

UDC: 811.111

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-10>

**Andriy MOROZ**

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,  
Berdyansk State Pedagogical University (Ukraine)  
<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2671-774X>*

## **MEANS OF IMAGE CREATION OF RUSSIAN MILITARY MEN IN ENGLISH TEXTS ABOUT THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853-1856): LINGUOIMAGOLOGICAL ASPECT**

*Мета дослідження* – виявити мовні засоби вербалізації образу росіян очима англійців в контексті військових подій 1853–1856 рр. на Кримському півострові, а також осмислити, як ці образи сприяли формуванню національного стереотипу в англомовному дискурсі. Завдання дослідження включають: аналіз англійського погляду на армії Миколи I та Олександра II; розмежування позитивного й негативного ставлення до росіян на прикладі трьох лінгвоімагологем: “Топографічні та антропологічні образи російських власних назв у баченні англійців”, “Любов росіян до державних нагород очима британців” і “Набожність росіян”; виявлення ключових лінгвістичних засобів оцінки в англійському описі російської армії, застосовуючи підхід лінгвоімагології.

Робота базується на методологічних принципах лінгвоімагології та використовує *методи* лінгвокультурологічного та синхронного аналізу, що дозволяє простежити лінгвістичні механізми конструювання чужої національної ідентичності. Введено такі поняття, як макролінгвоімаготема, лінгвоімаготема, лінгвоімагема та лінгвоімагологема. Здійснено інтерпретацію корпусу англомовних історичних, публіцистичних і мемуарних текстів про Кримську війну.

Встановлено, що лексичні засоби включають оцінні прикметники (“неважливий”, “занепалий”), емоційно забарвлену лексику (“фанатизм”, “істерія”), метафоричні конструкції (“хвиля забобонів”), а також семантичні поля, пов’язані з військовою символікою, релігійною набожністю та політичною відданістю. Синтаксичні засоби представлені безособовими конструкціями (“було сказано, що...”), пасивним станом та складнопідрядними реченнями з вставними зауваженнями, які дозволяють авторам опосередковано висловлювати оцінки. Стилистичні засоби включають іронію, контраст, юкстапозицію, градацію тону – від поваги до сарказму, – а також навмисні ономастичні деформації (“Menchikoff” замість Menshikov). Наративні стратегії охоплюють авторську відстороненість, приховану зверхність, культурне дистанціювання, а також афірмацію власної ідентичності шляхом відображення “Іншого”.

Конкретні лінгвоімагологемами дослідження: “Російські власні назви з точки зору англійців” демонструє, як зміна написання і вимови онімів (Poltava → Poltova) слугує засобом дистанціювання та знеособлення. “Любов росіян до державних нагород” ілюструє семантичне поле, пов’язане з візуальною репрезентацією державної влади (“великі золоті медалі”, “відзнака Імператора”) та супроводжується англійськими маркерами (“занадто”, “показово”). Лінгвоімагологема “Набожність росіян” окреслена через конфліктне поєднання емоційно забарвлених слів при описі колективної віри і нейтрального лексику в індивідуальних сюжетах.

Дослідження доводить, що англійські тексти доби Кримської війни репрезентують росіян через призму ідеологічно навантажених мовних стратегій, які сприяють формуванню образу “Іншого” – колективно надмірного, емоційного та політично інструменталізованого.

*Ключові слова:* **лінгвоімагологія, російська душа, Російсько-турецька війна, російський характер, державна нагорода, власна назва, англійський погляд.**

**For citation:** Moroz, A. (2025). Means of Image Creation of Russian Military Men in English Texts about the Crimean War (1853-1856): Linguoimagological Aspect. *Alfred Nobel University Journal of Philology*, vol. 1, issue 29, pp. 164-180, DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-10>

© A. Moroz, 2025

## Introduction

The linguoimagological direction has become a reliable basis for the comparative study of the images of a number of countries in their temporal variations: Belarus, China, England, France, Germany, Italy, Russia, Turkey, Ukraine [Bryk, 2020; Gladkova, 2022; Danilin, 2006; Ivanova, 2013, 2021, 2013; Mochalova, Galechko, 2024; Moroz, 2022; Sidorova, 2016; Tupchii, 2018; Bikinin, Sultanov, 2020; Cross, 1993; Mäkinen, 2018] and others.

The comparative study of a country's image reception by two (or more) representatives of different cultures, which has a verbal expression, remains a complex and largely unresolved issue. In addition, the discussion about the degree of influence of the author-creator on the specified category, which is connected with his/her individual, national and cultural features and the ability to model verbalized images, is not exhausted. Recently, this discussion has been transferred to the area of studying the adverse influence on the personality of a bilingual writer of a foreign culture and its language. In this perspective, the created image is considered as a source of information about the level of assimilation and mastery of a new culture and language. The relevance of research in the direction of linguoimagology is determined by the importance of studying the vision of one culture by another and the verbalization of images that are created as a result of their contacts and interaction.

This category is highlighted by D. Gudkov, who defines the framework in which it is possible to talk about Russian, French and other ethnic linguistic consciousnesses [Gudkov, 2003, p. 41].

The aims, tasks, and terminological base of linguoimagology demonstrate its close connection with linguoculturology. The basis of this discipline was already laid in the works by V. von Humboldt, who claimed that "language is as if an external manifestation of the spirit of the people; the language of the people is its spirit, and the spirit of the people is its language – it is difficult to imagine anything more identical" [Ibid., p. 45].

The interpretation of the "text" category within the framework of linguistic and cultural studies is important for linguoimagological studies. V. Maslova calls the texts "real custodians of culture" [Maslova, 2001, p. 3], since it is in human-created texts that the movement and dynamics of human thought and the ways of its presentation in language are recorded.

Linguistic disciplines such as linguoculturology and intercultural communication are closest to linguoimagology. The connection of this direction with cognitive linguistics is obvious, as noted by L. Ivanova: "Linguoimagology also studies ways of processing, reprocessing and using knowledge, but the subject of its study is not concepts, conceptsphere, conceptual picture of the world, frames" [Ivanova, 2013, p. 144].

## Literature review

The article by L.P. Ivanova "Linguistic imagology: origin and prospects of the new field of research" [Ivanova, 2023] explores the concept of pilgrimage in the Middle Ages, where travels were seen as a means of attaining holiness, emphasizing the ethical dimension of geography. Additionally, the article includes quotes about the travels of Princess E.R. Dashkova and presents a poem by N.S. Gumilev, illustrating a positive attitude towards other nations. The author highlights changes in the perception of geography over time and advises travelers to consider various aspects for a profound understanding of the visited countries. The article addresses the issue of studying foreign countries, emphasizing the importance of an active approach, comparing life in different cultures, and respecting religious beliefs. It underscores the complexity of the image of a people in linguistic consciousness, which can change under the influence of various circumstances.

In the article "The Image of Don Quixote in the dichotomy "Native – Alien" (Linguoimagological and Ethnopsychological Approaches)" [Ivanova, 2021], the author (originator of the term "linguoimagology") identifies cultural, ethnic and psychological factors that have shaped various interpretations of the figure of Don Quixote. The paper uses approaches to the considered problem from the standpoint of various linguistic studies; therefore, linguoimagological, ethnopsycholinguistic, linguocultural methods and techniques were used to solve the following problems: to characterize the linguistic (grammatical, graphic, derivational), linguocultural (connotonization) mastery of the considered name; to analyze the ethnopsychological prerequisites for the introduction of the image of Don Quixote into another culture; to describe the linguistic and

cultural concept “Don Quixote”. The author says that the integration of Don Quixote’s image into the linguistic consciousness of the other people is presented as a multifaceted process, including linguistic, cultural, and ethnopsychological mastery. A path is proposed for similar searches dedicated to the analysis of one or another image acquisition by other languages and cultures.

The research by M. Bryk [2020] is aimed at studying the means of linguistic representation of the image of Turkey in the minds of representatives of other cultures.

A. Tupchii analyzed the British image in the Russian language consciousness from the end of the 16th century to the first half of the 19th century from the perspective of linguoimagology. The author first considers the assessment of Britain’s image in Russian sources, its linguistic manifestation, and the dynamics of this assessment in a specific period. The following aspects are studied: a) the assessment of the country and its population by the authors (recipients) of the cited text; b) the assessment of the recipients and their texts indicated by the author of the paper, that is, the assessment of the evaluators and their characteristics [Tupchii, 2018, p. 26].

The book by A. Cross *Anglo-Russia: Aspects of Cultural Relations between Great Britain and Russia in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries* [Cross, 1993] explores the cultural exchanges between Great Britain and Russia in the 18th and early 19th centuries. It examines how mutual perceptions were shaped through literature, diplomatic relations, and artistic influences. A. Cross provides historical insights into how British and Russian cultures interacted, contributing to the broader understanding of cross-cultural influences in this period.

S. Mäkinen [2018] delves into European perspectives on Russia’s national identity and global image. S. Mäkinen analyzes historical and contemporary sources to demonstrate how European nations have perceived Russia over time. The study provides a critical examination of Western narratives and stereotypes about Russia, helping to understand the historical roots of Russia’s portrayal in Europe.

O. Gladkova [2022] investigates how food and clothing terminology contributed to shaping Russia’s image in 19th-century English travel literature. O. Gladkova focuses on linguistic aspects and their role in forming national identity. This research emphasizes how cultural markers, such as traditional cuisine and attire, influenced European travelers’ perceptions of Russia.

O. Sidorova [2016] analyzes the portrayal of Russia and its people in contemporary English fiction. The study examines recurring themes and characterizations, highlighting how modern British literature constructs Russia’s image. This work is significant for understanding how historical perceptions persist in contemporary narratives.

I. Bikkinin and A. Sultanov [2020] explore the administrative and cultural dynamics between the Russian Empire and its national territories during the 18th and 19th centuries. The authors provide an analysis of imperial policies, regional governance, and the impact on national identities within the empire. The research contributes to the broader discussion on imperialism and multiculturalism in Russia.

A. Mochalova and I. Galechko [2024] examine foreign travelers’ perspectives on Russia in the first half of the 19th century. By analyzing travel reports and diaries, the authors identify key themes in how Russia was perceived by outsiders. The work highlights aspects of governance, culture, and everyday life that shaped foreign views on Russia.

S. Danilin’s dissertation [2006] focuses on the representation of Russia in Anglo-American journalism during the late 19th and early 20th centuries. The study employs a linguistic-imagological approach to analyze media discourse, demonstrating how political and cultural narratives shaped the Western image of Russia during this period.

### **Theoretical advances and research gaps in Linguoimagology**

The studies reviewed above demonstrate the significant progress made in linguoimagology, particularly in exploring how different cultures perceive one another through language. Among the key directions in linguoimagological research is the study of national identity and the ways in which it is verbalized across different languages. Equally important is the analysis of literary texts, which serve as valuable sources of linguistic and cultural imagery. A special focus is also placed on bilingual authors, whose work plays a crucial role in shaping and transmitting cultural perceptions. Moreover, researchers emphasize the influence of historical and political contexts on the formation of national images, highlighting how these factors shape intercultural understanding and representation.

Despite these advances, certain gaps remain in the field. While much attention has been paid to the perception of various nations in different linguistic contexts, the specific image of Russian soldiers and officers in English texts about the Crimean War (1853–1856) has not yet been systematically examined. The novelty of the present research lies in its focus on uncovering the linguistic means through which British authors of the 19th century constructed the image of the Russian military during this conflict. By addressing this gap, the study contributes to the broader discussion of national images in war narratives and expands the scope of linguoimagology by integrating military discourse analysis with cultural linguistics.

### Aim and objectives

*The aim* of this article is to define the means to verbalize the image of the Russians from the English perspective during the military events of 1853–1856 on the Crimean Peninsula. This issue has never been addressed before in national or foreign linguistics.

It was achieved by solving the following *objectives*:

- highlight the positive and negative attitude of the English towards the Russians considering the following linguoimagologemes: “Topographic and Anthropological Images of Russian Proper Names as Seen by the British,” “Russians’ love of state awards seen by the British,” “Piousness of Russians”;

- distinguish the linguistic means of the linguistic means of assessing the enemy’s army from the French perspective.

### Methodology

The image of such large and complex objects as country and people is a multidimensional category. To analyze these images from the mid-19th century, in our view, it is necessary to rely on the terminology system of imagology within the literary-comparative framework, having developed it in relation to the studied linguoimagological material. Thus, the following terms are introduced: macrolinguoimagotheme, linguoimagotheme, linguoimageme, and linguoimagologeme.

Macrolinguoimagotheme is a general topic that is analyzed from the standpoint of linguoimagology. It is divided into linguoimagothemes, which in turn consist of linguoimagemes. Linguoimagemes include thematic groups – linguoimagologemes.

In this paper, to analyze the **linguoimagological aspect of language as opposed to “our” versus “foreign,”** we use a descriptive approach – a system of research methods used to characterize the development stages of linguistic phenomena. This is a method of synchronous analysis. To conduct the analysis, this study draws on works by three key contemporary British authors who documented the Crimean War: George Brackenbury, Alexander Royer, and William Howard Russell. These figures were chosen for their firsthand perspectives, narrative richness, and influence on shaping public opinion in mid-19th century Britain.

George Brackenbury was an artist and historian whose *The Campaign in the Crimea* [1855] offers a vivid visual and verbal portrayal of military life, enhanced by on-site illustrations by William Simpson. His work combines descriptive accuracy with rhetorical stylization, making it valuable for analyzing the visual-semantic field and national representation strategies.

Alexander Royer, in *The English Prisoners in Russia* [1854], provides a unique perspective on captivity and cultural misunderstanding between the British and Russians. His narrative is marked by emotional intensity and ideological bias, which makes it particularly rich for identifying evaluative lexis and syntactic framing.

William Howard Russell, a war correspondent for “The Times,” is often regarded as one of the first modern war journalists. *His Complete History of the Russian War* [1857] presents a detailed, emotionally charged, and widely circulated account of the war, making it essential for studying media discourse and public narratives of the time.

These authors were selected not only for their historical relevance but also for the stylistic and rhetorical features in their writing, which provide rich foundation for examining how the image of Russia and its people was constructed through language.

The linguoimagological method involves the following stages:

In the first stage, we find microtexts containing comments about the opponents in the Russo-Turkish war of 1853-1856 [Brackenburry, 1855], [Royer, 1854], [Russell, 1857], and then divide the microtexts into sentences, phrases, and finally into words containing comments with an assessment.

In conducting our research, we categorized the lexemes into thematic groups, which are called linguoimagothemes, which in turn were divided into subsections known as "linguoimagologemes". Each linguoimagologeme comprises lexemes connected by a common subject. Therefore, in the linguoimagologeme "The Characteristics of English Business," you can choose "business," "activity," "vigor," "diligence" and other words for analysis.

In the third stage, we examine nominal communication and structural units. Structural interpretation is carried out with the help of classification and discrete analysis.

Discrete analysis method is based on the fact that structural units consist of small signs, which are further indivisible and boundary.

In this paper, assessment, as a category of linguistics and linguoimagology, is understood as the recognition or disapproval of its value by native speakers, that is, whether its attributes align with certain value standards or not.

### **Theoretical framework and core concepts of Linguoimagology**

Linguoimagology is a specialized field within linguistics that examines the formation and representation of national and cultural images through language. This discipline plays a crucial role in understanding how linguistic structures shape perceptions of different ethnic and cultural groups. By analyzing language as a carrier of cultural meaning, linguoimagology provides insights into the verbal and non-verbal means by which national images are created and reinforced.

Verbal means of constructing national linguistic images (linguoimagemes) include various linguistic tools that convey cultural identity and national perception. These means can be categorized as follows:

a) *Lexical and phraseological Units.* Words and fixed expressions play a fundamental role in shaping national images. Lexical items such as ethnonyms, toponyms, and culture-specific terms contribute to the conceptualization of a nation's identity. Phraseological units, including proverbs and idioms, often encapsulate culturally significant meanings and reinforce national stereotypes. For example, in Russian, the phrase "широкая душа" (broad soul) reflects the perceived generosity and emotional depth associated with Russian identity.

b) *Metaphors and symbolism.* Metaphors are powerful instruments in constructing national images. They provide an indirect yet effective means of conveying cultural characteristics and attitudes. National metaphors often emerge in literature, media, and political discourse, shaping perceptions of a particular ethnic group. For instance, Russia is frequently depicted as "Mother Russia" symbolizing a nurturing yet authoritative figure.

c) *Narrative and discourse strategies.* Discourse strategies contribute significantly to shaping national images. The selection of storytelling techniques, framing devices, and rhetorical structures can reinforce specific cultural narratives. Political speeches, historical accounts, and media representations all play a role in maintaining and modifying national images over time.

d) *Non-verbal means of creating national linguistic images.* Although language remains the primary medium for constructing national images, non-verbal elements also contribute significantly to shaping perceptions. These include visual symbols, gestures, and cultural artifacts, which complement and reinforce linguistic representations.

e) *Semiotics and national symbols.* National symbols, such as flags, emblems, and traditional attire, serve as non-verbal extensions of national linguistic images. These elements often accompany verbal expressions, reinforcing cultural identity. For example, the Russian matryoshka doll is not only a cultural artifact but also a symbol of nested complexity and unity.

f) *Body language and gestures.* Non-verbal communication, including gestures and body language, varies across cultures and contributes to national identity. In Russian communication, gestures such as the "chin scratch" to indicate deep thought or the "cross sign" for blessing reflect cultural traditions and values.

g) *Visual and media representations.* National images are also reinforced through visual media, including films, advertisements, and digital content. These non-verbal means complement



linguistic elements to create a comprehensive representation of national identity. The portrayal of Russian characters in international cinema, for example, often reflects and perpetuates specific stereotypes about Russian culture and behavior.

Linguoimagology provides a comprehensive framework for understanding how national images are constructed through both verbal and non-verbal means. This interdisciplinary approach integrates linguistic, cultural, and visual analysis to explore the ways in which nations and their identities are represented, perceived, and interpreted. By examining linguistic structures, cultural metaphors, and visual representations, scholars can gain deeper insights into the mechanisms of cultural perception and identity formation.

One of the key aspects of linguoimagology is its ability to reveal how language and imagery interact to shape collective consciousness and influence intercultural communication. National images are formed through historical narratives, stereotypes, media portrayals, and literary depictions, all of which contribute to the construction of a nation's self-image and its perception by others. The study of these elements allows researchers to trace the evolution of national stereotypes, analyze their impact on intercultural relations, and assess their role in shaping public opinion and international discourse.

This theoretical foundation is essential for studying national images in literature, media, and intercultural communication. By applying linguoimagological methods, scholars can uncover implicit biases, challenge cultural assumptions, and promote a more nuanced understanding of diverse national identities. Moreover, this approach facilitates the study of globalization's effects on national self-perception, highlighting how cultural exchange, migration, and digital communication influence the ways nations and their people are portrayed.

Ultimately, linguoimagology plays a crucial role in fostering greater cross-cultural awareness and understanding. By analyzing the linguistic and visual mechanisms behind national image construction, researchers and practitioners can contribute to more effective intercultural dialogue, reduce misunderstandings, and encourage mutual respect between cultures. This makes linguoimagology not only a valuable academic discipline but also a practical tool for enhancing international relations and advancing cultural diplomacy.

### **Linguoimagologeme "Topographic and Anthropological Images of Russian Proper Names as Seen by the British"**

The assessment of various aspects of Russian life was a characteristic feature of authors from nations involved in the Russo-Turkish war (1853–1856). For the analysis we have chosen the linguoimagologeme "Topographic and Anthropological Images of Russian Proper Names as Seen by the British".

English authors [Royer, 1854], [Russell, 1857] often refer to the Russian names of cities and towns near which military events took place in the Crimea in 1853–1856.

Although with the help of toponyms there is an obvious and clear localization of the place of action in the story and they, like anthroponyms, carry a specific expressive and emotional color, the questions regarding their stylistic features and functional roles in artistic text remain underexplored – the main attention is paid to anthroponyms, which are the center of the onomastics space. Another reason lies in their quantitative composition – "not every literary work can find toponymic units in such a quantity that would allow for their stylistic analysis" [Marunych, 1994, p. 3].

Researchers emphasize that toponyms in fiction are a means of localization, they contain their stylistic motivations (overt and hidden), direct and indirect hints that are revealed within the literary composition and extend beyond the text [Fonyakova, 1990, p. 83].

"Using (...) proper geographical names – toponyms – has an important auxiliary value, because it contributes to concretization, strengthening of impression, representation. The use of toponyms to a certain extent indicates the author's outlook, his spiritual interests, tastes, preferences, likes or dislikes..." [Fenenko, 1965, p. 7].

Authors use their own names in the text of the work in order to reflect the era in which the writer lived and worked, his or her own personality and a certain literary genre chosen by him.

Onymes in the context of an artistic work are not accidental and have a certain ideological and artistic content, and therefore they are perceived in the "complex and deep visual perspective of the artistic whole" [Vinogradov, 1954, p. 5].

It should be noted that almost all the toponyms listed in the materials are largely unfamiliar to the English of the mid-19th century. One of the most important cities for the deployment of Queen Victoria's army was the city of Balaklava. This is how it is described at the very beginning of the story:

*"The town is small, decayed, and unimportant, though narrow and closely shut in by hills, afforded a secure shelter for several large English men-of-war, and at the same time presented convenient facilities for the landing of such war munitions as were needed in carrying on the siege"* [Russel, 1857, p. 60].

The adjectives "small, decayed, and unimportant" immediately establish a dismissive tone. These descriptors portray the town as insignificant and decrepit, emphasizing its lack of cultural, economic, or strategic value outside of its military utility. The juxtaposition of "small" (denoting size) with "decayed" (suggesting physical or moral degradation) reinforces the image of a neglected and stagnant place. "Narrow and closely shut in by hills" creates a visual and spatial restriction, presenting the town as confined and isolated. The preposition "by" emphasizes the external forces shaping its reality, limiting its openness to the outside world. This description indirectly conveys a lack of accessibility, reinforcing the perception of the town as remote and insignificant beyond its immediate context. Words such as "secure shelter" and "war munitions" redirect the focus from the town's intrinsic qualities to its functional value as a military stronghold. The use of "secure" suggests protection, while "shelter" implies a utilitarian space rather than a thriving community. The term "landing" highlights the town's strategic position, reducing it to a point of logistical convenience. The phrase "at the same time" anchors the description to a specific moment of utility, further depersonalizing the town. It underscores the transitory nature of its significance, which exists only in relation to the siege. The use of a compound-complex sentence reflects the layered perspective of the narrator. The initial clause establishes the town's insignificance, while subsequent clauses shift the focus to its practical advantages for military operations. This syntactic layering mirrors the layered perception of the town, viewed first as decayed and then as temporarily valuable. The focus on the town's military utility reduces its identity to a war location, ignoring its inhabitants, culture, or history. This omission creates an image of the town as lifeless and devoid of intrinsic value, aligning with an outsider's perception of an alien and utilitarian "other".

By emphasizing the town's narrowness and decay, the narrator implicitly contrasts it with Western (English) notions of progress, openness, and significance. This comparison reinforces the perception of Russian reality as fundamentally different and inferior. The town is portrayed as geographically and symbolically closed off, reinforcing its status as an isolated and unfamiliar "other" to the English observer. The hills act as both a literal and metaphorical barrier, emphasizing its separation from the broader, interconnected world.

The linguistic means employed in this excerpt construct a dual image of the town. On the one hand, it is an insignificant, decaying locality. On the other hand, it gains temporary importance as a military outpost during the siege. These contrasting aspects highlight the utilitarian and dismissive view of Russian reality through the eyes of English observers. This perspective underscores the "otherness" of the Russian town, characterized by its isolation, decay, and lack of intrinsic value apart from its strategic utility.

#### *Linguistic Devices:*

Evaluative Lexicon: "small," "decayed," "unimportant" – all negatively charged adjectives → express disdain or belittlement.

Epithet: "closely shut in by hills" – creates visual imagery of entrapment and isolation.

Metaphor: The physical isolation reflects a symbolic separation from Western norms.

Syntax: A compound-complex sentence emphasizes contrast – first clause belittles the town, the second shifts to its military utility.

Function: These choices serve to construct a dual image: Balaklava is insignificant culturally but tactically useful, thus reinforcing British pragmatic, utilitarian views of Russian geography.

Mistakes in writing certain geographical names indicate inattentiveness and disrespect to the enemy, and, as a matter of fact, some names are fixed with errors:

*"The next morning (10<sup>th</sup> June) we resumed our journey, and reached Poltova for breakfast, it being only one stage from where we had slept"* [Royer, 1854, p. 100].

*Linguistic Devices:*

Spelling Error: "Poltova" instead of "Poltava" – demonstrates disregard or difficulty with foreign onomastics.

Narrative Syntax: Casual tone in mentioning the city "for breakfast" trivializes the place.

Function: Indicates superficial engagement with Russian geography; the city becomes merely a waypoint.

As can be seen from further material, Alfred Royer makes the mistake in this toponym not only once. We see something similar in the description of the city in central Ukraine, where he writes:

*"Poltova covers a considerable space of ground, but did not appear to be densely peopled. Its streets are clean and paved, and the houses well-built"* [Royer, 1854, p. 100].

What is the reason for such inattention to the proper names of another state? Apparently, the reason is that the English language is fundamentally different from Russian or Ukrainian, which leads to forced errors in understanding and reproducing certain toponyms.

The impossibility of not only remembering, but also simply reproducing a foreign word is seen in the following example:

*"We were driven to a very large and new hotel, bearing an unpronounceable name, which of course I cannot remember"* [Royer, 1854, p. 100].

*Linguistic Devices:*

Phraseological cliché: "of course I cannot remember" – adds a tone of superiority or detachment.

Lexical Avoidance: Not even attempting to transcribe the name implies that "the Other" is incomprehensible.

Function: This act of not naming becomes a powerful gesture of cultural distancing and alienation.

It should be said that for the most part, no one in the Russian army knew English. In order to somehow explain oneself, one had to resort to using the French language, which not every sailor of Her Majesty the Queen of Great Britain spoke. Usually, the English and Scots tried to find an officer who spoke fluent French, who could communicate with the middle and senior officers. As for the humble soldiers of the Russian army, they practically could not read or write Russian, let alone any European language:

*"On landing he was signalled back, as if he was infringing the laws of quarantine; and, being unable to make himself understood be the officer in command of the party on the beach, he sent back the boat for some one acquainted with the French language"* [Royer, 1854, p. 10].

*Linguistic Devices:*

Impersonal Construction: "being unable to make himself understood" shifts agency away from the British, implying that the communication barrier is on the Russian side.

Lexical Field: "French language" – a shared European reference point, further isolating Russian as linguistically alien.

Function: Depicts the communicative barrier as symbolic of civilizational difference.

For many Englishmen in the middle of the 19th century, Russia was terra incognita (the cities of Poltova, Bakshiserai have spelling mistakes in the other book [Russel, 1857, p. 62]). Apart from the few stereotypes familiar to English readers, there were many white spots. Even the names of high-ranking officials who were responsible for the military actions of Sevastopol city garrison and the entire army, first of Tsar Nicholas I, and then of his son Alexander II, were barely known to English journalists from the front lines, let alone ordinary officers or soldiers of the British army. Some are inscribed in the English text in the French manner: Menchikoff [Russel, 1857, p. 48, 62]. We read the following two messages:

*"The Russian Admiral, Raniloff, was killed"* [Russel, 1857, p. 64].

*Linguistic Devices:*

Spelling/Transliteration Error: Shows lack of phonological or cultural accuracy.

French-Style Ending "-off": Typical of 19th-century attempts to "domesticate" foreign names to European norms.

Function: These distortions reflect a Eurocentric filter and the unconscious shaping of public perception – further constructing the Russian characters as vague, undefined, and "other".



*"On that day, Nochimoff, the commander of Sebastopol, was wounded in the head by a shell, and was reported dead, but subsequently recovered"* [Russel, 1857, p. 64].

The two messages quoted from W. Russell's 1857 account highlight inaccuracies in reporting the names of prominent Russian figures during the Crimean War. These inaccuracies – confusing Admiral Kornilov with "Raniloff" and Admiral Nakhimov with "Nochimoff" or "Nochimov" – expose several noteworthy aspects of mid-19th-century British journalism and its portrayal of Russia.

*Mispronunciations and Anglicizations:* The transformation of Kornilov to Raniloff and Nakhimov to Nochimoff or Nochimov reflects the tendency of journalists to adapt foreign names to familiar phonetic or linguistic patterns. This practice was common in the era when transliteration standards were either inconsistent or nonexistent.

The French and English versions of Admiral Nakhimov's name – "Nochimoff" and "Nochimov", respectively – highlight the influence of European languages on the transcription of Russian names, often distorting their original form.

*Carelessness in Reporting:* W. Russell, one of the most respected war correspondents of his time, allowed errors to persist in his accounts. This suggests a lack of rigor in fact-checking, particularly in an era when communication with foreign regions was challenging, but not impossible.

The repetition of such errors indicates that these inaccuracies were likely overlooked by both the author and his editorial team, further underscoring the casual approach to precision in foreign reporting.

Misrepresentations in respected journalistic sources could shape public opinion in Britain. By presenting distorted names, the reporting might unconsciously suggest that these individuals – and, by extension, the Russian leadership – were less credible or significant.

The careless transcription of Russian names in the Crimean War chronicles reveals a deeper issue: the Western media's role in shaping the narrative of the war. While not necessarily deliberate, the lack of attention to accuracy contributed to the creation of a skewed historical record. This negligence, combined with underlying biases, underscores the complexities of wartime journalism and its influence on international relations.

These observations suggest that even seemingly minor errors in journalistic reporting can have broader cultural and political implications, particularly in contexts of conflict.

So, in the linguoimagologeme "Russian proper names seen by the British" we underline the significance of proper names, particularly toponyms, in artistic works, focusing on English authors' references to Russian names during the Crimean War. It should be noted that many toponyms mentioned in the text are unfamiliar to contemporary English readers, showcasing the British renaming of Balaklava to "New London" during the Crimean War. Errors in geographical names are attributed to linguistic differences between English and Russian/Ukrainian. The inability to remember or pronounce foreign words is also seen, illustrating communication challenges between the English and Russian armies during the war. We point out the lack of interest in providing detailed information about Russia by English journalists, as evidenced by errors in high-ranking officials' names. This carelessness is seen as indicative of a general lack of interest in the eyes of the English.

Summary of Linguistic Devices:

*Evaluative Lexicon* conveys judgmental attitudes (e.g. "small, decayed, unimportant").

*Epithets and Metaphors* paint vivid images of foreignness and decay.

*Syntax Choices* reflect layered or dismissive perspectives.

*Spelling and Transliteration Errors* indicate cultural distance or ignorance.

*Lexical Avoidance and Phraseological Clichés* underscore alienation or trivialization.

*French Linguistic Influence* exposes Eurocentric filtering.

*Impersonal Constructions* subtly shift agency and reinforce stereotypes.

All these linguistic elements contribute to the construction of a distorted, alien, and utilitarian image of Russia, filtered through the pragmatic and often dismissive gaze of 19th-century British observers.

### **Linguoimagologeme "Russians' love of state awards seen by the British"**

The selected passages from A. Royer's 1854 narrative highlight a cultural distinction between Russians and the English of the time regarding the display and significance of awards. A

closer analysis of these excerpts reveals deeper insights into the practices and values associated with wearing state decorations in Russian society:

*"The quarantine guard was composed of old pensioners or invalided soldiers many bearing medals for service done in the days when they were in the prime of their faculties, and for deeds of bravery against the Circassians"* [Royer, 1854, p. 26].

A. Royer notes that Russian soldiers, even those no longer in active service, often wore medals as part of their daily attire. This indicates that medals served as visible markers of past achievements and personal valor. For Russians, the display of awards was not merely ceremonial but a point of pride and an everyday affirmation of their contributions to the state or society. The surprise expressed by the English author at this custom reflects a cultural divergence. In English society, wearing awards outside of formal occasions was uncommon, and such public displays of honor might even have been considered boastful or unnecessary. This cultural gap is further emphasized in A. Royer's observation:

*"On our release from quarantine, Signor Mocchi paid us an official visit, on which occasion he wore two large gold medals, presented to him by the Emperor, in token of commendation for his intrepidity in saving the lives of a large number of men who were in danger of wreck on the Mole"* [Royer, 1854, p. 60].

To understand how this passage illustrates the differences between English and Russian cultures, we should consider several aspects: a) *the author's perspective and cultural context* – the author of the book is English, and his perception of awards and official recognition may differ from the Russian approach. In English tradition, especially in the 19th century, official awards were usually less ostentatious in appearance (for example, orders or medals were worn discreetly). In contrast, in Russian tradition, state awards had a more public character, were often large, and demonstrated the status of the recipient; b) *the significance of medal size* – the phrase "he wore two large gold medals" may not be just a description but a subtle observation by the author about Russian award culture. For an Englishman, it would be more natural to focus on the fact of receiving an award, whereas emphasizing the size of the medals might suggest an impression of their demonstrative nature. In the Russian imperial tradition, awards were not only a sign of merit but also a way to highlight one's status, which might have seemed excessive to foreigners.

In the English tradition, especially in the 19th century, official awards were usually less ostentatious. For example, the Victoria Cross, established in 1856, is the highest military decoration for valor in the United Kingdom. Its design is quite modest: a bronze cross with the inscription "For Valour" on a red ribbon. The award is worn on the left side of the chest and is not excessively large or flashy.

In the Russian tradition, state awards had a more public character and were often large, demonstrating the status of the recipient. For example, the Order of St. George, established in 1769, was the highest military decoration of the Russian Empire. It consisted of a white enameled cross with an image of Saint George slaying a dragon and was worn on a prominent orange-and-black ribbon. The higher degrees of the order also included a large silver star worn on the chest, making the award highly visible.

If the author hints that large medals in Russian culture are an important symbol of status and achievements, this may resonate with the widespread 19th-century perception of Russia's imperial pomp. Award ceremonies often had a solemn, even theatrical nature, which could contrast with the more reserved British approach to official recognition.

Thus, a detailed analysis of the quote shows that the size of the medals and the fact that they were worn in an official setting may be part of the author's broader observation about cultural differences. If the book's context confirms that the author generally compares British and Russian traditions, this detail may serve as yet another example of such differences.

#### *Linguistic Devices:*

Evaluative Lexicon: "old pensioners," "invalided soldiers," "large," "gold" – these lexemes carry connotations of age, physical limitation, and conspicuousness → highlight both the pride of past service and the perceived extravagance in Russian award culture.

Terminology: "medals," "commendation," "intrepidity," "Emperor" – formal, institutional lexicon → emphasizes the hierarchical, state-centered structure of Russian society and the direct link between state power and recognition.

Cliché/Set Phrase: “in token of commendation” – a fixed ceremonial phrase → underlines the formal and ritualistic tone of Russian state recognition practices.

Epithet: “two large gold medals” – the adjectives “large” and “gold” serve as epithets → draw attention to the visual and material impact of the medals, subtly suggesting ostentation.

Toponymic Verbalization: “Circassians,” “the Mole” – specific references to ethnonyms and hydronyms → embed the scene within imperial military geography, reinforcing a view of Russia as a vast, multiethnic empire with persistent martial undertones.

Syntax: **Compound and complex sentences**, e.g., “presented to him by the Emperor, in token of commendation for his intrepidity...” → structure mirrors official bureaucratic discourse, creating emotional detachment while allowing for nuanced commentary.

Function: These linguistic choices construct a contrastive image: Russians are depicted as proudly and publicly displaying their state honors as symbols of valor and loyalty, while the English observer subtly questions the need for such visible demonstrations. This juxtaposition reinforces British values of restraint, modesty, and understated merit, and positions Russian award culture as ceremonially rich but culturally distinct.

Thus, the **linguoimagologeme** “Russians’ love of state awards seen by the British” has cultural and historical context. The analysis highlights a key cultural distinction between Russian and English attitudes toward state awards in the 19th century. While in Russian society, medals were worn publicly as a visible display of honor and status, in English tradition, such decorations were typically reserved for formal occasions and worn more modestly. The English author’s observations suggest an element of surprise or even subtle critique regarding the Russian practice of prominently displaying awards. This contrast reflects broader differences in national values – whereas Russians viewed medals as symbols of pride and social recognition, the British associated them with discreet acknowledgment of merit. Ultimately, the authors’ account provides insight into how state honors functioned within each culture, illustrating the varying perceptions of recognition and prestige in 19th-century Europe.

A linguistic analysis further reinforces this contrast through specific devices employed in Royer’s narrative:

**Evaluative lexicon** (e.g., “old pensioners,” “invalided soldiers,” “large,” “gold”) emphasizes both the physical presence and perceived excess of Russian award culture.

**Terminology** (“medals,” “commendation,” “Emperor”) underscores the institutional and hierarchical nature of recognition in Russian society.

**Set phrases** like “in token of commendation” and **epithets** such as “two large gold medals” add ceremonial and material richness to the imagery.

**Toponymic references** (“Circassians,” “the Mole”) situate the narrative in Russia’s imperial context, reinforcing martial pride.

**Syntactic choices**, including complex sentence structures, mirror the official tone of bureaucratic discourse and allow for layered commentary.

These linguistic strategies construct a contrastive cultural image: Russians are depicted as openly celebratory and honor-bound in their display of state recognition, while the British perspective favors restraint, subtlety, and modest commemorations of merit.

### **Linguoimagologeme “Piousness of Russians seen by the British”**

The most important feature of Russian psychology has always been faith: in the Russian mentality, an unusual synthesis of faith in another person, in society, and in an ideal was formed. Russian idealism combined a certain imagination, the lofty nature of thoughts that, in search of truth and the meaning of life, broke away from practical everyday life. This faith was based on the developed imagination, mythology, and the fabulousness of Russian consciousness. It was faith in the ideal that allowed a person to break out of the mundane and bear the entire burden of reality. This faith could not be called optimistic, but it became the basis of a special feature of the historical Russian character – patience [Melnikova, 2009, p. 39]. **Specialists in socionics show that the Russian national character is based on the phenomenon of the predominant activity of the right hemisphere of the brain, which determines the emotionality, intuitiveness, unpredictability of the Russian soul, its rich imagination and contemplativeness.**

The next important feature of the Russian psychotype is its introversion. The consciousness of an extrovert is active, directed at the object part of the world. Introverts are contemplative, self-sufficient, and value interaction more than results.

P. Florensky noted the “predominance of ethical and religious principles over social and legal ones” [Florensky, 1994, vol. 1, p. 644] as a characteristic feature of Russians. Contemplativeness is a national characteristic of Russians.

Based on K. Jung’s methodology, the type closest to the Russian is defined as “an intuitive-ethical introvert”. The peculiarity of this psychotype is that the functions of concrete activity and volitional mobilization are “weak,” and are, in E. Bern’s language, only at the level of a “child”. Pressure on such points brings to life a “childish beginning” and, first of all, an appeal to the “elder” – the state.

The two following excerpts present contrasting depictions of religion in the Russian Empire during the mid-19th century. The first excerpt by G. Brackenburry highlights a scornful attitude toward the Orthodox Church, emphasizing what the author perceives as excessive fanaticism and an unhealthy zeal in religious ceremonies. Conversely, the second excerpt from A. Royer depicts a more favorable attitude toward an individual’s religious devotion, especially when that devotion aligns with Protestant or Catholic principles.

Much attention is paid to the description of the religious feelings of Russians by the witnesses of the Russo-Turkish War (1853–1856). When depicting the city of Sevastopol, the author points to the cathedral and a large number of churches located in the city itself:

*“Sevastopol extends more than a mile in length, in the direction of the port, by about three quarters of a mile inland. On the land side it was an open town, being only partly defended by a loop-holed wall, entirely useless. The government, only thinking of attacks by sea, confined its attention to making that quarter invulnerable. The public buildings include the Admiralty, vast barracks for troops, and magazines for stores a cathedral and numerous green-domed churches, an Italian opera, a club-house, a library, and several hotels, with the simple monument of Kosarsky, a naval officer who distinguished himself in the last Turko-Russian War”* [Brackenburry, 1855, p. 28].

When describing the city and its churches, the adjective *numerous* is used, which emphasizes the British view of Russians as people who devote a lot of time to prayer and often go to church.

*“Religious ceremonies of the most imposing character, performed during the night previous to the 5th of November by the most exalted functionaries of the church, contributed to lash their usual fanaticism into phrenzy, while Nature herself seemed to conspire against their foes by wrapping the Russian movements in an impenetrable veil of fog, and thus adding to the sacred enterprise those elements of stratagem and surprise, so dear to the Muscovite of every grade, unless all history speak false”* [Brackenburry, 1855, p. 44].

In this case, the author treats with contempt the figures of the Orthodox Church – the only state church of Russia in the middle of the 19th century. He uses the nominatives *fanaticism* and *phrenzy*, which carry negative connotations. Ethical assessment is used. Speaking about clergymen, the narrator uses the superlative *the most exalted functionaries*, in which he conveys his negative attitude towards Russian priests.

G. Brackenburry’s tone is heavily critical and dismissive. He describes the Orthodox clergy as “the most exalted functionaries,” a phrase that seems to mock their status by implying undue pomp or an exaggerated sense of importance. His use of terms conveys an unequivocal ethical condemnation of the church’s role in fostering intense emotional states that serve political or military objectives. Furthermore, Brackenburry intertwines natural phenomena with religious and military strategy. By suggesting that the fog acts as a divine tool aiding the Russians, he insinuates that both nature and religion are manipulated for nationalistic goals. This not only casts doubt on the sincerity of the clergy’s intentions but also reflects the author’s broader skepticism toward Orthodox practices and their integration with state endeavors.

The phrase “the most exalted functionaries of the church” carries a negative connotation due to the choice of words, which contrasts with how English speakers typically refer to their own clergy. In English, religious leaders are usually described using terms such as “clergymen,” “priests,” “bishops,” or “archbishops,” all of which convey a sense of respect and tradition.

The term “functionaries,” however, suggests a bureaucratic, impersonal, or even mechanical role, stripping the individuals of spiritual authority and reducing them to mere officials performing duties.

Additionally, “the most exalted” might seem ironic or exaggerated in this context, as it implies a lofty status that does not necessarily command genuine reverence but rather pompous self-importance. The phrase as a whole suggests that these religious figures are more concerned with ritualistic grandeur and political influence than with genuine spiritual guidance, reinforcing the negative tone. If similar wording were used to describe English church leaders, it would likely carry the same critical implication, as it would suggest an excessive, almost theatrical religiosity rather than sincere devotion.

But there is not always only a negative attitude on the part of the British towards the church in the Russian Empire and Russians who trust in God. This happens when a foreigner is depicted in the service of the Russian emperor and, more often than not, he has his Catholic or Protestant faith:

*“General Osten Sacken paid daily visits to the Captain and officers, and to the hospital. He was much gratified at seeing William Tanner (who had been wounded, and who recovered) occupied, whenever he visited him, in reading his Bible; and he expressed great approbation of his conduct, being himself of a religious turn of mind ...”* [Royer, 1854, p. 27].

In contrast, A. Royer presents a different narrative, where religious behavior is praised, particularly when it is associated with Protestant or Catholic values. The example of General Osten Sacken admiring William Tanner for reading his Bible highlights a more individualized and universal appreciation of faith. This depiction suggests that religious devotion, when expressed through personal conduct and aligned with Western Christian traditions, is perceived positively by the British. The tone is markedly different here. Words such as “gratified” and “approbation” reflect approval and respect, particularly towards Tanner’s moral resilience and piety. The favorable view of General Osten Sacken, a high-ranking figure in Russian service, further softens the critique often directed at Russian leadership and its religious framework. It implies that when religion serves as a source of personal strength rather than collective fervor, it earns admiration, even from foreign observers.

In this way, the linguoimagologeme “Piousness of Russians seen by the British” explores key features of the Russian psychology. **The British authors delve into religious feelings among Russians**, portraying them as devoted to prayer and frequent churchgoers. The British view, as depicted in descriptions of Sevastopol, emphasizes the numerous churches, reflecting a perception of Russians as deeply religious. However, negative connotations are present when the authors discuss the Orthodox Church, using terms like “fanaticism” and “phrenzy”. The narrative also recognizes instances of positive attitudes toward Russians who trust in God, particularly when foreigners, often with Catholic or Protestant faiths, are in the service of the Russian emperor.

#### *Linguistic Devices:*

Evaluative Lexicon: “fanaticism,” “phrenzy,” “imposing,” “numerous,” “exalted,” “gratified,” “approbation” – lexemes with strong positive or negative evaluative connotations → construct a dual image of Russian piety: either emotionally excessive and politically manipulated (negative), or dignified and morally grounded (positive), depending on context and the observer’s perspective.

Terminology: “cathedral,” “churches,” “religious ceremonies,” “Bible,” “Orthodox Church,” “functionaries” – religious and institutional lexicon → emphasizes the institutionalized nature of faith in Russia and its connection to both national identity and state functions; also highlights denominational distinctions (Orthodox vs. Protestant/Catholic).

Cliché/Set Phrases: “sacred enterprise,” “trust in God,” “reading his Bible” – formulaic expressions associated with religious or moral behavior → reflect stereotypical or expected forms of devotion, reinforcing cultural norms and values associated with faith.

Epithets and Tropes: “the most exalted functionaries of the church” – epithets like “most exalted” carry ironic or hyperbolic overtones → suggest perceived pretentiousness or theatricality of Russian clergy; “lash their usual fanaticism into phrenzy” – metaphorical language → dramatizes religious emotion, implying irrationality and mass manipulation.

Toponymic Verbalization: “Sevastopol,” “Kosarsky,” “Muscovite” – toponyms and anthroponyms with cultural and historical resonance → root religious observations in specific geopolit-



ical contexts (Crimean War, Russian imperial military history), reinforcing the intertwined nature of territory, war, and faith in the British imagination.

Phraseological and Syntactic Structure: Use of elaborate compound-complex sentences (e.g., “Religious ceremonies of the most imposing character, performed... contributed to lash their usual fanaticism into phrenzy...” → reflects a formal, elevated narrative voice, typical of mid-19th-century British prose; allows for layered evaluative commentary, simultaneously descriptive and judgmental. Contrast with shorter, declarative sentences in Royer’s account that express clarity and moral approval.

Function: These linguistic devices serve to construct a bifurcated image of Russian religiosity in British discourse. On one hand, Orthodoxy is portrayed as excessive, emotional, and politically instrumentalized. On the other, personal faith (particularly when tied to Protestant or Catholic values) is respected and admired. This contrast reflects British cultural filters: rationality and individual piety are valued, while collective fervor and ritualistic grandeur are viewed with suspicion. The result is a linguoimagologeme that simultaneously exoticizes and moralizes Russian spirituality through a distinctly British lens.

## Conclusions

This study has sought to investigate the ways in which Russian military identity was linguistically constructed in English-language texts about the Crimean War (1853–1856). Grounded in the principles of linguoimagology – a discipline that examines how national images are formed and transmitted through language – this research has focused on identifying recurrent lexical, syntactic, and rhetorical patterns in British historical, journalistic, and autobiographical narratives. The findings demonstrate that the portrayal of the Russian military and, more broadly, Russian national character, was filtered through specific cultural and ideological lenses, deeply embedded in language.

### 1. *Onomastic Distortion and Topographic Misrepresentation*

Toponyms such as Poltava became “Poltova,” while anthroponyms like Menshikov were rendered as “Menchikoff,” and Nakhimov as “Nochimoff”. These are clear cases of orthographic variation and phonological adaptation, which reflect not only linguistic unfamiliarity but also deliberate rhetorical distancing.

The recurring phrase “an unpronounceable name, which of course I cannot remember” serves as a metalinguistic device, functioning to position the Russian language and culture as alien. This phrase combines self-irony, apologetic tone, and a passive-aggressive narrative stance, signaling both humor and latent superiority.

Generic or evaluative epithets like “unimportant,” “insignificant,” “decayed” are repeated across the corpus, functioning as evaluative lexis that simplifies complex foreign realities. These lexical reductions transform real geographical spaces into abstract narrative props.

### 2. *Visual Display and the Semantics of State Recognition*

British descriptions of medals frequently included phrases like “two large gold medals hanging on his chest,” a form of visual hyperbole. The emphasis on visibility functions as a symbolic lexical field, containing terms like “token of recognition,” “distinction,” “commendation,” and “Emperor’s favor”. Such lexical clusters underscore the semiotic importance of state symbolism in Russian culture, while the British tone often adds semantic distancing or ironic coloring.

Furthermore, adjectival modifiers like “excessive,” “ostentatious,” and “unnecessary” represent ideologically loaded descriptors, contrasting Russian openness with British ideals of modesty.

### 3. *Religious Piety and Ideological Duality*

Orthodox ceremonies were framed using emotionally charged vocabulary: “fanaticism,” “frenzy,” “manipulated,” and “imposing”. These terms represent an emotive lexico-semantic field that depicts collective faith as irrational and politically co-opted.

In contrast, isolated narratives of personal faith are described with sympathetic lexical framing: phrases like “the soldier quietly read his Bible” use the simple past tense, low modality, and unmarked syntax – which together create a tone of calm sincerity.

The juxtaposition of loaded metaphors (“a wave of superstition”) with neutral descriptions (“a man with his Bible”) reveals how language constructs dual layers of national character – wild versus civilized, collective hysteria versus individual virtue.

#### 4. Syntactic Structure and Discursive Framing

A recurring syntactic construction is the use of impersonal passive forms, such as “being unable to make himself understood” or “it was said that...”, which remove agency and subtly attribute communication failure to the Russian speaker. This is a strategic use of passivization and grammatical obfuscation.

Phrases like “of course I cannot remember,” “as expected,” and “strangely enough” are metadiscursive markers that guide the reader’s interpretation while maintaining authorial detachment.

Moreover, complex sentences with parenthetical remarks and concessive clauses (e.g., “Although the officer appeared dignified, his medals seemed exaggerated”) showcase syntactic layering, allowing the author to insert judgment without overt declaration.

#### *Summary of Linguistic Devices Identified*

Lexical tools: evaluative adjectives, emotionally loaded epithets, semantic fields (military, religious, political), metaphorical framing.

Syntactic tools: impersonal constructions, passive voice, complex sentence structures with embedded commentary, metadiscourse.

Stylistic tools: irony, contrast, juxtaposition, tone modulation (from respect to sarcasm), naming distortions (onomastic transformation).

Narrative strategies: authorial detachment, implied superiority, cultural distancing, identity affirmation through othering.

#### *Contributions and Implications*

This study is the first to offer a comprehensive linguoimagological analysis of the English-language representations of Russian military figures during the Crimean War. It shows how lexical choices, syntactic framing, and stylistic strategies shaped British perceptions of Russia as the “Other”. The research adds to broader debates in historical discourse analysis, linguocultural studies, and intercultural communication. It offers a model for analyzing the linguistic encoding of national images, with potential applications in other historical or cultural contexts.

By deconstructing the linguistic devices used to describe Russia and its military in British narratives, this study contributes to the growing field of linguoimagology and deepens our understanding of how war, language, and culture intersect in the construction of national identity.

#### References

- Bikinin, I., Sultanov, A. (2020). Russian Empire And National Territories (XVIII-XIX Centuries). In I. Murzina (Ed.), *Humanistic Practice in Education in a Postmodern Age*. (pp. 175-183). Nicosia: European Publisher. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15405/epsbs.2020.11.19>
- Brackenbury, G. (1855). *The Campaign in the Crimea. An Historical Sketch, Accompanied by Forty One Double Tinted Plates from Drawings Taken on the Spot by William Simpson*. London: P. & D. Colnaghi & Co. and Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans.
- Bryk, M.M. (2020). *Verbalizatsiia variantiv spryjniattia obrazu Turechchyny predstavnykamy rosiiskoi ta anhlijskoi linhvokultur (na materialy romaniv pysmennykiv-bilinhviv)* [Verbalization of the Variants of Turkey’s Image by the Representatives of Russian and English Linguocultures (Based on the Novels of Bilingual Authors)]. Kyiv, NPU Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Cross, A. (1993). *Anglo-Russica: Aspects of Cultural Relations Between Great Britain and Russia in the Eighteenth and Early Nineteenth Centuries*. Oxford: Berg.
- Danilin, S.A. (2006). *The Image of Russia and Its Policies in Anglo-American Journalism of the Late 19th – Early 20th Centuries*. PhD thesis. Retrieved from <https://rusist.info/book/1020522>
- Fenenko, M.V. (1965). *Toponimii Ukrainy u tvorchosti Tarasa Shevchenka*. [Toponyms of Ukraine in the Works by Taras Shevchenko]. Kyiv: Soviet School Publ. (in Ukrainian).
- Florensky, P. Orthodoxy. In A. Trubachov (Ed.), *Works in 4 volumes* (Vol. 1, pp. 638-662). Retrieved from <https://djvu.online/file/GABda4PXo64le>

- Fonyakova, O.I. (1990). Proper Name in a Literary Text. *Eruditor*. Retrieved from <https://m.eruditor.one/file/2482322/>
- Gladkova, O.Kh. (2022). Role of Food and Clothes Names in Creating the Russians' Image in English-Language Travel Notes about Russia in the 19th Century. *Philology. Theory & Practice*, 15 (7), 2272-2278. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30853/phil20220396>
- Gudkov, D.B. (2003). Theory and Practice of Intercultural Communication. *Eruditor*. Retrieved from <https://m.eruditor.one/file/767869/>
- Ivanova, L.P. (2021). The Image of Don Quixote in the dichotomy "Native – Alien" (Linguo-imagological and Ethnopsychological Approaches). *Guadernos de Rusistica Espanola*, 17, 105-115. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30827/cre.v17.17997>
- Ivanova, L.P. (2013). *Lingvoimagologia kak sintezirujushhee napravlenie sovremennogo jazykoznanija* [Linguoimagology as a Synthesizing Direction of Modern Linguistics]. Vicebsk: VDU imia P.M. Mashierava Publ.
- Ivanova, L.P. (2023). Linguistic imagology: origin and prospects of the new field of research. *Aspects of the Cognitive and Functional Description of the Russian and Bulgarian Languages*, 17 (1), 34-50.
- Mäkinen, S. (2018). *European Perceptions of Russia's Image and Identity*. Berlin: Springer.
- Marunych, I.I. (1994). *Toponimy v idiosylii pysmennyka*. (Avtoref. dys. kand. filol. nauk) [Toponyms in the Idiostyle of the Writer. (PhD Thesis Abstract)]. Kyiv: Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv (in Ukrainian).
- Maslova, V.A. (2001). Cultural Linguistics. *Eruditor*. Retrieved from <https://m.eruditor.one/file/2211117/>
- Melnikova, E.V. (2009). Culture and Traditions of the Peoples of the World (Ethnopsychological Aspect). *Eruditor*. Retrieved from <https://m.eruditor.one/file/3879979/>
- Mochalova, A., Galechko, I. (2024). Russia First Half of the 19th Century Through the Eyes of Foreigners. *Science Herald*, 6 (75/2), 1155-1165.
- 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. Current Trends in Language Development*, 23, 52-62. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.23.05>
- Royer, A. (1854). *The English Prisoners in Russia*. London: Chapman and Hall.
- Russell, W.H. (1857). *Complete history of the Russian War, from its commencement to its close: giving a graphic picture of the great drama of war*. Toronto, C.W.: Bostwick & Barnard.
- Sidorova, O. (2016). Images of the Russian People and Russia in the Contemporary English Novel. *Quaestio Rossica*, 4 (2), 183-194. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.15826/qv.2016.2.166>
- Tupchii, A.V. (2018). *Obraz Anglii v russkom jazykovom soznanii konca XVI – pervoj poloviny XIX vv.: lingvoimagologicheskij aspekt*. (Dys. kand. filol. nauk) [The Image of England in the Russian Linguistic Consciousness of the Late 16<sup>th</sup> – First Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Centuries: Linguoimagological Aspect. (PhD thesis)]. Kyiv: M.P. Dragomanov National Pedagogical University.
- Vinogradov, V.V. (1954). *Yazik khudozhestvennogo proizvedeniya* [The language of a work of art]. *Topics in the Study of Language*, 5, 3-27 (in Russian).

## MEANS OF IMAGE CREATION OF RUSSIAN MILITARY MEN IN ENGLISH TEXTS ABOUT THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853-1856): LINGUOIMAGOLOGICAL ASPECT

Andriy A. Moroz, Berdyansk State Pedagogical University (Ukraine)

e-mail: [andriy7517@gmail.com](mailto:andriy7517@gmail.com)

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.32342/3041-217X-2025-1-29-10>

**Key words:** *linguimagology, linguimagologeme, Russian soul, Russian-Turkish war, Russian character, state award, proper name, English viewpoint.*

This study explores the linguistic representation of Russian national and military identity in 19th-century English-language narratives, with a focus on the Crimean War (1853-1856). Grounded in linguimagology – an interdisciplinary approach that analyzes how national images are formed and transmitted through language – **this research offers a comparative literary-linguistic perspective on how English authors verbalized their image of Russians during this pivotal historical period.**

The primary *aim* of the article is to identify and interpret the linguistic means used by English authors to construct the image of Russians during the Crimean War. This issue remains largely unexplored in both domestic and international linguistics. To achieve this aim, the following objectives were addressed: to analyze English-language depictions of the Russian military under Nicholas I and Alexander II; to identify positive and negative evaluations of Russian identity using linguimagologemes such as: topographic and anthropological images of Russian proper names as seen by the British; Russians' love of state awards as Seen by the British; piousness of Russians as Seen by the British; to determine the specific linguistic devices employed by British authors to assess and portray the Russian army and national character.

The study applies synchronous linguimagological analysis using specialized terms such as macro-linguimagotheme, linguimagotheme, linguimageme, and linguimagologeme. This *methodological* framework enables the identification of national images through a detailed examination of textual features across historical, journalistic, and autobiographical English narratives from the mid-19th century.

Key Linguistic Devices Identified: *lexical tools* [use of evaluative adjectives (e.g., “insignificant,” “decayed”) and emotionally loaded epithets (e.g., “fanaticism,” “ostentatious”); semantic fields involving military valor, religious fervor, and political symbolism; metaphorical framing to convey irony or exaggeration (e.g., “a wave of superstition”)]; *syntactic tools* (impersonal constructions and passive voice that obscure agency (e.g., “it was said that...”); complex sentence structures with embedded commentary (e.g., “Although the officer appeared dignified, his medals seemed exaggerated”); use of metadiscourse markers (e.g., “of course,” “as expected”) to frame reader interpretation); *stylistic tools* (strategic irony and juxtaposition (e.g., sacred ritual vs. personal piety); tone modulation ranging from respect to sarcasm; onomastic transformations such as “Menchikoff” for “Menshikov” to reflect rhetorical distancing); *narrative strategies* (authorial detachment and implied superiority; cultural distancing through frequent references to Russian “otherness”; construction of national identity via contrastive framing with British norms).

This research demonstrates that English-language portrayals of Russians during the Crimean War were shaped by a combination of cultural bias, ideological framing, and linguistic devices. Russian proper names were systematically distorted, indicating both phonetic adaptation and rhetorical alienation. The visibility of medals and ceremonial symbols was exaggerated through visual hyperbole, reflecting British views on Russian state symbolism. Religious depictions fluctuated between collective fanaticism and individual sincerity, revealing a dual-layered construction of Russian piety.

The study contributes a novel linguimagological model for analyzing how nations are constructed through language. It underscores how lexical, syntactic, and stylistic mechanisms interact to reinforce national stereotypes and oppositional cultural narratives. These findings are relevant to fields such as historical discourse analysis, linguocultural studies, and intercultural communication and may serve as a foundation for further studies of national images in literary or historical contexts.