



# Zeitschrift für Diskursforschung

## Journal for Discourse Studies

Herausgegeben von Reiner Keller | Werner Schneider | Willy Viehöver

- **Ingo H. Warnke / Daniel Schmidt-Brücken**  
Die Analyse (post)kolonialer Diskurse?
- **María do Mar Castro Varela / Nikita Dhawan / Shalini Randeira**  
(Neo-)Koloniale Diskurse – Postkoloniale Gegendiskurse
- **Carsten Junker**  
Self-Aggrandizement: Discursive Effects of Early Abolitionist  
Self-Positioning
- **Aqtime Gnouleleng Edjabou**  
»Nos amis les Allemands«: Zum Diskurs der aktuellen  
Deutschland-Begeisterung in Togo
- **Alexander Korte / Elisabeth Lingenfelser / Borbala Balazs**  
Transkulturalität und deren Bedeutung im Alltag kinder- und  
jugendpsychiatrischer Versorgung – eine Bestandsaufnahme
- **Philipp Dreesen**  
Discursive Functions of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] in German Colonialism

# Inhaltsverzeichnis

*Gastherausgeber: Ingo H. Warnke / Daniel Schmidt-Brücken*

*Reiner Keller / Willy Viehöver / Werner Schneider*

Editorial ..... 214

*Ingo H. Warnke / Daniel Schmidt-Brücken*

Die Analyse (post)kolonialer Diskurse? ..... 216

*María do Mar Castro Varela / Nikita Dhawan / Shalini Randeira*

(Neo-)Koloniale Diskurse – Postkoloniale Gegendiskurse ..... 222

*Carsten Junker*

Self-Aggrandizement – Discursive Effects of Early Abolitionist

Self-Positioning ..... 241

*Aqtime Gnouleleng Edjabou*

»Nos amis les Allemands« – Zum Diskurs der aktuellen

Deutschland-Begeisterung in Togo ..... 265

*Alexander Korte / Elisabeth Lingenfeller / Borbala Balazs*

Transkulturalität und deren Bedeutung im Alltag kinder- und

jugendpsychiatrischer Versorgung – eine Bestandsaufnahme ..... 281

*Philipp Dreesen*

Discursive Functions of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] in German Colonialism ..... 302

Philipp Dreesen

## Discursive Functions of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] in German Colonialism

**Zusammenfassung:** Der Beitrag untersucht die diskursiven Funktionen der Konstruktion [für + KOLONISIERTE(R) MENSCH(EN)] anhand eines Korpus aus deutschen kolonialen Texten zwischen 1900 und 1920. Die Analyse von entsprechenden *für*-Präpositionalphrasen zeigt, dass diese bestimmte unidirektionale koloniale Relationen und Rollenzuschreibungen zwischen Kolonisierenden und Kolonisierten erzeugen und aufrechterhalten. Zudem ist es das Ziel des Artikels, auf Probleme der Anwendung deskriptiver grammatischer Kategorien (v. a. finaler, benefaktiver, repräsentativer, restriktiver Gebrauch von *für*) auf koloniale Diskursformationen hinzuweisen.

**Schlagwörter:** Diskurslinguistik, Postcolonial Language Studies, Kolonialismus, Beziehung, Präpositionalphrase, benefaktiv, repräsentativ, restriktiv

**Abstract:** This study examines the discursive functions of the construction [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE]. The corpus comprises German texts from the colonial era between the years 1900 and 1920. Looking at the use of such prepositional phrases, the text argues that the preposition *für* is crucial for creating and maintaining a specific relationship and semantic roles between colonizers and the colonized in a particular way. This study also aims to highlight problems by applying descriptive grammatical categories (especially final, benefactive, representative, and restrictive uses of *für*) for colonial discursive formations.

**Keywords:** discourse linguistics, (post-)colonial linguistics, colonialism, relation, prepositional phrase, benefactive, representative, restrictive

### Introduction

Toward the end of German colonialism, Wilhelm Solf, Governor of Deutsch-Samoa and State Secretary in the Imperial Colonial Office (Reichskolonialamt) wrote the following in *Kolonialpolitik. Mein politisches Vermächtnis*:

(1) Wer nicht jahrelang unter den Eingeborenen gelebt und Anteil genommen hat an ihren Leiden und Freuden, wessen Herz nicht für sie schlägt und wer nicht das Gefühl der Nächstenliebe auch für tieferstehende, anders denkende und fühlende Menschen empfindet, der wird die Freudigkeit und Begeisterung nie verstehen, mit der der berufene Kolonisor und Missionar an seine Arbeit geht. (Solf 1919, p. 43)

(1') ›Who has not lived for years among the natives, not experienced their joys and sorrows, whose heart does not feel for them and whose neighborly love does not extend to such lower humans, to those who think and feel differently, will never understand the joy and the enthusiasm which inspire the honest colonizer and the missionary.‹<sup>1</sup>

1 All colonial examples were translated by Anneliese Plogmann.

What is most irritating and vexing here is Solf's depth of benevolence toward colonized people. Against the backdrop of colonial oppression, Solf's position seems to contradict itself, or it is at least in need of explanation: on the one hand, colonialism is based on the racist belief in human inequality (*tieferstehende Menschen*), while on the other hand, Solf refers to humanity and Christianity (*Nächstenliebe*). This is in accordance with Warnke/Stolz (2013, p. 489) who describe German colonial statements that indicate a beneficial attitude towards the colonized as ›benevolent paternalism‹ (›benevolenter Paternalismus‹).<sup>2</sup> Such a statement raises a number of questions: What is Solf's argument based upon? Under which conditions does the statement not contradict itself? Is this Solf's personal perspective? According to a Foucauldian discourse linguistics, a speaker's intention and illocution (cf. Searle 1975) are not considered; however, the ›positivistic‹ description of what is said comes to the forefront (cf. Foucault 1969, p. 164 f.; cf. Warnke 2013). Therefore, the key question is, what kind of functions do these statements serve in the construction of a discursive formation (cf. Dreesen 2015, p. 59 f.). To discuss this question I will focus on the grammatical construction used by Solf:

(2a) wessen Herz nicht [für sie schlägt]

›whose heart does not feel for them‹

(2b) wer nicht das Gefühl der Nächstenliebe auch [für tieferstehende, anders denkende und fühlende Menschen empfindet]

›whose neighborly love does not extend to such lower humans, to those who think and feel differently‹<sup>3</sup>

As can be seen, the relationship between the voice of colonizers and the referred colonized people is expressed by using the German preposition *für* (›for‹). Through this study, I will specifically examine whether the uni-directional relationship between the colonizers and the colonized that is expressed through *für* is a common pattern in German colonial texts and what functions it may serve. My assumption is that Solf's statement from the de-jure end of the German colonial period is not personal, but discursive in nature. The preposition *für* is crucial for creating and maintaining this relationship in a certain way. The aims of this study are to describe the various types of *für* prepositional phrases (PPs, sing. PP) and to highlight the problems created in descriptive grammar by categorizing such types. I will argue that *für* PPs have discursive functions in speaking vaguely ›about‹, ›in benefit for‹, and ›instead of‹ the colonized. In particular, the question arises if a distinction between various kinds of final, benefactive, restrictive, and representative uses of *für* makes sense against the backdrop of colonialism.

2 Warnke/Stolz (2013, p. 490) point out that there is a lack in German linguistics regarding the concepts of colonial ›benevolent paternalism‹.

3 For this concern, the complex subject clause *Wer [...], [wessen], der [...]* can be ignored.

## 1 Problems of relations expressed by *für* in colonialism

Analyzing the PP *für* in colonial texts stresses principles of colonial ideology and their practices. First, colonialism does not simply divide the world in terms of ›us‹ and ›them‹, ›civilized humans‹ and ›savages‹, or ›North‹ and ›South‹. It must be considered that colonialism is based on an asymmetrical relationship (cf. Kohn 2012), that is, colonialism relates people, spaces, religions, cultures, etc. to one another. In brief, colonial thinking is a relationship of white *over* black, slaves *for* masters, Europe *ante* Africa etc. This happens not least based upon prepositions in use (*over*, *for*, *ante*). Prepositions relate constituents (subjects, objects, and adverbials), which – in this study – refer to colonizers and to colonized people, etc. It suggests that prepositions are important indications of relations, especially of uni-directional relationships. PPs can be attributed to semantic roles (agent and patient), and thereby implicitly evoke the image of a colonized people as more or less ›passive‹ (cf. Dreesen/Judkowiak 2011, pp. 13 ff.), ›lower‹, ›childish‹, ›without ability and temporal consciousness‹; in short, the colonized people are portrayed as implicitly ›prelogic‹ (»prälogisch«, Mbembe 2013/2015, p. 88). This leads to a second aspect: colonialism is a teleological ideology. The ›superior people‹ are to transform the colonized people according to the ideas of civilizing and proselytization. Therefore, the colonizers determine the relationship. This means that colonialism forces colonized people to integrate in already existing European discourses (such as economic, political, religious, and legal discourses) and their practices. From the colonizers' points of view, the lives of colonized people are subsumed under European categories. Integration and subsumption, therefore, maintains the European status quo, and thereby forces the colonized into discursive deviant roles. This can be described as a practice of »othering« (Spivak 1985, pp. 132 ff.) within the ideology of civilizing/proselytizing.

Investigating the preposition *für* in colonial texts indicates at least three main problems within postcolonial studies. Firstly, the colonial texts, written by Germans *for* Germans, speak *about* the colonized. In general, there is a lack of colonized voices and communication between the colonizers and the colonized. Secondly, the practice of ›speaking about‹ is often very closely linked to the practice of ›speaking for‹ (cf. Alcoff 1991/1992, pp. 8 f.).<sup>4</sup> Spivak asks *Can the Subaltern Speak?* and comes to the well-known conclusion that »[t]he subaltern cannot speak« (1988, p. 308). From a linguistic perspective, ›speaking for‹ concerns pronouns (*she*, *we*, *our*), deixis, speaker-typology (cf. Goffman 1979), polyphonic structures (cf. Dreesen 2013), and prepositions. As will be shown in this study, ›speaking for‹ *für* expresses the relationship ›x instead of y‹ (see section 3.3). Thirdly, it raises the post-colonial question of »how the third-world subject is represented within Western discourse« (Spivak 1988, p. 271) with a specific focus on political ›representation‹. One of the problems Spivak (cf. *ibid.*, p. 274) emphasizes is – in terms of grammar – verbal: German allows for the distinction between ›representation‹ in *vertreten* (›to (politically) represent‹) and *darstellen* (›to express/›to represent in words‹). This

4 This also raises discourse theoretical problems of relatively unbounded self, authorship, and voice (cf. Alcoff 1991/1992, p. 21; in contrast Trebilcot 1988, p. 1).

study focuses on the expression of representation as a function of language use. With the post-structuralistic »crisis of representation« (Alcoff 1991/1992, p. 9) in mind, this discourse-linguistic approach criticizes the idea of verbal signs as »representations of x« and understands verbal signs as parts of intertextual reference systems: discourses (cf. Spitzmüller/Warnke 2011, pp. 48 ff.); a meaning or function of a statement (*énoncé*, cf. Foucault 1969, pp. 105 ff.) depends on its discursive position related to other statements. At this point discourse analysis comes into play: How do statements in colonial texts use *für* in general to construct the concept of colonized people, and how is *für* used, particularly in descriptive grammar?

## 2 Compiling colonial *für* PPs

For this purpose, I focus on written texts from the German colonial era as discursive conditions that evoke and maintain colonial ideological statements. These discursive conditions and statements can be linguistically described as grammatical patterns. In the following, I will describe my approach to *für* PPs in a corpus-based manner.

### 2.1 Corpus

The BBDK (Bremisches Basiskorpus Deutscher Kolonialismus/Bremen Basic Corpus of German Colonialism) was compiled by Ingo H. Warnke and his research group. The corpus is specifically compiled for linguistic research in German colonialism (cf. Warnke/Schmidt-Brücken 2013). It consists of approximately 1,300,000 word tokens and 88,947 word types. The texts range from 1900 to 1920, the corpus does not include the first 16 years of de-jure German colonialism beginning in 1884, but contains text from the consolidation phase of German colonialism from 1900 until its de-jure end in 1919 (cf. *ibid.*, pp. 138 ff.).<sup>5</sup> The current version of BBDK covers four domains of communication: (i) periodical mass media, (ii) encyclopaediae, (iii) political debates, and (iv) private texts. These domains consist of samples from (ad i) *Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Zeitung, Kolonie und Heimat [in Wort und Bild], Deutsche Kolonialzeitung*; (ad ii) *Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon, Meyers Konversations-Lexikon, Encyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft, Deutsches Kolonialrecht*; (ad iii) Reichstag speeches of the Sozialdemokraten (SPD), Deutsche Zentrums-partei (Zentrum), Nationalliberale Partei (NLP); (ad iv) letters, diaries, travelogues.

### 2.2 Search queries

*Für* PPs are thematically unspecified and semantically vague. The construction grammar (CxG) demonstrates on reasonable grounds the analysis of sentences as well as ellipses

5 The *Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon* was published 1920.

(cf. Jacobs 2008, p. 14).<sup>6</sup> Therefore, it seems reasonable not only to search for complete sentences but also for ellipses. The BBDK contains 7,854 word tokens of the type *für*. To limit the results for the purpose of this study, it is necessary to define an appropriate query pattern.<sup>7</sup> Since I am assuming that *für* is often related to the colonized people in a specific way, the following »collostruction« (Stefanowitsch/Gries 2003) were drafted:

- (3a) PP → P + NP<sup>8</sup>
- (3b) PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N, COLONIZED PEOPLE, acc]</sub>]

As Klein (2002, p. 173) describes, in German colonialism, colonized people are mostly referred to as *Eingeborene* (>indigenes<), *Schwarze* (>blacks<), *Neger* (>negroes<), sometimes *Farbige* (>colored people<), and *Primitive* (>primitives<). Therefore, I specify [COLONIZED PEOPLE] and replace this place-holder with the abovementioned colonial terms. This yields the following search patterns:

- (3c) PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N, eingeboren\*, acc]</sub>]
- (3c') PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N, schwarz\*, acc]</sub>]
- (3c'') PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N, neger\*, acc]</sub>]
- (3c''') PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N, farbig\*, acc]</sub>]
- (3c''''') PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N, primitiv\*, acc]</sub>]

By applying the queries (max. two tokens between P and NP), I obtained the following results (Table 1):

Preposition	Collocating expressions referring to COLONIZED PEOPLE	Absolute frequency
<i>für</i>	<i>eingeboren*</i>	86
	<i>schwarz*</i>	14
	<i>neger*</i>	14
	<i>farbig*</i>	36
	<i>primitiv*</i>	0
<b>Total</b>		<b>150</b>

Table 1: Results for the search query [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE]

6 For example, the elliptical headline *Das Strafrecht für die Farbigen* (>The criminal law for the colored<).  
 7 I used AntConc 3.4.3.0, <http://www.laurenceanthony.net/software/antconc/> (accessed 28.05.2016).  
 8 NP = nominal phrase; N = noun; acc = accusative; P = preposition.

Next, a second variety of search queries was drafted to compare the total number of results shown above with the collostruction [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] (*deutsch*/German, *weiß*/WHITE, and *europäisch*/European), taking the common terms as granted. Thus, the search patterns are revised as follows:

- (3d) PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N,deutsch\*,acc]</sub>]  
 (3d') PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N,weiß\*,acc]</sub>]  
 (3d'') PP[P<sub>[P,für,acc]</sub> + NP N<sub>[N,europä\*,acc]</sub>]

By virtue of these search queries under the same conditions as above, I was able to locate PPs like *für uns Deutsche, für Weiße, für den europäischen Begriff* (excluded, for instance, *Europa*) (Table 2).

Preposition	Collocating expressions referring to COLONIZING PEOPLE	Absolute frequency
<i>für</i>	<i>deutsch*</i>	127
	<i>weiß*</i>	8
	<i>europä*</i>	26
Total		161

Table 2: Results for the search query [für + COLONIZING PEOPLE]

The comparison of total numbers in Table 1 (150) and Table 2 (161) shows that *für* PPs are approximately the same amount; *für* PPs are used for both groups. This immediately suggests that [für + PEOPLE] is not a colonial pattern that only serves the construction of concepts of the colonized. However, this also demonstrates that a quantitative analysis of this collostruction is insufficient to provide answers to the question: Which discursive functions does [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] have?

Returning to [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE], it is necessary to screen the results. The 150 PPs also include cases that are not gathered precisely, that is, do not correspond with the very interest in [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE]. For example, *hielt er es [...] nicht für gut, eingeborene Prediger heranzubilden* (>he did not consider it to be good to train indigenous preachers) does appear in the search results, and in *Prüfung für eine Eingeborensprache bestehen* (>to pass an exam in an indigenous language), the preposition does not relate to the NP referring to colonized people. Moreover, the total number includes double-counted PPs (for example, [*für die eingeborenen Schwarzen*]). Therefore, it is necessary to delete these obsolete data and the newly adjusted total number of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] becomes 116. Nevertheless, these PPs still form a heterogeneous group and must be subdivided into syntactical and semantic types as well as their discursive colonial functions for further differentiation.



### 3 Syntactic and functional grammatical analyses

The problem, once again, is the vague status of *für* PPs in the collocation [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE]. Structurally very similar, [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] show differences in meaning and function that are difficult to ascertain. Despite the fact that applying grammatical categories to these statements could be problematic, a traditional and functional grammar approach is employed to discover the syntactical forms, semantics, and discursive functions of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE]. This analysis uses a common differentiation of clauses (cf. Schierholz 2001) and the categorization of *für* according to Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker (1997, pp. 2129 ff.), who provide a way of differentiating semantic functions of this ambiguous preposition. The grammatical approach of Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker has its limits (see below), however, it still offers the most adequate semantic categorization of German *für* PPs (cf. Schierholz 2001, p. 181) and is, for this purpose, better suited than the categories established by construction grammar (cf. Coleman 2010). I start with the more formal category (i. e., attribute and lexicalization) before turning to the less formal ones (i. e., final, representative, and restrictive) which bring these problems to light.

#### 3.1 Attributes and lexicalization

A first formal distinction concerns the status of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] as an adverbial phrase, a prepositional attribute, and a prepositional object (Table 3). Temporal adverbial phrases (*für immer* (>for ever<)) or *wir verabreden uns für 8 Uhr* (>we arrange to meet at 8<)) are the only possible *für* adverbial phrases; they can easily be excluded because none of the 116 *für* PPs is an adverbial phrase. Second, the distinction between prepositional attribute and prepositional object (cf. Schierholz 2001, pp. 131 ff.) leads to the discursive status of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE].

	Prepositional adverbials	Prepositional attributes	Prepositional objects
Absolute frequency	0	32	84
Total 116			

Table 3: Distinction of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] according to traditional grammar

Half of the PP attributes (16 out of 32) refer to (educational) institutions and law (Table 4), for example:

- (4a) An den Regierungsschulen [für Eingeborene] sind L.[ehrer] nur vereinzelt tätig, da der Unterricht der Mädchen meist den Missionsschulen überlassen wird. (Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon, 1920. Leipzig, volume II, p. 448)  
 ›Not many teachers are employed at the government's schools for the indige- nous. Most girls are being taught at the missions.‹
- (4b) Auch nach der Erfahrung angesehener Ostafrikakenner ist die religionslose Schule [für die Eingeborenenkinder] dazu angetan, den Mohammedanismus in diesen Gegenden zu fördern. (Zentrum, 13.03.1906, Protokolle des Reichstags, p. 1975)  
 ›Many prominent experts on East Africa tend to consider secular schools for the natives as encouraging Mohammedanism in the regions.‹
- (4c) Strafverordnung [für die Eingeborenen] vom 21. Oktober 1888 erlassen worden, nach welcher die Strafjustiz von den Beamten der Gesellschaft ausgeübt wurde. (Florack, 1905, Die Schutzgebiete ihre Organisation in Verfassung und Verwal- tung. Tübingen, p. 63)  
 ›On October 21, 1888, a law was passed, according to which punishment against the natives was to be carried out by the Company's civil servants.‹
- (4d) § 43. Das Strafrecht [für die eingeborene Bevölkerung] (v. Holtzendorff, 1904, Encyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft. Berlin, volume 2, p. 1134)  
 ›§ 43. The criminal law of the native population‹

Domains	Example for prepositional attributes
Education	<i>Regierungsschulen [für Eingeborene]</i> ›government's schools for the natives‹
	<i>blühenden Gemeindeschule [für Eingeborene]</i> ›blooming parish school for natives‹
	<i>Institut [für eingeborene Gehilfen]</i> ›Institute for native assistants‹
	<i>religionslose Schule [für die Eingeborenenkinder]</i> ›secular schools for the native children‹
	<i>Handwerkerschulen [für die Eingeborenen]</i> ›craftsmen's school for the natives‹
	<i>Regierungsschule [für Schwarze]</i> ›government's schools for the blacks‹
	<i>Ackerbauschule [für Schwarze]</i> ›farming school for blacks‹

Law	Strafverordnung [für die Eingeborenen] vom 10. März 1890 ›On March 10, 1890, a law was passed, according to which punishment against the natives‹
	Strafverordnung [für die Eingeborenen] vom 21. Oktober 1888 ›On October 21, 1888, a law was passed, according to which punishment against the natives‹
	Strafrecht [für die eingeborene Bevölkerung] ›criminal law of the native population‹
	§ 28. Strafrecht [für die Farbigen] ›§ 28. The criminal law of the native population‹
	einheimischen Rechtssitten [für die farbige Bevölkerung] ›indigenous law customs for the colored population‹
	Justiz sowohl für die weiße als [für die farbige Bevölkerung] ›justice for the white as well as for the colored population‹
	Gerichtsorganisation [für Eingeborene] ›legislation for their indigenous population‹

Table 4: Examples of prepositional attributes in domains

Some of the prepositional attributes are part of structural and semantic stabilizations. By this I mean a conventional use of at least three tokens that become lexicalized (for lexicalization see Feilke 1996, pp. 186 f.). The stabilized PPs occur within the discourse as multi-word units like *x-Schule [für y]* (›x-school for y‹), *x-Recht [für y]* (›x-law for y‹), and also the institution name *Amerikanische Kolonisationsgesellschaft [für freie Neger]* (translation of *American Colonization Society*).<sup>9</sup> Thus, the *für*-P-attribute terms in the domains of education and law are relatively stable. The other attributes relate to different issues, for instance, *die umfangreiche Einfuhr des Plattentabaks [für die Eingeborenen]* (›the high level imports of tobacco for the indigenous‹), *reicht seine Ernte zur Beköstigung [für seine eingeborenen Arbeiter]* (›his harvest is sufficient for feeding his native workers‹); *menschwürdige Existenz [für die Eingeborenen]* (›dignified life for the natives‹).

### 3.2 Semantic-functional analysis

Based on the *für*-categorization by Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker (1997, pp. 2129 ff.), I proceeded to differentiate semantic functions within the corpus that can be distinguished as (i) final: (ia) sensu stricto, (ib) without mention of the goal, (ic) benefactive; (ii) representative: (iia) sensu stricto, (iib) standardized representative, (iic) representative in the sense of exchange; and (iii) restrictive (Table 5).

9 These stabilized units are close to attributes genitive (cf. Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, p. 2130) like *Schule der Schwarzen*, *Strafrecht der Eingeborenen*.

No.	Type	Example
i	final:	
ia	sensu stricto	<i>Die Arbeiter demonstrieren für mehr Schutz.</i> ›The workers demonstrate in support of more safety at work.‹
ib	without mentioned goal	<i>Ich kaufe Orangensaft für das Frühstück.</i> ›I am buying orange juice for breakfast.‹
ic	benefactive	<i>Er kocht für seine Eltern.</i> ›He cooks for his parents.‹
ii	representative:	
iiia	sensu stricto	<i>Sie spricht für ihren Mandanten.</i> ›She speaks for her client.‹
iiib	standardized representative	<i>Für sein Alter ist er groß.</i> ›He is untypical tall for his age.‹
iiic	representative exchange	<i>Er wird für etwas bestraft.</i> ›He is punished for something.‹
iii	restrictive	<i>Das Haus ist für uns zu klein.</i> ›The house is too small for us.‹

Table 5: Für types and examples based on Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker (1997, pp. 2129 ff.)

However, applying such categories leads to a number of problems (see below). First and foremost, like every linguistic classification, there is a gap between the categories' parameters and the ambiguous phrases found in discourses. Hence, it is far from clear how to establish a plain distinction between benefactive, restrictive, and representative semantics of *für* (cf. Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, pp. 2132 f.). Nevertheless, applying these categories is a necessary step for answering the question regarding how [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] work in colonial texts.

### 3.2.1 Final

Final: Sensu stricto and without mentioned goal

Once more, I begin with the most formal of the categories. Approximately 18 [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] are used in a final sense (types ia and ib, see Table 5). With one exception (see below), all avoid to mention the goals of the PPs. This means that the basic goal is unmentioned, instead, a central aspect of the goal is mentioned (cf. Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, p. 2130), that is,

(5a) Ich kaufe Orangensaft für das Frühstück.

›I am buying orange juice for breakfast.‹

(5b) Ich kaufe Orangensaft, um ihn (beim Frühstück) zu trinken.

›I am buying orange juice to drink it (at breakfast).‹

(5a) mentions a central aspect (*für das Frühstück*). (5b) shows the basic goal of the sentence (*zu trinken*). The following examples avoid the goals:

- (6a) [Für die Eingeborenen-Kultur] darf die nötige Belehrung nicht fehlen, damit die Leute solche Sachen bauen, an denen sie auch etwas verdienen können, und es muß durch Beschaffung von Verkehrswegen dafür gesorgt werden, daß ihre Erzeugnisse Absatz finden. (Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Zeitung, 17.10.1908, no. 80, p. 1)  
 ›Native culture needs guidance and improvement so that goods may be produced which earn them money, and trade and traffic routes must be built so that such goods can be forwarded.‹
- (6b) [Für die Eingeborenen-Strafrechtspflege] in den afrikanischen Schutzgebieten wurde zunächst durch die Verfügung des Reichskanzlers vom 27. Februar 1896 die Verhängung von außerordentlichen Strafen, insbesondere von Verdachtstrafen, verboten und zugleich zwecks Herbeiführung von Geständnissen und Aussagen die Anwendung anderer als der in den deutschen Prozeßordnungen zugelassenen Maßnahmen untersagt. (v. Holtzendorff, F., 1904, Encyclopädie der Rechtswissenschaft. Berlin, volume 2, p. 1135)  
 ›The German Imperial Chancellor's decree of February 27, 1896, prohibits exceptional punishment for suspected misdemeanors and crimes said to have been committed by natives in the African protectorates, for the purpose of extracting confessions and testimonials from the accused, by means other than permitted in Germany.‹
- (6c) Auf den Karolinen, Palau und Marianen ist eine Gerichtsorganisation [für Eingeborene] überhaupt noch nicht erfolgt. (Florack, F., 1905, Die Schutzgebiete, ihre Organisation in Verfassung und Verwaltung. Tübingen, p. 63)  
 ›On Palau and on the Caroline and Marianas Islands, there exists as yet no special legislation for their indigenous population.‹
- (6d) In Samoa sind die Zustände, welche in Zeit des Protektorates der am Samoaabkommen beteiligten Mächte eingetreten waren, von dauernder Bedeutung [für die Eingeborenenengerichtbarkeit] geblieben. (v. Hoffmann, H., 1907, Deutsches Kolonialrecht. Leipzig, p. 105)  
 ›On Samoa, the same conditions still pertain to legislation for the indigenous as during the period of the protectorate by the signatories of the Samoa Agreement.‹

The collocation [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] in (6a) to (6d) could be converted in final phrases *um... zu...* (to):

- (6a) ?Um die Eingeborenen nicht in ihrer Kultur zu belassen, darf [...]  
 (6b) Um die Eingeborenen dem Strafrecht zu unterstellen, wurde [...]  
 (6c) [...] um die Streitfälle der Eingeborenen vor einem eigenen Gericht austragen zu können [...]  
 (6d) ?[...] um den Gerichtsweg für Eingeborene zu erhalten [...]

The final phrases with goal mentioning (6a) to (6d) are more precise. Especially, (6a) shows the change from the vague aspect *Eingeborenen-Kultur* to a more-detailed goal. It

seems that there is no need to say what [*für die Eingeborenen-Kultur*] (›for the native culture‹) means as a goal. Likewise, there is not mention of what goal is established in *Eingeborenen-Strafrechtspflege* (›native judicature of criminal law‹), a *Gerichtsorganisation [für Eingeborene]* (›court organization for natives‹), and an *Eingeborenenengerichtsbarkeit* (›native jurisdiction‹). The unmentioned goals indicate common knowledge about colonialism and perhaps also ›colonial certainty‹ (cf. Warnke/Schmidt-Brücken 2011, pp. 35 ff.). In contrast, the sentence that is final by mentioning the goal is:

- (6e) Als ich mich nach langjähriger Überlegung zu dem Entschluß durchgekämpft hatte, nach Südwest zu gehen, konnte ich Grundregeln [für die Eingeborenenbehandlung] aufstellen und Gefechtsskizzen zeichnen. (Brockmann, C., 1912, Briefe eines deutschen Mädchens aus Südwest. Berlin, p. 115)  
 ›When I, after years of deliberation, decided to go to Südwest, I could put into writing some basic rules for treating the natives, and I could draw and describe the goings-on on a battlefield.‹

The goal of *Grundregeln* (›basic rules‹) is *Eingeborenenbehandlung* (›treatment of the natives‹). As stated above, (6e) is the only exemption—interestingly a proposition that (seems to) protect the colonized against the colonizers’ actions. Nevertheless, does this suggest that the colonized benefit from this treatment?

#### Final: Benefactive

As far as I can deduce, school grammar, functional grammar, and construction grammar do not solve the problem of how to determine a benefactive (cf. Kittilä/Zúñiga 2010). »Just positing a benefactive thematic relation label would not be adequate as an account for all these uses of for«, warn van Valin/Lapolla in their analysis of benefactives (1999, p. 384; see below). The prototypical use of benefactives consists of ditransitive clauses and dative objects in German (cf. Coleman 2010, pp. 224 ff.). In general, *for/für* PPs can have a benefactive sense in English and in German.<sup>10</sup>

- (7) He cooks for his parents.  
 ›Er kocht für seine Eltern.‹
- (8) Mittel für den Husten (Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, p. 2131)  
 ›remedy for cough‹
- (9) Sie hat sein Interesse für die Börse geweckt (adapted from Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, p. 2132)  
 ›She has sparked his interest in stocks‹

10 In English it is also possible to use a *for* PP to give a purpose:

(1a) They cried for help.

(1b) \*Sie riefen für Hilfe.

(Cf. another perspective on the difference between the German *für* and English *for* as benefactives, Radden 1997, pp. 54 ff.).

For now, sentence (7) is a prototype of benefactive *für* PPs. Sentence (8) shows the ambiguity of *für* (meaning here ›gegen/›against‹), and the wide understanding of ›benefactive‹ is shown in (9). According to the prototype (7), (10a) and (10b) have a benefactive sense:

- (10a) In den größeren Ansiedlungen werden öffentliche Aborte [für Eingeborene] gebaut, in den Plantagen für die Arbeiter. (Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon, 1920, Leipzig, volume 1, p. 2)  
 ›In larger settlements, public lavatories are being built for the natives, and also in the plantation for their workers.‹
- (10b) Man hat die Sklaverei aufgehoben, ruhige, friedliche Zustände [für die zahlreiche Negerbevölkerung] geschaffen, die Wege geebnet für die Kultur. (NLP, 25.04.1904, Protokolle des Reichstags, p. 2396)  
 ›Slavery has been abolished, and peaceful conditions have been created for the large negro population and for their cultures.‹

By substituting prepositions, the assumed benefactive sense of (10a) and (10b) becomes clear. Substituting *für* for *zugunsten* (›in favor of‹), leads to the following results:

- (10a) werden öffentliche Aborte zugunsten der Eingeborenen gebaut  
 (10b) ruhige, friedliche Zustände zugunsten der zahlreichen Negerbevölkerung geschaffen

Furthermore, the analysis of *für*-P-attributes shows benefactive patterns with nouns, for example *Eintreten für* (›advocacy of‹), *Vorliebe für* (›preference for‹), and especially *Fürsorge für* (›caring for‹):

- (10c) Ich habe gar keinen Zweifel, daß der Herr Abgeordnete Roeren und seine Gewährsmänner vollkommen recht haben, wenn sie die Anschuldigungen, die von seiten jener Zeitung gegen die Missionare wegen ihres Eintretens [für die Eingeborenen] erhoben werden, mit aller Entschiedenheit zurückweisen. (SPD, 18.03.1905, Protokolle des Reichstags, p. 5391)  
 ›I doubt not at all that deputy Roeren and his supporters are right when they reject forcefully the accusations made by that newspaper against the missionaries because of their taking sides with the natives.‹
- (10d) Ich selbst vertrete, bei einer großen Vorliebe [für unsere schwarzen Schutzbefohlenen], in ausgesprochenster [sic] Weise den Herrenstandpunkt, den wir Deutsche den Farbigen gegenüber unbedingt wahren müssen, ich halte es deshalb auch für wünschenswert, daß man dem Arbeitgeber etwas weitergehende Rechte einräumt, als er sie heutzutage besitzt. (Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, 17.10.1908, no. 42, p. 740)  
 ›With the greatest sympathy for our black charges, my standpoint is that of a Master over the coloreds which we Germans have to insist upon by all means, and I consider it desirable therefore that an employer should have somewhat better rights than enjoyed at present.‹

- (10e) Die Fürsorge [für die schwarze Bevölkerung] lässt sich die Verwaltung in hohem Masse angelegen sein. (Kolonie und Heimat in Wort und Bild, 28.02.1909, p. 2)  
 ›The administrators concern themselves extensively in favor of the black population.‹
- (10f) Dem Gouvernör [sic], wo er Abends vorher zu Gast war, hat er die Fürsorge [für die Eingeborenen] warm an's Herz gelegt. (Hellmann, G., Sonntag, den 1. Maerz [19]08. In: Kuchler Williams, Chr. (ed.), 2013, Südwest ist und bleibt das Land der Überraschungen und Enttäuschungen. Die Tagebücher des Missionskaufmanns Gustav Hellmann und seiner Frau Elisabeth 1907–1923. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin, p. 67)  
 ›As a dinner guest the previous evening, Hellmann warmly entreated the Governor to care for and look after the natives' welfare.‹
- (10g) Dann hat die Morogoro-Bahn größere Fürsorge [für die farbigen Fahrgäste] getroffen, und solche Anhäufungen, wie sie öfter in Tanga oder Muhesa zu sehen sind, wo die Eingeborenen wie [sic] verpackte Sardinen in den Wagen stehen müssen, kommen nicht vor. (Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Zeitung, 19.03.1908, no. 19, p. 2)  
 ›The Morogoro rail company has introduced better conditions for colored passengers, and such crowds, as frequently seen in Tanga and Muhesa, where the natives have to stand and to squeeze into the wagons like sardines in a tin, are a thing of the past in Morogoro.‹

As can be seen, (10c) through (10g) are relatively stabilized patterns that consist of benefactive NPs and required *für* PPs. The fundamental problem of categorizing those examples as benefactives is the suggested beneficial intention or effect these sentences carry. Dative objects (*er kocht seinen Eltern das Essen*) (›he cooks for his parents‹), but also *für* PPs (*er kocht für seine Eltern*) (›dito‹) in German, are benefactive markers. However, »the dative object in the German construction can encode the maleficiary of an action as well« (Colleman 2010, p. 228; cf. Wegener 1985, p. 266):

- (11a) Sie haben ihm das Bier umgekippt. (Colleman 2010, p. 229)  
 ›They tipped over the beer (on him).‹
- (11b) \*Sie haben für ihn das Bier umgekippt.  
 ›\*They tipped over the beer for him.‹

Whereas (11a) shows that dative can encode the maleficiary, (11b) shows that *für* PPs cannot. Nonetheless, the consequence is not that [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] cannot encode the opposite of benefactive. In the following, I shall explain how this concept works in colonial texts. This serves to show that, following Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker (1997), the ›instead of‹-function of *für* PPs is part of the ›representative‹ function (see above type iia sensu stricto).



### 3.3 Representative use

Van Valin/Lapolla (1999, pp. 383 f.) discuss benefactive senses including (i) »plain benefactives« (*Rita sings for the students*) and (ii) »deputative benefactives« (*Pat stood in line for Kim*). (i) can be paraphrased as »the action of the actor provides them with amusement, enjoyment or other kind of benefit«, while in (ii) the actor do not, but »the actor did the action in place of the beneficiary« (384). This is similar to Milligan (1967, p. 102) who calls *für* in the »semantic area« ›in place of/instead of‹ a »substitution« (»Vertretung«), for example *sie spricht für ihren Mandanten* (›she speaks for her client‹). Thus, from the postcolonial perspective, the colonial logic is based on the assumption that the colonized do not know what is good for them – and that they do not know that they do not know. Therefore, the benefactive sense means two things at the same time (cf. Milligan 1967, p. 102). The pattern

- (12)  $s_1$ [ [COLONIZING PEOPLE<sub>NP</sub>] [DO<sub>VP</sub>] [for COLONIZED PEOPLE<sub>PP</sub>] ].  
 says  
 X do Y in favor of Z  
 and  
 X do Y instead of Z.

This implies two readings of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] in this function. In this way, the colonial text constructs colonized people as passive recipients, without arrangements and ideas. With that in mind, (10a) and (10b) show a different perspective:

- (10a) In den größeren Ansiedlungen werden öffentliche Aborte [für Eingeborene] gebaut, in den Plantagen für die Arbeiter. (Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon, 1920. Leipzig, volume 1, p. 2)  
 ›In larger settlements, public lavatories are being built for the natives, and also in the plantation for their workers.‹
- (10b) Man hat die Sklaverei aufgehoben, ruhige, friedliche Zustände [für die zahlreiche Negerbevölkerung] geschaffen, die Wege geebnet für die Kultur. (NLP, 25.04.1904, Protokolle des Reichstags, p. 2396)  
 ›Slavery has been abolished, and peaceful conditions have been created for the large negro population and for their cultures.‹

The changes in the analysis lead to a different reading: (10a) *gebaut* [für Eingeborene] (›built for the natives‹) and (10b) *geschaffen* [für die zahlreiche Negerbevölkerung] (›created for the large negro population‹) can be understood in a final and/or in a representative sense. This means that the colonizers construct themselves as beneficial and active (agent) because they act instead of the colonized (patient). Even if the colonizers act for the benefit of the colonized, they *prevent* indigenous' activities.

Another representative type (iib) is ›standardized representative‹, which also deals with groups, however, with a standardized representative of a group:<sup>11</sup>

11 There is no evidence of type iic (representative use of *für* PPs, cf. Reiter 1975, pp. 253 ff.) in the corpus.

- (13a) was für den Europäer unter Umständen sehr wenig Wert hat, hat [für den Eingeborenen] einen ganz ungeheuren Wert; (SPD, 14.06.1904, Protokolle des Reichstags, p. 3130)  
 ›some items that may be of very little value to Europeans, may be immensely important to a native.‹
- (13b) Als Lohn erhielt er anfangs wöchentlich etwa 1 Mark 40 Pfennig, später noch etwas mehr, [für einen Neger] in unserer Gegend eine schöne Summe. (Wehrmeister, C., 1906, Vor dem Sturm. Eine Reise durch Deutsch-Ostafrika vor und bei dem Aufstande 1905. St. Ottilien, p. 71)  
 ›Initially, their wages amounted to about 1 Mark 40 Pfennigs per week, a little more later, a pretty sum for a negro in our region.‹
- (13c) Auf Wunsch des Gouverneurs wird die Summe für Lazarett-Bedürfnisse herabgesetzt, und zwar um 32 000 M, da allgemein empfunden wird, daß 1,50 M täglich als Medizinbedarf [für einen Farbigen] etwas reichlich hoch gegriffen sei. (Deutsche Kolonialzeitung, 27.02.1909, no. 9, p. 146)  
 ›At the Governor's request, the amount for hospital requirements has been reduced by 32,000 M, since it is generally thought that a daily 1.50 M for medicine for a colored person is rather much.‹

As can be seen in (13a), and also (13b) and (13c), distinct explicit or implicit comparisons between the colonizing and the colonized people are evident: A *für* PP constructs a standardized representative of a group and causes general statements about the colonized within colonial discourses (cf. Schmidt-Brücken 2015, p. 270).

The above-mentioned benefactive-and-instead-of-relation is only the first problem of applying ›benefactive‹ to colonial texts. A second problem concerns the circumstance that almost every colonial benefactive is also restrictive.

### 3.4 Restrictive use

Generally, restrictive phrases limit the meaning of a given proposition. A restrictive use of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] refer to a ›target group‹ (›Zielgruppe«, cf. Zifonun/Hoffmann/Strecker 1997, p. 2132), i. e., the semantic role ›goal‹, for example, *Das Recht gilt für neue Verträge* (›The law applies to new contracts‹). Such uses of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] limit, extend, or differentiate the scope of the proposition. The category ›restrictive‹ allows to show the communicative distinction between colonizing and colonized people:

- (14a) Wenn man regelmäßig dem Satze begegnet, die Besteuerung in den Kolonien solle verschieden sein [für die Eingeborenen] und für die weiße Bevölkerung, so ist das nur als teilweise richtig anzuerkennen. (Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon, 1920. Leipzig, volume 1, p. 515)

›If one is frequently being confronted with statements that, in the colonies, taxation between the native and the white populations should vary, that may be right in some cases, but cannot be generally accepted.‹

- (14b) Sie unterscheidet Bestimmungen, die für jedermann, solche, die nur für Europäer, und solche, die nur [für Eingeborene] gelten. (v. Hoffmann, H., 1907, Deutsches Kolonialrecht. Leipzig, pp. 71 f.)

›It distinguishes between regulations for everyone and such for Europeans only and for the indigenous.‹

The für PPs in (14a) and (14b) are explicitly restrictive because on the one hand they refer to the target group ›colonizing people‹ (*für die weiße Bevölkerung, für Europäer*), and on the other hand, they refer to the target group ›colonized people‹ ([*für die Eingeborenen*], [*für Eingeborene*]). As a result (in 14a: taxation), these examples are hardly to parse as benefactives. However, there are statements that seem to have restrictive and benefactive functions at the same time; cf. once again the case (10a):

- (10a) In den größeren Ansiedlungen werden öffentliche Aborte [für Eingeborene] gebaut, in den Plantagen für die Arbeiter. (Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon, 1920. Leipzig, volume 1, p. 2)

›In larger settlements, public lavatories are being built for the natives, and also in the plantation for their workers.‹

The sentence above consists of two *für* PPs, each referring to a target group (group of colonizers and group of colonized). This causes the prototypical colonial distinction and therefore restricts the goal of both *für* PPs. Yet, laying the focus more on the final than on the restrictive use of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE], the sentence seems to be benefactive.

#### 4 Postcolonial perspectives and limitations of descriptive grammar

To summarize, there are grammatical reasons to believe that the following [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] has a benefactive function:

- (15) Ob es später möglich sein wird, sich in der Weise zu helfen, wie die Franzosen auf Madagaskar, wo [eine medizinische Schule für Eingeborene] errichtet worden ist, erscheint fraglich, denn wir haben in unseren Kolonien kaum geistig und kulturell so hochstehende Eingeborene wie sie die Howas, die herrschende Klasse auf Madagaskar, sind. (Kolonie und Heimat, 20.12.1907, p. 2)

›If it may in future be possible to solve the problem the way the French did on Madagascar, by setting up a medical school for teaching natives, must be questioned because we have in our colonies hardly any such intelligent and cultured local personalities as the Howa, the ruling class on the island.‹

In this benevolent interpretation, France established *eine medizinische Schule* [für [beneficiaries:] *Eingeborene*] (›a medical school for [beneficiaries:] teaching natives‹) in its colony. However, this is a European colonial point of view. From a postcolonial perspective, it is obvious that this [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] has a restrictive function: The institution *medical school for the natives* restricts the colonized people's lives because they separate the colonized from the colonizers. This gives an indication of the practice of othering (cf. Spivak 1985, pp. 132 ff.). Moreover, [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] is representative: The French colonizers established a medical school *instead* of the colonized. Thus, beneficial, restrictive, and representative uses of *für* maintain the image of the passive colonized. From a postcolonial perspective, all cases of [für + COLONIZED PEOPLE] in the corpus are restrictive insofar as they refer to the colonized people as a target group in contrast to the group of colonizers.

In conclusion, the present study demonstrates the limits of descriptive grammar and of purely quantitative approaches in discourse linguistics.<sup>12</sup> As has been shown, discourse-linguistic analyses of colonial texts require reflection on the speakers' perspectives, including location, voice (cf. Alcoff 1991/1992, p. 7, 15), and time. This raises important questions for postcolonial language studies in particular and for linguistics in general.

The most pressing question is whether it is necessary to consider polysemic *für* as a deviation and what the implicit standard or prototypical use should be based on. Three aspects of a possible answer come to mind. Firstly, poly-functional *für* in colonial texts indicates the order of the complex relationship between the colonizing and the colonized. Underlying this is an assumption about the underlying self-legitimizing reasons for using such a polysemic preposition to construct images of colonized people: Each of the benefactive, restrictive, and representative functions indicates specific colonial practices such as ›caring for‹, ›oppressing‹, and ›patronizing‹. Secondly, it could be possible that the-in some respects contradictory-circumstance of restrictive *and* benefactive colonial communication evokes a double bind effect by the colonized (cf. Fanon 1986, pp. 35 ff.). In psychology, double bind means a communicative dilemma evoked by unexpressed contradictions by the superior speaker (cf. Bateson/Jackson/Haley/Weakland 1956): If A says to B *Be yourself!*, B is inherently unable to fulfill the demand because some broader context (for instance, cooperation, hierarchic relationship between A and B) forbids it. Thirdly, the description of poly-functional/polysemic PPs above seems to fit with Said's idea of a contrapuntal reading of colonial texts (1993, pp. 66 f.).

What does the present study mean to linguistics today? As has been shown, it is not possible to apply current categories of functional grammar to analyses of 100-year-old-texts. The main problem of applying grammatical categories to colonialism has been caused by the standpoint *hinc et nunc*, meaning that descriptive grammars are written from a particular point of view (cf. Nagel 1986). The categories in grammar books depend on the analyzed texts (newspapers, advertising, novels) used to ascertain the claimed explanatory potential of grammar. Therefore, we need a more careful reflection of

12 For descriptive and critic in discourse linguistics see Reisigl/Warnke (2013).

categories and standards of linguistic methods (such as the analytical steps taken in data collecting, classifying, and analyzing). This implies that a grammatically orientated discourse analysis of colonial texts is not a description based on categories with a critical attitude, but rather a critical use of categories for description. Moreover, a bottom-up approach seems to be a much more adequate analysis strategy; this means developing, for instance, categories of PP derived from actual texts. From this point of view, there is still much that needs to be done for postcolonial discourse linguistics.

## 5 References

### Sources

- Brockmann, C.: Briefe eines deutschen Mädchens aus Südwest. Berlin, 1920.  
 Deutsche Kolonialzeitung. Organ der Deutschen Kolonialgesellschaft. München, 1884–1943.  
 Deutsches Kolonialhandbuch. Nach amtlichen Quellen bearbeitet von Dr. Rudolf Fitzner. Ergänzungsband. Berlin, 1896–1903.  
 Deutsches Kolonial-Lexikon. Edited by Heinrich Schnee. 3 Volumes. Leipzig, 1920.  
 Deutsch-Ostafrikanische Zeitung. Publikationsorgan der Wirtschaftlichen Vereinigung von Daresalam und Hinterland. Daressalam, 1899–1916.  
 Florack, F., Die Schutzgebiete ihre Organisation in Verfassung und Verwaltung. Tübingen, 1905.  
 Hellmann, G. = Tagebücher. In: Küchler Williams, Chr. (ed.), 2013, Südwest ist und bleibt das Land der Überraschungen und Enttäuschungen. Die Tagebücher des Missionskaufmanns Gustav Hellmann und seiner Frau Elisabeth 1907–1923. Frankfurt am Main, Berlin: Peter Lang.  
 v. Holtzendorff, F.: Encyklopädie der Rechtswissenschaft. Bd. 2. Berlin, 1904.  
 v. Hoffmann, H.: Deutsches Kolonialrecht. Leipzig, 1907.  
 Kolonie und Heimat in Wort und Bild. Unabhängige koloniale Wochenschrift. Organ des Frauenbundes der Deutschen Kolonialgesellschaft. Berlin, 1907–1919.  
 NLP, SPD, Zentrum = Koloniale Reichstagsreden. 3 Volumes. Berlin, 1902–1907.  
 Solf, W.: Kolonialpolitik. Mein politisches Vermächtnis. Berlin, 1909.  
 Wehrmeister, C.: Vor dem Sturm. Eine Reise durch Deutsch-Ostafrika vor und bei dem Aufstande 1905. St. Ottilien, 1906.

### Literature

- Alcoff, L. (1991/1992): The Problem of Speaking for Others. In: *Cultural Critique* 20, pp. 5–32.  
 Bateson, G./Jackson, D. D./Haley, J./Weakland, J. (1956): Towards a Theory of Schizophrenia. In: *Behavioral Science* 1, pp. 251–264.  
 Coleman, T. (2010): The Benefactive Semantic Potential of ›Caused Reception‹ Constructions: A Case Study of English of English, German, French, and Dutch. In: Zúñiga, F./Kittilä, S. (eds.): *Benefactives and Malefactives. Typological Perspectives and Case Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins (= *Typological Studies in Language* 92), pp. 224–243.  
 Dreesen, Ph. (2013): Sprechen-für-andere. Eine Annäherung an den Akteur und seine Stimmen mittels Integration der Konzepte Footing und Polyphonie. In: Roth, K. S./ Spiegel, C. (eds.): *Angewandte Diskurslinguistik. Felder, Probleme, Perspektiven*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag (= *Diskursmuster – Discourse Patterns* 2), pp. 223–237.

- Dreesen, Ph. (2015): Diskursgrenzen. Typen und Funktionen sprachlichen Widerstands auf den Straßen der DDR. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter (= Diskursmuster – Discourse Patterns 8).
- Dreesen, Ph./Judkowiak, J. (2011): Passiv im Osten, kollektiv schuldig und selbstverständlich in Europa – Kritik an deutschen und polnischen Schulbüchern des Faches Geschichte mittels kontrastiver Diskurslinguistik. In: Aptum. Zeitschrift für Sprachkritik und Sprachkultur 1, pp. 1–31.
- Fanon, F. (1952/1982): *Black Skin, White Masks*. London: Pluto.
- Feilke, H. (1996): *Sprache als soziale Gestalt. Ausdruck, Prägung und die Ordnung der sprachlichen Topik*. Frankfurt am Main: Suhrkamp.
- Foucault, M. (1969): *L'Archéologie du savoir*. Paris: Gallimard.
- Goffman, E. (1979): Footing. In: *Semiotica* 25, pp. 1–29.
- Jacobs, J. (2008): Wozu Konstruktionen? In: *Linguistische Berichte* 213, pp. 3–44.
- Kittilä, S./Zúñiga, F. (2010): Introduction. Benefaction and Malefaction from a Cross-Linguistic Perspective. In: Zúñiga, F./Kittilä, S. (eds.): *Benefactives and Malefactives: Typological Perspectives and Case Studies*. Amsterdam and Philadelphia: Benjamins, pp. 1–28.
- Klein, J. (2002): Topik und Frametheorie als argumentations- und begriffsgeschichtliche Instrumente, dargestellt am Kolonialdiskurs. In: Cherubim, D./Jakob, K./Linke, A. (eds.): *Neue deutsche Sprachgeschichte. Mentalitäts-, kultur- und sozialgeschichtliche Zusammenhänge*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter (= *Studia linguistica Germanica* 64), pp. 167–181.
- Kohn, M. (2012): Colonialism. <http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/colonialism/> (accessed 14.01.2015).
- Mbembe, Achille (2013/2015): *Kritik der schwarzen Vernunft*. Berlin: Suhrkamp.
- Milligan, T. R. (1967): German *für*: Some Lines and Segments in a Semantic Spectrum. In: Fowkes, R. A./Sander, V. (eds.): *Festschrift für A. G. Rose*. Reutlingen: Hutzler, pp. 97–108.
- Nagel, Th. (1986): *The View from Nowhere*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Radden, G. (1997): Die Konzeptualisierung emotionaler Kausalität durch Präpositionalphrasen. In: Haumann, D./Schierholz, St. J. (eds.): *Lexikalische und grammatische Eigenschaften präpositionaler Elemente*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 371), pp. 47–62.
- Reisigl, M./Warnke, I. H. (2013): Diskurslinguistik im Spannungsfeld von Deskription, Präskription und Kritik. Eine Einleitung. In: Meinhof, U./Reisigl, M./Warnke, I. H. (eds.): *Diskurslinguistik im Spannungsfeld von Deskription und Kritik*. Berlin: Akademie Verlag (= *Diskursmuster – Discourse Patterns* 1), pp. 7–35.
- Reiter, N. (1975): *Die Semantik deutscher und russischer Präpositionen*. Berlin and Wiesbaden: Harrasowitz (= *Veröffentlichungen der Abteilung für Slavische Sprachen und Literaturen des Osteuropa-Instituts (Slavisches Seminar) an der Freien Universität Berlin* 43).
- Said, E. W. (1993): *Culture and Imperialism*. London: Vintage.
- Schierholz, M. (2001): *Präpositionalattribute. Syntaktische und semantische Analysen*. Tübingen: Niemeyer (= *Linguistische Arbeiten* 447).
- Schmidt-Brücken, D. (2015): *Verallgemeinerung im Diskurs: Generische Wissensindizierung in kolonialem Sprachgebrauch*. Berlin and Boston: de Gruyter (= *Diskursmuster – Discourse Patterns* 9).
- Searle, J. R. (1975): *Indirect Speech Acts*. In: Cole, P./Morgan, J. L. (eds.): *Speech Acts*. New York and Boston: Academic, pp. 59–82.
- Spitzmüller, J./Warnke, I. H. (2011): *Diskurslinguistik. Eine Einführung in Theorien und Methoden der transtextuellen Sprachanalyse*. Berlin and New York: de Gruyter.
- Spivak, G. C. (1985): The Rani of Sirmur. In: Barker, F./Hulme, P./Iversen, M./Loxley, D. (eds.): *Europe and its Others. Proceedings of the Essex Conference on the Sociology of Literature July 1984*. Volume 1. Colchester: University of Essex, pp. 128–151.
- Spivak, G. C. (1988): Can the Subaltern Speak? In: Nelson, C./Grossberg, L. (eds.): *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*. Chicago: University of Illinois Press (= *Cultural identity studies* 18), pp. 271–313.
- Stefanowitsch, A./Gries, St. Th. (2003): Collostructions: Investigating the Interaction Between Words and Constructions. In: *International Journal of Corpus Linguistics* 8.2, pp. 209–143.

- Van Valin, R./Lapolla, R. (1999): *Syntax. Structure, Meaning and Function*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press (= Cambridge Textbooks in Linguistics).
- Warnke, I. H. (2013): Diskurslinguistik und die wirklich gesagten Dinge – Konzepte, Bezüge und Empirie der transtextuellen Sprachanalyse. In: Felder, E. (ed.): *Faktizitätsherstellung in Diskursen. Die Macht des Deklarativen*. Berlin, New York: de Gruyter (= Sprache und Wissen 13), pp. 75–98.
- Warnke, I. H./Schmidt-Brücken, D. (2011): Koloniale Grammatiken und ihre Beispiele: Linguistischer Sprachgebrauch als Ausdruck von Gewissheiten. In: Stolz, T./Vossmann, C./ Dewein, B. (eds.): *Kolonialzeitliche Sprachforschung: Die Beschreibung afrikanischer und ozeanischer Sprachen zur Zeit der deutschen Kolonialherrschaft*. Berlin: Akademie (= Koloniale und Postkoloniale Linguistik/Colonial and Postcolonial Linguistics 1), pp. 31–53.
- Warnke, I. H./Schmidt-Brücken, D. (2013): Exemplarische Texte und beispielhafter Sprachgebrauch im deutschen Kolonialdiskurs: Zur Konzeption des Bremischen Basiskorpus Deutscher Kolonialismus (BBDK). In: Lück, Ch./Niehaus, M./Risthaus, P./Schneider, M. (eds.): *Archiv des Beispiels: Vorarbeiten und Überlegungen*. Zürich and Berlin: diaphanes, pp. 123–147.
- Warnke, I. H./Stolz, T. (2013): (Post)Colonial Linguistics, oder: Was ist das Koloniale an kolonial geprägten Diskursen? *Zeitschrift für Semiotik* 35, pp. 469–493.
- Wegener, H. (1985): In: *Zeitschrift [...]* Der Dativ im heutigen Deutsch. Tübingen: Narr (Studien zur deutschen Grammatik 28).
- Trebilcot, J. (1988): *Dyke Methods or Principles for the Discovery/Creation of the Withstanding*. In: *Hypatia* 3 (= Studien [...]), pp. 1–13.
- Zifonun, G./Hoffmann, L./Strecker, B. (1997): *Grammatik der deutschen Sprache. Volume 2*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

*Anschrift:*

Dr. Philipp Dreesen  
Universität Bremen  
Deutsche Sprachwissenschaft/Interdisziplinäre Linguistik  
philipp.dreesen@uni-bremen.de