

RESEARCH ARTICLE

About One Case of Linguistic Influence of Migration

Ketevan Gigashvili*¹, George Gotsiridze²

¹Dept. of Georgian Philology Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University 28^a, Leselidze street, Telavi, Georgia.

²Dept. of History Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State University 28^a, Leselidze street, Telavi, Georgia.

*Corresponding Author: E-mail: keti.gigashvili@gmail.com, god08@yahoo.com

Abstract

The work analyzes one peculiar case of linguistic influence of migration, namely the work deals with migrations of the speakers of Tsovatush language spread in a little village as well as their linguistic results. As a result of migration Tsovatushs were appeared in Georgian language environment. There were all the conditions for shifting Tsovatush language onto its dominated Georgian one. Just migration became the reason for starting language shift, which was resulted by the fact that at present the mentioned language is considered as endangered. The work names the essence of migration and gives its description due to the parameters such as: place, time, motivation, socio-cultural factors. The issue of migration is described on the bases of archival documents and historical or sociolinguistic literature and the nature of migration is revealed according to the mentioned parameters in case of Tsovatushs. After the research it was found out that we deal with short-distance, internal, long-lasting, massive, compulsory migrations from the village to the village, the linguistic result of which is the shift of Tsovatush language onto dominated Georgian one. The migration of the population from the mountain to the valley was enclosed with the illness caused from foreign climate conditions, which somehow decreased the number of speakers of the language.

The research was carried out under the scientific project, which was implemented at the Department of Georgian Philology at Telavi State University.

Keywords: *Internal migration, Short Distance Migration, Compulsory Migration, Massive Migration, Language Shift, Endangered Language.*

Introduction

Lots of factors have influence on the process of language shift. They are involved together in the regions of the contact of languages. Diverse combination of factors have difference influence in various regions, various contact situations. It is interesting that their research outcomes are factually coincided in spite the questionnaires were carried out in different countries or target groups. Even the mentioned factors have different influence in different time and space by taking a lot of parameters into our consideration. Resemblance of the research outcomes is natural as macro system, the organic part of which is linguistic space, consists of one and the same elements in all the countries or continents. In its tend, these component units are identical in their structural features. e.g. the language, which functions in any society, is everywhere the totality of lexical fund and grammatical structure;

Culture is everywhere the totality of achievements of the society in the fields of education, science, technique, art and life as well; Economy is the totality of relations between the persons connected to production and etc. The difference is in connections and attitudes of the component parts of their character and system revealed in any political space. It is impossible that the relations of these units to be analogical in every countries. Different interrelations between these elements cause just the fact, that we meet peculiar causes of danger in one country and the different reasons in another one and so on.

These reasons are widely named in linguistic literature. Here we should also mention that not only one cause has influence on the language shift but it is caused by the group of reasons.

We divide these reasons in two groups:

The first covers natural reasons such as: droughts, starvation, massive illnesses, inundations, earthquakes, tsunamis, spitting out of the volcano or other catastrophes which conditions people's migrations or movements to safer places. Migrations of the populations are followed by formation of the new language contact situations.

The second group contains political-economical-social-cultural reasons.

The given article deals with the case of migration which had important influence on the status of their language in case of Tsovatushs.

Body Text

The methods recognized in the science are used in the research process. These are the following: observation on the materials (in our case observation on historical sources) and systematization; analysis of the materials: segmentation and defining the interrelations between segmented elements; synthesis of the gained outcomes: integration and interpretation, also the methods of incorporation and comparison of the sources and the opinions expressed in scientific literature.

Results and Discussion

The language shift caused by the natural factors is called the sudden shift by Grimes. e.g. the people in the United States of America were 30.000 in 1804 but they were decreased up to 6000 because of smallpox and in 2001 they were only 90 among the population of 1000 persons [1]. The number of the population was decreased also in Brazil after the Europeans spread measles there [2].

We should regard the language motions caused by natural cataclysms as the language shift only if the functions of the language are not stopped. Otherwise, they should be called as the language death. Thus, the natural calamities and massive diseases may become the cause of sudden shift of the language or the language death.

Our target society-Tsovas-lived in one part of Mtatusheti-Tsovata-before 20-30s of XIX century near other Tush tribes-Chaghmas, Gometsarians and Pirikitians. Tusheti is located over the main ring of Caucasia on the North hem: as a result of inundation Tsovatushs settled in the village Zemo Alvani, thus the migration to the valley caused by the natural cataclysms became the fundamnetal of close language relations between Georgian and Tsovatush languages.

Today Zemo Alvani is the only place in the world

where Tsovatushs live. The village is situated in Akhmeta Region, the North-East part of Georgia. Akhmeta belongs to Kakheti region. It is bordered from the East by Republic of Dagestan (Federation of Russia) and Telavi Region, from the West by the Regions of Tianeti and Dusheti, from the South – Regions of Sagarejo and Telavi and from the North – Republics of Chechnya and Ingushetia (Federation of Russia).

Before settling in the valley, it was obvious that there existed the language contact between Georgian and Tsovatush languages, but not with this scale and nature. When Ivane Javakhishvili appreciated the merits of Anton Schiefner and Peter Uslar in studying Tsovatush language, he mentioned: “both of them knew well how great influence had Georgian onto Tsova language, mainly onto its treasure of words” [3]. The works of Schiefner and Uslar were created in II half of XIX century and accordingly we should take into consideration Ivane Javakhishvili's viewpoint while evaluating the scales of influence of Georgian language onto Tsovatush one. As it is clear, in spite of relief location of Tsovata (it creates the separate gorge, it is surrounded by the rocks and separated from the rest territory of Tusheti), Tushs had (not intensive but still) peculiar relations with other communities at the time of living in the mountain.

We have quite little information about settling Tsovatushs in Mtatusheti itself. Little quantity of information causes diversity of the viewpoints.

Peculiar part of the scientists thinks that they did not live in Tusheti at first and they were migrated from Ghlighveti. The internal conflict and strife between the tribes of Dzurduketi caused migration of Tsovas from Ghlighveti to the gorge of Gometsari: Kists, the ancestors of Tsovas, had quarrels with other kindred tribes, as a result of which they left the gorge of Ghlighvi and transferred to the various places, some of them went to the ravine, to Mtiuleti, to Kartli, to the ravines of Aragvi and Tergi. In those places they were oppressed by the head of the population of Aragvi. That was the reason they came to Tusheti and settled on the uninhabited lands near Gometsarians due to the consent by Tushs [4; 5; 6].

Mikheil Machabeli wrote in 1900, that Tushs speak in pure Georgian and do not differ from the rest Georgians, though they are originated from Kists and their language is the kindred one of Kist language [7].

Gyuldenshtedt and Veidenbaum also regarded Tsovas as the descendants of Kists. In the archive

of Veidenbaum the document is kept, where Kists are regarded as the ancestors of not only Tsovas but Pirikitelians as well [8, 9].

A. Zisserman and Iv. Tsiskarishvili supposed the origin of Tsovas and Pirikitelians as Vainakhian (Dalghian) and regarded Kists as their language [10; 11].

German scientist Heinrich Klapproth travelled in Caucasia at the beginning of XIX century, which was soon followed by his book: "Travelling in Caucasia and Georgia". Here he considered Tsovas together with other Tush people as originated from Kists [12].

A. Shavkhelishvili regards Tsovatushs (as well as Kists) as Vainakhs and describes them as separate group in the research written in 1963 in Russian language – "From the History of Relations between Georgian and Chechen-Ingush People (from the ancient period to XV century) [13]. In the next researches the scientist changes his opinions and expresses absolutely opposite standpoints, which we will see below.

According to A. Dirr, Tsovatushs are one of the tribes of Tushs, which settled from Chechnya to Tusheti and then they became Christians [14].

I. Desheriev also supposed that Tsovas settled from the North Chechnya, namely from Vabo [15].

Al. Khakhanashvili regarded Tsovatushs as the kindred tribe with Chechens in the language and origin, which were not different from "Tushs, the tribes of Georgians" [16]. Also Arnold Chikobava regarded Tsovatushs as other ethnos, which spoke in Georgian: "all Batsbs (Tsova-Tush) know Georgian and consider themselves as Georgians" [17].

Tush scholar Ivane Bukurauli described Tsovatushs in the work "From Tbatana to Tsovata (notes of the passenger)": Tsovas speak the disfigured Ghlighian language and the mentioned language becomes more and more disfigured due to the influence of Georgian language, in the future it will be totally put to the end" [18].

According to the information of Tush priest Irodion Elionisidze, the population of Chaghma and Gometsari speaks old Georgian, half of the population of Pirikiti speaks Kist language, the language of Tsovas as also close to Kist language" [19].

Academician S. Janashia regarded Tsovas and Chaghmas as the ethnically different tribes. He also regarded Pshavs, Khevsurians and Mokheves as various tribes: "ethnically and ethnographically different tribes are different even at present in the East Georgia: Pshavs, Tsova-Tushs and

Chaghma-Tushs, Mokheves... and many others" [20].

V. Lagazidze described Tsovas as originated from Nakh tribe and considered them different from Georgian tribes: "the inhabitants of Mtatusheti are divided into two ethnical groups: Tsova and Chaghma Tushs" [21].

Gyuldenshtedt points: "Tush people, which belongs and is located at the beginnings of the river Alazani, consists of Georgians, which are mixed with Kists" [8].

V. Elanidze notes in the article published in 1964, that Tusheti is not the first residence of Tushs. "The tribe of Tushs underwent the migration like other Georgian tribes" [22]. He based on the viewpoint of Iv. Javakhishvili, according to whom, "just those tribes had to come to Caucasus, which were settled in the north in historically well-known times. Thus, at first Abkhazians, then Apshils, Svans, Tushs and Mtiulis. Afterwards Kolkhs, Kaskhs" [23].

In the monograph "Issues of the History of Tusheti" written in 1988 V. Elanidze regarded Tsovatushs as Vainakh tribe and defined the time when they settled in Tusheti as II half of XVII century [24].

In the newspaper "Ganakhlebuli Tusheti (renewed Tusheti)" dated by January 13 of 1989 (#6) the scientist published the letter, where he noted that the tribe of Tsovas is considered as one of the ancient Georgian tribes, that the scientist has searched the materials which will be discussed in the special research in the future [25]. In the newspaper "Communist" dated by March 26 of 1989 the scientist published "the letter to the editorial board", where he recognizes that in the monograph published in 1988 he has done some mistakes "in revealing several issues". "Namely, he has not obviously and convincingly discussed the Georgian origination of Tsova-Tushs and the time of settling them in Tusheti is regarded as second half of XVII century. The research of the question for the second time made us sure that we have done some mistakes; accordingly we apologize for the readers. We note convincingly that Tsova-Tushs were the Georgian population and inhabitants of Tusheti like Chaghma-Tushs. They were not separated and they had common thoughts and troubles. It is revealed in their multi-century history" – writes the author [26].

In the monograph published in 2006 V. Elanidze writes the same viewpoints as in earlier times: "Tsovas came to Tusheti maybe at the time of late middle ages, though the time is not exact and

afterwards they got the names Tushs and Tsovas” [27].

The scientific literature gives us the opinion that the ancestors of North-Caucasian tribes were settled even since the earlier times in Transcaucasia, the territory inhabited with the kindred groups of people [28].

There are the opposite viewpoints as well according to which Tsovatushs belong to Georgian ethnos, which studied the language from the neighbor Chechen people. Vakhushiti Batonishvili describes the ethnical membership of Tusheti: “who are Tushs, know the language of Kists and Ghlighvis. They do not belong to the religion and language of Parsman like Kists [29]. “Tushs and Didos are not the descendants of Lezgins“ [30]. Community of Tsovata created the west part of Tusheti, which ethnographically and historically belonged to the local Georgian mountaineers like the communities of Pirikitians, Gometsarians and Chaghmas [31].

S. Makalatia does not share this opinion. He notes that the ethnical belonging of population of Tusheti was not known by that time. He writes about coming Tsovatushs: “it is difficult to define the time when Tsovas came to Tusheti. We introduce the information from the things taken out of the crypts of the former village Tsaro, that by the middle ages by nearly 8th-9th centuries the village Tsaro was inhabited with the population”. He thinks that Tsovas had to be settled from Ghlighveti. He supposes that the time when Tsovas settled from Ghlighveti to Tusheti should be the same centuries [32].

V. Itonishvili regards Tsovatush as the dialect of Georgian language, which is mixed by Kist words. Maybe, it is conditioned by the fact that Kists had lived near Tushs [33].

Georgian origin of Tsovas is proved by L. Sharashidze as well: “we can obviously note that Tsovatushs are local, the Georgian group with indigenous origin, unlike the idea that they are Kist tribe made Georgians afterwards” [34].

Sharashidze’s conclusion is based on the outcomes of the expedition carried out by the anthropologists in 1951, which did not prove “genetic interdependence” between Tsovatushs living in Zemo Alvani and Kists living in Pankisi gorge” [34]. As a result of the expedition it was defined that “Tsova-Tushs, which are connected to Kists in language, are anthropologically different from them and are close to the peculiar Georgian groups: Chaghma-Tushs, Mokheves, Pshavs, Khevsurians, Mtiulis, Gudamakarians and so on.

Their resemblance with Georgian groups and at first Chaghma-Tushs, gives us the fundamental to think that the group of Tsova-Tushs is not the result of assimilation of Kists and Chaghma-Tushs” [35].

It should be mentioned that while reading the information about Tushs and Tusheti in the historical sources of Old and Middle Ages, the information about the communities of Tsovas and Chaghmas are not concrete: when Tushs are discussed, we read the general information on all the communities included in it. Thus, the history of Tsovas is totally connected to the history of Tushs.

Arsen Bertlani objectively notes: even Tsovas themselves do not know the history of Tsovas... as it was not written. In these conditions we may suppose some opinions but not based on Historiography (or ethnography)” [36].

The first sample about naming Tushs as Tsovas and Chaghmas is noticed since II half of XVII century. We read in “Archiliani”: for unity of Tushs, Tsovas and Chaghmas” [37]. This fact made V. Elanidze think that Tsovas settled in Tusheti just since this period (II half of XVII century), but proving this fact will be difficult from the scientific viewpoint. This fact may be defined in another way: the communities belonging to Tusheti had common history, life, habits, religion, culture, geographical boundaries and the term of the tribe “Tush”.

Hence, the standpoints expressed in the scientific literature about origin of Tsovatushs may be divided into two groups. According to the first opinion, Tsovas belong to Kists-Ghlighvis. This viewpoint is agreed by: R. Eristavi, I. Tsiskarishvili, M. Machabeli, V. Itonishvili, Al. Khakhanashvili, S. Makalatia, T. Papuashvili, G. Melikishvili, T. Uturgaidze, V. Lagazidze, A. Schiefner, I. Iakovlev, E. Veidenbaum, I. Gyuldenshtedt, A. Zisserman, H. Klaproth and others; but due to the second viewpoint, Tsovas belong to Georgian ethnos and the language is regarded as mixed one as a result of living for a long time near the representatives of the tribes of Kists-Ghlighvis. The authors of the mentioned viewpoint consider Tsovatushs as inseparable part of Georgian ethno-social body and one of the communities of the tribe of Tushs.

This opinion is defended by: Vakhushiti Bagrationi, Iv. Javakhishvili, L. Sharashidze, G. Koranashvili, L. Tukhashvili, J. Kashia and others. The authors of the first opinion share agree with the idea about migration of Tsovatushs on the territory of Tusheti (Georgia), but the

authors of the second opinion regard them as the indigenous population of Georgia.

It should be also mentioned that the separate researchers have doubts and write the opposite opinions in the articles or monographs published in different time (A. Shanidze, V. Elanidze, A. Shavkhelishvili). Such doubts is conditioned by little number of historical documents. Sometimes polemics in the scientific literature takes place in not desirable format, which does not expel outrage between the scientists and researchers.

History of Tsovatushs has not been written separately. It was not separated from the history of Tusheti and accordingly Georgia in the time full of the base of source studies.

We have no trustworthy information about settling them from other country to Tusheti. Iv. Javakhishvili notes: “even the line of the above-mentioned middle part of Georgian land (is meant the space between the ravines of Lekhuri-Ksani and Aragvi-Iori) was not the first resident of the tribe of Tsovas. Maybe they came there from the different place. Even in this case, the geographical name is helpful for us to define the earlier resident” [3].

The only fundamental of the theory of relation between Tsovatushs and Nakh is different (Tsovatush) language, which is the member of Nakh group of Iberian-Caucasian language family. “If Tsovatushs like other Tushs belonged to Georgian people... why do they have different language from Georgians?” – the question is arisen by J. Stepnadze [38].

Tsovatushs lived in Tusheti before 20-30s of XIX century. According to Makalatia, making the villages of Tsovata empty and migration of Tsovatushs from Tsovata to Alvani was begun since XVIII century, as the population could not stand the attacks by Kists and Lezghins. In 1830 when the avalanche destroyed the village Etelta, Tsovas began massive migration to Alvani and built there the villages: Gurgal-Chala, Pkhakalkura and Tsistolokura [32]. In 80s of XIX century Tsovata was totally empty and today it is just the remains of the buildings, which are now the summer residents of the sheep-breeders [39].

V. Itonishvili names Sagilta instead of Etelta. Flood of it was begun in 1832 and it is regarded as the starting stage of migration: “a little stream, which is coming down from the right boundary of the former village Sagirta was turned into the flow and inundated the village. The saved part of the population inhabited in the valley” [40]. According to the researcher’s information, the process of migration of Tsovatushs into the valley

was begun by the last period of XVIII century and it got intensive form by 20s of XIX century [41].

According to G. Jalabadze, Tsovatushs came to the valley at the beginning of XIX century and especially in 30s, when their villages were destroyed as a result of inundation [42].

According to the information of Radde, Tsovatushs left Tsovata because of various reasons: frequent attacks of Kists and Lezghins, cold and long-lasting winters, useful conditions of Kakheti for developing sheep-breeding. According to him as well, mountaineers migrated in the valley left 2-3 families in Indurta even in winter in order to have connection with the mountain [43].

I. Tsiskarishvili names the reason of migration of Tushs into the valley. It is lack of the industrial conditions [11; 44].

The former villages of Tsovata are the following: Sagirta, Indurta, Etelta, Tsaro, Nazarta, Nadirta, Mozarta, Shavtskala. When Tsovas migrated into the valley, they inhabited in Pankisi at first as well as in Bakhtrioni and Gorisdziri in the east part along Alvani, at last they settled on the territory of Alvani [45].

While living in the mountain the quantity of Tushs was bigger. Tsovatushs migrated into the valley got into difficulties in connection with adaptation with the nature as they were adapted of the climate of the mountain. Different climate of the valley made their health worse. Lots of them became ill by Tuberculosis, which could not be treated at that time. It decreased their number. Decreasing of the number of the population as a result of the disease became one of the natural factors for the language shift.

Very often and even in case of Tsovatushs, the issue of migration is in peculiar connection with the issue of ethnicity: the authors of the viewpoint that Tsovatushs do not represent the indigenous population of Georgia, logically prove their double migration: from Ghlighveti to Tsovata and from Tsovata to the valley – in the village Zemo Alvani. In the first case migration is qualified as external and in the second case as internal. The authors of the opinion that Tsovatushs had lived on the territory of Georgia even since the earlier times, logically prove their single migration – or internal one: from Tsovata to the village Zemo Alvani.

Migration is one of the factors which have essential influence on the status and functions of the languages. The scientists think that migration of the people is the main reason of the changes conditioned by the contact. In any case of

migration, when homogenous people transfer to the isolated place, language or dialectical contact is formed [46; 47].

Migrations take important place in starting the process of language shift: we should discuss two cases here. The first is when the minority ethnical group is migrated from one historical territory to another one and the second is when other people are settled on the territory of such group. In this case the number of the receiver society may be decreased. e.g. Hawaiian people were only 20 percent of the whole population by 2001 on their own territory [1].

Frequently the languages are carried by just this population to the region, which is already inhabited by the people speaking in various languages. e.g. the local languages of America and Australia are widely altered by the West European languages for the last several centuries.

The small but high organized group may dictate the new language to the population in the way of military conquests, which took place in the empire of Rome, which created Roman languages.

Migration out of the traditional territory is the reason of the language shift in case of local Americans and Siberians. Grimes calls the shift caused by the migration as the planned one [1].

Migration always has sociolinguistic outcomes as demographic balance of the arrived and receiver population is changed. Urban flow of the population (frequently of the young people) and the processes of industrialization often abrogate the balance with the purpose of damaging the minority ethnical groups.

Due to Kerswill, migrants are often young and economically active people. At the time of migration they are separated from their social and sociolinguistic body and create ethnolinguistic minority on a new place. The receiver language society undergoes some alternations as a result of migration of migrants [48; 49].

The scientists denote that all the world languages are in connection with migration according to the peculiar significance. Only a few cases are proved when the ancestors of the speakers of any region were the first people living there. e.g. Austronesian languages were spread on the uninhabited islands of the ocean almost B.C. 1600 and in 1300.

As a result of migration language contacts are formed, when the language may be died due to the planned, thought prohibit or because the speakers are shifted on another language on the socio-economical bases. The second important result of the migration is formation of language families.

When the speaking society is separated because of transfer of peculiar number of speakers, the language spoken by various groups may be dismissed after different changes and the language variety is formed. For instance, we can name Austronesian languages.

Such language families represent the research object for linguistic-comparative linguistics.

One of the main movements of the population at the end of XIX century and at the beginning of XX century was carrying the people as the worker from India to European colonies [50]. It was reflected in new diversity of the languages of India. In this case we should specially mention Bhojpuri, which was formed beyond the big region from the West India and Caribbea to the South Africa [51] and Fiji [52] – mixed species of Koine like Fiji Hindi.

Together with pidginization and creolization the linguistic effect of migration is formation of new dialect with the help of koineization process. New diversity of the languages is formed as the understandings between the speakers. This fact is known as new dialectical [53], or immigrant Koine [54; 55].

It is interesting that in the nature not only the migration of the languages or the people take place but of other biological things as well: plants, birds, animals. In foreign electronic press dated by January 21 of 2011 the information was published about summer rains in Sarengeti because of which the valley of Ndutu was “inundated” by wild animals and zebras. It means the migration caused by the natural conditions took place [56].

The scientists agree with the parameters which should be discussed at the time of classifying and describing migrations. These parameters are the following:

- Place
- Time
- Motivation
- Socio-cultural factors [57, 58].

Boyle describes migration as movement beyond the boundary of regional unit [58]. If it happens inside the country, we deal with the internal migration. Movement inside the regional unit is simple local movement [57].

From the sociolinguistic point of view, movements inside and beyond the administrative boundaries if it happens inside the countries, have no big outcomes [49].

When migration happens beyond the boundaries of the country, its influence is bigger. In these cases the differences between the arrived and receiver societies plays the most important role from language, cultural, economical, political, social or other points of views.

One of the parameters of migration, as it was mentioned above, is the place. It covers the distance and direction. There are short-distance and long-distance migrations. Short-distance is different from long-distance migration in how the individuals can preserve the connections with the place of origin.

As for the direction, migration mainly takes place from the village to the city. Migrations in Europe and North America were organized from the villages to the cities. Such migrations were begun in Britain at the end of XVIII century as a result of industrial revolution [59].

Migration of the population of the village to the internal local cities is one of the main objects of sociolinguistic researches. Massive migration directed from the village to the city in developing world is the fact of the end of XX century.

As for the factor of the time, there are short-lasting and long-lasting migrations. Long-lasting (and long-distance) migration of workers from less developed to more developed countries was characteristic for the next period of 1950 [49].

In time itself as one of the parameters of migration 4 time categories are separated: daily, periodical, seasonal and long-term [Gould/Prothero 1975, is cited: 57].

Daily movements contain travelling by the social transport while the next three categories mean spending the nights.

From sociolinguistic viewpoint, periodical and backward migrations are important for even the migrants and the country from where migration takes place.

We may regard the politics of the United Nations as the sample of periodical migration, which suggests at least one year resident to the migrants [57]. Turkish “guest workers”, who work in Germany in winter period but go back to Turkey in summer, are periodical migrants or seasonal workers [60]. The guest workers and their families create quite big and steady groups for code switch.

According to the third parameter, from the viewpoint of motivation, migration may be compulsory and voluntary. In the scientific literature it is mentioned that the most well-known case of compulsory migration is sending

10-12 million Africans as slaves to Caribbea, West India and America in XVI-XIX centuries [61]. The captains of the ships specially took the people in the ships speaking in various languages. The captains wanted to decrease the probability of revolt [62]. The result of this compulsory multilingualism was formation of Pidgins and the kindred Creoles with the purpose of communication between the slaves and the owners.

In XX century the compulsory migration was still widely spread. In 1992 20 million from 100 million international migrants were migrated under compulsion as a result of pursuit, war and the projects of changes and development of the environment [49]. In Africa 47% are migrants. Many of the migrations are short-lasting. These movements increased urban multilingualism on this continent [63].

Voluntary migration is often caused by the wish for economical development of the population, though such migrations are also compulsory and their reasons stand in the hard political-economical situation of the country.

Thus, migration may be caused by natural cataclysms (such as Tsunami, inundation, ecological danger and so on) and in this case this reason as one of the factors of language endangerment, is considered in I group of the reasons causing danger (which are called natural cataclysms). It may be conditioned by political, economical or other factors as well. In this case migration should be included in the reasons of the second group.

We can analogically say the same about those segments of political field such as the war, annexation, genocide and other political or military actions, which may have the direct influence on the languages. e.g. the fact of genocide which was organized by European conquerors in earlier stage of XIX century against Tasmanian people, was resulted in annihilation of this nation and disappearance of the languages spread on its territory [1].

Conclusion

After reviewing the literature, we may define the natural reasons causing the danger of Tsovatush language:

- Migration of Tsovatushs became one of the factors which had an essential influence on weakening the status and functions of Tsovatush language and accordingly it played an important role in starting the process of shifting Tsovatush onto Georgian language: As a result of settling Tsovatush people into the

valley the close Tsovatush-Georgian language contacts were formed and afterwards Tsovatush became depended on its dominated official Georgian language. The society speaking Tsovatush was integrated with the group exceeded in quantity and power.

- Though Tsovatush-Georgian language contact existed in Mtatusheti even at the time of living Tsovatushs there, but it was not so wide and massive; in case of Tsovatushs migration into the valley is the result of natural cataclysm inundation, which happened on the place inhabited by Tsovas in 20-30s of XIX century; thus Tsovatush language underwent the migration caused from the natural conditions or inundation in this case.
- Migration took place beyond the boundary of regional unit Tusheti, which is evaluated in scientific literature as the simple local movement. As movement of Tsovatushs took place inside the country and it was not far from its boundaries, it is considered as the internal migration. In spite of the opinion spread in sociolinguistic literature that the internal movements are not followed by serious linguistic outcomes, it was followed in case of Tsovatush as here two different languages appeared in contact. In spite the differences between the arrived (Tsovatush) and the receiver (with wide significance Georgian) societies were not contrastive from cultural, economical, political, social or other viewpoints and by taking into consideration that Tsovatushs always actively participated in the history of Georgia together with other Georgian tribes and did their bits in its development, the language diversity and Georgian dominant environment (with all the fields of social life) created all the conditions for weakening Tsovatush language;
- Due to the parameters of place, migration of Tsovatushs was short-distance from the viewpoint of the distance. Though the short-distance migration is different form long-distance one in how the individuals can preserve the connections with the place of origin, in case of Tsovatushs this connection was stopped as the villages of Tsovata were totally emptied from the population. According to the direction, migration of Tsovatushs was directed from the village to the village.
- As a result of migration the demographic location of Akhmeta region was changed in the valley (the population of the region was importantly increased in number), also the following alternations took place: social-

economical class (there appeared great number of sheep-breeders and the side was developed in the field of sheep-breeding), culture (Tsovatushs enriched at first the language environment and cultural palette of the region with their cultural treasure). We cannot discuss change of the age of the population as the massive migration got in touch with all the persons of all the ages and it became natural for the ages of the receiver society.

- Due to the time, migration was long-lasting. Tsovatushs inhabited in the valley forever, in the village Zemo Alvani; due to the scale, migration is massive as movement was undergone by the whole population of Tsovatushs and not by the part of it.
- According to the motivation, migration is compulsory (as a result of natural cataclysm).
- Thus, in case of Tsovatushs we meet short-distance, internal, long-lasting, massive, compulsory migration from the village to the village. Its linguistic result is shift of Tsovatush onto its dominated Georgian language.
- Migration of the population from the mountain to the valley was enclosed by the disease caused by foreign climate conditions, which partially decreased the quantity of the population (About Tsovatush people see: 64; 65; 66; 67).
- the authors of the viewpoint that Tsovatushs do not represent the indigenous population of Georgia, logically prove their double migration: from Ghlighveti to Tsovata and from Tsovata to the valley – in the village Zemo Alvani. In the first case migration is qualified as external and in the second case as internal. The authors of the opinion that Tsovatushs had lived on the territory of Georgia even since the earlier times, logically prove their single migration – or internal one: from Tsovata to the village Zemo Alvani.

Acknowledgements

We want to express our gratitude towards Professors Makvala Mikeladze and Arsen Bertlani, who assisted us with great enthusiasm in the process of working. They are Tsovatush linguists famous with their high academic level, whose advices and suggestions were the great help for the common work.

References

1. Grimes BF (2001) Global language viability: causes, symptoms and cures for endangered languages. *Notes on Linguistics* 4:205-223.
2. Cahill M (2004) From Endangered to Less Endangered, Case Histories from Brazil and Papua New Guinea: SIL Electronic Working Papers 2004-004, August Online on <http://www-01.sil.org/silewp/2004/silewp2004-004.htm>
3. Djavakhishvili I (1950) Introduction to History of Georgia, vol. I, Historical-Ethnographical Problems of Georgia, Caucasus and the Near East, Tbilisi, pp. 47-48.
4. Eristov R (1854) Records about Tushetian-Phshavian-Khevsurian District, in: journal "kavkaz", #4, Tbilisi, pp. 80-81.
5. Schiefner A (1856) Versuch über die Thusch-Sprache oder die Khistische Mundart in Thuschetien : Aus den Mémoires de l'Académie des Sciences de St.-Pétersbourg. VI Série. Sciences politiques, historie, philologie. T. IX besonders abgedruckt.
6. Iakovlev I (1931) Languages and Nations of Caucasus, Tiflis, pp. 20-21.
7. Machabeli M (1900) 12 Days in Tushetian-Phshavian-Khevsurian District, №. 217, 222, 224, 229, 230, Tbilisi.
8. Güldenstädt JA (1962) Journey of Güldenstädt in Georgia, vol. I, German Text with Georgian Translation, ed. By Gelashvili, p. 263.
9. Archive of Veidenbaum, #45, dep. II,+++paper 16.
10. Zisserman A (1879) Twenty Five Years in Caucasus, vol. I, S. Petersburg, p. 236.
11. Tsiskarov I (1846) Portrait of Tusheti, in: journal "kavkaz", №50, Tbilisi, p. 18.
12. Klaprot M G (1814) Journey in Caucasus and Georgia, fulfilled in 1807-1808 Years on the instruction of Imperial Academy of Sciences of C. Petersburg, vol. 2, Galle and Berlin.
13. Shavkhelishvili A (1963) From History of Interrelations between Georgians and Chechenian-Ingushetian Peoples, from Early Period till XV Century, p. 75.
14. Durr A (1909) Contemporary Names of Caucasian Tribes, CMOMII, edition XI, section 3, Tiflis.
15. Desheriev I (1963) Comparative-Historical Grammar of Nakh Languages and Problems of Genesis and Historical Development of Mountainous Caucasian Peoples, Grozno, p. 62.
16. Khakhanashvili A (1888) From Diary of Passenger, in: journal "Iveria", #178, Tbilisi.
17. Chikobava A (1965) History of Investigation of Iberian-Caucasian Languages, Tbilisi, p. 9.
18. Bukurauli I (1897) From Tbatana to Tsovata (Notes of the Passenger), in: journal "Moambe", #8-9, Tbilisi, p. 43.
19. Eliosidze I (1874) Writings about Tusheti, Manuscript is kept in Leningrad, Institute of Eastern Studies.
20. Djanashia S (1949) Proceedings, vol. I, Tbilisi, p. 148.
21. Lagazidze V (1965) From History of Tusheti, in: journal "Macne", #4, Tbilisi, p. 74.
22. Elanidze V (1964) Notes about Genesis of Tush People, in: Transactions of Iakob Gogebashvili Telavi State Pedagogical Institute, vol. V, Tbilisi, pp. 53-63.
23. Djavakhishvili I (1960) History of Georgian People, vol. I, Tbilisi, p. 435.
24. Elanidze V (1988) Issues of History of Georgia, Tbilisi.
25. Elanidze V (1989) "I thought a lot how to Reply", in: Newspaper "ganaxlebuli Tusheti" 13 01, #6, Tbilisi.
26. Elanidze V (1989) "Letter to Publishing House", in: Newspaper "Komunisti", 26 03, Tbilisi.
27. Elanidze V (2006) Problematic Issues of History of Kakheti, Tbilisi, p. 227.
28. Melikishvili G (1951) Urartu, Tbilisi, p. 10.
29. Bagrationi V (1941) Description of Georgia Kingdom, Tbilisi, p. 104.
30. Bagrationi V (1941) Description of Georgia Kingdom, Tbilisi, p. 168.
31. Bagrationi V (1941) Description of Georgia Kingdom, Tbilisi, p. 104-105.
32. Makalatia S (1933) Tusheti, Geographical Society of Georgia, Tiflis, p. 17.
33. Itonishvili V (2012) Tusheti and Tush People, Tbilisi, p. 172.
34. Sharashidze L (1960) For Antropology of Tush People, in: Proceedings of Institute of Experimental Morphology of Academy of Sciences, vol. VIII, Tbilisi, p. 273.
35. Sharashidze L (1960) For Antropology of Tush People, in: Proceedings of Institute of Experimental Morphology of Academy of Sciences, vol. VIII, Tbilisi, p. 272.
36. Bertlani A (2009) Mists of Tsovata (old thoughts), to be said 1: Little Icon in the Big Church (for Terminological Order in the Country), Tbilisi, p. 112.
37. Archiliani (1936) vol. I, Baramidze A, Berdzenishvili N (eds), Tbilisi, p. 205.
38. Stefnadze Dj, Shavkhelishvili A (1978) From History of Mountainous of East Georgia, in: journal "Macne", 1, Tbilisi, p. 197.

39. Makalatia S (1933) Tusheti, Geographical Society of Georgia, Tiflis, p. 128.
40. Itonishvili V (2012) Tusheti and Tush People, Tbilisi, p. 9.
41. Itonishvili V (2012) Tusheti and Tush People, Tbilisi, p. 46.
42. Djalabadze G (1967) For Ethnographical Study of Tusheti, Tbilisi, p. 27.
43. Radde G (1881) Khevsureti and Khevsurian People, Tiflis, p. 313-314.
44. Tsiskarov I (1849) Writings about Tusheti, in: journal "kavkaz", №7, 8, 10-13, Tbilisi.
45. Shavkhelishvili A (1987) Tusheti (From History of Mountainous of East Georgia), Tbilisi, p. 24.
46. Thomason SG, Kaufman T (1988) Language Contact, Creolization, and Genetic Linguistics. Berkeley: University of California Press.
47. Trudgill P (1986) Dialects in Contact, Oxford: Blackwell.
48. Kerswill P (1994) Dialects Converging: Rural Speech in Urban Norway, Oxford.
49. Kerswill P (2006) Migration and language, in Klaus Mattheier, Ulrich Ammon & Peter Trudgill (eds.) Sociolinguistics/Soziolinguistik. An international handbook of the science of language and society, 2nd edn., vol 3. Berlin: De Gruyter, p. 1.
50. Mesthrie R (1993) Koineization in the Bhojpuri-Hindi diaspora-with special reference to South Africa", in: International Journal of the Sociology of Language 99, p. 25-44.
51. Mesthrie R (1992) Language in Indenture: A Sociolinguistic History of Bhojpuri-Hindi in South Africa. Johannesburg: Witwatersrand University Press; London: Routledge.
52. Siegel J (1987) Language contact in a plantation environment: A sociolinguistic history of Fiji. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
53. Trudgill P (1998) The Chaos before the Order: New Zealand English and the Second Stage of New-Dialect Formation. In E. H. Jahr (ed.) Language Change: Advances in Historical Sociolinguistics. Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter. 1-11.
54. Siegel J (1985) Koines and koineization. Language in Society, 14(3):357-378.
55. Kerswill P (2002) "Koineization and accommodation", in: Chambers, J.K. /Trudgill, Peter/Schilling-Estes, Natalie, eds., The handbook of language variation and change, Oxford, pp. 669-702.
56. <http://www.wildwatch.com/great-migration>
57. Lewis GJ (1982) Human Migration. A Geographical Perspective, London/Canberra, p. 9-19.
58. Boyle P, Halfacree K, Keith H, Robinson V (1998) Exploring Contemporary Migration, London, p. 34-38.
59. Boyle P, Halfacree K, Keith H, Robinson V (1998) Exploring Contemporary Migration, London, p. 5-9.
60. Boyle P, Halfacree K, Keith H, Robinson V (1998) Exploring Contemporary Migration, London, p. 35.
61. Iliffe J (1995) Africans: The History of a Continent, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, p. 131.
62. Dillard JL (1975) "A Sketch of the history of Black English", in: Stoller, Paul, ed., Black American English: its background and its usage in the schools and in literature. Paul Stoller. New York, p. 19.
63. Boyle P, Halfacree K, Keith H, Robinson V (1998) Exploring Contemporary Migration, London, pp. 32.
64. Gigashvili K (2014) The Principal Features of Tsovatush-Georgian Bilingualism, in: International Proceedings of Economics Development and Research, Language, Medias and Culture III, volume 77, "IACSIT Press", Singapore, p: 24-29.
65. Gigashvili K (2014) Modern Ethno-Sociolinguistic Profile of TsovaTush People, Grifoni", Tbilisi, p.473.
66. Gigashvili K (2014) Nationality and Ethnicity of Tsovatush People from Sociolinguistic Viewpoint, in: International Proceedings of Economics development and Research: Humanity and Social Sciences, vol. 80, edited by Feng Tao, IACSIT Press, Singapore, p: 5-10.
67. Gigashvili K Gotsiridze G (2014) Culture shift in the context of language shift in: Research inventory. Int. Journal of Engineering and Science, 4(8):24-28.