Discourse & Society

Meeting the Challenge on the Path to Democracy: Discursive Strategies in Government Declarations in Germany and the Former GDR

Christina Schäffner and Peter Porsch

The online version of this article can be found at:

Published by:

$SAGE

Additional services and information for *Discourse & Society* can be found at:

Email Alerts: http://das.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts

Subscriptions: http://das.sagepub.com/subscriptions

Reprints: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav

Permissions: http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav

Citations: http://das.sagepub.com/content/4/1/33.refs.html

Meeting the challenge on the path to democracy: discursive strategies in government declarations in Germany and the former GDR

Christina Schäffner
SAXON ACADEMY OF SCIENCES, LEIPZIG

and Peter Porsch
LEIPZIG UNIVERSITY

ABSTRACT. The communicative practice in the ex-GDR was complex and diverse, although public political discourse had been fairly ritualized. Text-types characteristic of the Communist Party discourse were full of general (superordinate) terms whose semantic specification was hardly possible (propositional reduction). Changes in the social world result in changes in the communicative practice as well. However, a systematic comparison of text-types across cultures and across ideological boundaries reveals both differences in the textual macro- and superstructures and overlapping as well as universal features, probably related to functional aspects (discourse of power). Six sample texts of the text-type 'government declaration', two produced in the ex-GDR, four in the united Germany, are analysed. Special attention is paid to similarities and differences (i) in the textual superstructure (PROBLEM–SOLUTION schema), (ii) in the concepts that reflect the aims of political actions (simple worlds), (iii) in the agents who (are to) perform these actions (concrete vs abstract agents). Similarities are found mainly in the discursive strategies, e.g. LEGITIMIZATION text actions. Differences become obvious in the strategies used for LEGITIMIZATION, and also in the conceptual domains referred to by the PROBLEM–SOLUTION schema. The metaphors of construction, path and challenge are of particular interest in this respect.

KEY WORDS: conceptual domain, discursive strategies, government declaration, language in the ex-GDR, macrostructure, metaphor, propositional reduction, public political discourse, superstructure, text actions

LANGUAGE IN THE EX-GDR: FROM WORDS TO TEXTS

The German language in the two German states has been much discussed. Again and again the question was asked whether the division of the

country had also resulted in a division of the German language. The answers were different, but the question remained till the end (for a survey cf. Hellmann, 1989, also Fleischer et al., 1987). And when, finally, the GDR did come to its end, the question of how the political system had influenced the language was being discussed with new vigour. We encounter a large number of papers, published in the last two years, on language, speech and speechlessness in the GDR, on how the peaceful revolution liberated the language as well, on 'old' and 'new' language (e.g. in the journals *Muttersprache*, *Sprachpflege und Sprachkultur*, *Der Sprachdienst*, *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*).

Quite a number of these initial papers were devoted to collecting and enlisting GDR-specific words and phrases, sometimes speculating which of them might survive in a united Germany (e.g. Hellmann, 1990, 1991). Kretzenbacher (1991: 181) has compared such endeavours with archaeologists' search for relics, the relics in this case being those of 'GDR-German' (linguists are busy with the 'Bergung kleiner lexikalischer oder etwas größerer idiomatischer "Scherben" [salvaging of small lexical or larger idiomatic "shards"]'). The relevance of such a collection for the history both of the language and of the people should not be neglected. Some of these words, e.g. *Kinderkombination*, *Komplexannahmestelle*, *Erntekapitän*, *Absolventenlenkung*, reflect almost complete scenarios of how life functioned. An interpretation of their meanings requires the activation of culture-specific, historically relevant knowledge (cf. Schäffner, 1990), and it is not so easy to explain their meanings to non-native speakers of German, let alone give a one-word equivalent in another language (a *Kinderkombination*, for instance, often abbreviated as *KiKo*, was an institution of child-care which combined a crèche, for children up to 3 years of age, and a kindergarten, for children between 3 and 6, in one building).

We cannot avoid the impression, though, that some of these word-centred papers lack a serious methodology and aim instead at a collection of examples to prove their point that GDR-citizens were exposed to words that choked and were also highly effective ('Würgende und wirkende Wörter', the title of a book by Oschlies [1989]). The argument is that, on the one hand, the people were not free to make use of the language because it was chained, and, on the other, that the words were so powerful that they affected the thinking and feeling of the people in the interests of the ruling Communist Party. Such a position, however, is one-sided and biased, in our opinion, since it seems to underestimate the variety of discursive practices which existed in the ex-GDR. What seems to be missing is an analysis of language in its use (also demanded by Kretzenbacher [1991]).

Communicative practice in the ex-GDR was much more complex than is implied by the characterization 'words that choke'. When we as linguists of the ex-GDR try to contribute to an elucidation of how (life in) the system functioned, we have to confess that such 'choking words' were somehow, at least sometimes, 'our words'. They did not just come over us. There was not only the official language of the party and the government, but there

was also a kind of diverse and multifarious language and speech, especially in everyday talk. This was often critical speech, the language of social experience, the language of change. But a simple dichotomy of official (party) discourse and private (everyday) discourse would not do justice to the complex communicative practice in the former GDR. For its description and explanation we would need a methodology which would have to take into account that we have to overcome a state of embarrassment and affliction and be able again to analyse discourse. But ability to analyse does not mean the discarding of our affliction, let alone its denunciation.

What we are interested in is not language (or words) in its isolation and as a mere object of research; what interests us is how social reality is created and shaped by language. An isolating and objectifying concept of language is one which contrasts collections of linguistic units and examines them for differences. Our assumption, however, is that social reality is not only reflected in language and in communication, but that it is also constantly renewed by and in communication. This perspective sees linguistic differences or changes from the point of view of the individual speakers not so much being exposed to them, but rather being involved in them (cf. Hartung, 1990).

For a thorough analysis of the communicative practice in its complexity we would have to consider the role of language in the process of reproducing, modifying and creating anew our social reality. We would have to know about the involvement of the speakers and hearers in this process. We would have to ask how language is related to and affected by processes in which identities change, get lost, are found again or rescued. Word lists recede, while text-types and their linguistic make-up become of central interest. We will limit our analysis to two questions. In a first, shorter, section we look at mechanisms of how the negotiation of social reality functioned in the GDR (for a more detailed analysis cf. Porsch, 1991). In a second section we illustrate the characteristic features by which social reality is reflected and constructed in one particular text-type, namely the government declaration ('Regierungserklärung'). In conclusion we will try to answer the question whether these features are culture-specific or whether they are determined by functional aspects which are more or less independent of cultural and/or political systems.

DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES IN PUBLIC POLITICAL SPEECH OF THE EX-GDR

The negotiation of social reality occurs either in public or in private communication. Obviously, it was the social conditions determining public speech which led to the impression of 'words that choke'. It was in public speech where peculiarities were especially obvious. We will try to list some of them, using a framework developed by Ehlich (1989) for his analysis of speech at the time of fascism in Germany. This framework seems suitable not for the period of fascism alone, but it is applicable as a general methodology for analysing public discourse in political domains.

The title of Ehlich's book is *Sprache im Faschismus* ('Language in Fascism'). He warns that trying to explain the 'language of fascism', which for a fairly long time had been the objective of linguistic research (mainly in the 1950s and 1960s), faces a double danger: either to get lost in a mere cultural criticism, or to concentrate on a sort of lexicological hoarding (the creation of a thesarus) in a positivistic way, while neglecting the pragmatic analysis of speech acts. This warning is also of relevance for linguistic research concerning a 'language of the GDR'. The study of 'language in the GDR', as much as 'language in fascism', should aim at another dimension of the topic: namely the socio-political conditions of the communicative practice.

Public political speech in the GDR (and in fascism) was characterized, first, by a particular solemnity, especially in the staged mass meetings. The text-types 'Gelöbnis [pledge or vow]' and 'Manifestation [demonstration]' were a characteristic part of them. On specific occasions, like May Day, we came together for 'Kundgebungen' or 'Manifestationen', with a 'Manifestation' being the more ritualized, solemn procedure. We did not come together for 'Demonstrationen' since the main purpose was not for the people to protest but to manifest their will to fulfil the decisions taken by the leaders of the ruling Communist Party, the SED (Sozialistische Einheitspartei Deutschlands). The word 'Demonstration' was hardly used in the official discourse, and when it was, then it was mainly with reference to people parading along the streets and marching past political leaders standing on rostrums. The whole procedure had become ritualized, texts set up and approved before being delivered. For the people these 'manifestations' meant a kind of experienced participation, real participation having been eliminated (cf. Ehlich, 1989: 21). The mass meetings in the autumn of 1989 were deliberately called 'Demos' because they were meant as protest actions against official policy. This made it possible for Christa Wolf in her speech at a mass rally for freedom of speech (Berlin, 4 November 1989) to contrast this new form of mass meeting with the ones the GDR citizens were used to by saying: 'Zu Huldigungsvorbeizügen, verordneten Manifestationen werden wir keine Zeit mehr haben. Dies ist eine Demo, genehmigt, gewaltlos [We won't have time any more for precessions of homage and for ordained manifestations. This is a demo, officially permitted and non-violent]' (cf. Schäffner, 1992).

As a second characteristic feature of public political speech in fascism Ehlich lists propositional reductions, by which he refers to the fact that the complex social reality was reduced to a short phrase or a keyword. The whole politically relevant vocabulary was created and re-created in this way, resulting in the development and consolidation of concepts guiding social action. Propositional reduction is often the promise of a simple world. Changes are promised which will, without cost, relieve individuals of their current ideological and material problems (Ehlich, 1989: 22). Public speech in the GDR, due to an excessive use of the attributes 'socialist' or 'communist' in political communication, was characterized by the promises of a better future, often seen as already having been realized,

with 'communism' presented as the highest form of the development of humankind.

When we look at another characteristic feature mentioned by Ehlich, the command, it is clear that propositional reduction, as a technique, is not sufficient to describe discursive strategies of public speech in the ex-GDR. Although we speak today of a 'command economy' with reference to the GDR, 'command' does not cover adequately the phenomenon of what was known as 'Partei- und Staatsdisziplin [party- and state discipline]'. Part of the illocutionary pattern of the command is, according to Ehlich, the systematic elimination of the decisions and the consciousness of the hearer, a transition from linguistic action to immediate force, an ordained speech-lessness of the addressees: 'verordnete Sprachlosigkeit', (1989: 25).

The command in the GDR did not function in exactly the same way. Rather, there was a feigned public discourse on all political and economic affairs which was fairly complex and communicatively controlled by a variety of text-types. The famous slogan 'Arbeite mit, plane mit, regiere mit! [Join in working, planning, governing]' (literally, work with, plan with, govern with) was indicative of this. The 'mit' should have made us suspicious. It is almost a kind of Freudian error which we hardly noticed. There were people who worked, planned and governed, and we were allowed to join them in doing so. And this in the GDR was called 'demo-cratic centralism'.

Those who governed gave an account at party congresses, at plenary sessions of the Central Committee of the Party, etc. Such procedures encompassed all levels of social life; there was a discourse on everything and everybody. Three specific discursive strategies had been developed: the rendering of the *account* (1) was followed by the *debate* (2). Giving an account meant proving that the decisions taken at the previous congress were correct and were creatively put into practice—in a word, that the rulers had acted correctly in all respects, but that there had been unfore-seen problems as well which legitimized the new congress. References to 'Life itself' to legitimize previous or future political actions were common in the official discourse: 'Natürlich verlangt das Leben, das Erreichte zu vervollkommen' (SED Party Congress, 1986). The debate proceeded in a similar way: the representatives of the lower-level institutions (the 'Basis [base]') reported how, in their own spheres, they had creatively applied the decisions taken at the previous congress. Problems could be mentioned. They were the result of insufficiencies, which had, finally, been overcome, and they were also the result of further social developments which made new decisions necessary, thus legitimizing another congress. Strategy (3) was providing the new *directive* ('Direktive'), whose elaboration could hardly be influenced by the 'Basis' at the congress itself, but which had been completed beforehand under what could be termed the indirect influence of the 'base'. In this connection, the monthly report from the base to the top, required from all social spheres, was of importance. The 'directive' could not be questioned discursively, rather it was analysed and utilized. In instructional meetings ('Anleitungen [instructions]') we made

accessible to ourselves the richness of ideas contained in the decisions and applied them creatively.

We were not speechless as in the case of a command, but we were speaking mainly about how things could be done in a better way. There were usually references to the party decisions which were always 'richtungsweisend [direction-pointing]'. Talking about social structures and the distribution of power, and also about alternatives to the 'directives', was not common in the public domain. The whole procedure was ritualized and almost identical on all levels of the party hierarchy. The higher the level, however, the more prepared and checked in advance were the individual contributions. At the lowest levels, i.e. at the monthly meetings of the party groups in institutions, free speech and even criticism were possible. Criticism, however, did not affect fundamental social structures.

The account and the directive were meant to be applicable in all spheres of social life. Therefore, their linguistic structure was fairly general. They were texts composed of the most general (superordinate) terms whose semantic content could hardly be specified. In the account to the XIth Congress of the SED (1986), for example, the task was set 'to shape the socialist relations of production in such a way that they promote the dynamic development of the productive forces in the interests of strengthening socialism [Auch künftig haben wir die sozialistischen Produktionsverhältnisse so auszugestalten, daß sie die dynamische Entwicklung der Produktivkräfte im Interesse der Stärkung des Sozialismus fördern]'.

This brings us back to the notion of propositional reduction, which, however, we understand in the following sense: the superordinate term was maximally vast in its extension, and maximally reduced in its intension. This is not to say that language was not made more and more complicated in an attempt to grasp the complexity of the social processes. But the less this attempt was successful, the more complexity turned into triviality and emptiness. The whole discursive system was no longer able to function. The more complicated social life in the ex-GDR became, the more the command was made use of—but it was increasingly ignored and refused.

In order to give in retrospect an objective account of communicative practice in the ex-GDR, its diversity and complexity has to be studied. Language and speech in the GDR was more than a list of specific words and also more than the highly conventionalized texts of the official SED discourse. As Teichmann (1991: 253) points out, mainly due to ideological reasons, critical linguistic analyses of public speech hardly existed. It has also repeatedly been pointed out that the breakdown of 'real socialism' did not result in a linguistic or communicative breakdown as well (Hellmann, 1990: Neubert, in press). Rather, what we are experiencing is changes in communicative practice, in the discursive strategies in the new federal states. We are also experiencing changes in text-types, both in everyday and in public discourse (cf. Porsch, 1992). A striking example is the text-type of the editorial or leading article in newspapers. In the GDR, the main function of the editorial was expository, the correct policy of the ruling Communist Party was explained by a social subject (who thought

her/himself to be in possession of the truth) with the aim of consolidating social consciousness. The function of the editorial today appears more as interpretative and argumentative. An individual subject (individual in the sense that no claims are laid to an objective truth) articulates his or her opinion of an event, this opinion itself being subject to objection.

SPECIFIC AND UNIVERSAL DISCURSIVE STRATEGIES: THE CASE OF THE 'REGIERUNGSERKLÄRUNG'

It is not so easy, however, to pinpoint such changes, since it usually takes some time before they have become conventionalized. And in addition, old habits die hard, that is to say, there will be traces of the 'old' communicative strategies in the new ones as well. It would be methodologically and theoretically wrong to look only for new aspects and qualities in linguistic and discursive structures whenever there is a change in social structures, i.e. in the extra-linguistic world. It is also necessary and useful to look for (the reproduction of) old as well as universal aspects. This is what we try to do in this second section of our paper, where we present observations based on a text-linguistic analysis of tokens of one particular text-type. The objects of our analysis are written versions of the text-type 'government declaration' (Regierungserklärung), originally presented orally to the respective parliaments. We have used the texts in their official wording as distributed in official publications. We analysed three texts by Kurt Biedenkopf, the Premier of the federal state of Saxony, one text by Chancellor Helmut Kohl, one text by Lothar de Maizière, the first freely elected Prime Minister of the GDR, and one text by Hans Modrow, the Prime Minister of the GDR elected by the Volkskammer (the East German parliament) in the autumn of 1989 (see Appendix A for detailed references).

We have concentrated on this particular text-type because it fulfils a particular function in the official political discourse. A government declaration is given, usually by the head of the government, at the beginning of a new legislative period, but also on the occasion of specific events of political relevance. The three speeches by Biedenkopf, for instance, were delivered at the first session of the newly elected Saxon Parliament (the Landtag), on the occasion of the first 100 days in power, and on the occasion of the first anniversary of the new government. The main purpose of the government declaration is to give an account of the policy of the government, both in retrospect and in prospect. This text-type did not exist as such in the GDR, due to the political power structure. What comes closest is the combined version of the *account* and the *directive* delivered at the congresses of the former ruling party, the SED. The speech by Modrow was the first that was called 'Regierungserklärung', a fact which makes it unique within the public discourse of the ex-GDR.

There is another phenomenon which relates the six sample texts: their temporal situationality (we refer to the seven standards of textuality in de

Beaugrande and Dressler, 1981). All of them were delivered between the autumn of 1989 and the autumn of 1991, after the peaceful revolution in the GDR and the subsequent disappearance of the GDR as an independent state. All the texts have the purpose of presenting decisions and steps for intended political changes in the country and of explaining and legitimizing them. This identical intentionality of the six sample texts finds its expression in the dominant semantic macropropositions which reflect the reconstruction of the new federal states in the united Germany and of the *Land* of Saxony. We were interested in the following four questions: (i) What is the typical structure of this text-type? (ii) What are the typical concepts that are presented as the aims of political actions? (iii) What are the typical actions that have to be performed to achieve these aims, and by whom are they to be performed? (iv) Are there differences in the textual structure and its linguistic make-up, both on a global and a local level, between the government declaration in a democratic society compared to that in a more totalitarian system?

The results of our analysis are of course tentative, given the restricted corpus, but seem nonetheless to provide valuable insights and pointers to further investigation.

Macro- and superstructures: PROBLEM–SOLUTION schema

Textual structures are the result of the conventionalization of particular (types of) strategies in specific communicative situations. As a first step we therefore looked at the more global structures of our sample texts, that is, we started with an analysis of their semantic macrostructures and their schematic superstructures (based on van Dijk, 1980). The texts revealed a fairly consistent PROBLEM–SOLUTION superstructure, with the exception of the Modrow text (which does not contain a PROBLEM block in the proper sense, but puts the emphasis on the measures to be adopted to achieve the aims set). This structure is characteristic of the argumentative text-type, for which four characteristic composition blocks of SITUATION–PROBLEM–SOLUTION–EVALUATION can be delimited (Tirkkonen-Condit, 1985; Schäffner et al., 1987). An example is the first government declaration delivered by the Saxon premier Biedenkopf at the first (constituent) session of the newly elected Saxon Parliament. For reasons of simplicity we provide the semantic macrostructure which comes close to the textual surface formulation (translated from the German) instead of the propositional content in its more abstract format. The functional components, that is, the categories of the schematic superstructure, are given in capital letters (we give only the highest levels here).

  I. SITUATION (sentences 1–81).
    The year 1990 marks a new beginning for Saxony. With our first aim, the unification of Germany, having been achieved, forces are set free for the second part of our historic task.
  II. PROBLEM (sentences 82–229).

Our objective is to complete German unity.
1. LEGITIMIZATION OF THE PROBLEM.
   This objective is defined by the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz)
2. EVALUATION OF THE PROBLEM.
   The achievement of this objective is subject to prerequisites.
III. SOLUTION (sentences 230–487).
   In order to achieve this objective, Saxony and its government have to fulfil tasks.
   1.–4. SPECIFICATION OF PROBLEM AND SOLUTION.
   1. The government has to be built up.
   2. Burdens left over by the old government have to be overcome.
      (a)–(d) FURTHER SPECIFICATION OF THIS SUBPROBLEM AND SOLUTION.
      (a) Economic burdens have to be overcome.
      (b) Ecological burdens have to be overcome.
      (c) Damage to the bodies and the minds of the people has to be healed.
      (d) Political burdens have to be overcome.
   3. A social system based on the rule of law must be built up.
   4. The relations to our neighbour states have to be developed.
IV. OVERALL EVALUATION (sentences 488–99).
   Although the challenge is enormous, we will meet our responsibility.

LEGITIMIZE, SPECIFY, etc. denote 'text actions' (Rothkegel, 1984) that function as a kind of sub-procedure in text production and reception. We refrain from illustrating the hierarchical structure of the text in a tree-like form, and we refrain as well from showing how the individual composition blocks and macropropositions, respectively, are interrelated to achieve coherence, for which we could make use of the 'rhetorical predicates' developed by Mann and Thompson (1986). We are, rather, interested in the social cognition processes that underlie these texts. We therefore examined rather more closely the relation between global and local levels of the texts to find out which conceptual domains were referred to in establishing PROBLEMS and SOLUTIONS.

PROBLEM and SOLUTION are closely related in the textual structures. The PROBLEM is formulated as doing something to achieve an objective, this action being made necessary by other PROBLEMS which result from the past. The ultimate objective is a positive state of affairs in the future. The achievement of this state is also seen as a SOLUTION.

The PROBLEM complex is related to the conceptual domains of 'damages', 'harm' and 'burden', the SOLUTION complex to the conceptual domains of 'construction' and 'renewal'. That PROBLEM and SOLUTION are closely linked can be seen by the fact that very often we find in the texts collocations like 'overcoming the inherited burden of the past, overcoming the damages inflicted by the SED-regime'. When the PROBLEM is formulated as such, e.g. 'destruction and devastation of the country caused by socialist rule', it functions as a LEGITIMIZATION for the SOLUTION envisaged. On the local level, that is, in the textual microstructures, these conceptual domains are

reflected in the choice of words such as 'damages, burden, destruction, deformation, havoc; construction, reconstruction, restructuring, rebuilding, renewal' (see Appendix B(1) for the original German quotations). These concepts function both on the global and on the local level with different degrees of generality, e.g. 'reconstruction of the country/society' vs 'reconstruction of the economy/administrative bodies'; 'renewal of the country' vs 'renewal of the education system'.

The construction metaphor in the SOLUTION block

The construction metaphor is of particular importance here. We understand metaphor in the sense of cognitive semantics (e.g. Lakoff, 1986; Chilton, 1989), which sees the essence of metaphor in 'understanding and experiencing one kind of thing in terms of another' (Lakoff and Johnson, 1980: 5). Metaphors not only map a source domain onto a target domain, but also correlate their internal structuring. Due to the reference to the conceptual domain of 'construction', we find metaphorical extensions mainly to 'foundations and pillars', such as 'lay the foundations for something; foundations on which we can build; an important pillar for this development; the foundation pillar', (Cf. Appendix B(2) for the original German examples.)

These conceptual domains for the PROBLEM and SOLUTION blocks are fairly similar in the speeches by Biedenkopf, Kohl and de Maizière. This is determined mainly by extra-textual factors. The socialist system in the GDR no longer existed, and at the time when the speeches by Biedenkopf and Kohl were delivered, the GDR itself also no longer existed. The aim was to build a society based on new foundations and different values. This explains all the references to 'renewal, restructuring, reconstruction, transition from X to Y'. The Modrow text differs in this respect in that he does not speak of 'reconstruction' but almost consistently of 'renewal' as the main objective. The only PROBLEM is seen in leading the economy out of the crisis, with the measures to be taken to do so, the SOLUTION, being 'stabilization' and 'reforms' ('Wirtschaft aus der Krise führen; Maßnahmen zur Stabilisierung; Reformen').

Although we find 'renewal [Erneuerung]' in all the speeches, there is, however, a difference in the semantic content of the word. This different meaning is due to the textual determination of the word. Modrow speaks of a 'renewal' of the existing system, which is illustrated by collocations such as 'renewal of the socialist society [Erneuerungsprozeß der sozialistischen Gesellschaft]', 'renewal of socialism in our country [Erneuerung des Sozialismus in unserem Lande]' or 'the future shape of the socialist society in the GDR [die künftige Gestalt der sozialistischen Gesellschaft in der DDR]'. When de Maizière, Kohl and Biedenkopf speak of 'renewal', they mean a new social system with new structures, values and mechanisms. This becomes obvious by the collocations into which 'renewal' enters, especially 'renewal and reconstruction', 'renewal and restructuring', but also—on a more global textual level—by reference to the state that is to be

the ultimate objective of all political actions. This objective is, for Modrow, a 'better socialism', 'a new socialist society', for de Maizière, a 'new order of freedom, democracy and justice (neue Ordnung der Freiheit, der Demokratie und des Rechts]', in a word, a 'social market economy [soziale Marktwirtschaft]', which is also the key concept in the speeches by Kohl and Biedenkopf.

In contrast to the previous official SED discourse which was constantly speaking of the 'perfection of socialist society [Vervollkommnung der sozialistischen Gesellschaft]' and of 'developing further the advanced socialist society [weitere Gestaltung der entwickelten sozialistischen Gesellschaft]', Modrow's speech displays some new tendencies. In the previous SED discourse there was no real PROBLEM block, since the system was good, and the task was to make it better and better; the output was high, and it was to be ever more increased. Although Modrow does mention PROBLEMS, he is still arguing within the traditional logical relations: the system is to be renewed by reforms, but it is still the same social system, i.e. the basis of comparison for his kind of socialist society ('a better socialism') remains the same.

LEGITIMIZATION by means of propositional reductions

In connection with the 'social market economy' one point was of particular interest to us. Above we have mentioned Ehlich's propositional reductions as a characteristic feature of public political speech, which are often related to the promise of a simple and better world. What we are experiencing right now seems to be exactly the same phenomenon. 'Soziale Marktwirtschaft [social market economy]' and 'freiheitlicher Rechtsstaat [liberal-democratic state based on the rule of law]' are the magic phrases: they promise a future state of affairs in which life will be better and easier, when all current problems have been overcome. This positive future state functions as a LEGITIMIZATION for the SOLUTIONS offered in the government declarations. The SOLUTIONS are also LEGITIMIZED by reference to the PROBLEM and its EVALUATION. The PROBLEM has been caused by the policy of the past, the policy of the previous system. Here again we find the method of the propositional reduction which, in its retrospective function, is also a simplification of the world. The past is mainly characterized as a 'regime of injustice, arbitrary rule, despotism, communist dictatorship [Unrechtsregime, Willkürherrschaft, Gewaltherrschaft, kommunistische Diktatur]', in short, the 'SED regime'. Sometimes, these two worlds are contrasted on the textual local level, e.g. the Federal Republic of Germany as a 'free state based on the rule of law' vs the GDR as a 'dictatorship' (Biedenkopf); or 'to transform a socialist command economy into a social market economy' (Kohl); or, as a last example, 'after decades of serfdom (Unfreiheit] and dictatorship we want to create freedom and democracy under the rule of law' (de Maizière). (Cf. Appendix B(3) for the original German examples.)

LEGITIMIZATION also functions through the use of adjectives such as

'proven' (bewährte soziale Marktwirtschaft). It is the better future for the people in the eastern part of Germany, the former GDR, that is promised. But at the same time, this promised future is already a reality, namely in the western part of Germany, the former Federal Republic of Germany. Related phrases are 'rule of law; freedom, justice and preservation of creation; a free community bound by the rule of law [Rechtsstaatlichkeit; Freiheit, Gerechtigkeit und Wahrung der Schöpfung; ein freiheitliches, der Rechtsstaatlichkeit verpflichtetes Gemeinwesen]'.

Such references to simple worlds with a LEGITIMIZATION function are more or less frequent and more or less textually embedded depending on the text-type in which they occur. They occur fairly often in the form of propositional reduction in spontaneous speech during parliamentary debates, as one of us (Porsch) has recently been able to experience personally. In this context, such statements may also function as accusations.

The two other aspects which are referred to in order to LEGITIMIZE the objective to be achieved, the SOLUTION, are the German Basic Law (Grundgesetz) and the outcome of the elections, the decisions of the voters (see Appendix B(4) for examples). LEGITIMIZATION by reference to the outcome of the elections is also very common in spontaneous loud interruptions during parliamentary debates.

Modrow stresses in his speech the unity of the wishes of the people and of the government. He thus fully continues the tradition of the official SED discourse which had always stressed that the people and the party were one: cf. the typical phrase 'unerschütterliches Vertrauensverhältnis zwischen Partei und Volk [unshakeable relation of confidence between party and people].

As already mentioned above, Kohl and Biedenkopf make reference to shortcomings of the previous political system, the 'SED regime', to LEGITIMIZE current SOLUTIONS. Kohl also uses as LEGITIMIZATION references to his own regime's successful policy in the past, e.g. 'hat unsere Politik . . . zu einem beispiellosen Maß an wirtschaftlicher Dynamik und sozialer Sicherheit geführt [our policy has led . . . to an unparalleled measure of economic dynamism and social security]'. Such references to the party's and/or government's own positive achievements and successes were typical, even predominant and exclusive, in the official SED discourse. A quotation from the account to the XIth SED Congress in 1986 illustrates such recurring statements:

> Seit dem X. Parteitag hat unsere Republik ihre Entwicklung als politisch stabiler und ökonomisch leistungsfähiger sozialistischer Staat erfolgreich fortgesetzt.... Alle Seiten des gesellschaftlichen Lebens ... wurden weiter vervollkommnet.
> [Since the Xth Party Congress our Republic has successfully continued its development as a politically stable and economically efficient socialist state. ... All aspects of social life ... have been further perfected].

In this connection, notice here the comparative adverb 'weiter [further]' and the verb 'vervollkommnet [perfected]', which implies a certain end-point on a path of development.

Text actions such as LEGITIMIZE are probably necessary components of the text-type government declaration, which in a sense is a kind of 'success discourse'. The fact that we do not have these text actions—at least not to the same extent—in the government declarations by de Maizière and Bie-denkopf is due to the fact that they were delivered in particular historical situations in which a programme had to be set out. We do, however, find statements praising the first successful measures of the new governments in the speeches by de Maizière and Biedenkopf; in the three Biedenkopf texts increasingly so. In relation to political discourse, Straßner (1991: 138) speaks of strategies such as, on the one hand, establishing one's own authority and competence, boasting of one's own success and self-legitimi-zation, and, on the other hand, devaluing, calling into question, which are directed at political opponent(s).

In Biedenkopf's third speech the SOLUTION is also LEGITIMIZED by refer-ence to the confidence of the people, that is, their confidence in a better future ('Zuversicht und Glaube an die Zukunft').

Concrete vs abstract agents

Important aspects of the presentation of agency can be uncovered by closer inspection of processes and participant functions in clauses. Who does what, mainly in the SOLUTION block, to achieve the objectives? On the basis of a microstructure analysis concentrating on this question, we arrived at three groups, two of which refer to more concrete agents: (i) the govern-ment, (ii) the people and other individuals, whereas group (iii) comprises rather vague formulations that leave the agent more or less open, although on a cognitive level the agent may be inferred as the government. The actions that are combined with these three groups are the following.

The government, group (i), will 'elaborate and submit acts and laws, create and guarantee prerequisites, elaborate concepts and plans, take steps and measures', it will 'aim at, promote, ensure, guarantee, strive at, encourage, support, help, do its utmost, see to it that, take care that'; it 'is responsible for, stands before [enormous] tasks, has to face and to meet challenges'. The concrete references in group (ii) are to institutions, such as factories, which 'will take investments, should make use of opportuni-ties, and fulfil tasks'; or to the people as a collective body who 'take part in the reconstruction' who 'face problems, bear the [enormous] burden, will be affected and afflicted by something', but who are also 'confident, opti-mistic, rely on their own power, on the government, and on the social market economy'. In the rather more vague formulations of groups (iii), we encounter collocations such as 'the point is, [doing] something will be necessary; something will have to be assured/taken into consideration; [enormous] efforts will be necessary, something will be a challenge, the challenge puts demands on somebody' (see Appendix B(5) for the original German examples).

These actions are almost identical in the speeches by Kohl, Biedenkopf and de Maizière. The speech by Modrow shows similarity primarily with

respect to group (i). In group (iii), the formulations are even more abstract. That is to say, whereas in the speeches by Kohl, Biedenkopf and de Maizière we usually infer the hidden agent as the government, the agents in Modrow's text are others, mostly the people. That is, the people as the agents are hidden in agent-less passive constructions such as 'pre-requisites are to be created in all spheres of social life; measures should be elaborated; the quality of something is to be improved'. Sometimes the role of agent falls to a programme or a reform (e.g. 'the programme should aim at ...; the reform should lead to ...'), or even to socialism ('such a socialism should be in a position to ensure'). The main difference, however, concerns group (ii): the people in the GDR did not suffer and did not have to endure problems or bear burdens—at least not in the official public discourse. Due to the actual situation, Modrow could not afford to go on saying that 'socialism was good for the people'. He had to be more realistic, but he did not want to blame the system. In his speech, therefore, reference is made to 'the people [being] seized by the intention to renew socialism', and they 'are called upon to work, to contribute to this renewal' (see Appendix B(5)).

Abstract agents were highly typical of the official SED discourse before the autumn of 1989. A cursory reading of the *account* delivered at the last SED Congress (1986) left us stunned by their high frequency, and we wondered why we had not critically commented on them in the past. (We were probably so used to them, to this uniform, even monotonous, kind of success-propagating discourse in general, that we had become indifferent to it.) In this discourse it was common to speak of 'the economic strategy being directed at combining more and more efficiently the advantages of socialism with the achievements of the scientific-technological revolution which itself has entered into a new stage', or 'our state of workers and peasants developing in the direction of a further unfolding and perfecting of socialist democracy' (cf. Appendix B(5) for the original German quotations). Such over-generalizations appeared necessarily true, in the sense that they could not be disproved. Their function was to integrate everybody into the highly politicized social life. They applied to everybody, and thus to nobody. Such presumed universal truths, couched in abstract sentences with abstract agents, combined with a success discourse which did not know any problems and which kept the people in the dark as to the real situation, contributed to the stagnation, the crisis and the subsequent breakdown of the ex-GDR. Many people were able to reproduce this kind of discourse when necessary—but only up to a point. To resist the SED's integration attempts they developed counter-strategies, at first in their private discourse, but then more and more also in public, until they were finally successful.

Fight and path metaphors

When we look at these groups of agents in the speeches by Kohl, Biedenkopf and de Maizière, a first striking point is that there, too, one

encounters this general, abstract way of referring to the actions of the government. The conceptual domains that are of relevance here are SOLV-ING A PROBLEM, MEETING A CHALLENGE, DEVELOPING CONCEPTS, SUPPORTING AND PROMOTING ACTIONS BY OTHERS. The domain MEETING A CHALLENGE is closely related to two conceptual domains or conceptual metaphors. The first one is the conceptual domain FIGHT: the challenge is the opponent who comes upon the fighter (in our case: the government) who has to take steps to be victorious and successful in the end. The second conceptual domain is the PATH: the government stands at the beginning of a path which leads to an end-point (an objective). On the path to this objective, hurdles, chal-lenges, have to be overcome. With the examples of the construction meta-phor above, we have already illustrated the way in which image schemata enter into our abstract modes of thought. The conceptual metaphor PURPOSES ARE DESTINATIONS is part of an even more general metaphor: ACTIONS ARE MOTIONS. In a hierarchy of metaphorical mappings of event structure, they can be derived from the even more general cognitive meta-phors CHANGES ARE MOVEMENT and STATES ARE LOCATIONS (cf. Radden 1992). The path metaphor (in relation to challenges) is widely used in the speeches by Biedenkopf and Kohl. They refer to the government standing 'at the beginning of a path', moving 'along the onerous path into the future', facing and 'meet[ing] challenges on this path' (see Appendix B(6) for the German quotations).

There are hardly any references to the path metaphor in the Modrow text. He only rarely speaks of doing something step by step ('schrittweise umsetzen, Schritt für Schritt)', and then of 'the path to the safeguarding and establishing of the self-determination of the GDR being taken on a new basis [wird der Weg zur Wahrung und Durchsetzung des Selbstbestim-mungsprozesses des Volkes der DDR auf neuer Grundlage gegangen]'. But this does not mean that this metaphor was not used in the SED discourse. For example, a typical phrase was 'continue on the way which has proved successful [den bewährten Weg fortsetzen]'. Challenges on this way were put by life itself: 'Naturally life itself demands that goals reached be perfected (Natürlich verlangt das Leben, das Erreichte zu vervoll-kommnen]'.

A second point that struck us when looking at the agents and their actions seems to be related to functional aspects of the text-type. Bieden-kopf's third speech is first of all a report on PROBLEMS and not so much an account of successes achieved. There is a shift from governmental activities such as LAYING FOUNDATIONS, DEVELOPING CONCEPTS, to more LEGITIMIZING strategies, legitimizing the fact that the government has not yet achieved so much as was expected by the people. This becomes obvious in references to not having concealed how big the problems will be, or having known before how people would have to suffer: 'Wir haben keinen Zweifel an der Größe der Schwierigkeiten gelassen [we have left no doubt about the extent of the difficulties]', or 'Wir wußten, daß die Beschäftigten ... betroffen sein werden [we knew that employees will be affected]'. It becomes obvious as well in the second sub-group, which illustrates that in

relation to the people the stress is on their suffering, their enduring powers, but also on their hope and confidence. In this way, the people are mainly seen as objects of governmental policies, although mostly indirectly so: they have to bear the burdens. There is both a negative and a positive aspect: their suffering is mainly due to the mismanagement of the previous political system (LEGITIMIZING function) or to the measures that had to be taken by the government, such as closing down factories and dismissing workers, but which in turn had become necessary due to the previous policy of the SED regime. But since the people trust the new government they will easily bear their burdens. For example, Biedenkopf declares: 'Wenn sie die Aussicht haben, daß die Dinge weitergehen, ist dieser Zustand leichter zu ertragen [If they have the prospect that things are progressing, this situation is easier to bear]'. Only in Biedenkopf's first speech do we also find examples whose surface structure reflects the fact that the people are objects of governmental policies. For example, he speaks of 'The workers in our *Land* [having] a right to be led, in their businesses and enterprises, by people they can trust [Die Arbeiter in unserem Land haben ein Recht darauf, in ihren Betrieben und Unternehmen von Menschen gefürt zu werden, denen sie vertrauen können]', and of 'those who lead and those who are led [der Führende und die Geführten]'.

This way of referring to the people as objects of policy was typical for the official SED discourse in which the collocation 'our people [unsere Menschen]' was the most characteristic phrase, with 'our people' always creatively applying the decisions taken by the SED and fighting to fulfil and surpass the plans.

CONCLUSION

There may be two sub-groups of the text-type 'government declaration', one which could be characterized as 'success discourse' and one which is rather a kind of 'problem discourse'. In the 'success discourse' the PROBLEM block is closely interrelated with the SOLUTION block, the PROBLEM being mainly to improve, further develop, increase, intensify, etc. the various fields of social life. Here we find text actions of LEGITIMIZING with reference to past policy with which the speaker identifies, and which is characterized as being effective and successful, thus worthy of being continued. This success discourse was the one exclusively employed for the official SED discourse. The 'problem discourse', on the other hand, first of all emphasizes the PROBLEM as such and adds specifications as to how complicated it is. SOLUTIONS are conceptualized as ultimate objectives to be achieved by measures to be taken. The path metaphor seems to be of particular importance in such a problem discourse (the measures are steps on the path to the end-point, on this path challenges have to be faced and overcome, positive states of affairs are waiting at the destination). The destinations are often conceptualized as simple worlds (cf. the propositional reductions mentioned above), such as 'social market economy', 'free

democracy', 'rule of law'. However, 'success discourse' and 'problem discourse' often go hand in hand in a particular text-token.

At the beginning of our paper we asked if there are changes in the communicative practice of the five new federal states. Complying with Ehlich's dictum that what we have to look at is not communication *of* a social system, but communication *in* a social system, i.e. the variety and diversity of the communicative practices, we have to say that there are undoubtedly changes going on in the communicative practice of the ex-GDR, both in public and in private discourse. However, a systematic comparison of tokens of one particular text-type has also revealed aspects of continuity in addition to those of discontinuity. With respect to the text-type 'government declaration [Regierungserklärung]' there seem to be basic structures—such as PROBLEM–SOLUTION structures, LEGITIMIZING text actions—which are relatively constant, independent of political systems, and which may depend rather on functional aspects of the text-type. Such structures, which reflect underlying discursive strategies, may even be universal. A cursory survey of some speeches by US presidents Bush and Reagan also revealed LEGITIMIZING text actions, path and challenge metaphors, and references to simple worlds, e.g.:

> Confident in our future, and secure in our values, Americans are striding forward to embrace the future. . . . But the call of the future is too strong, the challenge too great, to get lost in the blind alleyways of dissolution, drugs, and dispair. (Reagan's State of the Union speech, 4 February 1986)

> We know how to secure a more just and prosperous life for man on earth: through free markets, free speech, free elections and the exercise of free will unhampered by the state. (Bush's Inaugural Address, January 1989)

We think it is justified to speak of a *discourse of power*. Its function is to legitimize, justify and ultimately reproduce this power, and with respect to this function, this discourse seems to be universal. A systematic comparison of text-tokens of this type of discourse as produced in the former GDR, in the united Germany and in the USA revealed that there are differences, but that there are similarities as well. These similarities, if not universal, are at least overlapping; they are independent of political systems, but dependent on textual and political functions. The SED legitimized its political power by referring to the historic mission of the working class and tried to integrate the population by continuously stressing the confidence between the people and the party. Kohl and Biedenkopf legitimize their power by reference to the election results. Similarities in the discursive strategies are seen in the propositional reductions, the promise of a better future (a simple world) to secure the political power both for the present time and for the future.

Discursive strategies and mechanisms in official public speech in the ex-GDR and in the united Germany show some similarities. The main difference between a democratic and a totalitarian society, however, is to be seen in the mechanisms implemented when the promised better future does not come about: electoral processes on the one hand, and, on the

other, violence or in the case of the Eastern European states their development into democracies.

One aim of discourse analysis is to increase our understanding of how in our societies people use language for particular purposes. Discourse analysis should thereby pay attention to the relationship between sociocultural and linguistic-cognitive phenomena and to their changes and effects (cf. van Dijk, 1991). With the examples we have discussed we do not claim to have come up with generalizations. What we have tried to do is to pinpoint some linguistic phenomena at a particular time which are characterized by fundamental changes in all spheres of social life. Such a linguistic analysis which goes beyond individual words and phrases should be part of a discourse analysis in the widest sense of its social and philosophical implications (cf. Luutz, 1992).

APPENDIX A: SAMPLE TEXTS

1. Erklärung von Ministerpräsident Hans Modrow vor der 12. Tagung der Volkskammer der DDR, in *Außenpolitische Korrespondenz*, Herausgegeben von der Hauptabteilung Presse des Ministeriums für Auswärtige Angelegenheiten der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik, 33. Jahrgang No. 46, 24 November 1989.
2. Regierungserklärung des Ministerpräsidenten der DDR Lothar de Maizière, in *Neues Deutschland*, 20 April 1990.
3. Regierungserklärung von Bundeskanzler Helmut Kohl vor dem Deutschen Bundestag, 30 Januar 1991, in Presse- und Informationsamt der Bundesregierung. Reihe Berichte und Dokumentationen.
4. Regierungserklärung des Ministerpräsidenten Kurt Biedenkopf im Landtag des Freistaates Sachsen. (1) Wahlperiode, (2) Sitzung, 8 November 1990, in Sächsischer Landtag des Freistaates Sachsen. Plenarprotokoll.
5. Regierungserklärung des Ministerpräsidenten Kurt Biedenkopf im Landtag des Freistaates Sachsen. (1) Wahlperiode, (11) Sitzung, 21–22 Februar 1991, in Sächsischer Landtag des Freistaates Sachsen. Plenarprotokoll.
6. Regierungserklärung des Ministerpräsidenten Kurt Biedenkopf im Landtag des Freistaates Sachsen. (1) Wahlperiode, (30) Sitzung, 25 Oktober 1991, in Sächsischer Landtag des Freistaates Sachsen. Plenarprotokoll.

For comparison: Bericht des Zentralkomitees der Sozialistischen Einheitspartei Deutschlands an den XI: Parteitag der SED (Berichterstatter: Erich Honecker). Berlin: Dietz Verlag, 1986.

APPENDIX B

(1) PROBLEM–SOLUTION *schema*

The prototypical phrase for all quotations is 'Schäden der Vergangenheit überwinden'. Table B1 gives synonymous expressions which we encounter in the texts.

TABLE B1. Textually encountered synonyms for the prototypical phrase

Schäden	der Vergangenheit	überwinden
Altlasten		abtragen
Zerstörung	sozialistische Herrschaft	Bewältigung
Verwüstungen	das zusammengebrochene SED-Regime	abbauen
Verheerungen	die alte Ordnung	sozial abfedern
Verödung	politische Vergangenheit	
Deformation	Zusammenbruch der alten Strukturen	
Verarmung	SED-Diktatur	
Erblast		
Lasten		
Krisenzustand		

'Schäden der Vergangenheit überwinden' represents the PROBLEM, the SOLUTION is expressed by the following phrases: Aufbau, Wiederaufbau, Neuaufbau unseres Landes, Ausbau; Umstrukturierung, Neustrukturierung, Strukturwandel, Strukturanpassungen, Strukturreform; Erneuerung unseres Landes, Neubeginn; Gestaltung, Neugestaltung, tiefgreifende Umgestaltung; Zeit des Umbruchs und Wandels, Modernisierung, Umwälzung.

(2) Examples of the construction metaphor

die Fundamente legen, auf denen wir ... bauen können (Biedenkopf)

Bau dieser Anlage als ... Eckpfeiler im Rahmen eines ... Konzepts (Biedenkopf)

Grundlage gelegt (Biedenkopf)

ein solides wirtschaftliches Fundament eröffnet ... Handlungsspielräume (Kohl)

eine wichtige Säule bei dieser Entwicklung (Kohl)

Grundpfeiler des Föderalismus (de Maizière)

Deutschland ... Pfeiler ... für eine Brücke der Verständigung (de Maizière)

Grundpfeiler der Regierungspolitik (Modrow)

(3) Legitimization by means of propositional reductions

Hinzu kommt, daß die alte Bundesrepublik von vornherein ein freiheitlicher Rechtsstaat war, gegründet auf sozialstaatliche Verpflichtung, während die DDR nach wenigen Jahren, nach kurzen Jahren der Hoffnung in einer neuen Diktatur versank und die Menschen hier keine Gelegenheit hatten, während der letzten gut vierzig Jahre ein freiheitliches Gemeinwesen aufzubauen. (Biedenkopf, 8 November 1990)

Niemals zuvor ist versucht worden, eine sozialistische Kommandowirtschaft in eine Soziale Marktwirtschaft umzuwandeln. (Kohl)

Nach Jahrzehnten der Unfreiheit und der Diktatur wollen wir Freiheit und Demokratie unter der Herrschaft des Rechts gestalten. (de Maizière)

(4) Legitimization by reference to (a) the Basic Law, (b) election results, (c) the unity of the people and the party

> (a) Unser Ziel wird durch unsere gemeinsame Verfassung, das Grundgesetz, bestimmt. (Biedenkopf, 8 November 1990)
>
> Aufgabe, zu der uns das Grundgesetz verpflichtet (Kohl)

> (b) Die Bürger unseres Landes hanen uns in freien Wahlen die Verantwortung für dieses Land übertragen. (Biedenkopf, 8 November 1990)
>
> Wir haben einen demokratischen Auftrag. Den haben uns die Bürger der DDR gegeben. (de Maizière)
>
> Wählerauftrag, dem die Regierung verpflichtet ist (de Maizière)

> (c) Dem Volk der DDR, das einen guten Sozialismus will, wird diese Regierung verpflichtet sein. (Modrow)
>
> Das wurde erreicht dank des unerschütterlichen Vertrauensverhältnisses zwischen Partei und Volk. ... Partei und Volk sind bei uns durch tiefes Vertrauen verbunden, handeln gemeinsam zum Wohle des Volkes und haben bewiesen, daß sie in solcher Gemeinsamkeit allen Anforderungen der Zeit gerecht werden. (Honecker 1986, 7/8)

(5) Concrete vs abstract agents

The following expressions are equally used in the speeches by de Maizière, Kohl and Biedenkopf (the examples in (i) are used in Modrow's speech as well).
(i) Agent = the government:

> Wir werden Gesetze/gesetzliche Regelungen vorlegen/einbringen/durchführen/erarbeiten
>
> wir werden Maßnahmen treffen/Schritte unternehmen/rechtliche Möglichkeiten ausschöpfen/Herausforderungen annehmen, begegnen und bewältigen/Programme vorlegen/die Voraussetzungen gewährleisten, schaffen und weiter ausbauen
>
> Regierung steht vor einer großen, schwierigen Aufgabe
>
> die Regierung wird ... anstreben/unterstützen/begünstigen/fördern/sicherstellen /schützen/garantieren/darauf hinwirken/dafür Sorge tragen, daß .../sich einsetzen für/vorantreiben
>
> meine Regierung wird alle Anstrengungen unternehmen, um ...

(ii) Agent = some individual (note the focus in people bearing burdens in Biedenkopf's third speech):

> die Bundepost wird investieren
>
> die Menschen gewinnen Vertrauen in den Staat und seine Organe
>
> die Menschen sehen sich Herausforderungen gegenüber
>
> Die Ruhe und Gelassenheit, die Duldsamkeit der Menschen, mit der sie diese Erblast tragen und zu überwinden versuchen, sind bewundernswert (Biedenkopf)
>
> der Wille und die Bereitschaft der Menschen, sich selbst einzubringen und die Herausforderungen anzunehem, ... ihren Mut zur Erneuerung und ihre Kraft, die Lasten des Umbruchs zu tragen (Biedenkopf)

Trotz des Gebirges an Problemen, dem sich die Bürger ... gegenüberse-
hen, sind sie optimistisch. Sie sind voller Zuversicht, voller Vertrauen
... (Biedenkopf)

(iii) Agent = abstract:

X gilt besondere Aufmerksamkeit/Unterstützung

es gilt ... zu verbessern/zu beseitigen/zu gewährleisten/zu entwickeln/zu
unterstützen

dabei muß berücksichtigt werden/es muß Vorsorge getroffen werden,
daß ...

zu den Herausforderungen gehört/X ist eine Herausforderung/X bringt
neue Herausforderungen/die Herausforderungen verlangen

Chancen, die uns mit ... zuwachsen/so bietet sich die einmalige Chance/
X (z.B. der Neubeginn) hat uns die Chance eröffnet

In contrast, Modrow's speech and the previous SED discourse:

(ii)   der Wille zur Erneuerung hat Millionen Bürger erfaßt

(iii) ein solcher Sozialismus sollte in der Lage sein, ... zu gewährleisten
       ein Programm, das zum Ziel haben sollte/eine Reform mit dem
       Ziel .../die Reform muß führen zu ...

es sind Voraussetzungen für ... zu schaffen/es sind Maßnahmen zu erar-
beiten der Erneuerungsprozeß verlangt Reformen/X (z.B. staatliche
Sicherheit) ist Grundbedingung für die Erneuerung

Die ökonomische Strategie unserer Partei mit dem Blick auf das Jahr
2000 ist darauf gerichtet, die Vorzüge des Sozialismus noch wirksamer
mit den Errungenschaften der wissenschaftlich-technischen Revolution
zu verbinden, die selbst in eine neue Etappe eingetreten ist. (Honecker
1986, 49)

Unser Staat der Arbeiter und Bauern hat sich weiter entwickelt, die
sozialistische Staatsmacht hat ihre Autorität kontinuierlich erhöht.
Hauptrichtung, in der sie sich entwickelt, ist die weitere Entfaltung und
Vervollkommnung der sozialistischen Demokratie.(Honecker 1986, 74)

(6) The path metaphor in relation to challenges

den Herausforderungen gerecht werden, vor denen wir stehen (Bieden-
kopf)

Der eingeschlagene Weg muß 1991 mit großer Intensität weiter beschrit-
ten werden (Biedenkopf)

Wir stehen am Beginn eines langen und auch beschwerlichen Weges
(Kohl)

der Weg dorthin wird beschwerlich sein ... es lohnt sich, ihn zu gehen
(Kohl)

daß wir Deutschen diesen Weg in die Zukunft ... gemeinsam gehen können (Kohl)

wir begegnen dieser Herausforderung (Kohl)

damit rechnen, daß ... neue Herausforderungen auf uns zukommen (Kohl)

Wir wissen, daß wir einen mühsamen Weg vor uns haben (de Maizière)

CHRISTINA SCHÄFFNER has worked at the Saxon Academy of Arts and Sciences at Leipzig where she has conducted research on political vocabulary, lexical semantics, text-linguistics, cognitive aspects of political discourse, and translation studies. The articles and books she has authored, edited or co-edited are devoted to these topics. She is involved in international and interdisciplinary projects on diplomatic vocabulary, stereotypes, and language and peace. From September 1992 she is at the University of Aston, in Birmingham, UK.

PETER PORSCH is Professor for Linguistics and Sociology of Language in the Department of Germanistics at Leipzig University, where he teaches courses in sociolinguistics, dialectology and history of linguistics. He has published widely on topics of sociolinguistics, sociosemantics, history of linguistics, as well as on problems of speech barriers and gender. He is co-author of the book *Wortschatz der deutschen Sprache in der DDR* (1987). His current interests include aspects of language and culture, especially common and everyday communicative behaviour and its reflection in discourse and language. In addition, he has been a representative in the Saxon Parliament since October 1990.

REFERENCES

de Beaugrande, R. and Dressler, W. (1981) *Introduction to Text Linguistics*. London: Longman.

Chilton, P. (1989) 'Safe as Houses?', *Peace Review* 1(2): 12–17.

Ehlich, K. (1989) 'Über den Faschismus sprechen—Analyse und Diskurs', in K. Ehlich (ed.) *Sprache im Faschismus*, pp. 7–34. Frankfurt/Main: Suhrkamp.

Fleischer, W. et al. (1987) *Wortschatz der deutschen Sprache in der DDR*. Leipzig: Bibliographisches Institut.

Hartung, W. (1990) 'Einheitlichkeit und Differenziertheit der deutschen Sprache: Bemerkungen zur Diskussion um die "nationalen Varianten"', *Zeitschrift für Germanistik* 11(4): 447–66.

Hellmann, M.W. (1989) 'Die doppelte Wende—Zur Verbindung von Sprache, Sprachwissenschaft und zeitgebundener politischer Bewertung am Beispiel deutsch–deutscher Sprachdifferenzierung', in J. Klein (ed.) *Politische Semantik*, pp. 297–326. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Hellmann, M.W. (1990) 'DDR-Sprachgebrauch nach der Wende—eine erste Bestandsaufnahme', *Muttersprache* 100(2/3): 266–86.

Hellmann, M.W. (1991) 'Einigendes Band zerfasert?', *Spiegel-Spezial*: 82–5.

Kretzenbacher, H.L. (1991) 'Das deutschdeutsche Du', *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* 28(3): 181–3.

Lakoff, G. (1986) *Cognitive Semantics*, (Berkeley Cognitive Science Report 36), Berkeley: University of California.

Lakoff, G. and Johnson, M. (1980) *Metaphors We Live By*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Luutz, W. (1992) 'Soziale (Des)–Integration in und durch diskursive Sprachpraktiken', *Berliner Debatte INITIAL* 1: 78–85.

Mann, W.C. and Thompson, S.A. (1986) 'Relational Propositions in Discourse', *Discourse Processes* 9(1): 57–90.

Neubert, A. (in press) 'Auswirkungen des politischen Wandels auf die Sprache (aus östlicher Sicht), paper presented to the annual meeting of the Gesellschaft für Sprache und Wirtschaft, St Gallen, October 1990.

Oschlies, W. (1989) *Würgende und wirkende Wörter—Deutschsprechen in der DDR*. Berlin: Gebr. Holzapfel.

Porsch, P. (1991) 'DDR: Alltag und Sprache. Was bleibt nach der "Wende"?', in B. Ekmann, H. Hauser, P. Porsch, W. Wucherpfennig (eds) *Deutsch-Eine Sprache? Wie viele Kulturen? Vorträge des Symposiums abgehalten am 12 und 13 November 1990 an der Universität Kopenhagen (Text und Kontext, Sonderreihe, Band 30*, pp. 127–40. Copenhagen/München: Fink.

Porsch, P. (1992) 'Alltag—Alltagsbewußtsein—Sprache', in *Festschrift für Wolfgang Fleischer*. Berlin: Lang.

Radden, G. (1992) 'A Cognitive Approach to Natural Language', in K. Pütz (ed.) *Thirty Years of Linguistic Evolution*. Amsterdam/Philadelphia: Benjamins.

Rothkegel, A. (1984) 'Sprachhandlungstypen in interaktionsregelnden Texten—Texthandlungen in Abkommen', *Lunder Germanistische Forschungen* 53: 255–78.

Schäffner, C. (1990) 'Sind Abstrakta im politischen Bereich prototypisch beschreibbar?', in C. Schäffner (ed.) *Gibt es eine prototypische Wortschatzbeschreibung? Eine Problemdiskussion*, pp. 46–64 (Linguistische Studien, LS ZISW/A 202) Berlin: ZISW.

Schäffner, C. (1992) 'Sprache des Umbruchs und ihre Übersetzung', in Armin Burkhardt and K. P. Fritzsche (eds) *Sprache im Umbruch. Politischer Sprachwandel im Zeichen von 'Wende' und 'Vereinigung (Sprache, Politik, Offentlichkeit, Band 1)*. Berlin/New York: de Gruyter.

Schäffner, C., Shreve, G.M. and Wiesemann, U. (1987) 'A Procedural Analysis of Argumentative Political Texts: Case studies from *The Economist*', *Zeitschrift für Anglistik und Amerikanistik* 35(2): 105–17.

Straßner, E. (1991) 'Maximenverstoß als Regel: Zum Grundprinzip politischer Kommunikation', in M. Opp de Hipt and E. Latniak (eds) *Sprache statt Politik? Politikwissenschaftliche Semantik- und Rhetorikforschung*, pp. 124–55. Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag.

Teichmann, C. (1991) 'Von der "langue de bois" zur "Sprache der Wende"', *Muttersprache* 101(3): 252–65.

Tirkkonen-Condit, S. (1985) *Argumentative Text Structure and Translation. (Studia Philologica Jyväskyläensia, 18*. Jyväskylä: University of Jyväskylä.

van Dijk, T.A. (1980) *Macrostructures: An Interdisciplinary Study of Global Structures in Discourse, Interaction and Cognition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

van Dijk, T.A. (1991) 'Discourse and the Denial of Racism', *Discourse & Society* 3(1): 87–118.