

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.22.03>.

UDC: 800: 159.9 + 800: 316



Andriy A. Moroz

Berdyansk State Pedagogical University,
Berdyansk, Ukraine

THE FRENCH LANGUAGE AND CULTURE FROM THE VIEWPOINT OF RUSSIANS DURING THE CRIMEAN WAR OF 1853–1856 (LINGUOIMAGOLOGICAL ASPECT)

Bibliographic Description:

Moroz, A. (2022). The French Language and Culture from the Viewpoint of Russians during the Crimean War of 1853–1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 23, 5–18. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.22.03>

Abstract

The article analyzes the view of the Russian soldiers, officers and journalists on their opponents – the French during the Russian-Turkish war of 1853–1856 from the position of linguoimagology. For the study, memoirs of participants of the Crimean War, journal notes and letters were selected. The assessment given to the enemy by the Russians is of a particular interest. Based on the results of the study, the author comes to the conclusion that there was no universal image of the French as an enemy in the Russian society in the mid-19th century, which was facilitated by the presence of common cultural values among both the Russians and the French. An important factor was the French language, which was close or native to Russian aristocrats from their childhood. For the assessment's verbalization, the following means were used: exclamation marks and ellipses, meliorative epithets and attributes, vernaculars, vulgarisms, jargon, metaphors, non-equivalent vocabulary and figurative expressions. Barbarisms were used to ridicule the admiration of the Russian nobles for the French language. Such a detail as the desire of the French to give their names to the terrain of a foreign state is noted, too. The authors also use precedent statements to show that the opponents were quite familiar with each other.

Keywords: linguoimagology, assessment, enemy, image, verbalization, values.

1. Introduction.

In recent years, the problems of national mutual perception have become relevant in the domestic and European science of the humanitarian cycle. The main reason for this is the logic of science development itself, since without taking into account the peculiarities of interethnic reception, it is impossible to understand general cultural laws, and, secondly, the process of globalization, as well as the desire

of mankind to preserve and regulate the life of society as a multinational unity. Scientists in the field of cultural linguistics, ethnolinguistics, ethnopsycholinguistics and intercultural communication were engaged in a similar research.

The interest in the description and study of interethnic perception issues has its own history of development. In France, Great Britain, Russia, Ukraine, and Germany large-scale works appeared that studied the nature and structure of national images, stereotypes, myths, etc. (T. Denisova, E. Dubinina, L. Ivanova, T. Mikhed, D. Nalivaiko, V. Narivska, V. Orekhov, G. Sivashchenko, V. Khorev and other scholars).

The I Defense of Sevastopol, in which the languages and cultures of the Russians, the British and the French converged, is of particular interest from the standpoint of linguoimagology. L. Orekhova conducted a study of the imagological discourse of the Russian-Turkish war of 1853–1856 from the standpoint of literary criticism (Орехова, 2010). N. Ishchenko defended the thesis on myth-making (Ищенко, 2008).

2. Literature Review.

From the standpoint of linguistics, the image of the nation was considered in the works by L. Ivanova, who proposed the term “linguoimagology”: “Genre foundations of linguoimagological analysis” (Иванова, 2016-a), “Russian Berlin in the linguoimagological aspect” (Иванова, 2016-b), “Medialinguistics in the linguoimagological aspect” (Иванова, 2017-a), “French literature and writers in the perception of Russian writers of the 19th century” (Иванова, 2017-b), “Synergetics of the images of the author and the main character in the literary text (linguoimagological aspect)” (Иванова, 2019).

The thesis by A. Tupchiy (Тупчий, 2018) analyzes the image of England in the Russian linguistic consciousness of the late 16th – first half of the 19th century from the viewpoint of linguoimagology. The author examines, first of all, the assessment of the image of England in Russian-language sources, its linguistic embodiment, as well as the dynamics of this assessment over the specified period. The following aspects are investigated: a) assessment of the country and its inhabitants by the authors of the texts (recipients); b) assessment of the indicated recipients and their texts by the author of the thesis, that is, the assessment of the assessors and their characteristics (Тупчий, 2018, p. 26).

3. Methodology.

Showing the complex nature of assessing the enemy’s image, it is necessary to apply a special method to its analysis. It should be based on the accumulated linguistic knowledge, methods, techniques and approaches to the analysis of linguistic facts.

The linguoimagological method of studying the image is a set of techniques and procedures of an integrated approach to assessment in different languages to establish the laws of its verbalization.

To analyze the linguoimagological aspect of the opposition “Our” – “Alien” in this article, we use the descriptive method – a system of research methods used to characterize the phenomena of language at the stage of its development. This is a method of synchronous analysis.

The descriptive method consists of the following steps. At the first stage, we disclose the microtexts containing the opponent’s assessment in the Russian-Turkish war of 1853–1856, then we divide the microtexts into sentences, phrases, and, finally, words containing the assessment.

Conducting the research, we group lexemes in thematic groups-linguoimagothemes, which are divided into subsections called “linguoimagologemes”. Each linguoimagologeme consists of lexemes related to each other by a common theme. So, in the linguoimagologeme “business qualities of the English” the lexemes “business”, “activity”, “energy”, “diligence” are selected for the analysis (Mopoz, 2017).

At the third stage, we interpret nominative-communicative and structural units. Structural interpretation is done by using categorical and discrete analysis.

The method of discrete analysis is in the fact that the structural unit include small, further indivisible boundary signs.

The analysis of the assessment is carried out according to N. Arutyunova’s classification, which distinguishes emotional, aesthetic, ethical, sensory (visual and auditory), quantitative, rational, and logical assessments (Арутюнова, 1988, p. 181). E. Wolf points out that “assessment can be considered as one of the types of modalities that are superimposed on the descriptive content of linguistic expression” (Вольф, 2006, p. 11).

In this work, assessment, as a category of linguoimagology, is understood as the attitude of speakers to an object, conditioned by the recognition or non-recognition of its value from the viewpoint of compliance or non-compliance of its qualities with certain value criteria.

4. Aim and Objectives.

The **aim** of the article is to convey the means of verbalizing the image of the French from the viewpoint of Russians during the military events of 1853–1856 on the Crimean Peninsula. Such a question has never been raised in linguistics before.

When considering issues related to linguoimagology, the key point is the analysis of the concept of “image”:

“*Immagine* (picture, image) from *imitare* (to imitate), which, in turn, goes back to the late Latin *imitare*, it corresponds to the Latin classical *imitari*, which is intensive from *imare*, from *imago* (picture, image). Obviously, it goes back to the Indo-European root *Em* with the semantics ‘double, dicotyledonous fruit’” (Dizionario etimologico, 2005, p. 476–477).

“The indicated root contains the meaning of similarity. The meanings were transformed step by step: a half of the fruit is similar to the other half, then a metonymic transfer took place according to the *nomina acti* model ‘make it similar, imitate’. Then metonymy according to the model ‘action – its result’ gave the

meaning ‘picture’ – which is depicted in reality and reflects its appearance as much as possible. Further metaphorical transfer gave the meaning ‘image’ (of a person, country, company, etc.)” (Dizionario etimologico, 2005, p. 476–477).

Thus, in the internal history of the word “image” we observe the meaning of similarity, likeness, conformity to something.

The main differences between linguoimagology and imagology are as follows:

1. Linguoimagology is primarily concerned with the study of linguistic means of presenting the assessment of the particular people;
2. The material for imagological analysis is journalism, linguoimagological analysis – artistic speech, memoirs, and travel notes.
3. Reciprocity is not assumed, although it is of some interest.

It should be noted that synchronicity is important for the linguoimagological analysis: the assessment of peoples, countries and cultures, as a rule, changes in different eras.

5. Results and discussion.

Within the framework of linguoimagology, the author, the bearer of the national culture, assesses the foreign culture from his own position, which makes it possible to study the culture of both peoples on the basis of the corresponding texts. As a result of numerous studies, we have the reason to assert that the assessment does not characterize the assessed so much, as the assessor. Thus, linguoimagology provides data for the analysis of both cultures. “Let us emphasize that in the process of perceiving a new person, first of all, he or she sees something that differs from his / her native culture, so there is an opportunity to study culture from the opposite side” (Иванова, 2017-b, p. 76).

Communicating with representatives of other peoples, we will definitely assess them, extrapolating our opinion to the people as a whole.

The reflection in the language of the characteristic features of the national personality is one of the pressing problems of modern linguistics. Languages fix the most essential concepts for the culture of the corresponding people or significantly ignore them (Карасик, 2002, p. 145).

Consequently, using the material of the Russian language, one can trace what was primarily of interest to the Russian people in the French language and culture of the mid-19th century.

“Each historically formed collective – people, class, union, city, village, etc. – perceives, imagines, assesses, loves and hates the objectively current situation, the conditions of its being, this very being in its own way – and it is in this attitude to everything that objectively, its ‘spirit’ or ‘soul’ or ‘character’ in a real sense are expressed” (Шпет, 1996, p. 9).

From this we can conclude that the view of a Russian person on the French of the mid-19th century is special. The authors of the publications pass the French language and culture through themselves, focusing on the most interesting, from their point of view, aspects.

It should be noted that the number of memoirs published in Russian is much less than memoirs in French. L. Orekhova notes: “The stories ‘from the war’ enjoyed the special trust and respect of the reader. There weren’t many of them. There couldn’t be many. And the obstacles of censorship delayed the already difficult path from author to reader” (Орехова, 2010, p. 364).

So, in order to reveal the popular point of view as accurately as possible, we rely on the exemplary texts of the most prominent representatives of a particular ethnic group, since these are they who are able to embody the vision of their people. We subjected to the linguoimagological analysis the essays by N. Berg; “The Sevastopol Sketches” by L. Tolstoy and the novel by S. Sergeyev-Tsensky “Sevastopol Labors”. N. Berg is a participant in the Crimean campaign, a staff officer, and is rightfully considered as the first war correspondent of the Russian Empire (Орехова, 2010, p. 367). L. Tolstoy also took an active part in fighting against the French and shared with his impressions and assessments of the enemy in the stories. As for the novel by S. Sergeyev-Tsensky, its interest is in the fact that the author meticulously collected all the information about the war, using archival data, memoirs and letters of participants in the events, put them in the form of a literary work.

Using the above-mentioned material, we will consider the attitude of the Russian military to the French soldiers and try to answer the question of how the French language and French culture, instilled in Russian officers from childhood, influenced the attitude of Russians towards the French enemy during the Russian-Turkish war of 1853–1856.

The attitude of the Russians of the mid-19th century to the French language is of particular interest in the framework of linguoimagology. This language was often used in the literature of the mid-19th century. In his first story “Sevastopol in December” L. Tolstoy gives the following example (the translation of the source fragments into English is presented by us in this case and the others):

“– Vous êtes blessé? (Вы ранены?) – сказал ему Наполеон. – Je vous demande pardon, sire, je suis tué (Извините, государь, я убит), – и адъютант упал с лошади и умер на месте” (Толстой, 1987, p. 41) (Vous êtes blessé? (Are you injured?) Napoleon told him. – Je vous demande pardon, sire, je suis tué (Sorry, sir, I am killed), – and the adjutant fell from his horse and died on the spot).

Here, a Russian officer, thinking about the upcoming battle and possible death, did not find a better example than from the history of the Napoleonic wars. There is also a precedent text (a dictum of a historical person).

The French history was well taught in Russia and was very carefully studied by the younger generations. Even such a concept as “courage” is conveyed with the use of its French equivalent “bravoure de gentilhomme” (courage of a nobleman) (Толстой, 1987, p. 61). Thus, the author also applies barbarisms (gallicisms). According to O. Emelyanova, barbarisms perform two functions. “Firstly, they convey some unusual concepts and create a ‘local flavor’ that characterizes the life of different countries and peoples. ... secondly, barbarisms, or rather, speech saturated

with them, is one of the means for ridiculing those who worship everything foreign” (Емельянова, 2003, p. 23–24).

The Russian journalists and authors of memoirs are critical of their fellow citizens who speak French at home:

“Она говорила по-французски, как это было принято во дворце Николая, хотя война велась главным образом с французами и они преобладали численно в десантной армии, в Крыму, а русский язык Елена Павловна знала очень неплохо” (Сергеев-Ценский, URL: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada). (She spoke French, as was customary in the palace of Nicholas, although the war was fought mainly with the French and they prevailed numerically in the landing army, in the Crimea, and Elena Pavlovna knew Russian very well).

As it can be seen from the example, the author contrasts the tradition of speaking French in everyday life and the conduct of hostilities with the French, i.e. emphasizes the fact that the Russian nobles preferred to express themselves in the language of the enemy.

We should note that the literate population of the Russian Empire in the middle of the 19th century could at least understand certain words in spite the fact people did not speak French fluently. The proof of this is the barbarism that is inserted into the description of the French village on the outskirts of Sevastopol:

“И в два-три дня на пустынных до того берегах появился целый густо населенный деревянный город, игриво названный французами Petit Paris. В этом маленьком Париже на правильно разбитых прямых улицах запестрели даже и вывески маркитанток, парикмахеров и прочих необходимых для войск людей” (Сергеев-Ценский, URL: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada). (And in two or three days on the previously deserted shores a whole densely populated wooden city appeared, playfully called by the French Petit Paris. In this little Paris, on correctly laid out straight streets, even the signs of marquitants, hairdressers and other people necessary for the troops were full of colours).

The author of the narrative introduces barbarisms, because he is sure that it will not be a problem for the reader to understand a word written in a foreign language.

It should be emphasized that the attention of the Russian journalists is not directed to the use of the English language by Russians: at that time, English was not known to the majority of the literate population of the Russian Empire of Nicholas I and Alexander II, let alone ordinary soldiers. It should be underlined that the strong cultural ties between the Russian Empire and France were not limited only to peacetime. The two powers had fought against each other not so long ago in the French Invasion of Russia of 1812, and everyone remembered the experience of Alexander’s I victory over Napoleon. As for England, the two empires – Russian and English – fought against each other for the first time:

“Воевать с русскими войсками им приходилось в первый раз за всю историю Англии и России” (Сергеев-Ценский, URL: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada). (They had to fight the Russian troops for the first time in the history of England and Russia).

Very often in the speech of the highest dignitaries of Russia in the middle of the 19th century, the alternation of the Russian language with French is used, i.e. bilingualism is present here:

“– Они не должны возникать, – что там исчезнут! – крикнул, уже не сдерживаясь, Николай. – За распускание подобных слухов – в Сибирь подлецов! – перешел он на русский язык, как более сильный и подходящий к моменту. – Это – дело столичной полиции брать за шиворот всякого, кто только повторяет подлеиший этот слух!.. Войска Меншикова отступили в полном порядке!.. Потери наши ничтожны! Укрепления возведены! Орудия везде поставлены. И пусть-ка сунутся эти господа к Севастополю! Им устроят такой салют, что они едва ли унесут ноги! Да, они не унесут ног: Севастополь будет для них могилой!.. Могилой, да!” (Сергеев-Ценский, URL: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada). (– They should not arise – that they will disappear there! – shouted, no longer holding back, Nikolas. – For spreading such rumors – scoundrels to Siberia! – he switched to Russian, as a stronger and more suitable language for the moment. – It is the business of the metropolitan police to take by the collar anyone who only repeats this vilest rumor! ... Menshikov’s troops retreated in perfect order! ... Our losses are insignificant! The fortifications have been erected! The guns are everywhere. And let these gentlemen stick out to Sevastopol! They will be given such a salute that they can hardly carry away their feet! Yes, they will not carry their feet: Sevastopol will be a grave for them! ... A grave, yes!).

The author is inclined to consider the Russian language as a stronger one. In the sentence to convey the emphatic speech of Nicholas I, exclamation marks and ellipses are used, which only emphasize the expressiveness of the statement. Also, the vernacular “сунутся” (stick out), “унесут ноги” (carry away their feet) and the metaphor “могилой” (grave) are used.

A paradoxical situation is in the following example:

“Охрана моста была, но она была незначительная, разумеется, и куда же ей было отстоять мост. Лейтенант Сатин заведовал мостом. В таких передрыгах никогда не бывал, а тут недалеко, шагах в тридцати, Нахимов. Кричит ему Сатин по-французски: ‘L’ennemi s’approche, – que faire avec le pont?’” (Сергеев-Ценский, URL: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada). (The bridge was guarded, but it was insignificant, of course, and how could the bridge be defended. Lieutenant Satin was in charge of the bridge. He has never been in such troubles, but here not far, about thirty paces away, is Nakhimov. Satine shouts to him in French: “L’ennemi s’approche, – que faire avec le pont?”).

The Russian authors of memoirs emphasize that the highest circles of the Russian Empire, even in everyday life, not to mention official receptions, communicated in French:

“В первой комнате, куда мы вошли, собралось все семейство князя: княгиня, женщина с добродушным выражением в лице, дочь князя, уже невеста, и еще двое-трое знакомых. Все общество говорило по-французски” (Берг, 1856, p. 139). (In the first room, where we entered, the whole family of the

prince gathered: the princess, a woman with a good-natured expression on her face, the prince's daughter, already a bride, and two or three more acquaintances. The whole society spoke French).

The French language is used not only by the aristocracy and officers, but also by nurses:

“– Гм! Проводите их, – сказала она (старшая медсестра – А.М.) молодой сестре, по-французски, – вот сюда, – а сама подошла с фельдшером к раненому” (Толстой, 1987, р. 86). (– Hm! Escort them, – she (head nurse – А.М.) said to the young sister, in French, – here, – and she went with the paramedic to the wounded).

During the siege of Sevastopol by the French, there were truces. The war was still of a gentlemanly character:

“В сущности же, хотя и был на перемирии, он не успел сказать там ничего очень умного, хотя ему и ужасно хотелось поговорить с французами (ведь это ужасно весело говорить с французами)” (Толстой, 1987, р. 57). (In fact, although he was at the truce, he did not have time to say anything very clever there, although he terribly wanted to talk to the French (after all, it is terribly fun to talk to the French)).

Here L. Tolstoy is either ironic or really thinks so. However, one should not forget that there is a bloody war and losses on both sides reach up to 1000 people a day and, to put it mildly, there's no time for fun.

In the following example, one can observe the politeness on the part of a French officer, noted by a Russian participant in the events:

“– *Si vous voulez bien garder cela comme souvenir de cette rencontre, vous m'obligerez.* – И учтивый француз выдувает папироску и подает офицеру сигарочницу с маленьким поклоном. Офицер дает ему свою, и все присутствующие в группе, как французы, так и русские, кажутся очень довольными и улыбаются” (Толстой, 1987, р. 59). (– *Si vous voulez bien garder cela comme souvenir de cette rencontre, vous m'obligerez.* – And the courteous Frenchman blows out a cigarette and gives the officer a cigar-case with a small bow. The officer gives him his, and all those present in the group, both French and Russian, seem very pleased and smile). Here the reclamation attribute «учтивый» (courteous) is used.

There was a war going on that had not been in Russia for a long time, a war of several world powers. And what were Russian aristocrats doing at their leisure? They were reading French novels!:

“Доложив генералу все, что нужно было, он пришел в свою комнату, в которой, уже давно вернувшись и дожидаясь его, сидел князь Гальцин, читая ‘*Splendeur et misères des courtisanes*’ (‘Роскошь и убожество куртизанок’, роман Бальзака. Одна из тех милых книг, которых развелось такая пропасть в последнее время и которые пользуются особенной популярностью почему-то между нашею молодежью), которую нашел на столе Калугина” (Толстой, 1987, р. 49). (Having reported to the general everything that was needed, he came to his room, in which, having long since returned and waiting for him, sat Prince

Galtsin, reading “Splendeur et misères des courtisanes” (“The Splendors and Miseries of Courtesans”, a novel by Balzac. One of those lovely books, which have spread such an abyss lately and which are especially popular for some reason between our youth), which I found on Kalugin’s table).

In this example, there is an obvious irony, since the meliorative epithet “МИЛЫЙ” (lovely) is adjacent to the colloquial “развелось ... пропасть” (spread ... abyss).

The Russians were not alone in their desire for intercultural communication. French also tried to learn a lot about the Russian culture. Even A. Dumas wrote in his novel “Mémoires d’un maître d’armes, ou dix huit mois à Saint-Pétersbourg” that the French tried to enter the service of the Russian nobles as governesses, teachers of the French language, music, fencing, and so on. They, however, were not always a success, since all the prestigious positions had been already occupied by other French specialists (Dumas, 1840, p. 27). Thus, there was an interaction of cultures.

Unlike the officers, the Russian soldier did not understand French, as he often could neither read nor write even in Russian. And in general, an ordinary soldier called his opponents in his own way:

“– Так это ж они, ваше благородие, до храницуза дрова тянут! – очень оживился казак с серьгой.

И двое других подхватили:

– А известно, до храницуза!.. А то до англичанов” (Сергеев-Ценский, URL: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada).

(– So it is they, your honor, pulling firewood to the French! – the Cossack with the earring perked up very much.

And the other two picked up:

– And you know, to the French!.. Or to the English).

But ordinary soldiers, according to L. Tolstoy, were happy to talk to the French enemy:

“– Рус бун, – говорит солдат в розовой рубашке, причем присутствующие покатываются со смеху. – Франсе нет бун, бонжур, мусье, – говорит солдат в розовой рубашке, сразу уж выпуская весь свой заряд знаний языка, и треплет француза по животу и смеется. Французы тоже смеются” (Толстой, 1987, p. 59). (“Rus boon,” says a soldier in a pink shirt, and those present roll with laughter. “Francais no boon, bonjour, monsieur”, says a soldier in a pink shirt, immediately releasing his entire charge of knowledge of the language, and pats the Frenchman on the stomach and laughs. The French also laugh).

There were, however, in the works about the Eastern War of 1853–1856 the episodes when the attitude of Russians towards the French was extremely negative. As an example, let’s describe a shouting from a company commander:

“– Ребята! смотри, молодцами у меня! С ружей не палить, а штыками их, каналий” (Толстой, 1987, p. 47). (– Guys! look, well done with me! Do not shoot with guns but use your bayonets against these rascals).

Further, L. Tolstoy writes: *“– Сук(ин) сын... Дай только добраться, тогда попробуешь штыка трехгранного русского, проклятый! – заговорил ротный*

командир так громко, что батальонный командир должен был приказать ему молчать и не шуметь так много” (Толстой, 1987, р. 48). (– Son of the bitch ... Let me just get there, then you will try the three-sided Russian bayonet, damn it! – the company commander spoke so loudly that the battalion commander had to order him to be silent and not make so much noise).

As can be seen from the example, the company commander, who did not belong to the highest military caste, could afford to scold the enemy, which was not allowed by the commanders of the highest or middle echelon. Here vulgarisms are introduced. According to O. Emelyanova, “... vulgarisms are used, as a rule, in the speech of characters as a characterological means” (Емельянова, 2003, р. 34). Consequently, the author assesses his hero as a person of low culture.

6. Conclusions.

Thus, we conclude that the French language and French culture, transferred to the Russian land, could not but influence the positive attitude towards the enemy. The Russian writers of the mid-19th century have always treated the French better than the English. This is evidenced by the memoirs of direct participants in the events. During this war, armistice, and a polite attitude between the officers of the belligerent parties, the exchange of prisoners, and much more were possible, which became unthinkable during the First World War, not to mention the Second one.

Among the modern intelligentsia, the prevailing opinion is that it is possible to visit the grave of Napoleon, but it is completely unthinkable to visit the grave of Hitler (if there was one).

After the defeat, when Russia was forbidden to have warships on the Black Sea, the aristocracy, the highest and middle military personnel did not stop speaking French. There was no common image of the French enemy in the Russian society in the mid-19th century, which was facilitated by the presence of common cultural values among both Russians and French. An important factor was the French language, which was close or native to Russian aristocrats from childhood. To verbalize the assessment of the French language and culture in the linguoimagological aspect by the authors participating in the events of the Russian-Turkish war of 1853–1856 the following means were used: exclamation marks and ellipses, meliorative epithets and attributes, adverbs, vulgarisms, jargon, metaphors, non-equivalent vocabulary and figurative expressions. Barbarisms are used to ridicule the admiration of the Russian nobles for the French language. Such a detail as the desire of the French to give their names to the area of a foreign state is noted, too. The authors use precedent statements. Participants in the events and writers describing the era disapprove of the use of the French language by the Russian aristocracy in everyday life. Condemnation of this detail can be seen in almost all of the analyzed works about the Eastern War of 1853–1856.

In the future, we plan to conduct a study of the other aspects of the view of Russian soldiers, officers and journalists on their opponents.

References

- Dizionario etimologico. (2005). *Trento: Dizionario etimologico. Edizione Aggiornata. Rusconilibri* [Etymological dictionary. Updated Edition. Rusconilibri]. 512 p. [in Italian].
- Dumas, A. (1840). *Mémoires d'un maître d'armes, ou dix huit mois à Saint-Petersbourg* [Memoirs of a Master of Arms, or Eighteen Months in Saint Petersburg]. Paris: Dumont. 276 p. [in French].
- Арутюнова, Н. Д. (1988). *Типы языковых значений. Оценка. Событие. Факт* [Types of language values. Assessment. Event. Fact]. М.: Наука. 338 с. [in Russian].
- Берг, Н. В. (1856). Из крымских заметок [From the Crimean notes]. *Современник*. Т.58, №8, 131–202. [in Russian].
- Вольф, Е. М. (2006). *Функциональная семантика оценки* [Functional Semantics of Assessment]. М.: КомКнига. 283 с. [in Russian].
- Емельянова, О. Н. (2003). Варваризмы [Barbarisms]. *Стилистический энциклопедический словарь русского языка*. М.: Флинта, 23–25. [in Russian].
- Ищенко, Н. А. (2008). *Міфотворчість у воєнному дискурсі: національний міф про Кримську війну 1853-1856 років у літературі Великої Британії другої половини ХІХ століття* [Myth-making in military discourse: the national myth of the Crimean War of 1853-1856 in the literature of Great Britain of the second half of the XIX century]: дис. ... д-ра філ. наук: 10.02.04. Тавр. нац. ун-т ім. В. І. Вернадського. Сімферополь, 426 с. [in Ukrainian].
- Иванова, Л. П. (2016-а). Жанровые основания лингвоимагологического анализа [Genre foundations of linguoimagological analysis]. *Жанры речи: межд. научн. журнал*. Саратов: Саратовский Национальный исследовательский государственный университет им. Н. Г. Чернышевского, 148–155. [in Russian].
- Иванова, Л. П. (2016-б). *Русский Берлин в лингвоимагологическом аспекте* [Russian Berlin in the linguoimagological aspect]. К.: Издательский дом Дмитрия Бурого. 112 с. [in Russian].
- Иванова, Л. П. (2017-а). Медиалингвистика в лингвоимагологическом аспекте [Medialinguistics in the linguoimagological aspect]. Санкт Петербург: *Международный научный журнал*, № 3 (18), 33–41. [in Russian].
- Иванова, Л. П. (2017-б). Французская литература и литераторы в восприятии русских писателей XIX века [French literature and writers as perceived by Russian writers of the 19th century]. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова*. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов, Вип. 15, К.: Вид-во НПУ імені М. П. Драгоманова, 75–88. [in Russian].
- Иванова, Л. П. (2019). Синергетика образов автора и главного героя в художественном тексте (лингвоимагологический аспект) [Synergetics of the images of the author and the main character in the literary text (linguoimagological aspect)]. *Болгарская русистика*. София, 33–43. [in Russian].
- Иванова, Л. П. (2019). Соотношение лингвоимагологии и межкультурной коммуникации [Correlation between linguoimagology and intercultural communication]. *Науковий вісник Херсонського державного університету*. Херсон: ХДУ, 185–189 [in Russian].
- Карасик, В. И. (2002). *Языковой круг. Личность, концепты, дискурс* [Language circle. Personality, concepts, discourse]. Волгоград: Перемена. 477 с. [in Russian].
- Мороз, А. А. (2017). Соціально-економічний стан Великої Британії середини ХІХ сторіччя очима росіян (лінгвоімагологічний аспект) [Socio-economic state of Great Britain in the mid-nineteenth century from the Russian viewpoint (linguoimagological aspect)]. *Znanstvena misel journal*. №5. Ljubljana, 35–38. [in Ukrainian].
- Орехова, Л. А. (2010). *Крымская Илиада. Крымская (Восточная) война 1853–1856 годов глазами современников: литература, архивы, пресса* [Crimean Iliad. Crimean (Eastern) War of 1853–1856 as seen by contemporaries: literature, archives, press]. Симферополь: SGT. 480 с. [in Russian].

Седых, А. П. (2004). *Языковая личность и этнос (национально-культурные особенности коммуникативного поведения русских и французов)* [Linguistic personality and ethnos (national and cultural features of the communicative behavior of Russians and French)]. М.: Компания Спутник+. 268 с. [in Russian].

Седых, А. П. (2019). *Французская языковая личность: Академический и хроматический дискурс* [The French Linguistic Personality: Academic and Chromatic Discourse]. М.: URSS. 128 с. [in Russian].

Шпет, Г. Г. (1996). *Введение в этническую психологию* [Introduction to Ethnic Psychology]. СПб.: Алтейя; «П.Э.Т». 156 с. [in Russian].

Тупчий, А. В. (2018). *Образ Англии в русском языковом сознании конца XVI – первой половины XIX вв.: лингвоимагологический аспект* [The image of England in the Russian linguistic consciousness at the end of the 16th – first half of the 19th centuries: linguoimagological aspect]: дисс. ... к. филол. наук: 10.02.02, Киев, 426 с. [in Russian].

Sources of Illustrative Material

Сергеев-Ценский, С. Н. *Севастопольская страда* [Sevastopol Labors]. Retrieved February 12, 2022, from: http://librebook.me/sevastopolskaia_strada. [in Russian].

Толстой, Л. Н. (1987). *Севастопольские рассказы* [The Sevastopol Sketches]. М.: Правда. [in Russian].

Бібліографічний опис:

Мороз, А. А. (2022). Французька мова і культура очима росіян під час Кримської війни 1853–1856 років (лінгвоімагологічний аспект). *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 23, 90–110. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.22.03>.

Анотація

У статті аналізується погляд російських солдатів, офіцерів та журналістів на своїх супротивників – французів під час Російсько-турецької війни 1853–1856 рр. з позиції лінгвоімагології. Росіяни і французи воювали не вперше, але, якщо в 1812 році Франція прогнала Коаліції союзників, то в 1856 році вже піддані Наполеона III святкували перемогу разом із військовими Британської імперії над солдатами й офіцерами російського імператора Олександра II. Для дослідження були відібрані спогади учасників Кримської війни, журнальні нотатки та листи. Особливий інтерес викликає оцінка, яку росіяни дають ворогу. За результатами дослідження автор доходить висновку, що в російському суспільстві середини XIX ст. не існувало універсального образу французів як ворога, чому сприяла наявність спільних культурних цінностей у обох народів – росіян і французів. Важливим фактором була французька мова, близька або рідна російським аристократам з дитинства, якою ті користувались, навіть, під час битв. Для вербалізації оцінки вжито таких засобів: знаки оклику та три крапки, меліоративні епітети та атрибути, просторіччя, вульгаризми, жаргонізм, метафори, безеквівалентна лексика та образні висловлювання. Варваризми використовувались для висміювання захоплення російських дворян французькою мовою. Відзначається і така деталь, як бажання французів дати свої імена території іноземної держави. Автори також використовують прецедентні висловлювання, щоб показати, що опоненти були досить знайомі один з одним і російськомовний читач мав достатньо інформації про історію та культуру Франції.

Ключові слова: лінгвоімагологія, оцінка, ворог, імідж, вербалізація, деталь.