In this paper, we present two types of dictionaries: a discourse dictionary (http://www.ids-mannheim.de/lexik/SprachlicherUmbruch/ and http://www.owid.de/Diskurs1945-55/index.html) and a general dictionary (elexiko, http://www.ids-mannheim.de/lexik/elexiko/ and http://www.owid.de/elexiko_/index.html), both online in the same lexicographic portal based at the “Institut für Deutsche Sprache” in Mannheim (OWID: http://www.owid.de). Our aim is to show the special features of each type focusing on the semantic description and the relation between the two types. We will compare the dictionaries on the entry Demokratie, one of the most important concepts in the 20th century. Thus, Demokratie is one of the main words of the general political lexicon and has to be described in a general dictionary. At the same time, it plays an outstanding and specific role in certain public discourses over the last 100 years (e.g., 1918/19, 1945, and 1989) and should be described in a discourse dictionary. We begin with Demokratie in the Discourse Dictionary, contrasting its description of the headword with the one in a general dictionary in a second step.

1. **Discourse Dictionary**

1.1 **Preliminary Remark**

The type of a discourse dictionary can be situated between the two types general dictionary and individual dictionary. It represents the relevant vocabulary, that constitutes a discourse, and it describes this vocabulary following the both lexicographic principles semasiologically and onomasiologically. It describes the network structure of the discourse semantic. Since the discourse dictionary should be the result of a discourse analysis, the concept of such a dictionary depends on the concept of discourse, on which it is based. Here, we will give shortly the main ideas of the discourse dictionary’s concept, before the principles will be explained practically.
1.2 Main Ideas

Discourse Dictionary as a Lexicographical Type
In regard to function and content the type of a discourse dictionary lies between a general dictionary and an individual dictionary (like an author dictionary): It differs from a general dictionary, because it represents the vocabulary in relationship to the item, to the participants (which means speakers), to a certain period of time, to a special corpus. It differs from an individual dictionary, because it represents the vocabulary of a collective.

Semantic Network
The lexical elements of a discourse are in a semantic relationship towards each other. This means: Discourses can be imagined as a semantic network, which establish the conceptual discursive order. It is the total of the conceptual potential and of the regular relations of the lexical elements of a discourse. This means the integration of the onomasiological perspective into the semasiological principal of representation. Thus a discourse dictionary visualizes the topical, conceptual and semantic order of a discourse on the word level. It is this order, which creates the discourses coherence. And it is the net structure of a discourse dictionary, which symbolizes this order.

Discourse Analysis as a Condition
As we said, a discourse dictionary should be the result of a discourse analysis, which reconstructs the discourse semantic. What is a discourse? The dictionary which we show here assumes a concept of discourse as follows: A discourse is the total of collective communicative acts, with one identical topic, which is realized by one or several associations of participants, and which is represented by a typical and relevant vocabulary. Thus, discourse lexicography reconstructs semantic out of a certain historical, societal and communicative context. This semantic depends on the discourse structure, which is decisively determined by the topic, and the participants.

1.3 Principles in practice
The discourse topic of the dictionary presented here is ‘guilt’. ‘Guilt’ is the main topic of the early post war discourse in Germany. The participants of this discourse on guilt are the victims, the offenders, and the non-offenders. They together build the heterogeneous association of collectives with different experiences and perceptions and with different self
conceptions. Their utterances are elements of the discourse, and these utterances are evidently focused on the subject of ‘guilt’.

The explanation which follows, will concentrate on the association of the non-offenders, to show the principles of the early post-war discourse dictionary. The non-offenders’ main target is the rehabilitation of the German people. Since democracy is the one and only condition to regain respect and esteem, democracy is one of the key-words, which the group of the non-offenders uses in the context of the discourse of guilt. Thus, when they talk about democracy, they do it under the condition of guilt and of rehabilitation. And: Since this group of non-offenders again is to be separated at least into speakers of the eastern and of the western part of Germany, there is a third affect on the usage: We have to describe interpretations of democracy dependent on the western or on the eastern ideology. It is this constellation, which impacts the usage of our key-word evidently.

Semasiological level
The post war history of the concept of democracy begins with its idealization. Foil of the conceptualization is the total state. His characters are the negative equivalents of democracy. Idealization means: to create a democratic state and society, that is the total opposite of a national socialist state and society, and which makes a return of National Socialism impossible. This is the context, which is valid for both, the eastern and the western perspective. Democracy is a crucial element of the two stores – as we can see by the name of the nation German Democratic Republic, or by the formulation of the constitution: The Federal Republic of Germany is a democratic and social confederation. The separation of the concept begins, when the two systems mark off their ideological store to create identity.

In the following we will point out only three of several other aspects of the two different usages to show, how discourse lexicography is able to reconstruct and represent discoursive semantic structures semasiologically.
Eastern reading

1. The basic idea of the eastern self-identification is named antifascist-democratic. The socialist basic principal is expressed in the formula antifascist-democratic order (antifaschistisch-demokratische Ordnung):

   In der Deutschen Demokratischen Republik ist eine antifaschistisch-demokratische Ordnung errichtet, in der die Gesellschaft, die uns zweimal in einem Weltkrieg führte, entmachtet ist.

2. Since the socialist way is the way of fight, often used formula is militant democracy (kämpferische Demokratie): They call for the building of a vivid and militant democracy (Aufbau einer lebendigen und kämpferischen Demokratie), for example:

3. Another crucial category to interpret democracy is mass (Masse). In the socialist-communist context, mass is a high-graded conceptual element of democracy. For example: the nature of democracy is anchorage of the state power in the masses (das Wesen der Demokratie ist Verankerung der Staatsgewalt in den Massen) Grotewohl states in 1947:
Western reading

1 In the beginning of the political and societal restitution in the western part of Germany, democracy seems to be a non-political concept. Democracy is more than a political business (Demokratie ist mehr als ein politisches Geschäft) Kurt Schumacher states for example:

Demokratie westlicher Prägung ist ein zunächst überpolitisch ausgedehnter Begriff. Was ist Demokratie? fragen die nachkriegsdeutschen Zeitgenossen, und die Antwort wird von den Diskursbeteiligten mit Formeln wie 'Demokratie ist nicht nur ... aber Demokratie ist mehr als ... gegeben in Formen wie.' Die Demokratie darf sich nicht auf das Politische beziehen, die Demokratie hat sich nicht nur auf die politischen Institutionen beschränkt, die Demokratie ist ein ethisch-geistiges Verhalten (Demokratie ist eine ethisch-geistige Haltung in der politischen Praxis) und kulturelle Lebensformen einer bestimmten Gesellschaft." (Kurt Schumacher 1945, S. 253).

2 Democracy is interpreted as an ethical instance: Democracy is an ethical-spiritual behavior (Demokratie ist ein ethisch-geistiges Verhalten) is one of the utterances, which shows, that the western discourse association has a high developed moral claim to the restored German society:
3 The western interpretation of democracy is based on an individualized human image: *Dignity and liberty of the individual and thus true and real democracy (Würde und Freiheit der Person und damit wahre und echte Demokratie)* is a typical utterance, that represents this attitude.

Onomasiological level

The discourse dictionary integrates the two principles semasiology and onomasiology, we have said. The onomasiological principle visualizes the semantic relationships of a discourse like a network. It is represented in the articles by specifications about partner words, co-occurrences, and syntagmatic constructions. Each lemma is part of a net, which creates semantic connections, and each connection is a knot of this net. The onomasiological level represents so to say the hypertextual structure of the discourses vocabulary.

In case of our key word democracy you find references (in the print version) or links (in the online version) for example to Antifaschist (antifascist), from Antifaschist, for example, to Abendland (Occident), from Abendland to Kultur (culture), and so on:
These relations have different functions of course, which have been recognized by the discourse analysis preceding. The function of the relation between democracy and antifascist is: they are – out of the eastern perspective – almost synonyms, since in the early postwar eastern discourse there is a large semantic interface of democracy and antifascist. Antifascist and Abendland are connected, because they are both used for identificational purposes in the two discourses. Abendland and Kultur finally are used, because they name equivalent concepts: while the western discourse participants refer to Abendland to proof their anti Nazi confession, the eastern discourse participants refer to Kultur, especially to Kulturerbe (heritage of culture), to the same purpose.
Which discursive function is to be described between democracy on the one side, and Abendland and Kultur/Kulturerbe on the other? Abendland has the same function in the western, like Kultur/Kulturerbe in the eastern discourse. They are both words of confession: Who professes to the Abendland, or to the Kulturerbe respectively, he declares at the same time his democratic convictions, since they both name a condition for democracy.

Can we show a relation of democracy to the main discourse concept of guilt? Sure, at least in regard to the western discourse. The western political elite in the early post war time was convinced of the redeeming force of the democratic confession: Democracy and joint guilt are two concepts, in which future and past are collected like in a burning glass (Grimme 1946d, 93). Translated into terms of semantic: democracy and guilt are two concepts which are antonyms.

1.4 Conclusion
1 Discourse lexicography is not an alternative to general or standard lexicography. It is rather a completion, since discourse lexicography reconstructs the semantic structure of its lemmas on a high level of precision.
2 Discourse lexicography gives information about the usage of words: at a certain time, by a certain association of users, to a certain topic. Thus discourse lexicography reconstructs and presents discourse semantic, which means: contextualized semantic.
3 Discourse lexicography provides semantic information about words in societal use. Since our social reality is constituted by discourses, discourse lexicography is the representation of the relation between language and society.

2.  elexiko

2.1 Preliminary Remark
The lexikographic project elexiko compiles a general lexicographic reference work that explains and documents contemporary German; it was specifically designed for online publication and is free of charge. The primary and exclusive basis for lexicographic interpretation is an extensive German corpus.
elexiko is compiled by adopting the principle of modularity, that is, the lexicon is analysed systematically in modules, which are defined by specific semantic, syntactic or morphological criteria. Using this approach, a semantic field, a word family, or a word class is described systematically and separately. Furthermore, modules are also defined according to levels of frequency and distribution of lexemes. Right now we work on a module called “Lexikon zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch” (i.e., Dictionary on Public Discourse). It contains approximately 2,800 entries selected mainly by their (high) frequency, such as Qualifikation, Reform and Demokratie, which is of interest in our context here.

Currently, the dictionary contains over 1,400 fully lexicographically described entries. These entail sense-independent information on morphology and word formation as well as number of senses and their conceptual relationship. The entries also offer a large scope of sense-related information, in detail: meaning definition, collocations, syntagmatic patterns, sense-related terms, pragmatics, and grammar. With this wide spectrum of lexical information, elexiko exceeds other existing general German dictionaries.

2.2 The entry Demokratie

The word Demokratie is very high frequent in the underlying corpus: when searching the corpus, almost 200,000 citations with Demokratie will be found. Together with derivates like demokratisch or demokratisieren as well as very many compounds like Demokratiebewegung (i.e., democracy movement) or Direktdemokratie this word family plays a prominent role in the “Lexikon zum öffentlichen Sprachgebrauch”. In the following we will look at the semantic information given in the entry Demokratie, contrasting it with the information presented in the Discourse Dictionary.

Sense-independent information

Three meanings of Demokratie can be distinguished: ‘politisches Prinzip’ (i.e., political principle), ‘Staat’ (i.e., nation), and ‘Mitbestimmung’ (i.e., co-determination). The first meaning ‘politisches Prinzip’ is specified further: here we find a specification ‘Regierungsform’ (i.e., form of government):
The first meaning ‘politisches Prinzip’ is the one that is most frequent in the corpus. It is also the one prevalent in the Discourse Dictionary, which does, unsurprisingly, not mention the meaning ‘Mitbestimmung’. We will now look closer into the semantic information given for the meaning ‘politisches Prinzip’. Information on syntagmatic patterns, pragmatics and grammar will not be discussed here, but may be consulted online under www.elexiko.de.

**Meaning definition**

The meaning definitions in *elexiko* are always given as full sentences, following specific patterns for different semantic and syntactic classes of words. For a noun like *Demokratie*, which is classified as a word denoting an (here abstract and unpersonal) individual, the meaning definition begins with the phrase “Mit *Demokratie* bezeichnet man” (i.e., *With Demokratie one denotes*). This phrase is followed by a hyperonym (“politisches Prinzip”), which is then specified by a relative clause describing this principle:
Bedeutungserläuterung

Mit Demokratie bezeichnet man ein politisches Prinzip, nach dem die Bürger bzw. die von ihnen gewählten Vertreter politische Entscheidungen treffen. Eng verbunden mit der Demokratie sind außerdem Grundrechte der Bürger wie z. B. Schutz der Menschenwürde, freie Entfaltung der Persönlichkeit, Meinungs- und Pressefreiheit, Versammlungsfreiheit und Glaubensfreiheit.


Im Artikel 6, Absatz 1 des EU-Vertrages in seiner Fassung von Amsterdam werden die Grundrechte der Freiheit, Demokratie, Achtung der Menschenrechte und Grundfreiheiten sowie der Rechtsstaatlichkeit verbindlich niedergelegt. Eine schwerwiegende Verletzung dieser Grundrechte kann durch Sanctionen geahndet werden, die bis zum Entzug der Stimmrechte in den EU-Ortungen gehen, nicht aber zum Ausschluss führen können. Der Beschluss darüber fällt im Rat der Staats- und Regierungschefs. (Kleine Zeitung, 21.04.2000, EU-Aussent-Debatte über Verfassungsreform.)


Three citations chosen from the corpus illustrate the definition. Each citation focuses on one important aspect of the concept ‘Demokratie’: Vorzüge von Demokratie und Rechtsstaat (i.e., advantages of democracy and a constitutional state), die Grundsätze der Freiheit, Demokratie, Achtung der Menschenrechte und Grundfreiheiten (i.e., the principles of freedom, democracy, respect of the human rights, and fundamental freedom), and Prinzipien der Demokratie und öffentlichen Partizipation (i.e., principles of democracy and public participation). As can be seen from these citations, the word Demokratie is used in the elexiko-corpus referring to different nations (for example, the United States of America) as well as the European Union, and referring to the present time. The context of guilt or a differentiation in a Western and Eastern concept of Demokratie as described in the Discourse Dictionary is evidently not present in the corpus texts of the elexiko-dictionary. The elexiko-corpus consists exclusively of newspaper and magazine texts since 1945 with a concentration on texts since 1980. Since elexiko is a general dictionary, this does not pose a problem – a broader approach in the semantic analysis is to be expected for elexiko.
Collocations

Collocations of a headword in *elexiko* are given in semantically defined groups. They are answers to specific questions about the headword. For *Demokratie* those questions are “Wie ist Demokratie?” (i.e., *How is democracy?*), “Was macht man mit Demokratie bzw. was macht Demokratie?” (i.e., *What can be done with democracy or what does democracy?*), “Wer übt Demokratie?” (i.e., *Who practices democracy?*), and “Was wird im Zusammenhang mit Demokratie thematisiert?” (i.e., *Which themes are connected with democracy?*). Answers to the first question are adjectives, answers to the second question are verbs, etc.:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wie ist Demokratie?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>breit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>echt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>formal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>regional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>technisiert</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Was macht man mit Demokratie bzw. was macht Demokratie?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wer übt Demokratie?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Was wird im Zusammenhang mit Demokratie thematisiert?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diktatur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Föderalismus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freiheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frieden</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gerechtigkeit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gewaltenteilung</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gleichheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundfreiheiten</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundgesetz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kampf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kapitalismus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marktwirtschaft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meinungsfreiheit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menschenrechte</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In our context, the last question with its answers is especially important, since here we find other frequent words in the direct context of the headword, as *Kapitalismus*, *Föderalismus*, *Freiheit* (i.e. *freedom*), *Pluralismus*, etc. Here, the most frequent words of the vocabulary in the *Demokratie*-discourse as found in the corpus-texts, are presented. However, these collocates are not explained further or attributed to specific participants of the discourse,
as in the Discourse Dictionary. To give collocations in a general dictionary aims at something else: collocations support and broaden the meaning definition.

**Sense-related terms**

Part of the semantic description in *elexiko* is extensive information on paradigmatic partner words. These are found through diverse corpus-based and corpus-driven queries and are presented in groups. Each sense-related term is accompanied by a citation:

As synonyms the words *Parlamentarismus*, *Volksherrschaft* (i.e. *popular government*), and *Volkssouveränität* (i.e., *sovereignty of the people*) are given. Complementary words are *Diktatur*, *Faschismus*, and *Nationalismus*. In the discourse on guilt as described in the Discourse Dictionary, *Schuld* (i.e. *guilt*) is also a complementary word (here labelled as antonym). In the general context found in our corpus texts and presented in the *elexiko*-entries, *Schuld*, however is not a sense-related term.

Words like *Freiheit* (i.e. *freedom*), *Gerechtigkeit* (i.e., *justice*), *Menschenrechte* (i.e., *human rights*), etc. are classified as co-hyponyms (labelled as “inkompatible Partner”). Together with the concept of democracy, the concepts denoted by those lexems are co-hyponyms under the concept of value. This information in the paradigmatic information in the
elexiko-entry Demokratie corresponds with the thematic group of collocations mentioned earlier. When analyzing the sense-related partners for Demokratie, we find quite a lot of the words constituting the Demokratie-discourse in contemporary German language. Once again, their contribution to the discourse is not described in details, since this is not the focus of our general dictionary.

3. Conclusion

As we have seen by comparing the entries Demokratie in the Discourse Dictionary and elexiko, discourse lexicography and general lexicography complement each other. While discourse lexicography will give a very precise description of a lexeme in a certain discourse, general lexicography will give diverse information on meaning and usage, not to forget grammar and sense-independent information as spelling. When two online dictionaries as the ones presented here are combined in a lexicographic portal, users may benefit from the advantages of each approach in a convenient way, looking up words in two (or more) dictionaries at the same time.

When comparing the entries in the Discourse Dictionary and in elexiko, users may also learn a lot about the history of Demokratie in Germany during the 20th and early 21st century. When a new dictionary on the Demokratie-discourse in 1968 will shortly be implement into the portal OWID, a further milestone in the history of Demokratie in Germany will be described lexicographically.