WISDOM

3(16), 2020

YEREVAN – 2020

Iryna KULYNA,
Iuliia BEREZINA

GLOBALIZATION AND ANTIGLOBALIZATION TENDENCIES IN MODERN SOUTH GERMAN DIALECTS

Abstract

The article deals with the study of southern German dialects and their genetic connections with modern German. The article focuses on the analysis of linguistic features of southern German dialects: phonetic, lexical, grammatical and their comparison with Standardsprache. By the example of the development of southern German dialects and their interaction with Standardsprache, it is concluded that the German language, based on the laws of linguosynergy, is a complex open information system that is constantly evolving while saving data on its past states. The totality of knowledge of the past and present makes it possible to identify the prospects for the future development of the system. The results of the research give reasons to predict further changes in the modern German language at all its levels – phonetic, linguistic, grammatical – taking into account various dialectological features that are introduced into the German language system. The received knowledge is of particular importance for studying and teaching the history of the German language, introduction to German philology, dialectology, as well as practical course of the German language.

Keywords: South German dialects, modern German, Bavarian, Swabian-Alemanian, diachronics, synchronics.

Introduction

Language, language units, systems, cognition of a world through a language, the study of meaning at a certain level of language structure – all these linguistic categories and phenomena were considered at all stages of development of linguistics from different angles and in different aspects.

Depending on how these provisions and phenomena were characterized and explained from the standpoint of philosophy, linguistics and psychology, there have been developed corresponding methods and approaches to studying them.

Hence linguistics was first formed as part of philosophy, and later as an independent science, combined with sociology, psychology, logic, mathematics, it allows us to understand the basic methods of a language concept research.

Linguistic research methods were formed in the following historical sequence: pre-Socratic, pre-Aristotelian philosophy of language and Aristotelianism, the theory of knowledge and language theory of the 16-17 centuries, linguistic philosophy of the Enlightenment; development of linguistics of the 19th-20th centuries: Junggrammatical School, Leningrad and Moscow

Phonological Schools, Prague Linguistic Society, glossamatics of Danish structuralism descriptive linguistics. During this period there was an influence on the linguistic science of behaviourism, phenomenology and "gesture theory" (the era of psycholinguistics), generative psycholinguistics and formal language theory (Kushnerik, 2004, pp. 137-138).

Initially, the main methods were formed through direct observation of the phenomena of nature, the world, a language and their description with appropriate interpretations. For example, pre-Socratic, pre-Aristotelian philosophy, represented by Heraclitus, Democritus, Croton, Plato, Socrates, considered language and linguistic processes in a philosophical aspect. Democritus wrote about "images" that are separated from objects and deeply immersed in the "pores" of the body. Therefore, between language and the world, there is a level of "abstract reflections of the real world that transports information" (Kondrashov, 1979, p. 13). "Mechanical theory of reflections" entered the theory of cognition through the language of the environment. The Aristotelian ontology for the philosophy of language appears in the direct connection of the objects of the environment, their knowledge and language. The language coordinates the process of perception and cognition of reality (Kondrashov, 1979, p. 17).

Language theory of 16-17 centuries was built on a sign system, at the centre of which was the magical power of the sign, the theory of "sign mysticism" (Kondrashov, 1979, p. 21).

According to Kondrashov (1979), Leibniz's language theory combines language signs, thinking, and sensory perception. Thus "meanings of words are not arbitrary and defined (p. 15). Enlightenment is presented in language philosophy and the theory of knowledge by French philoso-

phy of E. Kondilak, German traditions of language philosophy of Hegel (1994), Humboldt (1974), Herder (1981), Kant (1964), Fichte (1988). Kondilak (1980) considered language "a necessary condition for the stabilization of sensations and a necessary prerequisite for the development of cognitive abilities" (p. 165).

He pointed out the correlation of language with society, geographical and social factors (Kondilyak, 1980, pp. 259-267), emphasized its relative nature and the need to develop a "universal language of science" (Kondilyak, 1980, p. 100).

J. Herder (1981) characterized language as "the main element in the transition from pure perception to reflection, to thinking" (p. 28).

W. Humboldt (1974) emphasized the role of the individual in the language process: "… the language is completely defined solely by the individual" (p. 78).

At the same time, W. Humboldt (1974) considered two main categories of speech activity: "spatial relationship" and "personal relationship I – you" (p. 275).

Thus, linguistic philosophy interprets its basic concepts, applying different research methods: descriptive, historical and historical-comparative.

The German language, like any other language, has a philosophical basis, so its units (language and speech) should be studied in the context of the historical development of philosophical thought, which enhances their deep essence and, accordingly, phonetic, grammatical, lexical-semantic and etymological specifics.

Learning the German language, its history and the current state is impossible without knowledge in the field of German dialectology. Although modern German (Standarddeutsch) is the main means of communicating information in

the media, literature, education, business and other fields, it is known that most Germans are bilingual, they are fluent in both the dialect of their region and Standarddeutsch according to scientists as H. Klausmann, N. K. Leonhardt, L. Zehetner. (Klausmann, 2014, pp. 1-3; Leonhardt, 2014, pp. 124-125; Zehetner, 2015, pp. 14-18).

German dialects appeared historically due to the existing subculture of the German-speaking population, who settled in central Europe and England (Anglo-Saxons) during the Great Migration of Peoples (Völkerwanderung) from about IV to VII centuries AD. The main tribes settling from the north to south were: Friezes (Friesen), Saxons (Sachsen), Franks (Franken), Thuringians (Thüringer), Alemanni (Alemannen) and Bavarians (Bayern). Each of these tribes developed their own dialect, as well as sub-dialects which were touched upon by scientists V. Zhirmunsky, V. Lewizkij, L. Golubenko, I. Kulyna, T. Kozak, I. Berezina, P. Ernst, G. Hübner, H. Schmid, A. Stedje, G. Wolff (Zhirmunsky, 1965, p. 19; Lewizkij, 2008, p. 9; Golubenko, Kulyna, & Kozak, 2019, p. 7; Golubenko, Kulyna, & Berezina, 2017, p. 11; Ernst, 2006, pp. 76-77; Hübner, 2015, pp. 16-17; Schmid, 2009, pp. 92-95; Stedje, 2007, pp. 81-81; Wolff, 2009, p. 14, 58-59).

Eventually, historical events caused some changes in the political borders of tribal residence. So, for example, in the areas where Swabians and Alemanni previously lived, Alsace, Baden, Württemberg, western Bavaria, western Austria, Liechtenstein, part of Switzerland, northern Italy are now located. The principality of Schwaben was once formed from these lands. Even though many centuries have passed since the appearance of the Alemannic dialect, the population of these areas can still communicate in it. This suggests that political and ethnolin-

guistic borders do not have to coincide (Zhirmunsky, 1956, p. 16; Berkov, 2006, pp. 45, 60-70).

German, like any other language, is subject to constant change. Global changes in public life, such as the spreading of mass media and the accessibility of higher education, have largely affected the verbal habits of native German speakers. At the same time, some versions of the "interpretation" of German seized to be used, and new dialect formations emerged in the German-speaking community: for example, the development of the so-called Verkehrsdialekte (interregional dialects), as well as the general tendency to use spoken German, which combines elements of different dialect groups (Berkov, 2001, pp. 60-70; Niebaum & Macha, 2006, pp. 220-223).

According to the research of modern linguists, such as H. Klausmann (2014), N. K. Leonhardt (2014), L. Zehetner (2016), the prestige (Ansehen) dialects was noticed to increase. German speakers, including city dwellers and representatives of the intellectual elite, for variety or emotional colouring reasons, have grown into the habit of adding some dialectic words and expressions to their speech on Standarddeutsch. According to the scholars mentioned above, the opinion that children and youth do not know dialects is wrong. On the contrary, they actively study the dialect, speak it, considering it one of the manifestations of the feeling of their homeland, and do not want to forget their regional roots. At the same time, the younger generation also learns foreign languages, willingly travels around the world, since one does not exclude the other. H. Klausmann and N. K. Leonhardt conducted an experiment throughout Germany and proved that not only adults but also children speak the dialects with pleasure. It turned out that

the residents of Germany are speakers of two, and sometimes three and four German dialects (Sellner, 2018).

The dialects are especially stable in the areas located away from large centres. For example, when analyzing the use of the verb *haben* in Stuttgart and its vicinity, which, based on the language atlas, it is traditionally located in the *han* space (old German Han – modern German Haben), it was found that most of the residents of this region say *Ich han* instead of *Ich habe*. A similar phenomenon is common today for the whole of Germany, according to Klausmann, who calls it a regiolect (Klausmann, 2014).

Recently, dialects are gaining more and more prestige, as reported by Nina Kim Leonhardt (Leonhardt, 2015). The trend of popularizing dialects is especially evident in advertising (*Das Ländle sucht Schnäpple jetzt am Mailändle; Woischd Karle, du sollschd amol a Seitenbacher Müsli esse*). This suggests that the dialects occupy a fairly strong position, are easily combined with Standardsprache, and take a form of anti-movement to globalization (Gegenbewegung zur Globalisierung).

There is an opinion that in the north they speak the real Hochdeutsch / Standarddeutsch, but this is not proved. Radio presenters, greeting the audience, say *[ta:x]* and not *[ta:k]* in the word *Tag,* considering such a greeting Hochdeutsch. In fact, this is nothing more than a North German dialect.

In schools, communicating in dialects has long been a sign of poor education. Fortunately, this time has passed. In Swabian-Alemannic territory, it is common to pronounce the rear-lingual consonant [x], as in *ach*, instead of the front-lingual consonant [ç], as in *ich*. If the speakers are corrected, then they consider such cases discriminatory.

Modern youth eagerly sends SMS or per Whatsup using dialects. This is "cool," considered a unique phenomenon, and it proves the vitality of the dialect. Many German celebrities also speak a dialect nowadays like the trainer of SK Freiburg Christian Steich (Christian Steich, SK Freiburg), the bundestrainer Yogi Löw (Jogi Löw) and others.

When asked whether there is a need to enable the continuing existence of dialects, H. Klausmann, N. K. Leonhardt, L. Zehetner answer: absolutely yes. It is wonderful that there are scientists who are dealing with this issue. This is important for the entire population of Germany and especially for young people, they say. Otherwise, they will think that speaking Nordeutsch is correct, but Swabians (Schwaben), Alemanni (Alemannen), Bavarians (Bayern) and others speak incorrectly. It would be interesting to know what will happen to the dialects in the year 2118. For example, in Switzerland 100 years ago, there was much doubt whether Schweizerdeutsch would be spoken in the future. Today we see that it exists. Therefore, it is very difficult and impossible to predict how the language will develop (Klausmann, 2014; Leonhardt, 2014; Zehetner, 2016).

All things considered, the *topic* related to the development and existence of German dialects remains relevant today, because, despite the dominance of Standarddeutsch in modern Germany, local dialects are also quite common.

Therefore, the *object* of the investigation is the dialectical features of southern German dialects.

The *subject* of the study includes linguistics characteristics of southern German dialects and their connection with the modern German language.

The *purpose* of this research is to analyze

linguistic features of southern German dialects (Bavarian and Swabian-Alemannic) and to identify their genetic connections with the modern German language – Standarddeutsch.

In order to achieve the purpose of the study, the following *tasks* have been resolved:

- to learn about texts written in southern German dialects;
- to study language characteristics which are typical for Southern German dialects (phonetic, lexical, grammatical);
- on the basis of texts and atlases (maps) to determine the linguistic characteristics that are typical for the Bavarian and Swabian-Alemanian dialects and compare them with modern German language;
- to identify changes in the modern language at all its levels, taking into account the various dialectological features that are being introduced into the German language system.

The research *material* was texts (fiction and newspaper) in the indicated dialects and identical to Standarddeutsch, dialect maps (atlases) of the German language, ancient and modern dictionaries dictionaries (Denz, et al., 2002; Goscinny & Uderzo, 1997[a]; Goscinny & Uderzo, 1997[b]; Klausmann, 1997; Klausmann, Kunze, & Schrambke, 1993; Klausmann, 2017; König, 2011; König, 2014; König & Renn, 2007; Zehetner, 2018).

Descriptive and comparative-historical methods have been used in the study.

From the diachronic perspective of language, according to M. M. Guhman, T. I. Dombrovan V. M. Zhirmunsky, V. V. Lewizkij, E. A. Selivanova, V. G. Taranets, V. Schmidt, S. Sonderegger, dialects became the basis for the formation of the language itself. The 8th century is considered to be the beginning of the fundamen-

tal development of dialectical problems within the framework of the comparative-historical paradigm of linguistics, and at the end of the XIX century, dialectology began to form as a separate area of linguistics (Guhman, 1955, pp. 10-12; Dombrovan, 2014, pp. 123-125; Zhirmunsky, 1965, p. 76; Lewizkij & Pohl, 2010, pp. 180-185; Lewizkij, 2008, pp. 163-167; Selivanova, 2010, pp. 133-134; Taranets, 2008, p. 21; Schmidt, 2007, pp. 176-177; Sonderegger, 2003, p. 287).

The need to create dialect maps of various countries, including Germany, with a specific dialect range eventually emerged. Today, the most complete are the dialect maps (atlases) of Germany, which are compiled by V. König (2011), where various isoglosses (phonetic, morphological, lexical) are quite clearly reflected (pp. 146-166).

Research

It has been discovered that South German dialects (Bavarian and Swabian-Alemannic) have certain signs of a phonetic system. Among them, three historical phenomena that participated in the formation of the system of internal inflection of these dialects, and subsequently in the formation of the standardised German language:

1) Ablaut – an alternation of vowels, Indo-European in origin, which received independent development in the Germanic languages, especially in the verb system (*gschriebn – geschrieben*);
2) refraction (Vokalharmonie oder Brechung) – assimilative alternation of vowels e -> i, u -> o (*keman – kommen, i kim, du kimst, er kimt; berg – gbirg, wurti – gwortn);*
3) umlaut (Umlaut) – palatalization of the back vowels *(bräuch – brauche, ghört – gehört,*

vergnüchn – vergnügen).

Along with this, it is noted that in the Bavarian and Swabian-Alemannic the appearance of the umlaut is prevented by the groups r + acc., L + acc., *gforchtn (gefürchtet)*. In Swabian, there is also a grammatical umlaut of the diphthong oa – *scoal* – pl. number *Säaler (Seil – Seile), Goast – Göaster (Geist – Geister).*

Moreover, in the Alemannic and Bavarian there is no umlaut of short u

- in front of the old heminant kk / gg, kx, which later turned into ck, for example: *Muk (Mücke), Bruk, Bruggen (Brücke), tsruck (zurück);*
- in front of the lingual: *Khuche (Küche), Luge (Lüge);*
- before the labial: *slupfe (schlüpfen);*
- before some other consonants*: nuts (nütze), murp (mürbe).*

It also turned out that the umlaut is less developed before suffixes, especially in nouns with -er ending, for example, *Kromer (Krämer), Burger (Bürger)*.

In the indicated dialects, processes such as diphthongization (*Bleamin – Blumen, Woid – Wald*) and monophthongization (*Bam – Baum, was – weiß*) are also recorded.

Unlike Standarddeutsch, which has three diphthongs: [ae] – ei, ai, ay, ey, [ao] – au, [ɔø] – eu, au, a large number of diphthongs were found in Bavarian: *ei (Friend – Freund), ua (guat – gut), oa (kloan – klein), ia (liaba – lieber), oi (Woid – Wald), ai (frai – frei), äu (bräuch – brauche), ea (Bleamin – Blumen), äi (däim – deinem), ui (Buid – Bild).*

In Swabian, the following diphthongs can be met: *ai (Schnai – Schnee), au (grauß – groß), ui (fuir – Feuer), oa (Goast – Geist, ia (miad – müde)*. The most common is a diphthong au, formed in ancient times from a long vowel (*tot –*

daut, ohne – aune). A wide diphthong is also noticed to be replaced by a double narrow vowel (*Haus – Huus, Maus – Muus, Zeit – Ziit*).

It is assumed that the indicated number and variety of diphthongs, especially in Bavarian, is connected, firstly, with their Indo-European past, where there were more than 40 diphthongs, and, secondly, is the result of mixing dialects due to communication between representatives of neighbouring dialects of the same language.

In linguistics, such phenomena as "mixing and alignment" (Sprachmischung und Ausgleich) are considered to be the basic laws of development both in ancient times and at present.

Southern dialects are known to differ from the northern ones in the movement of consonants along the so-called Benrather Linie or along with the II Movement of consonants (II. Lautverschiebung), when they preserved the voicelessness of the consonant.

As a result of the materials studied, we noticed the transition p -> pf, k -> kx, which actively captured the Bavarian and Alemannic dialects, for example: *Pfund (Pfund), Pferd (Pferd), Khind (Kind), trukxe (trocken); and b -> p, g -> k / h, e.g. peran (beren, gebären), kepan (geben), Kast (Gast), vergnüchn (vergnügen).*

Along with this, there were cases of mixing, for example, d instead of t: *machdd (macht), blaibd (bleibt)*; and t instead of d: *tumm (dumm), wert (werde)*. This is probably the result of a mixture of voiced and voiceless b, d, g / p, t, k, which dominated for many centuries in High German dialects, which led to the difference in spelling and pronunciation in modern German - Standarddeutsch: *Tag* [ta: k], *blieb* [bli: p], *Grad* [gʁa: t].

Further study of consonants also revealed that they can be in a weak or strong position. If the position is weak, then the voiced vocal con-

sonant b drops out, for example: *gist (gibst), git (gibt), han (haben)*; the weak closure g goes at the end of the word to k, e.g.: *slak (schlag), Gik (Geige)*, or vocalized: *saue (sagen)*. L very often appears in the root of the word, turning into i, for example: *Geid (Geld), Goid (Gold), Hoiz (Holz)*. A strong position is associated with the West German consonant lengthening (Konsonantendehnung), which in ancient times led to gemination and increased the number of heminants in German dialects, which could not but affect the current state of Standarddeutsch language: *Wozzer (Wasser), Pföffer (Pfeffer), Flosse (Flasche), Summer (Sommer)*.

Bavarian and Alemannic are characterized by reducing the final -e, for example: *laid (Leute), sif (Schiff), wox (Woche)*, and at the end of verbs, adjectives and nouns with diminutive suffixes, -n disappears, for example: At the end of Bavarian words after vowels nasal disappears, for example: *wule (wollen), seide (seiden), fegale (Vöglein)*. At the end of the Bavarian words after the vowels, the nasal ones disappear, for example: *sche (schön), gloa (klein), Mo (Mann)*.

Ancient suffixes such as -ing / -eng in Swabian are not exposed to reduction, for example *Pfeneng (Pfennig), Frieleng (Frühling)*. And the adjective suffixes -isch, -ig, -lich are more accentuated, therefore in Bavarian and Swabian they undergo reduction, for example: *truri (traurig), herli (herlich), freile (freilig)*. As for unstressed prefixes, they are also reduced in southern dialects, for example: *vrtaile (verteilen)*. This process began at the end of the Old High German period (end of VIII - beginning of IX century) and continues up to this day. It stands out the most in the Bavarian dialect. Widely used prefix ge- is reduced before nasals and fricatives and turns into g-, for example: *gmachd (gemacht), gfreit (gefreut), gforchtn (gefürchtet), Gsicht (Gesicht), gsund (gesund)*, and before stops and affricates it disappears completely, for example: *braxt (gebracht), degd (gedeckt), khullfa (geholfen), khora (gehören), kochd (gekocht), blim (geblieben), zeichnt (gezeichnet)*.

As it can be seen from the examples above, suffixes –n, –e are reduced. In the Bavarian dialect, consonant r is vocalized in the same way as in modern German, however in Standarddeutsch it is reflected only in a phonetic norm, not in a written one, unlike Bavarian, where there is a transition to a, for example: *Foda (Vater), Muada (Mutter), Bruada (Bruder)*. Consonant l is vocalized both after back vowels, for example: *Soidad (Soldat), en soi (er soll), koid (kalt)*, and front vowels, for example: *schnei (schnell), Muich (Milch)*. Moreover, in Bavarian unlike Standardsprache, the nouns with -e ending could not be seen, for example: *strass (Strasse), Nosn (Nase), Subbn (Suppe)*.

Reduction as a whole is more characteristic of Bavarian than Swabian-Alemannic. This fact can be explained historically, as the Alemannic dialect, unlike the Bavarian one, did not experience complete reduction of vowels that has been characteristic of the German language since the second half of the 12th century. Consonant combinations sp and st in the southern dialects differ from modern German. So, in the Swabian-Alemannic they change in inlaut to -schp, -scht: *Brust – Bruscht, hast – hascht, ist – ischt, Fest – Fescht, Respekt – Reschpekt*.

There is a transition in Bavarian in some words sp – schb, st – schd, for example: *spielen – schbuin, stehen – schden*.

Considering the case system of the modern German language, it should be noted that it is the result of a long historical development, which had a great influence on the number of cases, their meaning and use. In the ancient times (Old

German, Middle German.), the genitive case Genitiv was used very actively, although its meaning and use was significantly different from the modern one, for example: *diotisco lant (das Land der Deutschen), brotes leben (vom Brot leben), nioman thero friunto (niemand von den Freunden), thes wazzares giholto (Wasser holen), Vadars gelih (dem Vater gleichen)*, etc. This tendency is also associated with a large number of verbs previously controlled by the genitive, for example: *gedanken, bedürfen, entbehren, genießen, vergessen*, etc., many of which were in the XVIII-XIX centuries were no longer used in Genitiv, but in Akkusativ: *dvn. wir vergezzen irer schult, nvn. Wir vergessen ihre Schuld*. And some verbs controlled by Genitiv received prepositions, for example *harren (auf Akk.)*.

This situation was reflected in the development of the case system of German dialects, most of which today have three rather than four cases, unlike Standarddeutsch. This also applies to the Bavarian and Swabian-Alemannic, where Genitiv is completely displaced and replaced by Dativ, for example: *Bav. meim Voda is Heisl, swab. meim Vater sei Haus, Standarddeutsch das Haus meines Vaters / das Haus von meinem Vater*. Based on the last example, in a modern language, there can be two corresponding constructions. However, there is an opinion of some linguists that Genitiv in modern German is doomed to fail (Lewkowskaya, 2016).

While considering some syntactic structures that were found in the texts studied, the following information was revealed. Infinitive patterns with a particle zu, available in the German literary language, are replaced in the Bavarian dialect with various kinds of complex sentences, for example:

Ger. Aber um den Tank zuzubereiten,
braucht man immer noch einen Topf.

Bav. Aber damit wos zum Trinka draus
werd, brauchst ja doch wieda an Tiegl.
Ger. wieder nach Hause zu kommen.
Bav. dass i wieder hoam kimm.
Ger. deshalb hab' ich's eilig, unser Dorf
wiederzusehen.
Bav. deswegen pressiert's ma jetzt, dass i
unsa Kloahausn wieder siehg.
Ger. Es ist gut, dich zu begleiten.
Bav. Des is guat, dass mir mitkemma san.

In Swabian-Alemannic, in relative clauses, the interrogative adverb wo is used instead of the relative pronoun that Standarddeutsch has, for example:

Swab. Der Spieler, wo am Ball isch.
Ger. Der Spieler, der am Ball ist.
Swab. Die Frau, wo die lange Hoar hodd.
Ger. Die Frau, die lange Haare hat.
Swab. Der Mo, wo beim Daimler schaffd.
Ger. Der Mann, der bei Mercedes arbeitet.

Personal names that appear in Swabian texts are often used with articles, for example, *dr Paul, d'Rigge (Erika)*. A number of Swabian nouns have a different gender than Standarddeutsch, for example, *dr Buddr (die Butter), dr Schogglad (die Schokolade), dr Zwibl (die Zwiebel), dr Sofa (das Sofa), dr Genus (das Genus)*, which is evidence of later development in the Swabian female and middle gender compared with the male. Personal names in the Bavarian language are very often used in a diminutive form, for example, *Ade (Adolf), Anderl (Andreas), Katl (Katrin), Annl (Anna)*.

The analysis of sentences from the Bavarian and Swabian-Alemannic texts, containing various types of negations, showed the following. The rule that appeared in the New High German period in the XVI century regarding negatives and prohibiting their double use in the literary language did not affect the southern dialects,

both ancient and modern. For this reason, a structure with several negatives is common for Bavarian and Swabian, e.g.: *Des hätt i ma nia net denkt (Das hätte ich nie gedacht); Jetzt brauch ma uns nimma net maskieren (Jetzt brauchen wir uns nicht mehr zu verkleiden); Da gibt's koana freindlichn Menschen nimma (Da gibt es keine freundlichen Menschen mehr).*

The verb system in southern dialects is also different from Standarddeutsch. So, for example, in Bavarian there is only one synthetic time, Präsens. The future (Futurum) and the past (Perfect) are formed analytically. Among the moods are Indikativ (du machst), Imperativ (mach!) and Konjunktiv, formed synthetically, without auxiliary verbs (du machast). As for the simple past tense, Imperfekt, it exists only in two verbs sei (war) and woint / woit (werden), but mainly for the past tense, Perfekt is used, which, as in Standarddeutsch, is formed using the auxiliary verbs *ham (haben) or sei (sein)* and Partizip II of the main verb, where weak verbs most often have the prefix ge- and suffix -t *(maha – gmacht / machen – gemacht),* and strong ones have the prefix ge- and suffix -en *(stessn – gstesst / stoßen – gestoßen).* As in standard German, there is Partizip I, which often appears in the form of a subordinate clause, for example, *de Kinder, de was / wo laffa (die laufenden Kinder).*

The lexical stock of the southern German dialects, as our study has shown, has its own characteristics and does not always coincide with Standarddeutsch. Several words of the normalized German language are used in territorial dialects. However, dialects also have their vocabulary, which is most common in everyday life.

Speaking about the Bavarian dialect, it should be noted that it is very rich in its synonyms, that is, it has a wide type of paradigmatic relations of language units based on a conceptual community, for example*: Sofa – Diwan – Bettstoff, Mund – Mei – Goschn – Goschal – Babbn – Letschn – Fotzn, Kartoffel – Erdapfel – Grundbirne, Aprikose – Marille, Tomate – Paradeiser Paradiesapffel, Brötchen – Semmel, Bamhackl – Buntspecht, plaudern – plauschen – babbeln – schwatzen*, etc.

In Swabian, a certain synonymous row has also been identified, for example: *Falter – Schmetterling, Kartoffel – Erdapfel – Grundbirne – Potate, Marmelade – Gsälz, Ehefrau – Weib, Erdbeere – Breschdleng, Eltern – Leit, Topf – Hafa, heimlich – hähng.*

There is also a difference in some definitions and the gender of nouns in comparison to Standarddeutsch, for example: *der Mensch – des Mensch, der Bursche – des Burschle.* Fuas means not only the foot, but the whole leg (*Bein),* Hand – the whole arm to the shoulder, bald corresponds to the German literary *früh, Gsälz,* as noted above – this is not salt, but *Marmelade; schmegga* means not only *schmecken*, but *riechen* and so on.

The German population, including young people, do not want to forget the regional roots; they willingly add dialect words and expressions to their speech. Especially common are forms of greeting and farewell, such as:

Servus! – Hallo! – Grüß Dich!

Grieß God! / Grüß Gott! – Guten Tag!

Grüß Dich!

Ba-ba! – Auf Wiedersehen!

Guad Moang! – Guten Morgen!

Moizeid! – Guten Mittag!

Guan' Amd! – Guten Abend!

Guad(e) Nacht! – Gute Nacht!

The days of the week are eagerly used: *Manda – Montag, Diada – Dienstag, Migga – Mittwoch, Pfinzda – Donnerstag, Freida – Freitag, Samstag – Sonnabend, Sunda – Sonntag,*

which are ancient copies of the corresponding ancient Greek names that came to the Old High German language from gothic times.

Our study also showed that dialect synonyms having adapted can enter the main stock of German literary language contributing to it and enriching it. Thus, for example, south German words *Samstag (Sonnabend)*, *Falter (Schmetterling)*, *Semmel (Brötchen), schwatzen/plaudern (sprechen), Metzger (Fleischer)*, being dialecticisms add to modern German synonymic row. It is also known that in Prenzlauer Berg, a district of Berlin (Prenzlauer Berg – Berlin), street names began to be renamed in the Swabian manner *Gässle (Wörther Gässle)* instead of the literary *Gasse*. Moreover, in Berlin's restaurants, they order *Spätzle* – Swabian egg noodles served with cheese or used as a side dish.

We believe that synonymy in general, and dialectical, in particular, is an option for optimizing the language and serves to meet the needs of people. Moreover, in studying the problem associated with dialectic synonymy, there are still many unresolved issues, which need further consideration.

Conclusions

As a result of the study, we came to the following *conclusions*.

At present, the status of the dialect is being reassessed, changing from a single form of communication into one of the possible options for speech, which is socially marked. Thanks to the interest of the German population, the support of the German government, government representatives of the education sector, who allocate additional funds to the study of various dialects in kindergartens and schools, by the efforts of linguistic scholars, German dialects occupy a fairly

strong place today along with the normalized German language – Standarddeutsch.

Development of southern German dialects (Bavarian and Swabian-Alemannic) and their interaction with Standarddeutsch demonstrates that it can be argued that the German language, based on the laws of linguosynergetics, is a complex open information system that is constantly evolving while preserving information about its past states, and the combination of knowledge of the past and present makes it possible to forecast prospects for the development of the system in the future.

The research has proved that the German language, as well as any other language, is a synergetic system and has a certain range of states. As a part of the synergetic system, it is dynamic, nonlinear, non-equilibrium, adaptable, open and able to tune into different states if exposed to external influence.

German language development is a complex process, which varies in its numerous subsystems and is tightly connected with a number of fundamental notions gaining a new sense in synergetic – this is above all substance, space, time, information, evolution. Apart from this, it is impossible to discover the ways of language development without considering the extralinguistic impact on a language system. Continuous influence of the external environment (historical events, socio-political and cultural development and other) enables language system fluctuations on a wider scale, which can take the system to a new level, to a new attractor, such as active development of modern Southern German dialect, as in the example described above. The process led to the quantitative and qualitative changes of the language as the information system.

The modern state of the German language can be considered Global Deutsch as the newest

stage of its historical development. Merging into its new evolutionary phase, Althochdeutsch – Mittelhochdeutsch – Neuhochdeutsch – Global Deutsch, German language represents globalization and anti-globalization tendencies, in accordance with laws of linguosynergetics, which was demonstrated by the example of modern Southern dialects and their interaction with modern German language – Standarddeutsch.

The results of the study give reason *to predict* further changes in modern German at all levels – phonetic, linguistic, grammatical – taking into account the various dialectological features that are embedded in the German language system.

The data obtained on the evolutionary development of the German language and its dialects are of particular importance for the learning and teaching the history of the German language, an introduction to German philology, dialectology, and also the practical course of the German language.

References

Berkov, V. P. (2001). *Sovremennyi nemeckii yazyk* (Modern Germanic Languages, in Russian). Moscow: Astrel.

Berkov, V. P. (2006). *Vvedeniye v germanistiku* (Introduction to Germanistics, in Russian). Moscow: Vysshaja shkola.

Denz J., Funk E., Glück A., Rowley A. R., Schamberger-Hirt, A., & Schnabel, M. (2002). *Bayerisches Wörterbuch (BWB): A – Bazi.* De Gruyter Oldenbourg.

Dombrovan, T. I. (2014). *Synergetic Model of English Language Development.* Odessa: KP OGT.

Ernst, P. (2006). *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte.* UTB basics WUV.

Fichte, J. G. (1988). *Grundlage der gesamten Wissenschaftslehre als Handschrift für seine Zuhörer.* Hamburg: Felix Meiner Verlag.

Golubenko, L. N., Kulyna, I. G., & Berezina, I. O. (2017). *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache. Praktikum für den Kurs.* Odesa: Feniks.

Golubenko, L. N., Kulyna, I. G., & Kozak, T. B. (2019). *Einführung in die deutsche Philologie. Praktikum für den Kurs.* Odesa: Feniks.

Goscinny, R., & Uderzo, A. (1997[a]). *Asterix und die Goten.* Delta Verlag Stuttgart.

Goscinny, R., & Uderzo, A. (1997[b]). *Auf geht's zu de Gotn!* Delta Verlag Stuagat.

Guhman, M. M. (1955). *Ot nemeckogo yazyka k nemeckomu nacional'nomu yazyku* (From the German Language to the German National Language, in Russian). Moscow: Akademiya nauk SSSR.

Hegel, G. (1994). *Lektsii po istorii filosofii* (Philosophical Lectures, in Russian). Sankt-Peterburg: Nauka.

Herder, J. G. (1981). *Abhadlung über den Upsrung der Sprache.* Stuttgart: Reclam.

Hübner, G. (2015). *Ältere deutsche Literatur.* Tübingen Verlag.

Humboldt, W. (1974). *Über die Verschiedenheiten des Menschlichen.* Hildesheim: Olms Verlagsbuchhandlung.

Kant, I. (1964). *Sochineniya v shesti tomah* (Works in six Volumes, in Russian). (Vol. 3). Moscow: Mysl'.

Klausmann, H. (1997). *Kleiner Dialektatlas Gebundene Ausgabe.* Waldkircher Verlagsges.

Klausmann, H. (2014). Regionalismen in der

schriftlichen Standardsprache. Sprach-kultur – Regionalkultur. Neue Felder kulturwissenschaftlicher Dialektfor-schung. *Studien und Materialien des Ludwig-Uhland-Instituts der Universi-tät Tübingen, 49*, 96-120.

Klausmann, H. (2017). *Kleiner Sprachtatlas von Vorarlberg und Liechtenstein*. Studien-verlag.

Klausmann, H., Kunze, K., & Schrambke, R. (1993). *Kleiner Dialektatlas: Aleman-nisch und Schwäbisch in Baden-Würt-temberg*. Konkordia-Verl.

Kondilyak, E. B. (1980). *Filosofskoe nasledie* (Philosophical heritage, in Russian). Moscow: Mysl'.

Kondrashov, N. A. (1979). *Istoriya lingvistiches-kih ucheniy* (History of linguistic doc-trines, in Russian). Moscow: Prosvi-shchenie.

König, W. (2011). *dtv-Atlas Deutsche Sprache*. Deutscher Taschenbuchverlag.

König, W. (2014). *Dialektwörterbuch von Bay-erisch-Schwaben: Vom Allgäu bis zum Ries (Schriftenreihe der Bezirksheimat-pflege Schwaben zur Geschichte und Kultur)*. Wißner-Verlag.

König, W., & Renn, M. (2007). *Kleiner Spra-chatlas von Bayerisch-Schwaben (Ma-terialien zur Geschichte des Bayeris-chen Schwaben)*. Wißner-Verlag.

Kushnerik, V. (2004). *Fonosemantysm u her-manskykh i slovianskykh movakh* (Pho-nosemantics in German and Slovenian Languages, in Ukrainian). Chernivtsi: Ruta.

Leonhardt, N. K. (2014). *Dialektgrenzen als soziokulturelle Konstrukte. Subjektive Sprachräume in Nord-Baden-Württem-berg*. Eberhard Karls Universität Tü-bingen.

Leonhardt, N. K. (2015). *Dialektgrenzen als soziokulturelle Konstrukte. Subjektive Sprachräume in Nord-Baden-Württem-berg*. Dissertation. Universität Tübing-en.

Lewizkij, V. (2008). *Osnovy germanistyky* (Ba-sics of Germanistics, in Ukranian). Vin-nicja: Nova kniga.

Lewizkij, V., & Pohl, H.-D. (2010). *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. Vinnicja: Nova kniga.

Lewkowskaya, O. A. (2016). *Genetiv v sovre-mennom nemeckom yazyke na mate-riale diskursa periodicheskoi pechati* (Genetiv in modern German on the ma-terial of the periodic press discourse, in Russian). *Sciences. Questions of Theo-ry and Practice, 10*(64), 114-116.

Niebaum, H., & Macha, J. (2006). *Einführung in die Dialektologie des Deutschen*. Tü-bingen: de Gruyter Verlag.

Schmid, H. U. (2009). *Einführung in die deut-sche Sprachgeschichte*. Metzler Stutt-gart, Weimar: S. Hirzel Verlag.

Schmidt, W. (2007). *Geschichte der deutschen Sprache*. Stuttgart: S. Hirzel Verlag.

Selivanova, O. O. (2010). *Lingvistychna enczklo-pediya* (Linguistic Encyclopedia, in Ukrainian). Poltava: Dovkillya.

Sellner, J. (2018). *Was wird aus dem Dialekt? „Die Schwaben sprechen richtig"*. Re-trieved 25 February, 2020 from: https://www.stuttgarter-zeitung.de/inha-lt.was-wird-aus-dem-dialekt-die-schw-aben-sprechen-richtig.116b422a-cdaf-4f65-873f-f848a87374a7.html.

Sonderegger, S. (2003). *Althochdeutsche Spra-che und Literatur*. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Stedje, A. (2007). *Deutsche Sprache gestern und heute*. W. Fink UTB.

Taranets, V. G. (2008). *Diakhroniya movy* (Diachronics of the Language, in Ukranian). Odesa: Drukarskij dim.

Wolff, G. (2009). *Deutsche Sprachgeschichte von den Anfängen bis zur Gegenwart*. A. Francke Verlag Tübingen und Basel.

Zehetner, L. (2015). Mehr Mut zum regionalen Idiom – Dialekt ist keine Sprachbarriere. In *Freude an der Mundart, Lesebuch zum Bayernbund-Projekt* (pp. 14-18). Rosenheim: Bayernbund e.V.

Zehetner, L. (2016). *Basst scho!: Wörter und Wendungen aus den Dialekten und der regionalen Hochsprache in Altbayern.* Regensburg: Mittelbayerische edition vulpes.

Zehetner, L. (2018). *Bairisches Deutsch: Lexikon der deutschen Sprache in Altbayern.* Regensburg: Mittelbayerische edition vulpes.

Zhirmunsky, V. M. (1956). *Nemeckaya dialektologiya* (German Dialectology, in Russian). Moscow: Izdadelstvo akademii nauk SSSR.

Zhirmunsky, V. M. (1965). *Istoriya nemeckogo yazyka* (History of German Language, in Russian). Moscow: Vysshaya shkola.