

## Constructions Across Time and Space: Perspective Constructions in German \*

### I Introduction

The German standard language and some of its dialects distinguish two types of directional adverbs, depending on the perspective taken in the speech event. For example, both SHG *hinauf* vs. *herauf* mean *up*. However, the two adverbs differ in that a motion verb modified by SHG *hinauf* will be construed not only as being UP(WARDS) but also as being AWAY-FROM-(the)-ORIGO (we use the term *origo* to refer to the *deictic center* of a speech event). Similarly, SHG *herauf* means UP and TOWARDS-ORIGO. Languages like English encode the origo's perspective only in some motion verbs (compare e.g. *come* vs. *go*). In addition to perspective encoding verbs, German provides a systematic way to encode the origo's perspective in the above-mentioned adverbs.

Historically, these pairs of adverbs are compositions of a perspective marker (meaning *towards the origo* or *away from the origo*) and a locational adverb (e.g. *up*, *down*, *inwards*, *outwards*). In this paper we retrace the history of these perspective adverbs, using an approach, which relies on cognitive linguistics and construction grammar (cf. e.g. Langacker 1991, Fillmore & Kay 1999, Fillmore, Kay & O'Connor 1998). First, we will attempt to reconstruct the emergence of the compound forms in Old High German (OHG). Second, we will examine how different 'histories of composition' lead to different forms in the German dialects (e.g. Suabian *rauf/nauf* vs. Swiss German *uehe/uehi*). Third, we will show that the marking of deictic perspective is dropped independently several times throughout the historic development of German dialects and sociolects (e.g. colloquial *rauf* or dialectal *ufe*). Last, we will see that the contemporary speakers' construal of spatial relations and their processing of

---

\* **Acknowledgements:** Our acknowledgements go to Christian Demand, Christian Schmutz, Rudolf Wachter, Carsten Radzki for providing us with additional information on historical and regional aspects of the German perspective markers.

linguistic input are at the hinge of the observed linguistic changes (e.g. from collocation to a new lexical entry). The framework of Cognitive Grammar allows us to give a precise account of the meaning and conceptual integration of the lexemes involved.

We assume that all linguistic entities are either semantic, phonological or symbolic (cf. Langacker 1991: 18). It has been observed long ago (cf. for example Bréal 1897, Stern 1931) that there is a certain systematic relation between the change of form and the change of meaning. Furthermore, formal change can occur independently of semantic change and vice versa. The construction-oriented cognitive approach chosen in this paper puts a strong focus on two aspects of the linguistic system that go together with these observations.

## II The German Perspective Markers in Diachrony and Synchrony

The constructions analysed in this paper can be traced back to a collocation of two sets of Old High German (OHG) particles: The adverb *hara* or *hína* as a perspective marker (ADV\_PM) and a locational adverb ADV\_LOC such as *ûf* (like English *up*; other locational adverbs found in this construction are e.g. *in-inwards*, *nider-downwards*, *úbere-across*, *zûo-towards*;; cf. Bergman et al. 1987: 362). In the following we will predominantly use the preposition *ûf* as a paradigmatic example. Other prepositions behave in a strictly parallel way, which will be shown in our examples by the sporadic use of other topological relations such as the in-relation or the out-relation.

(1) *hara* ûf ADV\_PM<sub>towards\_origo</sub>+ADV\_LOC<sub>up</sub>

(2) *hína* ûf ADV\_PM<sub>away\_from\_origo</sub>+ADV\_LOC<sub>up</sub>

According to Schützeichel 1995, the adverbs *hara* and *hína* indicate a direction towards (*hara*) or away (*hína*) from the origo. They derive both from the IE demonstrative pronoun *\*ko-*, *\*ke-*, a pronoun which is related to a series of other deictic particles such as English *here*, *where*, or *he*, German *hier*, *jetzt* (cf. Pokorny, vol. I, 1959: 609). The exact phonological and semantic changes, which lead to *hara* and *hína* are obscure.

The origo most commonly is the speaker, but in certain discourse conditions it can also be transposed, if the discourse (e.g. a narration of past events) construes a mental space that is viewed from a specific viewpoint. In OHG the two particles could occur independently, (3) to (8), and together in the construction ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC (9) to (11):

**ADV\_PM occurring without ADV\_LOC**

- (3) her raet ostar hina (Krogmann/Hildebrandslied 46 v. 20)  
*he rode eastward AWAY-FROM-ORIGO*
- (4) Far hína, wídarwerto (Otfrid 2 4,93)  
*go AWAY-FROM-ORIGO, enemy!*
- (5) thaz er thih héra leitti (Otfrid 2 7,66)  
*that he you TOWARDS-ORIGO lead*
- (6) ther héra ward giséntit (Otfrid 3 21,26)  
*who TOWARDS-ORIGO was sent*

**ADV\_LOC occurring without ADV\_PM**

- (7) fâr ûf (Notker I: 106)  
*ascend!*
- (8) stant ûf (Otfrid 3 4,27)  
*get up!*

**ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC**

- (9) far hína ûf (Notker I: 108)  
*ascend AWAY-FROM-ORIGO*
- (10) thie éngila ouh hera nídargan (Otfrid 2 7, 72)  
*the angels also TOWARDS-ORIGO come down*
- (11) „Wérfet“, quad er, „thíz hina úz!“ (Otfrid 4 24,15)  
*throw, said he, this AWAY-FROM-ORIGO out*

The two examples (7) and (9) from the OHG Notker text are particularly interesting, because both are the OHG translation of the Latin "Scande celi templa uirgo" (cf. Notker I: 106 and 108). Once the Latin source text is translated with an ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC modifier construction, and once with a ADV\_LOC modifier.

The two particles occur together in 'classical' OHG texts (especially in Notker's texts, around the year 1000). According to our own investigations and to Hinderling (1980: 276), they overwhelmingly occur with the word order shown above, i.e. ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC. OHG Dictionaries only list a lemma *hera ûf* and not *ûf hera* (e.g. Schützeichel 1995: 164). The word order ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM only occurs with significant frequency in the 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> century (Hinderling 1980: 276).<sup>1</sup>

In Middle High German (classical period around 1200, forth MHG) the construction ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC again prevails:

- (12) *dâ von der helt wol rîten mac her ûf ze mir* (Wolfram, Parzival 22,7)  
*there from the hero well ride may TOWARDS-ORIGO up to me*
- (13) *diu hût hin abe hie* (Hartmann, Erec 5410)  
*the skin AWAY-FROM-ORIGO down hung*
- (14) *hin vür zer vrouwen îlte er* (Hartmann, Erec 3543)  
*AWAY-FROM-ORIGO to the front to the lady ran he*

Lexer's dictionary (Lexer 1872, Bd. I: 1301) only gives the headword *hin-ûfen*, *hin-aben* etc. (i.e. *AWAY-FROM-ORIGO* + *upor* + *down*) and no *ûf-hin*, but both constructions ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC and ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM are supported by MHG data (cf. Lexer 1872, Bd. 1: 1291, where for the lemma *hin*, *hine*, the forms *hin ûz* and *ûz hin* are attested).

---

<sup>1</sup> One of the major MHG dictionaries, Lexer 1872, vol. 1: 1291, gives the following etymological account for *hin-ûfen*: it is presented as a reflex of *hin ûf hin*. Either this is not accurate or the data, which Hinderling and we have examined, happen not to display this earlier occurrence of the word order ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM. A possible explanation for these observations could be the fact that MHG combines the ADV\_PM with the MHG reflex of the OHG preposition (*h*)*ûfan* (Schuetzeichel 1995:293). But then again OHG (*h*)*ûfan* could be a reflex of *ûf+hina* which would mean that there has been a similar composition building process already earlier in time. However, since the collocation of the type ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC is clearly dominant in OHG and early MHG, the interpretation given in the Lexer dictionary is unlikely and we tend to see the form *ufen* as the reflex of a different collocation of *ûf+ana* (cf. Grimm 1854, Bd. I: 603.)

A corpus search in Early Modern High German (Fruehneuhochdeutsch; 1400-1700)<sup>2</sup> showed the exclusive use of the ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC word order, which corresponds to an increasing conventionalization of the compound adverbial construction. Contemporary SHG, in consequence, has a lexicalized construct, which seems to be a reflex of the OHG and MHG collocation:

(15) herauf ADV\_PM<sub>towards origo</sub>+ADV\_LOC<sub>up</sub>

(16) hinauf ADV\_PM<sub>away from origo</sub>+ADV\_LOC<sub>up</sub>

However, the situation in SHG has changed in several aspects when compared to the earlier stages of German. The prepositional adverbs such as *ûf* do no longer exist – they have changed the syntactic category affiliation. The SHG *auf* (diphthongisation stands for a regular sound change from OHG/MHG to SHG) is now syntactically a preposition or a verb-prefix. Despite this change of category, the construction is still relatively motivated. Prepositions and adverbs share some syntactic properties and the semantics remain very similar. In OHG there is an irregular relationship between ADV\_LOCs and the corresponding prepositions. Some ADV\_LOCs can function both as adverbs and prepositions (e.g. *ûz* in the sense of 'out' and 'outside of'), some have etymologically related forms as prepositions (*ûf*, *în*; *up*, *in*), some are paired with unrelated particles as prepositions (*aba* (ADV, PRP): *down*; *untar* (PRP): *under*). The adverbs *her* and *hin* on the other hand in SHG still serve as ADV\_PM in various SHG constructions:

(17) Er ging zu ihm hin.  
*he went to him AWAY-FROM-ORIGO*

(18) Komm her!  
*come TOWARDS-ORIGO*

---

<sup>2</sup> Links to the corpora are located at <http://www.ikp.uni-bonn.de/dt/forsch/fmhd/index.html#texte>.

In spoken language and informal writing, the distinction of origo frequently is not made. SHG, in its colloquial registers, has forms such as *rauf*, *rein*, *raus*, *runter*. These forms do not display any difference in perspective:

- (19) Er kam rauf  
*he came UP-NO-PERSPECTIVE*
- (20) Er ging rauf  
*he went UP-NO\_PERSPECTIVE*

These lexical entries still show a phonological remnant [r-] of *herauf*, but there is no perspective incorporated. The forms are merely directional adverbs, just as the English *up*, *out*, *down*, *etc.*. A frequency count in large contemporary corpora reveals that the latter forms are the most frequent form in spoken language and quite frequent in written language:

|                 | <i>hinauf</i> |     | <i>herauf</i> |     | <i>rauf</i> |     |
|-----------------|---------------|-----|---------------|-----|-------------|-----|
| Written corpora | 6694          | 73% | 1155          | 13% | 1308        | 14% |
| Spoken corpora  | 27            | 28% | 10            | 10% | 61          | 62% |

**Table 1:** occurrences of *hinauf*, *herauf* and *rauf* in the COSMAS-corpora ([www.corpora.ids-mannheim.de/~cosmas](http://www.corpora.ids-mannheim.de/~cosmas))

The last set of data to be presented here is an overview of the perspective constructs' geographic distribution in the German dialect areas. With respect to the ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC and ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM constructions, this area can be divided into two major regions: A northern part where no distinction of perspective seems to be made (just as in Dutch or English) and a southern part where this distinction generally is made. Southern German dialects tend to have lexical items which distinguish the perspective (e.g. forms such as *rab* vs. *nab* are found in variants of Swabian dialect, see below), whereas in northern and middle German dialects the distinction initially has not been made (cf. Hinderling 1980: 280). Later, it has been introduced due to standardization. SHG has inherited this distinction from the southern dialects.

There are two main types of constructions, according to two historical antecedents outlined above: ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC and ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM. Figure 1 is an attempt to schematically sum up the synchronic distribution of the different types of directional adverbs.

[@@ insert Figure 1 here]

**Figure 1** Directional adverbs in the German language area: 0: no distinction of perspective; 1: ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC; 2a: ADV\_LOC (no distinction of perspective); 2b: ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM

As mentioned above, there is a large area in northern and middle Germany (Low German [Niederdeutsch] and Middle German [Mitteldeutsch], area 0) where the dialects do not distinguish the viewpoint (cf. Hinderling 1980: 293).<sup>3</sup> In area 1 the distinction is made with adverbs of the type ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC. In the Alemannic and Bavarian area (Oberdeutsch; i.e. at the southern border of the German-speaking area), there are two types of marking the perspective. The first (2a in Figure 1) corresponds functionally to area 1 (cf. for the Swiss German area, Baumgartner et al., vol. VI: 105-112):

(21) Si goht de bäarg ufe  
*she goes the hill up*

(22) Si chunt de bäarg ufe  
*she comes the hill up*

Diachronically, however, the form *ufe* represents an 'eroded' reflex of the construction ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM.<sup>4</sup> The other group of dialects do distinguish the viewpoint, just as in

---

<sup>3</sup> Hinderling's claim however is not completely supported by the literature: Lindow et al. 1998: 205ff. do list some adverbs which indicate perspective (*herop*, *hendaal*). It is possible that this is due to the considerable influence of SHG in the Low German area. In any case, the Low German dialects do have directional adverbs like *up* (up) and *daal* (down) which do not indicate perspective and cannot be reconstructed as modern 'eroded' reflexes of former perspective-marking adverbs. Non SHG-induced exceptions to the north of the dividing line between zones 0 and 1 are small dialect areas in Southern Hessen and in den Franconian dialect area (Hinderling 1980: 293).

<sup>4</sup> It is difficult to decide whether the forms are etymologically to be related to *hara* or *hina*, because both particles underwent considerable weakening in the dialects referred to here (cf. Staub et al. 1881ff.: 1318)

the standard language (2b). The forms found in area 2b, however, are - historically- of the inverted type ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM:

(23) Si geeht de bäarg uehi  
*she goes the hill up+AWAY FROM ORIGO*

(24) Si chunt de bäarg uehe  
*she comes the hill up+TOWARDS ORIGO*

In historical data from this Swiss German area, we find full forms which represent morphologically transparent reflexes of OHG ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM:

(25) Gang hin, heiss disen ynher kan (Id. 2, 1562)  
*go AWAY FROM ORIGO, tell this one in+TOWARDS ORIGO come*

The forms in examples 21 and 22, which have to be seen as modern reflexes of the OHG/MHG adverbial constructions, are not analysable anymore. Neither part of *ue-hi* or *ue-he* can occur as adverb independently. One could consider two morphemes {he} and {hi} in the above examples, which mark the perspective and can only occur with a handful of adverbs which themselves cannot occur as independent forms. But these morphemes are only productive with the modern reflexes of locational adverbs (which themselves can only occur with a perspective marker). We prefer therefore to speak of *necromorphs*,<sup>5</sup> of phonological relics of ancient morphemes.

The phonological shape of the adverbs can vary considerably in the groups 1, 2a and 2b (cf. Baumgartner (1962-1997: VI): 105-112). For the present purpose it is unnecessary to render the multiple morpho-phonological differences between the SG dialects, my transcripts in examples (23) and (24) roughly represent a variety that is spoken in the Berner Oberland.

---

<sup>5</sup> Jim Matisoff (p.c.) proposes this term for a form unit that can only be motivated diachronically (i.e. the average speaker-hearer is not aware of this motivation).

Area 2b includes Bavarian and Alemannic dialects in Austria, Germany and Switzerland.<sup>6</sup> Area 2a includes a part of the Alemannic dialects spoken mainly in Switzerland and in a small region of southern Germany. The meaning of *ufe*, without any distinction of perspective, corresponds semantically to the SHG *rauf* cited above (i.e. it does not encode perspective). Whereas most dialects show only one or the other compositional structure (or eroded reflexes of it), reflexes of both syntagma can be observed in some dialects. In the Swabian and Bavarian dialects (on the border between area 1 and 2a above), we find the interesting coexistence of dialectal reflexes of *ûf hina* (ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM) and *hina ûf* (ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC; cf. Fischer 1986: 228; Schmidt 1980: 199). Fischer's data stem from his fieldwork in the Swabian area between 1883-1920. According to the comments in the introduction to the 'Handwörterbuch' (Fischer 1986: 5) we have to assume that the following semantic distinction is still made in the Swabian dialect: *nauf* (*up*) profiles the goal and *aufe* (*up*) profiles the movement.<sup>7</sup> An analogous semantic differentiation is made for the paired forms *abhin – hinab* and *anhin – hinan* (cf. Fischer 1932, I: 10f. and 192f.). In many Bavarian dialects (cf. Schmidt 1980: 197ff.) there are double forms related to both word orders, with a semantic distinction regarding perspective vs. direction.

|                  | ADV_LOC+ADV_PM       |             | ADV_PM+ADVLOC          |               |
|------------------|----------------------|-------------|------------------------|---------------|
|                  | PM towards           | PM away     | PM towards             | PM away       |
| Swabian Dialect  | <i>aufe</i>          | <i>aufi</i> | <i>rauf</i>            | <i>nauf</i>   |
|                  | profile: movement    |             | profile: goal          |               |
| Bavarian Dialect | <i>ausa</i>          | <i>ause</i> | <i>hearaus</i>         | <i>hinaus</i> |
|                  | profile: up-movement |             | profile: away-movement |               |

**Table 2** Double pairs of directional adverbs in Bavarian and Swabian dialects

To sum up, we can distinguish the following types of perspective marking in the various lects of the German language area: some varieties distinguish perspective (SHG, some southern

<sup>6</sup> There is some evidence for a ADV\_PM+ADVLOC construction even in area 2b (cf. Hinderling 1980: 272). Especially the Highest-Alemannic dialects in the Wallis (Switzerland) might show reflexes of this type of construction. But, as Hinderling points out, these forms allow only speculation and do not prove the existence of the alternative word order.

dialects) and others do not (colloquial SHG, many dialects in the north, in the middle, and some in the south). Among those, which distinguish the perspective, there is a different degree of form-transparency, spanning from (seemingly) highly transparent forms (*hinauf*, *herauf*) to minimally contrasted forms (*uehe*, *uehi*). All of the perspective marking adverbials can be traced back to OHG collocations of two adverbs, either ADV\_LOC+ADV\_PM or ADV\_PM+ADV\_LOC.

### III Applying a CG approach to the case of perspective markers

For several reasons that will become clearer in the course of this section, the variation and changes discussed in section II present an interesting problem to grammar theories.

Let us look the development of OHG *hina* and OHG *uf* into SHG *hinauf* again. As the sets of examples (3)-(6) and (7)-(8) in section II show, both ADV\_PMs (e.g. *hina*) and ADV\_LOCs (e.g. *uf*) can modify a motion verb independently of each other in OHG. If an ADV\_PM and an ADV\_LOC co-occur in OHG, their order does not seem to be fixed. Additionally, all co-occurrences of two directional adverbs involve one ADV\_PM. Thus there is no reason to assume constituent structures (henceforth c-structure) of the form in (26) and (27) for the earliest preserved stages of OGH.

(26) AP → ADV\_LOC + ADV\_PM

(27) AP → ADV\_PM + ADV\_LOC

---

<sup>7</sup>

Fischer (1986: 228): "doch fasst *a.[aufē]* mehr die Bewegung, *h.[(hi)nauff]* mehr das Ziel in's Auge".

More likely, the two different type of ADVs modify the verb subsequently. There is no special c-structure that combines the two ADVs but each of them is combined with verb by the normal VERB-MODIFIER construction. Thus example (9) has the c-structure (28):

(28) [[[far<sub>V</sub>]<sub>VP</sub> [hina<sub>Adv</sub>]<sub>AP</sub>]<sub>VP</sub> [uf<sub>Adv</sub>]<sub>AP</sub>]<sub>VP</sub>

In SHG, the two ADVs have conflated into one corresponding unit resulting in the c-structure in (29). The SHG adverb with both PM and LOC meaning components is not syntactically analysed into its parts:

(29) [[[fahr<sub>V</sub>]<sub>VP</sub> [hinauf<sub>Adv</sub>]<sub>AP</sub>]<sub>VP</sub>

Most grammar theories do not pay much attention to changes like the one observed here. They simply employ ad hoc explanations for each of the cases. Frequently co-occurring words can become lexicalized as one (sometimes idiomatic) phrase. This observation is sufficient for a descriptive account of the development of perspective markers. However, we believe that construction grammar (we use this term to refer to the set of grammar theories which use a definition of constructions similar to Goldberg 1995:4) together with a usage-based model (cf. Kemmerer & Barlow 2000, Langacker 2000) actually provides a very intuitive way to account for lexicalization processes like the ones above.

Since not only OHG *hina* + OHG *uf* but many other combinations of ADV\_PM + ADV\_LOC have become lexicalized in SHG, it would be odd to consider the change to be purely idiosyncratic. Constrained-based and rule-based grammar theories usually capture regular diachronic change by reordering constraints or introducing a new rule. A rule-based generative account could deal with the above problem by introducing rule (2) and add subcategorization information to the ADV\_PM and/or ADV\_LOC. The latter is necessary since neither ADV\_PMs nor ADV\_LOCs combine freely with any other type of adverb to be lexicalized together. Since ADV\_PMs and ADV\_LOCs can modify the verb alone at the same

time, we would need two different lexical entries for each of the ADVs. This per se is not problematic but a rule-based grammar theory then still would not have provided any *motivation* for the change.

On the contrary, we will show that the change is in fact motivated by assuming constructions to be the basic units of grammar. We have shown that in OHG, ADV\_PM and ADV\_LOC are frequently co-occurring. Furthermore, in OHG, the frequency of ADV\_PM + ADV\_LOC is significantly higher than the frequency of ADV\_LOC + ADV\_PM (Hinderling 1980: 276). In section II, we have also seen that OHG and even late MHG authors still write the two adverbs separated by a space.<sup>8</sup> MHG certainly still allows the alternative adverb order ADV\_LOC + ADV\_PM, although these forms show up much less frequently. Regardless of this difference in word order, it seems reasonable to assume an intermediate stage in the development when speakers of MHG (and maybe already late OHG) had two different types of constructions: On the one hand, the subsequent modification construction (i.e. the assumed original construction, henceforth modification type 1). On the other hand, these speakers are hypothesized to have had a construction that combined the two adverbials first and then modified the verb with the resulting construct. The latter, henceforth modification type 2, construction finally became lexicalized as perspective marker (e.g. SHG *hinauf*).

So far, we have not achieved any new insights but only provided an analysis for a possible intermediate stage of the diachronic development. According to Goldberg's (1995:4) definition of constructions, we can only posit new constructions for a form-meaning pair C if and only if some aspect of its meaning or form is not entirely predictable by already established constructions and the components of C. For the cases discussed here, the MHG form of C (i.e. ADV\_PM & ADV\_LOC) is entirely predictable but is the meaning also? There seems to be no drastic change in meaning for the pattern ADV\_PM & ADV\_LOC from early

---

<sup>8</sup> However, it is unclear what those medieval writing conventions - and their normalized rendering in the editions available to the linguist - actually convey about the cognitive and syntactic status of compositional constructions.

OHG to MHG. But given the nature of diachronic (written) data, the reconstruction of subtle changes in meaning tends to be quite speculative. However, we found compelling new data of a very recent innovation in SHG that seems to parallel the early OHG stage of the perspective marker's development.

- (30) [...] ich weiß nur nicht bis wo *hin runter*.<sup>9</sup>  
*I do not know until where AWAY-FROM-ORIGO down*
- (31) Manchmal ist es wie eine grosse Steinplatte, die in einem Stück vom Berg *her runter* geht.<sup>10</sup>  
*sometimes it is like a large flagstone which goes as one piece from the mountain TOWARDS-ORIGO down*

On the first look, the examples under (30) and (31) do not seem to be significantly different. However, a closer examination of their meaning reveals that in (30) the ADV\_PM and the ADV\_LOC both contribute to a single construal of the movement's path as simultaneously AWAY-FROM-ORIGO and DOWN. In contrast to this, the ADV\_PM and ADV\_LOC in (31) serve the consecutive construal of firstly the path as a non-dimensional, topological-deictic AWAY-FROM-ORIGO and secondly a non-deictic path following the vertical dimension. This reading is corroborated by the observation that the latter construction often occurs in the form [[[PP (such as 'vom Berg her')] + [ADV\_PM]] + [ADV\_LOC]]. The two interpretations of (31) arise from an ambiguity in the corresponding c-structure. These two different c-structures are annotated in (32) and (33) with only the relevant bits of c-structure annotation being shown.

- (32) Manchmal ist es wie eine grosse Steinplatte, die in einem Stück [vom Berg  
 [her]] [runter] geht.
- (33) Manchmal ist es wie eine grosse Steinplatte, die in einem Stück [vom Berg]  
 [her runter] geht.

---

<sup>9</sup> source: <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:www.roboterwelt.de/forum/messages/305.html>

<sup>10</sup> source: [http://www.twikeklub.ch/challenge98/tagesnotizen\\_etappe4.htm](http://www.twikeklub.ch/challenge98/tagesnotizen_etappe4.htm)

It seems that the type 1 modifier construction allows modification of different parts of the movement's path but does not require it. The semantics of the lexicalized perspective markers of SHG (i.e. SHG *hinauf* and *herauf*) clearly contrast the data above. Modification of a motion process by the lexicalized perspective markers results in the same part of the movement being modified both by the ADV\_PM and the ADV\_LOC component. This is what we expect because the two ADVs are bound to each other before they modify the verb. We thus argue for the same subtle difference in meaning for the MHG [ADV\_PM & ADV\_LOC] construction (compared to the use of ADV\_PM and ADV\_LOC within the normal modifier construction).

In the following paragraphs we use the terminology and formalism developed within the cognitive grammar framework (cf. Langacker 1987, 1991, 1999a) to describe the semantics of the components involved in the change. For the case of OHG *uf* to SHG *hinauf* or *herauf* this involves the three image schemas UP, AWAY-FROM-ORIGIO and TOWARDS-ORIGIO. We first look at the lexical items that implement one of those I-schemas and then provide an I-schema analysis of the semantic compound that is implemented by SHG *hinauf*. Last we will show how to represent the minimal difference in meaning between the modification type 1 and the modification type 2.

Both OHG *ûf* and SHG *rauf* modify a motion verb, adding the fact that the motion of the trajector is upwards (like English *up*). Schema 1 depicts the prototypical I-schema for the OHG construct [ûf].<sup>11</sup> Like all directional adverbs, the I-schema UP incorporates a Source-Path-Goal I-schema (cf. Johnson 1987, Lakoff & Johnson 1999; henceforth SPG) and a trajector-landmark relation (cf. Langacker 1991, 1999a). The I-schema UP profiles the directionality of the motion as indicated by the bold arrow in Schema 1. At different points of conceived time, the trajector is bound to different points on a scale of height. For the purpose

---

<sup>11</sup> Our research has shown that SHG [rauf] and SG [ufe] have exactly the same semantics as OHG [uf]. Thus we will only discuss OHG [uf] and assume the same I-schema and construction for SHG [rauf] and SG [ufe].

of this discussion, we assume that the scale is the landmark of UP though actually more than one landmark seems to be involved in I-schemas of directional adverbs.

[@@ insert Schema 1 here]

**Schema 1** UP implemented by OHG [**ûf**], SHG [**rauf**], SG [**ufe**]

Note, that all directional adverbs describe a complex atemporal relation. In Schema 1, the complexity is indicated by the interior boxes, which depict subrelations holding at certain points of conceived time (as defined in Langacker 1991:79-81). The fact that directional adverbs (i.e. here OHG *uf*, SHG *rauf*) describe atemporal relations, is represented by the non-bold time arrow (cf. Langacker 1991:78). UP is implemented by the constructs OHG [*uf*], SHG [*auf*] and SG [*ufe*].

Schema 2 depicts the I-schema implemented by OHG *hara* and SHG *her*. Like the UP-schema, TOWARDS-ORIGO profiles the directionality of a trajector's motion. In contrast to UP, TOWARDS-ORIGO denotes a deictic directionality. The landmark of TOWARDS-ORIGO, that is the closeness-scale, is bound to the origo of the speech event. Thus, TOWARDS-ORIGO indirectly establishes a relation between the speech-event's origo and the trajector (i.e. it adds spatial perspective to the motion that it is bound to). Like UP, TOWARDS-ORIGO is complex atemporal relation.

[@@ insert Schema 2 here]

**Schema 2** TOWARDS-ORIGO implemented by OHG [**hara**], SHG [**her**]

The representation of AWAY-FROM-ORIGO, the I-schema implemented by OHG *hina* and SHG *hin*, is straightforward. Like TOWARDS-ORIGO and UP, AWAY-FROM-ORIGO modifies a motion verb. It modifies the motion of the trajector to lead away from the origo. The I-schema for AWAY-FROM-ORIGO is given in Schema 3.

[@@ insert Schema 3 here]

**Schema 3**      **AWAY-FROM-ORIGO** implemented by OHG [hina], SHG [hin]

We have described and represented all the single parts involved in the diachronic process. The following figure shows a CG representation of the resulting SHG perspective marker *hinauf*. Like UP, TOWARDS-ORIGO and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO, the I-schema implemented by SHG *hinauf* profiles the directionality of the trajector's motion. This motion is construed to be both upwards and away from the origo. Thus the I-schema of [hinauf] straightforwardly combines the I-schemas UP and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO. Note, that the subrelations and the landmarks of the UP and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO are bound to each other. The two I-schemas UP and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO are fully superimposed.

[@@ insert Schema 4 here]

**Schema 4**      **AWAY-FROM-ORIGO-UP** implemented by [hinauf]

Since the states of the two superimposed subrelations UP and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO are bound to each other, modification of a motion verb by [hinauf] results in a verb complex with the meaning depicted in Schema 5. Following Langacker (1991: 175f.) we assume that in the head-modifier construction the autonomous structure (i.e. the verb) determines the profile and which of its parts are bound to which parts of the dependent structure (i.e. the perspective marker). In our case this means that the trajector of AWAY-FROM-THE-ORIGO-UP is bound to the motion verb's trajector. The overall resulting trajector inherits profile from the motion verb's trajector. Furthermore, sequential scanning (cf. e.g. Langacker 1991: 78ff.) is inherited from the motion verb.

[@@ insert Schema 5 here]

**Schema 5**      Motion verb modified by **AWAY-FROM-ORIGO-UP**

In contrast to the above-described situation, the subsequent modification of a motion verb at the most recent stage (cf. examples (30), (31), and supposedly at the initial stage in OHG) results in two independent conceptualisations. One of the conceptualisations describes a topological-deictic path and the other one describes a vertically (or alternatively: laterally, transversally) oriented path. The two I-schemas UP and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO thus are not superimposed and bound to each other in the case of subsequent modification. Their states are not bound to each other. This is depicted in Schema 6. Note, that in the case of subsequent modification the involved I-schemas, UP and AWAY-FROM-ORIGO, employ two different landmarks.

[@@ insert Schema 6 here]

**Schema 6** Motion verb subsequently modified by **AWAY-FROM-ORIGO & UP**

Schemata 1-6 are attempts to be as explicit as possible about the conceptual content conveyed by the linguistic forms in the scope of this paper. In the following section, we will use these semantic descriptions in order to re-interpret the diachronic processes affecting the German perspective constructions.

#### IV Discussion

If we look at the diachronic development as described in Section II above, we can isolate two paths of change which are not only analogous but also lead to very similar results. The two paths are depicted in Figure 2.

[@@ insert Figure 2 here]

**Figure 2** Diachronic Form-Meaning Interrelation. I: co-occurrence, collocation; II: lexicalization, transparency form-meaning; III: form-attrition: form synchronically opaque; IV semantic-attrition: loss of meaning

Row A in Figure 2 depicts the development, which has been described as leading to the SHG forms *hinauf/herauf* and later *rauf* (cf. Section II). The first step is the creation of a new lexical entry after frequent co-occurrence of two adverbs (I to II). The construct in II is transparent both semantically as well as on the form side. Stage A-II<sup>12</sup> corresponds for example to today's SHG as illustrated in example (15) and (16) above.

The change from II to III is form-driven; it is the loss of the initial phonological material in both *her* and *hin* (e.g. aphaeresis from /her/ to /r/). This form-attrition leads to two form pairs: A-III corresponds to forms such as *rauf* and *nauf* as described in section II and depicted in Figure 1 (area 1), B-III corresponds to forms such as *uehi* and *uehe* as in Figure 1 (area 2b). On the semantic side there is no change, the meaning remains the one depicted in Schema 4 above. The resulting form in III is synchronically opaque, the (etymologically) compound form is perceived as a mono-morphemic form. Although the word-initial sound has no synchronic morphological function, it is the diachronic remnant of a morpheme.

The most important feature of the change from III to IV is the loss of the perspective meaning, paralleled by the loss of the weak phonological distinction in III. This change could be triggered by the loss of phonological form from II to III, a loss, which makes it perceptually more difficult to distinguish the two perspectives, but probably there are also conceptual reasons for this change. The loss of conceptual perspective marking seems to have started already at stage II, according to Grimm's Wörterbuch (DWB 1854, Vol. 4, 1025). The morphologically transparent form *herauf* can also shift towards taking a more generic

---

<sup>12</sup>

We will use the abbreviation A-II to refer to stage II in row A of Figure 2.

meaning *up* without a clear specification of viewpoint and perspective.<sup>13</sup> The same seems still to be true for contemporary SHG (Klosa 1997: 364).

With the completion of change III-IV we are in a similar situation as in the OHG time when the change described apparently started. Locational (directional) adverbs such as *rauf*, *runter*, *rein*, etc. correspond semantically and in their syntactical distribution to OHG *ûf*, *nidar*, *in*, etc.

The change depicted in row B is the alternative process which supposedly started later (cf. section II) and dominantly occurred/spread out/happened in the southern Germany. The process closely resembles the one in A and leads to the analogous forms in IV, which do not distinguish perspective (just as OHG *ûf*, colloquial SHG *rauf* and English *up*).

It is important to note that the loss of the perspective concept (from III to IV) occurred several times independently within the German speaking world - in several dialects as well as in the colloquial register of the standard language. A similar process can also be found in Yiddish, leading to the form *aroyf* without distinction of perspective (Talmy 2000: 297).

Another general tendency is that linguistic forms become shortened in diachrony (Lüdtke 1980: 11). This is what we observe from II to III. If there is only weak formal motivation of a semantic distinction the distinction may eventually fall. And this is what changes between stage III and IV.

It is important to consider the varieties of German, in which the different stages depicted in Figure 2 can be observed synchronically. Stage A-II has been codified and "fixed" in the lexicon by the standardisation of the German language. The impact of linguistic standardisation on ongoing changes in the language is well known. It is therefore not surprising that this stage is still the one we find in prescriptive grammars of the German language. However, we have shown above (section II, Table 1) that in contemporary spoken

---

<sup>13</sup> "in einer reihe von fällen tritt bei herauf (wie bei herab sp. 1005 der begriff der richtung nach dem sprechenden zu mehr zurück und der begriff aufwärts in den vordergrund" Grimm, DWB (Vol 4, 1025)

SHG stage A-IV is actually predominant. In some dialects (Swabia, Bavaria, cf. II), stage A-III seems to be maintained, although we would need new dialectological data to confirm that there has not been a shift to stage A-IV.

Schmutz/Haas (2000: 589) have provided the latest evidence that in some alpine Swiss German areas where the change of type B occurred the perspective distinction is still made. Therefore, at least some of the dialects seem to be in stage B-III. Most of the dialect speakers, who have to be attributed to the diachronic process in B, however have abandoned the perspective distinction. Their dialects correspond to stage B-IV.

It is a general tendency of remote and isolated speech communities to maintain a number of archaic features and in the same time to exhibit idiosyncratic developments. Obviously, in this case we are dealing with the relatively conservative trait of maintaining the perspective distinction. In contrast, the Swiss German low-land simplification (i.e. the loss of perspective in forms such as *ufe* (cf. examples (21) and (22)) could be an aspect of koineization.

However, speakers of low-land Swiss German dialects (area 2a in Figure 1) have the possibility to introduce the origo via a deictic adverb meaning ‘here’ or ‘there’, such as in:

- (34) *chum do ufe/abe/use/ine !*  
*come here up/down/out/in !*
- (35) *gang det ufe/abe/use/ine !*  
*go there up/down/out/in !*

Speakers using a colloquial register of SHG can turn to the SHG *herauf*, *hinauf* etc. As the examples (30) and (31) above suggest, we seem to be dealing with a cyclical development.

Additional examples might support this claim:

- (36) *Plötzlich spürte ich etwas auf dem Rücken und fragte mich, was Paul mir wohl da hin rauf getan hatte.*<sup>14</sup>  
*suddenly I felt something on my back and asked myself what Paul had put me there AWAY-FROM-ORIGO up*

---

<sup>14</sup>

Found at <http://www2.club.ch/ssort/bord19.htm>

- (37) Du bis ne Tusse, weißt, EMINEM ist der geilste! Steck dir deinen Mozart sonst wo hin rein!<sup>15</sup>  
*you are a chick, you know, Eminem ist the coolest! Stick yourself your Mozart somewhere else AWAY-FROM-ORIGO in*
- (38) Der Kontinent misst vom Nördlichsten Ende bis runter hin zu den südlichst gelegenen Inselgruppen mehr als 3000 Meilen<sup>16</sup>  
*the continent measures from the most northern end until down AWAY-FROM-ORIGO to the most southern archipelago more than 3000 miles*

These examples stem from a simple search in the google-search engine for phrases such as “her rauf”, “hin rauf” or “rauf hin” etc. We found tokens for *hin rauf*, *her rauf*, *runter hin*, *hin runter*, *her runter*, *rein hin*, *hin rein*, *her rein*, *raus hin*, *hin raus* and *her raus*.<sup>17</sup> The complete search results are given in the appendix. Due to the often very informal nature of internet communication in newsgroups and on web pages, there is much less pressure to monitor the means of expression and to converge towards the standard than in other written styles. The examples above show that in fact the forms at stage A-IV might be the input to a new collocation process.

Some of our examples (see (36) to (38) and Appendix) are ambiguous in several ways. In all of those cases, only one of their readings is synonymous to their lexicalized variants (i.e. for example *hinaus* for *hin raus*). This reading corresponds to the superimposed image schemas as shown in Schema 4. The other possible reading is the subsequent modification of the verb as shown in Schema 6. As we have argued above, we believe that this ambiguity corresponds to the ambiguity in OHG *hara ûf*.

---

<sup>15</sup> Found at [http://www.ud-lernmaterialien.de/\\_diskus-brief/0000005c.htm](http://www.ud-lernmaterialien.de/_diskus-brief/0000005c.htm)

<sup>16</sup> Found at <http://gareth.gomp.net/tor/dsa/wasistdsa.htm>

<sup>17</sup> The examples found could be explained as simple typos which happen to put a space between the two components of forms such as *hinauf*. This may be true for some of them, but definitely not for the examples of the inversed order (corresponding to row B in Figure 2) such as “rein hin”.

## V Conclusions

One important observation, which arises from the diachronic processes described in this paper, is that we are dealing with a cyclic phenomenon. Stage IV (e.g. *rauf*) in Figure 2 is semantically equivalent to the 'input' on stage I (i.e. the OHG ADV\_LOC *ûf*). With the help of dialectological and historical data we have shown that stage IV has emerged more than once and through different historical paths (row A and B in Figure 2 above). It seems that perspective marking was dropped at different stages and in the German dialect areas. The chain of changes is intuitively plausible, given the great ease of shifting perspectives and given the universal tendency of shortening of linguistic forms. Standardization and codification of the language at stage A-II leads to a sustained vitality of the compound adverb, but language users nevertheless abolish the perspective marker in less monitored registers. But since it was possible for the [[hara]+[ûf]] construction to become a lexical entry [herauf], there had to be quite a lot of communicative situations where speakers wanted to express and even profile perspective. Given this and the synonymy of [ûf] and [rauf], one would therefore expect the forms at stage IV to be possible input to a similar circular change, if there is a communicative need to introduce the perspective. As we have seen in examples (30), (31) and (36)-(38), the first step of such a new change can in fact already be observed in informal communication. This could hypothetically lead to new compound forms (not only of the type her-rauf, but also rauf-her). For now, this is highly improbable because the SHG forms corresponding to stage II block this type of change.

It remains to be clarified by future research exactly what constraints interact for a change like the one described here. Clearly, the actual 'success' of a change (i.e. the realisation for a *possible* change) depends on social as well as direct<sup>18</sup> cognitive constraints. This paper is the modest attempt to use constructional and cognitive approaches in order to describe variation

---

<sup>18</sup> We speak of *direct* cognitive constraints because we believe that ultimately social constraints are based on cognitive constraints as well. Social factors would then be *indirectly* constrained by cognition.

across time and space. The basic claims of CG allow us to account for the gradually changing entrenchment of linguistic chunks of different sizes, whereas cognitive grammar is an excellent tool to describe the subtle conceptual change of the German perspective constructions.

## VI References

- Baumgartner, Heinrich et al. 1962-1997. *Sprachatlas der deutschen Schweiz*. Bern: Francke.
- Bergman, Rolf (et al.). 1987. *Althochdeutsch, Band I*. Heidelberg: C. Winter.
- Bréal, Michel 1897 [1983]. *Essai de sémantique*. Brionne: G. Monfort.
- Erdmann, Oskar (ed.). 1973. *Otfrids Evangelienbuch*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Kay, Paul, O'Connor, Mary C. 1988 "Regularity and Idiomaticity in grammatical constructions: The case of 'Let Alone'". In: *Language* 64(3): 501-538.
- Fillmore, Charles J., Kay, Paul. 1999 "Grammatical constructions and linguistic generalizations: The "What's X doing Y?" construction". In: *Language* 75(1):1-33.
- Fischer, Hermann. 1904-1936. *Schwäbisches Wörterbuch*. Tübingen: Verlag der H. Laupp'schen Buchhandlung.
- Fischer, Hermann. 1986. *Schwäbisches Handwörterbuch*. Tübingen: H. Laupp/J.C.B. Mohr.
- Goldberg, Adele. 1995. *Constructions: A construction grammar approach to argument structure*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grimm, Jacob, Grimm, Wilhelm. 1854ff. *Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Hartmann von Aue. 1963. *Erec. hrsg. von Albert Leitzmann*. Tübingen: M. Niemeyer.
- Hinderling, Robert. 1980 "Die Richtungsadverbien im Bairischen und im Alemannischen. Versuch einer Synopse". In: *Sprachliche Orientierung I*, Anthony Rowley (ed.), 249-293. Bayreuth: Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaftliche Fakultät der Universität.
- Johnson, Mark. 1987. *The Body in the mind. The bodily basis of meaning, reasoning and thought*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Keller, Rudi. 1994. *On Language Change: The Invisible Hand in Language*. London, New York: Routledge.
- Klosa, Annette (et al.). 1997. *Richtiges und gutes Deutsch. Duden Bd. 9*. Mannheim: Bibliographisches Institut.
- Krogmann, Willy (ed.). 1959. *Hildebrandslied, in der langobardischen Urfassung hergestellt*. Berlin: E. Schmidt.
- Lakoff, George, Johnson, Mark. 1999. *Philosophy in the Flesh*. New York: Basic Books.

- Langacker, Ronald W. [unpublished manuscript]. *A Course in Cognitive Grammar; Preliminary Draft as of 09/2000*, San Diego: University of California.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1987. *Foundations of Cognitive Grammar, Volume 1. Theoretical Prerequisites*; Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1988 "A usage-based model". In *Topics in Cognitive Linguistics*, Rudzka-Ostyn, B. (ed.), 127-161. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1991. *Concept, Image and Symbols: The cognitive Basis of Grammar*. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1992 "The symbolic nature of Cognitive Grammar: the meaning of of and of of-periphrasis". In *Thirty years of linguistic evolution: studies in honour of René Dirven on the occasion of his sixtieth birthday*, Pütz, M. (ed.), 483-502. Amsterdam, Philadelphia: John Benjamins.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1993 "Correspondence, Compositionality, and Grammar". Reprinted in *Actas del XXI Congreso Internacional de A.E.O.E.A.N.*, Iglesia, F.T. et al. (eds.), 55-74. Sevilla: Secretariado de Publicaciones de la Universidad de Sevilla.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1999a. *Grammar and Conceptualization*. Berlin, New York: Mouton De Gruyter.
- Langacker, Ronald W. 1999b "A Dynamic Usage-Based Model". In *Usage-based models of language*, Barlow, M., Kemmer, S. (eds.), 1-64. Stanford: CSLI Publications.
- Lexer, Matthias, et al. (eds.) 1872-1878. *Mittelhochdeutsches Handwörterbuch*. Leipzig: S. Hirzel.
- Lindow, Wolfgang; Möhn, Dieter; et al.. 1998. *Niederdeutsche Grammatik*. Bremen: Verlag Schuster Leer.
- Lüdtke, Helmut. 1980. *Kommunikationstheoretische Grundlagen des Sprachwandels*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Müller, Wilhelm, Zarncke, Friedrich. 1990. *Mittelhochdeutsches Wörterbuch*. Stuttgart: S. Hirzel, 1990.
- Notker, Labeo. 1999. *Die Hochzeit der Philologie und des Merkur (De nuptiis Philologiae et Mercurii by Martianus Capella)*. Hildesheim, New York: G. Olms.
- Pokorny, Julius. 1959-1969. *Indogermanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. Bern: Francke.
- Schmidt, Oskar. 1980 "Kontrastakzent und Aspekt bei Richtungsadverbien im Bairischen". In: *Sprachliche Orientierung I*, Anthony Rowley (ed.), 197-207. Bayreuth: Sprach- und Literaturwissenschaftliche Fakultät der Universität.
- Schmutz, Christian, Haas, Walter. 2000. *Senslerdeutsches Wörterbuch*. Freiburg (Schweiz): Paulusverlag.
- Schützeichel, Rudolf. 1995. *Althochdeutsches Wörterbuch. 5., überarbeitete und erweiterte Auflage*. Tübingen: Niemeyer.
- Staub, Friedrich, et al. 1881ff. *Schweizerisches Idiotikon. Wörterbuch der schweizerdeutschen Sprache*. Frauenfeld: Huber.
- Stern, Gustaf. 1931. *Meaning and Change of Meaning*. 2<sup>nd</sup> Printing 1965. Bloomington: Indiana University Press.
- Talmy, Leonard. 2000. *Toward a cognitive semantics. Volume II: Typology and process in concept structuring*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London: MIT Press.

Traugott, Elizabeth C. 2000 "From Etymology to Historical Change; plenary paper for: Conference on Studies in English Historical Linguistics, UCLA". The document can be downloaded at: <http://www.stanford.edu/~traugott/ect-papersonline.html>

Wolfram von Eschenbach. 1994. *Parzival. Nach der Ausgabe Karl Lachmanns revidiert und kommentiert von Eberhard Nellmann*. Frankfurt a.M.: Deutscher Klassiker Verlag.

## VII Appendix

Search results, using www.google.com for rauf-hin; rauf-her; hin-rauf; her-rauf; runter-hin; runter-her; hin-runter; her-runter; rein-hin; rein-her; hin-rein; her-rein; raus-hin; raus-her; hin-raus; her-raus:

Plötzlich spürte ich etwas auf dem Rücken und fragte mich, was Paul mir wohl da hin rauf getan hatte. Bis ich merkte, dass sich dieses Ding bewegte! Ich glaube, so schnell war ich noch nie aufgestanden", erzählte sie. - <http://www2.club.ch/ssort/bord19.htm>

HEY SIE DA, brüllt ne Frauenstimme von unten von der Strasse her rauf. Ich mach die Augen auf und schau runter. Fünf bis zehn Gestalten sin da unten wie festgfrorn und glotzn hoch. - <http://www.triptease.de/schall.htm>

Ich werd den Kähnen zusehn, wie sie rausfahn den Rhein runter hin zu einem blauerem Meer, das sich vom Himmel absetzt - <http://www.tomliwa.de/sprachland/ressources/sweetthi.html>

Der Kontinent misst vom Nördlichsten Ende bis runter hin zu den südlichst gelegenen Inselgruppen mehr als 3000 Meilen, eine Entfernung für die ein Aventurier mehrere Monate brauchen würde um sie zu bewältigen - <http://gareth.gomp.net/tor/dsa/wasistdsa.htm>

Entweder ein 556 Timer da sin zwei 555 enthalten damit kommst Du au jedenfall hin oder einen Pulser aus einem Inverter IC damit bekommst Du auch langsame Taktungen hin ich weiß nur nicht bis wo hin runter es gibt noch einen 74HCTxxx ein Frequenzteiler der Perioden dauern bis 35minuten produziert aus einem entsprechenden quarz! Falls Du den Bausstein nicht findest dann mail mal ich sag dir dann die Bezeichnung sobald ich das Datenblatt wieder gefunden hab! Ciao Peter - <http://www.google.com/search?q=cache:www.roboterwelt.de/forum/messages/305.html>

Da es im Cafe aber zunging als gäbe es Freibier, verzogen sich einige Insulaner auf die Einladung von Galaxos hin runter zum Strand.- <http://195.248.129.105/kilahu/logbuch/seite09.html>

Als dann alle im Bett waren, durfte auch hin runter in den Goldfischeich, wo ich wieder auf Moira warten mußte.- <http://www.fortunecity.de/lindenpark/beethoven/461/Sozi.htm>

Also Eltern, seht zu, daß Ihr her runter kommt, ich warte auf Euch. - [http://www.planet-interkom.de/busiek/reisebericht72\\_rio.htm](http://www.planet-interkom.de/busiek/reisebericht72_rio.htm)

dann Springt man (mit dem Sack zwischen den Beinen ) die Treppe (her)runter und hofft auf schönes Wetter - <http://www.bnhof.de/~Conica/klumpe.htm>

Nach etlichen Stürzen und dem Training von ihm war sie einigermaßen sicher vom Berg her runter gekommen.- <http://www.minako.handshake.de/news117.htm>

Hier können Sie auf Ihrem Computer eine ganze Schafszucht züchten, sie fallen von oben her runter und laufen unten am Bildschirmrand umher. –  
<http://home.t-online.de/home/speth.lukas/Startseite/Verruecktes/sonstiges.htm>

Manchmal ist es wie eine grosse Steinplatte, die in einem Stück vom Berg her runter geht. -  
[http://www.twikeklub.ch/challenge98/tagesnotizen\\_etalpe4.htm](http://www.twikeklub.ch/challenge98/tagesnotizen_etalpe4.htm)

Ich hab noch keinen Richter gesehen der sich zu den Hunden her runter bewegt hat um ihn zu begutachten. - <http://www.sheltie.de/ausstell.html>

Kurz vor Oberriedenberg ging es links den Berg rauf in die Wolken rein hin zum Berghaus Rhoen, wo Thomas dann seine fuer die Triumph faellige Runde Kakao ausgab. -  
<http://www.frankenbiker.de/fbi0398.html>

Rein hin und los geht's - <http://www.soll.de/gala/fachthem/baumpfle/teupen.htm>

da kommt ihr hin rein -  
[http://no.blowjob.de/thenp/tuts/tnp\\_c163\\_mirv2k/tnp\\_c163\\_mirv2k.html](http://no.blowjob.de/thenp/tuts/tnp_c163_mirv2k/tnp_c163_mirv2k.html)

Du bis ne Tusse, weißt, EMINEM ist der geilste! Steck dir deinen Mozart sonst wo hin rein! -  
[http://www.ud-lernmaterialien.de/\\_diskus-brief/0000005c.htm](http://www.ud-lernmaterialien.de/_diskus-brief/0000005c.htm)

"Da unten links kommst du von Hanau her rein", erklärt ein ehemaliger Einwohner einer ortsfremden Betrachterin. - Frankfurter Rundschau, 030.12.1998, S. 2, Ressort: N

Es ist kalt, selbst mit Birgers hochgelobten Snowboardhemd (trotzdem Danke, ich schätze, es kriecht mir nur leider von Hals und Beinen her rein). –  
<http://www.privat.schlund.de/s/setzdichnimmdirneks/sverige1.htm>

Diese Seite befindet sich im Aufbau und wird ständig aktualisiert. Schauen Sie bitte des öfteren her rein. - [http://www.islammarkt.de/cgi-bin/portal/ilink.cgi?action=Add\\_Link](http://www.islammarkt.de/cgi-bin/portal/ilink.cgi?action=Add_Link)

Da genau die, die keine Punkte erreichen sollten, viele Punkte her rein gefahren haben, muß Dino in den letzten beiden Rennen in Kerpen am kommenden Wochenende Nervenstark sein und einige Punkte mehr holen. - <http://www.neuigkeiten.purespace.de/dino/rennen10.html>

Keine Grund, von Bruck hin 'raus mit der Obus zu fahren... -  
<http://www.bahn.sembach.de/gaeste/>

Dann kann sie ruhig wieder woanders hin raus gehen -  
<http://www.handl.net/zitig/kongoausst.html>

Da muss ich mich fragen was dabei wieder her raus kommt.- <http://home.t-online.de/home/heupel.k/konzgrim/stand1-2000.htm>

kamen wir auch hier aus dem Staunen nicht her raus -<http://home.t-online.de/home/ak.sunny/norg.htm>

stellt sich als sehr anstrengend her raus. –

[http://www.becritical.de/altefilme/Weisheit\\_der\\_Krokodile/weisheit\\_der\\_krokodile.html](http://www.becritical.de/altefilme/Weisheit_der_Krokodile/weisheit_der_krokodile.html)

Sobald man sich für einen entschieden hat , stellt sich her raus ,dass man nur kurz auf ein besseres Modell hätte warten müssen. - <http://www.kristinkerkring.de/witze.htm>