

UDC 811.222.1-119

## THE CONCEPT OF *OTHER* IN THE CONSCIOUSNESS OF PERSIAN SPEAKERS (BASED ON THE RESULTS OF PSYCHOLINGUISTIC EXPERIMENT)

*Olena Mazepova*

DSc (Philology), Associate Professor

Institute of Philology

Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv

14, blvd. Taras Shevchenko, Kyiv, 01601, Ukraine

[mazepova.olena@gmail.com](mailto:mazepova.olena@gmail.com)

The goal of the paper is to determine the content of the concept of *OTHER* as a member of “self – other” binary opposition in the consciousness of Persian speakers based on the results of psycholinguistic experiment and their further cognitive interpretation. The need for studying the conceptual structure of this opposition by means of psycholinguistic experiment is determined by the fact that it substantially affects both interpersonal contacts of representatives of a given linguistic society and intercultural relations as a whole. Two methods of psycholinguistic analysis of word semantics have been used in the research, viz. free word association test and the method of direct interpretation of a word meaning. In total 102 Persian speakers of different age and social status took part in the experiment. The associative field of the concept was formed based on the results of processing of the data collected during the 1st stage of the experiment. Its semantic field was determined after analysis of unabridged predications in the course of explanation of the proposed words. Result data were processed using special method of grouping language material based on content-analysis: the benchmark words repeated in the answers of different participants were taken as units of the analysis and regarded as key concept features. At the final stage the cognitive interpretation of the data was performed after the principle of “construing” the meaning of linguistic expressions stipulated by R. Langacker. The obtained results demonstrate that the perceptions of *Other* in Persian language consciousness completely match the common world-view, in which the notions of *Self* and *Other* play an important role in conceptualization of human value system.

**Keywords:** concept of *OTHER*, “self – other” binary opposition, Persian language, Persian language consciousness, psycholinguistic experiment

In the age of globalization and intensification of migration processes we witness the growing attention of researchers to the problems of intercultural communication which is mostly regarded as interaction between individuals or groups with different linguistic and cultural origin. In this context studying the peculiarities of communicative behavior of representatives of different cultures becomes of particular interest for the linguists. One of the most significant features defining the specifics of culturally determined behavior of interlocutors is their attitude to the notions of *Self* and *Other*.

The binary opposition of “self – other”, same as “up – down”, “far – near”, “good – bad”, “right – left”, etc. belongs to basic cultural oppositions derived from the ancient archetypal concepts. The existence of “self – other” opposition is based on “axiological

---

© 2022 O. Mazepova; Published by the A. Yu. Krymskyi Institute of Oriental Studies, NAS of Ukraine on behalf of *The World of the Orient*. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

antithesis existed in the perception of primitive man, who regarded *something of his/her own* as something positive and safe because of being well known, on the contrary to *something of another* which is treated as something negative, unknown, and dangerous” [Selivanova 2012, 197].

The significance of investigation of “self – other” opposition can hardly be overestimated since it substantially affects both individual behaviors of members of a given linguistic and cultural group, and international relations as a whole. Despite the evident universal essence of this opposition, we assume that in every culture it is conceptualized in a specific way, demonstrating features of both universal and ethnical nature, which can be determined when analyzing appropriate language material and making use of up-to-date linguistic methods.

The goal of this research is to determine the content of the concept of OTHER as a member of “self – other” conceptual opposition in the consciousness of Persian speakers by means of psycholinguistic experiment and further cognitive interpretation of its results. We believe that joint usage of the tools of Psycholinguistics and Cognitive linguistics when reconstructing one of the most important concepts of human life in the consciousness of representatives of a given culture, will provide us with a better understanding of cognitive mechanisms of their ethno-specific behavior in both intra- and intercultural communication.

The notion of culture has been defined in many ways. One of the most famous definitions of the culture belongs to G. Hofstede: “Culture is the collective programming of the mind that distinguishes the members of one group or category of people from others” [Hofstede 2011, 3]. This definition confirms the need for studying the mechanisms of self-identification by the representatives of a given culture by reconstructing their mental process of distinguishing themselves from those of another culture. Besides, the understanding of Self and Other in any culture plays a significant role in the conceptualization of all other human values.

As L. Brons states, “since De Beauvoir’s (1949) introduction of the notion of ‘the other’ as a construction opposing and thereby constructing ‘the self’, the concepts of ‘the other’, ‘othering’, and ‘otherness’ have taken root in areas of thought and inquiry...” [Brons 2015, 69]. This author defines Othering as “the simultaneous construction of the self or in-group and the other or out-group in mutual and unequal opposition through identification of some desirable characteristic that the self/in-group has and the other/out-group lacks and/or some undesirable characteristic that the other/out-group has and the self/in-group lacks” [Brons 2015, 70].

In Iranian culture, the notions of Self and Other need to be studied in connection with the traditional system of politeness *ta’ārof*, some components of which are considerably determined by how Persian speakers distinguish between the Self/in-group and the Other/out-group in their consciousness.

William O. Beeman observes that the word “ta’ārof” is used “to indicate a nearly untranslatable, but fundamental cultural concept encompassing a broad complex of behaviors in Iranian life that mark and underscore differences in social status and degrees of social intimacy” [Beeman 2020, 203]. This word is derived from Arabic to Persian and comes from Arabic root عرف [‘arafa], which means “to know.” In Arabic *ta’ārof* literally means “becoming acquainted”, but in Persian its semantic field grew considerably, and now it has several meanings. In the Persian-Russian Dictionary by Yu. Rubinchik it is translated as “exchange of courtesies”, “observance of ceremonies, conventions”, “gift giving”, and “treat” [Персидско-русский словарь 1985, 379]. The Aryanpur Persian-English dictionary suggests quite a wider range of meanings, such as “compliment(s), ceremony, offer, gift, flummery, courtesy, flattery, formality, good manners, soft tongue, honeyed phrases, respect” and renders *ta’ārof kardan* (to do ta’ārof) as “to use compliments, to stand upon ceremony, to make a present of, to speak with courtesy, to use

honeyed phrases (soft tongue)” [Aryanpur & Aryanpour 1986, 306–307]. Therefore, translating this word is a quite difficult task because it has no one-word equivalent in other languages.

Ta’ārof is a multidimensional etiquette complex, which has received a lot of attention from the side of researchers [see: Beeman 2001, 2020; Keshavarz 2001; Koutlaki 2002, 2009; Eslami 2005; Sharifian 2007, 2013; Izadi 2015]. One of the most fruitful directions of its investigation is associated with the concept of Face in Iranian culture [Koutlaki 2002, 2009; Sharifian 2007, 2013; Izadi 2016, 2019]. We believe that studying the Persian etiquette complex as a whole and conceptualization of Persian Face in particular should be linked to examining the content of “self – other” binary in the consciousness of Persian speakers because it is noticed that utilizing ta’ārof is extremely intensified in communication with Others. Moreover, as F. Bargiela-Chiappini states, cultural conceptualizations of the social Self and its relationship to Others may become “an alternative and possibly more fruitful way of studying the relevance and dynamics of ‘face’ and ‘facework’ in interpersonal contacts” [Bargiela-Chiappini 2003, 1463].

Religious, social, and cultural phenomena existing in the modern Iranian society impose on its members a number of limitations, which regulate their communicative behavior including the manner of speaking in each particular situation. W. O. Beeman states: “The basic dimensions of Iranian society are not terribly complex in a structural sense, but they provide for a rich play of linguistic expression” [Beeman 2001, 37]. In his view, the particularity of this play is determined by the continuum of the situations, some of which are used for communication with “inside” interlocutors, and some – for “outside” ones. The distinction between the “inside” and “outside” space comes from ancient times and totally occupies Iranian worldview. Beeman believes that the notion of “inside” has its roots in the philosophical and religious concept of **bāten** (lit. باطن – ‘inner’), which in medieval times was regarded as the inner world of a man. The concept of **bāten** opposes the concept of **zāher** (lit. ظاهر – ‘external’), which is understood, firstly, as an appearance, which a person demonstrates in communication with outside world, and secondly, the world around an individual as a whole. The pair **bāten** – **zāher** borrowed from Arabic has its equivalent antonymic pair of Persian origin: **andarun** (lit. اندرون – ‘inner part’) – **birun** (lit. بیرون – ‘outer part’), which shifted from the traditional Iranian dwelling to the field of social relations. Traditionally **andarun** is a part of living area at home, most private, insulated place, where women could feel safe and protected from the menaces of outer world, and other family members might speak free and behave unrestrictedly. This inner space counters the external space – the kingdom of controlled emotions, territory of politesse, moderated expressions and deeds, where real feelings must be watched and a person should “keep a straight face” [Beeman 2001, 38–43].

Therefore, we can conclude that in “outside” circumstances a Persian speaker is supposed to communicate with Others, and in “inside” situations – with those who belong to his/her own (i.e. **andarun** / **bāten**) space. Thus, studying the conceptual structure of Other as a representative of **birun** / **zāher** world by means of psycholinguistic experiment and cognitive interpretation of received results can shed light on the attitude of Iranians towards those who do not belong to their inner space and should be treated in accordance with the rules of ta’ārof.

The main approach of this study is based on the combination of the tools of Psycholinguistics and Cognitive linguistics. Two methods of psycholinguistic analysis of word’s semantics have been used, viz. free word association test and the method of direct interpretation of a word meaning.

Persian speakers of different age and social status took part in the experiment, among them students of Tehran University and Payame Nur University, staff of the Saadi International Foundation, which coordinates internships for Persian students and teachers in

Iran, and members of their families, Iranian acquaintances and colleagues of the author. The total number of participants was 102 persons, of them students aged 20 to 30 – 72 persons, staff and other participants aged 30 to 40 – 24 persons, aged 40 to 60 – 6 persons. Gender composition of the audience: 62 females, 40 males.

At the first stage of the experiment the free word association test (AT) was done. During AT the respondents were provided with the list of 20 words, among them those verbalizing the concepts of SELF (pers. خودی *xodi*) and OTHER (pers. غریبه *qaribe*), which were read aloud by the experiment conductor. The task was to write down a word coming first to the respondent's mind which he associates with the word-stimulus [see: Zalevskaya 2011; Goroshko 2001]. At the second stage the method of direct interpretation or "expanded word definition" was applied [see: Belyanin 2003, 77–78; Butakova 2012, 199]. The respondents were asked to explain in written their own understanding of the meaning of the words in the list. In the result of processing the AT data the "associative field" (AF) of the examined concepts was formed. Their "semantic field" (SF) was molded after analyzing the obtained expanded predications. The result data were processed using a special methodic of grouping language material based on content-analysis: the benchmark words repeated in the answers of different participants were taken as units of the analysis and regarded as key concept features. This procedure was based on the approach applied in Cognitive linguistics when "the associates are interpreted as linguistic representations of certain cognitive features making up the content of a given concept" [Sternin 2007, 40].

At the final stage the cognitive interpretation of the data after the principle of "construing" the meaning of linguistic expressions stipulated by Ronald Langacker was performed [see: Langacker 2008, 55; Zhabotynskaya 2013, 65]. In this process the factor of salience was taken into consideration, i.e. emphasis of those elements which had a higher quantitative indicator. In this paper the results of examination of one member of Self – Other opposition – the concept of OTHER – are presented.

The Associative Field (AF) of the word-stimulus غریبه *qaribe* 'other' ('strange') is structured traditionally – from the stimulus towards the reaction; having fixed the core (most frequent reactions) first, and then – the periphery (less frequent and singular reactions) of the AF. Number of the respondents who reacted to the stimulus in appropriate way is specified in the breaks. When processing the results of AT all the reactions were combined in groups according to their semantic similarity or derivational relations. In the AF specified below the reactions assembled in this way are at first place, and then – singular reactions.

AF of the word-stimulus غریبه *qaribe* 'other' ('strange')

I – Reactions grouped by semantic similarity or derivational relations:

**unfamiliar (18):** *nāāšnā* 'unfamiliar' (13), *nāšenās* 'unknown' (2), *nemišenāsam* 'I don't know (him)', *kas-i ke bā mā āšnāyi nadārad* 'someone unfamiliar for us', *šāyad ruz-i āšnā šavad* 'maybe someday will become familiar'; **foreign, weird (11):** *bigāne* 'foreign' (8), *qeyr-e xodi* 'not akin', *digar-i* 'someone different', *nāmafhum* 'vague'; **distastfulness (9):** *dur* 'far' (6), *duri* 'farness' (3); **fear (8):** *tars* 'fear' (5), *kam-i tars* 'a little of fear', *tarsnāk* 'fearing', *harās* 'dread'; **enemy (4):** *došman* 'enemy' (4); **newness (3):** *jadid* 'new', *tāzevāred* 'just arrived', *hess-e tāzegi* 'feeling of novelty'; **passerby (3):** *rahgozar* 'passerby', *piyāderu* 'pedestrian'; *mard-i ke nemišenāsam dar xiyāban* 'a man in the street whom I don't know'; **mistrust (3):** *bi e'temādi* 'mistrust' (2), *qeyr-e qābel-e e'temād* 'untrustworthy'; **good or bad (3):** *xub* 'good', *ādam-e xub yā bad* 'good or bad man', *ehsās-e bad* 'bad feeling'; **friendship (3):** *dusti* 'friendship', *dustyābi* 'getting friends', *hamnafas* 'intimate'; **familiar (2):** *āšnā* 'familiar' (2); **solitude (2):** *tanhāyi* 'loneliness', *bikas* 'lonely'; **darkness (2):** *tāriki* 'darkness', *siyāh* 'black'; **all people (2):**

*hame* ‘all’, *har kas* ‘everyone’; **disturbance (2)**: *hayajān* ‘excitement’, *negarāni* ‘anxiety’; **help (2)**: *komak* ‘help’, *rāhnamāyi* ‘showing the way’.

II – Singular reactions:

*ārāmeš* ‘quietness’, *āsib didan* ‘to get hurt’, *orupā* ‘Europe’, *alber kāmū* ‘Albert Camus’, *bi ertebāt* ‘unrelated’, *bi hess budan* ‘to be insensitive’, *tark* ‘leaving’, *češm* ‘eye’, *harf nazadan* ‘not talking’, *xejālat* ‘shame’, *xoš-am nemiyād* ‘I don’t like’, *dānešju-ye xāreji* ‘foreign student’, *dozd* ‘thief’, *seks* ‘sex’, *šakk* ‘doubt’, *surat* ‘face’, *arab* ‘an Arab’, *loving* ‘loving’, *marg* ‘death’, *na* ‘no’ (20).

Refusal (7).

In the result of formal classification five groups of reaction types were detected, to wit (only translations are quoted):

1) **paradigmatic** (26,92 %): **unfamiliar (15)**: ‘unfamiliar’ (13), ‘unknown’ (2); **weird, different (11)**: ‘foreign’ (8), ‘not akin’, ‘someone different’, ‘vague’; **familiar (2)**: ‘familiar’ (2);

2) **thematic** (56,73 %): **distantness (9)**: ‘far’ (6), ‘farness’ (3); **fear (8)**: ‘fear’ (5), ‘a little scare’, ‘scaring’, ‘dread’ (1); **enemy (4)**: ‘enemy’ (4); **newness (3)**: ‘new’, ‘just arrived’, ‘feeling of novelty’; **friendship (3)**: ‘friendship’, ‘getting friends’, ‘intimate’; **passerby (2)**: ‘passerby’, ‘pedestrian’; **mistrust (2)**: ‘mistrust’ (2); **loneliness (2)**: ‘solitude’, ‘lonely’; **darkness (2)**: ‘darkness’, ‘black’; **all men (2)**: ‘all’, ‘everyone’; **disturbance (2)**: ‘excitement’, ‘anxiety’; **help (2)**: ‘help’, ‘showing the way’; **singular reactions (18)**: ‘quietness’, ‘to get hurt’, ‘Europe’, ‘Albert Camus’, ‘unrelated’, ‘to be insensitive’, ‘leaving’, ‘eye’, ‘not talking’, ‘shame’, ‘foreign student’, ‘thief’, ‘sex’, ‘doubt’, ‘face’, ‘an Arab’, ‘loving’, ‘death’;

3) **evaluative** (3.85 %): **good or bad (3)**: ‘good’, ‘good or bad man’, ‘bad feeling’; **mistrust (1)**: ‘untrustworthy’;

4) **personal** (5.77 %): **unfamiliar (3)**: ‘I don’t know’, ‘someone unfamiliar for us’, ‘maybe someday will become familiar’; **passerby (1)**: ‘a man in the street unfamiliar for me’; **singular reactions (2)**: ‘I don’t like’, ‘no’;

5) **refusal** (6.73 %).

The results demonstrate that the largest group (59 responses) consists of the reactions combined thematically. These associates are represented by the following groups of notions: distantness (9), fear (8), enemy (4), newness (3), friendship (3), passerby (2), mistrust (2), loneliness (2), darkness (2), all men (2), disturbance (2), assistance (2), and ungrouped singular reactions (18).

The thematic classification of all non-zero reactions to the word-stimulus **qaribe** ‘*other*’ (‘*strange*’) revealed that the respondents considered this concept through the following lexicosemantic groups: human characteristics and states (49.48 %), abstract concepts (16.5 %), emotions and feelings (15.46 %), people (13.4 %), objects and phenomena of the world (5.16 %) (see: Table 1).

To form the semantic field (SF) of the word **qaribe** ‘*other*’ (‘*strange*’) all the explanations obtained after completion of the 2<sup>nd</sup> stage of the experiment were divided into several “semantic subdivisions” comprising all types of language units having similar meaning: separate words, combination of words, parts of sentences, and phrases. All the mentioned subdivisions are located on the principle of frequency, while meanings that do not match any subdivision are listed separately. Here is the formed SF:

SF of the word-stimulus غريبه **qaribe** ‘*other*’ (‘*strange*’)

I – Explanations sorted by semantic similarity:

**Unfamiliar (26)**: *nāāšnā* ‘unfamiliar’ (9), *bigāne* ‘alien’ (4), *kasi u-rā nemišenāsad* ‘nobody knows him’ (4), *u kasi-rā nemišenāsad* ‘he does not know anybody’ (2), *kas-i ke dar šahr-i qeyr az šahr-e xod bāšad* ‘someone who is not in his own town’ (3), *kas-i ke*

*nāāšnā bā mohit ast* ‘someone who is unfamiliar with the environment’ (2), *fard-i ke mitavān ān-rā šenāxt* ‘someone who could be acquainted with’ (2); **loneliness (19)**: *bikas* ‘lonely’ (13), *ehsās-e tanhāyi* ‘feeling of solitude’, *tanhāyi-ye fekri* ‘intellectual solitude’, *nadāstan-e hičkas dar in donyā* ‘to have nobody in this world’, *kas-i ke dust-o rafiq-i nadārad* ‘someone who has no friend’, *bi hamdami* ‘lack of intimate relations’, *bi xānevāde* ‘without family’; **unpleasant feelings (14)**: *ehsās-e tars* ‘feeling of fear’ (2), *deltangi* ‘missing somebody’ (2), *xeyli saxt ast* ‘very hard’ (2), *bi e’remādi* ‘mistrust’, *adam-e etminān* ‘lack of confidence’, *šegeft* ‘weird’, *bā u ehsās-e sangini va saxti dāram* ‘with him I feel depressed and discomforted’, *dar barxord bā u hess-e negarāni va delšure dārim* ‘when dealing with him we feel anxiety and unrest’, *adam-e ehsās-e amniyyat va ārāmeš va xošhāli* ‘feeling no security, rest or joy’, *kas-i ke hess-e nāxošāyand va sargardom dāšte bāšad* ‘someone who has unpleasant feeling of confusion’; **distantness (9)**: *dur* ‘far’ (2), *duri* ‘farness’, *mahjur* ‘abandoned’, *yek šahr-e dur* ‘a remote town’, *duroftādegi az digarān* ‘distance from others’, *duroftāde az ešq* ‘away from love’, *ehsās-e duri az fard-e qarib mikonam* ‘I feel aloof from the strange’, *dur šodan be now’-i qaribi bā xištan* ‘distantness as a kind of otherness from oneself’; **inspires positive attitude (6)**: *qaribnavāzi* ‘hospitality to strangers’ (2), *mazlum* ‘oppressed’ (2), *bāyad mehrabān bāšad* ‘should be kind to him’, *niyāz be komakhā-yi dārad* ‘requires support’; **difficult for understanding (5)**: *dur az zehn* ‘out of mind’ (2), *kas-i harf-aš-rā nemifahmad*, *kas-i dark-aš nemikonad* ‘nobody understands him’ (2), *sāket ast*, *harf nadārad* ‘silent, has nothing to say’; **problems in relations (4)**: *kas-i-ast ke dar ertebāt bar qarār kardan bā u moškel dāram* ‘someone who is difficult to get communication with’ (2), *kasi ke bāyad bā u bā ehtiyāt barxord kard* ‘someone to be treated with caution’, *bā fard-e qaribe dar avval rābete-ye samimi vojūd nadārad* ‘with a stranger there is no sincerity at the beginning’; **novelty (3)**: *fard-i ke bā mohit-i jadid ru be ru šode* ‘someone who faced new circumstances’ (2), *tajrobe-ye jadid* ‘new experience’; **better than familiar ones (2)**: *šāyad behtar az har āšnā* ‘may be better than every familiar ones’, *gāh az sad āšnā be ādam nazdiktar ast* ‘sometimes closer than a hundred of familiar ones’.

II – Singular explanations: *kas-i mesl-e barādar-am* ‘someone like my brother’, *kas-i ke fard-e xānevāde-ye mā nist* ‘someone who is not our family member’, *ensān-i ke xāterāt-e moštarak bā mā nadārad* ‘a man who has no common memories with us’, *hame-ye ensānhā* ‘all people’, *hamiše in kaleme barāyam qarib bude* ‘this word has always been strange to me’, *in kaleme jegar-rā misuzānad čun qarib be sorāq-e ādamhā-yi miravad ke xod dar del-ešān qorbat dārand* ‘this word causes suffering since the stranger is looking for the people who have nostalgia in their hearts’.

Refusal: (6).

In the result of the cognitive interpretation of the data summarized in two stages of the experiment it was revealed that the concept of QARIBE / OTHER (Strange) in the consciousness of Persian speakers has the following content:

**OTHER (Strange) is first of all (80)** unfamiliar person (42), different from us (14), someone who is far away from native town (18), facing new challenges (6). **He suffers from (26)**: solitude (18), lack of friendly communion (5), forced silence (2), absence of family (1). **He feels depressed (25)**, i.e., feels scarred (10), misunderstood (5), worry (2), upset (2), uneasy (2), unconfident (1), ashamed (1), lost (1), and hurt (1). **Other (Strange) may be (26)** enemy (4), passerby (3), foreign student (1), an Arab (1), someone who has no common memories with us (1), someone who is not from our family (1), though may look like the one (1), insensitive person (1), thief (1). Stranger may be good (2) or bad (1), but sometimes he may be better than familiar ones (2). Stranger can be identified by the eyes (1) and the face (1). All people are strange to each other (3) and some of them even to themselves (2). **Other (Strange) often provokes negative emotions (17)**: mistrust (4), bad feeling (1), doubts (1), wonder (1), rejection (1), aloofness (1), and arguing (1). He is

difficult to deal with (3) because of lack of sincerity at the beginning of relations (1). He causes feeling of unease (1), disturbance and unrest (1), unsafety, discomfort and displeasure (1). On the other hand, **Other (Strange) may stimulate positive attitude (10)**: wish to help (3), to show hospitality (2), compassion (2), kindness (1), and to comfort (1). A symbol of Other (Strange) may be Europe (1) and Albert Camus (1). Irrationally it is associated with darkness (2), sex (1), and death (1). However, someone does not understand at all what this word means (1).

This interpretation demonstrates that Persian speakers consider the concept of OTHER within the scope of general ideas existing in every ethno-cultural community. Remarkably, towards the Other almost no hostility was expressed (only 4 “hostile” reactions). Instead there was a lot of compassion and even intention to help. Presumably, the reason is that many Iranians or their relatives now are “strangers” around the world (as emigrants or students abroad), so their personal experience impacted the results of the experiment.

Thus, the psycholinguistic experiment held among Persian speakers and the further cognitive interpretation of its results reveals that the content of the concept of OTHER in the consciousness of Persian speakers consists of universal features mostly. It can presumably be explained by the universal character of “self – other” binary opposition and conventional perceptions of Otherness as something negative, unknown, and dangerous. Therefore the ideas of Persian speakers about Other have completely matched the common worldview, in which the notions of Self and Other play a considerable role in conceptualization of human value system as a whole. There was the only ethnically marked reaction that is “an Arab”, which points out a low degree of the respondents’ need for differentiating themselves from other ones on a national ground. In general, the analysis proved that the respondents demonstrated mostly tolerant attitude toward the Other: almost no hostility had been expressed. We assume that such a tolerance, compassion and intention to help the Other may be partly explained by the *ta’arof* tradition, which supposes demonstration of exaggerated politeness toward the counterpart, especially if he/she does not belong to internal (**andarun / bāten**) space.

It seems that combination of the tools of Psycholinguistics and Cognitive linguistics when reconstructing certain conceptual structures in the consciousness of a given language speakers enables a better comprehension of not only the mechanisms of their culturally specific conceptualization, but also particularities of their communicative behavior in both interpersonal and intercultural contacts. The importance of the conducted analysis for further research is, firstly, that it opens the way to relevant cross-cultural studies, and secondly, it is of interest in the aspect of intercultural interaction, during which communicators not only should be aware of ethno-specific concepts of another linguistic culture, but also should consider the peculiarities of conceptualization of universal concepts by their communication partners.

## Appendix

Table 1

Thematic classification of valid reactions  
to the word-stimulus **qaribe** ‘other’ (‘strange’)

№	Thematic field	Reaction	Total	%
1	Human characteristics and states	<i>nāāšnā budan</i> ‘to be unfamiliar’ (18), <i>bigāne</i> ‘foreign’ (11), <i>bi e’etemādi</i> ‘mistrust’ (3), <i>dusti</i> ‘friendship’ (3), <i>āšnā budan</i> ‘to be familiar’ (2), <i>tanhāyi</i> ‘loneliness’ (2), <i>komak</i> ‘help’ (2), <i>ārāmeš</i> ‘rest’, <i>āsib didan</i> ‘to be harmed’, <i>bi ertebāt</i> ‘unrelated’, <i>bi hess budan</i> ‘to be insensitive’, <i>harf nazadan</i> ‘not talking’, <i>seks</i> ‘sex’, <i>šakk</i> ‘doubt’	48	49.48

2	Abstract concepts	<i>duri</i> ‘distantness’ (9), <i>jadid budan</i> ‘to be new’ (3), <i>xub yā bad</i> ‘good or bad’ (2), <i>tark</i> ‘leaving’, <i>marg</i> ‘death’	16	16.5
3	Emotions and feelings	<i>tars</i> ‘fear’ (8), <i>ehsās-e bad</i> ‘bad feeling’, <i>negarāni</i> ‘anxiety’, <i>hayajān</i> ‘agitation’, <i>xejālat</i> ‘shame’, <i>xoš-am nemiyād</i> ‘I don’t like’, <i>loving</i> ‘loving’, <i>na</i> ‘no’	15	15.46
4	People	<i>došman</i> ‘enemy’ (4), <i>rahgozar</i> ‘passerby’ (3), <i>hame</i> ‘all’ (2), <i>alber kāmu</i> ‘Albert Camus’, <i>dānešju-ye xāreji</i> ‘foreign student’, <i>dozd</i> ‘thief’, <i>arab</i> ‘an Arab’	13	13.4
5	Objects and phenomena of the world	<i>tāriki</i> ‘darkness’, <i>siyāh</i> ‘black’, <i>orupā</i> ‘Europe’, <i>surat</i> ‘face’, <i>češm</i> ‘eye’	5	5.16
<i>Total</i>			97	100

## REFERENCES

- Baranov A. N. (2001), *Vvedeniye v prikladnyuyu lingvistiku*, Editorial, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Bargiela-Chiappini F. (2003), “Face and Politeness: New (Insights) for Old (Concepts)”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 35, Issues 10–11, pp. 1453–1469. DOI: [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166\(02\)00173-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-2166(02)00173-X)
- Beeman W. O. (2001), “Emotion and Sincerity in Persian Discourse: Accomplishing and Representation of Inner States”, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 148, pp. 31–57. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/ijsl.2001.013>
- Beeman W. O. (2020), “Ta’arof: Pragmatic Key to Iranian Social Behavior”, in Östman J.-O. and Verschueren J. (eds), *Handbook of Pragmatics*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, pp. 203–224. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/hop.22.taa1>
- Belyanin V. P. (2003), *Psikholingvistika*, Flinta, Moskovskiy psikhologo-sotsial’nyy institut, Moscow. (In Russian).
- Butakova L. O. (2012), “Znachenije slova kak dostoyaniye individa (na primere eticheski znachimykh leksem pravda / lozh’”, *Vestnik Kemerovskogo gosuniversiteta*, No. 4 (52), Vol. 1, pp. 198–204. (In Russian).
- Eslami Z. R. (2005), “Invitations in Persian and English: Ostensible or genuine?”, *Intercultural Pragmatics*, Vol. 2, Issue 4, pp. 453–480. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1515/iprg.2005.2.4.453>
- Goroshko E. I. (2001), *Integrativnaya model’ svobodnogo assotsiativnogo eksperimenta*, RA-Karavella, Kharkiv and Moscow. (In Russian).
- Hofstede G. (2011), “Dimensionalizing Cultures: The Hofstede Model in Context”, *Online Readings in Psychology and Culture*, Vol. 2, No. 1, available at: <https://scholarworks.gvsu.edu/orpc/vol2/iss1/8/> (accessed December 1, 2021). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.9707/2307-0919.1014>
- Izadi A. (2015), “Persian honorifics and im/politeness as social practice”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 85, pp. 81–91. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2015.06.002>
- Izadi A. (2016), “Over-politeness in Persian professional interactions”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 102, pp. 13–23. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pragma.2016.06.004>
- Izadi A. (2019), “An investigation of face in Taarof”, *Journal of Researches in Linguistics*, Vol. 10, pp. 67–82.
- Keshavarz M. H. (2001), “The role of social context, intimacy, and distance in the choice of forms of address”, *International Journal of the Sociology of Language*, Vol. 148, pp. 5–18. DOI: 10.1515/IJSL.2001.015
- Koutlaki S. A. (2002), “Offers and expressions of thanks as face enhancing acts: Tæ’arof in Persian”, *Journal of Pragmatics*, Vol. 34, Issue 12, pp. 1733–1756.
- Koutlaki S. A. (2009), “Two sides of the same coin: how the notion of ‘face’ is encoded in Persian communication”, in Bargiela-Chiappini F. and Haugh M. (eds), *Face, communication and social interaction*, Equinox, London, pp. 115–133.
- Langacker R. W. (2008), *Cognitive Grammar: A basic introduction*, Oxford University Press, New York.
- Selivanova O. O. (2012), “Opozytsiya sviy-chuzhyy v etnosvidomosti (na materialy ukrayins’kykh paremiy)”, in Selivanova O. O., *Svit vidomosti v movi. Mir soznaniya v yazyke*, Yu. Chabanenko, Cherkasy, pp. 196–218. (In Ukrainian).
- Sharifian F. (2007), “L1 cultural conceptualizations in L2 learning. The case of Persian-speaking learners of English”, in Sharifian F. and Palmer G. B. (eds), *Applied Cultural Linguistics*:



*implications for second language learning and intercultural communication*, John Benjamins Publishing Company, Amsterdam, Philadelphia, pp. 33–51. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.1075/celcr.7.04sha>

Sharifian F. (2013), “Cultural conceptualisations in learning English as an L2: Examples from Persian-speaking learners”, *Iranian Journal of Language Teaching Research*, Vol. 1, Issue 1, pp. 90–116.

Sternin I. A. (2007), “Psikholingvistika i kontseptologiya”, *Voprosy psikholingvistiki*, No. 5, pp. 37–46. (In Russian).

Zalevskaya A. A. (2001), “Psikholingvisticheskiy podkhod k probleme kontsepta”, in Sternin I. A. (ed.), *Metodologicheskiye problemy kognitivnoy lingvistiki*, Izdatelstvo VGU, Voronezh, pp. 36–44. (In Russian).

Zhabotinskaya S. A. (2013), “Imya kak tekst: kontseptual'naya set' leksicheskogo znacheniya (analiz imeni emotsii)”, *Kognitsiya, kommunikatsiya, diskurs*, No. 6, pp. 47–76. (In Russian). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.26565/2218-2926-2013-06-04>

O. B. Мазепова

### **Концепт ЧУЖИЙ у свідомості носіїв перської мови (за результатами психолінгвістичного експерименту)**

Метою статті є встановлення змісту концепту ЧУЖИЙ як члена бінарної опозиції “свій – чужий” у свідомості носіїв перської мови на основі проведеного з ними психолінгвістичного експерименту та подальшої когнітивної інтерпретації його результатів. Необхідність вивчення специфіки концептуалізації цієї опозиції у свідомості представників різних культур зумовлена її суттєвим впливом як на міжособистісні стосунки людей всередині однієї лінгвоспільноти, так і на міжкультурні взаємини в цілому. У дослідженні використано два методи психолінгвістичного аналізу семантики слова: вільний асоціативний експеримент та метод прямого тлумачення або розгорнутої дефініції слів. Всього в експерименті взяли участь 102 носії перської мови різного віку і соціального статусу. За результатами оброблення даних, отриманих на першому етапі експерименту, було сформовано асоціативне поле досліджуваного концепту, а внаслідок аналізу розгорнутих предикацій у процесі семантизації запропонованих слів – його семантичне поле. В основу оброблення експериментальних даних покладено особливу методику групування мовного матеріалу із застосуванням контент-аналізу: одиницями аналізу поставали опорні слова, що повторювалися у відповідях різних респондентів і розглядалися як ключові концептуальні ознаки. Завершальним етапом аналізу стала когнітивна інтерпретація даних, базована на принципах “конструювання” змісту мовного виразу Р. Ленекера. Отримані результати засвідчують, що уявлення про Чужого у перській мовній свідомості повністю вкладаються в загальнолюдську картину світу, в якій поняття Свого і Чужого відіграють значну роль у концептуалізації системи людських цінностей.

**Ключові слова:** концепт ЧУЖИЙ, бінарна опозиція “свій – чужий”, перська мова, перська мовна свідомість, психолінгвістичний експеримент

*Стаття надійшла до редакції 2.12.2021*