

## **Dialectology and Ecology (The Principle of Spatial Attachment)**

### **S u m m a r y**

A dialect, sociologically speaking, is an ecological phenomenon. It implies the way of life of the population of the appropriate region. Thus, the territory, inhabited by the appropriate population, is not a geographical category only. The link of the inhabitants of a dialect with its territory is of historic character. It is hard to say when this link was formed. Dialects, and sometimes their conglomeration, are the basis of a literary language.

From the linguistic point of view, it is incorrect to regard a dialect to be a lower grade in relation with a literary language, that dialect is a non-estigeous form of a literary language (the debate between Akaki Tsereteli and Vazha Pshavela dealt namely with this). The opposition: concrete – abstract – is not correct. This might be connected with the layer of a vocabulary denoting new objects of civilization: the lack of such vocabulary is due to the lack of the production of civilization. But a dialect has big opportunities to denote going, eating, drinking... We should reject Bach's opinion, that a dialect is full of words of sensual appearance, that lacks the capability of abstraction. It has been debated whether the environment and climatic conditions determine the speech peculiarities, so this link is hard to be shown. The outstanding German linguist J. Grimm, also Jakob Bodmer considered that (especially on the example of Switzerland) the severe climate influenced the speech peculiarities, prevalence of consonants.

In the work L. Weisgerber's opinion has been shared, he himself following A. Bach (rendered in the second edition of "German Dialectology"), that "a dialect is a part of spirituality" and a linguistic worldview of the people who formed the appropriate dialect with its spiritual power.

Supposedly, due to the multifaceted economic links of an appropriate people with its territory, and due to the fact this link is ideological, the unity of a territory and a people is historic and has been conditioned by a deep tradition. A linguistic sign, nomination and the appropriate association has been loaded with the historically significant reality and semantic, being important solely for this people. The interrelation of a territory and its inhabitants, due to the intrinsic essence and comprehensiveness of the linguistic worldview, is only of an ecological character. It is hard to match a non-ecological economics to the life of a local farmer, who has "conquered" the neighbouring forests, valleys and fields with the names, that is, not only with an axe, a spade..., but also with their names. There is a great harmony between them: their movement from the native lands is both the destruction of the semantic structure and the elimination of Weltanschauung.

Now we are interested only in the phenomenon of "spatial attachment" as a dialect and an ecological structure have "the principle of spatial attachment in common": the people, speaking an appropriate dialect, inhabit an appropriate territory and is engaged in the economic activities. On the example of Georgia it is observed that a peculiar economic structure is traditionally the activities of the people having an appropriate dialect. For a farmer, living in this or that region, a dialect is not simply a variant of the common language, but it is a peculiar form to linguistically comprehend the objects and, thus, it is relevant together with the literary language. The link of a dialect with a territory does not imply its limitation within the geographical boundaries, it is only a contouring of a territory. Judging from "the principle of spatial attachment", it might be said that the link with the environment is spiritual and historic, and has not been strengthened by a material tradition. This tradition has been formed by the unique economic activities. All this, as already said, indicates the spiritual unity, and makes the bases of the inhabitants being. I think that the destruction of this unity means to destroy the basis of their being. "Spatial attachment" is not a external link with the environment, this link is *internal*. Dialects make the basis which make the demands and needs of this part and which has been elaborated by the history of the population. This is the same with the economic activities. The inhabitants succeed in the very branches having descended from their ancestors. This is the tradition developed through a long course of history, nearly an archaic one, and this is the difference between an individual, speaking one dialect, from another individual, speaking another one. Thus, the mentioned tradition, besides the fact that it has descended from the ancestors, is also an *internal program* of action, and makes the psychology distinguishing one dialect-speaker from another.

Both an ecological structure and a dialect are historically stable and not permanently changeable. The first is a constituent of a nation's common economics, the second being a caterer for a literary language, and there is no contradiction between them: besides, ecological structures enrich the national economics from various sides. A dialect, as a spiritual formation, is not solely a firm structure and a caterer for a literary language, but it itself is an active basis for the folk art (e. g. Khevsurian poetry) and for a great poet (see Vazha-Pshavela).