LINGUOCULTURAL IMAGE OF IRAN AS A CONSTANTLY CHANGING COGNITIVE SPACE IN RUSSIAN LANGUAGE WORLD PICTURE

Victor M. Shaklein
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (Moscow, Russia)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3576-3828

Mona Afshar
Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (Moscow, Russia)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5984-0149

A b s t r a c t . The article analyzes linguocultural image of Iran. The main goal of the study is to determine which linguistic units with national and cultural specificity have the ability to express the linguocultural image of the said country while simultaneously reflecting various fragments of the national world picture.

The paper concretizes the concept of "linguocultural image" in relation to the verbalized units of those texts. The country image is presented as a certain system, which is characterized by ambivalent characteristics at the levels of value and semantics. The picture of Iran is modeled through the special view of the representative of one country and culture on another country and culture. The ethnocultural component of this image is constructed as a certain semantic field with its core and periphery. Linguistic, figurative and associative tools that mark the main components of the image are revealed. The concept of the linguocultural image of the country as a dynamic and diachroic semantic field is clarified. The article includes the description of the core of this field: proper names, different compounds, dynamics of the entry of certain units, and the role and place of proper names in the construction of the cognitive space. At last, the paper emphasizes the historical variability of the field in its configurations and structure.

ЛИНГВОКУЛЬТУРНЫЙ ОБРАЗ ИРАНА КАК ПОСТОЯННО МЕНЯЮЩЕЕСЯ КОГНИТИВНОЕ ПРОСТРАНСТВО В РУССКОЙ ЯЗЫКОВОЙ КАРТИНЕ МИРА

Шаклеин В. М.
Российский университет дружбы народов (Москва, Россия)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3576-3828

Афшар М.
Российский университет дружбы народов (Москва, Россия)
ORCID ID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5984-0149

А н н о т а ц и я . В статье анализируется лингвокультурный образ Ирана. Основная цель исследования – определить, какие языковые единицы, содержащие национально-культурную специфичность, отражая различные фрагменты национальной картины мира, обладают способностью выражать лингвокультурный образ этой страны. Рабочей гипотезой исследования послужило предположение, что эти информативные единицы могут быть выражены как в языке: словах, отдельных значениях, фразеологизмах, семантических категориях, так и в речи: в формулах, метафорах.

В работе конкретизировано понятие «лингвокультурный образ» в отношении к вербализованному единицами этих текстов. Образ страны представлен как определенная система, которой присущи амбивалентные характеристики на ценностном и семантическом уровнях. В результате проведенного исследования осуществлено моделирование образа Ирана, обусловленное особым взглядом представителя одной страны и культуры на другую страну и культуру. Показана этнокультурная составляющая этого образа как определенного семантического поля, состоящего из ядра и его периферии. Выявлены лингвистические и образно-ассоциативные средства, маркирующие основные составляющие образа. Определены прагматические особенности языковых средств создания лингвокультурного образа и способы его трансляции в другие лингвокультуры. Уточнению подверглось понятие лингвокультурного образа страны, которое представлено как динамическое, диахроническое семантическое поле. Описывается ядро этого поля – имена собственные, состав, динамика вхождения тех или иных единиц, а также роль и место имен собственных в построении когнитивного пространства. Также рассматривается состав периферии поля: группа номинаций, среди которых большинство оказалось словами, называющими людей в соответствии с их социальными характеристиками, лексические единицы, называющие реалии культуры, образные средства, формирующие устойчивые ассоциативные связи. Подчеркивается историческая изменчивость этого поля как в основных конфигурациях, так и по структуре.

К л ю ч е в ы е с л о в а : лингвокультурный образ; семантическое поле; русский язык; национальная картина мира; слова-реалии; ономастика; топонимы; антропонимы

Introduction

Research in the field of the national world picture, the identification, and description of cultural concepts made it possible to talk about the existence of "linguocultural images". They can be described as special cognitive entities that are specific to one national culture or a group of related cultures. The establishment and characterization of linguocultural images is possible by comparison with other cultures. A set of characteristic linguocultural units can represent a complete linguocultural image of the country. The stable scientific interest in the way unique sociocultural processes are reflected in the language of cultural changes lays in the growing importance of globalization, the increase in contacts between representatives of different cultures, the emergence of cultural conflicts. No doubt, country images require deep research.

The paper concretizes the concept of "linguocultural image" in relation to the verbalized units of artistic, poetic and journalistic texts. The country image is presented as a certain system or semantic field, which is characterized by ambivalent characteristics at the levels of value and semantics. As a result of the study, the picture of Iran is modeled through the special view of a representative of one country and culture on another country and culture. The ethnocultural component of this image is shown as a certain semantic field with its core and its periphery. Linguistic, figurative and associative tools that mark the main components of the image are revealed. The ways of transferring a linguocultural image to other linguocultures with the help of pragmatic features of language tools are determined.

The goal is to define the composition of units with national and cultural specificity that make up the linguocultural image of Iran in the Russian language world picture. Achieving the goal is impossible without solving the following tasks: 1) finding out the theoretical basis of the concept of a linguocultural image; 2) analyzing literary and journalistic texts that reveal the linguocultural image of Iran; 3) identifying, describing, and classifying language and speech tools that have national and cultural significance; 4) exploring the linguocultural image of Iran in the systematic way and in the dynamics of formation.

The study is based on the works devoted to linguoculturology and linguocultural aspects of communication of established scientists: M. M. Bakhtin [1979], Yu. M. Lotman [1996], E. M. Vereshchagin, V. G. Kostomarov [1980, 1990], V. V. Vorobyev [2006], V. I. Karasik [1996, 2001], Yu. N. Karaulov [2006], V. V. Krasnykh [1997], V. A. Maslova [2001], Yu. S. Stepanov [2001], V. N. Telia, V. M. Shaklein [2012], issues of intercultural communication by V. S. Bibler [1991], L. I. Grishaeva, L. V. Tsurikova [2004], O. A. Leontovich [2002] and many others. And literary and journalistic texts of the famous witers: poems by V. A. Khlebnikov, S. A. Esenin,

V. V. Kamensky, N. S. Gumilev, "Travel Notes" by A. S. Griboedov, the novel "The Death of Vazir-Mukhtar" by Yu. N. Tynyanov, essays on Iran by L. Reisner, V. V. Ovchinnikov, "Persia. History of an undiscovered country" by A. Gromov, as well as materials from the National Corpus of the Russian Language.

The materials and results of the paper can be considered a contribution to the study of Russian-Iranian cultural relationship. The paper reveals the transformation of the country's archetypal linguocultural image into a complexly organized system of the semantic field. Methodical ways of describing the linguocultural image of Iran can be used in other similar studies.

The description and research techniques can be used in the educational process in courses on linguoculturology, linguistic analysis of a literary text, and intercultural communication. Individual research materials can help in the preparation of textbooks for translation and cultural analysis of literary and journalistic texts. Also, individual results of the study can be applied in the classroom to study Russian as a foreign language.

Discussion and results

The concept of "linguocultural image" is productive to study based on the interaction of cultures at the level of national language world picture, at the level of cultural concepts and at the level of interpersonal intercultural communication. As it is implemented at the lexical and discourse levels. The concept of "linguocultural image" was first formed within the boundaries of the linguoculturology. Later, it started to be used in works devoted to the study of the national world picture in cognitive linguistics. Thus, V. V. Vorobyov singles out "linguocultureme" and "linguoculturological field". Linguocultureme is the smallest unit of description (inventory unit), which correlates with such units as lexico-semantic variant in vocabulary, sign in semiotics, concept in cognitive science. It can be expressed in the language as a separate meaning, word, phrase, statement. "Linguocultureme reflects the results of the interaction of two semiotic systems – language and culture, and therefore is heterogeneous in its essence" [Vorobyev 2006: 43]. Linguoculturemes are units of the "linguocultural field". They have hierarchical relations and paradigmatic and syntagmatic connections. The concept of "linguocultural field" corresponds to the semantic field in semantics, or world picture in cognitive science.

The notion of "linguocultural image" correlates with such cognitive units of description as "prototype" and "complex concept". A. D. Makarova tried to clarify the content of the notion: "A mental stereotyped representation of phenomenons and facts that take place in the world... A linguocultural image is studied in the unity of language, consciousness, and culture on the basis of a discourse in which it is mainly used. It is important to realize that a linguocultural image reflects national and cultural features that are significant for the linguocultural society where it is formed" [Makarova 2011: 245]. In a study by A. V. Taskaeva the "linguocultural image" is considered as a complex multi-level concept [Taskaeva 2009]. It consists of a number of small informative units that have such qualities as national and cultural specificity. In Cui Liwei's dissertation "Linguistic and Cultural Images of Russia and China in the Works of Art of the Russian Far Eastern Emigration" the author uses this term as "a cultural concept which has national and cultural specifics but at the same time contains distinctive features and signs of a recognizable representative of a particular ethnocultural community" [Cui Liwei 2015: 6]. Thus, the notion of "linguocultural image" is complex. Its structure is a combination of information elements of various origins: some are universal, others have national specifics or characterization of certain groups of cultures. Those paradigms are distinguished on the basis of the opposition "friend or foe".

Linguistic and cultural images are special informatively complex units that have national and cultural specificity and express it based on various life processes in the national world picture. These units can be expressed both in language: words, individual meanings, phraseological units, semantic categories. And realized in speech: in formulas, scenarios of verbal and non-verbal behavior.

Linguoculturological study and description of the units of the national world picture is impossible without referring to the text. Since is a certain cultural dominant that determines the essence of the era and its contribution to other cultures. Such linguocultural dominants unfold in each specific linguoculture in different ways. As for their function and nature, culture and text have similar roots. They form the conditions and means

of communication between people and create a special semiotic environment, which can be called culture. Thanks to the unique nature of cultural objects and their perception, there are intersections in the cultural spaces of the sender and receiver, even if they are representatives of various social and cultural groups. And because of communication culture is preserved, developed and created in order to be perceived, known and understood. Cultural texts don't just convey meanings. They are internally dialogic and require a response in the form of interpretation and evaluation.

The conceptual center of the linguocultural changes in different periods of its development. At the initial stage, ideas about the country arise as a result of interpersonal communication or culturally mediated contacts. Different elements are at the forefront: primarily proper names. The linguocultural image doesn't exist outside of culture and outside of chronology. It is emphatically diachronic. The linguocultural image of the country is ambivalent, because it doesn't only represent the main properties of the national mentality, it reflects the "foreign" through the eyes of "one's own".

The linguocultural image of another country, another people, another culture forms in the process of contacts. The contacting parties compare each other and single out the common and the different. The common creates the basis for further relations, the search for joint solutions and joint activities. The differences form the basis of the linguocultural image and turn into distinctive features. Subsequently, they help to identify both culture and its bearer. Cultural contacts can be direct (associated with the traveling representatives of two contacting cultures) and indirect (through works of art, literature, cinema, and the media). "The processes of cultural exchange are repeatedly mediated: artistic, intellectual and spiritual contacts occur on the basis of economic and political ties. Political trust arises on the basis of knowledge of each other and a correct understanding of other cultural realities. With a gradual, purposeful and comprehensive contact of cultures with each other, many things become natural and explainable" [Martynova 2007: 59]. As we know from history, the initial contacts between Russian and Persian cultures were personal (through individual travelers) or professional (thanks to merchants who sought trade exchange). Today it is

necessary to establish interstate contacts, as in the modern world a lot depends on them. The denser the interstate contacts of countries, the more often other named forms of contacts arise. And as a result of cultural exchange and tourism, cultural contacts will also expand.

The linguocultural image of Iran (Persia) in Russian culture begins to shape in the 16–17 centuries as a result of the stories of merchants who visited Persia. But a complete image of the country develops because of increased political and economic contacts between countries in the 18–19 centuries. This image is initially detailed in the form of proper names – toponyms and anthroponyms. They represent the idea of important places and significant people who deepen the interaction between the countries. The linguocultural image of the country shifts over the centuries. The direction of following changes can be characterized as expansion and transformation. On the one hand, the increase of information flow and information exchange leads to the expansion of the linguocultural image. On the other hand, the culture itself is gradually changing. The "focal points" of linguistic and cultural spaces are becoming different. It leads to the transformation of the country image.

Speaking about the structure of the linguocultural image of Iran in the Russian language world picture, it is necessary to clarify something.

The main components of the linguocultural image of Iran are organized along several directions: geography (significant political and cultural places), history (places and people – names of historical and cultural figures), political and social structure of society (customs, morals, beliefs). The image of Iran isn't evaluative, but to a certain extent it is a projection of the image of the recipient country in the Russian culture. The dynamics and diversity of ideas about the country can be illustrated by the analysis of the words "Persia" and "Iran" in the National Corpus of the Russian Language. The word Iran is more common: it has 937 occurrences in 435 documents. The word Persia has 372 occurrences in 242 documents. By the number of references in documents, Iran is 2 times more frequent than Persia, which is understandable. Most of the texts in the corpus were created after 1935, when Persia was already renamed Iran. If analyze only newspaper texts of the corpus, the ratio changes dramatically: Iran

is used 5870 times in 3041 documents, Persia is mentioned 11 times in 10 documents. If we compare the mentions of words in poetic texts, Iran has 24 occurrences in 10 documents, and Persia has 15 occurrences in 11 documents. Oral texts do not use Persia at all. Iran is mentioned in 35 documents 81 times (in the conferences, reports and television programs).

The described picture refers only to the modern times. It doesn't allow us to compare the use of words in journalistic and artistic discourse. But at the same time it clearly shows that the "linguocultural image" is closely connected with the "linguocultural situation". Both "synchrony" and "diachrony" can be clearly distinguished in it. For that matter, poetic devices that rely on stable associations reflect the development of the image in a historical perspective, as opposed to the synchrony of "journalistic" discourse. In poetic examples, Persia appears not as a state, but rather as a mythological country and the center of the Eastern culture. In this context the notion of culture can include many different semes referencing to the art of the East, its political culture, as well as to ancient history: 1) *Что призрак зол, глухая Персия, И допотопный* **Арарат?** [М. А. Кузьмин]. «*Теперь я вижу: крепким поводом…*» [*Маяк любви*, 8] (*translated by the author: What is the ghost of evil, deaf Persia, And ancient* **Ararat?**) 2) *Кровь застыла в нас, иль обветшала, Наша переметная сума? Здравствуй,* **Персия!** *Здорово ночевала, Полусонная богатая кума!* [Н. Н. Туроверов. «*Что мы, братцы, по-пустому спорим…*» (1920–1965)] (*translated by the author: The blood froze in us, or decayed, Our saddle bag? Hello,* **Persia!** *You had a great night, our Half-asleep rich godmother!*).

The relative adjectives modeled after word "Persia" clearly reflect the width of this concept. On the one hand, "Persian" means "originates from Persia": Persian carpet, Persian cat, Persian silk. On the other hand, it can mean something indefinite. According to the speakers, it may even have a weak connection with Persia: 3) *К тому же прикаспийские земли поставляли бы «эзенгоутово дерево» для российского флота, нефть, медь, свинец, табак, вино, сухие фрукты, пряности и – важнее всего –* **персидский шелк**. [*Игорь Курукин. «Восточного пути врата отворить»: Каспийский поход Петра I» // «Знание-сила», 2013*] (*translated by the author: In addition the Caspian lands will supply the "ezengout tree" for the Russian fleet, oil, copper,*

lead, tobacco, wine, dry fruits, spices, and most importantly **Persian silk**); 4) *Жена была похожа на мужа как его уменьшённая копия – та же тонкость, тот же* **персидский рисунок лица**. [*Людмила Улицкая. Казус Кукоцкого (Путешествие в седьмую сторону света) // «Новый Мир», 2000*] (*translated by the author: The wife looked like his reduced copy of her husband. They had the same delicacy, the same* **Persian face pattern**); 5) *В рай тот невесть чей.* **В рай тот персидский…** *В сласть и в страданье – Дай – через руку!* [М. И. Цветаева. «*Наворковала…*» (1922.03.10)] (*translated by the author: To heaven that knows who, To that* **Persian paradise…** *In sweetness and suffering – Give – through the hand!*).

In this poetic texts, we can see that the linguocultural image of Persia that exists in Russian culture. It is a country with its history, myths, and certain notable features – patterns, ornaments, fairy tales, the sybarite lifestyle of the elites.

Describing the Onomasticon of the linguocultural image of Iran in the Russian language world picture, some notes has to be made. The semantic field representing the linguocultural image of Iran is based on proper names – toponyms and anthroponyms. The core of the field starts forming first. It consists of the names of politically significant places and the names of politically and historically significant characters, as well as toponyms and anthroponyms associated with the country's culture. Then this core starts to expand by anthroponyms representing other historical eras associated with various historical events. The periphery of the field is formed by the realias and the names of people according to theirs social status. "The features of national onomasticons aren't only determined by their belonging to a particular national language. It depends on the specifics of the national culture – the environment that created and formed each national omonamy" [Kidarov, Kerimbaev 1990: 3].

The most common cities that Russian poets and writers use are Shiraz, Isfahan, Tabriz, and the capital of Iran – Tehran. Among them, special attention is given to the city of Shiraz. This city is at least 3000 years old and has been repeatedly named as the capital of Persia over the course of history. It is famous as the "city of roses", "city of poets", "city of love and wine". Great poets such as Khayyam, Saadi and Hafiz lived in Shiraz and created many world famous works. Such names of cities as *Abbas-Abad, Mezanderan, Erivan, Yezd,*

Luristan, Kerman, Ferahan, Anzeli, Rasht, Persepolis are less common. Some of these cities are included in the general semantic field of the linguocultural image, as they concretize it and are remembered by native speakers due to geographical and historical connections. Others can be easily replaced by different language units. The toponymic system is a reflection of material and spiritual culture of various peoples that has been preserved for many centuries. Toponyms are a relic heritage of past generations. They are the reason we know about certain historical events, parts of spiritual culture (ex. rites and rituals), and religious beliefs. The development of social relations and the spiritual image of society in any period of history depends on the material basis of the society itself [Ayubov 2018: 56]. It is important to note the role of *Persepolis*. The name of this place has real magnetic power and links modern Iran with Ancient Persia.

A special place among toponyms is occupied by the names of memorable places: the Shah's palaces (*Bagishumal, Negeristan, Ali-Kapu*), mosques (*Imam-Zume, Jami Mosque*), and other famous points of attraction (*Naqsh-e Rustam necropolis*).

The second group of onomastic components are anthroponyms. They are also capable of reflecting national and cultural specifics. Each person whose name is expressed by anthroponyms is associated with the history and culture of a certain country. According to A. V. Superanskaya: "Despite the fact that anthroponyms only refer to the naming of people, they give as an extremely complex range of naming categories. It is connected with the history of culture, traditions, the peculiarities of the people's psychology, etc." [Superanskaya 2007: 174]. Anthroponyms found in the analyzed texts are mainly the names of Persian poets, religious figures, historical and mythical characters.

A special group of anthroponyms is formed by the names of Persian poets. As previously mentioned, many Russian writers and poets were well acquainted with such personalities as Hafiz, Ferdowsi, Khayyam, Saadi. Their traces can be found in some of Russian works: «***Голубая родина Фирдуси***, // Ты не можешь, памятью простыв...» [С. Есенин «Персидские мотивы»] (*translated by the author:* ***"Ferdowsi's blue homeland***, // You can't lose your memory..."*); «Вмиг отразится во взгляде // Месяца желтая прелесть // Нежность, как песни **Саади**»; «Ты сказала, что **Саади** // Целовал лишь только в грудь» [С. Есенин «Персидские

мотивы»] (*translated by the author:* "In a moment it will be reflected in the gaze // The yellow charm of the moon // Tender like the **songs of Saadi**"; "You said that **Saadi** // Kissed only on the chest"); // «Шут шутил для него шутливо. **Саади** том для него издавал» [Б. А. Слуцкий. «Хан был хамом, большим нахалом...» (1970–1973)] (*translated by the author:* "The jester joked for him playfully. **Saadi** published a book for him"); «Спой мне песню, моя дорогая, // Ту, которую пел **Хаям**»; «Я спою тебе сам, дорогая, То, что сроду не пел **Хаям**...» [С. Есенин «Персидские мотивы»] (*translated by the author:* "Sing me a song, my dear, // The one **Khayyam** sang"; "I'll sing to you myself, dear, Something **Khayyam** never sang..."); «И только **Омар Хайям**, глядя на нас, разразился бы печалью стиха о превратности сего мира...» [А. И. Цветаева. Сказ о звонаре Московском, 1976] (*translated by the author:* "And only **Omar Khayyam**, looking at us, would make a sad poem about the viciousness of this world...").

Another group is the names of the characters from famous literary works: Shagane, Scheherazade, Farhad and Shirin. Those names are used as a symbol of an oriental character: «Словно нежная **Шахерезада**, завела магический рассказ» [Н. С. Гумилев «Об озерах, о павлинах белых...» (1917)] (*translated by the author:* "Like a gentle **Scheherazade**, she started a magical story").

The names of rulers and historical figures are a group of lexemes that are constantly growing. First, it includes the names of the leaders who are leading the country at the moment: «Встреча, почести, **Фетхалихан** боится каймакама» [А. Грибоедов «Путевые заметки»] (*translated by the author:* "Meeting, honors, **Fethalihan** is afraid of kaymakam") – the second Shah of Iran of the Qajar dynasty, ruled from 1797 to 1834. Then this group grows at the expense of the all great political figures: «Решил однажды **шах-Абас** // Мечеть построить в Исфагане»; «– Догнать! – взъярился **шах-Абас**, – // Живым иль мертвым, но доставить, // А не исполните приказ, // Всех вас велю я обезглавить...» [Р. Гамзатов «Персидские стихи»] (*translated by the author:* «One day **Shah Abbas** decided to build a mosque in Isfahan»; «Catch him! – **Shah Abbas** was furious, – // Bring him alive or dead, // If you don't follow the order, // I will order to behead all of you...»). The number of anthroponyms grows due to new and old figures. This can be explained by the fact that the amount of information about the country in the public field

is growing all the time. As L. B. Boyko notes: "...the anthroponym exists in the context of a particular culture, obeying the rules of the national language and sensitively responding to the dynamics of society development. The name is a piece of the national world picture. Without national world picture it would be incomplete and impossible. Even the absence of a personal name in the cultural paradigm of society (more on that below) does not change this conclusion" [Boiko 2013: 17].

Cyrus, Artaxerxes, Xerxes, Mithridates, Shahanshah Khosrow, Mohammad Reza Pahlavi, Darius, Shah Abbas, Caliph Umar, Naser al-Din Shah, Nadir Shah – all of these names belong to the outstanding rulers of Persia and Iran. These people are inextricably linked with the various historical eras of the country. Thus, they can act as certain culturemes that create a cultural image of Iran: *Появление на карте ойкумены Персии как великой державы неразрывно связано с именем царя **Кира** II Великого, происходившего из династии Ахеменидов и правившего в 559–530 гг. до н. э.; **Ксеркс** тщательно готовился к походу в Грецию, заботясь не только о подготовке армии, но и о переправе через пролив Геллеспонт: были наведены два понтонных моста длиной более километра каждый; **Шахиншах Хосров** был просвещенным владыкой, он покровительствовал наукам и искусствам; То, что в 1967 году **Мухаммед Реза**, последний шах династии Пехлеви, короновал собственную супругу **Фарах Диба**, не учитывается, потому что он все равно оставался правителем* [А. Громов «Персия. История неоткрытой страны»] (*translated by the author: The appearance of Persian ecumene as a great power is indissolubly linked with the king **Cyrus the Great**, who came from the Achaemenid dynasty and ruled in 559–530. BC e.; **Xerxes** carefully prepared for a campaign in Greece, taking care of the army and finding a way to cross Hellespont: he made two pontoon bridges more than a kilometer long; **Shahanshah Khosrow** was an enlightened lord, he patronized sciences and arts; The fact that in 1967 the last shah of the Pahlavi dynasty **Mohammad Reza** crowned his wife **Farah Diba** is not taken into account, because he still remained the ruler*).

When we talk about the realities of national culture, we can't skip realias or non-equivalent lexis. They aren't at the center of the linguocultural image of Iran, but they fulfill the semantic field and make it more obvious and diverse. They are naturally a premise for the expansion of its boundaries. Realias are "words and phrases that name objects that are characteristic of the everyday life (culture, society and history) of a specific nation; Usually they don't have numerous equivalents in the common language. Therefore, they can't be translated into mainstream sources. That's why realias require special care" [Vlakhov 2012: 47]. In the end realeas aren't just fullfiling a referential function. They are always carrying a lot of background information, which firmly connects them with the development of national culture.

Among non-equivalent lexemes certain persistent groups can also be distinguished. The most popular, is one group that names people according to their social status and occupation. Firstly, it is the names of the political elite: *shah, emir, mirza, khan, sultan, vizier, ayatollah, rahbar*. Secondly, there are the names of the military personnel: *sardar, sarbaz, bagadyran, serkheng, sartip-evvel, naib-serkheng, pahlevan*. At last, we have officials and representatives of different professions: *nyuker, naib, gulam-pishkhimet, eunuch, khoja, chaparkhan, ferrash, mukhessil, sadrazam, naib, kafechi, kebabchi, shcherbetdar, hakim-bashi, tufendar, abdar, sunduktar, dervish, agda, siga*. Here are a few examples: «*Приезд **шах-зиды** // **Шах-зиды**, большие и малые. // Лошади **шах-зиды** славные; день кроткий, бессолнечный; с обеих сторон пригорки, слои белые, глинистые, из которой дома строятся*» [А. Грибоедов «Путевые заметки»] (*translated by the author: "The arrival of the **shahzid** // **Shahzids**, big and small. // The horses of **shahzids** are glorious; the day is meek, sunless; hills are on both sides, layers looks like a white clay that is used to build houses"*); **Сарбазы** *убегали, эти разбойники втыкали штыки себе в животы, чтоб не сдаваться бывшей родине, России; Бородатый и тучный хан, бывший **сардар** Эриванский, говорит другому, узкобородому...; **Багадераны**. По-тамошнему значит: богатыри. Стали отличаться; У шахского **гарем-ханэ**, наискосок через переулок, сидели двое бахадеран, его солдаты, и мирно спали; **Серхенг** Ениколопов был брат евнуха, Манучехр-хана, беглый русский поручик* [Ю. Н. Тынянов. Смерть Вазир-Мухтара] (*translated by the author: "**Sarbazes** fled, these bandits slaughtered themselves because they didn't want to surrender to their former homeland, Russia; The bearded and obese khan, the former **sardar** of Erivan, talked with another narrow-bearded...; **Bagaderans**. In the local language it means heroes; At the shah's **harem-khane** across the alley two **bakhaderans**,*

his soldiers, slept peacefully; **Serking** *Enikopov was the brother of a eunuch, Manuchehr Khan, a fugitive Russian lieutenant"*).

It is impossible not to notice that most of the words belong to the periphery of the linguocultural image of Iran and are rather just oriental exoticisms. They are still important, since their composition reflects the social structure of society in the projection on the society of the recipient country. It clearly demonstrates what the "other culture" focuses on and how the "image of the alien" is formed.

The presence of evaluative names of a person in this group of words is interesting. The words with positive connotation (hakim-bashi) and negative connotation (harab, bazanid) are significant due to their rich expressive component. They are often borrowed into other languages, sometimes changing their meanings and assessment: *«Хараб» имеет много значений: дурная дорога, опустевший и развалившийся город, глупый или больной человек* [Ю. Н. Тынянов. Смерть Вазир-Мухтара] *(translated by the author: "Kharab" has many meanings: a bad road, an empty and collapsed city, a stupid or sick person).*

Realias of other semantic groups aren't so common and sit far in the periphery of the field. For example, names of the holidays and the special dates (Ashura, Muharrem, Rezhzheb, Navruz), clothing details (jurabs, jubbes, kajari, coolidji), social signs (jira, kharaj, kururs, amanats, destkhat, firman, zulfa). They are unknown to most native Russian speakers who have not personally encountered Iranian culture. However, their meaning can be easily restored from the context: *Задерживают джиру; Харадж исправный? Пушистые ковры, как трава, приминались под ногами, зо-* лотые сосуды стояли на маленьких столиках, и хорасанские ткани по стенам развешаны были так, что разноцветные стекла казались той же тканью, только светящейся; Это проходил мимо дома военного генерал-губернатора сводный гвардейский полк, возвращавшийся из Персии и везший **куруры и трофеи** [Ю. Тынянов. Смерть Вазир-Мухтара] *(translated by the author: "Stop the jira; Is Kharaj working? Fluffy carpets, like grass, laid the floor, golden vessels stood on small tables, and khorasan fabrics hung on the walls; Guards regiment passed by the house of the military governor-general, they carried kurury and trophies from Persia").*

Thus, the linguocultural image of Iran in the Russian language world picture is historically changeable and undergoes constant transformation (it is diachronic). These changes are influenced by the density of information flow, which is constantly growing. Mainly, due to the rise of interpersonal contacts, the increase of interactions between cultures and evolution of individual highly specialized discourses (professional, social, scientific, educational). Culturally marked information plays the dominant role in the transformation of linguocultural image. It also preserves the national and cultural core of the image. On this basis, we can say that the core of the country image consists of proper names – toponyms and anthroponyms. And the main field of linguocultural image is made up by realias. Significant part of such words are names that come from different occupations. On the periphery of the field are stable speech units – cultural artifacts (names of holidays, clothing details, items of everyday life). They are individually oriented and depend on level of awareness about Iranian culture of the bearer of the Russian language world picture.

Литература

Афшар, М. Имена собственные в лингвокультурном образе Ирана (на материале русских художественных текстов) / М. Афшар // Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики. – 2021. Т. 12, вып. 7. – С. 117–120.

Афшар, М. Трансформации в лингвокультурном образе Персии в романе Ю. Тынянова «Смерть Вазир-Мухтара» в сравнении с «Путевыми записками» А. С. Грибоедова / М. Афшар // Litera. – 2021. – № 12. – С. 158–167.

Аюбов, А. Р. Топонимы как ценное наследие культуры / А. Р. Аюбов // Ученые записки Худжандского государственного университета. Гуманитарные науки. – 2018. – С. 53–57.

Бахтин, М. М. Эстетика словесного творчества / М. М. Бахтин. – М. : Искусство, 1979. – 424 с.

Библер, В. От наукоучения – к логике культуры. Два философских введения в двадцать первый век / В. Библер. – М., 2001. – 411 с.

Бойко, Л. Б. К вопросу о роли антропонима в лингвокультуре / Л. Б. Бойко // Вестник Балтийского федерального университета им. И. Канта. – 2013. – № 2. – С. 13–21.

Верещагин, Е. М. Лингвострановедческая теория слова / Е. М. Верещагин, В. Г. Костомаров. – М. : Русский язык, 1980. – 320 с.

Верещагин, Е. М. Язык и культура. Лингвострановедение в преподавании русского языка как иностранного / Е. М. Верещагин, В. Г. Костомаров. – М. : Русский язык, 1990. – 1037 с.

Влахов, С. Непереводимое в переводе / С. Влахов, С. Флорин. – М. : Международные отношения, 2012. – 406 с.

Воробьев, В. В. Лингвокультурология / В. В. Воробьев. – М., 2006. – 170 с.

Грибоедов, А. С. Статьи. Корреспонденции. Путевые записки. Заметки / А. С. Грибоедов. – Москва ; Ленинград : ГИХЛ, 1959.

Гришаева, Л. И. Введение в теорию межкультурной коммуникации : учебное пособие / Л. И. Гришаева, Л. В. Цурикова. – 2-е изд., доп. – Воронеж : Воронежский государственный университет, 2004. – 424 с.

Громов, А. Б. Персия. История неоткрытой страны / А. Б. Громов, С. Н. Табаи. – М., 2017. – 900 с.

Есенин, С. А. Избранные сочинения / С. А. Есенин. – М. : Худож. лит, 1983. – 426 с.

Кайдаров, А. Т. Этнолингвистические аспекты казахской ономастики / А. Т. Кайдаров, Е. А. Керимбаев // Известия АН КазССР. Серия филологическая. – 1990. – № 3. – С. 2–5.

Карасик, В. И. Культурные доминанты в языке / В. И. Карасик // Языковая личность: культурные концепты : сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград ; Архангельск : Перемена, 1996. – С. 3–16.

Карасик, В. И. О категориях лингвокультурологии / В. И. Карасик // Языковая личность: проблемы коммуникативной деятельности : сб. науч. тр. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2001. – С. 3–16.

Караулов, Ю. Н. Русский язык и языковая личность / Ю. Н. Караулов. – 5-е изд. – М. : КомКнига, 2006. – 262 с.

Красных, В. В. Когнитивная база vs культурное пространство в аспекте изучения языковой личности (к вопросу о русской концептосфере) / В. В. Красных // Язык, сознание, коммуникация. Вып. 1. – М., 1997. – С. 128–144.

Леонтович, О. А. Русские и американцы: парадоксы межкультурного общения / О. А. Леонтович. – Волгоград : Перемена, 2002. – 435 с.

Лотман, Ю. М. Внутри мыслящих миров. Человек – текст – семиосфера – история / Ю. М. Лотман. – М. : Языки русской культуры, 1996.

Макарова, А. Д. Лингвокультурный образ: сущность понятия / А. Д. Макарова // Вестник Челябинского государственного университета. – 2011. – № 33 (248). – С 243–245.

Мартынова, Н. А. Культурные контакты как один из факторов развития языка и культуры / Н. А. Мартынова // Вестник ТГПУ. Серия Гуманитарные науки (Филология). – 2007. – Вып. 2 (65). – С. 58–61.

Маслова, В. А. Лингвокультурология : учеб. пособие для студентов вузов / В. А. Маслова. – М. : Academia, 2001. – 202 с.

Овчинников, В. В. Своими глазами: Страницы путевых дневников / В. В. Овчинников. – М. : Изд-во агентства печати «Новости», 1989. – 382 с.

Собрание произведений Владимира Хлебникова : в 5 т. Т. 3 / под общ. ред. Ю. Тынянова и Н. Степанова. – Л. : Издательство писателей в Ленинграде, 1931. – 392 с.

Степанов, Ю. С. Константы: Словарь русской культуры / Ю. С. Степанов. – изд. 2-е, испр. и доп. – М. : Академический проспект, 2001. – 990 с.

Суперанская, А. В. Теория и методика ономастических исследований / А. В. Суперанская [и др.]. – М., 2007. – 254 с.

Таскаева, А. В. Лингвокультурный образ «детектив»: (на материале детективных романов Артура Конан Дойла о Шерлоке Холмсе и Агаты Кристи об Эркюле Пуаро) : дис. ... канд. филол. наук / Таскаева А. В. – Челябинск, 2009. – 188 с.

Цуй, Ливэй. Языковые средства создания линвокультурного образа Китая в лингвокультуре дальневосточной эмиграции / Цуй, Ливэй // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Русский и иностранные языки и методика их преподавания. – 2015. – № 4. – С. 112–119.

Шаклеин, В. М. Лингвокультурология: традиции и инновации : монография / В. М. Шаклеин. – Москва : Флинта, 2012. – 301 с.

Afshar, M. Linguistic and Cultural Image of Persia in "Travel Notes" by A. S. Griboedov / M. Afshar // The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioral. – 2019. – No. 310. – P. 2328–2333.

References

Afshar, M. (2019). Linguistic and Cultural Image of Persia in "Travel Notes" by A. S. Griboedov. In *The European Proceedings of Social & Behavioral*. No. 310, pp. 2328–2333.

Afshar, M. (2021). Imena sobstvennye v lingvokul'turnom obraze Irana (na materiale russkikh khudozhestvennykh tekstov) [Proper Names in the Linguocultural Image of Iran (Based on Russian Literary Texts)]. In *Filologicheskie nauki. Voprosy teorii i praktiki*. Vol. 12. Issue 7, pp. 117–120.

Afshar, M. (2021). Transformatsii v lingvokul'turnom obraze Persii v romane Yu. Tynyanova «Smert' Vazir-Muhtara» v sravnenii s «Putevymi zapiskami» A. S. Griboedova [Transformations in the Linguocultural Image of Persia in Y. Tynyanov's Novel "Death of Vazir-Mukhtar" in Comparison with "Travel Notes" by A. S. Griboedov] In *Litera*. No. 12, pp. 158–167.

Ayubov, A. R. (2018). Toponimy kak tsennoe nasledie kul'tury [Toponyms as a Valuable Culture Heritage] In *Uchenye zapiski Khudzhandskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta. Gumanitarnye nauki*, pp. 53–57.

Bakhtin, M. M. (1979). *Estetika slovesnogo tvorchestva* [Aesthetics of Verbal Creativity]. Moscow, Iskusstvo. 424 p.

Bibler, V. (2001). *Ot naukoucheniya – k logike kul'tury. Dva filosofskikh vvedeniya v dvadtsat' pervyi vek* [From Science Teaching to the Logic of Culture. Two Philosophical Introductions to the Twenty-First Century]. Moscow. 411 p.

Boyko, L. B. (2013). K voprosu o roli antroponima v lingvokulture [On the Question of the Role of the Anthroponym in Linguistic Culture]. In *Vestnik Baltiiskogo federal'nogo universiteta im. I. Kanta*. No. 2, pp. 13–21.

Cui, Liwei. (2015). Yazykovye sredstva sozdaniya linvokulturnogo obraza Kitaya v lingvokulture dalnevostochnoi emigratsii [Linguistic Tools of Creating a Linguocultural Image of China in the Linguoculture of the Far Eastern Emigration]. In *Vestnik Rossiiskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Russkii i inostrannye yazyki i metodika ikh prepodavaniya*. No. 4, pp. 112–119.

Esenin, S. A. (1983). *Izbrannye sochineniya* [Selected Works]. Moscow, Khudozestvennaya literatura. 426 p.

Griboedov, A. S. (1959). *Stat'i. Korrespondentsii. Putevye zapiski. Zametki* [Articles. Correspondence. Travel Notes. Notes]. Moscow, Leningrad, GIKhL.

Grishaeva, L. I., Tsurikova, L. V. (2004). *Vvedenie v teoriyu mezhkulturnoi kommunikatsii* [Introduction to the Theory of Intercultural Communication]. 2nd edition. Voronezh, Voronezhskii gosudarstvennyi universitet. 424 p.

Gromov, A. B. (2017). *Persiya. Istoriya neotkrytoi strany* [Persia. History of an Undiscovered Country]. Moscow. 900 p.

Kaidarov, A. T., Kerimbaev, E. A. (1990). Etnolingvisticheskie aspekty kazakhskoi onomastiki [Ethnolinguistic Aspects of Kazakh Onomastics]. In *Izvestiya AN KazSSR. Seriya filologicheskaya*. No. 3, pp. 2–5.

Karasik, V. I. (1996). Kul'turnye dominanty v yazyke [Cultural Dominants in the Language]. In *Yazykovaya lichnost': kul'turnye kontsepty: sb. nauch. tr.* Volgograd, Peremena, pp. 3–16.

Karasik, V. I. (2001). O kategoriyakh lingvokul'turologii [About the Categories of Linguoculturology]. In *Yazykovaya lichnost': problemy kommunikativnoi deyatel'nosti: sb. nauch. tr.* Volgograd, Peremena, pp. 3–16.

Karaulov, Yu. N. (2006). *Russkii yazyk i yazykovaya lichnost'* [Russian Language and Linguistic Personality]. 5th edition. Moscow, KomKniga. 262 p.

Krasnykh, V. V. (1997). Kognitivnaya baza vs kulturnoe prostranstvo v aspekte izucheniya yazykovoi lichnosti (k voprosu o russkoi kontseptosfere) [Cognitive Base vs Cultural Space in the Aspect of the Study of Linguistic Personality (Question of the Russian Concept Sphere)]. In *Yazyk, soznanie, kommunikatsiya*. No. 1, pp. 128–144.

Leontovich, O. A. (2002). *Russkie i amerikantsy: paradoksy mezhkulturnogo obshcheniya* [Russians and Americans: Paradoxes of Intercultural Communication]. Volgograd, Peremena. 435 p.

Lotman, Yu. M. (1996). *Vnutri myslyashchikh mirov. Chelovek – tekst – semiosfera – istoriya* [Inside the Thinking Worlds. Man – Text – Semiosphere – History]. Moscow, Yazyki russkoi kultury.

Makarova, A. D. (2011). Lingvokul'turnyi obraz: sushchnost' ponyatiya [Linguistic and Cultural Image: The Essence of the Concept]. In *Vestnik Chelyabinskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta*. No. 33 (248), pp. 243–245.

Martynova, N. A. (2007). Kul'turnye kontakty kak odin iz faktorov razvitiya yazyka i kul'tury [Cultural Contacts as One of the Factors in the Development of Language and Culture]. In *Vestnik TGPU. Seriya Gumanitarnye nauki (Filologiya)*. Issue 2 (65), pp. 58–61.

Maslova, V. A. (2001). *Lingvokul'turologiya* [Linguoculturology]. Moscow, Academia. 202 p.

Ovchinnikov, V. V. (1989). *Svoimi glazami: Stranitsy putevykh dnevnikov* [With My Own Eyes: Pages of Travel Diaries]. Moscow, Izdatel'stvo agentstva pechati «Novosti». 382 p.

Shaklein, V. M. (2012). *Lingvokulturologiya: traditsii i innovatsii* [Linguoculturology: Traditions and Innovations]. Moscow, Flinta. 301 p.

Stepanov, Yu. S. (2001). *Konstanty: Slovar' russkoi kul'tury* [Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture]. 2nd edition. Moscow, Akademicheskii prospekt. 990 p.

Superanskaya, A. V. et al. (2007). *Teoriya i metodika onomasticheskikh issledovanii* [Theory and Methods of Onomastic Research]. Moscow. 254 p.

Taskaeva, A. V. (2009). *Lingvokul'turnyi obraz «detektiv»: (na materiale detektivnykh romanov Artura Konan Doila o Sherloke Kholmse i Agaty Kristi ob Erkyule Puaro)* [Linguistic and Cultural Image of the "Detective" (Based on Detective Novels by Arthur Conan Doyle about Sherlock Holmes and Agatha Christie books about Hercule Poirot)]. Dis. ... kand. filol. nauk. Chelyabinsk. 188 p.

Tynyanov, I., Stepanov, N. (Eds.). (1931). *Sobranie proizvedenii Vladimira Khlebnikova: v 5 t.* [Collected Works of Vladimir Khlebnikov, in 5 vols.]. Vol. 3. Leningrad, Izdatelstvo pisatelei v Leningrade. 392 p.

Vereshchagin, E. M., Kostomarov, V. G. (1980). *Lingvostranovedcheskaya teoriya slova* [Linguistic and Regional Theory of the Words]. Moscow, Russkii yazyk. 320 p.

Vereshchagin, E. M., Kostomarov, V. G. (1990). *Yazyk i kultura. Lingvostranovedenie v prepodavanii russkogo yazyka kak inostrannogo* [Language and Culture. Linguistic and Regional Studies in Teaching Russian as Foreign Language]. Moscow, Russkii yazyk. 1037 p.

Vlakhov, S., Florin, S. (2012). *Neperevodimoe v perevode* [Untranslatable in Translation]. Moscow, Mezhdunarodnye otnosheniya. 406 p.

Vorobyev, V. V. (2006). *Linguoculturologiya* [Linguoculturology]. Moscow. 170 p.

Данные об авторах

Шаклеин Виктор Михайлович – доктор филологических наук, профессор, заведующий кафедрой русского языка и методики его преподавания, Российский университет дружбы народов (Москва, Россия).

Адрес: 117198, Россия, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6.
E-mail: shaklein_vm@pfur.ru.

Афшар Мона – аспирант, Российский университет дружбы народов (Москва, Россия).

Адрес: 117198, Россия, Москва, ул. Миклухо-Маклая, 6.
E-mail: monaaf@mail.ru.

Authors' information

Shaklein Victor Mikhailovich – Doctor of Philology, Professor, Head of Department of Russian Language and Methods of Teaching, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (Moscow, Russia).

Afshar Mona – Postgraduate Student, Peoples' Friendship University of Russia (Moscow, Russia).