

Reinhold Utri

A few remarks on Austrian languages for special purposes

Lingwistyka Stosowana / Applied Linguistics / Angewandte Linguistik nr 7,
165-177

2013

Artykuł został opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach
dozwolonego użytku.

Reinhold UTRI

Uniwersytet Warszawski

A Few Remarks on Austrian Languages for Special Purposes

Abstract:

Starting with questions about the definition of the language spoken in Austria, the author arrives at the anthropocentric theory of human languages with the basic concept of *idiolect* and *polylect*. From this point of view the differences in language use between Austria and Germany can not only be described, but also interpreted as differences between certain groups of idiolects. The fact that terms that are typical for Austria are used in the translation offices in the European Union should already have led to a larger German-Austrian word list which could be used by translators and interpreters. The latter already work with the help of certain Austrian dictionaries within the field of languages for special purposes, e.g. of law and administration. Furthermore, such dictionaries ought to be used more frequently by language teachers, especially in the translation departments, where the students already could become aware of the fact that German belongs to the group of pluricentric languages.

Before we try to answer the question about the definition of the Austrian Languages for Special Purposes, we have to ask some more general questions: What is the language in Austria? Is the Austrian German just a local variation of the German in the “Bundesrepublik”? Does the Austrian German consist only of the dialectal parts of the language, and the standard German (the “Duden” German) in Austria is the same as in Germany? Or is Austrian German a sort of a separate variety of German, caused by a different historical, political and social development within the borders of the Austrian state and is part of the identity (unique personality) and social life/ social acknowledgement of the Austrians?

To be able to answer these questions we have to put the very basic question at the very beginning: what is language?

There are probably as many definitions of language as there are linguists (the same difficulties occur with the term “culture”, see R. Utri 2009a; for the definition of “polyculture” see S. Bonacchi 2011: 74 ff.). But what most of them have in common is the feature that language constitutes a highly important ability of the human being. Mankind developed this ability a long time ago (about the possible reasons of the origin of the language of mankind see R. Utri 2009b). St. Pinker (2007: 4) states that undoubtedly language is

man's most important cultural invention, the quintessential example of his capacity to use symbols, and a biologically unprecedented event irrevocably separating him from other animals, but it should not be considered as a cultural artifact that we learn the way we learn to tell time or how the federal government works. Instead, it is a distinct piece of the biological makeup of our brains. Language is a complex, specialized skill, which develops in the child spontaneously, without a conscious effort or formal instruction (...). (ibid.) I think it is fruitful to consider language as an evolutionary adaptation, like the eye, its major parts designed to carry out important functions (ibid.: 11).

The evolution of human language was for sure strongly connected with the development of cognitive abilities in general, but not necessarily with the changing environment or the better control of it, but rather with social development of individuals or groups:

Some anthropologists believe that human brain evolution was propelled more by a cognitive arms race among social competitors than by mastery of technology and the physical environment. (...) And a cognitive arms race clearly could propel a linguistic one. (...) Finally, anthropologists have noted that tribal chiefs are often both gifted orators and highly polygynous – a splendid prod to any imagination that cannot conceive of how linguistic skills could make a Darwinian difference. I suspect that evolving humans lived in a world in which language was woven into the intrigues of politics, economics, technology, family, sex, and friendship that played key roles in individual reproductive success. They could no more live with a Me-Tarzan-you-Jane level of grammar than we could (ibid.: 380).

Since the creation of language, man has developed and is still developing his language, and thus all parts of the language: the lexical, phonetic, grammatical parts and the practical use. Examples for the first mentioned are the enormous developments of languages for special purposes in the last decades (development connected with the evolution of science as well with that of computer and other technological equipment) as well as the borrowing and subsequent regular use of e.g. English words in the German language (like “cool”, “sorry” or “etwas ist in”; about the – occasionally mixed – use and sometimes misleading use of English in German advertisements see R. Utri 2012a: 654 f.). Another example of lexical evolution is the enlargement of vocabulary (not only because of the developing languages for special purposes) and a certain liquidation of old-fashioned words. P. Braun explains that from the 2300 words in the 15th edition (in 1961) of the “Duden” 128 of these were missing in the next edition (in 1967). On the other hand, he argues, many more new words were added: the 19th edition, for example (in 1986) contains about 3000 more words than the edition before, and nouns, verbs as well as adjectives. This is also due to the political development of a country at that time. That is why some new words can be found in the newspapers and magazines. Here some added words in 1986: abgasarm, antiamerikanisch, ausländerfeindlich, aufpoppen, Abgaskatalysator, Afro-Look, alternativbewegung, Arbeitsbeschaffungsmaßnahmen (more see the chapter “Neue Wörter” in P. Braun 1993, pp. 179–183; other examples of lexical change by “Sprachkontakt” see

C.M. Riehl 2009: 92; language minorities often take words from the language in the country surrounding them: so use the German immigrants some words from African languages like *Munoko*, those in Australia use Rubbish-tin, *putten* as “setzen, stellen, legen”, *etwas bei der Versicherung claimen* or *das Auto servicen lassen*).

The modification of the pronunciation in the space of time is explained in many works concerning the history of the German language. When one language develops, the other sometimes does not change. For example the Old Saxon word “etan” developed through Old German “ezzan” into “essen”, while in English the “t” stayed (“eat”) – see G. Wolff 1999: 60). Other examples are the shortening of words like “klagete” into “klagte”, “arebeit” into “arbeit”, “gelücke” into “glück”, “herre” into “herr”, starting in the 13th century (ibid.: 80), or the cutting of the “e” in the first person singular like “ich kaufe” into “ich kauf” in modern times, especially in spoken language. It is probably only a question of some decades that the shortened form will also be used in the standard written language.

A good example of the change of the German grammar is the more and more rare use of the second (genitive) or even the third grammatical case (dative) – that is the reason why there are books published in which the author encourages the reader to continue using the correct form of the cases (see B. Sicks “Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod”). Changes in the pragmatic field, one can easily observe reading texts produced for new technical/ electronic products, for the virtual world – texts in chat rooms, short messages for mobile phones, records in homepages of social networks etc.

We should not mix up the term “language” with the term “text/texts” that we produce on the base of our language abilities (see F. Grucza 1994a:17). Here we have to refer to the anthropocentric theory of human languages. From the texts of J. Baudouin de Courtenay, written already at the beginning of the 20th century, we can draw the conclusion that the generally used term “language” is a kind of mental construction, a linguistic concept: “The real process of forming and recording of the individual language takes place in the brain and soul of each person. [...] Language exists only on the base of the psyche of the individual human soul.” (J. Baudouin de Courtenay 1984: 15, transl. R. U.)¹. With these words we can conclude that he wanted to point out that language cannot be outside of the human brain.

The fact that everybody has his/her language network in certain cerebral areas in the brain was later developed by F. Grucza (see e.g. 1992a, 1992b, 1993, 1994a and for languages for special purposes by S. Grucza, e.g. 1994b, 1996, 2004,

¹ Orig.: “Właściwy proces powstawania i utrwalania się języka indywidualnego dokonywa się w mózgu jednostkowym, w duszy jednostkowej. [...] Język *istnieje* tylko na gruncie psychicznym, w indywidualnej duszy ludzkiej.”

2006, 2008). He states that we should distinguish language features and language abilities. To the first ones belong thinking in a language and producing texts in our brain. To the latter ones we can count the actual expressive ways of language, speaking, writing or showing (common body language and sign language). F. Grucza (1992: 13) remarks that

Any natural language really exists only as an ingredient of humans who are alive; it does not exist, and what is more, cannot exist as any other kind. No realized uttering however is in my opinion a part of the language, neither does it contain the latter, but it is an object that is created on the base of a certain language and as such they ‘certify’ or represent it in the same meaning as any other type of creation only ‘certifies’ or represents the creating system, with the help of which it has been realized. (transl. R.U.)²

This means that only the oral and written texts (what F. Grucza called “wypowiedzi”) and not the language itself can be the means of communication. The language itself stays in the brains of human beings and is not “transferred”. If you transfer texts you would not have them anymore yourself, you would lose them. So we can at the most speak of a language output that stimulates (by hearing or reading and at least partly understanding) the language network in another brain and thus developing the latter by enlarging the language possibilities and capacity or by correcting wrong or incorrectly learned parts of language.

This meets the philosophical thoughts of Socrates who did not consider our brain to be a barrel that should be filled with information/ knowledge, but an ingenious being that can only be stimulated (more about the comparable parts of the approach of Socrates and the anthropocentric approach of F. Grucza see R. Utri 2010). This old but partly forgotten approach has recently been confirmed by neuro-linguistic and neuro-biological research (see J. Bauer 2010: 48).

This language (features and abilities) in our brain F. Grucza calls “idiolect”. It does not matter if this idiolect consists of English, German or Polish parts. The distinction which we make for analytic reasons is an artificial one anyway. All these so-called national languages are embedded in the same cerebral network. The different parts can be bigger or smaller and more or less available in a passive (listening and understanding) or active way (speaking, writing). My English language – my English idiolect – is a unique one; nobody has exactly the same one. There are small differences within the idiolects (we of course can only observe and analyze the expressed texts) of one-egg-twins. So in fact there

² Orig.: “jakikolwiek język ‘naturalny’ istnieje naprawdę tylko jako pewien składnik żywych ludzi i nie istnieje, a nawet więcej: istnieć nie może, w żaden inny sposób. Natomiast żadne zrealizowane wypowiedzi ani nie są, moim zdaniem, składnikami języka, ani nie zawierają go, lecz są obiektami wytworzonymi na podłożu określonego języka i jako takie go jedynie ‘zaświadcniają’ czy reprezentują, zresztą w takim samym sensie, w jakim inny rodzaj twórców ‘zaświadcza’ czy reprezentuje ‘system wytwórczy’, z pomocą którego został zrealizowany.”

does not exist one English language, but as many as there are English speakers (hundreds of millions).

The fact that we analyze the texts and then, due to smaller or bigger differences in pronunciation, vocabulary, meaning (denotate) or practical use, put them into groups, is only a hypothetic differentiation which we need for practical, political, social or linguistic reasons. But still this division is a splitting up that we perform only in our mind.

Such a common language is called “polylect” (F. Grucza 1994: 18). One can use this term for national groups (British, American, Australian English), for ethnic groups, but also for smaller groups within a national group (e.g. the youth language in Scotland) or for professional groups (writers, technicians, lawyers, medical doctors etc.). A national language, like F. Grucza (ibid.: 20) quotes J. Baudouin de Courtenay, is

an abstraction and a generalizing construction created from the whole range of individual languages; it is the sum of (extra-)linguistic associations as part of individuals and on the average abstract for peoples and tribes. (transl. R.U.)³

Therefore, we should not call these polylects “the language of literature”, “the language of the movies”, “the language of music”, “the language of computer science” etc. (ibid.: 11), because literature itself, movies, music etc. themselves do not have any language – the only “owner” of language is man (apart from some beginnings of language within the animal kingdom – from the linguistic point of view they are neglectable, since they are very little developed; about language and culture of chimpanzees see R. Utri 2011). That is the reason why this – convincing – theory is called the anthropocentric theory of human languages.

All these polylects to which we can refer to are dynamic beings – as dynamic as people who use them by producing texts all the time. It should also be pointed out that there is no sharp border between them. Many connections between these different polylects exist and they are being developed all the time. So we can state that the polylects overlap each other as the idiolects at the individual level do.

It is important to add that enduringly new polylects are created – when the medical science grows because of increased knowledge and specialization due to a large number of experiments and the larger experience of medical researchers, one can distinguish more fields and sub-fields of medical science (e.g. one can split surgery into cosmetic surgery and others).

We have to bear in mind all these idiolectal and polylectal phenomena when we discuss the question of Austrian German. The question whether a polylect is

³ Orig.: “abstrakcją i konstrukcją uogólniającą, wytworzoną z całego szeregu języków indywidualnych, jest sumą skojarzeń językowo-pozajęzykowych, właściwych indywidualom i przeciętnie, abstrakcyjnie ludom i plemionom.”

to be considered a separate language, is partly a linguistic one, but partly also a political one.

Kashubian was considered to be only a regional language of Poland for a long time, later on linguists who analyzed and compared the Kashubian and the Polish polylect came across too many differences as to call them two varieties of one and the same polylect. F. Grucza (1994: 12) states that linguists have to work exactly in this field:

The questions, if a dialect, vernacular jargon and other realized variation (concretizing) are languages, or if they aren't, and if they are (not), in which sense they are them (or not), needs in general a more detailed analysis. (transl. R.U.)⁴

That is why the Silesians who are still fighting for the acknowledgement of their polylect. More and more linguistic analyses after all show (see the research of e.g. E. Gajewska 2012) that it is quite clear that Poles understand the Silesian language as badly as they understand the Slovakian texts – and Slovakian is rather close to Polish, but still it is a separate language. Poles would be able to follow the thoughts expressed only on a small scale.

Dutch for example is a separate language in a separate country. You understand or you are able to guess only about one third of the Dutch texts having German as your mother tongue, although the origin of the term “Dutch” can easily be recognized as “Deutsch”. In Dutch the word is “duitsch”; in Old Saxon the word was “thiudisc”, where you can see similarities to the Italian “tedesco”; it meant *people* and was “(...) used to distinguish ‘the vulgar tongue’ from Latin, hence to denote German vernaculars and consequently the speakers of any of these.” (T.F. Hoad 2003: 139)

Most authors point out that the differences between the regions of the German speaking area have historical backgrounds. M. Clyne (1995: 31) gives examples for Austria:

Variation between the Austrian and German national varieties of Standard German is the result of separate cultural and sociopolitical development, particularly since the establishment of an Austrian-based state in the late eighteenth century and the dissolution of the Holy Roman Empire in 1806. (...) The proportion of the population accepting the notion of an Austrian nation (as opposed to state) is greater than ever.

After the Second World War, in 1951, the first Austrian dictionary (ÖW = Österreichisches Wörterbuch) was published under the auspices of the Ministry of Education and Arts. This first attempt of setting a norm of the “Austriazismen”

⁴ Orig.: “Pytania, czy dialekt, gwara, żargon itp. warianty realizacyjne (konkretyzacje) są językami, czy nie są, a jeśli są (nie są), to w jakim sensie są nimi (lub nie są), wymaga w ogóle dokładniejszego rozważenia.”

was not very exact concerning the regional use of different words (*Müll* instead of *Mist*, *Aprikose* instead of *Marille*, *Sahne* instead of *Obers* etc. are also used in West Austria). Also in later editions the words marked as “ma.” (mundartlich, *dialectal*) or “volkstüml.” (volkstümlich, *folkloristic* – whatever this means) as well as words from social groups in Austria (“stud.” = studentisch, students’ slang) were also included. Words like “Sahne” are marked as not or not much used in Austria, also “Tomate” (ÖW, 1965: 213), although this word is used as much as the so-called typical “Paradeiser” (the same is true for the word *Kukuruz/ Mais*, *Ribisel/ Johannisbeere*, *Plafond/ Zimmerdecke*). The dictionary has been strongly criticized because of its Vienna-centric character (M. Clyne 1995: 35). Altogether we can state that there are some words which do not fit into the borders of Austria, although stated like that in the ÖW.

Many typical Austrian words have their origin in the languages of Austrian neighbours like Hungary, Slovenia and Slovakia (see M. Clyne 1995: 34), as well as Italy (see R. Utri 2012b; examples: *Kipferl*, *Palatschinken*, *Topfen*, *Semmel*, *Ribisel*, *Zuckerl*, *Kukuruz*, *Karfiol* from Italian *cavolfiore*, *Frittaten* from Italian *frittata*, *Faschiertes* from French *farce*; some words have their origin in the Jewish or Jiddish language: “ein Maßl haben” = to have luck). For many words it has till now been unclear if they are used only in the spoken language (“umgangssprachlich”) or if they should belong to the Standard Austrian German. Some words are old-fashioned, like “Kommissär” or “Affaire” in the French writing (see M. Putz 2002: 66; he calls such Austrian words “Pseudo-Austrizismen”) and should not be considered typical for Austria anymore. M. Clyne (1995: 38) explains the word “Jause” as the German “Kaffee” (morning and afternoon tea), which is completely wrong, because *Jause* can be any small (or even big) meal, if coffee, tea or a beer is drunk together with it; it does not really matter (it can even be used as a synonym for dinner).

What M. Clyne (ibid.) also lists is the expressions of institutions which are different in Austria: *Flugpost* (airmail, in Germany *Luftpost*), *Kanzleizeit* (clergy consultation, in G. *Sprechstunde*), *Matura* (matriculation examination, in G. *Abitur*; here he forgets to mention that in both countries the official term “Reifeprüfung” ist used, as M. Putz 2002: 62 points out), *Ordinationszeit* (doctor’s surgery times, in G. *Sprechstunden*), *Parteienverkehr* (office-hours, in G. *Bürostunden*), *Spital* (hospital, in G. *Krankenhaus*; here we have to mention the fact that both terms are used in Austria, the latter term especially in compounds like *Landeskrankenhaus*).

Apart from other differences like pronunciation (M. Clyne 1995: 29) and morphology (these differences occur in the general language as well as in the terms for special purposes, e.g. *Klagsbegehren* (A) – *Klagebegehren* (D), *das Risiko* – *die Risiken* (A) – *die Risikos/Risiken* (D); different prepositions: *außer Obligo* – *ohne Obligo*, *um 1 Euro/ für 1 Euro*; more see A.D. Kubacki 2011: 217)

there are many terms that are used in Austrian administration and in the political area: *Landeshauptmann* (Ministerpräsident), *Klubchef/in* (Fraktionsvorsitzende/r), *Staatsbürgerschaft* (Staatsangehörigkeit), *Bezirkshauptmannschaft* (Landratsamt) or *Bezirkshauptmann* (Landrat) (see *ibid.*: 218; here the author mentions also *allfällig*, which ought to be in German, as he states, *eventuell* or *etwaig*, but in this context it is rarely used, but mainly as *Allfälliges* in meetings = “order of the day/ business”).

A.D. Kubacki also gives many examples of terms in the language used by lawyers. Although many of them were known and used in Austria, the topic of different terms in politics, administration, law etc. (these fields are very important in the EU) before Austria’s access to the European Union was not at all discussed within the German or linguistic departments of the Austrian universities (about the language discussions in Austria see P. Wiesinger 1995 and about the discussions concerning the EU see P. Wiesinger 2008). After a short request to the ministries a list of 23 terms (the “Protokoll 10”, see A.D. Kubacki 2011: 214) was established – this list contains only terms of the Austrian cuisine, which is in fact essential when it comes to tourism or to the identity of the Austrian population, but in the work of the European Union it for sure plays a marginal role. Others, e.g. Polish authors, also complain about missing Polish-German word-lists of the EU institutions and authorities (see Z. Weigt 2003: 374).

I. Jacewicz (2010: 193) points out that especially the language of the law has different terms in every country (as opposed to some other languages of special purposes have many international terms):

Was jedoch die Rechtssprache von anderen Fachsprachen sehr deutlich unterscheidet, ist die Tatsache, dass die normierten Rechtsbegriffe nicht international, sondern national sind, d.h. ihre Bedeutung variiert von Land zu Land, von Rechtsordnung zu Rechtsordnung und zieht daher große Schwierigkeiten für die Übersetzer nach sich (I. Jacewicz 2010: 193).

Much more important therefore is the dictionary of the Austrian language of the law and administration (*Österreichisches Wörterbuch zur Rechts- und Verwaltungsterminologie*), which H. Markhardt (2010) has drafted for the translators dealing with texts from Austria, after having experienced this missing help during a *praktikum* in the European Union.

Here are some examples that illustrate the big variety of differences of the Austrian German (see H. Markhardt 2010/2006):

Austrian German	German German	English
abgängig	vermisst, verschwunden	missing
beeinspruchen	Einspruch erheben	file appeal against
Dienstauftrag	Weisung	instruction
einheben	erheben (Steuern)	collect, impose
Flugzettel	Flugblatt, Werbezettel	leaflet, handbill
Gerichtsakt m.	Gerichtsakte f.	court record
Hacklerregelung	Schwerarbeiterregelung	regulation for heavy labor
Inspektor	Komissar	lieutenant
Jus	Jura	(science of) law
Landeshauptfrau	Ministerpräsidentin	(county) prime minister
Monatsbezug	Monatsvergütung	monthly honorarium
supplieren	(einen Lehrer) vertreten	replace (a teacher)
Vorstand; Klassenvorstand	Vorsteher; Klassenlehrer	head, chairman; class teacher

Table 1: Variety of differences of Austrian German

The pluricentric concept, together with the anthropocentric theory of human languages (that means that the language of every human being is different and the so-called polylects – like national languages as well as ethnic or professional languages – are only a construct of and in our minds) have till now rarely been attached importance to in the educational system (see D. Zeman 2009: 197); therefore they should be popularized already in schools. This is also confirmed by R. Muhr (2005: 19):

A solution (...) could be the development of systematic bilingualism teaching both norms (the own and the former dominating one) in school. Whether this option is feasible, depends on different factors which are difficult to predict. In any case, a self-confident and culturally progressive political class seems to be a precondition in order to take the necessary steps to achieve such a fundamental change in language policy.

Then the students become aware of the fact that there are not only many different dialects (although they are less and less spoken and substituted by a colloquial type of language in towns), but also different national varieties of the German language. This is then the base for those who later on deal with German at universities. Students who plan to become teachers should learn the differences in the lexical field, in pronunciation, in phrasal verbs and in practical use.

This concept is particularly important in the translation studies, where the students should learn to be able to translate any text from any German speaking country. That is why they ought to have at least a good passive understanding of Austrian terms (R. Utri 2013):

Besides, this concept should be considered above all within the studies of interpreters and translators. They ought to have at least a passive knowledge of the Austrian German, although they probably get to know it in their later professional life only as a ‘market niche’. In most of the institutes for translation studies, whether they are in German-speaking countries or outside of them, there is a severe lack of Austrian German-related texts that are used for translation didactics. (transl. R.U.)⁵

To improve the situation within the translation studies, first the lexicology of the Austrian German has to be improved. H. Markhardt has given a very good example with the dictionary of the Austrian legal, economic and administrative language. But more research has to be done and more dictionaries have to follow in order to cover all the fields where a lot of Austrian terms, phrases and words occur: these could be tourism, gastronomy (which is already partly covered), medicine, media, film, literature or techniques (e.g. the building industry). All these new dictionaries should be proved and then taken into account by the *Duden* editorial team (and not always defined as regional/ local). Only then will we be able to consider the Austrian terms to be fully recognized and codified in all the German-speaking countries. This is also necessary because the importance of languages for special purposes is growing steadily:

Every community differs in the field of technolects as soon as a work splitting into specialized work areas occurs. This difference increases the more in its quantity and speed, the quicker the specialized areas split up. And that is why one can say that the technolectal differentiation reflects the level of advancement of civilization of a given society up to a certain point. (F. Gruzca 1994: 17; transl. R.U.)⁶

Together with the enlarged codification of the Austrian German in Germany – that goes along with an increased number of entries in the *Duden* – the German

⁵ Orig.: “Darüber hinaus müsste dieses Konzept vor allem bei der Ausbildung von DolmetscherInnen und ÜbersetzerInnen Berücksichtigung finden. Diese müssten, obwohl sie in ihrem späteren Berufsleben das Österreichische Deutsch (ÖD) wahrscheinlich nur als „Marktnische“ kennen lernen werden, imstande sein, sich zumindest passive Kenntnisse des Österreichischen Deutsch anzueignen. In den meisten Dolmetschsinstituten gibt es, egal, ob sie in den deutschsprachigen Ländern angesiedelt sind oder außerhalb dieser, einen eklatanten Mangel an ÖD-bezogenen Texten, die für die Translationsdidaktik eingesetzt werden.“

⁶ Orig.: “Technolektalnie różnicuje się każda wspólnota w miarę dokonywania się w jej obrębie jakiegokolwiek specjalizacyjnego podziału pracy. Zróżnicowanie to pogłębia się tym bardziej i tym szybciej, im prędzej następuje jej rozpad specjalizacyjny. I dlatego można powiedzieć, że stan zróżnicowania technolektalnego w pewnej mierze odzwierciedla jednocześnie poziom cywilizacyjnego zaawansowania danego społeczeństwa.”

speaking countries (Germany and Austria are the EU members) should apply for an official dictionary or a satisfying large word list that has to be used in official documents of the European Union as well as by the translators who translate these documents. The EU translators and interpreters already use an unofficial word list anyway (see H. Markhardt 2010: 7). The EU politics is concerned about regional and minority languages, but is not very concerned about the big Austrian minority of 8,2 million people (about the danger of loosing Austrian terms by the dominant German mass media in Austria, see R. Muhr 2006). R. Muhr (2006) shows the language shift on thirty items: words like “Häferl”, “Zippverschluss”, “in der Früh”, “Wimmerl”, “angreifen” change into “Tasse”, “Reißverschluss”, “am Morgen”, “Pickel”, “anfassen”). Or does the European Union really want to stay with the ridiculously short and one-sided list of 23 words from the Austrian cuisine? Should such a big political and economic organization, where important decisions are made and where experts of all kind work in international commissions not have a more professional and linguistically based approach to issues that are connected to languages? Finally, the EU has to cope with about thirty national languages (and many more minority/regional languages) and there are more to come in the future.

Finally, we ask ourselves another question: how many Austrian languages (idiolects) for special purposes do exist? Because a strict border between a common and a language for special purposes cannot be distinguished, many state that one also cannot strictly distinguish between different languages for special purposes.

From the point of view of the anthropocentric theory of human languages, we have to say that all the languages for special purposes are in the brain. An expert can have several smaller or bigger parts of languages for special purposes in his brain, and this in English, Polish or (Austrian) German. They even work, interfere and develop in the same network (although they can physically be located in slightly different parts of the brain; the same brain parts are active in people who were educated bilingually from an early stage on; more see in C. M. Riehl 2009: 58). So every Austrian who has parts of the Austrian terminology of one or more fields in his/her brain, possesses an Austrian language for special purposes; at the end of the day we can state that there are several millions of them.

REFERENCES

- BAUER, J. (?2010), *Nervenzellen für das intuitive Verstehen sowie für Lehren und Lernen*. In: R. Caspary (ed.), *Lernen und Gehirn. Der Weg zu einer neuen Pädagogik*. Freiburg/ Basel/ Wien. 36–53.
- BAUDOIN DE COURTENAY, J. (1984), *O języku polskim*. Wybór prac pod redakcją Jana Basary i Mieczysława Szymczaka. Warszawa.

- BONACCHI, S. (2011), *Höflichkeitsausdrücke und anthropozentrische Linguistik*. Seria: Języki. Kultura. Teksty. Wiedza. Warszawa.
- BRAUN, P. (1993), *Tendenzen in der deutschen Gegenwartssprache. Sprachvarietäten*. Stuttgart/ Berlin/ Köln.
- CLYNE, M. (1995), *The German language in a changing Europe*. Cambridge/ New York/ Melbourne.
- GAJEWSKA, E. (2012), *Schlesische Sprache – deutsche und polnische Einflüsse*. Bachelor paper, Uniwersytet Warszawski.
- GRUCZA, F. (ed.) (1992a), *Język, kultura – kompetencja kulturowa*. Warszawa.
- GRUCZA, F. (1992b), *Kulturowe determinanty języka oraz komunikacji językowej*. In: F. Grucza (ed.), *Język, kultura – kompetencja kulturowa*. Warszawa. 9–70.
- GRUCZA, F. (1993), *Język, ludzkie właściwości językowe, językowa zdolność ludzi*. In: J. Piontka/ A. Wierciński (eds), *Człowiek w perspektywie ujęć biokulturowych*. Poznań. 151–174.
- GRUCZA, F. (1994a), *O wieloznaczności wyrazu „język”, heterogeniczności wiązanych z nim desygnatów i istocie rzeczywistych języków ludzkich*. In: *Przegląd Glottodydaktyczny* 13. 8–37.
- GRUCZA, F. (1994b), *O językach specjalistycznych (= technolektach) jako pewnych składnikach rzeczywistych języków ludzkich*. In: F. Grucza (ed.), *Języki specjalistyczne*, Warszawa. 7–27.
- GRUCZA, S. (1996), *Idiolekt specjalistyczny – idioskultura specjalistyczna – interkulturowość specjalistyczna*. In: J. Lewandowski/ M. Kornacka (eds), *Języki Specjalistyczne 6: Teksty specjalistyczne w kontekstach zawodowych i tłumaczeniach*. Warszawa. 30–49.
- GRUCZA, S. (2004), *Od lingwistyki tekstu do lingwistyki tekstu specjalistycznego*. Warszawa
- GRUCZA, S. (2006), *Zu den Forschungsgegenständen und den Forschungszielen der Fachtextlinguistik*. In: F. Grucza/ H.-J. Schwenk/ M. Olpińska (eds), *Texte – Gegenstände germanistischer Forschung und Lehre*. Warszawa. 101–122.
- GRUCZA, S. (2008), *Lingwistyka języków specjalistycznych*. Warszawa.
- HOAD, T.F. (ed.) (2003), *The Concise Dictionary of English Etymology*. Oxford.
- JACEWICZ, I. (2010), *Zur Frage des gemeinsamen Interessensobjekts der Linguistik und Rechtswissenschaft: Sprache und Recht*. In: *Lingwistyka Stosowana/ Applied Linguistics/ Angewandte Linguistik* 3. 185–195.
- KUBACKI, A.D. (2011), *Austriacki Język Prawa – z doświadczeń tłumacza*. In: *Komunikacja specjalistyczna* 2. 212–224.
- MARKHARDT, H. (2005), *Das Österreichische Deutsch im Rahmen der EU*. Reihe Österreichisches Deutsch Sprache der Gegenwart, ed. By R. Muhr/ R. Schrod, Band 3. Frankfurt/ M.
- MARKHARDT, H. (2010), *Wörterbuch der österreichischen Rechts-, Wirtschafts- und Verwaltungsterminologie*. Serie Österreichisches Deutsch Sprache der Gegenwart, hrg. v. R. Muhr/ R. Schrod, Frankfurt/ M.
- MUHR, R. (2005), *Language Attitudes and language conceptions in non-dominating varieties of pluricentric languages*. In: R. Muhr (ed.), *Standardvariationen und Sprachideologien in verschiedenen Sprachkulturen der Welt/ Standard Variations and Language Ideologies in different Language Cultures around the World*. Frankfurt/ M. 11–20.
- MUHR, R. (2006), *Asymmetry in action. The sociolinguistics of lexical change in Austrian German*. In: R. Muhr (ed.), *Innovation und Kontinuität in Sprache und Kommunikation verschiedener Sprachkulturen/ Innovation and Continuity in Language and Communication of different Language Cultures*. Frankfurt/ M. 57–72.
- ÖW = Österreichisches Wörterbuch (1965), hrg. Im Auftrage des Bundesministeriums für Unterricht, 23. Aufl., Wien.
- PINKER, S. (2007), *Language Instinct. How The Mind Creates Language*. New York et al.
- PUTZ, M. (2002), „Österreichisches Deutsch“ als Fremdsprache? Kritische Überlegungen. In: *GFL (German as a foreign language)–journal* 3/2002. 48–76.

- RIEHL, C.M. (2009), *Sprachkontaktforschung. Eine Einführung*. Tübingen.
- SICK, B. (2005), *Der Dativ ist dem Genitiv sein Tod. Ein Wegweiser durch den Irrgarten der deutschen Sprache*. Köln.
- UTRI, R. (2009a), *Sprache – Kultur – Idiotkultur – Interkulturalität. Anmerkungen zur Begriffsunterscheidung*. In: *Annales Neophilologiarum*. Czasopismo naukowe Wydziału Filologicznego Uniwersytetu Szczecińskiego. Szczecin. 73–86.
- UTRI, R. (2009b), *Wie der Mensch zur Sprache kam – die Umstände der Entstehung der menschlichen Sprache*. In: *Studien zur Germanistik. Rocznik Germanistyczny*, 2009/3. 93–102.
- UTRI, R. (2010), *Der Mensch im Mittelpunkt: Sokrates, H. v. Schoenebeck, F. Grucza und ihre anthropozentrischen Ansichten im Vergleich*. In: *Lingwistyka Stosowana/ Applied Linguistics/ Angewandte Linguistik* 2. 203–215.
- UTRI, R. (2011), *Der Mensch ein intelligenter Affe? Zur Sprach- und Kulturentwicklung unserer nächsten „Verwandten“ – Erkenntnisse der Primatenforschung der letzten Jahrzehnte und deren Konsequenzen für die menschliche Entwicklung*. In: I. Bartoszewicz/ J. Szczęk/ A. Tworek (eds), *Germanistische Linguistik im interdisziplinären Gefüge I*. Dresden/ Wrocław. 19–27.
- UTRI, R. (2012a), *Wir zer-FRANZ-en uns. Eine sprachlich-kulturelle Analyse von Werbetexten*. In: M. Olpińska-Szkiełko/ S. Grucza/ Z. Berdychowska/ J. Żmudzki (eds), *Der Mensch und seine Sprachen. Festschrift für Professor Franciszek Grucza*. Frankfurt/ M. 650–661.
- UTRI, R. (2012b), *Die regionale Vielfalt des Deutschen als Kulturrealität – am Beispiel des österreichischen Deutsch*. In: F. Grucza/ G. Pawlowski/ M. Olpińska-Szkiełko/ S. Bonacchi (eds), *Człowiek – język – kultura/ Mensch – Sprache – Kultur*. Warszawa. 300–310.
- UTRI, R. (2013), *Die Plurizentrität der Sprachen – Geschichte, derzeitiger Stand, Ausblicke*. In: *Germanica Wratislaviensia* 138, [in press].
- WEIGT, Z. (2003), *Die Translationsdidaktik und das Problem der Integration*. In: F. Grucza (ed.), *Deutsch-polnische und gesamteuropäische Integration in Forschung, Lehre und Öffentlichkeitsarbeit der (polnischen) Germanistik*. Warszawa. 370–374.
- WIESINGER, P. (1995), *Das österreichische Deutsch in der Diskussion*. In: R. Muhr/ R. Schrodt/ P. Wiesinger (eds), *Österreichisches Deutsch. Linguistische, sozialpsychologische und sprachpolitische Aspekte einer nationalen Variante des Deutschen*. Wien. 59–76.
- WIESINGER, P. (2008), *Austriazismen als Politikum. Zur Sprachpolitik in Österreich*. In: P. Wiesinger (ed.), *Das österreichische Deutsch in Gegenwart und Geschichte*. Reihe: Austria: Forschung und Wissenschaft, Bd. 2. Wien. 133–143.
- WOLFF, G. (1999), *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte. Ein Studienbuch*. 4. Aufl., Tübingen/ Basel.
- ZEMAN, D. (2009), *Überlegungen zur deutschen Sprache in Österreich. Linguistische, sprachpolitische und soziolinguistische Aspekte der österreichischen Varietät*. Hamburg.