritüütsch, there is no *consecutio temporum* at work, i.e. no shift from past vs. non-past to anterior vs. non-anterior. In two cases, however, clause linkage affects tense value.

The first syntactic constraint concerns purposive and precessive clauses. They are subordinated by means of *das* and *bevor*, respectively. The inherent posteriority of such clauses is expressed by the Non-Past, provided the matrix points to a Non-Past event:

(9) a. *Ich **schriib** mim   Brüeder en   Brief, das   er **wäiss**,*
      I   write:1s my:DATsM brother   INDEF:Ms letter COMP he know:3s
      das   ich zue[n] em   uf Bsuech chume[n].   [FTRQ: 95]
      COMP I   to   he:DAT on visit   come:1s
       'I am writing a letter to my brother so that he will know that I am coming to see him.'

    b. *Er **gaat** is   Bett bevor i häi **chume[n]**.*
      he go:3s in:DEFsN bed SUB   I home come:1s
       'He goes to bed before I come home.'

With a matrix clause in the Past, however, purposives require a Non-Past (10a) whereas precessives force the use of a Past form (10b):

(10) a. *Ich **ha[n]**   mim   Brüeder en   Brief **gschribe[n]**, das   er **wäiss**,*
      I   AUX:1s my:DATsM brother   INDEF:Ms letter PST:write   COMP he know:3s
      *(*das i **gwüsst ha**)   das   ich zue[n] em   uf Bsuech chume[n].* [FTRQ: 96]
      (COMP I PST:know AUX:1s) COMP I   to   he:DAT on visit   come:1s
       'I wrote a letter to my brother so that he would know that I was coming to see him.'
    b. *Ich **bi[n]**   is   Bett **ggange** bevor min   Brüeder häi*
      I   AUX:1s in:DEF:Ns bed PST:go SUB my:Ms brother   home
      ***choo**   isch. (*bevor min   Brüeder häi   **chunt**.)*   [FTRQ: 22]
      PST:come AUX:3s   SUB my:Ms brother   home come:3s
      'I went to bed before my brother came home.'

The second phenomenon shows up with the general subordinator *wo^n* that introduces adsententially subordinated and relative clauses (on this polysemy cf. Bickel (1991: 120ff *et passim*)). When adsententially used, a *wo^n* clause forces a historical present interpretation upon Non-Past forms:

(11)   *Wo^n er häi **chunt,** gseet er uf em   Tisch en   Brief.*
        SUB he home come:3s see:3s he on DEF:DATsM table INDEF:Ms letter
        'When he comes home, he sees a letter on the table.'

The constraint can be infringed if the *wo^n*-clause functions as a topic in a fashion similar to English *given that* -clauses (cf. Haiman 1978: 573) (on *choo* cf. Section 17). I am not aware, however, of sentence-initial *wo^n*-topics. (The contradiction particle *doch* is virtually obligatory and presumably serves to assure conversational relevance of the 'weather topics' in (12).)

(12)   a. *Wieso gönd er   nöd veruse^n, wo^n s doch so^n schön **isch?***
           why   go:2p you^p NEG outdoors SUB it PTCL so   fair   BE:3s
           'Why don't you^p go out, given that the weather is so fair?'

        b. *Wieso söl   i jetz e^n Wösch   oobtue^n,*
           why   should:1s I now INDEFsF wash   put_on
           *wo^n s doch bald **chunt** cho **rägne^n?***
           SUB it PTCL soon come:3s SP^3 rain
           'Why should I do a wash, given that it will be raining soon?'

To convey a non-past meaning in an adsententially subordinate clause without implying givenness, the subordinator *wän* may be used, cf. (8) above. This device covers conditionals in general. The subordinate clause contains either an Indicative to capture a "real" condition (13) or a Conditional to encode an "unreal" one (14):

(13)   *Wän de   Bueb (moorn) s   Gält **überchunt,***
        SUB DEF:Ms boy   (tomorrow) DEFsN money receive:3s
        chaufft er em   Mäitli es   Gschänk.   [FTRQ: 13]
        buy:3s he DEFsN:DAT girl   INDEFsN present
        'If the boy gets the money (tomorrow), he will buy a present for the girl.'

(14)   *Wän de   Bueb (moorn) s   Gält **überchèèm,** wu¨~u¨~rd   er*
        SUB DEFsM boy   (tomorrow) DEFsN money receive:COND:3s COND:3s he
        em   Mäitli es   Gschänk chauffe^n.   [FTRQ: 14]
        DEFsN:DAT girl   INDEFsN present   buy
        'If the boy were to get the money (tomorrow), he would buy a present
        for the girl.'

Note that inclusion of *moorn* 'tomorrow' has no effect on tense morphology. For completeness, the following examples give the same opposition with past reference:

(15) *Wo de   Bueb s   Gält **überchoo hät**,*
SUB DEFsM boy   DEFsN money PST:receive   AUX:3s
hät   er em   Mäitli es   Gschänk gchauft.   [FTRQ: 15]
AUX:3s he DEFsN:DAT girl   INDEFsN present   PST:buy
'If the boy has received the money, he will have bought a present for the girl.'

(16) *Wo de   Bueb s   Gält **überchoo het**,*
SUB DEFsM boy   DEFsN money PST:receive   COND:3s
het   er em   Mäitli es   Gschänk gchauft.   [FTRQ: 16]
COND:3s he DEFsN:DAT girl   INDEFsN present   PST:buy
'If the boy had received the money, he would have bought a present
for the girl.'

10. Future time reference and marked speech act types

Except for phraseological phenomena (cf. (5b) in section 3), no grammatical particularities were observed when the Non-Past is used in promises or threats.

13 — 14. Prospectivity and remoteness

Prospectivity and remoteness are not categories of Züritüütsch grammar. A sentence like 'it is going to rain' (FTQR: 47) will be rendered in the same way as 'it will rain' (FTQR: 49).

(17) *S chunt   cho rägne^n.*
it come:3s SP   rain
'It is going to rain / it will rain.'

Imminence requires adverbial expressions in order to be made explicit, *grad* in the affirmative and *fascht* for negation:

(18) a. *Ich schlaaff   jetz dän **grad**   ii.*   [FTRQ: 85]
I   fall_asleep:1s now then immediately PREV
'I am about to fall asleep.'

   b. *Geschter bi^n i **fascht** vomen   Auto*
yesterday AUX:1s I nearly   by:INDEFsN:DAT car
überfaare^n woorde^n.   [FTRQ: 86]
run_over   PASS:PST
'Yesterday, I was on the verge of being run over by a car.'

17. Inchoativity, change of state, and future in copular constructions

Copular constructions have either adjectival or nominal predicates. I shall first discuss the former.

With adjectival predicates, there are two copulas indicating change of state: *wèèrde*[n] (literally 'to become, get'; 3s Indicative Non-Past *wììrt*) and *überchoo* (literally 'to get, receive'; 3s Indicative Non-Past *chunt über*). Their distribution is complementary: Where a predicate is constructed with a *sii* copula ('to be'; 3s Indicative Non-Past *isch*) to indicate a state, its change is expressed by *wèèrde*[n]; where the copula is *haa* ('to have'; 3s Indicative Non-Past *hät*), the corresponding change of state verb is *überchoo*. (In interlinear glossing, I indicate only the temporal or aspectual value of the copula. Other surface distinctions follow from selectional restrictions or from the syntactic frame in which the copula occurs.)

(19) a.   *Es **isch**   chalt.*
         it   PRS:3s cold
         'It is cold.'

     b.   *Es **wììrt**   chalt.*
         it   INCH:3s cold
         'It's getting cold.' (also: 'It will be cold.')

(20) a.   *Si **hät**   chalt.*
         she PRS:3s cold
         'She is cold'

     b.   *Si **chunt**   chalt **über**.*
         she   INCH:3s cold   PREV
         'She is getting cold.' (also: 'She will be cold.')

An exeption to this rule occurs with phraseological *haa*-expressions that contain a dummy object pronoun *(e)s*. Thus, if in a construction like (21a) the pronoun *(e)s* cannot be replaced by anything, there is no change of state alternative available (21b):

(21) a.   *Er **hät**   s guet .*
         he PRS:3s it well
         'He is fine.'

     b.   **Er **chunt**   s guet **über**.*
         he   INCH:1s it well   PREV
         (*He is getting fine)

The translations of (19b) and (20b) suggest that both auxiliaries may indicate future time reference. This results from focusing on the result of the change of state rather than on the process being observed at the moment of speech. Inchoative and future reading are easily disambiguated by means of adverbial qualification:

(22)   *Es **wììrt**   langwiilig.*
           it   INCH/FUT:3s boring
           'It is getting boring / it will be boring.'

      a.   *Es wììrt   langsam langwiilig.*
            it   INCH:3s slowly   boring
            'It's (slowly) getting boring.'
            (said e.g. while watching a movie)

      b.   *Hütt z aabig wììrt s langwiilig.*
            today at evening FUT:3s it boring
            'It will be boring tonight.'
            (said e.g. in view of an anounced party)

(23)   *I glaub, er **chunt**   en   gèèrn   **über**.*
           I believe:1s he INCH/FUT:3s he:ACC love(ADJ)   PREV
           'I think he is getting to love him / he will love him.'

      a.   *I glaub, er chunt en   langsaam gèèrn   über.*
            I believe:1s he INCH:3s he:ACC slowly   love(ADJ)   PREV
            'I think he is (slowly) getting to love him.'

      b.   *I glaub, er chunt en   scho no   emaal   gèèrn   über.*
            I believe:1s he FUT:3s he:ACC PTCL PTCL some_time love(ADJ)   PREV
            'I think he will certainly love him some time.'

Thus, whereas *wèèrde^n* has no future sense with verbs, it does have such a reading with adjectival predicates.

    Adjectives of judgement (*guet* 'well', *schön* 'nice', *rächt* 'right', *blööd* 'silly, wrong', *lätz* 'wrong', *schief* 'wrong, distorted') allow an alternative construction with *usechoo* (literally 'to come out of something'; 3s Indicative Non-Past *chunt use*). This construction excludes an inchoative reading and is restricted to future time reference.

(24)   *Es **chunt** guet use^n.*
           it   FUT:3s well PREV
           'It will turn out well.'

Especially younger speakers tend to shorten the expression by omitting *use^n*.

    What we have observed in the last example holds generally for nominal predicates: They are not compatible with an inchoative sense. That is, a nominal referent cannot be captured *in statu nascendi*.[4] There are, however, specific copulas to index future reference. Three types of nominal predication are distinguished: Existence, identity, and possession (in a general relational sense).

    Existential clauses have a dummy *(e)s* subject and *haa* as copula (25a). As shown in (25b), future reference is expressed by *gèè* (literally 'to give'; 3s Indicative Non-Past *git*).

(25) a. *Une^n ine* **hät** *s e*   *Baar*.
below inside   PRS:3s it INDEFsN bar
'Downstairs there is a bar.'

  a. *Une^n ine* **git** *s e*   *Baar*.
below   inside   FUT:3s it INDEFsN bar
'Downstairs there will be a bar.'

The same future copula is used with nominal predicates in identity constructions. Present reference is expressed by the *sii*-copula. (26a) shows present, (26b) future tense.

(26) a. *Das*   **isch**   *öises Huus*.
DEMsN PRS:3s   our:Ns house
'This is our house.'

  b. *Das*   **git** *öises Huus*.
DEMsN FUT:3s our:Ns house
'This will be our house.'

Nominal predicates without determination take *wèèrde^n* instead of *gèè* as future copula (27b). In this regard, they belong with adjectival constructions. The impossibility of inchoative reading, however, suggests a particular syntactic status. Moreover, the use of *wèèrde^n* is synchronically at variance in so far as sentences like (27c) and (27d) are possible though archaic for some speakers.

(27) a. *Er* **isch**   *Leerer*.
he PRS:3s teacher
'He is a teacher.'

  b. *Er* **wììrt** *Leerer*.
he FUT:3s teacher
'He will be a teacher.'

  c. *Er* **git**   *puur*.
he FUT:3s farmer.
'He will be a farmer'

  d. *Was wotsch emaal*   **gèè?**
what want:2s some_time FUT
'What (occupation) do yo want to go into (when you grow up)?'

Possessive or 'relational' constructions take the *haa*-copula for present reference (28a) and *iiberchoo* 'to receive; to get' to point to a future state (28b).

(28) a. *Ich* **ha^n**   *es*   *Velo*.
I   PRS:1s INDEFsN bike

'I have got a bike.'

b. *Ich chume^n es   Velo über.*
   I   FUT:1s   INDEFsN bike PREV
   'I will get a bike.'

In all cases from (24) to (28), the unavailability of inchoative meaning precludes inclusion of an adverb like *langsam* 'slowly' which elsewhere (cf. (22b) and (23b) focusses on the process of a change of state. An apparent counter-example is (29).

(29)   *Das git   langsam öppis.*
        DEM FUT:3s slowly   something
        'It looks like something will come of it.'

Yet a closer inspection shows that in (29), *langsam* 'slowly' does not suggest a view of something coming into existence. Rather, the adverb indicates that the speaker has more and more evidence that something will exist in future time.

   In one case, however, inchoativity is a possible reading. This occurs with 'possessive' constructions denoting an emotional state or a corresponding state to be:

(30) a.   *Si hät   e   rise Wuet.*
           she PRS:3s INDEFsF giant rage
           'She is in a rage.'

   b.   *Si chunt e   rise Wuet über.*
         she FUT:3s INDEFsF giant rage   PREV
         'She will be in a rage.'

   c.   *Si chunt langsam e   Wuet über.*
         she INCH:3s slowly   INDEFsF rage   PREV
         'She is slowly becoming enraged.'

   The inchoative and/or future copulas we have met so far are all etymologically derived from change expressions, viz. change of orientation, change of place or change of possession (in a narrow sense). Change of orientation is found with *wèèrde^n* whose Proto-Germanic root **werþ-a-* goes back to Proto-Indo-European **wert-* meaning 'to turn over' (cf. Sanskrit *vártate* 'it turns, rolls' and Old Church Slavonic *vrŭtěti sę* 'it turns, rolls' (Kluge, s.v. *werden*)). Change of place is presumably at the basis of *überchoo*, which seems to derive from *über* 'over' and *choo* 'come'. A similar semantic core provides the etymon for the future sign *usechoo*. This etymon, a full verb meaning 'to come out of something', is still found in modern Züritüütsch. Finally, the future copula *gèè* has a change of possession etymon which is still present as a full verb denoting active 'to give'.

   Yet another 'change' expression gives rise to a sign for inchoativity and future reference, viz. the change of position simplex *choo* ('to come'). It is productively used as an inchoative sign with infinitive plus *z*. By the same construction, *choo* covers also future time reference. This is similar to the ambiguity of *wèèrde^n* and *überchoo* with adjectival predicates (cf. (22) and (23) above.) Incidently, notice that the semantically

closest equivalent in idiomatic English requires adjectival constructions (E. Danziger, p.c.):

(31)   *Si **chunt**   z   schwitze*^{n}.
         she INCH/FUT:3s INF sweat
         'She is getting sweaty / will be sweaty.'

   a.   *Si chunt   langsam z   schwitze*^{n}.
         she INCH:3s slowly   INF sweat
         'She is slowly getting sweaty.'

   b.   *Si chunt   scho no   z   schwitze*^{n}.
         she FUT:3s PTCL PTCL INF sweat
         'She will certainly be sweaty.'

The construction may only be applied to verbs denoting a limited range of body states: *schwitze*^{n} ('to sweat'), *früüre*^{n} ('to feel cold'), *schnuufe*^{n} ('to breathe', in the *choo* construction in the sense of 'to breathe heavily'). With *schlottere*^{n} ('to tremble') and *stinke*^{n} ('to stink'), the construction is attested but not unanimously accepted by informants:

(32) a. *Me **chunt**   z   schlottere*^{n}.   [Weber ^{3}1987: 244]
         one INCH/FUT:3s INF tremble
         'One starts trembling (is getting "trembly").'

   b.   *Er **chunt**   z stinke*^{n}.   [*Id*. III, 269 with note "said of a corpse"]
         he INCH/FUT:3s INF stink
         'It is getting stinky / it will be stinky.'

In contrast, *rede*^{n} 'to talk' does easily combine with the *choo*-construction.

(33)   *...und dänn sind   mer no   uf s   Abstimigsresultaat z   rede **choo***.
         and then AUX:1p we PTCL on DEFsN ballot:result   INF   talk INCH:3s
         '...and then we got talking about the results of the ballots.'

In (33) there is a clear sense of unintentionality which can hardly be attributed to the lexical meaning of *rede*^{n}. (In contrast to e.g. *schwitze*^{n} 'to sweat', *rede*^{n} does easily combine with *wele*^{n} 'to want'.) Rather, the semantic effect is due to a 'contamination' from the notional core of the verb class that the *choo+z INF* frame primordially defines, viz. 'uncontrolled body state' (cf. above). This is also the reason why an intrinsically more intentional *verbum dicendi* like *säge*^{n} 'say' does not enter the construction.

    Apart from this, *choo* does not seem to have fully grammaticalized into an inchoative or future marker. There are, however, some metonymic shifts yielding future sense. With weather expressions, for instance, *choo* is often shifted from local movement to the result of its implied temporal change of state:

(34)   *Es **chunt**   cho rägne^n.*
         it   come:3s SP   rain
         'There is rain on the way / it will rain.'

A sentence like (34) may be used when the speaker does in fact see the rainy clouds approaching him. This local sense is then easily faded out, yielding 'it will rain'. This purely temporal meaning is the regular reading when (34) refers to another place than where the speaker is. A similar case can be observed with certain locative constructions:

(35) a.   *Si **chunt** i d   Pubertèèt.*
          she come:3s in DEFsF puberty
          'She is reaching puberty.'

     b.   *Si **chunt** i di   foift.*   [VZ I, 4:30]
          she come:3s in DEFsF fifth
          'She is going into the fifth [form].'

Here, the shift to a change of state or future meaning hinges upon the semantic value of the locative noun. It has to denote a life span like *Pubertèèt* 'puberty' or, by metonymy, *di foift* [sc. *klass*] 'the fifth [sc. form]' rather than a place.

19. Conclusions

In investigating future time reference in Züritüütsch, it appears to be fruitful to consider not only verbal tense systems but also to focus on copular constructions. It is in this area that Züritüütsch shows grammatical future marking devices. Except for *usechoo* and *gèè,* which are restricted to future time reference, the devices combine future with inchoative meaning. Regarding the syntactic frames in which these devices are used, nominal predicates, in contrast to adjectival ones, allow future but not inchoative copulas, except for emotional state expressions. However, further research is needed in this area. In the verbal system, the only grammaticalized future and inchoativity marker (*choo*) requires a substantivized infinitive. It has, therefore, some affinities with copular constructions. Interestingly, the *choo*+infinitive construction shows the feature of unintentionality often associated with 'to come' based future tenses in other European languages. All productive future and inchoative markers etymologically derive from change (of orientation, position or possession) expressions.

Notes

[1]I would like to thank Edgar Suter (Zürich), Eve Danziger and John Haviland (both Nijmegen) for useful comments on earlier drafts. Data come from the future time reference questionnaire (noted as 'FTQR' after examples) and from video tapes (different reference lables). Examples without reference are invented but have been checked with a number informants.

[2]In interlinear glossing only Past ('PST') will be indicated, Non-Past gets no glossing. The same policy will be followed throughout, i.e. only morphologically marked categories are labelled.

[3]After certain modal and movement verbs (*müese^n* 'to have to', *laa* 'to let', *tö~ö~rfe^n* 'to be permitted', *schicke^n* 'to send', *choo* 'to come', *gaa* 'to go'), the infinitive particles *go (~ goge^n)* and *cho (~ choge^n)* are compulsory. Except after *gaa,* where only *go* is possible, the choice between the two forms is governed by empathy: *cho* relates the event to the speaker (abbreviated 'SP' in the example), implying personal affectedness or involvement, *go* turns it away from the speaker, implying generality. I am not aware of any temporal or aspectual meaning of these particles.

[4]Unless there is evidence that no language allows such a meaning, I assume this constraint to be linguistic if perhaps with a Whorfian effect. It seems to me possible to conceptualize the mere process of e.g. a painting coming into existence without focusing on the act of painting itself (which the language would usually suggest). This is presumably due to interference from High German where a construction like *Das Haus ist im Werden* or *… ist im Enstehen (begriffen)* ('The house is coming into being' or '… is in the making) is possible. (Notice that Züritüütsch, like English, has no equivalent to High German *entstehen*. *entstaa*, which is occasionally heard, is a recent loan.)

Abbreviations

ACC	Accusative		INF	Infinitive
ADJ	Adjective		M	Masculine
ANA	Anaphor		N	Neuter
AUX	Auxiliary		NEG	Negator
COMP	Complementizer		p	Plural
COND	Conditional		PASS	Passive
DAT	Dative		PREV	Preverb
DEF	Definite (article)		PRS	Present
DEM	Demonstrative		PST	Past
EVID	Evidential		PTCL	Particle
F	Feminine		s	Singular
FUT	Future		SP	Speaker oriented
Id.	Schweizerisches Idiotikon		SUB	Subordinator
INCH	Inchoative		1,2,3	Grammatical persons
INDEF	Indefinite (article)			

References

Bickel, Balthasar 1991. *Typologische Grundlagen der Satzverkettung*. Ein Beitrag zur allgemeinen Grammatik der Satzverbindung und des Fährtenlegens. Zürich: Universität (= Arbeiten des Seminars für Allgemeine Sprachwissenschaft. 9)

Dieth, Eugen 1986. *Schwyzertütschi Dialäktschrift*. Dieth-Schreibung bearbeitet und herausgegeben von Christian Schmid-Cadalbert. Aarau: Sauerländer.

Ebneter, Theodor 1973. *Das bündnerromanische Futur*. Syntax der mit *vegnir* und *habere* gebildeten Futurtypen in Gegenwart und Vergangenheit. Bern: Francke.

Ebneter, Theodor 1978. Diasystem vs. Kontakt: der Ausdruck der Zukunft im Deutschen, Rätoromanischen und Nordostitalienischen. In: Werner, Reinhold [ed.], *Sprachkontakte*. Zur gegenseitigen Beeinflussung romanischer und nicht-romanischer Sprachen. Tübingen: Narr. pp. 43 - 59.

Haiman, John 1978. Conditionals are topics. *Language* 54, 564 - 89.

Kluge, Friedrich 1989. *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der deutschen Sprache*. 22. Auflage unter Mithilfe von Max Bürgisser und Bernd Gregor völlig neu bearbeitet von Elmar Seebold. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Schweizerisches Idiotikon. Wörterbuch der schweizerdeutschen Sprache [14 vols.]. Frauenfeld: Huber 1881 - 1987.

Szadrowsky, M. 1930. Zur hochalemannischen syntax. *Beiträge zur geschichte der deutschen sprache und literatur* 54, 65 - 137 and 281 - 93.

Weber, Albert 1987. *Zürichdeutsche Grammatik*. Ein Wegweiser zur guten Mundart. Unter Mitwirkung von Eugen Dieth. Zürich: Rohr [Third edition].