DIALECTOLOGY IN MODERN LINGUISTIC RESEARCH: THEORETICAL APPROACHES AND METHODS

[a]OKSANA VINTONIAK, [b]MYROSLAVA HNATYUK, [c]ROMAN MINIAILO, [d]OKSANA TURYSHEVA, [e]VIKTORIIA KOTVYTSKA

[a]*Kolomyia Pedagogical Professional College of the Ivano-Frankivsk Regional Council, Kolomyia, Ukraine.*
[b]*Lviv Polytechnic National University, Lviv, Ukraine.*
[c]*Municipal Establishment «Kharkiv Humanitarian-Pedagogical Academy» of the Kharkiv Regional Council, Kharkiv, Ukraine.*
[d,e]*National Technical University of Ukraine "Igor Sikorsky Kyiv Polytechnic Institute", Kyiv, Ukraine.*
email: [a] oksana.zv@ukr.net, [b]mur_vas@ukr.net,
[c]roman298@gmail.com, [d]turysheva.kpi@gmail.com,
[e]v.a.kotvytska@gmail.com

Abstract: In the context of modern dialectology, we are observing the influence of a wide range of new theoretical approaches and technological innovations that are changing the traditional understanding and study of linguistic dialects. The development of digital technologies, especially in the areas of machine learning and big data processing, opens up new opportunities for analyzing language structures and the interaction between different dialects. This allows researchers to study and understand language differences in more detail and assess their impact on social and cultural processes. Modern dialectology also integrates cognitive and socio-linguistic approaches, enabling a more complete consideration of language as a complex system that reflects not only communicative but also cognitive and sociocultural aspects of human life. Expanding the availability of language data, in particular, through online platforms and social networks, opens up new perspectives for studying the dynamics of language dialects in the modern world. This requires us to rethink traditional approaches and adapt them to rapidly changing socio-cultural conditions. The research shows how the use of synchronic, diachronic and cognitive approaches enriches the understanding of linguistic variations. Particular attention is paid to the influence of cognitive linguistics on the perception of linguistic dialects, as well as the role of structural approaches and diasystems in understanding the interrelationships of different dialects. The conclusions of the academic paper emphasize the need to integrate various approaches in modern dialectology. The combination of traditional and innovative methods makes it possible to gain a deeper and more comprehensive understanding of language differences and their role in social and cultural processes. The success of modern dialectology lies not only in the preservation and use of traditional methods but also in the active incorporation of the latest research strategies that reflect the rapid changes in the linguistic and sociocultural landscape.

Keywords: Dialectology, Synchronic and diachronic approaches, Cognitive dialectology, Perceptual dialectology, Lemki dialect.

1 Introduction

Dialectology, as one of the most exciting and dynamic fields of linguistic research, occupies a unique place in studying language variations. This discipline has emerged in response to the need to understand the diversity of language forms arising in different geographical and social contexts. Since its origins in the XIX century, when linguists started systematically documenting language differences between different communities, dialectology has come a long way.

Dialectology originally focused on the descriptive study of geographic language variation, using field studies to collect data. However, the approach to this discipline has transformed significantly over time. Modern dialectology includes a wide range of methods and approaches, from quantitative analysis of corpus data to deep structural analysis of language differences, thanks to modern technologies and theoretical advances in linguistics.

Currently, dialectology not only helps understand how language variation reflects cultural, historical, and social influences but also plays an important role in preserving linguistic diversity. In the era of globalization and rapid social change, the study of dialects is becoming especially relevant, enabling the preservation of unique linguistic features that may disappear.

In the proposed academic paper, we try to cover a wide range of theoretical approaches and methods in modern dialectology, reflecting the versatility of its methodological tools, on the one hand, and its importance in linguistic research, on the other hand. We would like to draw attention to the importance of integrating traditional methods with the latest technologies and theoretical innovations, which opens up new perspectives for understanding the complexity and diversity of language variation.

2 Literature Review

The study of dialects unites the scientific efforts of scientists on both sides of the Atlantic Ocean. N. J. Albury and M. Diaz (2021) consider the transition from traditional perceptual dialectology to perceptual multilingualism on the example of Hong Kong. Their study reveals how language stereotypes and perceptions influence language behavior in a multilingual environment. On the other hand, L. Anderwald and B. Szmrecsanyi (2009) examine corpus-based approaches in dialectology. They emphasize the importance of using corpus data to analyze language variations, emphasizing the possibilities and limitations of this method.

G. Aurrekoetxea et al. (2013) present "DiaTech" – a new tool for dialectological research that integrates different technological approaches for collecting and analyzing language data. This expands the possibilities of dialectologists in using computer technologies. G. Aurrekoetxea et al. (2021) apply fuzzy logic in their next study to analyze transition zones in dialectology, demonstrating how quantitative methods can help identify complex language interactions.

The topic of historical dialectology is explored by B. Bába (2021), analyzing sources in historical dialectology and their importance for understanding language evolution. E. J. Benson & A. Williams (2022) focus on the impact of boundary representation in perceptual dialectology, exploring how the representation of geographical boundaries influences language perception.

W. Bisang (2004) proposes an integrative approach, combining dialectology and typology. This scientific work is important for understanding the common trends and features of different language systems, pointing out the connection between geographical and structural aspects of language. C. Boberg, J. Nerbonne and D. Watt (2018) provide a broad overview of theories and methods in dialectology, considering various aspects from phonology to sociolinguistics, as well as modern technological approaches in the field. D. Watt, M. E. Renwick, and J. A. Stanley (2023) explore the interconnection between sociophonetics and dialectology, considering their role in the study of language variation and changes.

V. Wolfram and N. Schilling-Estes (Wolfram & Schilling-Estes, 2017) study dialectology and linguistic spread, analyzing how historical and contemporary processes influence the development of linguistic differences. The contribution of J. K. Chambers and P. Trudgill (1998) is also important in their scientific work, where they thoroughly examine both traditional and modern approaches to dialectological studies, noting the importance of integrating different methods for full understanding of language differences.

Another important contribution to the understanding of perceptual dialectology is made by J. Cramer (2021), who explores mental maps and their importance in studying the perception of dialects. This helps reveal how people represent and categorize language variations. M. Crivelli (2021) focuses on the issues of structural dialectology, emphasizing the difficulties related to the analysis of language structures in different dialects and identifying opportunities for further development of this field. V. de Andrade Aguilera (2022) explores the interrelation between dialectology and linguistic geography, analyzing the importance of spatial differences in linguistic diversity.

The research of J. A. A. de la Fuente (2021) ranges from macro-etymology to micro-etymology, highlighting key aspects of diachronic dialectology and their importance for studying historical language differences. M. Díaz-Campos and S. Sessarego (2021) explore various aspects of the dialectology of Spanish in Latin America in their scientific article, emphasizing its importance and diversity.

The latest approaches and methodologies are gaining importance in the modern study of dialectology. A. Dinkin (2021) analyzes the importance of acoustic sociophonetics in the study of dialects of New England, pointing to the growing role of large-scale acoustic studies in modern dialectology. An innovative approach to dialectology is presented in the work of J. Dunn (2022), who studies the correlation between cognitive linguistics, computational linguistics and dialectology, especially through the prism of constructive grammar. This shows how the integration of different fields can enrich the understanding of linguistic diversity.

The study of J. Ellis (2021) extends this context by proposing general comparative linguistics that connects dialectology to the broader field of linguistic studies. This publication emphasizes the importance of an interdisciplinary approach to studying language variations. Historical aspects of dialectology are covered in the project of J. Fisiak (2011), which focuses on regional and social dialects, emphasizing the significance of historical context in understanding language evolution. K. Franco (2022) examines how cognitive linguistics can interact with dialectology, drawing attention to the synergies between these fields and the mutual enrichment of each other.

V. Garnett and S. Lucek (2021) explore the interconnection between linguistic and political borders in Ireland, revealing the complexity of perceiving dialects in the context of political divisions. J. Goldshtein and L. M. Ahlgren (2021) examine ideologies of language and place in their scientific article, highlighting conflicts in expectations of dialect speech between informants and dialectologists. R. Hickey (2017) connects dialectology, philology, and historical linguistics, showing how these fields can complement each other to better understand language transformations. P. Jeszenszky, K. Steiner, and A. Leemann (2021) propose a new methodological approach based on clustering.

In modern studies of dialectology, special attention is paid to researching dialect zones and contact dialectology. P. Jeszenszkya, A. Hasseb, and P. Stöcklec (2023) analyze dialect areas and their impact on language contact, emphasizing the importance of geographical and social factors in the development of languages. B. Jones (2021) focuses on the spatiality of perceptual dialectology in his study, exploring how the perception of dialects varies depending on geographic location and social context. A. Kim (2022) studies historical dialectology and language contact in the case of Marchfeld in Lower Austria, demonstrating how historical events influence language change and development.

A. Magidow (2021) examines Arabic historical dialectology, pointing out the importance of integrating old and new approaches for a deeper understanding of linguistic history and development. A. F. Pinget and K. K. Voeten (2023) investigate social factors in accent perception by conducting a large-scale study in the field of perceptual dialectology. K. Poletto (2012) considers the role of dialectology in contrastive linguistics and micro-variation, demonstrating the importance of dialect studies in comparative linguistics. Finally, D. R. Preston (2011) analyzes perceptual dialectology by examining non-linguistic perspectives on regional linguistics and their implications for understanding language differences.

It can be concluded that modern dialectology encompasses a wide range of methods and approaches, which is reflected in the diversity of studies in this field. The general trend is to integrate traditional dialectological methods with the latest technologies and theoretical concepts from other fields of linguistics. The

proposed academic paper also belongs methodologically to the general trend aimed at enhancing the methodological tools of dialectology.

3 Purpose

The purpose of the present academic paper is to systematically analyze current trends and methods in dialectology in order to identify key areas of development in this field and their impact on understanding language variations. We seek to integrate approaches from different fields of linguistics, including cognitive linguistics and sociolinguistics, in order to better understand the ways in which linguistic dialects interact with social, cultural, and cognitive processes. A specific aim of this research is to identify new directions and opportunities in studying dialectology, given the rapid development of digital technologies and data processing methods.

The methodology of this research is based on three main approaches: the conceptual approach is dialectical, which is complemented by the systemic method, as well as analysis and synthesis.

The core of the research is based on a dialectical approach that makes it possible to consider dialectology in all its complexity and diversity. This approach includes not only the study of contradictions, changes and development of language dialects in different social and geographical contexts, but also the analysis of transformations and development of the history of understanding the subject of dialectology. The dialectical analysis can be used to identify the interconnections between different aspects of language variations and influential factors such as historical development, social processes, and cultural influences. A systematic approach is used to complement the dialectical vision, which enables to consider linguistic dialects as part of a larger language system. This approach involves analyzing the structural connections between different elements of the language, considering linguistic variations as an integrated part of the general language system. Thus, the study of the interaction between dialects, social groups, and cultural contexts takes place within the framework of a holistic system of language relations. Methods of analysis and synthesis are applied to ensure the depth and completeness of the research. The analysis makes it possible to disassemble complex linguistic phenomena into simpler elements, revealing basic properties and dependencies. Synthesis, in turn, helps combine these elements into a coherent picture, providing a comprehensive understanding of dialectological processes.

The application of this toolkit facilitates a comprehensive analysis of dialectological phenomena, allowing for new perspectives and a deeper understanding of language variations and their interrelationships.

4 Results

The methodology of dialectology has undergone several transformations over time. The initial focus of dialectology was on the descriptive study of geographic linguistic variation, using fieldwork to collect data. Over time, dialectology began to take on a more modern scientific identity due to the impact of linguistics, which provided a variety of methodologies and approaches that dialectology adopted. Borrowing synchronic and diachronic approaches can be considered one of the forms of such convergence. The synchronic approach developed by Ferdinand de Saussure focuses on studying a language at a certain point in time, enabling the analysis of dialectal differences and their functioning in modern society. The main goal of synchronic dialectology is to study and describe the allocation of linguistic variations in geographical and social contexts at a given point in time, without delving into the historical changes that may have caused these variations. The synchronic approach makes it possible to analyze the diversity of dialects, their features, and the interaction between them, as well as to study how social and cultural factors influence language use in different communities. It can also include analysis of

language interaction and dialect mixing, especially in multilingual or linguistically diverse regions.

A conditional drawback of the synchronic approach in dialectology is its limitation in studying the historical development and origin of language variations. Given that synchronic dialectology focuses on describing linguistic differences at a particular point in time, it is unable to take into account historical processes that may have influenced the formation of these dialects. This means that the synchronic approach may not be able to fully explain why certain linguistic features or differences exist since it does not analyze the historical changes that may have caused them. Thus, although the synchronic approach is effective for describing the state of linguistic dialects at a particular point in time, it may not provide a complete picture of their development and evolution.

By contrast, the diachronic approach considers the evolution of a language over time, helping understand how dialects have changed and developed to reflect historical and cultural shifts in society. It should be viewed as a dialectical opposite and, at the same time, a complement to the synchronous approach, but in no way as an alternative to the latter. However, a conditional drawback of the diachronic approach in dialectology is its focus on the historical development of linguistic differences, which is less concerned with the current state of linguistic dialects and their functioning in a real social context. The primary focus of the diachronic approach is to examine how dialects have developed and changed over time, which can detract from understanding current language practices, social identities, and interactions between dialects in the modern world. This means that the diachronic approach may not always adequately reflect current linguistic diversity and dynamics (which is not its purpose, after all) since it focuses on historical aspects.

At the same time, both of these approaches are crucial for a deep understanding of the dynamics and diversity of language forms, and their use has become axiomatic in dialectology.

Dialectology has made significant progress in methodological terms under the influence of structural linguistics. Structural linguistics is characterized by an approach to language that focuses on the analysis of its structural elements and the ways in which they are organized. This approach assumes that language consists of different levels, such as phonetics, phonology, morphology, syntax, and semantics, each of which has its own internal organization and rules. Structural linguistics emphasizes the systemic nature of language, believing that each element of language functions in the context of other elements and interacts with them.

One of the main ideas of structural linguistics, which is crucial in the context of our research, is that language has an internal hierarchy of rules that determines how words, sentences, and phrases are formed. Binary opposition is a central concept that makes it possible to analyze linguistic units through their differences and interrelationships. The concept of a phoneme as a minimal unit of the sound system of a language is also important since it distinguishes the meaning. Structural linguistics seeks to study language objectively, separating it from cultural, historical, or individual factors influencing language communication. According to it, language can be learned as an independent system that has its own internal organization and patterns.

We owe the very idea of combining structural linguistics and dialectology to Uriel Weinreich, a scholar, whose work was far ahead of its time and set a number of trends in both linguistics and dialectology. In his famous scientific work dated 1954, Uriel Weinreich argued that traditional dialectology often treats language forms in isolation, not as part of a larger system (Weinreich, 1954). In the light of the aforementioned, the scientist proposed an approach that allows taking into account partial similarities and differences between different dialects, forming so-called "diasystems".

The diasystem according to Uriel Weinreich is a concept in structural dialectology that describes a system integrating several dialect systems to analyze their partial similarities and differences. It makes it possible to see systematic connections between different dialects and analyze linguistic variations at a higher level, illustrating how different language forms interact and influence each other within this integrated system.

We can use the situation where two dialects have different phonemes that perform similar functions in the language as an example of the diasystem defined by Uriel Weinreich. For instance, let's imagine that one dialect has separate phonemes for "a" and "o", while another has only one phoneme that covers both of these sounds. These differences are combined into one larger system in the diasystem, which allows us to analyze and compare these varieties on a more abstract level, identifying both common and different elements in their phonological systems. For instance, British and American English have different pronunciations of words with the root "bath". It is pronounced [bɑːθ] in British English and it is pronounced [bæθ] in American English. The diasystem in this case integrates both of these variants, allowing them to be considered as different expressions of the same phonological system. This provides a deeper understanding of the functionality and interrelation of these pronunciations in the context of the larger language system.

The criticism of Uriel Weinreich's approach and his introduction of diasystems in dialectology cover several key aspects. One of the main problems is the difficulty of identifying and isolating individual phonemes within different dialects. Phonemes that appear identical on a superficial level can often have different functions or meanings in different dialects, making it difficult to create an accurate diasystem.

Another challenge is the limitation of the approach to certain levels of language. Weinreich's approach focuses more on the phonological and phonetic aspects of language, while other important aspects such as morphology, syntax, and vocabulary may be insufficiently considered. This creates particular difficulties when trying to universalize the approach and apply it in different language contexts since each dialect has its own unique features and differences.

Problems also arise in defining the meaning of a "system" in a language. Different dialects may have different systemic organizations, which makes it difficult to define one unified diasystem. In addition, the practical implementation of diasystems requires significant resources and voluminous data, which can be difficult to achieve in explorations of poorly studied or rare dialects.

In general, Weinreich's approach, although certainly innovative and an important step in the development of dialectology, has certain limitations and challenges that should be taken into account when applying it.

The study of linguistic phenomena from the perspective of the recipient, called "perceptual dialectology", should be considered one of the newest trends in dialectology. The idea of perceptual dialectology is methodologically related to rethinking language, speech, and such a linguistic phenomenon as a text. In the second half of the XX century, a refusal to comprehend the traditional idea of the functioning of language was observed. For instance, it was described in the well-known communication model of P. Grice, where an intention initially originates, which is formalized in a certain language code to be communicated to the recipient, who interprets in the form of an inversion of the process of understanding (the movement of thought goes from the language message to the author's intention). Reconsideration touched upon such a fundamental concept as the author of a message (or a text). For instance, R. Barth declared the death of the author, and M. Foucault argued in a similar methodological vein that the author of a text is not a specific subject, but his concept is reduced to the semantic function of the text. Therefore, many dialectological studies have gradually shifted their focus from intentions to the reader's response. This

methodological metamorphosis led to the emergence of perceptual dialectology.

Currently, perceptual dialectology is a branch of dialectology that focuses on people's perceptions and ideas about linguistic dialects. It studies how people identify, categorize, and evaluate different dialects, and how these perceptions influence their language preferences and behavior. This field is of particular importance for understanding the sociolinguistic aspects of language since the perception of dialects is closely related to social, cultural, and identity aspects. It helps identify stereotypes, prejudices and ideologies influencing linguistic behavior, and can also point to social barriers and inequalities related to linguistic diversity.

One of the examples of using perceptual dialectology can be found in the study of language stereotypes and social prejudices related to different dialects. Let's take, for example, the scheme of a study that examines how different dialects of English are perceived in the United States. In this study, respondents may be provided with audio recordings of various dialects, such as Southern, Mid-Atlantic, New England, and others. Following the listening session, participants may be asked to rate the dialects on criteria such as attractiveness, intelligence, reliability, or friendliness. It is also possible to study how accurately participants can identify the geographical origin of dialects. The results of this study reveal the stereotypes and prejudices that exist about different dialects and how this influences people's perceptions and behavior. For instance, it may turn out that the southern dialect is perceived to be friendlier but less intelligent compared to dialects from other regions. Such findings help understand how language variation is perceived in social contexts and what impact it can have on interpersonal relationships and social interaction.

At the same time, perceptual dialectology faces several problems. Firstly, it is often based on subjective assessments, which can be unstable and context-dependent. Secondly, there is a risk of bias in assessments, especially when it comes to social stigmas or stereotypes related to certain dialects. However, in general, perceptual dialectology opens up an important perspective in understanding linguistic dialects, making it possible to see not only their structural features but also their social and cultural influence.

Another important aspect of modern dialectology is the integration of the tools and methods of cognitive linguistics. In the context of our research, a distinctive feature of cognitive linguistics is its focus on the internal cognitive processes underlying language expression and perception. It studies how people form the concepts and categories they use in language, and how language structures reflect the ways people think. Metaphor is one of the key concepts in cognitive linguistics, which is considered not just a linguistic device but the main mechanism through which language reflects and structures our thinking. Cognitive linguists also study how conceptual schemas and frames influence linguistic organization and expression.

The cognitive approach to dialectology focuses on the study of how the human mind perceives, processes, and uses dialectal variations in language. He integrates the findings of cognitive linguistics into dialectology, treating dialects not just as a set of sound and grammatical differences but as part of a larger cognitive system that includes perception, speech habits, and social aspects of language.

The main aspects of the cognitive approach in dialectology include the study of how people identify and categorize different dialects, paying attention to language stereotypes and prejudices. This is complemented by an analysis of how individuals mentally map the geographical arrangement of linguistic variations and how this influences their understanding of linguistic communities and identities. In addition, the cognitive approach seeks to understand how the brain processes information about language differences, including phonetics, grammar, and vocabulary.

The cognitive approach allows for a deeper understanding of the internal mechanisms of perception and use of dialects, as well as the interconnection between language variations and social, cultural and cognitive processes. Finally, the last modern methodological trend in dialectology, which we will discuss below, is the use of modern digital technologies.

For instance, B. Szmrecsany and L. Anderwald consider the use of corpora-based methods in the study of dialects (2016). This methodology allows analyzing linguistic phenomena and variations based on a large amount of data collected from various sources. The authors emphasize the heuristic potential of this approach, which makes it possible to identify geographical and social variations in language. They note that this approach differs from traditional methods of dialectology in its ability to process large amounts of data and provide deeper analysis. This methodology includes the collection and analysis of language data from various dialect corpora. This enables researchers to uncover variations and structural features of a language based on a large amount of data. The methodology described above is used to analyze the grammar, morphology, syntax, and discourse of various dialects. At the same time, corpora may contain both written and oral sources, but most modern corpora contain written material. In our opinion, this methodology has considerable potential for detecting deep structural differences in language and can reveal both quantitative and qualitative variations in language. In contrast to traditional methods, corpora-based dialectology allows the processing of large amounts of data and provides a deeper analysis of grammatical and lexical features of dialects.

This discipline initially focused on a purely descriptive approach, which included the collection and analysis of dialectal features. This approach involved documenting phonetic, grammatical, and lexical variations in different geographical regions. Using field studies and surveys, the researchers recorded dialectal features, creating detailed cartographic representations of linguistic differences. This methodological approach made it possible to identify historical and geographical influences on the language. With the development of technology and changes in the socio-cultural context, dialectology has begun to incorporate quantitative methods such as big data analysis and computer modeling. This provided a deeper analysis of linguistic variations and an understanding of the interconnections between language, culture, and society (Hnatyuk et al., 2021).

The peculiarity of the development of dialectology methodology in modern conditions is the integration of traditional approaches with the latest technologies and theoretical concepts that open up new possibilities for analyzing language variations. On the one hand, a deep and detailed description of dialectal features at the levels of phonetics, grammar, vocabulary, and semantics remains relevant. On the other hand, new approaches are being added to this. In particular, modern dialectology is increasingly using computational linguistics methods, including big data processing and machine learning, to analyze language differences and model language changes. An important role in modern dialectology is played by the study of social factors, such as identity, status, age, and gender, which influence language use and dialect development. In addition, the development of the methodology also includes integration with other fields of knowledge, such as cognitive science, anthropology, history, and cultural studies, which allows for a deeper understanding of the context and functions of dialects. Particular attention is paid to the perception of dialects (perceptual dialectology), exploring how people understand and evaluate linguistic variations that affect their attitudes toward different language groups. Finally, considering the fact that modern digital technologies are changing the ways of communication and language interaction, this poses new challenges for dialectology in studying the impact of digital media on linguistic dialects.

Thus, it can be concluded that modern dialectology is developing toward greater complexity and interdisciplinarity, using the latest technologies and theoretical approaches to gain a deeper

understanding of language variation and its interaction with social and cultural factors.

5 Discussions

There are several debatable issues in modern dialectology concerning approaches to the study of language variations. One of the main issues is the choice between synchronic and diachronic analysis. The synchronic approach focuses on studying language structures at the very moment, while the diachronic approach examines how language forms have changed over time. Some linguists argue that historical context is necessary to fully understand language differences, making diachronic analysis indispensable. Others argue that modern linguistic forms can be effectively analyzed without immersion in the history of the language, which makes the synchronic approach more suitable for certain studies. Nevertheless, in our opinion, this discussion is scholastic in nature since a comprehensive analysis of language variations requires both synchronic and diachronic approaches, which form the so-called circle of complementarity, expanding our understanding of dialects and their components.

Criticism of using the structural approach is another aspect that we would like to draw attention to in the context of current discussions. One of the arguments against this approach is that it may concentrate too much on the formal aspects of language, ignoring the social, cultural and functional aspects of language use. In addition, it may be difficult to define the boundaries of the diasystem, especially in the context of the diversity of language variations. Despite these challenges, we are convinced that the structural approach remains valuable for in-depth analysis of language systems and their components. It can play a crucial role in understanding the structural relations between different dialects, as well as in identifying common patterns and structures in the language. In this context, Weinreich's ideas about diasystems provide a particularly useful perspective that makes it possible to combine a deep understanding of language structure with a broader study of language variation and its social and cultural aspects.

Another significant discussion is related to the influence of cognitive linguistics on dialectology. In this case, the disputes center on the importance of taking cognitive processes into account in the analysis of language dialects. Some researchers believe that the cognitive aspects of language are essential to understanding how people use and perceive language variations, while others dispute the need for such integration, believing that language differences can be studied independently of cognitive processes.

We believe that both of these approaches – cognitive and more traditional – will make an important contribution to the development of dialectology. They are not mutually exclusive but rather complement each other, offering different perspectives on language learning. The integration of cognitive linguistics into dialectology can enrich the understanding of linguistic phenomena by providing insights into how language structures are influenced and shaped by human perception and thinking. At the same time, the traditional approach continues to be the cornerstone for ensuring the most objective analysis of language forms.

6 Conclusions

In summary, it can be emphasized that modern dialectology is developing in the context of constant interaction between traditional methods and innovative approaches. This is conditioned, on the one hand, by the need to document and analyze linguistic variations in their social and cultural context, and, on the other hand, by the necessity to respond to the modern challenges posed by the rapidly changing world.

The integration of cognitive approaches and perceptual dialectology opens up new possibilities for a deeper understanding of the interaction between language and

perception, providing valuable tools for studying social identities and cultural processes shaped by language. At the same time, structural approaches and concepts, such as diasystems, broaden the scope of analysis, allowing us to consider linguistic variation within a broader language system.

The role of technological advances is also important, enabling dialectologists to use the latest data collection and analysis tools, including machine learning and big data processing. This contributes to a better understanding of language changes and their impact on social processes.

However, these new opportunities also pose particular challenges. The integration of different approaches requires dialectologists not only to possess deep knowledge in their field but also to be open to new research methods and ready to work interdisciplinarily.

In general, modern dialectology is facing an opportunity to significantly expand its understanding of linguistic phenomena, while maintaining a critical view of the use and implementation of new methods and theoretical approaches. The attitude toward these new challenges and opportunities will determine the future development of dialectology as a discipline.

Literature:

1. Albury, N. J., & Diaz, M.: From perceptual dialectology to perceptual multilingualism: a Hong Kong case study. *Language awareness*, 2021, 30(2), 152-175.
2. Anderwald, L., & Szmrecsanyi, B.: Corpus linguistics and dialectology. *Corpus linguistics: An international handbook*, 2009, 2, 1126-1139.
3. Aurrekoetxea, G., Fernandez-Aguirre, K., Rubio, J., Ruiz, B., & Sánchez, J.: 'DiaTech': A new tool for dialectology. *Literary and linguistic computing*, 2013, 28(1), 23-30.
4. Aurrekoetxea, G., Iglesias, A., Clua, E., Usobiaga, I., & Salicrú, M.: Analysis of transitional areas in Dialectology: Approach with Fuzzy Logic. *Journal of Quantitative Linguistics*, 2021, 28(4), 337-355.
5. Bába, B.: Sources in historical dialectology. *Dialectologia et Geolinguistica*, 2021, 29(1), 19-36.
6. Benson, E. J., & Williams, A.: Crossing the line: Effect of border representation in perceptual dialectology. *Journal of Linguistic Geography*, 2022, 10(2), 67-75.
7. Bisang, W.: Dialectology and typology-An integrative perspective. *Trends in Linguistics Studies And Monographs*, 2004, 153, 11-46.
8. Boberg, C., Nerbonne, J., & Watt, D. (Eds.): *The handbook of dialectology*. John Wiley & Sons, 2018.
9. Chambers, J. K., & Trudgill, P.: *Dialectology*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
10. Cramer, J.: *Mental maps and perceptual dialectology*. Language and Linguistics Compass, 2021, 15(2), e12405.
11. Crivelli, M.: The problem of structural dialectology. Energeia. Online Journal for linguistics, language philosophy and history of linguistics, 2021, 96-117.
12. de Andrade Aguilera, V.: Dialectology and linguistic geography. *Manual of Brazilian Portuguese Linguistics*, 2022, 21, 251.
13. de la Fuente, J. A. A.: From Macroetymology to Microetymology: Some Thoughts on Wanderwörter and Diachronic Dialectology. *Studies in Asian Historical Linguistics, Philology and Beyond*, 2021, 320-337. Brill.
14. Díaz-Campos, M., & Sessarego, S. (Eds.): Aspects of Latin American Spanish Dialectology. *Honor of Terrell A. Morgan*, 2021, 32. John Benjamins Publishing Company.
15. Dinkin, A.: *Book Review: New England English*. Large-Scale Acoustic Sociophonetics and Dialectology, 2021.
16. Dunn, J.: Cognitive Linguistics Meets Computational Linguistics: Construction Grammar, Dialectology, and Linguistic Diversity. *Data Analytics in Cognitive Linguistics: Methods and Insights*, 2022, 41, 273.
17. Ellis, J.: *Towards a general comparative linguistics*. Walter de Gruyter GmbH & Co KG, 2021, 52.

18. Fisiak, J. (Ed.): *Historical dialectology: regional and social*, 2011, 37. Walter de Gruyter.

19. Franco, K.: What Cognitive Linguistics can learn from dialectology (and vice versa). *Data Analytics in Cognitive Linguistics: Methods and Insights*, 2022, 41, 309.

20. Garnett, V., & Lucek, S.: Perceptual Dialectology between Varieties of Irish English: The Relationship between Linguistic and Political Boundaries on the Island of Ireland. *Expanding the Landscapes of Irish English Research*, 2021, 199-216. Routledge.

21. Goldshtein, Y., & Ahlgren, L. M.: Ideologies of language and place. Conflicting expectations to dialectal speech between informants and dialectologists. *Journal of Postcolonial Linguistics*, 2021, 5, 178-203.

22. Hickey, R.: Dialectology, philology, and historical linguistics. *The Handbook of Dialectology*, 2017, 23-38.

23. Hnatyuk, M. V.: 2021. *North Lemki speech of immigrants: phonological and phonetic features: dissertation*. Lviv, 2021, 286. https://lnu.edu.ua/wp-content/uploads/2021/04/dis_hnatiuk.pdf

24. Jeszenszky, P., Steiner, C., & Leemann, A.: Reduction of Survey Sites in Dialectology: A New Methodology Based on Clustering. *Frontiers in Artificial Intelligence*, 2021, 44.

25. Jeszenszkya, P., Hasseb, A., & Stöcklec, P.: Dialect areas and contact dialectology. *Language contact*, 2023, 135.

26. Jones, B.: The Spatiality of Perceptual Dialectology. *University of Washington*, 2021.

27. Kim, A.: Historical dialectology and historical language contact: a case study on the Marchfeld (Moravské pole) in Lower Austria. *Slovo a slovesnost*, 2022, 83(4), 279-306.

28. Magidow, A.: The Old and the New: Considerations in Arabic Historical Dialectology. *Languages*, 20216(4), 163.

29. Pinget, A. F., & Voeten, C. C.: Social factors in accent recognition: a large-scale study in perceptual dialectology. *Journal of Linguistic Geography*, 2023, 11(2), 78-90.

30. Poletto, C.: Contrastive linguistics and micro-variation: The role of dialectology. *Languages in contrast*, 2012, 12(1), 47-68.

31. Preston, D. R.: *Perceptual dialectology: Nonlinguists' views of areal linguistics*, 2011, 7. Walter de Gruyter.

32. Szmrecsanyi, B. & Anderwald, L.: Corpus-Based Approaches to Dialect Study, 2016. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/326929931_Corpus-based_approaches_to_dialect_study

33. Watt, D., Renwick, M. E., & Stanley, J. A.: Sociophonetics and dialectology. *The Routledge Handbook of Sociophonetics*, 2023, 263-284. Routledge.

34. Weinreich, U.: Is a Structural Dialectology Possible? *Word*, 1954, 10(2-3), 388-400.

35. Wolfram, W., & Schilling-Estes, N.: Dialectology and linguistic diffusion. The handbook of historical linguistics, 2017, 713-735.

Primary Paper Section: A

Secondary Paper Section: AI