

“GRÜSS GOTT!”: A STUDY OF AUSTRIAN IDENTITY THROUGH
LANGUAGE

Katherine Portnoy

A Thesis

Submitted to the Graduate College of Bowling Green
State University in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

May 2011

Committee:

Dr. Geoffrey Howes, Advisor

Dr. Edgar Landgraf

ABSTRACT

Dr. Geoffrey Howes, Advisor

As Austria shares both a language and a border with Germany, a distinct relationship has developed between the two countries. Germany, with a population of over eighty million, is often viewed as the more dominant nation of the pair, resulting in foreigners tending to group Austria with their northern neighbor. Because Austria is often associated with Germany, Austrians have endeavored to forge a separate identity for themselves, particularly through language. It can be said that Austrian Standard German, as well as Austrian dialects, have provided Austrians with the opportunity to contrast themselves against speakers of German Standard German, resulting in the formation of a unique Austrian sense of linguistic identity. This thesis explores how and why Austrians identify with the language they speak, examining how the various comparisons with Germany, as well as the influx of German Standard German into different aspects of Austrian life, provide a foil against which Austrians can contrast themselves and their language. The paper examines this topic through the analysis of the linguistic situation in Austria, Austrian reactions to perceptions of Austrian Standard German abroad, and the portrayal of Austrian Standard German and Austrian dialect in the country's media. Through the analysis of such topics, it is concluded that while the frequent contrasts against speakers of German Standard German significantly strengthen an Austrian sense of identity, this identity cannot fully reach its potential until Austrians are better educated about the norms and characteristics of their language.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank the members of my thesis committee for their assistance with this project. Their unwavering support and guidance have helped to make this study possible. In particular, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Howes, for his numerous ideas relating to my thesis. His passion for Austria and the language of the country was an inspiration to me, and I am very grateful. I would also like to thank Dr. Landgraf for his insightful comments and advice throughout the writing process. The constructive criticism offered by both Dr. Landgraf and Dr. Howes was extremely beneficial, and I wish to express my sincere gratitude to both of them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER I: LINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AUSTRIAN STANDARD GERMAN AND GERMAN STANDARD GERMAN.....	16
CHAPTER II: LEVELS OF LANGUAGE USAGE IN AUSTRIA.....	25
CHAPTER III: “ÖSTERREICHISCH KLINGT EINFACH NICHT DEUTSCH”: VIEWS OF AUSTRIAN STANDARD GERMAN ABROAD.....	34
CHAPTER IV: “DA BIN I HER, DA G’HÖR’ I HIN”: LANGUAGE USAGE IN AUSTRIAN MEDIA.....	48
CONCLUSION.....	60
WORKS CITED.....	64
APPENDIX.....	69

INTRODUCTION

“Austrian German is a major part of who I am. This is the language I learned as a child, my native language” (Loibl).

This sentiment expressed by Medea Loibl, a thirty-year old Austrian from Lower Austria, expresses a significant sense of Austrian linguistic identity. Although the official language of Austria is German, the language varieties spoken throughout the country are quite different from the standard language spoken in Germany. Despite the differences, the language employed in the public domain in Austria also meets the requirements for a standard language, as it is used in both public discourse and written form nationwide. Various regional dialects are also spoken throughout the country, which, along with Austrian Standard German (ASG), strongly correlate to a sense of Austrian identity. In the following study, I will explore how, as well as the reasons why, Austrians identify with their language today.

Current academic literature on Austrian identity deals mainly with the development of an Austrian national identity, the relationship of Austria to Germany, and the negative perceptions the outside world has of Austrian Standard German. While these topics are important, and shall be discussed in the study, many of the previous studies offer rather simplistic psychologies, simply victimizing the positions of Austrians in a world where ASG is not viewed as standard. I will strive to look beyond this “victim” status in my work, examining the many positive expressions of Austrian identity through language. I will endeavor to show how the various comparisons with Germany, as well as the influx of German Standard German (GSG) into different aspects of Austrian life, both of which have previously been viewed as negative, provide a foil against which Austrians can contrast themselves and their language. This idea that one’s identity can be defined and sharpened by contrasting one’s self against an “other,” or a

type of “us” versus “them,” (“Definitions of Othering”) is particularly prevalent in Austria. As the country shares both a border and a language with Germany, foreigners often tend to group Austria with their dominant neighbor. However, through speaking ASG or Austrian dialects, which differ from GSG, Austrians have the opportunity to define themselves and their identity by contrasting themselves *against* GSG speakers, as it is possible to say that “we” (Austrians) speak ASG, while “they” (Germans) do not. This leads to feelings of solidarity with other Austrians, creating a type of “us,” which then results in a stronger sense of Austrian identity.

In order to understand how and why Austrians identify with their language today, it is important to look at the history and development of the language. By examining the factors that helped to form ASG and Austrian dialects over the centuries, we are able to gain a better understanding of the current linguistic and national identity of the Austrian people today.

First, however, we must understand the concepts of nationalism and national identity. Nationalism, defined as devotion and loyalty to one’s own nation (“Merriam-Webster”), dates back to the nineteenth century, emerging out of eighteenth-century Enlightenment ideals and strengthened by the French Revolution (Stapleton 41). With the resulting development of aristocratic, hierarchal societies into more “nation-oriented” societies based on equality, it can be argued that the formation of national identities occurred during this time. Feelings of nationalism were increased by the Congress of Vienna, which established the boundaries of various states in Europe, and also unified parts of Germany, reducing the number of German states from over three hundred (before the Napoleonic period) to thirty-nine. The complete unification of both Germany and Italy in the latter part of the nineteenth century was both motivated by and contributed to a sense of nationalism and national identity throughout Europe (Stapleton 44).

In Austria's case, the history of the country and the relationship with Germany through a shared language have led to the formation of a specific Austrian national identity. The turbulent political and social events of the twentieth century in particular have contributed to the sense of identity that exists in the country today. For instance, after World War I, Austria underwent major political changes with the end of the Habsburg Empire and the beginning of the First Republic. The country's government transformed again in 1934, when Austria became a fascist state under Federal Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss. With the annexation of Austria to Germany in 1938, Austria completely ceased to exist as a country until 1945, when the ten year Allied occupation of Austria began (Muhr, "The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language" 213). While these events made for a tragic twentieth century experience for Austrians, they have each contributed to the current sense of an Austrian national identity.

The history of the ASG language variety in particular dates back to the Middle Ages. During the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, regional Early New High German written language varieties began to develop from the dialects present throughout the German-speaking realm. One of these written languages was Austro-Bavarian (*bairisch-österreichisch*), a language variety which gradually became more and more homogeneous throughout the regions of Bavaria and most of the lands that would become Austria in the twentieth century, including Upper and Lower Austria, Styria, Carinthia, Salzburg, and Tirol. At the end of the fifteenth century, Kaiser Maximilian contributed to the spread of the Austro-Bavarian language by employing the language in written documents throughout his chancellery. Since Kaiser Maximilian, as well as his bureaucrats, wrote numerous documents in the dialect, the language variety became more well-known throughout the German Empire. A few decades later, Martin Luther also helped to increase the popularity of Austro-Bavarian through his 1534 German translation of the

Bible. Although he chose the East Middle German Upper Saxon dialect (*ostmitteldeutsch meißnisch-ober-sächsisch*) instead of the Upper German Austro-Bavarian variety (*oberdeutscher bairisch-österreichischer*), he modified the East Middle German Upper Saxon dialect to fit with the norms of the Upper German Austro-Bavarian dialect, trying to reach as many people as possible through his language usage. Luther's new language combination became popular throughout much of the German-speaking realm (Wiesinger, "Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich" 14).

In Austria, however, more than two hundred years would pass before Luther's new language variety became the norm. With Catholicism's stronghold on the country, the new religious beliefs were simply not enough for the Austrian people to give up their traditional writing conventions in favor of the new language form. Furthermore, with the onset of the Counter-Reformation in 1580, Luther's language variety began to acquire a heretical connotation, which contributed to Austria and Bavaria choosing to remain loyal to their own Austro-Bavarian dialect (Wiesinger, "Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich" 14).

During the time of the Enlightenment, however, loyalties to the Austro-Bavarian dialect began to waver. With a history of a strong aristocratic presence in Austria, members of the middle and lower classes welcomed the ideals of the Enlightenment, as they included freedom, democracy, and reason. The Enlightenment offered the chance to alter the societal hierarchy in Austria, and this chance was received gladly. The Enlightenment took an especially strong hold in Vienna, where many Viennese authors admired the literary and linguistic guidelines recently published by the east Prussian author Johann Christoph Gottsched. Gottsched's work, which focused on creating guidelines for the East Middle German Upper Saxon language variety, sparked an interest in "improving" the written language in Austria (Wiesinger, "Die deutsche Sprache in

Österreich” 15). This interest in improving the language was also promoted by other Austrian intellectuals, who believed that the lack of a cultivated language in Austria was the reason that Austria seemed to have fewer cultural achievements than the East Central German and North German areas. These scholars believed that if a controlled language was available to the growing reading public, reasoning and cultural achievements would flourish in Austria (Auer 4). Since many Austrian scholars and writers were of the opinion that this desired language progress could only be achieved by writing in a widely accepted form of German, they turned to the already standardized East Middle German Upper Saxon form. Grammar books by authors such as Johann Balthasar von Antesperg, Johann Siegmund Valentin Popowitsch, Friedrich Wilhelm Gerlach, Ignaz Weitenaur, and Franz Joseph Bob helped to support this language variety. Gottscheds “Deutsche Sprachkunst” was republished in 1775 in Vienna and his “Kern der deutschen Sprachkunst” was published twice, both in 1764 and 1778. Moral weeklies, magazines promoting the ideas and values of the Enlightenment, discussed the use and distribution of the written German language. One letter, written in 1762 by Christian Gottlob Klemm, read, “Die Reinigkeit der Sprache liegt uns besonders am Herzen“ (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 15). This new desire to write in a more “correct” form of German, however, led to a stark contrast between the written language and the spoken language, a contrast which is still apparent in Austria today. This phenomenon is described in a statement by Lindemayr, a Benedictine during the time of the Enlightenment, when reflecting on the linguistic situation of priests in Austria:

Eben darum, daß Sie ein Prediger in Osterreich würden, müßten Sie sich die sächsiche Mundart ab- und die österreichische angewöhnen. [...] glauben Sie ja nicht, mein Herr, dass Augustin nicht gut Lateinisch gekonnt. [...] Schrieb er, so war er, ein Römer. Redete er, so war er, ein

Hipponenser. So, mein Herr: so sollens auch wir machen. Im Schreiben, sollen wir Sachsen; im Predigen aber, Österreicher seyn. (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 90)

In 1774, Abbott Johann Ignaz von Felbiger came to Vienna at the request of Maria Theresia, in order to reform the school system in the city. Felbiger intensified German language instruction, with the goal of teaching correct orthography as well as ways in which to express oneself through the written word. The grammar books that were published during this time stayed in circulation for over 70 years. Educated people also began to attempt to rid their speech of regionalisms. One such book that offered help in this field was Adelung’s “Versuch eines vollständigen grammatisch-kritischen Wörterbuchs der Hochdeutschen Mundart,” published in 1774 (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 15). This dictionary began to serve as a basis for the “false” Austrian terms versus the “correct” German terms (16).

The attempt to speak a dialect-free German increased in the middle of the nineteenth century, primarily within the aristocracy and educated middle classes. However, Austrians no longer tried to model their speech after that of the northern Germans, which had previously been the fashion in the late 1700s. Instead, with Austria’s withdrawal from German political matters and the cultivation of the Austrian-Hungarian Empire from 1866 onward, Austrians instead chose to model their speech on the dialect-free German enclaves of their own empire, such as Prague and Laibach (Ljubljana). Around this time, ASG first began to distinguish itself as a separate language variety from GSG, as it differed from the language in its Upper German Bavarian roots in lexicon and grammar and was enriched through loan words by contact with the Slavic, Romanic, and Magyar peoples. The term “österreichisches (Hoch)deutsch” was first introduced during these years. Not everyone was pleased with

the recognition of this language variety, however. In 1875, Austrian Hermann Lewi described ASG as a “Versuch einer Darstellung seiner hervorstechendsten Fehler und fehlerhaften Eigenthümlichkeiten” (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 16). Nevertheless, in 1879, after the unsuccessful attempts of the Berlin Orthographic Conference to create a unified German orthography, Austria took the written language norms which were already in use and developed a fixed German orthography, which, with certain modifications, stayed in use until 1938. Therefore, certain Austrian lexical items became a part of the standard written German language (17).

Besides influencing the Austrians linguistically, the Slavic peoples in the Habsburg Empire also affected the Austrians’ sense of identity throughout the 1800s. Many historians believe that a nation of German-speaking Austrians began to develop in contrast to the Slavic people in the empire (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 56), demonstrating the idea of sharpening one’s identity against an “other.” By comparing themselves against those of Slavic backgrounds, the German-speaking Austrians were able to form more of a sense of their own identity. These German speakers considered themselves to be Germans, but were also loyal to the multilingual Habsburg Empire (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 89). These feelings, according to some historians, led to the formation of two separate German nations, the “German German” nation and the “Austrian German” nation. Although the Austrian German nation leaned politically towards the Austrian state, they gravitated more towards the German traditions in terms of culture (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 56). This phenomenon also created a type of *Identitätsambivalenz* on the part of the Austrians, as members of the Austrian German nation felt as if they were both a part of Germany and a part of the larger Habsburg Empire (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 89).

After the fall of the Habsburg regime in 1918, many Austrians desired that their country become a part of Germany, calling themselves a “second German state” (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 51). In fact, in October 1918, the German-speaking deputies to the former imperial parliament decided to call themselves the “Provisional National Assembly for Deutschösterreich,” and, a month later, declared the new state a part of the German Republic. The Social Democratic leader Karl Renner even went so far as to call the country “Südostdeutschland.” However, the 1919 Treaty of St. Germain required that Austria maintain its independence, and the Allied Powers insisted that the new republic be named “Republic of Austria.” Many Austrians, however, continued to hope for the annexation of Austria to Germany, especially members of the Social Democratic Party. Although Austria could not become a part of Germany, German was proclaimed as the national language of the new Republic, in order to emphasize the country’s connection with the Weimar Republic (51).

Although Austria wished to convey unity with Germany through linguistic means, certain authors were beginning to discuss the differences in the language varieties during this time. For example, in 1918, Paul Kretschmer published a book about the *Wortgeographie der hochdeutschen Umgangssprache*. In this book, Kretschmer discussed the regional differences among the various colloquial languages in German-speaking countries. However, he did not discuss any ideas of Austrian Standard German specifically being different from German Standard German, most likely because the First Republic still adhered to the idea of a united German language ideology (Pollak 60).

As the twentieth century progressed, a sense of Austrian identity slowly began to increase. In the 1930s, Federal Chancellor Engelbert Dollfuss tried to foster an idea of national identity during his time in office. He attempted to unify the political parties of Austria around the “Austrian idea,” reminding Austrians of the “greatness” Austria

enjoyed during the time of the Habsburgs and conveying the idea that Austria could establish a “Reich” by adhering to Catholic-Austrian instead of Protestant-German beliefs and traditions. However, Dollfuss also emphasized the idea that Austria held an important position in the German *Kulturnation*.¹ Historian Felix Kreissler called the ideology of this time a “national schizophrenia,” as the government promoted the desire to be simultaneously Austrian and German (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 52). After Dollfuss’ murder in 1934, his successor Kurt Schuschnigg continued to promote the idea of Austria as “a second, better German state” (52).

Although the government promoted the idea of Austria as a *second* German state, separate from Germany, many Austrians were nevertheless happy to become a part of Germany with the 1938 annexation of Austria into the Third Reich. The Allied Powers, however, refused to recognize the German occupation of Austria and declared the independence of Austria as one of their goals. This Allied goal helped to keep the name “Austria” alive, as the Nazis had changed the name of the country to “Ostmark” in relation to its eastern location in the Third Reich (52).

Most historians agree that a new Austrian sense of identity and a separate Austrian national consciousness began to further develop during the time of Nazi occupation and the years directly following. In contrast to the Austrian national consciousness of the 1930s under the governments of Dollfuss and Schuschnigg, any feelings of German identification that Austrians had previously possessed were now beginning to disappear (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 56). Because of the poor economic conditions during the war, which increased resistance against the Nazi regime, a number of Austrians began to feel more of a sense of a separate Austrian national consciousness at this time (53). Furthermore, the fact that many political prisoners were

¹ *Kulturnation* can be defined as an area or areas in which the inhabitants share the same language, history, and culture (as opposed to the definition of a nation as an area with political boundaries).

held in concentration camps and prisons during the war increased the longing to be free of the Nazi regime and intensified the yearning for a separate Austrian state (57).

After World War II, patriotic feelings for Austria became even stronger (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 17) and the idea of “German” versus “Austrian” became more prevalent, especially in the academic world. Austrian music, Austrian films, Habsburg nostalgia, and Austrian cultural events were now discussed as “typically Austrian” culture and traditions (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 56). Austrians also began to see the virtue in being a small country, and prided themselves on their idea of permanent Austrian neutrality and the signing of the State Treaty in 1955 (53).

This new Austrian consciousness affected the German language in Austria. Since anti-German sentiments were common during the years after the war, Austrians wanted to distance themselves from Germany in as many ways as possible, including linguistically. Many Austrians even wanted to change the name of the subject of German in schools to “Unterrichtssprache” and introduce dialect features in language instruction. However, Leopold Figl, the chancellor at the time, stated that although the nation could be called “österreichisch,” its language should continue to be called German (Pollak 62). The reason for this decision was that the official language of Austria had previously been decreed in the 1920 constitution, which reads, “Die deutsche Sprache ist, unbeschadet der den sprachlichen Minderheiten bundesgesetzlich eingeräumten Rechte, die Staatssprache der Republik Österreich” (qtd. in Pollak 62).

Gradually, more and more scholars and authors began to be interested in the language variety spoken in Austria. The first known author to write about this topic was Carl Friedrich Hrauda in the middle of the twentieth century. The manuscript of his book “Die Sprache des Österreichers” had been completed before the German annexation of

Austria, but it was not published until 1948 by the Österreichischer Kulturverlag Salzburg. In his book, Hrauda discussed the comparison between “richtigen hochdeutschen, aber unösterreichischen Bildungen und ...österreichisch-hochdeutschen Ausdrücken” (qtd. in Pollak 60). As a move against the dominance of northern Germany, Hrauda listed the southern German language varieties as the model for a standard German language (Pollak 60).

A few years later, the Austrian Ministry of Education decided to commission an Austrian dictionary for use in schools. In 1950, a year before the first edition appeared in print, the Ministry sent questionnaires to Austrians around the country asking their opinions on the model dictionary that had previously been assembled (Pollak 18). The next year, an official *Österreichisches Wörterbuch*, consisting of many terms from the various Austro-Bavarian dialects, appeared in print. The preface of the dictionary states, “Das Österreichische Wörterbuch ist ein Wörterbuch der guten, richtigen deutschen Gemeinsprache” (19), exemplifying the idea that Austrians should view their language as a proper, correct form of German. This dictionary also helped to standardize the orthography of German-speaking countries (20).

The first articles about the question of Austrian German began to appear in Austrian newspapers between 1950 and 1972. Some of these newspapers that discussed the topic included the *Arbeiter Zeitung*, *Tagebuch*, and the Salzburg *Österreichischen Nation*, the latter of which published forty-five articles about the question of ASG between 1957 and 1972. The publisher, Dr. Ferdinand Langbein, was a strong advocate for the recognition of the various Austrian German language varieties (Pollak 63). The fact that such articles were published at this time demonstrates that Austrians were becoming more aware of their language usage (both ASG and Austrian dialects),

realizing that ASG and Austrian dialects were a main factor in the concept of an Austrian identity.

As the ideas of "German" versus "Austrian" have become more prevalent in the decades after World War II, the Austrian sense of a national identity has continued to become more sharply defined. In a 1965 survey, for example, over half of the Austrians polled did not believe that the idea of Austria as a nation existed (Pollak 19). However, approximately forty years later,² 61% of Austrians polled reported to being 'very proud' of being Austrian, while an additional 31% reported to being 'fairly proud' (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 54), demonstrating that there now existed a sense of Austria as a nation. According to Rudolf Muhr, this change in opinion can be attributed to the widespread feeling that Austria as a nation had survived the various obstacles of the twentieth century (including two world wars, Fascist regimes, and civil war) and has since developed for the better ("The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language" 214). Further factors contributing to an Austrian sense of identity today include neutrality, political and social stability, cultural heritage, tourism, domestic security, and the country's landscapes (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 54). Most Austrians also display a high level of patriotism for their country. This patriotism, associated with the revival of Austria after World War II and the "myth of the Second Republic" (qtd. in Muhr, "The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language" 214) serves as a type of protective barrier against Germany (214) and is an effort to show the world that Austria is indeed a nation in its own right. However, although levels of patriotism are high, many Austrians still have a tendency to be very critical of their country, a phenomenon known as "Austro-masochism." According to Muhr, Austro-masochism, which is a main theme in Austrian literature in the second half of the twentieth century, is a result of the attempts to

² The survey took place in 1993.

deny involvement with the Nazi regime as well as a reaction to the hegemonic structures of the state. He maintains that the tendency to criticize Austria represents low levels of self-assurance on the part of Austrians (214). However, I would argue that the willingness and ability to be critical of one's country can also represent high levels of self-assurance. This is shown by the fact that Austrians are unafraid to criticize the negative qualities of their state, which illustrates that they possess enough confidence in their identity to admit that there are improvements to be made in their country.

Furthermore, although some politicians name the critics as *Nestbeschmutzer*, the fact that the Austrian state does not condemn such critics represents high levels of self-assurance on the part of the government overall. Accepting criticism is a sign of confidence, and, as Austrians are granted the freedom to criticize their country in various ways, it can be said that the state displays high levels of self-assurance and confidence.

The idea of an Austrian identity has changed throughout the course of history. Although a sense of a specific Austrian identity has taken centuries to develop, Austrians today are continuing to become more aware of and willing to endorse such a concept. While all factors of identity are clearly important, the German language spoken in Austria has greatly influenced the collective Austrian consciousness. Austrian Standard German, which has both tied Austria to Germany as well as separated Austria from Germany, continues to play an important role in the construction of an Austrian national identity today.

Since ASG is an important factor in the concept of an Austrian identity, the following study will begin with a linguistic comparison between present-day ASG and GSG. As the main focus of this paper is to discuss how Austrian identity is affected by speaking ASG, it is important to be aware of the characteristics and norms of the language in question. It is necessary to understand the ways in which ASG differs from

GSG, morphologically, syntactically, and pragmatically, in order to better understand how *othering* (defining one's identity by contrasting one's self against an "other") can occur. I will further analyze the linguistic situation of ASG and Austrian dialects in chapter two by looking more specifically at the different registers of language usage in Austria. By doing so, I hope to establish a more thorough understanding of the forms and language varieties that affect or express the Austrian sense of identity in various ways. In particular, I will examine Peter Wiesinger's study on the topic, which examines the use of dialect, colloquial speech, and standard speech in different types of situations in Austrian life.

Once an understanding of the complex linguistic situation in Austria has been established, I shall examine foreign views of ASG. While Muhr and Schmid maintain that the many negative perceptions of ASG abroad lead to feelings of linguistic confusion among ASG speakers, I endeavor to demonstrate how speaking ASG also allows Austrians to define themselves and their identity by contrasting themselves against GSG speakers, once again exemplifying the idea that one's identity can be defined by comparison to an "other." I shall also discuss how the tendency to favor GSG abroad provides the opportunity for Austrians to fight for the protection and promotion of their language, further strengthening the concept of an Austrian identity.

Finally, I shall examine the portrayal of ASG and Austrian dialect in the media, discussing the usage of these language varieties in television, films, and music. While Muhr has previously studied the increase of GSG in the media and its effect on the linguistic behavior of Austrians, there is not a significant amount of research on the topic of ASG or Austrian dialect usage in the media. I shall examine certain television shows and films in dialect, as well as look at the recent *Austropop* movement, which uses a variety of dialect in modern music genres. I hope to demonstrate that, because of the

popular television shows, films, and songs, most of which cater to younger generations, the question of an Austrian linguistic identity has shifted in recent decades. It is no longer a question that simply concerns old-fashioned, traditional venues in Austria, but, with the influx of dialect in the media, one that now includes younger generations as well.

CHAPTER I: LINGUISTIC DIFFERENCES BETWEEN AUSTRIAN STANDARD GERMAN AND GERMAN STANDARD GERMAN

Although ASG and GSG are mutually comprehensible, linguistic differences between the two language varieties abound. In the next section, I will discuss these linguistic variations between ASG and GSG, in order to establish a more thorough understanding of the forms and language varieties that are involved in an Austrian sense of identity. Differences in morphology, lexicon, syntax, and pragmatics will be discussed.

Morphological differences are prevalent between ASG and GSG. For example, in ASG, vowels are umlauted more frequently than in GSG. This difference in umlauting occurs especially before /r/, /l/, and plosive /t/, /b/, /r/, and /l/, as well as before /ts/ and /kt/. Some examples of this include ASG *färbig* versus GSG *farbig* (colored), ASG *nützen* versus GSG *nutzen* (to benefit someone/something), and ASG *bäckt* versus GSG *backt* (to bake) (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 215). Another difference in morphology between the two language varieties is that ASG sometimes makes use of “-s” to connect compound nouns, when GSG uses “-e” or no morpheme, as shown in ASG words such as *Aufnahmsprüfung* (entrance examination), *Gelenksentzündung* (arthritis), and *Fabriksbesitzer* (factory owner), in comparison to the GSG words *Aufnahmeprüfung*, *Gelenkentzündung*, and *Fabrikbesitzer*. On the other hand, some ASG words may simply have no morpheme in cases when GSG words use “-e,” as shown in ASG *Taglohn* versus GSG *Tagelohn* (daily wage) (216).

Suffix usage also differs between ASG and GSG. For instance, ASG frequently adds an “er” suffix to words, such as *der Einser* or *der Zweier*, (the number one and the number two), while GSG does not do this (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 215). The diminutives “-el,” “-erl,” “-eln,” “-ern,” and “-erln” are also

common suffixes in ASG. GSG, however, avoids these suffixes, using instead the diminutive “-chen” or no suffix at all. Some examples of this phenomenon include ASG *das Brettel* versus GSG *das Brettchen* (slat), ASG *das Würstel* versus GSG *das Würstchen* or *die Wurst* (sausage), ASG *das Busserl* versus GSG *das Küßchen* (a peck), and ASG *bisserl* versus GSG *bisschen* (a little) (216).

Another morphological difference between GSG and ASG includes prefix-verb combinations. For instance, there are a number of words in GSG and ASG that have the same prefix and same meaning, but a different verb after the common prefix. For example, ASG *absperren* and GSG *abschließen* both mean “to lock,” although different verbs, *sperren* and *schließen*, follow the prefix *ab*. Another such example is ASG *ausständig* in comparison to GSG *ausstehend* (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 217). Both words contain the prefix *aus* and mean “outstanding” (in the sense of “unpaid”), even though the words following the prefix are different. There are also certain words in ASG that make use of a prefix, while their counterparts in GSG do not. Some examples include *dazukommen* in comparison to the GSG *die Gelegenheit haben*, meaning “to have the opportunity” and *übertauchen* versus the GSG *die Krankheit durchstehen*, meaning “to weather or survive a sickness” (218).

Adverbial differences are also common between ASG and GSG, as there are different adverbs for various concepts in each language variety. For example, *da* and *dort* have different usages in ASG and GSG. In GSG, for example, it is common to say “Ich war gestern *da*” for “I was *there* yesterday,” while in ASG, one would be more likely to say “Ich war gestern *dort*.” GSG also uses the adverb *ran*, while ASG does not. For example, one might hear the sentence “Ich brachte eine ganze Kiste Getränke *ran*” for “I brought an entire box of drinks (to a spot)” in GSG, but “Ich brachte eine ganze Kiste Getränke” in ASG. ASG speakers might sometimes make use of the adverb *her*

after this type of sentence, but would not use the adverb *ran* as GSG speakers would (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 222).

There are also many differences in prepositional usage between ASG and GSG. For example, many ASG speakers would say *auf* in certain phrases when GSG speakers would say *am*. For instance, for the phrases “on the tree,” “at the university,” or “on the floor,” ASG speakers would say “auf dem Baum,” “auf der Uni,” and “auf dem Boden.” However, GSG speakers would be more likely to employ “an dem Baum,” “an der Uni,” and “am Boden” (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 223). The prepositions *an* and *am* are also used in GSG at times when ASG speakers would use *bei*. For example, in ASG, people say “Sie müssen *bei* der Kreuzung rechts abbiegen” when telling someone that he or she should turn right at the intersection, while in GSG, the sentence would be “Sie müssen *an* der Kreuzung rechts abbiegen.” Another such example is that ASG speakers would be more likely to say “Der Tisch steht *beim* Fenster” for “The table is next to the window,” while GSG speakers would prefer “Der Tisch steht *am* Fenster.” ASG also makes use of the preposition *auf* when GSG prefers the preposition *zu*, as exemplified when expressing the idea “He goes to the professional school.” In ASG, the sentence would be “Er geht *auf* die Meisterschule” while in GSG it would be “Er geht *zur* Meisterschule.” However, *zu* is used in ASG in cases when it is not used in GSG. Some examples of this include “Wir setzen uns *zum* Tisch” in ASG for “We sit down at the table,” versus the GSG “Wir setzten uns *an* den Tisch” and “Wir rücken den Stuhl *zum* Fenster” as opposed to “Wir rücken den Stuhl *ans* Fenster” for “We are moving the chair to the window” (224).

Grammatical differences also exist between ASG and GSG, although not in large amounts. One such grammatical difference is the merger of the second and third person singular present tense of verbs whose stem ends in “sch.” For example, in ASG, the verb

duschen, meaning “to shower,” is conjugated as “du duscht, er duscht,” while in GSG it is conjugated as “du duschest, er duscht.” However, this vowel retention is archaic even in GSG and is not as common today. Some superlative adverb forms also differ between GSG and ASG. For example, in advertising texts, Austrians tend to use adverb forms such as *schnellst*, *modernst*, and *billigst* for “fastest,” “most modern,” and “cheapest,” while in GSG, the form of *am (adverb)-sten* is more common (Russ 64).

Other grammatical differences between ASG and GSG are more syntactical. For example, in ASG, the present perfect tense is formed with *sein* with the verbs *liegen*, *stehen*, *sitzen*, *hängen*, *knien*, *lehnen*, *schweben*, and *stecken*, while in GSG, the present perfect tense of these verbs is formed with *haben*. Simple past usage also differs between ASG and GSG, as it is used far more frequently by speakers of the latter. For the most part, speakers of ASG use the present perfect instead of simple past when speaking, with the exception of using *war*, the simple past of *sein*. However, the present perfect form of this verb, *ist-gewesen*, also occurs frequently in speech. In writing, however, ASG speakers use the simple past regularly (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 227). ASG also makes use of a *Doppeltes Perfekt*, or “double perfect” instead of the past perfect. This double perfect tense is used in speaking and occasionally in writing. Double perfect is formed with *haben/sein* + *past participle of the verb* + *past participle of haben*, as seen in the phrase “Das *hat* er schon *gesagt gehabt*.” ASG speakers also tend to avoid forming the past perfect with *sein*, as in *war-gewesen*, although this practice is quite common in GSG (228).

There are also many lexical differences between ASG and GSG, particularly in the realm of food-related words. With the ASG word listed first, such words include *Marillen* instead of *Aprikosen* (apricots), *Obers* instead of *Sahne* (cream), *Karfiol* instead of *Blumenkohl* (cauliflower), *Paradeiser* instead of *Tomaten* (tomatoes), *Topfen* instead

of *Quark* (curd cheese), *Weichseln* instead of *Sauerkirschen* (morello cherries), *Erdäpfel* instead of *Kartoffeln* (potatoes), and *Fisolen* instead of *grüne Bohnen* (green beans) (de Cillia 130). Many activities related to food also differ lexically between the two language varieties, as in *selchen* instead of *räuchern* for “smoking meat or fish” and *seihen* instead of *sieben* for “sieving” (Russ 68).

However, there are more lexical differences between the two language varieties than merely those in the realm of gastronomy. For instance, there are a wide number of differences in the words for professions and trades. Some words include *Spengler* instead of *Flaschner* (plumber) and *Fleischhauer* instead of *Metzger* (butcher) (Russ 67). There are also many examples that do not belong to a specific category, including *heuer* versus *dieses Jahr* (this year), *kehren* versus *fegen* (sweep), *fad* versus *langweilig* (boring), *eh* versus *ohnehin* (anyway), *deppert* versus *blöd* (stupid), *Jänner* versus *Januar* (January), *Sackerl* versus *Tüte* (bag), and *fortgehen* versus *ausgehen* (going out). These words are all examples of *Austrianisms*, of which there are many. In fact, 1,357 Austrianisms are listed in *Duden Großes Wörterbuch* (Russ 65).

Although there are many lexical differences between ASG and GSG, there are also many words which are the same in the two language varieties, but have different genders. For example, in ASG, the word for cola is *das Cola*, but in GSG, it is *die Cola*. *Das Gulasch* (goulash), *das Prospekt* (brochure), and *der Akt* (act) are also examples of ASG words which have different genders than their GSG equivalents, which are *der Gulasch*, *der Prospekt*, and *die Akte* (Muhr, “Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale” 214).

Finally, there are many colloquial phrases that one uses in Austria that one would not use when speaking GSG. For example, *Grüß dich*, *Grüß Gott*, and *Servus* are common phrases used to greet someone in Austria, while *Auf Wiedersehen*,₂

Wiederschauen, *Servus*, or *Pfir di*³ are common ways to say “goodbye” (Swartz). These phrases are not common GSG phrases. Other colloquial phrases include the ASG *Na geh!* to express the idea that something can’t be true, as opposed to the GSG *Das gibt’s doch nicht!*. *Ja eh* is another common Austrian phrase, basically meaning “yes, exactly.” Finally, before eating a meal, Austrians say *Mahlzeit*, while those speaking GSG say *Guten Appetit*.

Austrianisms have come from a variety of sources, including colloquial speech, dialects, and even other languages. Because the Austro-Hungarian Empire included a number of non-German-speaking states, Austrians have been exposed to a wide variety of linguistic influences from these regions throughout history. Some loan words include *Jause*, meaning “afternoon snack,” which comes from Slovene *južina*, meaning “midday meal” (Russ 70) and *Gatehose*, which comes from Hungarian and means “long underpants.” Austria has also borrowed words from Italy, another of its neighbors. For example, *Kassa*, the ASG word for counter, is the Italianized form of the German word *Kasse*. Other Italian influences include *skartieren*, from the Italian *scartare*, meaning “to throw out or discard,” *sekkant*, from the Italian *seccante*, meaning “bothersome,” and *Faktura*, a word that is the same in both languages, meaning “bill” (Russ 69).

ASG has also been influenced by the French language, which was the language of diplomacy and culture for many years. For example, ASG uses French loan words *Fauteuil* for the word “armchair” (as opposed to GSG *Sessel*, which is also used in ASG, but for the word “chair” instead of “armchair”) and *Volantl-s* for the word “steering wheel,” (as opposed to GSG *Lenkrad*). The suffixes “-ieren” and “-ist,” which also come from the French language, are more widely used in ASG than in GSG, as exemplified in the ASG word *röntgenisieren* versus GSG *röntgen*, meaning “to x-ray.”

³ Although Swartz represents this phrase as “Pfir di”, it is also often written as “Pfia di.”

The English language has also had a significant impact on ASG. ASG contains a vast amount of original English loan words in the realm of sports, while GSG has translated these words into German for nationalistic reasons. Some examples include *tackeln* for “to tackle,” which GSG translated to *anpacken*, *skoren* for “to score,” which GSG translated to *ein Tor schießen*, and *Keeper* for “goal keeper,” which GSG translated to *Tormann*. There are also many English loan words used in ASG which are not related to sports, such as *Fading* for “the disappearance of a radio signal,” *Kloth* for “cotton material,” and *Zipperverschluß* for “zip-fastener” (Russ 70).

Another linguistic area in which ASG and GSG differ is in the field of pragmatics. For instance, in the 1990s, researchers examined how 200 Austrians and 200 Germans formed requests and apologies in different types of situations in a study known as the Austrian Speech Act Realisation Project. They discovered that when forming requests, the German group used 20% more indicative modal verb interrogatives than the Austrian group. This was exemplified by German utterances such as “Hi Maria, kannst Du mir vielleicht die Mitschrift von letzter Stunde geben?” (Muhr, “The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language” 231), in comparison to Austrian utterances such as “Sei so lieb und borge mir dein Skriptum zum Abschreiben.” The Austrian group also used more subjunctive modal verbs than the German group, who tended to use the indicative for requests. For example, when asking someone to clean the kitchen, members of the Austrian group used phrases such as “Bitte könntest du die Küche wieder aufräumen?,” while members of the German group would typically use phrases similar to “Kannst Du jetzt bitte mal da aufräumen?” (230). The Austrian group also tended to use the subjunctive form of *sein* more often than the German group, using the subjunctive in 74.2% of requests. Germans, however, only used the subjunctive form of *sein* in 25.8%

of requests (231). The study supported the idea that Austrians prefer more indirect forms when expressing a request, while Germans tend to use the more direct form (232).

According to the study, Austrians are also more likely than Germans to use “appeasers” when asking for something, such as a salutation plus the first name of the person they are speaking with, the personal pronoun *du* (as in *du* plus first name), or an apology or an appealing phrase (*entschuldige, sei so lieb*, etc.) (Muhr, “The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language” 236). Germans are also more likely to use demands in situations in which Austrians would use requests. For example, when confronted with the situation of a roommate leaving behind a dirty kitchen, German respondents used more interrogative and imperative demands, such as “Räumst du die Küche auf?/Kannst du die Küche aufräumen?” or even “Räum sofort die Küche auf!” Austrian respondents, on the other hand, said they would be more likely to use explicit requests, using such phrases as “bitte” or “sei du so gut” when asking their roommate to clean the kitchen (232). Austrians and Germans also make use of different phrases when issuing an apology. In the study, Austrians used almost twice as many listener-oriented elements, defined as attempts to avoid confrontation and maintain harmony between the two speakers. Austrians also used more exclamatory elements when beginning the apology, or elements which show sympathy with the person to which they are speaking. Based on the results of the study, researchers concluded that Austrians are more expressive than German speakers. This idea was further supported by the fact that the Austrians respondents tended to explain the reason they did not do a task when apologizing, while German respondents, on the other hand, used a high number of face-threatening explanations. A face-threatening explanation is defined as an explanation which avoids explaining to the listener why a person did not do something and instead simply states the circumstances which convey the idea that the speaker is unwilling to fulfill his obligation

to the listener. For example, Austrian respondents were more likely to issue such an apology: “Tut mir leid, aber ich bin gestern nicht mehr dazu gekommen. Eine wichtige Sitzung hat es leider verhindert,” while German respondents were more likely to say something similar to “Ich bin leider noch nicht zum Durchlesen gekommen” (238).

In conclusion, ASG and GSG contain many differences in the realm of linguistics. Since ASG serves as a tool with which Austrians can differentiate themselves from Germans, the language has become an important factor in the construction of Austrian identity. This differentiation between ASG and GSG helps to sharpen the sense of an Austrian identity, as it defines more clearly how Austrians themselves speak in comparison to how speakers of GSG speak. In the following chapter, I shall continue to explore this concept of othering by discussing the various usage of language in Austria.

CHAPTER II: LEVELS OF LANGUAGE USAGE IN AUSTRIA

While a standard form of the German language exists in Austria (ASG), there is also a variety of different dialects in use throughout the country, as well as other levels of language usage. The ability to speak these different varieties of German results in the ability to choose which type of German to employ in various situations. In the following section, I will first discuss the different dialects of Austria, as they are in frequent use in Austrian life and are an important part of the Austrian linguistic situation. Next, I will examine the so-called “higher” levels of language spoken in Austria, as discussed by linguist Peter Wiesinger. Finally, I will discuss when each of these language levels is used by Austrians, examining the various factors which lead to this linguistic decision.

The high number of dialects in Austria stems from the time of the Middle Ages. Since Austria was divided into separate feudal territories during this time period, individual speech patterns began to emerge in each territory. As the boundaries of these areas remained unchanged for many years, each dialect had time to develop specific characteristics and features. Certain dialects, however, are more similar to each other than others. For instance, the dialects of Lower and Upper Austria, Burgenland, Vienna, a large part of Salzburg, and a small part of Styria developed from Middle Bavarian, and, because of the common origin, share similar features and characteristics with one another. These features include the weakening of certain consonants, omission of vowels with secondary stress, such as the “e” in the prefix “ge-” and the “-e” at the ends of words, the vocalization of “l” and “r” in certain positions, and the preservation of specific sounds from Old High German and Middle High German, especially in the “ui-dialect” of Lower Austria and Burgenland (Devrient). The “ui-dialect”, spoken in eastern Austria, is a dialect which makes particular use of the “ui” sound. This sound developed from the Middle High German sound “uo”, which later changed to “üe”, and then eventually to the

current “ui” (Hornik 10). Some examples of words in the “ui-dialect” include *guißn* in comparison to GSG *gießen* (to pour), *Huiz* in comparison to GSG *Holz* (wood), and *schuißn* in comparison to GSG *schießen* (to shoot) (Hornik 11). The dialects spoken in Carinthia, Tirol, some parts of Salzburg, most of Styria, and the south of Burgenland, however, have developed from Southern Bavarian and are closer to ASG, as they retain both the fortis sounds (k, p, t) and the vowels of the secondary stress syllables. The dialect of Vorarlberg greatly differs from the other two dialect groups, as it has Alemannic instead of Bavarian roots. With such origins, the Voralrberg dialect is more similar to the language spoken in Switzerland and Swabia than to the other dialects of Austria (Devrient).

While dialect usage is common throughout Austria, there are certain situations in which Austrian society calls for different levels of German. Linguist Peter Wiesinger describes the different types of language levels in his 1988 article “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich.” In this article, Wiesinger maintains that there are a variety of factors that contribute to which level of language one should use at which time, according to societal standards. In order to better describe this linguistic situation, Wiesinger has divided the German usage in Austria into four different levels. He names these levels primary dialect (*Basisdialekt*), regional dialect (*Verkehrsdialekt*), colloquial speech (*Umgangssprache*), and written/standard speech (*Schrift-und Standardsprache*) (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 18; Russ 59). Wiesinger then describes the societal opinion of the different language varieties, stating that “Die gesellschaftliche Wertschätzung und damit das Prestige der einzelnen Sprachschichten nimmt vom Dialekt über die Umgangssprache zur Standardsprache zu bzw. umgekehrt ab” (Wiesinger 18); hence, the “higher” the level of language in this four-level model, the higher the level of prestige it has in Austrian society. In order to illustrate the four-level model, Wiesinger shows how a person from

the Weinviertel would communicate the idea “Heute abend kommt mein Bruder nach Hause” at each of the different levels:

Primary Dialect: “Heint af d’Nocht kimmt meiⁿ Bruider hoam.”

Regional Dialect: “Heit auf d’Nocht kummt meiⁿ Bruader ham.”

Colloquial Speech: “Heit ab’nd kommt meiⁿ Bruder z’Haus.”

Standard Speech: “Heut Ab’nd kommt mein Bruder nach Haus.” (18)

According to Wiesinger, the primary dialect consists of the more traditional dialect, which is used in daily life by the older inhabitants of country villages, farmers, and workers, as well as with younger family members. This dialect also includes the language used in cities by the lower classes and some parts of the middle class (such as by blue and white collar workers and small businessmen). The primary dialect is occasionally used by upper class members of society, although this usually only occurs if a person has risen in society and maintained their previous language habits. Primary dialect can be heard in everyday conversations in both the country and the city among the above mentioned people, as well as in the workplace between colleagues of equal rank (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 19).

The next level of Wiesinger’s model is the regional dialect. This dialect shares many features with primary dialect, but is used mostly by the younger generations in both the city and the country. Many businessmen, policemen, clergy, bank workers, doctors, and teachers in villages often employ this dialect, although many choose to use colloquial speech in certain situations as well. Colloquial speech, the third level of Wiesinger’s model, is used in small Austrian towns and villages by business men, police, postal workers, and bank workers with customers, by teachers in private conversations with students and parents, and by priests with their congregation (Wiesinger, “Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich” 19), as well as in the cities of Austria in more formal situations by

members of the middle and upper class, such as salesmen and women, businessmen and women, officials, teachers, doctors, lawyers, et cetera. Since colloquial speech still contains certain dialect characteristics, but is nearer to the written language in form, it is viewed as a type of compromise between dialect and standard, as it retains the intimacy level of dialect, but at the same time conveys a tone of formality (20).

The final level of Wiesinger's model is the standard language. This level, which is the spoken version of the written language, is the language used in the public sphere in Austria (known throughout this paper as Austrian Standard German, or ASG). This language variety is used by teachers in class, political figures in public address, priests, religious officials, and congregations in church services, and television and radio moderators during public programs. The standard language is also used with superiors at work, teachers, and public officials, as well as with foreigners (in order to allow for better understanding) (Wiesinger, "Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich" 20).

Wiesinger states that most Austrians are capable of speaking all four levels of language, meaning they can choose which language level to use in various situations. According to linguist Sigrun Braverman, many different factors can play a role in which variety of German Austrians choose to employ. These factors include self-assurance, social mobility, education, personal aspirations, and prestige (Braverman 26). Wiesinger maintains that this language choice is more of a subconscious choice than a conscious one, as most Austrians automatically intuit what level of language a certain situation requires (which, he agrees, is based on the factors Braverman lists) ("Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich" 20). In his 1988 article, Wiesinger shows frequency of language level usage by Austrians in different situations (see table 1).

Table 1

Use of Linguistic Varieties in Austria according to Interlocutor

Situation	Dialect (%)	Colloquial Speech (%)	Standard Language (%)	Adaptation to Language of Interlocutor (%)
Family	60	35	5	—
Good Friends	53	42	3	2
Work Colleagues	39	48	10	3
Acquaintances	27	46	21	6
Strangers	12	42	39	7
Store clerk/ Baker	43	51	6	—
Hairdresser	33	53	14	—
Bank	23	44	33	—
Clothing Shop	18	55	27	—
Doctor	19	45	36	—
Superiors at Work	15	42	43	—
Teachers	10	40	45	5
City Officials	9	42	49	—

Source: Peter Wiesinger, *Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich. Eine Einführung*. Das

Österreichische Deutsch. (Wien: Böhlau Verlag Gesellschaft m.b.H. und Co.KG.,
1988) 22. Print.

As a result of his research, Wiesinger maintains that the language usage in Austria varies immensely. Although over seventy-five percent of Austrians consider themselves to be dialect speakers and dialect usage in small towns is relatively strong, it can be concluded that dialect is mostly restricted to conversations with family and close friends. Colloquial speech, on the other hand, has more or less become the everyday speech of the middle and upper classes, particularly in bigger towns and cities (Russ 60). Finally, with distant acquaintances and strangers, when one is expected to be more formal, most Austrians use either colloquial or standard speech (61). Although these same patterns may also emerge in other countries with a wide variety of dialects, it is important to establish an understanding of the specific language usages of the Austrian people, as the use of ASG, colloquial speech, or Austrian dialect in certain situations helps to form a sense of solidarity with other Austrians who employ similar language practices.

Although there are certain factors which dictate when and where one should use which language variety, it should also be noted that speaking in one's regional dialect can be a matter of pride for Austrians. The local language and the area's history is part of a person's cultural heritage, and many Austrians are proud of their region and the language spoken there. One receives a sense of emotional support, familiarity, and belonging by being a member of a smaller speech community (Braverman 27). Braverman explains this feeling, maintaining that "there is a sense of intimacy with a fellow dialect speaker, even one from a different dialect area, as opposed to a speaker of standard German" (27). Austrian dialect usage allows Austrians to define themselves and their identity by contrasting themselves *against* GSG speakers, exemplifying the idea that one's identity can be defined against an "other," or a type of "us" versus "them" ("Definitions of Othering"). In this case, the "us" can be defined as "speakers of Austrian dialect" while the "them" can be defined as "GSG speakers/non-speakers of Austrian dialect." By

contrasting themselves against GSG speakers, Austrians achieve a type of solidarity with other Austrian dialect speakers.

Because dialect can represent pride, solidarity, and loyalty, Austrians would often rather speak in dialect than in GSG (Braverman 27). Josef Hader, an Austrian comedian and actor who works in Germany and Austria, aptly describes this feeling to television host Jorg Thadeusz, explaining, "... es ist immer so, dass die eigene Sprache und der eigene Dialekt einem einfach *näher* ist. Es ist immer die Schriftsprache ist quasi das hier (points to outer jacket) und der eigene Dialekt ist das Hemd, das direkt über die Haut ist" ("Josef Hader bei Thadeusz—Mein Dialekt"). This quote exemplifies the idea that, although most Austrians are capable of speaking ASG and/or GSG, most feel much more "at home" when speaking in their own dialect, as they have grown up doing so and it is part of their identity. Braverman agrees that dialect is an important part of an Austrian's identity, stating that although "standard German carries an acknowledged high prestige ... strong feelings of identity prevent the native speaker from using the prestige language in a nonpublic situation, even if the speaker is capable of doing so because of extended schooling" (28). This statement is supported by Wiesinger's studies, as the previous table of language usage in Austria shows. Although very low percentages of Austrians would speak in dialect with city officials, teachers, and clerks in shops (i.e. those in the public sphere), many would do so with family and close friends. Only five percent or fewer of those surveyed would speak in the standard language with friends and family (i.e. a nonpublic situation). In fact, if one does not speak in dialect in nonpublic situations, it can be viewed as being unfaithful to one's region, as Braverman describes in her book "The City Dialect of Salzburg." She states: "Use of standard German by a native of Salzburg would be interpreted as disloyalty to the community, thereby dissolving the bond of birthplace, with all its meaning in tradition and feeling of

belonging ...” (127). Since those who use the standard language with family and friends would be using a more formal level of language in the private sphere, they may be perceived as trying to distance themselves from the more intimate bonds of the smaller dialect speech community. As Braverman suggests, this rejection of dialect would then be viewed as an act of trying to separate oneself from the dialect group, which is frowned upon by many Austrians. This belief prompts the question as to whether someone from one region should speak in the dialect of another region when conversing with the locals. I would argue that the visiting speaker would most likely not try to conform to another region’s dialect, as this could be perceived as “phony.” This statement is based on personal experience, as I have observed Austrians from various parts of Austria adhering to their own specific regional dialects when conversing with residents of Salzburg. I believe that it is not perceived as trying to separate one’s self from the dialect group if the speaker employs his/her own regional dialect, as the idea of the dialect group could expand to include all varieties of Austrian dialect in cases such as this. It would normally only be viewed as negative if the speaker was expected to speak Austrian dialect in a nonpublic situation, but instead chose to speak GSG or ASG.

It can be concluded that speaking in dialect is a representation of where one comes from and a matter of pride in one’s region. I would add that speaking in dialect represents a feeling of trust with the interlocutor, as, when the speaker uses dialect, he or she allows his or her “formal” guard to come down and uses the more intimate language. In this sense, dialect can be viewed as more of an “elect” language that only a small number of people know, and, only once the speaker is comfortable with the interlocutor, does he or she allow the interlocutor into this “elect” community. Linguist Wolfgang Dressler supports this idea, stating, “the more comfortable and at ease the speaker, the more likely he is to employ dialect” (qtd. in Braverman 30). Therefore, even though

dialect is viewed as socially “lower”, it is a strong symbol of belonging, conveying a sense of prestige of being a part of an elect group. In the following chapters, I will examine the feelings associated with Austrian dialect and ASG in more detail, as well as discuss the portrayal of dialect and ASG both in Austria and around the world.

CHAPTER III: “ÖSTERREICHISCH KLINGT EINFACH NICHT DEUTSCH”: VIEWS OF AUSTRIAN STANDARD GERMAN ABROAD

Because Austria and Germany share a language, the question of whether Austria belongs to any kind of a larger German nation has been prevalent throughout the last century. The concept of a German *Kulturnation*, as discussed by historians Fellner, Höbelt, and Mölzer, posits that although Germany and Austria are two separate German nations, there is only one German people and one German cultural community. According to these theorists, Austrians belong to the German people because of their shared German language. Höbelt even goes so far as to argue that “Austrian” and “German” are not separate identities, but, because of their shared language, different parts of *one* identity (Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart 56). The idea of a shared German identity is further supported by the fact that Austria and Germany share much of their history, as both countries belonged to the Holy Roman Empire of the German Nation for seven hundred years, both were members of the German federation (1815-1864), and both were part of the Third Reich (1938-1945). However, even though Austria and Germany share a common history, the majority of Austrians have rejected the idea of a shared identity since 1945, because “accepting this would once again question the country’s independence” (Muhr, “The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language” 215).

Although many Austrians reject the idea of a shared identity with Germany, the national identity of Austrians is nevertheless strongly influenced by sharing a common language with their northern neighbor. According to linguist Ulrich Ammon, the way in which two nations perceive each other is affected when two nations speak the same language, but one nation is more dominant than the other. In most cases, while members of the dominant nation possess feelings of friendliness and affability towards members of

the non-dominant nation, those living in the non-dominant nation view their more powerful counterpart in a negative light (Ammon 117).

According to Ammon, this theory currently applies to the German-speaking countries of Germany, Austria, and Switzerland. For instance, many Germans, members of the dominant nation (with a population of over 80 million), tend to speak of the smaller countries of Austria and Switzerland in a complimentary manner and often “lieben die Österreicher und die Schweizer sogar mehr als sich selbst” (117). However, as nations, Austrians and the Swiss tend to have conflicting, although more often negative, feelings towards Germans. Although most Austrians do consider themselves to be related to the people of Germany, many view the Germans as their “unliebsame Verwandte,” describing them as loud, inconsiderate, brash, and uncultured (117). Austrians even have a derogatory name for Germans: “Piefkes.” The origin of the word is uncertain, but some claim that it originated in the nineteenth century, when Gottfried Piefke, a Prussian officer, led a parade in Austria to celebrate the Prussian victory (against the Austrians) in the Battle of Königgrätz. According to the story, Austrians warned others about the parade with the call, “Die Piefkes kommen!” (“wer weiss was”). Today, Austrians use the term primarily to describe people whom they consider to be pompous northern Germans, exemplifying Ammon’s idea that members of the non-dominant nation in pluricentric language contexts tend to have negative opinions of those in the dominant nation.

One factor that Austrians use to distinguish themselves from their more dominant northern neighbor is the type of German spoken in Austria. As discussed in previous chapters, ASG allows Austrians to define themselves and their identity by contrasting themselves against GSG speakers, exemplifying the idea that one’s identity can be defined by contrasting one’s self and one’s community against an “other” (“Definitions

of Othering”). However, while language is a significant factor in the construct of an Austrian identity, many uncertainties exist among ASG speakers about what features of their language are typically Austrian and what features are shared with GSG. One reason for these uncertainties is that most schools do not teach students which specific words are Austrian Standard German, German Standard German, and Swiss Standard German in the Austrian standard language. Therefore, most Austrians, even those who are highly educated, cannot name the distinguishing qualities between ASG and GSG, with the exception of the widely known word differences such as *Paradeiser/Tomate* and *Schlagobers/Sahne* (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 96). The lack of knowledge about ASG then leads many Austrians to believe that the stylistically “higher” or “less frequent” variety is the “correct” form. In general, the variety which “sounds more German Standard German” is viewed as the proper variety. For example, when asked which words of a pair, such as *Stiege* or *Treppe*, *anfangen* or *beginnen*, *reden* or *sprechen*, *kriegen* or *bekommen*, and *rennen* or *laufen*, were words one could use in standard language, many Austrians chose the second word of the set, as they thought that the first words, words they would use on a daily basis, must “only” be dialect. Furthermore, when certain words do not sound to be GSG, many Austrians believe that they must be specific dialect words used exclusively within their area of Austria, rather than part of the ASG lexicon. Because of this belief, Austrians can often be heard saying, “In Wien / in der Steiermark / in Tirol etc. würden wir ‘...’ sagen,” even though the words or phrases might be standard throughout all of Austria. Linguists Schmid and Muhr call this phenomenon “linguistic schizophrenia,” defined as believing that one’s everyday language is inadequate, while at the same time believing that the way one does *not* normally speak is superior to the way in which one does normally speak (82). Schmid further describes this Austrian feeling of linguistic schizophrenia, stating:

Denn wir ‘dürfen’ nicht so sprechen (= glauben, nicht so sprechen zu dürfen, zu sollen), wie wir eigentlich sprechen wollten – wir denken, es wäre verächtlich, so zu sprechen, wie es uns ‘natürlich’ erscheint, also wie wir gewohnt sind zu sprechen: und genau indem wir diesen Eindruck produzieren, wird es überhaupt erst verächtlich. (qtd. in Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 82)

According to Muhr, linguistic schizophrenia in Austria stems from the previously discussed idea that Germany is the “dominant” country of the Germany/Austria pair, as well as from the fact that the Austrian Standard German language is not codified. Since ASG is not codified, it is not formally recognized as standard, even though the language meets the requirements for what a standard language should be (82). Victoria Martin agrees with Muhr’s basis for linguistic schizophrenia in her article “Vorurteile und Meinungen zu einem Auslandsjahr in Österreich aus sprachpädagogischer Sicht.” She explains: “Solange die österreichische Hochsprache nur Hochsprache und keine Standardsprache bleibt, werden sowohl die Österreicher selbst als auch die Deutschstudenten aus dem Ausland ihr einen niederen Status zuordnen als dem Bundesdeutschen” (Martin 140).

Feelings of linguistic schizophrenia are increased by foreign opinions of ASG, which often convey the belief that “proper” German is only spoken in northern Germany.⁴ While ASG meets the requirements for a standard language, many Austrians are nevertheless aware of the idea that “kein richtiges Deutsch” is spoken in their homeland (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 79). This depreciation of the language has an influence on the linguistic identity of the Austrians, as they are

⁴ More specifically, many believe that proper German is only spoken in Hannover and the surrounding area.

sometimes given the impression that the language they speak in everyday life is not correct German.

Many foreign translators and interpreters, for example, name ASG as more of a nuisance than a valid language. In 1995, for instance, a Dutch interpreter was cited in the *Kurier* as saying, “Österreichisch klingt einfach nicht deutsch. Ganz vergangen ist das Lachen den Übersetzern, wenn Österreicher am Wort sind. Dann bricht Panik aus, da Sprüche wie ‘die Krot werd’ ma schluck’n müssen’, auch für geschulte Ohren fremd sind” (qtd. in de Cillia 128). The fact that this interpreter views ASG as more of a hassle than as its own language variety exemplifies the demeaning view many have of ASG.

Austrian-born translators also encounter problems in the field. Many Austrian translations for German clients are not accepted, returning to translators with words marked as a *falsche Übersetzung* or *zu österreichisch* (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 81). The response *falsche Übersetzung* conveys the idea that the ASG lexicon is not as highly regarded the lexicon of GSG, as clients state that these translations, which are part of the standard language in Austria, are simply incorrect German. While it can be asserted that this devaluation of ASG in the world of interpretation and translation contributes to lower levels of linguistic self-assurance among Austrians, I would argue that, although it can lead to linguistic schizophrenia when trying to speak in a “correct” register, it also provides a type of “other” against which Austrians can define and value themselves. The verbal “attacks” on (or simply lack of recognition of) ASG and Austrian dialects allow Austrians the chance to stand up and defend their language against the advancement of GSG, thus sharpening an Austrian sense of linguistic identity. The promotion and defense of ASG and Austrian dialects, as well as the effects on Austrian identity, will be discussed in greater detail later in the chapter.

Literature written in ASG or Austrian dialect also faces various obstacles.

Although half of German literature since 1945 has come from Austria (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 79), many Austrian words and linguistic characteristics have been systematically removed from Austrian literature and replaced with GSG or neutral words. The reason for this “purification” is that the literature market in Austria is not very large, requiring Austrian authors to turn to German companies to publish their works. German companies then change the Austrian authors’ manuscripts to make them fit with the norms of GSG. However, if the author feels very strongly about the inclusion of his or her Austrianisms, German publishing companies may accept these words and phrases. Nevertheless, it is not an easy process for the author to convince the publisher to leave the Austrianisms in the work, and often requires lengthy discussions between the two parties (84). This fight for the Austrian lexicon on the part of the author exemplifies a sense of linguistic identity, as the authors believe that using Austrian words and phrases adds a certain feeling to their works and do not want these words removed. Most authors identify with the Austrian words, and would like their own language to be portrayed in their literature. Contesting the removal of Austrian words in favor of GSG words can also be applied to defining one’s identity through othering, as Austrian authors want their own lexicon to be included in their works instead of “the other’s” words. The necessary fight against “the other” (in this case, the GSG lexicon) serves as a strengthening factor in Austrian linguistic identity.

Although the defense of ASG can strengthen Austrian linguistic identity, these types of situations (in which GSG is viewed as the correct variety) can also lead to greater feelings of linguistic schizophrenia. For instance, speaking ASG instead of GSG can cause problems for Austrian teachers abroad. In France, for example, secondary school teachers are required to take the CAPES, the required test for teaching in France.

When Austrian teachers took the test, however, they were told that they would need to speak with a northern German accent in order to pass the exam. The reason for this was that their Austrian accents were deemed to be “dialect” and not appropriate for teaching German in the French school system (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 80). The fact that the Austrian teachers were forced to change their speaking habits, habits which are accepted as standard in Austria, in order to be allowed to teach their own language in a foreign country, exemplifies the idea that academics abroad do not view ASG as an acceptable language variety. This requirement of speaking GSG communicates to Austrians the idea that their own language variety is not respected in other countries, an opinion which further contributes to feelings of linguistic schizophrenia.

Students studying German in foreign countries have also run into problems with ASG. For instance, in September 1995, a Swedish university student in Britain came close to failing her German final exams because she spoke ASG. In the end, however, the professors reluctantly decided to accept her variety of German because she was consistent in her language usage (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 80). However, the fact that her German language skills were questioned because she spoke ASG instead of GSG further exemplifies the fact that many academics feel that ASG is not an equal variety to GSG. These types of experiences may discourage students from learning ASG, as they are likely to encounter some difficulties when choosing to learn ASG instead of GSG. In fact, many people believe that although Austria is a beautiful country steeped in culture, it is not a place where one has the opportunity to learn “richtiges Deutsch” (de Cillia 128). This negative opinion of ASG was confirmed in 1991 when the Fessel-Institut sent out a survey to eastern European countries, posing the question, “Was würden Sie lieber lernen, österreichisches, deutsches, oder Schweizer

Deutsch?” While 28-52% of those polled answered “deutsches Deutsch,” only 7-14% answered “österreichisches Deutsch” and 0-1% answered “Schweizer Deutsch” (de Cillia 129). These results, although disheartening for Austrian and Swiss Standard German, come as no surprise, as students have realized that GSG is the language variety viewed as the norm and that more people know or have learned GSG than ASG, a fact which allows for a wider circle of communication. Students’ view of GSG as the norm is confirmed in an article by Victoria Martin, who completed a study on British students who studied abroad in Austria for a year, after which they were required to take a final examination in Britain. She states:

Einige jedoch berichteten von einem ‘Verfallen’ in die österreichische Sprechweise, wenn sie während der Prüfung unter Druck gesetzt wurden. Hier tritt die Bewertung des österreichischen Deutsch als eine Variante mit niederem Status deutlich hervor. Die mündliche Prüfung an den britischen Hochschulen wird im gehobensten sprachlichen Register geführt, und es herrscht offensichtlich die Meinung, daß die österreichische Sprechweise eben nicht gehoben genug, d.h. dieser Situation nicht angemessen sei.

(Martin 137)

Stating that using ASG is a “lapse” (“Verfallen”) indicates that these British students think of ASG as a lower variety than GSG. This idea was further exemplified by the fact that many of the British students who had studied in Austria spoke of feelings of “language inferiority” in comparison to the students who had studied abroad in Germany and learned the “correct German” (139).

Finally, the view of GSG as a superior variety of German is conveyed by German language dictionaries, which also lead to the recognition of GSG as *the* correct variety. Duden dictionaries, for example, clearly portray the language of northern and central

Germany as the standard, as the northern and central German words are not marked as “Standard German” or “Northern/Central German,” but simply left unmarked. However, all southern German, Austrian Standard German, and Swiss Standard German words are followed by a description of which regions in which the word is in use. This description signals to the user of the dictionary that the word is not widely used and subtly urges them to look for a more standard unmarked form of the word (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 97). Since GSG words are the only words left unmarked, the Duden dictionary does not represent a dictionary for the entire German language, but rather for the “German German” language (Ammon 116). According to Ammon, this lack of concern for equality among the language varieties shows an editors’ prejudice for their own language (GSG), as these editors see no need to define the linguistic boundaries of GSG (116). Muhr agrees with the fact that the Duden dictionary is biased towards GSG, stating, “Es ist nicht akzeptabel, daß nur die spezifischen Varianten der A(nderen) Nationen markiert werden, der D-(ominierenden) Nation aber nicht” (97). If the Duden dictionary were merely a dictionary for Germany, it would be considered acceptable for the editors to mark the Austrian and Swiss words and leave the GSG words unmarked. This is, in fact, what the *Österreichisches Wörterbuch*, a dictionary for ASG, does to non-Austrian words. However, the Duden dictionary is a dictionary for the entire German-speaking realm, and as such should show no bias towards a language variety of any certain country. Muhr’s solution to this GSG bias would be to leave all the “(All)Gemeindeutsch” words, which are in regular use in Germany, Austria, and Switzerland unmarked, and then have the other words, which are specific to one of the three regions, asterisked with an explanation of where they are in use (98). This solution would help dictionaries to display equality towards all three variations of German.

Although the apparent foreign preference to GSG as the norm may cause feelings of linguistic schizophrenia, many Austrians have nevertheless taken measures to defend and promote the Austrian language variety, demonstrating self-assurance in the language, as well as a sense of linguistic identity. For example, although the Standard Duden Dictionary is accepted in Austria, in recent years Austrians have strived to distinguish themselves from Germany by publishing their own reference works. As previously stated, the first edition of the *Österreichisches Wörterbuch* was published in 1951, consisting of many word forms specifically attributed to ASG. The preface of the dictionary states, “Das Österreichische Wörterbuch ist ein Wörterbuch der guten, richtigen deutschen Gemeinsprache” (Pollak 19), exemplifying the idea that Austrians believe their language to be a “proper” form of German. In 1979, with the publication of the thirty-fifth edition, Austrians strove to further differentiate themselves from the Germans, asterisking about 120 words that were regarded as GSG (Russ 61), or “binnendeutsch,” as the dictionary described. The dictionary did not include all GSG words, but merely the words that were already in use in Austria (Ammon 115). This edition also included a significant increase in Austrian colloquial and dialect words, which were, for the most part, not marked as such (Russ 61).

However, the reactions to the thirty-fifth edition were somewhat critical. Many believed the dictionary, which was anonymously edited, to be a form of linguistic planning and an expression of egalitarian and separatist approaches to language. Most felt that the dictionary had taken things too far. In 1983, linguist Ingo Reiffenstein stated that he felt that there were two contradictory strands within the dictionary, a separatist strand and a progressive linguistic planning strand. The separatist strand, Reiffenstein said, placed too much emphasis on the Austrian part of the vocabulary by listing older dialect material, while the progressive linguistic planning strand strove to promote

colloquial items to standard status. This edition was also criticized for favoring the Viennese dialect over other regional varieties of Austria. Because of the high level of criticism of the thirty-fifth edition, the thirty-sixth edition backtracked on the new developments, including by incorporating stylistic labels, particularly of colloquial language forms (Russ 62).

Ulrich Ammon believes that the special marking of GSG words in the *Österreichisches Wörterbuch* is a type of linguistic purism, also known as linguistic protectionism. By asterisking the non-ASG words, the dictionary conveys the idea that the ASG word should be “protected,” and subtly urges users to employ the non-asterisked version of a word. Ammon explains that language protectionism is typical in a region whose language has a lower contact status than another region whose language (or language variety in the case of Austria and Germany) has a higher contact status (115). Nevertheless, the publication of an Austrian language dictionary portrays confidence and a sense of identity with the language. This sense of identity is enhanced by the fact that Austrians can contrast their language against GSG, as they are able to portray ASG as its own unique language variety that is able to be used in the same situations as GSG.

Another step taken to promote ASG occurred in 1995 with the accession of Austria into the European Union. As a result of the determined efforts of Austrian politicians, twenty-three agricultural terms were given protected status in Protocol Number 10 in the accession treaty, meaning that these words were to be valued on the same level as their German equivalents and could be marketed under the Austrian names in Austria (de Cillia 121).⁵ Before the treaty, many Austrians were afraid that if certain

⁵ Protocol Nr. 10: “The specific Austrian terms of the German language contained in the Austrian legal order and listed in the Annex to this Protocol shall have the same status and may be used with the same legal effect as the corresponding terms used in Germany listed in that Annex” (European Union).

Austrian words were not protected, these products would not be able to be marketed under the Austrian names in the European Economic Community (125). Markus Klingler discussed this idea in his 1993 article in *Economy-Fachmagazin*, stating, “Auch in Zukunft kann der österreichisch Hersteller seine ‘Marillenmarmelade’ auf dem inländischen Markt unterbringen, ohne beanstandet zu werden, eine ‘Praline’ nach EG-Jargon kann für Österreich weiterhin ein ‘Schokoladenkonfekt’ bleiben” (qtd. in de Cillia 125).

With the addition of Protocol Number 10 to the accession treaty, the “safety” of twenty three ASG words was assured. Some of the words protected in the treaty include *Melanzani* (GSG: *Aubergine*), *Marillen* (GSG: *Aprikosen*), *Fisolen* (GSG: *Grüne Bohnen*), *Erdäpfel* (GSG: *Kartoffeln*), *Paradeiser* (GSG: *Tomaten*), *Topfen* (GSG: *Quark*), *Weichseln* (GSG: *Sauerkirchen*), and *Eierschwammerl* (GSG: *Pfifferlinge*) (130).⁶ However, while Austrian politicians viewed this movement as a great success, the media took a different viewpoint (121). Protocol Number 10 was highly criticized because it included only twenty-three words out of the vast ASG lexicon, omitting other widely used words such as *Palatschinke*, *Beuschel*, and *Burenwurst* (124). This criticism, as well as the effort on the part of the politicians, who fought for their cause with slogans such as “Erdäpfelsalat bleibt Erdäpfelsalat” (121), to protect their language, demonstrates a strong sense of linguistic identity. The fact that the Austrian names for certain items may have been threatened gave Austrians the opportunity to express confidence in their linguistic identity, as they needed to fight for their language in order for some parts of the

“In the German language version of new legal acts the specific Austrian terms mentioned in the Annex to this Protocol shall be added in appropriate form to the corresponding terms used in Germany” (European Union).

⁶ The complete list of words in Protocol Nr. 10 includes: Beiried, Eierschwammerl, Erdäpfel, Faschiertes, Fisolen, Grammeln, Hüferl, Karfiol, Kohlsprossen, Kren, Melanzani, Marillen, Nuß, Obers, Paradeiser, Powidl, Ribisel, Rostbraten, Schlögel, Topfen, Vogerlsalat, Weichseln (de Cillia 130).

lexicon to remain alive. Once again, the concept of defining one's self against an "other" comes into discussion. With the possibility of the advancement of more GSG words into the Austrian market, the concept of the Austrian linguistic identity was able to be defined more sharply, as it was contrasted against the possible influx of a GSG lexicon.

Another step which has been taken to promote ASG is a separate Austrian certificate for *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* (de Cillia 129). This separate certificate, known as the "Österreichisches Sprachdiplom Deutsch," was established in 1992 by a working group headed by Dr. Robert Saxer at the University of Klagenfurt. The ÖSD exam, of which 20,000 now take place per year ("Österreichisches Sprachdiplom Deutsch"), helps to promote ASG as a standard language in countries outside of Austria and contributes to the prestige of ASG around the world. Some of the goals of a separate ASG certificate include the following:

Das ÖSD will strukturelle Hilfen im Zusammenhang mit der Ausbildung und Integration ausländischer SchülerInnen anbieten. Es will also auch auf die spezifischen innerstaatlichen Gegebenheiten Österreichs in Bildung und Ausbildung (Bildungssektor) DaF/DaZ wirken...Das ÖSD zielt auf die Vermittlung einer multiregionalen Sprachkompetenz der deutschen Standardsprache ab und will dem österreichischen Deutsch den entsprechenden Stellenwert im DaF-Unterricht geben. Denn die sprachlichen Unterschiede zwischen dem österreichischen (bzw. dem schweizerischen) Deutsch und dem sog. Binnendeutschen Raum haben bisher keine ausreichende Beachtung gefunden, was zu einer einseitigen Ausrichtung des DaF-Unterrichts anhand binnendeutscher Normen führte. (qtd. in Muhr "Das neue Österreichische Sprachdiplom" 133)

The creation of the *Österreichisches Sprachdiplom Deutsch* is a step in the process of achieving the recognition of ASG as a norm equal to GSG, and the fact that the founders of the ÖSD are fighting for this further exemplifies the idea that language plays a significant role in Austrian identity. By demonstrating that ASG can have a different certification than GSG, the concept of ASG as a different, unique variety from GSG is strengthened.

Finally, there have also been steps taken to promote ASG and Austrian dialects in the media of Austria. With an increase of television shows, films, and songs in dialect, the Austrian media is ensuring that the Austria language remains alive. The use of ASG and dialect in the media will be discussed in greater detail in the next chapter.

In conclusion, ASG is still struggling for a recognized place among the standard languages of the world. Since it is not formally recognized as a standard, many Austrians often experience feelings of linguistic schizophrenia, believing that the language one does not normally speak (i.e. GSG) is superior to the way in which one does normally speak (i.e. ASG or Austrian dialect). However, in the past few decades, there have been multiple steps taken to promote ASG and Austrian dialect, including the creation of an Austrian language dictionary, the protection of certain Austrian lexical items in the EU accession treaty, and the establishment of a separate Austrian certificate for *Deutsch als Fremdsprache*. These measures demonstrate that many Austrians are willing to defend their language and fight to give it a recognized place in the outside world. This exemplifies a sense of confidence and self-assurance in the language, as well as a strong sense of linguistic identity. These feelings will be further explored in the next chapter through the use of media in Austria.

CHAPTER IV: “DA BIN I HER, DA G’HÖR’ I HIN”: LANGUAGE USAGE IN AUSTRIAN MEDIA

The use, as well as the portrayal, of ASG and Austrian dialects in the media exemplifies feelings of Austrian identity. In the following section, I will examine how Austrian identity is expressed through various forms of media in Austria. First, I will show how GSG has become more common in the television programs and radio shows in Austria throughout the last decades. I will also discuss how this increase in exposure to GSG has affected the language of ASG speakers. Next, I will examine the use of Austrian dialects in television in Austria, as well as how the use of language in these series helps to promote stronger feelings of self-assurance in the language one speaks. Finally, I will look at the Austropop movement in Austria, providing examples of how musicians express the Austrian identity through songs in Austrian dialect, looking particularly at Rainhard Fendrich’s popular song “I am from Austria.”

Media significantly influences language in the world today. With a television in most households, two different language groups must no longer come into contact with each other in order for linguistic changes to take place in a society. Since television stations may broadcast shows nationally or even worldwide, those who live thousands of miles apart may hear the same pronunciations, words, and phrases through television programs. Television has thus resulted in a new type of language contact, simply requiring the press of a button to be confronted with a certain language variety.

This new type of language contact increased in the late 1980s in Austria, corresponding to the introduction of the private television into the household and the broadcasting of German television programs over satellite and cable. These new events greatly increased many Austrians’ exposure to GSG, since German programs could be received in almost every Austrian home. Muhr argues that this increased media exposure

to GSG since the late 1980s has affected the word choice of ASG speakers. He bases this claim on a study completed in 1995, in which he surveyed Austrian youth (groups of 16-18 year-olds and groups of 10 year-olds) on their language usage and amount of television watched. He discovered that the groups of children, all of whom used GSG expressions when speaking (as opposed to their ASG equivalents), watched up to 10 hours of television per weekend day, 90% of which was broadcast in GSG (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 89). Consequently, writes Muhr, “Unter Druck stehen von dort her alle österreichischen Sprachmerkmale, die in direkter Opposition zu den bundesdeutschen Formen stehen” (88). Some words and phrases the children used during the study included GSG *anfassen* instead of ASG *angreifen*, GSG *der Service* instead of ASG *das Service*, GSG *die Akte* instead of ASG *der Akt*, and, in the realm of grammar, using *haben* with *stehen*, *liegen*, and *sitzen* (GSG) instead of *sein* (ASG). In fact, Muhr claims, due to the high amount of television programs in GSG today, many Austrian children are no longer even aware of the fact that the ASG phrase is *ist gelegen* instead of *hat gelegen*. When questioned about their high usage of GSG phrases, the children simply replied, “Man hört es ja immer im Fernsehen” (88), thus exemplifying the idea that the amount of GSG on television affects the language choices of children. These results are not surprising, as it is common that when one is exposed to particular words and phrases on a regular basis, one begins to employ these words him or herself. Children, especially, are prone to repeat what they hear, a fact exemplified by many parents carefully monitoring the television shows their children watch so that their children do not begin to use offensive words. Since many people imitate words and phrases they hear on a regular basis, it is to be expected that when the number of GSG words and expressions on Austrian television increases, Austrian use of GSG words and expressions will also increase. Muhr states that he has also observed many middle-aged

adults using more GSG phrases, claiming that the amount of GSG on television does not only affect children, but older people as well (88).

Muhr also discusses the role radio has played in influencing the usage of GSG in Austria in the past decades. Many Austrian radio programs have been taken over by German companies, resulting in Austrian broadcasters using more GSG during these shows. Such GSG words include *Junge* instead of *Bub/Bursch*, *jmd. anmachen* instead of *jmd. aufreißen*, *die Eins* instead of *der Einser*, *anfassen* instead of *angreifen*, *schon/doch mal* instead of *schon/doch einmal*, and *am Morgen* instead of *in der Früh*. These GSG expressions are especially used in radio programs for young people, as well as in *Zeitgeistmagazinen*. Muhr states that the frequency of these words on the radio and in magazines has led to an increased usage of certain GSG words by children and teenagers. This claim is based on his personal observations from 1991-1995 (Muhr, “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich” 87).

The University of Vienna/Klagenfurt University Centre for Intercultural Studies, an organization which has summarized the results of the studies of various academics, supports this idea, stating in a report on the status of ASG:

Der intensive Sprachkontakt besteht vor allem zum Dd. in Form umfangreichen Fernsehkonsums von Sendungen deutscher (Privat-)sender, Über Hörkassetten und Kinderbücher deutscher Herkunft sowie im Bereich der Jugendkultur über die Nachahmung von Sängern und DJs deutscher Herkunft. Nicht unerheblich sind auch die sprachlichen Auswirkungen, die von der Synchronisierung amerikanischer Filme ausgehen. Sie wird ausschließlich von Studios in Norddeutschland durchgeführt. Der intensive mediale Sprachkontakt hat bei dem

meisten österreichischen SprecherInnen zu guten passiven Kenntnissen des DDt. geführt (nicht jedoch umgekehrt) ... Aufgrund von kürzlich erfolgten Untersuchungen konnte festgestellt werden, dass verschiedene Bereiche des ÖDt. seit der Einführung des Satellitenfernsehens sehr stark unter dem Einfluss der DDt. stehen und sich dieser Einfluss vermutlich noch verstärken wird. ("Centre for Intercultural Studies")

Along with the widespread usage of GSG in Austrian television and radio, there are also television shows which portray GSG as the "better" variety in comparison to ASG. One example of such a series is "Kommissar Rex," produced by the Austrian ORF and the German SAT1. The man who plays the head police inspector, an Austrian actor from Tyrol, speaks in GSG, even though the show takes place in Vienna. While this in itself is interesting, even more intriguing is the fact that his subordinates speak ASG or Austrian dialect. There is a clearly marked difference between the boss and his employees, as the boss speaks "proper" German and those under him speak either ASG or Viennese dialect (Muhr, "Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich" 79). As the "lower" characters speak ASG and the more powerful character speaks GSG, the media portrays the idea that GSG is the language variety used by the more successful and powerful people in Austria. The show's viewers then observe that their language is the language used by the subordinate characters, while the more powerful characters use another language variety. "Kommissar Rex" exemplifies the idea that the media sometimes portrays ASG in a negative light.

With the influx of GSG on television, along with some negative portrayals of ASG, the question as to whether the Austrian language is dying out in Austria comes to the surface. Although the Bavarian language group (of which ASG is a member) is threatened, an Austrian sense of linguistic identity is strong. Paradoxically, as German is

becoming more standardized throughout the German speaking realm, more and more people are stepping forward and writing songs or producing television shows in Austrian dialect, which ensures the vitality of their language. The following section will discuss various television shows and songs which portray dialect in a positive manner.

One television show which portrays Austrian dialect positively is “Ein echter Wiener geht nicht unter.” In this 1970s comedy, Austrian actor Karl Merkatz plays the main character Edmund “Mundl” Sackbauer, head of the Sackbauer family. The show follows the everyday lives of the Sackbauers, who live in Vienna’s 10th district, a working-class area. The title itself shows a sense of Austrian identity (or, at the very least, Viennese identity). In English, the title means “A real Viennese person does not give up,” which conveys the idea that the Viennese are determined to succeed, a personality trait of which one can be proud.

“Ein echter Wiener geht nicht unter,” in which the characters speak Viennese dialect, has contributed to the popularity of Viennese dialect phrases throughout the country. Many Austrians, no matter which region they are from, like to use quotes from the characters, such as “mei bier is ned deppat” or “Kriagst glei a Watschn das da 14 Tog da Schädln wögl” (“Mundl.net”). The fact that “Ein echter Wiener geht nicht unter” is in Viennese dialect, yet aired nationwide, exemplifies the idea that a certain regional dialect is not merely a part of that region’s identity. Instead, the specific regional dialect can be viewed as a part of *all* the Austrian dialects, thus contributing to the sense of an overall Austrian identity. The national broadcasting of one region’s dialect also conveys the idea that all Austrian dialects are valid languages for formal usage throughout Austria, no matter what the region. As previously discussed, Austrian dialects contain many similar features among themselves, features which allow them to be different from GSG. This

sense of being part of a larger Austrian dialect community provides the opportunity for Austrians to feel that “we” speak this way, while “they” (GSG speakers) do not.

Furthermore, “Ein echter Wiener geht nicht unter” allows Austrians the chance to feel more confident in their language, as it is a well-known, popular television series which employs the language they speak. It is so popular, in fact, that it was made into a film in 2008. Such an expression of Austrian identity through media contributes to the linguistic self-assurance of Austrians, as the use of Austrian dialect as an acceptable language variety (as opposed to only GSG and ASG) can be validated through public media usage of the language.

Another show which expresses Austrian identity through media is “Die Piefke Saga,” written by Austrian screenwriter Felix Mitterer in the early 1990s. Produced by the NDR and the ORF (German and Austrian television stations, respectively), “Die Piefke Saga” is a satire about the relationship between Austrians and Germans. The show specifically focuses on northern German tourists meeting Tyroleans, Austrians who are known for having a rather thick accent. Throughout the various episodes, Mitterer satirizes the linguistic misunderstandings that many northern Germans encounter while in Austria, as well as the stereotypical qualities of both Germans and Austrians. One such example from “Die Piefke Saga,” in which the daughter of the Tyrolean hotel owners is speaking to the northern German couple, is shown below:

Mädchen (Austrian): “Nåcha kennts frühstücken. Die Mama håt scho' an Kaffee gmåcht und a Mûch gibt's a.”

Karl-Friedrich Sattmann (German): “Aha. – Was hat sie gesagt?”

Frau Sattmann (German): “Keine Ahnung, ich komm mir vor wie in Jugoslawien.” (“World Lingo”)

This conversation parodies the fact that Germans are often not able to understand Austrians, and also exemplifies the common Austrian phenomenon of making fun of themselves and their language. Although some might maintain that this display of misunderstanding between Germans and Austrians could foster feelings of inadequacy on the part of Austrian dialect speakers, I would argue that the tendency to make fun of Austrian dialect in the media shows higher levels of self-assurance on the part of Austrians. With the production of “Die Piefke Saga,” it is evident that Austrians are confident enough to make fun of the language they speak and the fact that other people may not be able to understand it. Such satirizing would not take place if feelings of insecurity related to dialect were higher, as one must feel confident in one’s self in order to employ self-mockery. It is also interesting to note that the show was not only aired in Austria, but in Germany as well. The fact that Austrians are willing to make fun of their dialect not only in Austria, but also abroad, demonstrates further levels of self-assurance in Austrian dialect. This appreciation for dialect is further exemplified by the awarding of a *Romy*, an Austrian television prize, to “Die Piefke Saga” (“Ard Video”). “Die Piefke Saga” has also been awarded a German television prize (“fernsehserien.de”),⁷ illustrating the idea that Germans and Austrians alike appreciate the parody of the relationship the two countries share. Through the show’s popularity and honors it has received, we can see that both nations possess enough confidence and self-assurance to make fun of themselves and each other, with no serious feelings of injury on either side.

Another popular show which contributes to the validation of Austrian dialect is “Die Millionen Show,” the Austrian version of “Who Wants to Be a Millionaire?” In this series, Armin Assinger, born and raised in Carinthia, hosts the show using his Carinthian dialect. Speaking in a regional dialect as a television host is unusual, as the majority of

⁷ The *Adolf-Grimme-Preis*

professional moderators speak GSG or ASG. Since “Die Millionen Show” is an “intellectual” type of show, the expectations that the moderator will use GSG or ASG are even higher, as GSG and ASG are viewed as more “intellectual” language varieties than dialect. However, Assinger goes against the expectations of the audience and uses a regional dialect on the series. He explains that he speaks “Kärntnerisch” in order to preserve his culture, a goal which also demonstrates self-assurance in the Austrian language. Since Assinger speaks in dialect on such an “intellectual” show, this program demonstrates to Austrians that dialect can be used in more formal situations. It also provides further validation of the language normally reserved for only family and friends, since it is now used on a more formal, knowledge-oriented game show. Furthermore, as Assinger uses Carinthian dialect, which is specific only to Carinthia, on a nationally broadcasted show, he conveys the idea that *all* Austrian dialects, no matter where they are spoken, are valid languages for formal usage throughout Austria. Since “Die Millionen Show” is nationally broadcasted, one no longer needs to be in Carinthia to hear the Carinthian dialect-the dialect can go beyond its borders, an idea which increases confidence in Austrian regional dialects as a whole. Assinger’s portrayal of dialect allows for greater feelings of self-assurance in relation to language usage in Austria.

In 2009, Assinger was awarded for his use of Carinthian dialect on the show, winning the prestigious Bairische Sprachwurzel language prize (“Mittelbayerische”). This prize is awarded to one who significantly promotes the Bavarian (*Bairisch*) language group in the public sphere, helping to ensure that the language does not die out (“tz-online.de”). Assinger has also won five Romys for his work in the category of “Beliebtester Show- und Talkmaster” (“ORF.at”). The numerous honors Assinger has received for his use of the Carinthian dialect demonstrate that many Austrians (and even

Bavarians) value the Austrian language and want to reward those who promote Austrian dialects.

A sense of linguistic identity is further expressed by Austrian musicians who make use of dialect words and phrases in their lyrics. Many of these musicians are considered to be part of the Austropop movement, a genre of pop music by Austrian musicians. The movement is said to have been started by Marianne Mendt and Wolfgang Ambros in the early 1970s with the release of their songs “Glock’n” (Mendt) and “Da Hofa” (Ambros). Although many of the songs in the Austropop movement are written in Austrian dialect, there are also a number of songs written partly in GSG and even in English. Their lyrics, however, all deal with Austria and the Austrian people (“Infoplattform wissenswertes.at”), which in itself shows a sense of Austrian identity.

Rainhard Jürgen Fendrich, an Austrian singer from Vienna, has written many popular songs of the Austropop movement. In 1985, Fendrich won the Amadeus Award (an Austrian music award) in the category of “Best Composer,” exemplifying that his work was appreciated by the Austrian public. In 1997, his album “Blond” rose to number one on the Austrian charts and remained there for weeks. Furthermore, in the fall of that year, when Fendrich went on tour, his concerts sold over 170,000 tickets (“laut.de”), an additional sign of his immense popularity in Austria. An excerpt of Fendrich’s most famous song, “I am from Austria,” is shown below:

Da kann ma’ machen was ma’ will,
da bin i her, da g’hör’ i hin,
da schmilzt das Eis von meiner Seel’
wie von an Gletscher im April.
Auch wenn wir’s schon vergessen hab’n,
i bin dei Apfel, du mein Stamm. (Schinko)

“I am from Austria” is a prime example of Austrian identity expression. The lyrics speak of what it means to be Austrian—of how the country is in one’s blood and how Austria is simply where the singer belongs. At the end of the song, the singer expresses that he is incredibly proud of Austria and the Austrian identity, as shown with the lyrics: “sog i am End der Wöt voi Stolz...I am from Austria.” Fendrich’s lyrics portray high levels of Austrian identity. In fact, “I am from Austria” is said by many to be the unofficial national anthem of Austria, and it is played frequently throughout the country.

The fact that the song is written in dialect further validates an Austrian sense of identity. By using the everyday language of the people, Fendrich is showing that Austrians should value the language they speak. Moreover, the use of dialect in the song allows for the portrayal of a more intimate and more personal feeling for the listener, as dialect is the language variety usually reserved for family and friends. Dialect usage allows Austrians to feel more connected to the song and the sentiments associated with it.

One unique aspect of this song is that the title and main line (“I am from Austria”) are in English. Most songs which express feelings of identity with one’s country usually employ the language of that specific country; however, Fendrich chooses to use English for the most important part of the song. As “I am from Austria” enjoys immense popularity throughout the country, it seems that most Austrians do not have anything against the English title. In fact, many often quote the title itself, as shown through various comments on the song’s YouTube page. Austrians have written comments such as “jawoi:) i bi stoiz drauf das i a richtiger Österreicher bin:) *Im from Austria*,” “wer lieber strand und palmen hat, ist nur zu faul auf einen berg zu gehen. *I am from Austria*,” and “der Reinhard Fendrich hat mit diesem Lied was ausserordentlich wunderbares zusammengebracht. mich reisst dieses Lied, dieser Text, diese Melodie auch immer mit, wenn ich es höre, es ist tatsächlich sowas wie die heimliche Nationalhyme Österreichs. *I*

am from Austria :)” (“Rainhard Fendrich- I am from Austria”). The repetition of the song’s most famous line throughout Austrian listeners’ comments exemplifies the fact that many Austrians are proud of their nationality, and it does not bother them that this line is in English. Most visitors to the song’s YouTube pages have written positive comments about the song, and, if the title is mentioned, it is simply to exclaim “I am from Austria” in a proud manner.

Although one could argue that the English title and the Austrian support of it illustrate the globalization of the English language, I would also point out that the use of English in an otherwise dialect song shows confidence in the Austrian language itself. Austrian dialect no longer needs to be isolated in order to “stay alive”; on the contrary, there is now enough self-assurance in the language to feel that Austrian dialect can be equal to English and that one can have both strong local and global identities, as demonstrated by the fact that both a local and a global language are used in the song. This shows a maturing on the part of Austrian dialect, as it has moved away from conservatism and is now proudly expressed on equal footing with the English language. Furthermore, the use of English makes the song’s main message understandable for an international audience, allowing Austrians to express their pride in their country to non-dialect speakers around the world.

Through the use of dialect in pop and rock music, the concept of Austrian dialect as a part of one’s identity is becoming more popular among younger generations. While dialect has frequently been employed in more traditional, old-fashioned settings, Austropop artists such as Rainhard Fendrich, Wolfgang Ambros, Roland Neuwirth, STS, and Hubert von Goisern have contributed to the perception of dialect as something modern and hip. Although this movement does have stereotypical traditional elements (i.e. Neuwirth uses traditional “Wienerlieder” in his works), it goes beyond normal

conservative traditions by setting dialect to modern music. With the use of dialect in popular music genres, younger generations of Austrians are able to feel more connected to what has been previously viewed as old-fashioned, conservative Austrian tradition.

German Standard German, Austrian Standard German, and Austrian dialect are all prevalent in the Austrian media today. With a high number of television and radio shows in GSG, the lexical choices of Austrians have changed in the past years. However, Austrian dialects also play a major role in Austrian media, which contributes to the validation of Austrian dialect as a legitimate language variety. Through the portrayal of Austrian dialect in the media, Austrians have the chance to see the language they use in everyday life expressed in modern popular culture, which increases the levels of self-assurance in relation to language usage in Austria. Furthermore, the question of dialect as a significant part of one's identity is no longer only a question which simply concerns old-fashioned, traditional venues in Austria, but rather a question which all generations, youth included, now deem to be important. The fact that both young and old alike are interested in the question of an Austrian identity exemplifies the idea that this sense of identity is flourishing in Austria today.

CONCLUSION

Throughout history, scholars have compared the smaller state of Austria to the larger state of Germany. According to Wodak, de Cillia, Reisigl, and Liebhart, these comparisons, as well as the fact that the two countries speak the same language, have a significant effect on the concept of an Austrian identity (57). Because Austria is often associated with Germany, Austrians have endeavored to distinguish themselves from their northern neighbor, particularly through language. This distinction is made possible by the fact that GSG provides an “other” against which Austrians can contrast themselves and their language, as Austrians are able to claim that “we” speak ASG or Austrian dialect, while “they” (GSG speakers) do not. This concept of othering helps to strengthen Austrian linguistic identity, offering Austrians the chance to reflect on who they are and the language they speak, particularly in comparison to speakers of GSG.

The concept of othering in relation to Austrian linguistic identity is expressed in a variety of ways. For instance, with the establishment of the Austrian certificate for *Deutsch als Fremdsprache* and the creation of an Austrian language dictionary, Austrians have endeavored to show the world that their language is different from GSG and should be treated as such. Furthermore, by fighting for ASG in both works of literature and through Protocol Number 10, a sense of linguistic pride and self-assurance is expressed, illustrating that Austrians are willing to defend their language in order to give it a recognized place in the outside world. Finally, Austrian linguistic identity is asserted in the Austrian media, with numerous television shows, films, and songs being produced in dialect. With the popularity of these forms of media among the younger generations, the question of linguistic identity has transcended the more traditional, conservative realm of Austrian society, becoming a question that younger Austrians are interested in as well. The use of ASG and Austrian dialect in literature and media, as well as the creation of

reference works and language certificates promoting ASG, helps to distinguish ASG and Austrian dialects from GSG, providing Austrians with means by which to contrast themselves against GSG speakers and strengthening a sense of Austrian identity.

Although there are numerous expressions of Austrian linguistic identity, the fact remains that many Austrians are unsure of the norms of their language, resulting in a sense of linguistic schizophrenia (Muhr, "Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich" 82). Uncertainties abound in the field of Austrian language usage, including which aspects of the language are ASG or GSG, as well as which words only belong to a specific regional dialect or are instead used throughout the whole of Austria. I would argue that as long as these uncertainties exist, the concept of an Austrian linguistic identity cannot develop to its full potential. One cannot feel a sense of identity with a certain aspect of a language if he/she does not know if it is typically Austrian or both Austrian and German. In order for an Austrian sense of linguistic identity to become even stronger, measures must be taken to educate Austrians on the characteristics and norms of ASG and Austrian dialects.

In a 1995 article entitled "Das Österreichische Deutsch in der Diskussion," Peter Wiesinger discusses various ideas for the promotion of Austrian dialects and ASG. Although Wiesinger provides these steps as means to increase the recognition and respect of the language of Austria, his ideas could also be used to strengthen a sense of an Austrian linguistic identity. The measures he lists include the publication of a pronunciation dictionary for ASG and Austrian dialects, as well as the creation of a language atlas and a grammatical dictionary. This dictionary would discuss form, gender, syntax, and other grammatical differences among the different dialects of Austria, in order to convey to the reader which grammatical features are widespread and which are confined to one specific region. Wiesinger also advocates a compilation and explanation of specific Austrian phrases, according to type and area of usage, as well as

more research on the pragmatics of ASG and Austrian dialects. He believes this research would help to explain typical Austrian characteristics in conversations. Furthermore, Wiesinger maintains that the differences between ASG and GSG must be taught in the schools, in order to increase awareness of the characteristics of ASG. He also would like to see ASG-specific language instruction intensified in the school system, as this would allow more people the chance to master the standard language of Austria (Wiesinger, “Das Österreichische Deutsch in der Diskussion” 70). Finally, Wiesinger believes that the Austrian media should increase its usage of ASG by employing the language more often in newspapers, on the radio, on television, and by dubbing foreign films into ASG instead of GSG (71).

If applied, Wiesinger’s ideas could significantly strengthen an Austrian sense of linguistic identity. For instance, an Austrian language atlas and grammar book would allow for more Austrians to be aware of the distribution of the various aspects of language, thus making it known whether a certain word, pronunciation, or grammar aspect is ASG or specific to a certain dialect instead. This knowledge would help to decrease feelings of linguistic schizophrenia, as one could be certain he/she was employing the standard language if a situation called for it. The intensification of ASG language instruction could also contribute to a decrease in feelings of linguistic schizophrenia in Austria, as more people would have the opportunity to master the standard language, thus feeling more confident in their language ability. Another of Wiesinger’s ideas which would contribute to a stronger sense of linguistic identity is the collection and explanation of typical Austrian phrases. By realizing which phrases are typically Austrian, Austrians are provided with further differences between ASG/Austrian dialect and GSG. This knowledge would then contribute to the sense of othering, as Austrians would realize that they make use of specific phrases, but most

Germans do not (perhaps with the exception of those in Bavaria). Education on the differences between GSG and ASG in school would also contribute to the sense of othering, allowing Austrians to realize that “we” (Austrians) say something one way, while “they” (Germans) say it differently. This understanding could then result in a better sense of linguistic identity, as the foil against which Austrians contrast themselves will have been made clearer. Finally, the increase of ASG in the media could also help to strengthen an Austrian sense of linguistic identity. As discussed in chapter four, when one sees the language he/she uses in everyday life expressed in modern popular culture, self-assurance and confidence in one’s language usage can grow stronger. Although a flourishing sense of Austrian linguistic identity exists in the country today, such actions could significantly contribute to strengthening Austrians’ identification with their language.

WORKS CITED

- Ammon, Ulrich. "Vorschläge zur Typologie nationaler Zentren und nationaler Varianten bei plurinationalen Sprachen – am Beispiel des Deutschen." Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen. Ed. Rudolf Muhr, Richard Schrod, Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Verlag Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1995. 110-120.
- "Austropop." Infoplattform wissenswertes.at. N.p., n.d. Web. 15 Feb 2011.
<<http://www.wissenswertes.at/index.php?id=austropop>>.
- Auer, Anita. "Österreichisches Deutsch ist eine *würde*-volle Sprache: The Subjunctive Mood in Eighteenth-Century Austria." 1-20. Web. 13 March 2011.
<<http://www.let.leidenuniv.nl/pdf/luc1/lwpl/4.1/auer.pdf>>.
- "Bayerischer Dialektpreis für einen Österreicher." tz-online.de.
N.p., 10.08.2009. Web. 28 Feb 2011. <<http://www.tz-online.de/aktuelles/bayern/tz-bayerischer-dialektpreis-einen-oesterreicher-440835.html>>.
- Braverman, Sigrun. The City Dialect of Salzburg: A Definition of Dialect in Its Social Reality. Göppingen: Kümmerle Verlag, 1984.
- "Das österreichische Deutsch." Centre for Intercultural Studies. Centre for Intercultural Studies, n.d. Web. 20 Feb 2011.
<<http://www.cis.or.at/enquete/ag9.html>>.
- "Das Österreichische Sprachdiplom Deutsch: Entstehung." Österreichisches Sprachdiplom Deutsch. ÖSD, 2009. Web. 23 Feb 2011.
<<http://www.osd.at/default.aspx?Slid=48&LAid=1>>.
- de Cillia, Rudolf. "Erdäpfelsalat bleibt Erdäpfelsalat: Österreichisches Deutsch und EU Beitritt." Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische,

sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen. Ed. Rudolf Muhr, Richard Schrodtt, Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Verlag Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1995. 121-131.

"Definitions of Othering." University of Texas, n.d. Web. 15 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.cwrl.utexas.edu/~ulrich/rww03/othering.htm>>.

Devrient, Max. "Das österreichische Wissensnetz." Austria-Forum.

Encyclopedia of Austria, n.d. Web. 04 May 2010.

<http://www.aeiou.at/aeiou.encyclop.d/d404705.htm;internal&action=_setlanguage.action?LANGUAGE=en>.

"Die Piefke-Saga." fernsehserien.de. imfernsehen GmbH & Co. KG,

2011. Web. 26 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.fernsehserien.de/index.php?serie=2205>>.

"Die Piefke-Saga." World Lingo. World Lingo, n.d. Web. 25 Feb

2011. <http://www.worldlingo.com/ma/dewiki/de/Die_Piefke-Saga>.

"DVD Die Piefke Saga." Ard Video. Ard Video, 2009. Web. 26 Feb

2011. <<http://www.ardvideo.de/70-d71034-dvd-die-piefke-saga.html>>.

"Ein Echter Wiener Geht Nicht Unter." Mundl.net. N.p., 13.02.2011. Web. 13 Feb

2011. <www.mundl.net>.

European Union. DOCUMENTS concerning the accession of the

Republic of Austria, the Kingdom of Sweden, the Republic of

Finland and the Kingdom of Norway to the European Union

Official Journal C 241 , 29 August 1994. , 1994. Web.

<<http://eurlex.europa.eu/en/treaties/dat/11994N/htm/11994N.html#0370010045>>.

Hornik, Ursula. "Die UI-Mundart." *Der fröhliche Kreis* 56.2 (2006): 10-11. Web. 13 Mar

2011. <<http://www.volkstanz.at/bag/FKkreis/2006/DFK06-2.pdf>>.

"Josef Hader bei Thadeusz- Mein Dialekt." YouTube. Web. 11 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=CJse3vsJ1xc>>.

"Kurier Romy: Der österreichische Filmpreis." ORF.at. ORF, n.d.

Web. 15 Feb 2011. <<http://oe3.orf.at/aktuell/stories/260123/>>.

Loibl, Medea. Interview by Katherine Portnoy. 24 Jan 2011. 2 Mar 2011.

"Nationalism." *Merriam-Webster*. Merriam-Webster, Incorporated, 2011. Web. 12 March

2011. <<http://www.meriam-webster.com/dictionary/nationalism>>.

Martin, Victoria. "Vorurteile und Meinungen zu einem Auslandsjahr in Österreich aus sprachpädagogischer Sicht." *Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen*. Ed. Rudolf Muhr, Richard Schrod, Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Verlag Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1995. 132-140.

Muhr, Rudolf. "Das neue Österreichische Sprachdiplom und andere DaF Zertifikate im Vergleich." *Zagreber Germanistische Beiträge* 3. (1994): 127-139. Web. 25 Feb 2011. <<http://www-oedt.kfunigraz.ac.at/OEDTBIB/054-Muhr-1994-Sprachdiplom.pdf>>.

Muhr, Rudolf. „Grammatische und pragmatische Merkmale des österreichischen Deutsch.“ *Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen*. Ed. Rudolph Muhr, Richard Schrod, Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Verlag Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1995. 208-234.

Muhr, Rudolph. "The Pragmatics of a Pluricentric Language: A Comparison between Austrian German and German

German.” Variational Pragmatics. Ed. Anne Barron, Klaus Schneider,
Philadelphia: John Benjamins B.V., 2008. 211-244.

Muhr, Rudolf. “Zur Sprachsituation in Österreich und zum Begriff
Standardsprache in plurizentrischen Sprachen. Sprache und Identität in
Österreich.” Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und
sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen. Ed. Rudolph
Muhr, Richard Schrodtt, Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Verlag Holder-Pichler-Tempsky,
1995. 75-109.

Pollak, Wolfgang. Was halten die Österreicher von ihrem Deutsch: Eine
sprachpolitische und soziosemiotische Analyse der sprachlichen Identität der
Österreicher. Wien: Institut für Sozio-Semiotische Studien, 1992.

"Rainhard Fendrich - I am from Austria." YouTube. Web. 24 Feb 2011.

<http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=KMSa_xb2h5U>.

"Rainhard Fendrich." laut.de. laut.de, n.d. Web. 14 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.laut.de/Rainhard-Fendrich>>.

Russ, Charles. The German Language Today: A Linguistic Introduction. London:
Routledge, 1994.

Schinko, Peter. "I am from Austria Lyrics." elyrics.net. elyrics.net, n.d. Web. 3 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.elyrics.net/read/r/rainhard-fendrich-lyrics/i-am-from-austria-lyrics.html>>.

"Sprachwurzeln gehen nach Österreich." Mittelbayerische. N.p., 10 08 2009. Web. 14
Feb 2011.

<http://www.mittelbayerische.de/index.cfm?pid=10009&pk=440163&p=1>.

Stapleton, F.G. "The Unpredictable Past: Making Sense of 19th Century
Nationalism." History Today Ltd. (2008): 41-45. Web. 1 Mar 2011.

<<http://media.web.britannica.com/ebsco/pdf/210/34868210.pdf>>.

Swartz, Suzanne. "High German vs. Austrian German." suite101.com. N.p., 10 07 2008.

Web. 19 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.suite101.com/content/high-german-vs-austrian-german-a59954>>.

Wiesinger, Peter. "Das österreichische Deutsch in der Diskussion." Österreichisches Deutsch: Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen. Ed. Rudolf Muhr, Richard Schrod, Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Verlag Holder-Pichler-Tempsky, 1995. 59-75.

Wiesinger, Peter. "Die deutsche Sprache in Österreich. Eine Einführung." Das Österreichische Deutsch. Ed. Peter Wiesinger, Wien: Böhlau Verlag Gesellschaft m.b.H. und Co.KG., 1988. 9-30.

Wodak, Ruth, Rudolf de Cillia, Martin Reisigl, and Liebhart Karin.

The Discursive Construction of National Identity. 2. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2009.

"Woher kommt Ausdruck 'Piefke' für die Deutschen?." wer weiss was.

werweisswas.de, 05 05 2003. Web. 2 Feb 2011.

<<http://www.wer-weiss-was.de/theme138/article1530775.html>>.

APPENDIX



Office of Research Compliance
308A University Hall
Bowling Green, OH 43403-0183
Phone: (419) 372-7716
E-mail: hsrb@bgsu.edu

**HSRB MEMBERSHIP
2010-2011**

Amy Morgan, HSRB Chair
Kinesiology
372-0596
amorgan@bgsu.edu

Mary Hare, HSRB Vice Chair
Psychology
372-2526
mlhare@bgsu.edu

D. Wayne Bell, M.D.
Wood Health Corp.
353-6225
speakingdoc@dacor.net

Cheryl Conley
Alzheimer's Assn., NW Ohio
419-537-1999
conleyc@bgsu.edu

L. Fleming Fallon, Jr., M.D.
Public & Allied Health
372-3136
ffallon@bgsu.edu

Rodney Gabel
Comm. Sciences & Disorders
372-2515
rgabel@bgsu.edu

Hillary Harms
Office of Research Compliance
372-7716
hsrb@bgsu.edu

Lesa Lockford
Theatre & Film
372-9381
lockflo@bgsu.edu

Montana Miller
Popular Culture
372-0184
montanm@bgsu.edu

Jeanne Novak
Intervention Services
372-7293
jnovak@bgsu.edu

Erin Smith
Psychology
372-4396
esmith@bgsu.edu

Marie Tisak
Psychology
372-2273
mtisak@bgsu.edu

December 10, 2010

TO: Katherine Portnoy
GREAL

FROM: Hillary Harms, Ph.D.
HSRB Administrator

RE: HSRB Project No.: H11T074GE7

TITLE: *Austrian German: A Question of Identity through Language*

You have met the conditions for approval for your project involving human subjects. **As of December 10, 2010, your project has been granted final approval by the Human Subjects Review Board (HSRB). This approval expires on October 28, 2011.** You may proceed with subject recruitment and data collection.

The final approved version of the consent document(s) is attached. Consistent with federal OHRP guidance to IRBs, the consent document(s) bearing the HSRB approval/expiration date stamp is the **only** valid version and you **must** use copies of the date-stamped document(s) in obtaining consent from research subjects.

You are responsible to conduct the study as approved by the HSRB and to use only approved forms. If you seek to make any changes in your project activities or procedures (including increases in the number of participants), please send a request for modifications immediately to the HSRB via this office. Please notify me, in writing (or email: hsrb@bgsu.edu) upon completion of your project.

Good luck with your work. Let me know if this office or the HSRB can be of assistance as your project proceeds.

Comments/ Modifications:

Stamped consent form is coming to you via campus mail.

c: Dr. Geoffrey Howes

Research Category: EXPEDITED #7

Interview Questions

1. Which variety of German did you speak with your family as a child?
2. Which variety of German did you speak in elementary school? Did this change as you got older?
3. Was it discouraged to speak Austrian German at school?
4. Which variety of German did your teachers speak at school?
5. If you have applied for a job, which variety of German did you speak in the interviewing process? Why?
6. Do you often find yourself switching back and forth between Austrian German and High German?
7. Have you ever been in a situation where you were embarrassed of speaking Austrian German?
8. Do you have to concentrate on speaking High German instead of Austrian German?
9. How do you feel Austrian German is portrayed in Austrian media and literature?
10. How do you feel Austrian German is portrayed around the world, specifically in other German-speaking countries?
11. Do you feel that speaking Austrian German affects your identity? If so, how?

Interview with Medea Loibl

1. As a child I spoke proper German. Although my parents used dialect in their private conversations they used proper German when talking to us. I spoke proper German only when I entered primary school. I attended kindergarten (3-5) in a neighboring town and there again only proper German was used. I attended primary school in my home village and I guess at this time I started to use dialect when talking to my class mates. They did not attend kindergarten in town but in our small village and I guess there they were more confronted with dialect. Also, their parents might not have used proper German with their education.
2. As already mentioned above when entering primary school I was mainly speaking proper German. Very soon I became fluent in both proper German and dialect. I spoke dialect mainly with my class mates in school breaks or on play dates. But I still had friends from kindergarten with whom I spoke proper German only. When I got older I started to use more and more dialect. I only used proper German in class (Referate, Stundenwiederholungen etc.).
3. I have to say that is interesting question. Austrian German was the only German I knew when I was a child. I think I was not really aware that there exists also German German until I was maybe at Gymnasium and we finally got cable TV. My family got cable TV very late so most of the time I was confronted with Austrian German only.
4. My primary school teacher tried to speak proper German and did so most of the time. Since they were local people they sometimes tended to use also dialect - but that was rather rare. At Gymnasium all my teachers used proper German in class and they hardly ever switched to dialect. Out of class they tended sometimes to use a more colloquial language - a mixture of dialect and proper German.

5. In an interviewing process I certainly always used proper German. Dialect is not appropriate for job interviews. Although I think it is of advantage to be able to use both dialect and proper German, using dialect at a job interview is a no go!
6. Well here is my question: how do you define High German? For me proper German or High German is Austrian German! This is the language I grew up with - it is my native language! The only time I really have to use German German is when teaching German. Still I cannot really get used to speak German German and use typical German German phrases. Let me give you an example: how does it makes you feel if you suddenly should talk with an British English accent and you are asked to use typical British English words instead of you American English words you are more used to and more familiar with?
7. I have never been embarrassed of speaking Austrian German! It happened to me several times when around people from Germany that they make fun of my Austrian accent and that they try to ridicule it. One German girl from Munich, she only spoke German German and had no Bavarian dialect at all, made me say typical Austrian word, because she loved the sound of it so much. She asked me to teach her how to say "lewand" so that it sounds really Austrian. Being ridiculed for my language did not embarrass me. This might sound strange but I was somehow proud to be different. I have the advantage to be fluent in both German German and Austrian German. This is mainly due to the several German TV stations. German German speakers do not have this advantage. If I do not want to be understood by Germans I just use very broad dialect. This always works! ;-)
8. I definitely do not have to concentrate when speaking High German. I guess this is due to my education as a child, when I only spoke High German.

9. I do not know how Austrian German is portrayed in Austrian media and literature. If the media is Austrian, or the novel is written by an Austrian it is the language they would use. I do not know if I ever came across an Austrian author that wrote in German German and used typical German German terms. If so I might feel that she or he is trying to hide where she or he is originally coming from or just trying to make more money by reaching the German market as well. I would say that the Austrian media is using Austrian German. The news presenters on ORF are definitely using Austrian German - you can tell that from the "Zeitenfolge". German German speakers use a different "Zeitenfolge" as we Austrians do.
10. I do not think that Austrian German is portrayed so much around the world. My experience is that the Austrian and Swiss German are always presented as variations of proper or High German. In one textbook I had to use in Scotland there were only two pages with a large headline saying: "So sagt man in Österreich und der Schweiz...". I think that Austrians are maybe more aware of the language differences between Austrian and German German than Germans are. I guess it would be interesting to ask a German how Austrian German is portrayed in Germany. For me as Austrian this is hard to tell. Furthermore I have no experiences of school in Germany and how the German language is presented to students. The only experience I have is with non German speakers.
11. Austrian German has definitely an effect on my identity. I think you already got an insight when reading through all my answers. Austrian German is a major part of who I am. This is the language I learned as a child, my native language. I like languages and I especially like Austrian German. Austria is a very small country but it has very broad variety of dialects. It is interesting to find out just by listening to people speak where they are from. Let me tell you a short story about

Claudia and her German: in the very first weeks I asked where about she is from in upper Austria. Claudia reacted somehow upset and said: How do you know I am from upper Austria? And is said, that it is very obvious, just by certain words she uses, by how she pronounces certain words etc. Again Claudia reacted upset and said: All my friends say I have a Viennese accent when speaking German! I lived in Vienna for the past 10 years and I now am using more the Viennese dialect. I replied, that maybe her friends in upper Austria might say so, because she is no more using a maybe broader dialect she might have had before she left for Vienna. She was not very happy about this answer and insisted that she is using the Viennese dialect. We changed topics and went on in our conversation and suddenly she said the sentence: “Des hot er mir vazöht!” (“This is what he told me!”) And I asked her: “Wos hot er dir VAzöht?” Nobody coming from Vienna would use VAzöht they would rather say DAzöht. I forgot why I told you this story - maybe to show you that there are even differences in the appreciation of certain dialects within Austria. Having a strong accent when speaking High German is still something that should not occur in academics. Also having an accent from a very rural area might not be appreciated as well as having a rather posh Viennese accent.

Interview with Samuel Deore

1. High German.
2. High German.
3. Yes, teachers wanted us to speak in High German, especially when we had to conduct a presentation.
4. Most of them used High German. I went to school in the city of Salzburg, where it is more common to speak High German
5. Mostly High German. But if my interviewer spoke dialect I usually switched to dialect as well.
6. Yes!
7. Sometimes people make fun of the dialect, but usually it is funny for me too ;-)
So, usually it is not embarrassing for me to speak Austrian German. But usually I speak High German with people who speak High German as well.
8. No, usually not, because my mother always spoke in High German, when she was talking to me, despite she spoke Austrian German with other people.
9. I like Austrian movies, where people talk in Austrian German. And I think there are a good variety of Austrian movies in Austrian German and I think some of the movies are quite popular in Austria. Also in literature there are writers who write in Austrian German like Ernst Jandl.
10. In Germany some people make fun of the Austrian German, but some people like it. But I think it is regarded as part of the Austrian culture, which finally also attracts many tourists.
11. I think everything what we do and what we think affects our personality. So I believe that language and even Austrian German influences us. Since language is

the way we interact with other people even small differences in language can influence our behavior and therefore have an impact on our identity. But I don't regard Austrian German as a major part of my personality. Maybe because I grew up talking High German.

Interview with Markus Schober

1. Meine ganze Familie kommt aus derselben Gegend und deshalb sprechen wir alle den gleichen österreichischen Dialekt.
2. In der Volksschule sprachen alle im Dialekt. Es kamen auch alle Schüler aus dem selben Ort wodurch es keine anderen Einflüsse gab. Auch später änderte sich die Sprache unter den Mitschülern nicht.
3. Es war in allen Schulen die ich besuchte normal Dialekt zu sprechen. Einzige Ausnahmen waren Präsentationen im Deutschunterricht wo wir meistens angehalten waren, hochdeutsch zu sprechen.
4. Die meisten Lehrer die ich hatte, sprachen im Dialekt. Dies war in allen Schulstufen so. Ausnahme gab es manches Mal im Deutschunterricht, wo Hochdeutsch nötig war um etwas zu erklären oder zu verdeutlichen.
5. Bei meiner ersten Bewerbung um eine Lehrstelle kannte ich den Chef bereits persönlich und es war selbstverständlich, dass wir im Dialekt kommunizierten. Bei einer anderen Bewerbung in einer großen Firma stellte sich der Chef auch bereits mit Dialekt vor, weshalb wir auch Dialekt sprachen. Jedoch war dieses Interview etwas förmlicher und ich betonte vereinzelt Wörter in Hochdeutsch anstatt im Dialekt.
6. Normalerweise ist ein wechseln nicht nötig. Wenn der Kommunikationspartner nur Hochdeutsch versteht bleibe ich im Hochdeutsch, andernfalls im Dialekt.
7. Nein da ich ansonsten Hochdeutsch spreche wenn es sein muss.
8. Wenn ich nur selten Hochdeutsch spreche, fällt es schwerer fließend zu sprechen, weil im Dialekt oft andere Wörter verwendet werden. Es fällt mir einfacher Hochdeutsch zu sprechen wenn ich gerade deutsche Literatur lese oder gelesen habe.

9. In Österreich wird in den Medien Hochdeutsch geschrieben bzw. gesprochen.
Allerdings kommt es vor allem im österreichischen Fernsehen oft vor, dass Kommentatoren Mundart sprechen was sehr authentisch und sympathisch wirkt.
10. Ich glaube nicht, dass viele Menschen eine Ahnung vom österreichischen Dialekt haben bzw. nicht wissen dass es ihn gibt. Da es bereits innerhalb Österreichs sehr unterschiedliche Dialekte gibt die je nach angrenzendem Land bereits stark beeinflusst werden, glaube ich nicht, dass man für andere deutschsprachige Länder eine pauschale Aussage darüber treffen kann.
11. Ich glaube schon, dass die Sprache Einfluß auf die Persönlichkeit hat. Gerade im Umgang mit anderen Menschen macht es für mich einen Unterschied ob die verwendete Sprache sehr direkt oder eher formell gesprochen wird. In diese Richtung entwickelt man sich auch selbst. Dies fällt mir vorallem auf, wenn ich mich in einer anderen Sprache nicht so ausdrücken kann, wie ich es im Dialekt gemacht hätte.