

Interactive comment on “Heldenstadt Leipzig und Weihnachtsland Erzgebirge – Zur Bildhaftigkeit von sprachlichen Raumkonstruktionen” by F. Meyer zu Schwabedissen and M. Micheel

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 21 November 2006

General aspects:

The paper written by *Meyer zu Schwabedissen* and *Michael* is an interesting contribution to the current discussion and application of space and place constructions. The paper outlines the imaging and making of space of the German region *Erzgebirge* and the city of *Leipzig* as related to linguistic means found in the mass media and in expert interviews. It provides a good overview over the potential of a linguistic analysis and is – due to its applied focus – a substantial contribution to scientific.

I do have, however, some reservations due to the outline of the scientific approach, the applied methods and a lack of theorising questions of space and place. This mainly

concerns the German centred focus on the discussion of the social construction of place and space. I am convinced that the article would greatly profit from a close reading of Bender's (1998), Massey's (Massey 1998 and Massey 2005) and Murdoch's (Murdoch 2005) work which might enhance the good potential of the article and provide a conceptual framework in which the authors can easily connect their arguments with those of a wider research community in social geography and rural studies. Furthermore, I would like to express that the discussion of linguistic construction of space is – from my perspective – a bit too superficial. It might be good to depict and connect Luhmann's concept of space and communication in more detail and see where conceptual connections to Lakoff/Johnson's (image schemas/metaphorical schemas) work and those mentioned in cultural geography exist. This might add some terminological clarity and an analytical tool box with which the data set could be analysed in more detail – and the scientific results could be made clearer and concise.

I would range the rate of the current state of the article fair and propose some revisions but clearly underline that the paper holds a great potential due to its interdisciplinary combination of concepts and ideas.

Detailed suggestions for revision

1. Abstract: the abstract should be checked by a native speaker.
2. Line 14-16, page 131: Is the peaceful revolution the prevailing characteristic? If so, I would leave the “unter anderem” out.
3. Line 2-6, page 132: The sentence is a bit hard to understand. Perhaps add a comma or insert a point.
4. 16-19, page 132: Please explain in greater detail what Luhmann means by “Schemata”. Lakoff and Johnson also use the term image schemata/metaphorical schema and there might perhaps be an overlapping potential.

5. 16-19, page 133: When you talk about media what exactly do you mean? Mass media?
6. 17, page 133: It sounds like a tautology when you talk about “(Vorstellungs)-Bilder”. Please explain what you exactly mean by this word.
7. 18-25, page 134: when you talk about Wittgenstein please mention the works from which the quotes were taken. This might clarify the some of the notions used by the other authors who quote him (and what is the relation to languages games and language as a form of life?)
8. 1-7, page 136. Why does one not have to distinguish between the places or regions? Please explain.
9. 16-19, page 136: You talk about “rhetorisch Stilmittel”. This might cause some confusion as metaphor has recently been discussed as a mean of thinking instead of “uneigentliches Sprechen”.
10. 5-9, page 136: Please explain the difference between personification and metonymy as they are not the same even if they are a trope.
11. 6-15, page 138: This has been outlined before. I would suggest deleting this section and inserting the information provided in footnote 8.
12. 19, page 138: You use the notion of narrative without using it as an analytical later on. I would suggest deleting it as it adds a new dimension which is not relevant for your purpose.
13. 11, page 140: You mention an internet search. Which words and categories did you use and why?
14. 21-29, page 141: You first mention the divergent conceptualisation of the region and the come to a conclusion. Some more material would back-up your claim!

15. 10, page 146: How did you come to the conclusion that there are two grand line of argumentation?
16. 24, page 147: I would highlight here the intertextual reference to “Das Wunder von Bern” as it resonates with aspects of your analysis.
17. 19-25, page 148: Why mention the “Pauliner Kirche”? Please outline in more detail what had happened and why this is relevant for your study.
18. 28, page 153. You use again the notion of “Repräsentation”. What is the relation between “Representation” and “Bilder”. Is it really necessary to use “Repräsentation”?

I hope that my comments are helpful and I would be happy to re-read the revised version of the paper as it holds a good potential.

References:

Bender, Barbara (1998): Stonehenge: The Making of Space. London: Berg.

Massey, Doreen (2005): For Space. London: Sage.

Massey, Doreen/Allen, John/Pile, Steve (1998): City Worlds. London: Routledge.

Murdoch, Jonathan (2005): Post-Structuralist Geography: A Guide to Relational Space. London: Sage.

Interactive comment on Soc. Geogr. Discuss., 2, 129, 2006.

[Full Screen / Esc](#)[Printer-friendly Version](#)[Interactive Discussion](#)[Discussion Paper](#)