

---

**THE PROCESS OF FORMATION OF THE LINGUISTIC SITUATION IN  
JAVAKHETI AND THE INFLUENCING FACTORS**

**CAVAKHETİ'DE DİL DURUMUNUN OLUŞUMU SÜRECİ VE ONU  
ETKİLEYEN FAKTÖRLER**

**ПРОЦЕСС ФОРМИРОВАНИЯ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ СИТУАЦИИ В  
ДЖАВАХЕТИ И ФАКТОРЫ ВЛИЯЮЩИЕ НА НЕЕ**

**Maka BERİDZE\***

**ABSTRACT**

The Georgian historical sources preserve important information observing which enables us to restore the process of changes taking place in one of the frontier districts of Georgia, Javakheti, from the linguistic and ethnical viewpoint.

In Javakheti region the ethnical Georgians, Armenians and Russians live together in a close vicinity. They have usual interinfluences and interrelations in their daily life, they have ties, relationships and are obedient to the same government and are the citizens of one country. They study often at same schools, though the regular interinfluence does not eliminate their cultural peculiarities and differences which are important. Each group maintains own peculiarities and characteristic features, traditions, values, aspirations which reveal themselves in the different circumstances.

Based on the historical sources, to the extent possible, the processes which in the different times were conditioning alteration of the spheres of usage of the different linguistic components, are described in the represented work in sequential manner. The spheres which nowadays are divided in Javakheti region as spheres of Georgian, Russian, Armenian or Turkish languages and their linguistic variations, are identified; The perspectives of the language policy and the peculiarities of using the State language are clearly shown. The historical events are analyzed basing on the modern days situation and the main factors influencing the language situation in the region are shown.

the research work represented is based on the methods of social linguistics as well as on the linguistics as a discipline. Those methods can be for the purpose of discussion divided in three parts. The scientists refer the methods of gathering the language material to the first group; the second group involves the methods of the material processing and the third group involves the methods of evaluation and interpretation of the received data.

---

\* ORCID: [0000-0002-5338-3661](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5338-3661), BERIDZE, M., Assoc.Prof. Dr., Samtskhe-Javakheti State University, Akhaltsikhe, Georgia, beridzemaka@gmail.com

## The Process Of Formation Of The Linguistic Situation In Javakheti And The...

**Key words:** *Georgia (Country), Javakheti, ethnic minority, linguistic situation, language policy, bilingualism.*

### ÖZ

Gürcü tarihi kaynaklarında Gürcistan'ın serhat bölgesi olan Cavakheti'de meydana gelen dil ve etnik açıdan var olan değişiklikler mevcuttur.

Günümüzde Cavakheti Bölgesi'nde yan yana din ve kültür açısından birbirinden farklı olan Gürcüler, Ermeniler ve Ruslar yaşamaktadır. Bu insanlar birbirini etkiler ve halka açık yerlerde birbirleriyle özgürce iletişim kurarlar. Aynı kanunlara uyarlar ve genellikle aynı tür devlet okullarında eğitim alırlar. Bununla birlikte, aralarındaki sık ve düzenli etkileşimler en önemli ve kültürel farklılıkları ortadan kaldırmaz. Her grup, farklı özelliklerde ortaya çıkan özel geleneklerini, değerlerini, isteklerini korur.

Cavakheti'deki dil durumunu gelince, özellikle iki dilliliğe odaklanmamızı uygun gördük. Çünkü buradaki dil durumunu göz önünde bulundurduğumuzda dillerin kullanımında değişikliklere tanık oluyoruz. Bununla birlikte, iki dilli faktörlerde de değişiklikler izlenmektedir. Cavakheti'de, dilbilimsel açıdan iki dillilik bileşeninin dil kullanım alanlarını yeniden dağıtılmasına neden olacak bir süreç başlamış ve bu durum her dilin işlevselliğini doğrudan etkiler. Bahsedilen mesele konu üzerindeki ilgiyi daha da artırır.

Makalede, tarihi kaynaklara dayalı Cavakheti Bölgesi'nde kullanılan dillerin farklı zamanlarda değişkenliğe yol açan süreçler mümkün olduğu kadar değerlendirilmiştir. Bugün Cavakheti'de kullanılan Gürcüce, Rusça, Ermenice ve Türkçe dil alanları tespit edilmiştir. Dil politikasının bakış açıları ve devlet dilinin işleyişinin özellikleri özetlenmiştir. Tarihi olaylar günümüz duruma göre değerlendirilmiş ve Cavakheti'deki dilsel durumu etkileyen ana faktörler tanımlanmıştır.

Makaledeki araştırmada dilbilimsel bir disiplin olarak sosyolinguistik, saha araştırmaları (anket, röportaj, doğrudan gözlem) ile analiz (gruplama, matematiksel istatistikler), tanım ve karşılaştırma-açıklama yöntemleri kullanılmıştır.

**Anahtar Kelimeler:** *Gürcistan, Cavakheti, etnik azınlık, dil durumu, dil politikası, iki dillilik.*

### АННОТАЦИЯ

Грузинские исторические источники сохранили важнейшие данные, по которым можно устанавливать, как изменялся Джавахети с языковой или этнической точки зрения. Языковая ситуация Джавахети проходила различные фазы и формы двуязычия и многоязычия. И сейчас в Джавахети одной из основных характеристик языковой ситуации является билингвизм, существование которого наряду с внутренними языковыми факторами значительно обусловлено языковыми компонентами, демографической сменой населения, особенностями социально-политической обстановки.

В языковой ситуации Джавахети необходимо обратить внимание на билингвизм, так как мы считаем, что прямо перед нашими глазами происходят изменения в сферах использования составных языковых компонентов существующей там языковой ситуации. Меняются факторы, обусловленные двуязычием. В Джавахети начался процесс, который с языковой точки зрения требует нового перераспределения сфер использования билингвизма языков, что прямо сказывается на функциях отдельного языка. Всё вышесказанное увеличивает актуальность рассматриваемого вопроса.

Основываясь на исторических источниках, в статье описывается как можно более последовательно процессы, которые в разные времена привели к изменениям составляющих компонентов языковой ситуации в Джавахети. Были определены

грузинские, русские, армянские и турецкие языковые зоны, используемые в Кавкаheti. Обобщены перспективы языковой политики и особенности функционирования государственного языка. Намечены перспективы языковой политики и особенности функционирования государственного языка. Исторические события анализируются с учётом текущей ситуации и выявляются основные факторы, влияющие на языковую ситуацию в Джавахети.

Исследование производится на основе методов социолингвистики, как их называют учёные, методы полевых исследований (анкетирование, интервью, непосредственное наблюдение...), также методы анализа (групповая работа, математическая статистика...). Используются описательные и сравнительно-сопоставительные методы.

**Ключевые слова:** *Грузия, Джавахети, этническое меньшинство, языковая ситуация, языковая политика, билингвизм.*

### **Introduction**

Historically, Javakheti is a part of Zemo Qartli (upper Kartli). It shares borders with Samtskhe, from the North-East; East with Kartli; in the South-East with Armenia (Somkheta in Georgian), and in the South-West with Turkey. Javakheti situates in South Georgia and includes the territories of Akhalqalaqi and Ninotsminda municipalities.

According the data of the general census of population of 2014, the population of Akhalqalaqi municipality amounts to 45 070, municipality of Ninotsminda 24 491. The population of the region shows the following data according the ethnical origin: Akhalqalaqi municipality: Georgians - 6,8%; Armenians – 92,9%, Russians – 0,1% and others - 1,2%. Ninotsminda municipality: 4,2% Georgians, 94% Armenians, 0,8% Russians and 1,2 – others.

Before assessing the linguistic situation in Javakheti region we shall briefly concern the notion “linguistic situation” itself. The opinions among the specialists of the scientific linguistics differ though they basically agree with the definition. Many researchers comprehend the “linguistic situation” as certain unity of some languages acting in the communication processes within one administrative-territorial unit. According V. Barnet linguistic situation implies functioning of the national language through its different forms in the given national society (Barnet, 1988:188). A.D. Schweither defined the linguistic situation as “a model of social-functional distribution and the model of hierarchy of the social-communicative systems and subsystems which co-exists and is in the process of mutual influencing within the given political administrative unity and cultural area in the given period of time (Schweitzer, 1977:133-134; see also Nicolski, 1976b:79-80). Tumanian considers that this formulation can be simplified. Under the term **linguistic situation** he implies the unity of all the existencial forms of one, or of a number of languages, which can fully serve the concrete society within such administrative-political and territorial unity as a state is, and are closely tied with each other by means of the mutually supplementary functions (Tumanian, 1981 d:74). In other words, Tumanian considers that bilingualism and diglossia turn to be the components of the linguistic situation. This fact clearly shows that in the majority of cases, the society uses some linguistic units which are functionally connected with each other. As T. Sikharulidze

## **The Process Of Formation Of The Linguistic Situation In Javakheti And The...**

denotes, this fact implies that the language (or languages) represented in the given state, also, the units of the related languages or the non-related linguistic units are functioning and interrelated (Sikharulidze, 2008:84).

We took the opinion of American scientist Charles Fergusson as the most precise definition: “Linguistic situation denotes the common configuration of language usage in the given time and given area. This implies such data as the number and names of the languages being used in the given area; number of the given language-speakers and the situations in which those people use the named language; it implies also what are the attitudes of the society members towards those languages.” (Ferguson, 1959:157). Agreeing with any of the given considerations, it becomes clear from the definition that language situation is quite a complex phenomenon. It implies unity of different forms, styles of the same language or the unity of the different languages within the territorial, social, geographic, administrative-political formations. The term “language situation” usually refers to the large linguistic societies - countries, republics, regions, large administrative units.

### **Methods of investigation**

the research work represented is based on the methods of social linguistics as well as on the linguistics as a discipline. Those methods can be for the purpose of discussion divided in three parts. The scientists refer the methods of gathering the language material to the first group; the second group involves the methods of the material processing and the third group involves the methods of evaluation and interpretation of the received data. The methods included in the first group from the related disciplines – such as sociology, social psychology and partially, dialectology are borrowed (Desheriev, 1977:334-338). Just that is the reason these methods were called synthesis of linguistic and sociological procedures by Schweitzer who divided those methods into the field methods and sociolinguistic analysis methods of the linguistic material. He referred questionnaire method, interviewing, and direct observing to the field investigation methods (Schweitzer, 1977; 181-184).

At the stage of the information gathering we often used observation and different kinds of interrogation. It was also very important that during researching period we lived in Javakheti region and were considered the part of the society the speech activities of which were under our interest. The material under our interest included different kinds of written texts (research papers, and abstracts written by the students, different kinds of public documentation, medicine documentation and recipes and so on). We often had some hypothesis and then examined it by means of our observation or by special questionnaires. Our status of a teacher of the Georgian language allowed us to interview the people without causing influence on the speech habits during the interview. We were able to interview the people writing the material down by means of either special audio facilities or by hand; though we should say that the latter was more convenient; it was especially useful to fix the rare linguistic elements (words, syntactic constructions).

The material we fixed by dictophone was also important as it allowed to listen and follow the living speech through dialogues built on the different everyday

themes. We used this method openly but sometimes secretly too. We used also questionnaires and tests. Taking into consideration the peculiarities of the targeted groups we used the questionnaires of the different levels of complexity. We tried our best so that the material would be reliable and unbiased, though the moments of subjectivity cannot be excluded. The traditional linguistic methods such as description, comparison and analysis were also used in our work.

## Results

We consider that common and specific factors are those which influence the situation in Javakheti nowadays and used to influence historically too. The common factors, in our opinion, are:

**Geo-political situation of Georgia.** Having Armenia and Russia as neighbors remains the serious factor, as territorial vicinity conditions close and intensive contacts of the ethnically non-Georgian population with the places of their origin. As for Turkey, the same regarding of close neighborhood and widening the business contacts will seriously increase the interest to the Turkish language.

**State interests.** Today, the correct policy chosen by the government – to support teaching of the Armenian language, its usage, to help retaining the cultural and national identity and on the other hand to guarantee teaching and full functioning of the Georgian language as the state language are the measures to guarantee full functioning of the State language and retain the bilingual situation in the Javakheti region, adequate to the status of the languages.

**Migration processes and diversities of the demographic situation.** The fact is that the migration processes in Javakheti are not active and the index is low (3.1%). But the main country to which the local population migrates is Russia. This makes difference with other places of the country in this relation. As for the Georgian regions and social groups, after comparing their data, it turned out that the birth rate is highest in Javakheti (2, 2 per one woman) (SAKSTAT, 2016). In this regard Ninotsminda and Akhalkalaki are most remarkable in the region.

**Social and economic situation.** Because of the hard social-economical environment, the local population seeks their income out of Javakheti (out of Georgia). This is one additional factor to have long-time ties with non-Georgian linguistic situation. The population of Javakheti was always oriented on Armenia and Russia. Only in the recent time when Georgian money unit, lari, became stronger, the situation changed and Javakheti returned to Georgian economic space.

The general (global) factors are reflected on the level of concrete linguistic unity and it becomes a determinant of the bilingualism on the level. Such factors are: place of dwelling – the population near the district centers (Akhalkalaki, Ninotsminda), the population of the villages is in more cases bilingual than the villages which are far from such centers. Neighboring of other language speaking village is also influential.)

**Place and sphere of work.** The people who are active in a certain sphere of business, mainly do their businesses in Armenia and Russia. Consequently, Russian-

## **The Process Of Formation Of The Linguistic Situation In Javakheti And The...**

Armenian bilingualism is more often. Among the people working at the agriculture are less bilingual.

**Place of Education.** We have mentioned education as one of the spheres of language usage. We consider that the place for education is also important in this direction. It conditions the choice of the language and correspondingly, orientation on Russia condition Russian-Armenian bilingualism.

**The Conditions and Degrees of Massmedia Spreading.** The named factor is one of the most important in the 21<sup>st</sup> century. In this case we regard the conditions and degrees of mass media spreading especially attentively. We do not think that in the given paper we have noted all the factors influencing the linguistic situation in Javakheti Region. We regard them as the most essential.

### **Discussion**

#### **1. Historical Circumstances**

In the beginning of the XVII century, Javakheti region was inhabited only with the people of Georgian nationality, until the Osman Turks occupied it. The Georgian public figure of the end of XIX and beginning of XX century, Alexandre Proneli noted that the nomad people such as Kurds and Tarakams entered Javakheti territory from Osmaleti (i.e. territory of Osman Turks). As they were nomads and did not have certain, stable territory for living, they were roaming all over the nearby territories. The state officials who were appointed by the Osman government had great influence over the Georgians dwelling in Javakheti – wrote Proneli (Proneli, 1991 : 170).

From the end of the 17<sup>th</sup> century, the Georgian feudal lords of Meskhети had almost fully undergone the influence of the Mohammedan (Muslim), namely the Sunnite religion. But the common people, the peasants were strongly defending and following their religion, Christianity. The French traveler Sharden wrote that he used to meet Christian people on that territory. He noted that in the valleys the population was of the diverse faith and nationality and as for the mountainous region, its population was mainly Christian. According this and other existing historic data, it can be said that the peasants of Javakheti and Meskhети went under influence of the Muslim governors beginning from the end of the XVII century and the process went on till the 20-ies of the XIX century. (Narkvevebi, 1970: 367).

Sh. Lomsadze in his book “Meskhети and Meskhეთian people” noted: “Despite the fact that local peasants got Muslim religion, Georgian preserved their native language, though, as we see from the work by Vakhushti Batonishvili, the noble men in Meskhეთi spoke Turkish at different public places but they spoke only Georgian at home” (Lomsadze, 1975a: 30).

In 1769, the Russian governmental official, (“statsky sovetnik” in Russian), Georgian by nationality, a nobleman, Knyaz Amilkhvარი travelled through the territory of Meskhეთ-Javakheti, then called “sapasho” in Georgian (the territory under Turks governance). In his papers concerning the situation in the region he mentioned that all the inhabitants of the city including Pasha, talked Turkish and Georgian languages equally.” (Tamarashvili, 1995a:43) So, this situation shows

how the Turkish language began to take roots in the Georgian language space. Religion became the powerful aiding factor to this process. History kept precise information for us about establishing the religious schools in the given region in the XVIII century, where Turkish was mandatory spoken language and the children were also taught to say prayers in Arabic. Such propaganda brought corresponding results. This situation remained until the beginning of Russian governance on the territory.

In 1828-29, when the part of the former Georgian territories were deoccupied from Turks by Russian army, Georgians were not allowed to settle in their native country. According the order and instruction by Paskevich the interjacent government was obliged, under the conditions of war, to exile as many mahmadian Georgians to Turkey as possible. In the 30-ies of the XIX century, the Armenian colonists rushed from Erzerum. many of them were rich merchants and Grigorian church servants. With help of the Russian officials, 30 000 Armenians settled on the mentioned territory and they constituted the majority. In the first half of the XIX century Greeks also came to the mentioned territory (in Tsalka region) from Turkey, 50 families went to Akhalkalaki and part of them soon wrote themselves as Armenians.

Sh. Lomsadze brings an abstract from writings by the publicist Vermishev in relation with the above mentioned events: “The Armenians moved to live in Javakheti region from Turkey. The inhabited this territory and turned it thickly settled; Georgian villages looked as small islands among them.” According Zagurski, the country at this period looked as if it was inhabited by Armenians from the ancient times.” (Lomsadze, 1975b:60).

In the linguistic area which is under our investigation, at the times spoken above, the position of the Turkish language strengthened. This process was supported by large number of Karabakh, Kurd and Armenian inhabitants sent to this region by Russian tsarist administration. Their speaking language was Turkish. Zagurski wrote: “they tried to assure me that local population did not any more try to get education in Georgian. This atmosphere influences the Georgian youth in the region. By physical view and by their family names they were Georgian but they did not know their native language (Tamarashvili, 1995b:60).

It was paradoxical in the XVIII-XIX centuries that the administration invited Turkish religious persons from Anatolia to teach children in one of the regions of Georgia. Naturally, in such situation, the Georgian language was gradually losing its functions. In 1839 the executive order of the Russian government was published about the settling in Javakheti the group of people called “dukholders” in accordance to their affiliation to the certain religious group in Russia. Till that time Russian population never lived on that territory. They inhabited the former settling places of Georgian people.

The following note of Al. Proneli is very interesting from that viewpoint “when Russians inhabited Javakheti region in 1828, this ancient part of Georgia was almost completely under the Muslim influence.... Javakh people, who got Muslim religion, did not like the fact of Russian settling their region and in fact taking the initiative to their hands in the surrounding places. Indigenous Javakh people left their

## **The Process Of Formation Of The Linguistic Situation In Javakheti And The...**

homes and migrated to Turkey. Only the Christian Javakh population who kept their religion secretly and Georgian Catholics of the Armenian typicon, Kurds, Tarakams and very small part of the Muslim Georgians remained there. The Commander –in Chief of the Russian Army, General Paskevich brought large number of Armenians to Javakheti region giving them the former Georgian villages to dwell. Ten years later, in 1840, Russian government added the number of non-Georgian nationality people to dwell there. Russia persecuted the Russian religious sect of “dukhobors” regarding them as heretics. So the Russian government exiled them from Russia, their home country and settled them in Georgia, Javakheti. Thus, the population of Javakheti includes: 1. Kurds remaining here after Osmani (Ottoman) governing; 2. Tarakams; 3. Armenians from Erzerum; 4. Dukhobors exiled from Russia; and 5. Native (aborigine) Georgians. (Proneli, 1991:119).

Such reality formed out of the many years and centuries, with such multinational society, formed the historical background which became in its turn the determinant of the linguistic situation in Javakheti region of Georgia. In the middle of the 19<sup>th</sup> century the components of the linguistic picture were as follow: Turkish language, Armenian language, Georgian language and Russian language (all of them with their own characteristic features). For the start of the changes within the existing linguistic situation, the “Regulations of the educational department of the Caucasus and Trans-Caucasus” approved on June 25 1867, were especially important. According these regulations, during the starting 2-3 years teaching would be conducted in native language and Russian was taught as one of the subjects. (Tavzishvili, 1948:109).

Beginning education in the native language was undoubtedly very progressive event from social as well as from political viewpoint. But it did not last long. The resolutions of the 70-ies of the XIX century, was followed by complete disappointment of national minorities of Russia. In the beginners classes all the subjects were taught only in Russian. Georgian language was not taught as a subject (neither Armenian nor Turkish). Such attitudes to the languages of the national minorities resulted from the Russian Tsarist policy.

Pavle Ingorokva, Georgian scientist, described that period as follows: “ For all the muslim population of Georgia, till the Church Council of the XIX century, and in the XIX century as well, the native tongue was Georgian but later the knowledge of Georgian weakened. Russian tsarist regime was a“creator” of such situation. Its policy was directed to weakening of Georgian and everything that was of Georgian origin was ignored and any kind of friendly relations between Muslim and Christian Georgian people were hindered. Georgian language was ignored. It can be clear for only one fact – during the Turkish governance here, in the administrative units of the villages and in the courts, Georgian language was used. But Russians introduced administration, different documents and court cases to be led in Russian and Turkish. The same languages were introduced as necessary school subjects too. In fact, Georgian language was ignored and diminished. This resulted in the fact that in the region Akhaltsikhe-Akhalkalaki, in the beginning of the XIX century, all the population of the Georgians who were followers of Muslim religion

spoke only the native language but approximately to the second half of the century, there were villages where the Georgian population had already completely forgotten the native language. (Ingorokva, 1990:22)

From the very beginning of establishing the Soviet Power the muslim schools in Meskheta were combined with the Armenian catholic schools and the Soviet national schools were established on the basis. Due to so called policy of internationalism, demographic picture worsened for the native Georgians.

It is widely discussed in the scientific literature how the linguistic situation changed in the following Soviet period not only in Javakheti but in Georgia all over the country. The researchers have done the same assessment to the mentioned processes – **“the languages which were forcibly placed in the unequal conditions “lost the game.”** The unequal conditions were made up by the certain factors, first of all the fact that the Russian language enlarged its spheres of usage and as M. Tabidze denotes, (Tabidze, 2005: 189-192), in its turn, this factor was conditioned by the following events: Russian language was taught at the Georgian schools from the very beginning to the end; all the administrative systems were dependent on Moscow administration and Russian was used in all governmental organizations and for all kinds of management; all kinds of dissertations for the scientific degrees were translated and sent to Moscow for approval. There existed the only supreme attestation commission. Teaching Georgian at Russian as well at non-Russian schools mainly was just a formal process. The special literature to get high school level education in different branches was mainly in Russian or translated from Russian. Due to the centralized system of education, for example, in history books, school children could read only Russian history and the facts of the history of Georgia could be read only in the short review of different Soviet republics' history or in so called facultative reading books, none-obligatory.

In Javakheti the Georgian language had at the same time the status of the majority (in the country's scale) and the status of minority language (actually, in the region's scale). The people of Russian nationality in Javakheti had the status of minority according to the objective situation in comparison with Georgian people but at the same time they had self-identification of the majority of the Soviet Union population and their language, Russian, held the first position in the hierarchy of languages.

The Armenians always showed disposition to refer to their status of the minority not in relation to Georgia (the country) but in relation to the USSR and particularly, to Russia. Such dual regarding of the juridical and real statuses could be observed in Javakheti and it brought quite serious results: the Georgian language status as obligatory language, in fact, was only for Georgians and as for the all other nationalities living in the given territory, they either could not speak it or only the smallest part of such population knew it only on the simplest level of their daily life. Non-Georgian nationality people got their education only in Russian, large part of Armenians mostly in Armenian, though theoretically, Georgian language was included among the obligatory school subjects. The situation thus requested Georgians to know Russian well and not vice versa. In fact, it can be said

## **The Process Of Formation Of The Linguistic Situation In Javakheti And The...**

that the situation in Javakheti was complicated due to existence of the situations of “bilingualism” and even “trilingualism” (because of existence of the II and the III levels languages) It is notable that non- Georgians dwelling in Javakheti had to be trilingual (1. Native language; 2. Language of then so called Republic of Georgia or the State language and 3. Russian language. But in reality only bilingualism was observed – the native language and Russian language. The region got such hard situation from the USSR. When it was deconstructed, the new reality emerged. In the 80-ies of the XX century, the political processes taking place in Georgia changed again the linguistic situation and its components.

### **2. Present-day Situation**

In Javakheti region the ethnical Georgians, Armenians and Russians live together in a close vicinity. They have usual interinfluences and interrelations in their daily life, they have ties, relationships and are obedient to the same government and are the citizens of one country. They study often at same schools, though the regular interinfluence does not eliminate their cultural peculiarities and differences which are important. Each group maintains own peculiarities and characteristic features, traditions, values, aspirations which reveal themselves in the different circumstances.

In everyday life an inhabitant of Javakheti region meets people who are strangers for them but in the active social life his behavior strictly merges from his behavior and relations with the family, relatives, to say more broadly, with his clan. Every citizen can have relations with other circles of people at work or within some groups. He can have friends at school, at work or other places and can even undergo some influence but he lives in absolutely different circumstances at home. This social ambience requires him to return again and again to the established standards and norms of life.

The administrative, law or other public servants compile other groups as well. The staffs of public servants represent administrative or juridical staffs and of course, ethnically they are not homogenous groups. Resulting from their work, those groups are mostly the bilingual ones. The different social functions performed by a person, defines the number of the social behaviors which that person should possess.

The concrete number of the language codes and their unity (their number) which is used in the given surrounding (collective), also their genetic roots, for example, in case of Javakheti, they are determined according historical accidents, for example, a variation of Turkish language confirmed in the region or variation of the Armenian language, which can be conditionally named as “variation of Gipsy language”. They are all acknowledged in the Javakheti region due to the described historical events, but as they took roots in that region, the both language codes mentioned earlier, begin to be associated with the whole group behavior which regularly use them.

Some Armenian people nowadays living in Javekheti are able to speak Russian as freely as their native language. They can talk, write, read and deliver lessons and lectures in Russian. But the same people when they are in Russia, in Russian speaking society, clearly see that their speech retains linguistic code peculiarities of

their native region. So it can be said that “Javakh Russian language” is deviated from the Russian language norms. This deviation does not at all mean poor knowledge of the language. It is a natural result of the social events taking place in the given region where the Russian language functions. Those peculiarities come from the special peculiarities of Javakheti Region of Georgia.

The circumstances also dictated the assimilation processes among a small group of Greek nationality from the side of regional national majorities. A group of Greek people came to Javakheti in 1830 and settled there, near Akhalkalaki where the Armenians escaped from Turkey lived also. About 50 Greek families assimilated with Armenians (Lomsadze, 1975: 337). It represents very interesting case of assimilation called “covert assimilation” – when a minority group turns to be a majority towards the other group of minority and causes its assimilation (Kobaidze, 2008: 13).

It also should be noted that in Javakheti region where demographically, Georgians represent minority, they obtain the characteristics of the minority. (Lortkipanidze 1994:100-103). There were also the cases of their assimilation by Greeks (Samtskhe, village Tsikhisdjvari, in the XIX c. (Lomsadze 1975:337) and by Armenians in three villages in the surroundings of Akhalkalaki where the Georgians came from the Georgian village in Turkey, in the XIX century (Lomsadze, 1975:63-64). Large number of the factors which give priority to one of the languages and gives to it the important status in bilingual situation in Javakheti villages (give a special role, special importance in the social spheres) are imposed on the inhabitants due to the existing situations. That is why in the given situation interrelations between the languages appear to be the same for the bearers of the different languages.

We should also denote here the following types of language usage: **oral and graphical** or the same as speaking code and written code. We will also take into consideration the active and passive kinds of usage: **dialogue language and monologue language**. The dialect of the Turkish language acknowledged in Javakheti region, is usually used only in dialogues, not in other ways of communication. We consider that it is necessary to concretely name those dialects which represent the basis for the data given in the represented table. Nowadays the data correspond to the situation acknowledged in the bilingual collectives dwelling in the ethnically diversified villages, i.e. in the language collectives, where the linguistic unity corresponds to the language-using collective. Language unity coincides with the ethnical group. The first data given in the table correspond to the language collective, the native language of which is Armenian and the second data correspond to the linguistic unity groups, one of the languages of which is Georgian. The languages used in the region divide the spheres of usage. It is notable that the language of church services and prayers belongs to the non-concurrent (exceptional) sphere of usage for any linguistic collective. The Russian language is non-dominant but rather stable component of the bilingualism existing in Javakheti. It is interesting to observe the other relations of the other components.

## The Process Of Formation Of The Linguistic Situation In Javakheti And The...

*For the non-Georgian language collective* the Georgian language is used mainly in everyday colloquial situations. This language is not active in such priority and basic realms as the mass media in the modern days life (despite the fact that Georgian broadcasting spreads over the Javakheti territory), education (despite the fact that the educational policy of the country considers important benefits for education). Georgian language takes its place in these spheres only now and such factors as the status different from the other languages in the region, the multiple special programs and useful benefits support this. Maybe, there were times when these spheres were not so important but for the modern times society they all are prioretic.

It is natural that the languages which are used in the same sphere differ according frequency of usage. The instances of watching TV, reading a letter are random and this fact coincides with random fact of chosing the language. Bilingual people do not plan to watch the equal number of films in Georgian and in Armenian. This happens at random. The same can be said about choosing of language. But surely, it cannot be said about all the spheres of language usage. The law about the State language decreed in 2015 represented the important event in this direction.

## REFERENCES

### a) Monographs

- Tavzhishvili G. (1948). Saxalxo ganatlebisa da pedagogiuri azrovnebis istoria saqartveloshi 1801-1870. Tbilisi:
- Tamarashvili M. (1995). Qartuli eklesia dasabamidan dgemde. Tbilisi.
- Ingorokva P. (1990). Saqartvelos istoriis sazgvrebis Shesaxeb. Tbilisi.
- Lomsadze S. (1975). Samtskhe-Javakheti (XVIII saukunis Sua wlebidan XIX saukunis Sua wlebamde). Tbilisi.
- Lortkipanidze V. (1994). Samtskhxe-javakhxeti XIX-XX saukuneebshi. Tbilisi.
- Lomsadze S. (1975). Meskhebi da Meskheti, Tbilisi.
- Nicolski L. B. (1976) Sinkhronnaia sotsiolingvistika (teoria I problemi), Moskva.
- Saqartvelos istoriis narkvevebi. (1960). Tbilisi.
- Tabidze M. (2005). Enobrivi situatsia saqartveloshi da qartuli enis funcionirebis sakitkhebi. Tbilisi:.
- Ferguson, C. A. (1959). Diglossia. Word.
- Froneli A. (1991). Didebuli meskheti, Tbilisi.
- Schweitzer A.D. (1977) Sovremennea sociolingvistika. Teoria, problemi I metodi, Moskva.

### b) publicity

- Barnet V. (1988). Diferenciacia nacionalnogo iazika I socialnaia komunikacia. Hovoe v zarubejnoi lingvistike, XX. Moskva.
- Desheriev U. D. (1981). Teoria iazika I rechevaia praktika, Teoreticheskie problemi socialnoi lingvistiki, Moskva.

- Tumanian E. G. (1981). Tipologia iazikovikh situacii, Kompleqsnie modeli form sushestvovania iazika. Teoritechnie problemi socialnoi lingvistiki, Moskva.
- Kobaidze M. (2008). Vinaobisa da enis politikis dagegmvis istoriidan saqartveloshi. <http://www.ice.ge/GAMOCEMEBI/ICE/pdf/15%20.kobaidze.pdf>.
- Sikharulidze T. (2008). Enobrivi situacia saqartveloSi. Gulani. 1. Akhaltsikhe.