

**Фольман Ральф**

доктор филологических наук, профессор  
Университет Граца  
Грац, Австрия

**Ralph Vollmann**

Habilitated Doctor of Philology, Professor  
University of Graz  
Graz, Austria  
vollmannr@gmail.com

## STANDARD LANGUAGE AND DIALECT IN AUSTRIA

The German language in Austria is known for a number of particular features based on the local dialects and their interaction with Standard German. The speakers are competent to apply linguistic variation to their speech in an interplay between dialectal and standard forms. For the description of the “mixing” of the two extremes for producing actual speech, it is useful to apply the sociophonological model of input-switch rules intervening between two (or more) alternative forms (variable rules). Ranging from dialect and urban speakers across L1 and L2 learning of Austrian German to the use of dialect in mass media, we show that the delicate choice of ISR variables helps explain how sociopragmatic meaning is generated through the application of variation. At the same time, it is shown how dialects are finally merged into a wider spoken standard language in the framework of a pluricentric language.

**Key words:** *sociophonology; Austrian German; standard language; dialects.*

### **1. Background**

#### **1.1. German in Austria**

The German language consists of a number of dialects; in the South of the German-speaking area, there are two large groups; firstly, the Alemannic area covering the South-West of Germany, parts of Switzerland, Liechtenstein, and the westernmost county of Vorarlberg in Austria; secondly, the Bavarian dialect group covering parts of Germany's Bavaria and Austria; nonetheless, due to different linguistic centres, Austrian German can also be distinguished from Bavarian in Germany. German is therefore grouped among the “pluricentric languages” [1; 2].

Austrian German dialects can be subdivided into Southern-, Middle/Southern-, and Middle-Bavarian subdialects, roughly distinguishing the Northern, Middle, and Southern parts of the country – including South Tyrol (now part of Italy) and other areas which are no longer German-speaking.

In (much) earlier times, the dialects of German were partly not mutually understandable, however, the development of Standard German has approached the dialects to the standard language, and, therefore, also to the other dialects. The Bavarian dialects of Austria are all mutually intelligible for all speakers, while speakers can usually distinguish local varieties, such as, e.g. Carinthian German, Tyrolian, Viennese, or more precisely in the vicinity of one's own location.

The historical dialects of Austria have been catalogued and compared by philologists of the German language [3; 4; 5]. The modern situation has been assessed by linguists, especially for the urban areas of Salzburg, Vienna, Graz (e.g., [6; 7; 8]). This reflects the traditional divide between historical dialects spoken in rural areas, and mixed varieties in the urban areas which are characterised by dialect mixing and more influences from the standard language. This makes the language of speakers in urban centres similar to each other, while rural areas may remain more dialectal. In the urban varieties, sociolectal differences are found as well. Speakers are often able to use more than one sociolect in dependence of the communicative situation.

## 1.2. Standard language and vernacular

Speaking a dialect and a standard language taught at schools is a bilingual, often diglossic situation with a register variation. Standard languages and vernaculars therefore influence each other, whereby typically the standard language provides lexical items, the vernacular may influence the phonology and possibly grammatical structures of spoken forms of the standard language. Before all, dialects will lose words which are very different from the standard language and which denote objects that are no longer widely used, e.g. words for traditional farming objects. Deviant morphological forms may also be replaced. To give an example, let us consider the verb *haben* 'have': in Standard German (SG), the verb form *[ich] habe* '[I] have' in Austrian dialects have been *ʔi haõ* which reminds of the medieval written form, e.g., *Ich hân mîn lêhen* ([9] 28,31; 'I have my fief' by Walther von der Vogelweide, 1170–1230, who originated from what is today Austria). However, this form *ʔi haõ* has fallen out of use over the last few decades; people would say *ʔi hɔ:b* today when speaking dialect. This means that the dialectal form has actually been replaced with a phonologically adapted variant of SG. In this way, dialects become mere phonological variants of the standard language.

(03) Language change in the dialect: *[ich] habe* '[I] have'

STD ʔiç habe ↔ ʔiç hab(e) ↔ ʔiç ha:b

DIA ʔi(ç) /han/ → ʔi haõ || ↳ ʔi hɔ:b

A grammatical difference between dialect and standard can be seen in the following dialectal verb form *to be becoming burning* for *to start burning* with a present participle *brenat* (SG ‘brennend’) which could not be used (as a gerund) in Standard German:

(04) Grammatical differences between dialect and standard language

- |          |           |                     |     |             |             |
|----------|-----------|---------------------|-----|-------------|-------------|
| (a) DIA1 | də        | stɔ:dl̩             | is  | bɾənət      | vʊən.       |
|          | DEF.M.NOM | barn                | is  | burning     | become      |
| (b) STD1 | der       | Stadel <sup>1</sup> | hat | zu brennen  | begonnen    |
|          | DEF.M.NOM | barn                | has | to burn     | started     |
| (c) DIA2 | də        | stɔ:dl̩             | hot | tsum bɾənən | aɔ̯gfaɔ̯nən |
|          | DEF.M.NOM | barn                | has | to burn     | started     |
| (d) STD2 | der       | Stadel              | hat | zum Brennen | angefangen  |
|          | DEF.M.NOM | barn                | has | to burn     | started     |

*The barn has started to burn.*

But the situation is more complex. After (a) may have fallen out of fashion in modern times, and (b) represents normative language, the (urban) dialect speakers may use (c), with the verb ‘anfangen’ and a verbal noun (gerund) with an inflected preposition, SG ‘zum Brennen’ which is the replacement for the infinitives which are not usable in this context in AD. This new dialectal form can be rendered in colloquial SAG with ease as in (d). In short, the interplay between Austrian dialects (AD) and SG is intricate and creates stylistic and pragmatic variations which can be chosen and interpreted by the communicators.

There are also morphological differences in nominal agreement; AD do not have a genitive case, the dative and accusative suffixes are different; furthermore, the suffixes partly differ from SG forms. German distinguishes the so-called “strong” and “weak” inflections, the AD system is as follows:

(05) Nominal morphology: (in)definite article + adjective + noun in AD

	M	N	F	PL
NOM	a kla:nə mað	a kla:ns haos	a kla:ne frao	klane haesə
ACC	an kla:n(ən) mað	a kla:ns haos	a kla:ne frao	klane haesə
DAT	an kla:n(ən) mað	an kla:n haos	ana kla:nən frao	klane haesə
	<i>a small man</i>	<i>a small house</i>	<i>a small woman</i>	<i>small houses</i>
	M	N	F	PL
NOM	də kla:ne mað	is kla:ne haos	di kla:ne frao	di klanən haesə
ACC	in kla:n(ən) mað	is kla:ne haos	di kla:ne frao	di klanən haesə

---

<sup>1</sup>The Austrian standard language adopted a dialect word here for German ‘Scheune’, by applying SG phonology on the word.

DAT in kla:n(ɐn)      in kla:n(ɐn) haos da kla:nən frao      di klanən haesə  
mað  
*the small man the small house the small woman the small houses*

Since the agreement patterns differ between AD and SG, the SG phrase (from our corpus) *ein Hase mit langen Ohren* [æ:n ha:sɐ mit laŋən o:v.n] ‘a rabbit with long ears’ (dative neuter) would be *ɐ hɔ:s mit laðŋe uən* in AD; an urban speaker, however, actually produced *ɐ ha:sɐ mit laŋe o:vən* – which is very commonly heard. I.e., the indefinite article *ein* is reduced to the dialect form, but not the nouns *Hase* and *Ohren*. The missing *-n* in *langen* reflects a different morphological form in the dialect. The speaker would probably never say (c) (or perhaps only inside the family), but might switch to (b) in a more formal situation.

(06) Variation in Graz: Urban speech is neither the traditional dialect nor the standard language

(a)	URBAN	ɐ	ha:sɐ mit	laŋe	o:vən
(b)	STANDARD	ein	Hase mit	langen	Ohren
(c)	DIALECT	ɐ	hɔ:s mit	laðŋe	uən
	CHOICE	DIA	STD	DIA/STD	STD
	gloss	a	rabbit with	long	ears

For Austrian speakers, the two extremes of AD and SG form a continuum with sociopragmatic relevance; since dialect only has covert prestige for the ingroup feeling of a local community (cf. [10]), the standard language certainly has the overt prestige of an acrolectal variety. Urban speakers attempt to speak SG, but consider their AD forms to be “facilitations” rather than dialectal forms; saying [ɐ] for ‘ein’ feels like a mere phonological reduction. Considering prestige, speakers are sensitive to the choice of dialectal and standard forms. One man once emphatically uttered: “ois va:s i, alles weiß ich!” which means “I know everything” twice; switching from AD to SG gives weight to his statement.

In the following example, a rural speaker from a touristic region in Upper Styria complains about the German influence on the local language. She complains that people nowadays use words such as *Nudelholz* ‘rolling pin’ which is “German” for her, while the (preferred) “Austrian” (i.e., dialect) word is *nudlvɔɛgɐ* (orthogr. *Nudelwalker*).<sup>1</sup> What follows next is interesting: She speaks in dialect and says *dɛis is ɔɛs des daet]ɛ* (SG: *das ist alles das Deutsche* ... ‘That is all this German ...’), but then she changes into SG and repeats *a]ɛs dɔɛt]ɛ vɔɛtv* (‘[these are] all German words’). The word *prɔɛsi]* (preußisch, ‘Prussian’) is an emotional way of referring to Germany in a negative way.<sup>2</sup> In other words, the speaker uses SG in

<sup>1</sup>Austrian speakers of German often feel very strongly about some words which they cannot accept in the form used in Germany; for instance, a ‘plastic bag’ is *Tüte* in Germany, but *Sackerl* in Austria. All speakers in Austria agree never ever to use *Tüte*.

<sup>2</sup>The kingdom of *Preußen* (Prussia), leader of the German unity, is a traditional rival of the Austrian Empire (resisting German unity at that time); referring to Germans as “Prussians” makes them “rivals”, often with respect to language use. Another derogatory Austrian word for Germans is *Piefke* which was the name of a Prussian composer (1917-1884) of military marches.

order to criticise that people speak SG nowadays (in her words: Prussian-German) instead of AD.<sup>1</sup> Again, the overt prestige of SG is used in order to emphasise on an opinion.

(07) Styrian speaker complaining about SG words – speaking SG, not AD

	ode	nudl hɔ ts	– nudl vɔ egə!	dɛis is ɔɛs	– dɛis is ɔɛs
orth.	oder	‘Nudelholz’	– Nudelwalker!	Des is ois	– des is ois
gloss	or	rolling pin	– rolling pin	this is all	this is all
	DIA	STD	– DIA	DIA	DIA
	dɛs daɛtʃɛ;	a ɛs dɔɛtʃɛ	– prɔɛsn	– prɔɛsiʃɛ vɔɛtɐ!	
orth.	des deutsche;	alles deutsche	Preußen-	preußische Wörter!	
gloss	this German	all German	Prussia-	Prussian words	
	DIA	STD	STD	STD	

To conclude, the way people are actually speaking is often a mixture of dialect and standard language with sociopragmatic functions. In the following, it will be shown how this system can be described in a sociolinguistic analysis.

### 1.3. Sociophonology

Modern sociolinguistics observed that beside dialects, there are also social differences in language use (*sociolects*, [11]). It is socially relevant which variety is chosen by a speaker in a situation, as has been convincingly shown by Labov in a number of studies. Sociolinguistic variation can appear in two forms, by choices between dialect and standard language, or between two different languages; both activities usually lead to some degree of mixing of the involved varieties. Therefore, sociolectal variation and multilingual variation within one speaker’s production is analysed with regard to the choice of variables (cf. [12]; overview: [13]). This approach sees phonological variation as a dynamic process of variable selection. Speakers do not simply choose either a standard language or a dialectal register; rather, they mix these two sets of forms, thereby creating a mixed output which allows for more sociopragmatic choices which are sociolinguistically and pragmatically interpretable by competent listeners.

(08) The mixing of dialect and standard variables leads to various sociolinguistic registers.

WRI:	Ich	habe	das	Haus	selbst	gebaut.
STD:	iç	ha:bɛ	ɖas	haʊs	sɛlbst	gɛbaʊt
DIA:	i	hɔɸ	əs	hɔ:s	sœ:va	ɸɔ:t
URB:	iç	ha:ɸ	dəs	hɔ:s	sɛlbɐ	ɸɔ:t
UPP:	iç	ha:bɛ	das	haʊs	sɛlbst	gɛbaʊt
gloss:	I	have	the	house	self	built
	<i>I have built this house myself.</i>					

<sup>1</sup>She equates SG with the German from Germany, which is, of course, inaccurate, but also a widely accepted perception based on the perceived linguistic dominance of Germany; her perception of local Austrians having to linguistically adapt to the German tourists is her main motivation for this rant.



Historiographically, the description of phonological variation departed from the idea of “ease of pronunciation” or “slow/fast speech”, following the idea that the same speaker would produce any of these forms in different situations. Dressler termed these forms “casual vs. allegro speech styles” [14; 15; 16]; in a study of Salzburg German, a model for sociophonological variation as an extended competence of the speakers was developed (“one-competence model”, [17]). The phonological model of Natural Phonology (NP; cf. [18;19]) proved useful for the description of sociolinguistic variation, as it was first implemented for Viennese German (VG; [20; 21]), assuming a “two-competence model”, i.e., a co-existence of two sets of phonological rules, with variables being connected through “input-switch rules” (cf., e.g., [22]) which are bidirectional. Since every phoneme is a variable, it is possible to describe the above-mentioned apparent “mixture” of the sociolinguistic registers.

NP distinguishes phonological “processes” and “rules”, whereby processes are substitutions that adapt phonological intentions to phonetic conditions, and rules are frozen adaptations, i.e., non-phonetic substitutions. This proved to be particularly useful for the description of (socio)phonological variation. A phonological process would apply across-the-board under specific phonetic circumstances; a rule, on the other hand, would occur for other reasons than mere phonetic conditions, e.g., sociolinguistic parameters. Moreover, phonological processes can oppose each other in a sociophonological input-switch rule; for instance, a process in one register may be opposed to a static phoneme in another.

The NP-based description of VG [6] and spoken SAG [7] describes both the variable rules and “pluricentrism” [1;2], the latter in terms of hierarchical (cascaded) *centres and peripheries*, where rural speakers will be influenced by a smaller urban centre, while speakers of the smaller urban centre will be influenced by the speech in Vienna, and all are under the influence from Germany, e.g., through media, with every higher centre being more overtly prestigious than the smaller one [23]. The microanalysis of the phonological interactions between standard language forms and local varietal forms shows a complex interaction of variables which are used differently from the simple binary distinction between standard and vernacular forms.

#### **1.4. Input-switch rules**

Input-switch rules are rules which define variables for phonemes or words. It is important to note that they are not unidirectional rules, instead they put two (or more) variables in an equivalence relationship (bidirectionality). The list of input-switch rules describes the phonological differences between SAG and VD (cf. 01). However, some switches are more salient than others. For instance, a dialectal variant will sometimes be considered “more/less dialectal” than others, other forms or phonological realisations will rather be interpreted by speakers as “low register” (slang) or in terms of “ease of pronunciation” (casualness, laziness). This is intuitive, if one considers forms such as AD [ɪs] for SG *das* (‘the’ DEF.N.NOM/ACC). This perception explains why some “dialectal” features can enter the meso- or acrolectal register, i.e., the sociolect which, in principle, requires standard language, while other forms are frowned upon if used in formal settings.

Very clearly, function words can have *reduced* forms (such as indefinite article *ein* pronounced as [ɐ]). However, there are systematic correlations between forms perceived as SG and AD by competent language users. This correlation has been described in the form of input-switch rules from which a user can choose in order to achieve sociopragmatic effects. For Austrian German, one can establish a list such as the following, where the SG form is on the left, and the AD form is on the right. The rules are to be separated into phonological correlations and word-based rules applying to specific function words (and few frequent lexical words) only.<sup>1</sup>

(09) Some segment- and word-based input-switch rules for VG (cf. [6; 7; 24])

S1	/aɛ/ ↔ /ɛ:/	W1	/aɔx/ ↔ /a:/
S2	/aɛ/ ↔ /a/ ↔ /ɔɐ/ <sup>2</sup>	W2	/vɪɐ, mɪɐ/ ↔ /ma/
S3	/u:/ ↔ /uɐ/	W3	/iç, diç, miç, siç/ ↔ /i:, di:, mi:, si:/
S4	/i:/ ↔ /iɐ/	W4	/niçt/ ↔ /nɛ:ɖ/
S5	/y, ʏ/ ↔ /i:, i/	W5	/das/ ↔ /dɛ:s/
S6	/ø, œ/ ↔ /ɛ:, ɛ/	W6	/sɪnd/ ↔ /sa:n/
S7	/ɔɛ/ ↔ /ɜ:/	W7	/ɪst/ ↔ /i:z/
S8	/a:/ ↔ /ɔ:/	W8	/kɔm(ɛ)/ ↔ /kum/ ↔ /kim/ <sup>3</sup>
S9	/l/ ↔ /ɛ/ <sup>4</sup>	W9	/V-st du/ ↔ /V-st/ <sup>5</sup>
S10	[...]	W10	/gɛ-/ ↔ / _ / ; /g-/ <sup>6</sup>

Translations (spoken/written/English): aɔx /auch/ ‘also’; vɪɐ /wir/ ‘we’; iç /ich/ ‘I’; diç /dich/ ‘you (SG.ACC)’; miç /mich/ ‘me’; siç /sich/ ‘him/her (DAT/ACC)’; niçt /nicht/ ‘not’; das /das/ ‘this’; sɪnd /sind/ ‘be (1/3P)’; ɪst /ist/ ‘be.3S’; kɔm(ɛ) /komme/ ‘come (1S)’.

These substitutions are exemplified in example (10): In the sentence *Was hast du gesagt?* ‘What did you say?’<sup>7</sup>, the input-switches a↔ɔ/a, -du↔Ø, gɛ-↔Ø are applied by different speakers in different ways, thereby allowing the recognition of various social group memberships. The exact choice of variables constitutes a sociolectal register.

<sup>1</sup>Function words and grammaticalised forms are not the denotative information of a text, but rather cues for the interpretation of the text. They can usually be less salient (unstressed, phonologically reduced), as is described in grammaticalisation theory.

<sup>2</sup>A word such as *breit* SAG /braɛt/ is /brɔɐɖ/ in many dialects, except in Vienna (and Lower Austria) where it is /bra:ɖ/ (in VD); in accordance with the model of centre and periphery, the latter (Viennese) form is spreading to other dialects (in rural areas) and therefore becomes another input-switch rule for some speakers who may then fluctuate between the forms /braɛt/ ↔ /brɔɐɖ/ ↔ /bra:ɖ/.

<sup>3</sup>The word (*ich*) *komme* is SG /kɔmɛ/, colloquially /kɔm/, dialectally (AD) either /kum/ or /kim/; the dialect forms coexist and do not belong to a specific region.

<sup>4</sup>This is an l-vocalisation (i-type) resulting in a glide /ɛ/ (cf. [6], etc.; [25]), e.g. /ɔɛgɛmaɛn/ ‘allgemein’ (*generally*).

<sup>5</sup>Absence of the 2nd person pronoun after the inflected verb in AD.

<sup>6</sup>Deletion of the verbal prefix *ge-* in AD, or its shortening to a sesquisyllable, e.g. /ɔɛfresn/ ‘gefressen’ (*eaten* [when speaking of animals]).

<sup>7</sup>Word by word: ‘What have you said?’

- (10) Various discernable speech styles in AG
- (a) STANDARD LG. *vas hastu gesa:kt*
  - (b) UPPER CLASS<sup>1</sup> *vas hastu gesa:kt*
  - (c) DIALECT/LC *vos host ksok(t)*
  - (d) URBAN MC *vas hast ksa:kt*

It is noteworthy that it is partially acceptable for a realisation of SAG [a] as [a] in (b) (upper class), while middle-class speakers would avoid [a] in favor of [a], as in (d). For the prefix [gɛ-/g-], the opposite choice applies. The deletion of /du/ ‘you (SG.NOM)’ is another input-switch rule (W9).<sup>2</sup>

It may happen that rules interact with each other; the alternative spoken forms *aesɔ* and *ɔesɔ* for /also/ (‘well’) requires two different historical phonological analyses, either (a) *a[ɔ]sɔ* → *aesɔ* (S9), or (b) *a[ɔ]sɔ* → \**ɔ[ɔ]sɔ* (S8) → *ɔesɔ* (S9). In (a), the switch S9 creates a new phoneme which does not undergo the same sociophonological treatment as the intermediary form in (b). This example shows that the microsociophonological analysis can deal also with more difficult examples.

### 1.5. Standard languages and vernaculars

A standard language is a historically planned (predetermined), relatively uniform variety of a language used in a wide range of communicative functions, based on prescriptive, written norms codified in grammars and dictionaries. A linguistic standard is an *ideal* influencing the spoken practices of speakers, and ultimately their respective varieties.

The introduction of written languages provides a superimposed linguistic layer to be used by specialists for religious, administrative and educational purposes (e.g., Sumerian, Latin, Sanskrit). Spoken varieties coexist independently in the form of dialect continua and spoken languages (largely unnoticed by historical records). The communicative needs are still bridged through multilingual practices (e.g., learning more varieties, or by the establishment of a spoken *lingua franca*). In this situation, the standard language will not interact much with the spoken varieties, as it is not actively accessible to most people.

Modern standard languages, on the other hand, are formed from one (prestigious) spoken variety (*ausbau language*; [26; 27]) and spread through school education. This language is also elaborated for context-independent, active use (*activation, textualisation*) which makes written and spoken (elaborated) communication more easily accessible to more people (*demotisation*) which proves to be highly effective in economy and education. Since standard languages are planned, codified, and mostly learned as L2 (cf. [28]), they are well-described and therefore objectively

---

<sup>1</sup>The term *class* shall be understood vaguely, not strictly, in the sense that in a sociologically more complex situation, we can still establish a simplified model for “social classes” based on family background, wealth, and education.

<sup>2</sup>Historically, the form *du* has been integrated into the verb in the form of the *-s-t* ending and probably reattached in SG (*V-st du*), while not in AD (*V-st*). To give another example for such processes, in dialects in Carinthia (South Austria), the 1P pronoun is reattached after having become a suffix of the verb: *hamɐ-miɐ* /haben wir/ ‘we have’, lit. ‘haben-wir wir’ (‘have-we we’).



accessible as a norm for writing and speaking. Furthermore, standard languages are *elaborated* (= *ausbau*) in structure and lexicon and allow high information density, grammatical complexity, precision, and lexical richness, and therefore serve *higher-level* (acrolectal) communicative functions.

Standard languages and spoken nonstandard varieties (*dialects*) create a stylistic spectrum between *orate* and *literate* registers of a “language” (cf. [29; 30; 31; 32]). These registers express the distinction between context-dependent (situative, dialogic) and context-independent, i.e., well-planned, unidirectional text production (cf. [33; 34])<sup>1</sup>, with literate registers being more explicit in expressing semantic relations by junctors and subordination.

Modern nation-states usually define a national standard language and subsume other varieties as dialects or minority languages (*abstand languages*; [26; 27]). Education in a standard language leads to a one-sided multilingualism in which all speakers of nonstandard varieties share one common and elaborated language which subsequently influences the spoken varieties structurally and assimilates them to the standard language (dialect levelling), leaving less and less space for local peculiarities. Eventually, this situation leads to *one* language with various registers (*orate* vs. *literate*) and small dialectal (geographical) or sociolectal (social) differences, with mostly phonological and the lexical differences (dialect levelling).

One complication is pluricentrism ([1; 2]), when one (standard) language has various political centres and therefore develops small differences also in the respective standardised forms. Chinese, English, German are examples for such a situation. For our purpose, the common rejection of some “Germany”-identified lexemes used in Austria gives a glimpse of such a situation.<sup>2</sup>

Standard languages have *overt prestige* and influence non-standard varieties now termed *dialects*. Convergence is the result of the sociopragmatically motivated application of ISR. It is common for standard languages to influence dialects and minority languages as a *dominant* language. The following example shows one of the autochthonous minority languages spoken in Austria, Carinthian Slovene (CSlov.), with visible lexical influences from German; compare with the German and Standard Slovene (Slov.) translation:

(11) Slovene as a minority language under German superstratic influence ([36]):

CSlov.	O Maria!	Jz	sem	bla	na	<b>tankštele</b>	in
gloss	Oh Mary!	1S	be.1PR	AUX	at	gas station	and
			F				
Germ.	Oh Maria!	Ich	bin			zur Tankstelle	und

<sup>1</sup>Cf. also “high- and low-context communication” ([35]).

<sup>2</sup>When Austria joined the European Union, since this also led to many standardization efforts, the permission to use of certain specific “Austrian” words was agreed upon, e.g., *Paradeiser* for *Tomate* ‘tomato’; this leads to German EU texts such as “[...] Ausfuhrlicenzen [...] im Sektor Obst und Gemüse (Tomaten/Paradeiser)” (<https://eur-lex.europa.eu>). This is mostly symbolic for an Austrian linguistic demarcation from Germany, as the word *Paradeiser* by and large fell out of use in spoken AG already – people say *Tomaten*.

Slov. O, Maria! Jaz sem bila na bencinski črpalki in

CSlov. sem **fauš**<sup>1</sup> **tankava!**  
gloss be.1PRF false refuel-1PRF  
Germ. habe falsch getankt!  
Slov. sem napačno natočila!

On the other hand, vernaculars usually influence standard languages as a substrate, adapting the standard forms phonologically and sometimes morphologically and with different function words as well as culture-specific lexemes.

(12) The various substratic influences from vernacular to standard

- (a) phonological adaptation ha:bɛ → ha:bɛ (S8)
- (b) morphological adaptation mit langen → mit lange
- (c) function words adaptation ein → ɐ; einen → a:n
- (d) Certain lexemes Tüte → Sackerl

Sociophonological behavior reflects stereotypical attitudes on standard and dialect forms, where dialect is seen as the basilectal, familiar and thus also casual register. The forms which are phonologically “closer” to the standard language are interpreted as merely being casual forms, even if they are dialect variables.

## 2. Material & method

The following analyses gives a synopsis and summary of various aspects of sociolinguistic behavior in Austria. (a) The first section discusses one complex input-switch between a process (a gradual monophthongization) in SAG and a corresponding monophthong in VD in the so-called ‘Viennese monophthongization’ [37; 38]. (b) The second section discusses the acquisition of phonological variation by Austrian children facing a sociolectally complex situation [39]. (c) Thirdly, a case study on the sociophonological competence of an immigrant is presented [24]. (d) Finally, a description of acrolectal dialect use in acrolectal usage (i.e., in media) is given.

### Abbreviations

1P	1st person plural	NOM	nominative case
1S	1st person singular	NP	Natural Phonology
ACC	accusative case	orth.	orthographic form
AD	Austrian dialect(s)	P	phoneme-based ISR
AUX	auxiliary verb	PRF	perfect
DAT	dative case	S	segment-based ISR
DEF	definite article	SAG	Standard Austrian German
DIA	dialect form	SG	Standard German (also SAG)
F	feminine gender	Slov.	Slovene
Germ.	German	STD	standard language
ISR	input-switch rule	UPP	upper class language
L1	first language development	URB	urban language

<sup>1</sup>In Carinthian Slovene, the l-vocalisation is of the u-type.

L2	second language development VG	Viennese German
M	masculine gender	WRI written form
N	neuter gender	

## LITERATURE

1. *Clyne, M.* The Interaction of National Identity, Class and Pluriglossia in a Pluricentric Language. In D.C. Laycock & W. Winter (ed.): A world of language. Papers presented to Professor S.A. Wurm on his 65th birthday. – Pacific Linguistics, 1987 – P. 100, 127–139.
2. *Clyne, M.* Pluricentric Languages: Differing Norms in Different Nations (Contributions to the sociology of language 62. – Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter, 1992.
3. *Kranzmayer.* Historische Lautgeographie des gesamtbairischen Dialektraumes. Mit 27 Laut- und 4 Hilfskarten in besonderer Mappe. – Wien: Böhlau Nachfolger, 1956.
4. *Wiesinger, P.* Die Wiener dialektologische Schule. Grundsätzliche Studien aus 70 Jahren Forschung. – Wien: Halosar, 1983.
5. *Hornung, M. & F. Roitinger* Die österreichischen Mundarten. Eine Einführung. Neu bearbeitet von Gerhard Zeillinger. – Wien: Wiener Verlag, 2000.
6. *Moosmüller, S.* Soziophonologische Variation im gegenwärtigen Wiener Deutsch. Eine empirische Untersuchung. / S. Moosmüller. – Stuttgart: Steiner (= Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik, Beiheft 56), 1987.
7. *Moosmüller, S.* Hochsprache und Dialekt in Österreich. Soziophonologische Untersuchungen zu ihrer Abgrenzung in Wien, Graz, Salzburg und Innsbruck (Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe 1). – Wien, Köln, Weimar: Böhlau, 1991.
8. *Moosmüller, S. & H. Scheutz.* Chain shifts revisited: The case of monophthongisation and e-confusion in the city dialects of Salzburg and Vienna. In: Peter Auer & J. Caro & G. Kaufmann (eds.), Language variation (European Perspectives IV). – Amsterdam: Benjamins, 2013. – P. 173–186.
9. *Lachmann, K.* Die Gedichte Walthers von der Vogelweide / K. Lachmann. – Berlin: G. Reimer, 1864.
10. *Chambers, J. K.* Dialectology / J. K. Chamber, P. Trudgill. – 2nd edn. – Cambridge University Press, 2004.
11. *Labov, W.* The Social Stratification of English in New York City / W. Labov. – Washington: Center for Applied Linguistics, 1966.
12. *Cedergren, H. & D. Sankoff.* Variable rules: Performance as a statistical reflection of competence. Language. – 1974. – P. 50, 333–355.
13. *Watt, D.* Variation and the variable. in: Carmen Llamas & Louise Mullany & Peter Stockwell (eds.): The Routledge Companion to Sociolinguistics. – London: Routledge, 2007. – P. 3–11.
14. *Dressler, W. U.* On rule ordering in casual speech styles. / W. U. Dressler // Wiener Linguistische Gazette 4. – 1973. – P. 3–7.
15. *Dressler, W. U.* Methodisches zu Allegro-Regeln. In Wolfgang U. Dressler & František V. Mareš (eds.), Phonologica 1972. – München. – 1975. – P. 219–234.

16. *Dressler, W. U.* Grundprobleme der Soziophonologie. / W. U. Dressler // Grazer Linguistische Studien 1. – 1975. – P. 25–31.
17. *Rennison, J. R.* Bidialektale Phonologie : die Kompetenz zweier Salzburger Sprecher / J. R. Rennison // Zeitschrift für Dialektologie und Linguistik. – Beihefte 34. – Wiesbaden: F. Steiner, 1981.
18. *Stampe, D.* A dissertation on Natural Phonology. / D. Stampe. – New York, 1979.
19. *Donegan, P. J. & D. Stampe.* The study of Natural Phonology. In Daniel A. Dinnsen (ed.), Current approaches to phonological theory. – Bloomington, London, 1979. – P. 126–174.
20. *Wodak-Leodolter, R.* Phonological variation in Colloquial Viennese / R. Wodak-Leodolter, W. U. Dressler // Michigan Germanic Studies 4(1). – 1978. – P. 30–66.
21. *Dressler, W. U.* Sociophonological methods in the study of sociolinguistic variation in Viennese German. / W. U. Dressler, R. Wordak // Language in Society 11. – 1982. – P. 339–370.
22. *Moosmüller, S.* Diskrimination und Einschätzung des dialektalen input-switch /a/ ↔ /ɔ/. / S. Moosmüller // Wiener Linguistische Gazette 35–36. – 1985. – P. 75–94.
23. *Moosmüller, S. & R. Vollmann.* Fenomén ‘spisovný jazyk’ na príklade Rakúska. In Ondrejovic, Slavo & Mária Šimková (eds.), Sociolingvistické Aspekty výskumu Súčasnej Slovinciny. – Bratislava: Veda (= Sociolingvistická Slovaca 1), 1995. – P. 50–65.
24. *Hobel, B.* Phonological case study of the use of (Styrian) dialect and standard language in German as a second language. / B. Hobel, R. Vollmann // Grazer Linguistische Studien 84. – 2016. – P. 5–20.
25. *Vollmann, R. & B. Hobel & T. Seifter & F. Pokorny.* The spread of /l/-vocalization in Styria. in: Sylvia Moosmüller & Manfred Sellner (eds.): Phonetik in und um Österreich. – Wien: Verlag der ÖAW (= Veröffentlichungen zur Linguistik und Kommunikationsforschung 31), 2017. – P. 123–136.
26. *Kloss, H.* Abstand-languages and Ausbau-languages. / H. Kloss // Anthropological Linguistics 9. – 1967. – P. 29–41.
27. *Kloss, H.* Die Entwicklung neuer germanischer Kultursprachen seit 1800, 2. erw. Aufl., – Düsseldorf, 1978.
28. *McWhorter, J.* Language interrupted. Signs of non-native acquisition in standard language grammars. / J. McWhorter. – Oxford: OUP, 2007.
29. *Biber, D.* Variation across speech and writing. / D. Biber. – Cambridge: CUP, 1988.
30. *Biber, D.* Dimensions of register variation. / D. Biber. – Cambridge: CUP, 1995.
31. *Maas, U.* Können Sprachen einfach sein? / U. Maas // Grazer Linguistische Studien 69. – 2008. – P. 1–44.
32. *Maas, U.* Literat und orat. Grundbegriffe der Analyse geschriebener und gesprochener Sprache / U. Mass // Grazer Linguistische Studien 73. – 2010. – P. 21–150.

33. *Vollmann, R.* Die Entwicklung literater Kompetenz bei Vorschulkindern mit Migrationshintergrund. in: Inci Dirim & Hans-Jürgen Krumm & Paul Portmann-Tselikas & Sabine Schmölzer-Eibinger (eds.): Theorie und Praxis. (= Jahrbuch für Deutsch als Fremd- und Zweitsprache 3/2014. Schwerpunkt: Schreiben und Literalität). – Wien: Präsens, 2014. – P. 29–49.
34. *Vollmann, R.* Protoliterate Strukturen bei monolingualen und bilingualen Kindergartenkindern. / R. Vollmann, K. Schwabl // Grazer Linguistische Studien 82. – 2014. – P. 63–90.
35. *Paul, R.* Language disorders from infancy through adolescence. / R. Paul. – 3rd ed. – St. Louis: Mosby Elsevier, 2007.
36. *Simić, J.* Der soziolinguistische Status der slowenischen Sprache in Kärnten. / J. Simić. – MA thesis. – University of Graz, 2020.
37. *Vollmann, R.* Phonetics of Informal Speech: The Viennese Monophthongization. / R. Vollmann // Studia Phonetica Posnaniensia 5. – 1996. – P. 1–15.
38. *Moosmüller, S. & Ralf V.* The spread of the Viennese monophthongization: A socio-phonetic analysis. in: Schaner-Wolles, Chris & Rennison, John R. & Neubarth, Friedrich (eds.): Naturally! Linguistic studies in honour of Wolfgang Ulrich Dressler presented on the occasion of his 60th birthday. – Torino: Rosenberg & Sellier, 2000. – P. 327–335.
39. *Moosmüller, S. & R. Vollmann.* Dialekt- und Hochsprachevariation bei Kleinkindern in Wien: Phonologie. In Harald Burger & Annelies Häcki-Buhofer (eds.): Spracherwerb im Spannungsfeld von Dialekt und Hochsprache (Zürcher Germanistische Studien 38), – Bern: Lang, 1994. – P. 109–128.

*Окончание статьи в следующем номере.*

*Поступила в редакцию 08.07.2021*