

Forum: Austrian Studies

The focus of this issue of the *The German Quarterly* is on Austrian studies. The five preceding essays, each illustrating different approaches to the study of Austria's literatures and cultures, were not solicited specifically for this issue, but were submitted through the regular channels and underwent a double-blind peer review process. In order to gain more insight into scholarly developments in the field, however, we decided to also create space in this issue for a more deliberate reflection on what it means to do Austrian studies. The editors of this forum asked a number of scholars (most of them working in the US, but also one representative from the UK and one from Austria) for their views on the state of Austrian studies today. We were interested specifically in developments in scholarship on Austrian literature and culture since the year 2000. We asked our contributors to illustrate what they see as important accomplishments, the challenges and dilemmas they perceive as specific to Austrian studies, problems and issues that remain underexamined, and promising trends and developments.

Below you will find the results. The development of the field of Austrian studies certainly has been driven by institutional structures: organizations, journals, and curricula. But scholarship also developed its own dynamics that often remained implicit. Research in literary and cultural studies clearly moves in certain directions without an explicit master plan (and maybe this is not such a bad thing). The following short essays attempt to trace those dynamics. Most of the contributions reveal a concern about canonization and a narrowing of the field. They also acknowledge that the canon of Austrian culture has not only shifted over time, but is also highly dependent on one's own position and investments. Media studies and a concern about cultural diversity have clearly had an impact on the study of Austrian literature and culture, and the field is still deliberating on how exactly to incorporate them. The relations between Austrian and German studies are complex and not without tension; this too is reflected in the contributions to our forum.

We hope that the following forum will offer some orientation for those active—in whatever capacity: as a scholar, teacher, or simply as someone interested in literary and cultural history—in Austrian studies, but also may be of value to those whose main areas of expertise are located elsewhere. In some respects, Austrian studies offers an interesting case study on the relevance and problems of the nation-state paradigm when practicing cultural analysis and on the question of how the area studies model functions in academia today.

ELIZABETH LOENTZ & CARL NIEKERK

A Once and Future Austrian Studies

Contemporary Austrian studies in the United States has a specific (re)birth date: the year 2000. Until then, Austrian literary studies in the US had been in the hands of the *International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association*, which had published its *Journal* (in mimeo form) from 1961 to 1968. The journal then became *Modern Austrian Literature (MAL)*, eventually ending up under Donald Daviau at the University of California at Riverside, who hosted a yearly conference there between 1971 and 1999. And then things changed again: the 2000 conference was announced and then cancelled, when Daviau lost his traditional venue (the faculty club was demolished) and shifted his focus. The journal lapsed, and a small East Coast Austrian Studies Association that had held its own conferences soldiered on to replace what was lost (starting at Allegheny College in 1994, with subsequent conferences at the University of Delaware, Bowling Green State University, Dickinson College, Lafayette College [in 1999 and 2001, with the latter cancelled due to 9/11], and the University of Pennsylvania in 2002). Through their help, Austrian studies in the US regrouped, first by finding new editors who edited and published all the missing issues of *MAL* and brought it forward, as a new board structure was put into place for what became the *Modern Austrian Literature and Culture Association* in Spring 2000. Conferences at the University of Vermont (2003) and Rice University (2004) relaunched the association's brand as *MALCA*, the *Modern Austrian Literature and Culture Association*. The new Austrian studies in the US finished its transformation when it became the *Austrian Studies Association* in 2011, changing its journal's title to *Journal of Austrian Studies*, and attracting a significant international and interdisciplinary presence in its conferences (in sessions that *mix* disciplines).

This identity shift signals scholars' full-scale adoption of *cultural studies* in the contemporary sense: the millennial Austrian studies claimed its identity as a brand of cultural studies that embraces the multicultural, multilingual, and multiethnic heritage of Central Europe, including not only present-day Austria but its political formations from the latter Holy Roman Empire through the Austrian Empire and Austria-Hungary, and texts written in each of the region's languages, not just German. The Austrian Studies Association and its conferences assumed responsibility for scholarship across the broad range of the humanities and social sciences (including, most notably, cultural history, film, cultural events and practices, music, art, and monuments—not only traditional literary studies). To do less would have meant to surrender the integrity of cultural studies as historically situated scholarship to the presentism that can blind cultural studies to persistent regional and cultural identities. In taking up this mission, it stands next to the Center for Austrian Studies at the University of Minnesota Twin Cities (founded 1977), which has provided a home for the study of Austrian history, principally its cultural and intellectual histories, and the Wirth Institute for Austrian and Central European Studies (established 1998) at the University of Alberta, which more consciously includes Habsburg cultural legacies outside Austria and Hungary, as well as a broader span of arts and humanities.

Yet this more inclusive image of Austrian cultures now espoused within its North American professional organization is also fragile and in a real sense under threat by trends in US-*Germanistik*, which has become progressively more presentist over the last three decades and less interested in seeing germanophone cultures as pluricentric. Part of that threat is simply demographic. Not only are “German” departments shrinking and disappearing in areas of the country where German heritage is receding into historic memory, but a great number of the major Austrianists who made this area of study significant within *Germanistik* have either retired or continue to practice at liberal arts colleges or regional campuses of state universities, where they influenced generations of students but yielded no PhD students.

The more significant danger for Austrian studies is the damage done by twentieth-century geopolitics. The fall of the Wall and the end of the Cold War has not (for example) led many Slavic Studies scholars to consider how their national cultures are implicated with Austria's. Even worse, *Germanistik* in the US almost uncritically aggregates Austrian and Austro-Hungarian authors and filmmakers with Germans, overlooking, for instance, Kafka's bilingualism or the fact that Elfriede Jelinek and Thomas Bernhard write about Austria but with the German audience in mind. Hollywood Austrians like Christoph Waltz are all too often “German,” and experimental filmmakers like VALIE EXPORT, familiar on the European art stage, are often invisible to German film scholars.

The damage caused by such scholarly imperialism is ongoing and real. When in 2014–2015 the MLA realigned its older division structure, I had suggested that using “German” to describe pre-1871 germanophone cultures was anachronistic at best, or a nationalist falsification, at worst. Even for the twentieth century, the term perpetuates the Cold War or the geography of Hitler's Germany, the only historical entity that espoused the name “Deutschland” before the “Bundesrepublik Deutschland” came into being. The GDR, notably, did not call itself “Deutschland.” To remediate this problem, I had suggested “germanophone literatures and cultures” as a more proper description of “German studies” in the US, since “German” culture never had a stable center that could be understood in terms similar to London or Paris (except, arguably, for Vienna, given Berlin's late development and unstable position in history). My suggestion seemed straightforward: British studies does not get to aggregate England, Scotland, Wales, and Ireland unthinkingly just because “they all speak English (mostly),” while US *Germanistik* happily aggregates “Austria” with “Germany”—a particular violence against Austria and Austria-Hungary's history and a definite affirmation of scholarly colonization. Alas, the largely Austrianist-free East Coast Germanist establishment rose in protest against my attempt at historical rectification, and we are left with “German languages and cultures” for the forum names, and with a German studies that affirms neither geography nor the histories setting that geography into place, while nominally allowing the plural form. Robert Burns gets to be from Scotland, not the UK, but Kafka and Hofmannsthal still remain “German” in MLA programs.

This resolution does also not bode well for the future of scholarship within US germanophone cultural studies in general and for Austrian cultural studies in par-

ticular. By definition, cultural studies is supposed to engage identities and historical experience, which means that it requires scholars to attend to *differences* in their objects of studies rather than using unconsidered or vague terminology like “German” culture. Such terms cannot really apply before 1871 as anything other than as Heine’s “Wintermärchen”—a Germany that exists only as an imagined community. In these eras, individuals who spoke German still identified primarily as Rhinelanders or Bavarians. Not all German-speakers are/were Germans; nor do/did all Austrians speak German. And then there are the Swiss, *Banat Schwaben*, Texas Germans ... and on and on. To ignore these differences means that scholars are simply not interested in the sites they study in any other context than through the lens of the present and of nationalist cultural studies.

This situation also has implications for the training and scholarly habits of future Austrianists. PhDs trained by US *Germanisten* are today simply not exposed to current international standards for cultural studies outside a narrow set of reference points tied to Germany’s Federal Republic. Thus the vibrant, multidisciplinary cultural studies presently cultivated in Austria, influenced by the Birmingham School, Ruth Wodak’s version of critical discourse analysis, and the historiography of the Vienna School, is unknown, occluded by the persistence of the Frankfurt School and Hegelian histories. Such PhDs are also often unwittingly presentist and unwilling or unable to understand historical differences in sites of germanophone cultural production—different conditions of production, reception, and circulation of culture, and even different corpora correlating with specific class positions.

In such situations, Austrians speak of *Fortwursteln*: muddling through. Austrian studies will survive, as it always has, if it continues to embrace interdisciplinary, multinational, and multiethnic scholarship while eschewing national isolationism, either in its scholarship or its scholarly networks.

KATHERINE ARENS

The University of Texas at Austin



Austrian Studies: Thriving among Challenges

Austrian Studies in the United States is very different from German Studies not only in terms of its subject but also in terms of its organization. Its different disciplinary branches do not come together under the umbrella of a common organization like the German Studies Association. The membership of the Austrian Studies Association is primarily made up of scholars interested in literary and cultural studies; historians and political scientists with an Austrian focus would not consider it their professional organization. Hence the disclaimer: my reflections on Austrian Studies and its development since 2000 concern primarily

the literary/cultural branch represented by the Austrian Studies Association. Here the most important development is the move towards interdisciplinarity. In 2000, the “International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association” (IASRA) and editor of *Modern Austrian Literature*, retired. IASRA was renamed the “Modern Austrian Literature and Culture Association” (MALCA), signaling a move away from the singular focus on literature to include cultural studies. In 2011, MALCA became the “Austrian Studies Association,” and its journal *Modern Austrian Literature* was renamed *Journal of Austrian Studies*, further emphasizing the organization’s attempt to embrace more disciplines, and also to extend its focus on the modern period to include “scholarship on the cultures of Austria’s earlier political forms (the Holy Roman Empire, the Austrian Empire, and Austria-Hungary) and scholarship that acknowledges this region’s historical multi-ethnic, multilingual, and transcultural identities and their legacies in the present” (<http://www.austrian-studies.org/associationinfo.html>). The recent annual conferences of the Austrian Studies Association suggest considerable progress toward that objective. While the majority of the presentations were still focused on literature and film, there were also talks on music, fine arts, philosophy, and history. The keynote addresses and support programs especially showed that the conference organizers were mindful and supportive of the Association’s objectives.

Yet the conference programs also reveal that Austrian Studies remains heavily focused on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries. This impression is reinforced when considering the publications in the journal over the past decade and a half. A survey reveals that within the focus on the modern period, articles on the Viennese *fin de siècle* and the works of Schnitzler, followed by Musil, Kafka, and Broch, dominate. Postwar and contemporary literature come in second with most publications dealing with Bernhard, then Bachmann or Jelinek (excluding special topics volumes on Heimrad Bäcker, Michael Hanecke, and W.G. Sebald). Here too the lens is too narrow as it neglects not only canonical authors like Ilse Aichinger, Friederike Mayröcker, H.C. Artmann, and Ernst Jandl, but also those of the following generations like Christoph Ransmayr, Marlene Streeruwitz, Lilian Faschinger, Anna Mitgutsch, Norbert Gstrein, Doron Rabinovici, Eva Menasse, Thomas Glavinic or Margit Schreiner. Earlier periods are mainly represented by a handful of articles on Ebner-Eschenbach, Stifter, and Grillparzer. Incidentally, this is mirrored by publications on Austrian topics in other literary journals like *German Quarterly* and *Monatshefte*. The *Austrian History Yearbook* published by the Austrian Center at the University of Minnesota presents a somewhat different picture, as it also features scholarship on earlier periods. One reason for the strong interest in the turn of the century is certainly the legacy of scholars like Carl Schorschke, Allan Janik, and Stephen Toulmin, whose seminal works on the Viennese *fin de siècle* contributed greatly to the interest in Austrian history, culture, and art in the United States. It also bears keeping in mind that in the US the study of Austrian literature has its roots in the “International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association,” whose primary interest in the literature of the modern period set the direction for a long time. Such a legacy is hard to shake, notwith-

standing the fact that the turn of the century is one of Austria's richest and most intriguing eras in most respects: literature, culture, art, music, science, and politics. The dilemma, however, is that it reduces Austria to a single époque to the detriment of its earlier periods and unique traditions such as the Austrian Baroque or the Alt-Wiener Volkskomödie of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The challenge to overcome this limited focus is compounded when we look at Austrian Studies in the curriculum at US universities and colleges. Very few Austrian Studies Programs exist to begin with, as contemporary Austria's relative insignificance with regard to politics and economics does not merit a prominent place in regional studies. Thus, Austrian Studies is usually subsumed under "European Studies" even at universities with an "Austrian Chair" such as Stanford University or Columbia and Harvard, where it is part of International Affairs. Generally, few history departments devote courses specifically to Austria, and when they do, the focus remains on the Habsburg Empire. The same can be said for philosophy, fine arts, film studies, and music. It is even or especially true for German departments. Their offerings in Austrian literature are few and mirror the emphasis on the *fin de siècle* or the modern period with an occasional specialized course on well-known Austrian writers. With the shrinking numbers of MA and PhD programs in German at US universities and colleges, Austrian Studies will further lose ground as specifically Austrian topics will be covered even less. Moreover, the problem starts at the level of language instruction. For their cultural sections, textbooks draw largely on the literature and culture of Germany. In those chapters devoted to Austria (or Switzerland), well-worn clichés like the coffee house tradition or Austrian music are evoked; older periods prevail, and rarely is there any mention of contemporary popular music from Austria. There is also the question of funding. One of the major supporters of Austrian Studies in the United States, the Austrian Cultural Forum, does not support travel for pre-1945 research. Indeed, it seems there is little chance that Austrian Studies will be freed from its twentieth-century ghetto.

This very pessimistic outlook is offset by the exciting work that is happening in Austrian Studies and the many young scholars the field keeps attracting. This was showcased most impressively at the recent annual conferences. So: could Austrian Studies be more interdisciplinary? Yes! Should its research focus go beyond the twentieth and twenty-first centuries? Yes again. There is no doubt that it is progressing in the right direction. This progress should not, however, prevent the Association for Austrian Studies from increasing its effort to network with other similarly oriented organizations such as the Austrian Centers in Minnesota and New Orleans; to more aggressively solicit submissions to the journal on earlier periods; and to work with Fulbright and the Botstiber Institute for Austrian-American Studies (BIAAS) to support the next generation of Austrian Studies scholars.

HELGA SCHRECKENBERGER

University of Vermont



Austrian Studies in a New Époque

Around 2000, two decades after the publication of Carl E. Schorske's *Fin-de-Siècle Vienna: Politics and Culture* (1980), a number of scholars (including Pieter Judson in *Exclusive Revolutionaries* [1997], Scott Spector in *Prague Territories* [2000], and Steven Beller in *Rethinking Vienna 1900* [2001]) turned a critical eye both to Schorske's work and to the reasons behind the outsized influence it exerted on the practices of cultural historians in general and the field of Austrian Studies in particular. Around the same time in New York City, the entrepreneur and collector Ronald Lauder opened the *Neue Galerie*, a museum that boasts a stunning collection devoted to fine and decorative Viennese modernist art. In the fifteen years of its existence, the *Neue Galerie* has contributed to the prominence of "Vienna 1900" for a North American understanding of what Austria was and is. The first decade of the twenty-first century saw the opening of the European Union towards Central and Eastern Europe and the inclusion into the EU of many countries that had formerly been provinces or crown lands of the Habsburg Monarchy but had been cut off from dialogue with Western Europe by the Iron Curtain. In 2016, 100 years after the death of Emperor Franz Joseph, Europe is in the midst of a refugee crisis that threatens to pit many of the EU's newest members from Central and Eastern Europe against Western member states, exposing historical fault lines in the process. Within the context of the increasingly interdisciplinary field of Austrian Studies, it behooves us to ask whether "Vienna 1900" might offer not simply a circumscribed modernist case study but also a lens through which Austrian Studies scholars might think through the history of discourses about the "outsider": "Asien beginnt an der Landstraße," Metternich purportedly stated when he served as the Austrian Empire's foreign minister during the first half of the nineteenth century. However, the latter half of the century saw not merely a liberalization of opinions as well as laws about outsiders, but also a renewed backlash against the "other within."

The Habsburg Empire was a multicultural body containing a wide variety of ethnic groups, but responses to these "ethnic others" and, in particular, to Jews when they migrated to Vienna in large numbers following the 1867 *Ausgleich* with Hungary and the implementation of the *Staatsgrundgesetz über die allgemeinen Rechte der Staatsbürger*, were fraught with prejudice. We should not forget the cold reception that Theodor Herzl received from his *Burschenschaft* when Jews were refused the right of satisfaction in a duel or the anti-Semitism that colored reception of the works of authors like Arthur Schnitzler and many of his contemporaries. Whoever travels to Vienna in 2016 will find the city displaying a whitewashed version of its imperial past and the waning days of Habsburg: indeed, exhibits abound that examine the legacy of Emperor Franz Joseph. The *Österreichische Nationalbibliothek* and other sites currently display a multiple-exhibit ex-

travaganza, “Der ewige Kaiser,” suggesting the emperor’s legacy will never die (11 March – 27 November 2016). “Mater Dolorosa—Die trauernde Kaiserin Elisabeth” is the title of a special exhibit that purports to look sympathetically at the parenting habits of Franz Joseph’s wife Sisi and will be on view in Vienna’s *Hofburg* until 22 May 2016. And the arts and crafts of the *Wiener Werkstätte*, Gustav Klimt’s paintings, and Schiele’s drawings continue to be on permanent view, of course, at the *MAK*, the *Sezession*, the *Belvedere*, the *Leopold Museum*, and many other places in and around Vienna, drawing a steady stream of visitors. The 100th anniversary of Franz Joseph’s death, then, provides the perfect excuse to indulge in a nostalgia for a bygone empire—and one that seems a lot more benign than the *Reich* that Austria so readily joined in the *Anschluss* of 1938. In a critical response to this cultural trend, the Austrian Studies Association organized three panels on the topic of “Habsburg Nostalgia” at the 2013 Modern Language Association convention in Boston. The *Journal of Austrian Studies* published a special issue (47.2 / Summer 2014) on “Habsburg Nostalgia,” featuring essays on topics including the Corpus Christi celebrations in Vienna at the *fin de siècle*, the spectacle surrounding Otto Habsburg’s funeral in 2011, and “Sisi” as recuperated heroine in contemporary Trieste. The volume includes essays by scholars of literature and culture, art history, and history. The current intense interest in Habsburg nostalgia on the part of North American scholars of Austrian Studies mirrors the turn in German and in European Studies to transnational literature and to literature produced by writers with hybrid cultural identities. The simultaneous expansion and crisis within the European Union and the current migration trends have spurred on scholars of literature and culture to consider more closely the multicultural and multiethnic history of contemporary Austria.

Even as the Habsburg Empire offers rich material for critical reconsiderations of the nation-state model, Habsburg nostalgia is most keenly in need of critical interventions in light of the historical events that occurred between the collapse of the empire in 1918 and the signing of the Austrian State Treaty in 1955: the emergence of both Austro-fascism and Nazism. It is this period that Habsburg nostalgia seeks to render dormant in the casual monarchist. Here, we believe, is the crucial point at which Austrian Studies needs German Studies, where the two fields must speak to one another. Whereas Germany (in particular West Germany) has been forced since 1945 to admit guilt for the genocide committed by the Nazis during World War II, Austria has, to a large extent, elided this shame. According to the 2004 Nobel Prize winner Elfriede Jelinek, “Es gibt nur zwei Länder, die sich aus der Verantwortung geschlichen haben: Österreich und Japan. Den Japanern ist natürlich Hiroshima zugute gekommen, während die Österreicher es so vollzogen haben” (*Sturm und Zwang. Schreiben als Geschlechterkampf* [1995], 47). Perceived both as a “Nestbeschmutzerin” and as a national treasure in contemporary Austria, Jelinek is emblematic of the many Austrian authors who have pointed adamantly to Austria’s crimes during the *Third Reich*. These authors, including such prominent figures as Ingeborg Bachmann, Thomas Bernhard, Doron Rabinovici, Robert Menasse, Christoph Ransmayr, Robert Schindel,

Peter Turrini, and Lilian Faschinger, were surely spurred on by conversations with their German counterparts, and they often published (and continue to publish) their works in Germany. They have honed a mode of critique that is razor sharp, one that has, in turn, inspired German writers.

Hence, while the separate field of Austrian Studies offers unique multi-disciplinary perspectives on a cultural view significantly different from the German one, in particular prior to Hitler's annexation of Austria in 1938, the history of Nazism calls for continued cross-fertilization between German Studies and Austrian Studies and even blurs, at times, the boundaries between these fields. We believe that while Austrian Studies attends to multiple discourses indigenous to the Austrian context and hence not adequately considered within German Studies proper (i.e., its Enlightenment, distinct from the German one; the unique history of the Dual Monarchy, etc.; see, for example, Katherine Arens, *Vienna's Dreams of Europe* [2015]), the field needs German Studies as an intimate interlocutor with regard, in particular, to the shared burdens of twentieth-century history (the rise of anti-Semitism in the early decades of the twentieth century in both nations and, most dramatically, Nazism). Conversely, German Studies needs Austrian Studies in order to deepen its transnational and regional sensitivities. We propose, then, that intimate and sustained communication between the two fields is a crucial path to facing the central ethical issues of the time head on.

Comparative literary and cultural studies have always fostered sincere interrogations of ethical questions germane to multiple geographical spaces, and the current humanitarian crisis of migration in Europe is occurring on both Austrian and German soil. Surely this historical moment requires from the two nations not only empathy but also an honest reckoning with the shared shame of the Holocaust and with the divergent histories that contributed to the formation of modern Austria and Germany. Together with their counterparts in German Studies, contemporary scholars of Austrian Studies are called upon to grapple with the dominant discourses, representational strategies, and alternative voices emerging from this complex terrain.

IMKE MEYER AND HEIDI SCHLIPPHACKE
University of Illinois at Chicago



The Many *Fins de siècle* of Austrian Studies, or: What Follows Vienna 1900?

The study of Vienna's *fin de siècle* is today a specific reference to that pre-World War I font of transcultural innovation across the arts and social sciences as one of the most important and influential intellectual eras in European modernism. Unfortunately, in his book *Fin-de-siècle Vienna* (1980), the historian Carl E.

Schorske has also given Austrian Studies a brilliant emblem that eclipses its other equally significant eras. Without question, there is still a great deal to rediscover, analyze and experience about Vienna 1900. It is not the concept of the *fin de siècle* that limits Austrian Studies unfairly; rather, it is how German language programs deploy that heavily coded term as the perceived totality for their canonical representation of Austria. These German programs all too often forget that Austrianists have several *fins de siècle* to deal with, and all as rich as Carl Schorske's internationally identifiable one, as some scholars now point out.

For example, Deborah Holmes and Lisa Silverman have indicated another characteristic of Vienna 1900 that becomes problematic for their exploration of postimperial Austria with its Red Vienna and Black Austria: "In order to prove itself worthy of study, then, interwar Vienna not only has to face down the notion that anything of cultural significance occurred in the years preceding the First World War, but also that during the interwar years everything of significance happened in Berlin" ("Introduction," in *Interwar Vienna: Culture Between Tradition and Modernity* [2009], 5). Aside from Vienna's unique modernist movements during this period, "anything of cultural significance" would encompass the city's progressive urban planning and housing, design, literature, music, theater, visual arts, and film. Calling for analysis and refutation of the various myths and stereotypes which still represent interwar Berlin and Vienna culture—even in academia—Holmes and Silverman insist on a consideration of Vienna's (and Austria's) interwar development on its own merits (*ibid.* 6).

Austrian Studies deserves a better image for its many sites of investigation. Traditional scholarly tropes in Austria posit strong relationships with the past for the 1900 *fin de siècle* Vienna (the Baroque and the Enlightenment) as well as with its future, so the construct must connect to sites far beyond its era. Preliminary discussions about the theme for a projected (but only partially realized) Carnegie Hall Vienna Festival in New York in 2013 affirmed that Vienna's multiple *fins de siècle* reached across the centuries, extending its importance as a cultural and artistic center of German-language Europe and beyond. Those dialogues between the planning committee, its musicologists, and David Luft, Katherine Arens, and me (representing diverse strands of Austrianist scholarship in the U.S.), stressed how presenting Vienna's extraordinary music, literature, art, design, and film for both scholars and popular audiences could be gathered symbolically at the turns of three or four "new centuries"—1700, 1800, 1900, and 2000.

I highlight this discussion here in hopes of directing academics to look beyond a single, albeit fascinating *Jahrhundertwende* as the focus of Austrian Studies. Such a fresh reading of Austrian cultural heritage not only reconsiders popular and scholarly perceptions of Vienna as a monolithic and conservative society; it also interprets the city over time as an innovative melting pot whose nationhood is strongly associated with its cultural identity. Knowing how the city's great cultural output grew out of societies under stress helps us to understand why they continue to speak to us today and show how Vienna's cultural voice is significant and in a key relevant to public understanding of the world in which we live now.

Given the limitations of space, I underscore just one of the arts that would have connected two *fins de siècle* (Vienna 2000 and 1900) in the Carnegie Hall festival plan. New Austrian Film (1990s to the present) connects straightforwardly with Austria's significant role as a "film nation" beginning in Vienna 1900 with the female filmmaking pioneer Louise Kolm-Fleck, who is comparable to France's Alice Guy, followed later by monumental silent biblical epics by Sascha Kolowrat, Michael Kertész (Curtiz), and Sandor (Alexander) Korda that deflated Hollywood's early versions of such materials. Vienna's film industry attracted transnational talent and exported Austrians and Austro-Hungarian creativity to the studios of Berlin, Paris, London, and Hollywood. A century later, New Austrian Film strongly embraces female film artists and functions both as a counter cinema to the memory of nation-building postwar Austrian dominant film (1945 to early 1960s) and as semi-national film. It seeks to avoid the simplistic national tropes familiar to the international market (as opposed to critical self-examination) and resists being folded into German cinema.

Recovering these two sites allows us to see how Austrian and German filmmakers and performers have always worked across their borders, how they have variously paralleled, reflected, or diverged from each other in film genre, style, and content from cinema's inception. That these two cinemas represent different approaches even toward shared concepts of genre, however, has only recently been advanced in scholarship; the variances between these filmmaking sites can vary as strongly as the language and cultures that support them, and thus they defy scholars' attempts to posit "dominance" or "marginalization" within the various generations of German language film. One recent example of such scholarship demonstrates that the *Trümmerfilm* emerging from the collapse of the Third Reich takes on vastly different qualities in the two countries under Allied occupation, and that Austrian filmmakers' rejection of a replication of the style and content of the genre in Germany does not postulate an avoidance of the genre itself (see Amanda Z. Randall, "Austrian *Trümmerfilm*?: What a Genre's Absence Reveals about National Postwar Cinema and Film Studies," *German Studies Review* 38 [2015]: 573-95). Germanophone studies should take on New Austrian Film and its international visibility with the enthusiasm that New German Cinema and Post-Wall German Film has enjoyed, especially since there are also linkages between Vienna's productions and the current *Berliner Schule* counter cinema.

Fortunately, younger Germanists show interest in an expanded Austrian Studies that moves the field beyond the limitations of Vienna 1900. Nonetheless, the most broadly disseminated idea of German(ic) Studies, named for the language but signifying Germany, has grown stale. The exciting flux and nuance that multicultural/transcultural Francophone and Hispanic Studies have is missing in the practice of our label. That deficit might easily be remedied with conscious effort to include what should have been there in the first place: Austrian German and a presentation of an independent Austrian Studies, or the kind of broader canonical reflection that a true Germanophone approach accommodating the plurality of German-language cultures would demand.

One ought also to remember that Austrian literature, culture, and the arts includes non-German-language Central European voices as well, both past and present, and such transculturalism can only broaden and enrich our discipline. As literary scholar Klaus Zeyringer lucidly asks: “warum sollte im deutschen Sprachraum alles unter ‘deutsch’ subsumiert werden? Warum sollte ein Autor, der auf Deutsch schreibt, ein ‘deutscher’ Schriftsteller sein, bedeutet doch dieses Adjektiv auch eine nationale Identität, eine Staatsangehörigkeit, eine Zugehörigkeit zu einem Kulturraum? [...] Somit verschwinden die Schweiz und Österreich von der literarischen Landkarte, steht jede derartige literarhistorische Betrachtung auf dem Boden eines falschen Text-Kontext-Bezuges” (*Österreichische Literatur seit 1945* [2008], 23). The realities of history and geography, at least, demand a revision of canonical practice to avoid the kind of marginalization that creates the problematic single Vienna 1900-centered *fin de siècle* Austrian Studies. A more representative approach is not only possible, but also crucial in helping to nourish and expand our often self-limiting university programs in the field.

ROBERT DASSANOWSKY

University of Colorado, Colorado Springs



Austrian Studies Unlimited: Some Perspectives from the UK

Looking at the field of Austrian Studies in the UK from the current vantage point of 2016, it is clear that a considerable process of re-focusing has taken place since the turn of the century. Renewed energy and definition has emerged even as the disciplinary spread has paradoxically tended to both narrow in its temporal range as well as reach out to areas of scholarship and interest beyond the traditional fields of literature and history.

There is no national organization in the UK that operates under the “Austrian Studies” banner and thus no counterpart to the “Austrian Studies Association” of North America (ASA) to which scholars and students could sign up and thereby demonstrate interest in all things Austrian, for instance by attending annual conferences or by paying organizational subscriptions. The “Association of German Studies” in Great Britain and Ireland (AGS) is the professional body for university Germanists, and the standard nomenclature belies the fact that the discipline of *German Studies* boasts researchers and teachers of Austrian culture and history amongst its faculty, just as a publication with the title *The Cambridge Companion to the Modern German Novel* (ed. Graham Bartram, 2004) of course covers Swiss and Austrian writers too. Measuring the health and developments of Austrian Studies in the UK and Ireland is not, then, made easier by the fluidity of disciplinary boundaries. Personally, I like to think that in every Germanist there lurks a hidden Austrianist.

Where there used to be a number of smaller centers or institutes at individual

universities which claimed Austrian Studies as part or all of their *raison d'être* (Aberdeen and Edinburgh with Janet Stewart and Andrew Barker; St. Andrews under Peter Branscombe; Nottingham with David Childs), very few such entities now exist. The "Ingeborg Bachmann Centre for Austrian Literature and Culture" (IBC) is housed by the University of London's School of Advanced Study as part of its portfolio of research centers in the Institute of Modern Languages Research (it also has a "Centre for German and Austrian Exile Studies"). The words "and Culture" were added to the IBC's name at its last board meeting in 2015 in a move that parallels other journals' and organizations' recent name changes and attempts to reflect more accurately the wider scope of professional interests and expertise that reside under the umbrella term of Austrian Studies. The US journal *Modern Austrian Literature* changed its name to the *Journal of Austrian Studies* in 2011 with precisely this intention. The UK Yearbook has always been titled *Austrian Studies* and ran to ten volumes with Edinburgh University Press (1990-1999) before recommencing in 2003 with Maney Publishing for the Modern Humanities Research Association. The yearbook was first launched under the editorship of eminent UK Austrianists Edward Timms and Ritchie Robertson and has enjoyed the steer of senior scholars through the years (Judith Beniston, Robert Vilain, Jon Hughes, and many more, including occasional guest editors since 2003).

2017 will see the twenty-fifth volume of *Austrian Studies* come to light, and to prime this publication, an international workshop is being held in June 2016 on the topic of "Celebrations: *Festkultur* in Austria" at the IBC and steered by the current editors of *AS*, Deborah Holmes and Florian Krobb. Established names in UK and Irish Austrian Studies (Andrew Barker, Gilbert Carr, Gar Yates, historian Robert Knight, and others already mentioned above) are joined by younger scholars (the IBC's Heide Kunzelmann, Caitríona Ní Dhúill) and by colleagues from Austria and the US. The "Austrian Cultural Forum" in London (ACF) will also participate and mark the occasion of its sixtieth year in London. The Forum (currently directed by Elisabeth Kögler) has been a constant source of support to colleagues in the UK. Renamed in 2001, the ACF shedding its rather formal-sounding "Institute" (Austrian Institute) but has continued to bring Austrian artists, musicians, intellectuals, and writers to the UK and to foster Austro-British exchange in artistic and scholarly projects and events. In 2012 (the year of London's Olympics is no coincidence), previous ACF director Peter Mikl commissioned the Just a Must theatre company to stage the English-language première of Elfriede Jelinek's *Sports Play*. The first night production took place in tandem with the first Anglophone conference on Jelinek's work (Lancaster University, July 2012; proceedings were published as *Elfriede Jelinek in the Arena*, vol. 23 of *Austrian Studies* [2014], ed. by Allyson Fiddler and Karen Jürs-Munby), and the production went on to tour at a number of UK theatres as well as enjoying festival appearances abroad.

Conferences are part of the lifeblood of any discipline, and Austrian Studies is no exception. John Warren and friends' many Austro-German conferences in Oxford (mostly in the 1990s) have not been replaced by a single venue or organizer.

Indeed, there have been a number of designated Austrian Studies conferences since 2000. One thinks of the Trinity College Dublin event in 2005 on the “State Treaty Fifty Years On” (see Gilbert Carr / Catriona Leahy [eds.], *The State Treaty Fifty Years On* [2008]), or Anthony Bushell and Martin Liebscher’s “Polemical Austria” conference at the IBC in 2010. The University of Nottingham hosted a major event on “Contemporary Austrian Literature, Film and Culture” in April 2015 (see Katya Krylova [ed.], *The Long Shadow of the Past* [forthcoming 2017]). This kind of cultural studies approach, inviting papers and perspectives from a variety of related disciplines (including political science, musicology, linguistics, history, or sociology), has proved a fertile way of fostering academic exchange on themes, questions or time periods. From this researcher’s viewpoint, a concentration of work on the twentieth and twenty-first centuries is evident. That said, there are new initiatives in “Habsburg Studies” such as the “Cambridge New Habsburg Studies Network” (CNHSN). It aims to promote new approaches to researching the history and cultures of Central and Eastern Europe and was launched in 2014. The University of Cambridge is the hub of an inter-institutional, Arts and Humanities Research Council funded project, the “Digital Critical Edition of Middle-Period Works by Arthur Schnitzler,” led by Andrew Webber. Cambridge has also recently staged a conference dedicated to the discussion of Austrian Cinema. “Picturing Austrian Cinema” was convened by Frederick Baker and Annie Ring with support from the Austrian Film Institute and will enjoy a second meeting in the autumn of 2016.

The current landscape of Austrian Studies in the UK is vibrant, exciting, and multifaceted. There is a long list of colleagues making significant contributions to the scholarship and teaching of Austrian Studies on these islands. I can neither enumerate all of these here nor the many important volumes that have appeared recently, some of which have arisen from conferences mentioned above. A few additional titles must suffice. The “Cambridge Companion” series has produced volumes on Kafka (Julian Preece, 2002) and on Rilke (Karen Leeder and Robert Vilain, 2010), as well as numerous volumes on Austrian composers. Katrin Kohl and Ritchie Robertson’s *A History of Austrian Literature, 1918–2000* appeared in 2006. Published by Camden House in the States, the volume profiles research by scholars working in the UK, USA, Germany, and Austria and furnishes insightful perspectives on prose, poetry, drama, film, cabaret, and popular culture, as well as covering political developments and literary sociology. Works like this demonstrate the wide-ranging nature of Austrian Studies and suggest, in fact, that Austrian Studies (or the study of Austria, even in its geographically shrunken Republican form) resists neatly forged boundaries, whether national, genre-specific, or institutional.

ALLYSON FIDDLER
Lancaster University

Austrian Studies in Österreich

“Austrian Studies” verstanden als wissenschaftliche Auseinandersetzung mit “Österreich” in seinen unterschiedlichen Staatsformen und Territorien finden unter diesem Begriff fast ausschließlich außerhalb Österreichs statt. Die Etablierung des Masterstudiengangs “Austrian Studies – Cultures, Literatures, Languages” (“Österreichstudien – Kulturen, Literaturen, Sprachen”) am Institut für Germanistik der Universität Wien 2010 ist eine Entscheidung, die in der Entwicklung dieses Curriculums auch eine Neuperspektivierung des eigenen Fachs vornimmt, den Blick von “außerhalb” sucht und eine wichtige Distanzierung zum “Eigenen” schafft. Die englische Bezeichnung ist Teil dieses programmatischen Vorhabens gemeinsam mit dem Anspruch, die Erforschung und Lehre österreichischer Literatur und Kultur in einen internationalen Kontext zu stellen. Ziel dieser Gründung ist dabei auch, das germanistische Literaturstudium zu erweitern, den Gegenstand “Österreich” interdisziplinär zu untersuchen und mehrsprachig zu konturieren. Mit der verstärkten Ausrichtung auf historische und kulturwissenschaftliche Fragestellungen sowie die Sprachen und Literaturen, die in der Habsburger-Monarchie vertreten waren, werden kritische Mythenrevisionen ebenso wie ein *europäisches* (Selbst)Verständnis von “Österreich” unterstützt.

Interdisziplinarität ist in diesem Master-Studium konzeptuelle Grundlage; konkret bleiben Fächer und Methoden trotz der förderlichen Bedingungen tendenziell getrennt. Darin spiegelt sich eine Crux, die für Austrian Studies generell zu bestehen scheint: Interdisziplinarität, die tatsächlich Modelle, Zugänge, Theoreme verschiedener Fächer verbindet, bleibt auch in der jüngeren Forschung eher die Ausnahme, wiewohl nach wie vor philosophische, politologische oder soziologische Erkenntnisse starken Einfluss auf die Theoriebildung in den Philologien haben. Es sind häufig sehr ergiebige disziplinäre Begegnungen, die beobachtet werden können. Filmstudien, die in den letzten Jahren sehr produktiv waren, sind hier aus meiner Sicht besonders hervorzuheben: Nicht wenige Literaturwissenschaftler_innen beschäftigen sich mit Filmen und nützen für ihre Filmanalysen sowohl ihr textwissenschaftliches als auch ein filmwissenschaftliches Repertoire. Der Umstand, dass theoretisch anspruchsvolle bildwissenschaftliche Diskussionen in der Germanistik der letzten Jahre verstärkt stattfinden, war für diese Entwicklung gewiss ein Faktor und wird für die Austrian Studies generell an Bedeutung gewinnen. Das gilt nicht nur für jene Arbeiten, die im Zusammenhang von Textanalysen auch Fotografie und bildende Kunst reflektieren (Honold/Simon [Hgg.], *Das erzählende und das erzählte Bild* [2010]; Fliedl/ Oberreither/Serles [Hgg.], *Gemälderedereien* [2013]), sondern für all jene, die Interesse an Genres wie Comic und Graphic Novel entwickelt haben (Eder/Klar/Reichert [Hgg.], *Theorien des Comics* [2011]; Hochreiter/Klingenböck [Hgg.], *Bild ist Text ist Bild* [2014]) – ein Segment, das erst in den letzten 15 Jahren literaturwissenschaftliche Aufmerksamkeit im deutschsprachigen Raum erhalten hat. Die Frage nach einer transmedialen Literaturwissenschaft etwa könnte mit viel Gewinn in den Austrian Studies diskutiert werden.

Die Entwicklung der Austrian Studies in den letzten Jahren zeigt nach meiner Beobachtung insgesamt einen Theorie-Schub, der erfreulich und notwendig war

und gewiss auch durch die kontinuierliche Förderung von Nachwuchswissenschaftler_innen in diesem Feld möglich gemacht wurde, deren Interesse an den neuen Theoriebildungen sehr hoch ist. Ablesen lässt sich dies an den Fragestellungen und Terminologien, aber auch natürlich an den konkreten Beiträgen – seien es Vorträge, Aufsätze oder Buchpublikationen. Postcolonial Studies spielen hier eine wichtige Rolle (Feichtinger/Prutsch/Csáky [Hgg.], *Habsburg postcolonial* [2003]; Schmidt et al. [Hgg.], *Narrative im (post)imperialen Kontext* [2015]) auch Männlichkeitsforschung hat die Fragestellungen der Gender Studies im Feld der Austrian Studies ergänzt und erweitert (Krammer [Hg.], *MannsBilder* [2007]). Queer Theory ist hingegen immer noch kaum vertreten – und das, obwohl Fragen der “Identität” insgesamt – vor allem im Sinne von kultureller oder ethnischer Identität im Kontext der verstärkten europäischen und internationalen Migrationsbewegungen seit den 1990er Jahren sehr intensiv diskutiert werden. Die Auseinandersetzung mit Literatur von Autor_innen, deren Erstsprache nicht Deutsch ist, führte zu Begriffen wie “inter”- und “transkulturelle” Literatur, deren theoretische Konzeption bis heute umstritten ist (Bürger-Kofigis [Hg.], *Eine Sprache – viele Horizonte* [2008]).

Mit Blick auf Werke und Autor_innen, mit denen sich Austriazist_innen befassen, bleibt eine Mainstream-Orientierung erkennbar. Die Forschungsschwerpunkte liegen in den literaturwissenschaftlichen Österreichstudien im 19. Jahrhundert, sehr stark vertreten sind dabei immer noch Arbeiten zum *Fin de siècle* (insbes. Schnitzler, Kraus); im 20. Jahrhundert fokussieren die Analysen neben den Holocaust-Studien und den Arbeiten zu Emigration und Exil sehr stark auf einige kanonisierte Autor_innen wie vor allem Franz Kafka, Ingeborg Bachmann, Elfriede Jelinek oder Thomas Bernhard. Diese sehr ungenaue Skizze berücksichtigt nun viele sehr originelle Beiträge nicht, die weniger Bekanntes in den Blick nehmen oder mit ganz neuen Fragestellungen in ein sehr dicht bestelltes Forschungsfeld treten (Schlipphacke, *Nostalgia after Nazism* [2010]; Prutti, *Unglück und Zerstreuung* [2016]). Dennoch ist mein Eindruck, dass, ganz analog der Tendenz in der (österreichischen) Germanistik, manches zu kurz kommt. Das betrifft u.a. Gattungen: Lyrik und Drama sind mit Ausnahme der Werke einiger Autor_innen deutlich weniger präsent. Ebenso ist die jüngere Gegenwartsliteratur im Vergleich zu den genannten Schwerpunkten weniger oft Thema (hervorzuheben ist u.a. Millner/Ivanovic [Hgg.], *Die Entsetzungen des Josef Winkler* [2014]). Das mag mit den Herausforderungen der Ausbildung der Studierenden zu tun haben, denen auch in den deutschsprachigen Germanistik-Instituten mehrheitlich kanonisierte Literatur vermittelt wird: Die (Studien-)Zeit von Bachelor-Studien fordert Reduktion der Inhalte und eine Auswahl, die repräsentativ erscheint.

Zu den Herausforderungen der Austrian Studies zählt daher aus meiner Sicht – abgesehen von den Problemen auf institutioneller Ebene (Stichwort Budget-Kürzungen) – eine (neue) kritische Diskussion des Kanons, nicht zuletzt deshalb, weil der Fokus auf “Hauptwerke”, bestimmte Themen und Bilder einer Reifizierung dessen, was “Österreich” vermeintlich ist, Vorschub leisten könnte (der Fokus auf Literatur des *Fin de siècle* kann so etwa – unfreiwillig – Teil einer problematischen Habsburg-Nostalgie werden, die das touristische

Zugpferd Wiens ist). Zudem halte ich die Entwicklung internationaler, interdisziplinärer sowie intermedialer Projekte und Foren, die der Forschung auch aus Ost- und Südosteuropa Raum geben, für dringend geboten. Ein kaum thematisierter Bias ist immer noch eine “westlich” orientierte (Literatur)Wissenschaft, die Beiträge aus Ländern Süd/Ost/Europas in geringerem Ausmaß zur Kenntnis nimmt. Ein vorbildhaftes Projekt wie es die Plattform “kankanien revisited” war – und in ihrer Archivfunktion auch noch jetzt ist (<http://www.kankanien-revisited.at>) – scheint mir heute, angesichts der Herausforderungen eines starken zentrifugalen Kräften ausgesetzten Europas, sehr wichtig – nicht nur für das Feld der “Austrian Studies”, das selbst eine Chance für die Verständigung darüber bieten könnte, was Europa war, ist und sein kann.

“Austrian Studies” sind eine paradoxe Konstruktion, indem sie auf ein zeitlich, räumlich, politisch, kulturell, sprachlich, ethnisch höchst vielgestaltiges Gebilde abzielen, das zu denken es notwendig macht, “Österreich” jeweils zu definieren. Zugleich verbietet sich die Perspektive auf Österreich als *eines* (Forschungs)Gebiets faktisch und wenn man verstehen will, was die problematischen Aspekte einer solchen Konstruktion sind. Dass die Frage beispielsweise danach, was “österreichische Literatur” ist, immer noch und wieder neu gestellt wird, halte ich für ein positives Signal – weniger im (ökonomischen) Sinne der Konkurrenz um nationale Abgrenzungen oder Eingemeindungen, sondern weil die Frage nach Wesenheiten, Essenzen oder Prägungen von Literaturen, Ländern oder Kulturen immer zu stellen ist.

SUSANNE HOCHREITER

Universität Wien



Keeping Austrian Studies Weird

It is hardly possible to assess the current state of and future prospects for Austrian Studies in North America without addressing its relationship to German Studies. There are no departments of Austrian Studies and only a handful of positions (mostly occupied by historians) that focus specifically on Austria. Academic organizations such as the German Studies Association and publications such as—well, *German Quarterly*—regularly feature Austrian Studies topics under the umbrella of German Studies. Indeed, one of us is guilty of titling a co-edited volume *Tatort Germany* even when nearly half of its chapters deal explicitly with Austria! Whether one is advocating a reconceptualization of Austrian Studies as a type of germanophone studies, as Katherine Arens has provocatively argued, or suggesting a fruitful dialog between German and Austrian Studies, as do Imke Meyer and Heidi Schlipphacke, German Studies remains the touchstone for Austrian Studies. There are good reasons for this. The institutional framework for Austrian Studies in North America (and indeed even in Austria itself, as Susanne Hochreiter points out) is

sparse. Unlike German Studies, Austrian Studies cannot assume, based on institutional taxonomies or a shared linguistic component, that it constitutes a viable field of study not needing validation. Austrian Studies must constantly reexamine and justify itself. This continuous crisis of confidence, we would argue, makes Austrian Studies an especially vibrant and thoughtful field of study.

Austrian Studies sees itself as being somewhat at odds with the academic establishment, populated by people who don't quite fit into their institutional homes, who constantly seek to make a place for themselves and their scholarly interest and who often have a bit of a revolutionary edge. This is precisely what attracted us to Austrian Studies in the first place. And this is why, when we were asked to assume the editorship of the flagship journal of the Austrian Studies Association in 2012, we leapt at the chance to oversee its transition to a new name and new scope that would rethink the object of study known as Austrian Studies.

Four years into what we initially thought would be a three-year tour of duty as editors of the *Journal of Austrian Studies (JAS)* seems like a good time to take stock of what we have learned about a field of study for which neither of us had a natural connection, but which we have both enthusiastically adopted as part of our institutional identities.

- Austrian Studies is always “in transition.” Austrian Studies is always “expanding its scope.” Austrian Studies is always rethinking itself. As we began to write our first “From the Editor” column for the inaugural issue of the *JAS* in which we would announce that we were undertaking a mission to expand and rethink the scope of the journal and its conception of Austrian Studies, we soon realized that we were not the first to have taken on this task. Twelve years earlier, in their introduction for the first co-edited issue of *Modern Austrian Literature* (33.1 [2000]: i-iii), Jacqueline Vansant and Geoffrey Howes suggested that at the dawn of a new century there were good reasons to examine each of the terms that made up the journal's title and question their scope. They were themselves following in a long tradition of the journal dating back to 1968 when the editor of the *Journal of the International Arthur Schnitzler Research Association* announced the transition to a new title (*Modern Austrian Literature*) and a broader scope for the journal. We became acutely aware that the transition that we were overseeing in 2012 was in fact part of a long continuum stretching back over four decades. Austrian Studies is always transforming itself.
- Austrian Studies is an inherently interdisciplinary field that is slowly struggling to live up to its interdisciplinary potential. The *JAS* receives and publishes articles by historians, political scientists, art historians, and scholars in various disciplines. But the bulk of its contributions and publications remains tied to literature and film, even when conceived more broadly as cultural studies. The trend is clearly toward increasingly multi-disciplinary and inter-disciplinary studies, but the limitations of the academic journal publication system (peer-review by established—and therefore invested—members of the field, scarcity of space available for experimental forms) impedes this progress. This is not an Austrian Studies-specific problem, but rather a broader problem

with academic publishing. But we think that a small, marginal field such as Austrian Studies is well positioned to point the way toward messier and more hybrid methodologies. One issue of the *JAS* of which we are particularly proud takes on the topic of Habsburg Nostalgia from a variety of perspectives (47.2 [2014]). Guest-edited and curated by Heidi Schlipphacke, this issue could serve as a model for the future of the journal.

- Austrian Studies is at least as Vienna-centric as German Studies is Berlin-centric. From Carl Schorske's seminal *Fin-de-siècle Vienna* (1980) to Katherine Arens's recent *Vienna Dreams of Europe* (2015), Austria is consistently conceived in terms of its one global city. But, even though we would argue that other regions of Austria need to be more rigorously addressed as geographically and historically distinct from the capital, the Vienna-centric focus is not necessarily limiting. Indeed, when Vienna is seen as the historic seat of a multi-national, multi-linguistic, multi-ethnic empire (as it is in Arens's book, for example), it can actually serve to destabilize clear national or geographic borders and open up the object of investigation.
- Austrian Studies is a small world and a close-knit community. When we seek peer reviewers for a submission to the *JAS*, our most difficult task is to find someone who is at least one step removed from the submitter. Our first choices of reviewers often heard a version of the paper as part of the same panel or work in the same department or were the student or advisor of the person submitting the work. Austrian Studies is driven by a small—and highly-talented—group of people. Although it makes finding blind reviewers a challenge and carries with it the danger of falling into predictable and mutually-reinforced patterns of thought, there is a sense of community in Austrian Studies that stretches across geographic, disciplinary, and methodological differences to unite a group of scholars with a similar interest in a joint exploration.

We have no doubt that future editors of the *JAS* will announce a new, expanded conception of the journal and that a future edition of *GQ* will contain a forum in which Austrian Studies is seen as being simultaneously in crisis and on the verge of a major transformation. Indeed, we not only expect, but hope that both of these things will occur. We need to keep Austrian Studies moving and expanding. We also need to make sure that we keep it weird.

HILLARY HOPE HERZOG

University of Kentucky

TODD HERZOG

University of Cincinnati