

UDC 811.11

DOI: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

**THE RUSSIAN ARMY OF NICHOLAS I, SEEN BY THE BRITISH DURING THE  
RUSSIAN-TURKISH WAR OF 1853-1856 (LINGUOIMAGOLOGICAL ASPECT)**

© **Andriy MOROZ**

*PhD in Philology, Associate Professor  
Department of Foreign Languages and Methods of Teaching  
Berdiansk State Pedagogical University  
4, Schmidta St., Berdiansk, Zaporizhzhia region, 71100, Ukraine  
e-mail: [andriy7517@gmail.com](mailto:andriy7517@gmail.com)  
[ORCID: 0000-0003-2671-774X](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2671-774X)*

**Abstract:**

The article analyzes the views of the British soldiers, officers and journalists on their opponents – the Russians during the Russian-Turkish war of 1853-1856 from the perspective of linguoimagology. This science considers the means of image verbalization. For the study the memoirs of the Crimean War witnesses, journalists' notes, letters of the English soldiers and officers home were selected. The assessment, given to the enemy by the British, is of particular interest. The following aspects are explored: the Russians in battle, cunning behavior of Nicholas I army soldiers, their ammunition. The British writers also drew attention to the color of the officers' uniforms (blue) and highlighted the color of the soldiers (gray), which was different from the red one, used in England. The authors emphasize the unsatisfactory state of the ordinary soldiers' clothing (low assessment) and the excellent condition of the elite troops (high assessment). In addition, the English writers paid attention to the beards of the Russians, which were not already widespread in Europe at that period of time, but were considered as a sign of holiness in Russia, and were worn both by nobles and people of the lower strata. The authors of the memoirs use the following means of interpreting the linguoimagological aspect: inversion, metaphor, exclamation marks, superlatives, lexical repetitions, stereotypes, details, and even French borrowings. Aesthetic and ethical assessments are used to add expressiveness to the narrative.

**Keywords:** linguoimagology, assessment, expressiveness, detail, intercultural communication.

© Moroz A., 2019

*This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0.*

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

## Introduction

### Formulation of the problem

The direction of "linguoimagology" was proposed only a few years ago by L. Ivanova (Иванова, 2014). Unlike literary imagology, linguoimagology considers the verbalization of a nation's image by another nation with the help of lexical-semantic means. Our experience suggests that the national point of view is manifested in the selection of vocabulary, the nominations of the realities that people see firsthand, lexical and semantic groups, which serve as the subject of author's research, syntactic constructions, morphological and derivative tools, sound instrumentation. In our opinion, it is advisable to develop the following problems in the linguoimagological aspect: the perception of a country, its people, locality by representatives of another people in synchrony or diachrony; one country or people in the mirror of another; first impressions about some country and people as a result of geographical discoveries. If to fill in this list with specific countries and peoples (for example, a comparative analysis of the secretaries' diaries of the first Russian, English and French diplomatic missions to Japan), then it will be endless. The material for analysis can be folklore, artistic texts, epistolary, memoirs, journalism, and notes in the media.

**The aim of this article** is to convey the means of verbalizing the image of the Russians from the British point of view during the military events of 1853-1856 on the Crimean peninsula. Such a question has never been considered before in domestic or foreign linguistics.

### Analysis of recent researches and publications

Issues related to the analysis of the image of the country or the people were considered by the following linguists: (Иванова, 2016a; Иванова, 2016b; Сабитова, 2014, О. Тупчий, 2018). S. Miloslavskaya published the monograph "Russian as a Foreign Language in the history of the Russian European Image Formation" (Милославская, 2012) which explored issues related to the image of the studied country. But it should be noted that the term "linguoimagology" was not used. The authorship of L. Ivanova includes the following works: "The Genre Foundations of Linguoimagological Analysis" (Иванова, 2016a), where as an example of the implementation of various genres, the image of England and the English people in the notes by E. Dashkova, letters by D. Fonvizin, in the notes by such travelers as N. Karamzin, as well as in the journal articles by A. Pushkin and N. Gogol is considered. In the article "The reception of France in the linguoimagological aspect" (Иванова, 2014), L. Ivanova analyzes the French writers and the French literature; the events and personalities that played an important role in the Russian-French relations; French people and the French language; France and Paris, Versailles. It's important to mention such articles as "The synthesis of science – architecture – religion as a subject of linguoimagological description (based on the journalism by N. Gogol) (Иванова, 2015); "The synthesis of sciences and arts as an important trend in the development of modern consciousness" (Иванова, 2015) and some others.

The work by L. Ivanova "Russian Berlin in the linguistic aspect" (Иванова, 2016b) was also carried out from the perspective of linguoimagology. The author considers the capital of Germany in terms of Russian emigration at the beginning of the twentieth century. Different aspects are analyzed, such as the characterization of the most famous Russian writers and poets; Russians and their traditions in

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

the capital of Germany; Russian theater in Berlin; German as a means of communication between Russians and locals. A view of the Russian person and his/her traditions has been made.

The thesis by A. Tupchiy (Тупчий, 2018) analyzes the image of England in the Russian language consciousness of the late XVI – first half of the XIX century from the viewpoint of linguoimagology, too. The author examines, first of all, the assessment of the image of England in Russian-speaking sources, its linguistic embodiment, as well as the dynamics of this assessment during the specified period. The assessment is considered in the following aspects: a) assessment of the countries and their inhabitants by the authors of the studied texts (recipients); b) assessment of the mentioned recipients and their texts by the thesis' author, that is, the assessment of the evaluators and their characterization. The work has the following headings: Person. Character and mood; Names of dishes and drinks; Person. Ethnic invocations; Person. Names and titles; Socio-cultural phenomena; Maritime vocabulary; Card Games' Names; Names of clothes; Transport. As for the problem of the enemy's image assessment in the Russian-Turkish War (1853-1856), it should be said that it wasn't conveyed in the mentioned researches.

### **The methodology**

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

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

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

The use of the descriptive method consists of the following actions:

At the first stage of the descriptive analysis, we disclose micro texts containing an opponent's assessment in the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856. Then divide the micro texts into sentences, phrases and, finally, words with an assessment.

At the third stage, we interpret nominative-communicative (first stage) and structural (second stage) units. Structural interpretation is carried out using categorical and discrete analysis.

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

### **The main material**

The national language creates a specific color of the real world, due to the cultural significance of objects, phenomena, processes, selective attitude towards them of the language-culture bearers, which is generated by the peculiarities of activity, way of life and national culture of the people (Милославская, 2012: 372-373). People who speak different languages see the world through the

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

prism, prompted them by their native language, submit to the worldview that their language dictates. "Different languages are not different signs of the same subject, but a different vision (Ansichten) of it", – pointed out W. von Humboldt (Гумбольдт, 1960: 80).

Each language reflects a certain way of perceiving the world, which is imposed on all native speakers (Сабитова, 2014: 373). In the way to think about the world, the collective philosophy inherent in this people is embodied. "Intuitive language, the way of conceptualizing reality (the view of the world) is partially nationally specific, so people who speak different languages can see the world a little differently, through the prism of their languages" (Апресян, 1995: 39).

The I Defense of Sevastopol is of particular interest from the viewpoint of linguistic imagology, in which the languages and cultures of Russians, English and French have converged.

Although there were many wars in the history of Great Britain, it was the Crimean War (1853-1856) itself that was the most obscure and bloody war of the mid-nineteenth century and the only pan-European conflict for one hundred years from the Vienna Congress to the First World War. In its geographic scope, it was not equal and became a geopolitical war. It was based on a tangle of interstate contradictions, unraveling which an inquisitive researcher can trace the logical thread of all European history from the beginning of the New time to our days. The results of the Crimean War directly or indirectly influenced the historical destinies of Europe, and the rest of the world as a whole.

The attitude of the British to this war was extremely complex and ambiguous: from hatred to "the gendarme of Europe", Nicholas I, and the desire to once again fulfill the "civilization mission" to the fear not to get their share in the expected division of the Ottoman Empire. By the middle of the nineteenth century, the Englishmen had been thinking geopolitically for several decades, that is, everywhere they pursued their national interests, exposing themselves, at every opportunity, as advocates of civilization and progress.

However, the sacrifices they made (25 thousand people) were not worth its results. In 1877, Lord Salisbury, the future prime minister of Great Britain, said: "Every day I am increasingly convinced that the Crimean War was worthy of regret for stupidity", and a prominent British parliamentarian T. Sinclair described the war as "stupid and immoral" (Виноградов, 1991). They were not alone in their assessment. V. Vinogradov points out the opinion of the famous scientist R. Siton-Watson, expressed by him in the 1930-s: "The Crimean War began to be considered by most historians as the most unnecessary in modern Europe" (Виноградов, 1991).

Some of the authors point out that the Crimean War of 1853-1856 was the last argument that indicated the need for significant changes both in the structure of the Russian Empire and in the army itself:

*Up till the mid-nineteenth century it was still possible for the Russian army to function more or less adequately on the basis of what an agrarian society could produce when bolstered by good ordnance and textile factories. The Crimean War provided the first clear warning that this was ceasing to be the case. The army proved to defend a fortified base in its own homeland against troops dispatched from thousands of miles away* (Hosking, 1997: 194).

The attribute *clear* adds expressiveness to the phrase *clear warning*, emphasizing that the time has come for certain structural changes and the main indicator of these changes was the war of 1853-1856. There is an aesthetic assessment here.

There was a lot in the Russian army that did not correspond to the European standards:

*The low pay of the ordinary soldiers makes it vital for them to stretch their imagination and make themselves self-sufficient in every respect. They become their own bakers, brewers, butchers, tailors, cobblers, perruquiers, locksmiths, wheelwrights, saddlers, blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, coppersmiths, musicians and painters – in other words, any occupation which comes to mind. Nowhere in the world are there people who are so resourceful* (Hosking, 1997: 187).

The author of the story lists the professions: *bakers, brewers, butchers, tailors, cobblers, perruquiers, locksmiths, wheelwrights, saddlers, blacksmiths, carpenters, masons, coppersmiths, musicians and painters*, giving the impression of dynamism when using a letter *b* in words *bakers, brewers* and *butchers*. Repeated use of professions underlines the writer's surprise. It seems that the memoirist used practically all the common occupations of the mid-XIX century. In addition, the eyewitness of those events uses inversion: *Nowhere in the world there are people who are so resourceful*.

The events happening at the Crimean front were known to everyone. The Times regularly published reports from the theater of war. Its worker William Russell, who became the first military correspondent, was in Balaclava and saw this war from the inside. His reports were read by whole Britain. The information obtained from newspapers was interpreted and processed on pages of fiction.

There was a significance in the military discourse of the binary opposition "our / another" (or "friend / enemy"). According to many modern researchers, the image of a stranger is always a construct (Малахов, 1997; Рябов, 2003; Аho, 1994). It is determined not only by the real qualities of the other side, but also by its functions, which O. Ryabov formulates as follows:

"First, to maintain the identity of a social subject, separating strangers from own people;

Secondly, prove the superiority (military, moral, at last, aesthetic) and thus contribute to the victory over the enemy;

Thirdly, to strengthen the internal order and mark internal borders in own society" (Рябов, 2003).

The indicated functions of this image determine its main features. "Enemy" must create a sense of danger, cause conviction in the moral right of "their people" and wrong of "strangers". In order to induce obligatory anger, disgust and inexorability to this image at once, it is supposed to use such a method as the dehumanization of the "enemy". Finally, the "enemy" must be depicted rather weak and comic for "their people" not to lose the confidence in the belief that victory is inevitable (Aho, 1994; Harle, 2000; Keen, 1986).

In the numerous works by British poets and writers on the Crimean War of 1853-1856, the main archetypes were realized: the hero (the British soldier, the French soldier) – the villain (the Russian tsar, a soldier with a bayonet, the Cossack), own space (Great Britain, Balaklava, transformed into "Little London") – alien space (Sevastopol in the siege, Russia as a whole), backward (Russian, Tatar, Turk) – civilized (British, French) (Ищенко, 2008: 78).

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>



The above mentioned can be proved by the following example. The famous correspondent describes the heroic feat of the British brigade near Sevastopol:

*This gallant brigade, a majority of whom had so suddenly met a bloody death, were the flower of the whole army, and many a heart is saddened by their untimely fate* (Russell, 1857: 74).

As one can see, the author of the story treats his military with great respect. He uses the attribute *gallant*, metaphor *flower of the whole army* to portray the heroic actions of the English brigade.

Here's another example:

*A charge, such as never before took place, led our brave fellows beyond the guns (I believe twenty in number) which they captured, when they perceived they were unsupported and enfiladed by a terrible fire of infantry* (Brackenbury, 1855: 38).

Consider the key word *brave*:

*Brave – having or displaying courage, resolution, or daring: nor coward or timid. From French, from Italian bravo courageous, wild perhaps ultimately from Latin barbarous* (Collins, 1991: 194).

Specify the etymology of this word. According to one version, *bravo* comes from the "indomitable", "violent", "rapid", "passionate", which were used in relation to wild bulls, further with the development of the meaning, this word was used in relation to the winner, then it began to mean "courageous", "bold", "noble". As some researchers point out, extreme courage is manifested where the rationality of the mind retreats. U. Karpenko-Ivanova makes the assumption that in the English perception the death of a fighter in the battle naturally implies the courage of the dead. Those who survived are not called *brave*; it gives the deceased some kind of vibrancy, a distinction among others (Карпенко-Иванова, 2006: 147).

In the letters from the front there were many decorated heroic stories about the victory over the army of Nicholas I in the battles for Sevastopol:

*Down, too, alas! Fell many a hero with a warm Celtic heart, and more than one fell, screaming loud for victory. ... I can not depict my feelings when I returned. I sat down completely exhausted and unable to eat, though deadly hungry. All my uniform, my hands, my very face were bespattered with blood. It was that of the enemy! Grand idea! But my feelings, they were full of that exultation which it is impossible to describe. At least twelve Russians were sent wholly out of the "way of the war" by my good steel alone, and at least as many more put on the passage to that peaceful exit by the same excellent weapon* (Russell, 1857: 97).

In the analyzed passage, the author of the story used three exclamation marks and twice the word *at least*, which indicates the excited emotional state of the speaker, anxiety, emphasizing his enthusiasm for the British army's the military actions.

The English military officer also describes his allies – the French:

*The French are very good soldiers, and very kind and good natured. They will do any thing for the English. They fight to the last man of the English* (Russell, 1857: 98).

In the analyzed sentence, the superlative *very* was used twice, which underlines the great respect of the British to their French allies, also representatives of the Western world.

As well as at any other level, repetitions at the syntax level are the linguistic means for interpreting the additional meaning, expressiveness. According to I. Arnold, "as well as other figures of the language that enhance the expressiveness of the statement, repetition can be considered as the difference between the traditionally defined and situationally defined as a certain purposeful deviation from the neutral syntactic norm, for which one-time use of the word is enough (Арнольд, 2005: 244).

The author further notes: "The phenomena, excessive from the position of the speaker, and the listener (tautology, pleonasm, duplication of phrases, sentences) – absolute redundancy, amplify the impact on the listener as a result of various components' repetitions of the text, both in terms of content and in terms of expression" (Арнольд, 2005: 245).

It is known that the distance between words that are part of repetitions is not set. The task of repetition as a stylistic tool is to highlight words that are repeated in the sentence in such a way that the reader would pay special attention to them.

The journalists actively used the stereotypes that were fixed in the minds of the British about the Russians and provided vivid examples:

*The Officers on board the steamers could not distinguish, in the crowd on the beach, their fellow-countrymen, who were bravely carrying up the wounded in the midst of a shower of shells, which burst in all directions: to avoid which, the Russians had been trained to lie down flat, on a signal being given them to do so; and occasionally the remarkable scene was exhibited, of the jolly tars proceeding on their route up the cliff, regardless of the explosions and shot from the ships, whilst several thousand Russians were lying flat on their faces* (Royer, 1854: 16).

The author of the memoirs calls this a *remarkable scene*. Here is a comparison of the behavior of the British *jolly tars proceeding on their route up the cliff, regardless of the explosions and shot from the ships* and Russian sailors *whilst several thousand Russians were lying flat on their faces*.

The eyewitness of the event uses informal *tars* ((also Jack tar) (dated infml) sailor – (OALD, 1992: 933) and the attribute *jolly* that applies to adjectives with an ethical assessment. The British officer emphasizes that the Russian soldiers were specially trained to fall to the ground and to lie motionless: *the Russians had been trained to lie down flat*. The author of the memoirs uses the lexical repeat: *lie down flat and were lying flat*. Thus, by contrast, the author expresses irony and a certain negative attitude to the opponent.

It is clear that the falling on the ground was especially unacceptable for the English in the middle of the XIX century, since the recourse to this detail is found in many authors' memoirs of the period of the Crimean War of 1853-1856:

*The Russians had an ugly trick of lying on the ground, pretending to be wounded, and firing at us as soon as we passed; so our men massacred them right and left* (Russell, 1857: 57).

The attribute *ugly* refers to the words with negative connotation and has an ethical assessment.

The author protects his army, although one of the first treatises on the war "The Art of War" by Sun-tzu speaks of military trick as one of the components of the army's success (Sun-tzu).

The Russians had always had an example of M. Kutuzov's retreat from Moscow in 1812. The same happened in Sevastopol in 1853. The main goal of the returnees was not to leave behind anything useful to the army of the Allies. The British accepted this tactic with contempt and indignation. The eyewitness writes: *No pen can describe the scene within* (Russell, 1857: 48).

The author remarks later:

*The first villa we came to was the residence of a physician or country surgeon. It had been ruthlessly destroyed by the Cossacks* (Russell, 1857: 48).

The lexeme *ruthlessly* gives grounds to speak about the negative aesthetic assessment.

The retreat of the Russian army is often described in the memoirs of British newspaper reporters of the Times:

*The Russian cavalry, followed by our shot, had retired in confusion, leaving the ground covered with horses and men* (Russell, 1857: 71).

As can be seen from the example, the author emphasizes the chaotic retreat of the Russian army: *had retired in confusion*, reacting negatively to the event.

There's another example:

*The retreating Russians encamped at this village on the night of the battle of Alma, in a fatigued and dispirited condition* (Russell, 1857: 60).

The lexemes *fatigued and dispirited* have low assessment.

The description of the events on the Crimean peninsula contains a completely negative assessment of the behavior of Nicholas I army, who, incidentally, was called "Old Nick". (*Down, one by one – aye, two by two – fell the thick-skulled and ever-numerous Cossacks, and other lads of the tribe of old Nick* (Russell, 1857: 97)).

The next scene is about the shame that happened on the battlefield:

*The Russian gunners, when the storm of cavalry passed, returned to their guns. They saw their own cavalry mingled with the troopers who had just ridden over them, and, to the eternal disgrace of the Russian name, the miscreants poured a murderous volley of grape and canister on the mass of struggling men and horses, mingling friend and foe in one common ruin* (Russell, 1857: 74).

Here are used: words with the low assessment of *miscreants*, the phrase *to the eternal disgrace of the Russian name*. An Englishman-eyewitness is surprised by this detail: Russian soldiers confused the enemy and the friend, failed not to hurt their soldiers, destroying both their own people and foreigners (*mingling friend and foe in one common ruin*).

Many British narrators firmly established the stereotype of the Russian militaries as barbarians, which was often used by the British military journalists:



*The enthusiasm aroused in those whose foot-fall on this classic soil awoke at every step the slumbering echoes of departed grandeur, was only by the intense glow of indignation with which each succeeding chronicler banned the ruthless barbarity of the Muscovite conqueror, who had stripped the tumuli of the sacred relics deposited in them by the piety of a race of which they were almost the only memorials, defaced the temples, and shattered the sculptured marbles which had survived the havoc of successive revolutions, and wantonly destroyed monuments justly held the dearest by the enlightened nations of the world (Brackenburry, 1855: 83).*

In the following example, the statement is of particular interest “ruthless barbarity of the Muscovite conqueror”.

The following has the humiliating assessment:

*At 11.35 A. M., not a British soldier, except the dead and dying, was left in front of the bloody Muscovite guns (Russell, 1857: 74).*

In this example, the phrase "bloody muscovite guns" is used. It contains the negative ethical assessment.

The appearance of the Russian soldiers and officers, as well as nobles, is of considerable interest for the British who participated in the Eastern War of 1853-1856 or had the opportunity to observe the events. The authors often distinguish such a detail as a beard, which was already not fashionable in Europe, but which was considered as a sign of holiness in the Russian society:

*Besides our escort of mounted Cossacks, with their long lances, we were accompanied by a great many droshkies on each side of the road, filled with fair ladies and bearded gentry, who did not allow the lower classes to monopolize the curiosity of the country, and crowded as near to us as the troops would allow them (Royer, 1854: 19).*

The author emphasizes that the nobles wore beards: bearded gentry.

Otherwise, the portrait of the priest of the Russian Empire is of particular interest:

*We met many carriages of all kinds; in one was a fat priest, dressed in a violet-coloured gown, buttoned up to the neck, and extending down to the heels. He had a large, broad-brimmed hat, from which his hair hung down upon his shoulders, his beard was long and venerable, and he appeared quite at his ease in his carriage (Royer, 1854: 112).*

The author underlines the obesity of the priest, points out that *his beard was long and venerable*, and notes the clergy's unusual dress for the British: (*violet-coloured gown, buttoned up to the neck, and extending down to the heels*).

In the stories about the war a lot of attention is drawn to the Cossacks:

*... we could discover the well-known figure of a Cossack on horseback, with long lance in hand, no doubt meditating on the expediency of galloping off to announce the news to his superiors, of the grounding of a steamer on the coast (Royer, 1854: 3).*

The narrator writes the lexeme Cossack with a capital letter. He thus emphasizes that the figure of this hero is important and characteristic for understanding the entire Russian culture. The word

combination *the well-known figure* indicates that for the English in the middle of the nineteenth century this hero was familiar. It should be noted that this is one of a few cases in which the inhabitants of the Foggy Albion had some idea of the Russian Empire.

The thought of the Cossack is transmitted to a stilted verb *meditate* instead of a neutral *think*. This is also emphasized by the slow, leisurely movements of a person who is not afraid of the enemy and has every reason not to hurry.

The memoirist repeatedly uses *long lances* as a detail without which it is impossible to reproduce the image of the Cossack.

During the military events, the Russian army soldiers did not always have good ammunition. Their clothes did not suit well to conducting the war activities in the Crimea and in Odessa region:

*Our guard, in addition to the mounted Cossacks, consisted of about two hundred men of the 31<sup>st</sup> Regiment of Infantry: these poor fellows were so overpowered by fatigue, that it was found requisite to halt on the way for some time, to give the troops and the prisoners a little rest. The former, indeed, required repose more than the latter, for they were so encumbered with the knapsacks containing their extra clothing, their great coats, belts, ammunition, swords, and muskets, their heavy boots, and long thick coats reaching to their ankles, that they were not in a condition to march quickly over the ground in such sultry weather, and were really as much to be pitied as their prisoners (Royer, 1854: 19-20).*

The author of the story points to the color of the soldiers' uniform in the Russian Army. Traditionally, it was gray – very practical, in our opinion, during military campaigns. Next, the narrator lists all things that seemed to be superfluous and unnecessary during the summer heat: *extra clothing, their great coats, belts, ammunition, swords, and muskets, their heavy boots, and long thick coats reaching to their ankles*. The narrator uses the word *encumber*. This verb has the following definitions: *Encumber (derog.) crowd sth.; fill up sth.* (OALD, 1992: 299).

As one can see, the lexeme *encumber* contains additional negative connotations because it is marked as *derog.* The writer applies the negative utilitarian assessment of clothing and ammunition of ordinary Russian soldiers. Through the transfer of objects the purpose of influence on the reader, the desire to emphasize the difficult life of an ordinary military are achieved.

In addition, the author of memoirs introduces the nominative of *poor fellows*, which adds expressiveness to the assessment of the poor state of the Russian soldier during the Eastern campaign of 1853-1856.

In another description, the image of elite parts of the Russian Tsar's army is given:

*The Russians – evidently **corps d'elite** – their light blue jackets embroidered with silver lace, were advancing on their left, at an easy gallop, towards the brow of the hill. A forest of lances glistened in the rear, and several squadrons of gray-coated dragoons moved up quickly to support them as they reached the summit (Russel, 1857: 69).*

The author highlights the phrase *corps d'elite* using a French borrowing. He seems to separate the officer corps from ordinary and junior officers, especially since, as it's known, the Russian higher ranks communicated in their own circle in French.

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

In addition, unlike soldiers, the officers wore *light blue jackets embroidered with silver lace*.

### **Conclusions and perspectives for further studies**

Summarizing the above material, we can draw some conclusions.

Thus, it should be said that, from the viewpoint of many British historians, the Eastern War of 1853-1856 was a "senseless" and "unnecessary" war. The authors tend to believe that this was the last campaign of an uncompetitive army of the Russian emperor.

The English writers during the military events of 1853-1856 on the Crimean peninsula drew attention to the color of officers' uniforms (blue) and highlighted the color of the common soldiers (gray), which differed from the red color, adopted in England. Also, the storytellers were interested in the eccentric figure of a Cossack, which was to some extent known to the English reader, but still seemed something exotic, inherent in the Eastern civilization. The authors emphasize the unsatisfactory state of ordinary soldiers' clothing (low assessment) and the excellent condition of elite troops (high assessment). In addition, the English writers drew attention to the beards of the Russians, which were not already widespread in Europe at that period of time, but were considered as a sign of holiness in Russia, and were worn mainly by nobles.

The authors of the memoirs use the following means of interpreting the linguoimagological aspect: inversion, metaphor, exclamation marks, superlatives, lexical repetitions, lexemes with pejorative meaning, stereotypes, details, and even French borrowings. The narrators most often apply aesthetic assessment, which has a negative connotative meaning. They condemn the defensive tactics of the Russians to fall to the bottom and also destroy everything possible during the retreat. The English writers and journalists use stereotypes that have negative connotations.

In the next researches we plan to analyze some other aspects of the Russian-Turkish War (1853-1856) from the viewpoint of linguoimagology.

### **REFERENCES**

- Арнольд, И. (2005). *Стилистика. Современный английский язык*. Москва: Флинта: Наука. 384 с.
- Виноградов, В. (1991). *Британский лев на Босфоре*. Москва: Наука. 160 с.
- Гумбольдт, В. (1960). *О различии строения человеческих языков и его влиянии на духовное развитие человеческого рода*. Москва: Прогресс. С. 68–86.
- Иванова, Л. (2012). *Имагология как новое направление в лингвистике*. Киев: Издательский Дом Дмитрия Бурого. С. 73-76.
- Иванова, Л. (2014). *Рецепция Франции в лингвоимагологическом аспекте*. Киев: Издательский Дом Дмитрия Бурого. С. 91-100.
- Иванова, Л. (2015). *Синтез науки – архитектуры – религии как предмет лингвоимагологического описания (на материале публицистики Н. В. Гоголя)*. Спб.: Мир русского слова № 1. С. 52–57.

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

- Иванова, Л. (2015). *Синтез наук и искусств как важная тенденция развития современного сознания*. Київ : Вид-во НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова, 2015. Вип. 8. С. 164–171.
- Иванова, Л. (2016) *Жанровые основания лингвоимагологического анализа*. Саратов: Саратовский Национальный исследовательский государственный университет им. Н. Г. Чернышевского. С. 148-155.
- Иванова, Л. (2016). *Русский Берлин в лингвоимагологическом аспекте*. Киев: Издательский Дом Дмитрия Бурого. 112 с.
- Иванова, Л. (2016). *Французские города в видении Д. И. Фонвизина-путешественника*. Київ: Вид-во НПУ ім. М. П. Драгоманова. С. 177-183.
- Ищенко, Н. (2008). *Міфотворчість у воєнному дискурсі: національний міф про Кримську війну 1853-1856 років у літературі Великої Британії другої половини XIX століття*. Сімферополь: Тавр. Нац. ун-т ім. В. І. Вернадського. 426 с.
- Карпенко-Иванова, У. (2006). *Фрейм «Вооруженное противостояние» в русской, английской, итальянской культурно-языковой традиции*. Киев: Издательский Дом Дмитрия Бурого. 232 с.
- Малахов, В. (1997). *«Война культур», или интеллектуалы на границах*. Москва: Октябрь. № 7.
- Милославская, С. (2012). *Русский язык как иностранный в истории становления европейского образа России*. Москва: ФЛИНТА: Наука. 400 с.
- Рябов, О. (2003). *Нация и гендер в визуальных репрезентациях военной пропаганды*. Retrieved from: <http://ivanovo.ac.ru/alumni/olegria/Nation2.htm>
- Сабитова, З. (2014). *Языковая картина мира: языковые свидетельства вживания народа в природу*. Москва: ФЛИНТА: Наука, 2014. С. 370–380.
- Тупчий, А. В. (2018). *Образ Англии в русском языковом сознании конца XVI – первой половины XIX вв.: лингвоимагологический аспект: дис. ... канд. филол. наук: 10.02.02 – русский язык*. Киев: 282 с.
- Aho, J. (1994). *This thing of darkness: a sociology of the enemy*. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press. 189 p.
- 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*. 2<sup>nd</sup> series. London: P. & D. Colnaghi & Co. and Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans. 136 p.
- Collins English dictionary*. (1991). 3-d ed. Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers. 1791 p.
- Harle, V. (2000). *The enemy with a thousand faces: The tradition of the Other in Western political thought and history*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger. 232 p.

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.  
doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

- Hosking, G. (1997). *Russia: people and empire, 1552-1917*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 548 p.
- Keen, S. (1986). *Faces of the enemy: reflections of the hostile imagination*. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 292 p.
- Oxford Advanced Encyclopedic Dictionary*. (1992). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1081 p.
- Royer, A. (1854). *The English Prisoners in Russia*. London: Chapman and Hall. 543 p.
- Russell, W. (1857). *Complete history of the Russian War, from its commencement to its close: giving a graphic picture of the great drama of war / by Russell, correspondent of the London Times*. Toronto, C. W.: Bostwick & Barnard. 181 p.
- Sun-tzu. *The Art of War*. Retrieved from: <http://classics.mit.edu/Tzu/artwar.html>

(in English)

- Arnold, I. (2005). *Stilistika. Sovremennyiy angliyskiy yazyk*. [Stylistics. Modern English]. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka. 384 p. (in Russian).
- Vinogradov, V. (1991). *Britanskiy lev na Bosfore*. [British Lion on the Bosphorus]. Moscow: Nauka. 160 p. (in Russian).
- Gumboldt, V. (1960). *O razlichii stroeniya chelovecheskih yazykov i ego vliyaniya na duhovnoye razvitiye chelovecheskogo roda*. [On the Difference of the Human Languages Structures and its Impact on the Humanity Development]. Moscow: Progress. P. 68–86. (in Russian).
- Ivanova, L. (2012). *Imagologiya kak novoe napravlenie v lingvistike*. [Imagology as a New Trend in Linguistics]. Kyiv: Izdatelskiy Dom Dmitriya Burago. P. 73-76. (in Russian).
- Ivanova L. (2014). *Retseptsiya Frantsii v lingvoimagologicheskom aspekte*. [Reception of France in Linguoimagological Aspect]. Kyiv: Izdatelskiy Dom Dmitriya Burago. P. 91-100. (in Russian).
- Ivanova L. (2015). *Sintez nauki – arhitekturyi – religii kak predmet lingvoimagologichnogo opisaniya (na materiale publitsistiki N. V. Gogolya)*. [Synthesis of Science – Architecture – Religion as the Linguoimagological Description Object (Based on the Material of N. V. Gogol Articles)]. S.-Peterburg: Mir russkogo slova # 1. P. 52–57. (in Russian).
- Ivanova L. (2015). *Sintez nauk i iskusstv kak vazhnaya tendentsiya razvitiya sovremennogo soznania*. [Synthesis of Sciences and Arts as an Important Trend in the Modern Consciousness Development]. Kyiv : Vyd-vo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova, 2015. Vyp. 8. p. 164–171. (in Russian).
- Ivanova L. (2016). *Zhanrovyye osnovaniya lingvoimagologicheskogo analiza*. [Genre Basis of Linguoimagological Analysis]. Saratov: Saratovskiy Natsionalniy issledovatel'skiy gosudarstvenniy universitet im. N. G. Chernyishevskogo. P. 148–155. (in Russian).

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.  
doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>



- Ivanova, L. (2016). *Russkiy Berlin v lingvoimagologicheskom aspekte*. [Russian Berlin in Linguoimagological Aspect]. Kyiv: Izdatelskiy Dom Dmitriya Burago. 112 p. (in Russian).
- Ivanova, L. (2016). *Frantsuzskie goroda v videnii D. I. Fonvizina-puteshestvennika*. [French Cities in the Vision of D. I. Fonvizin the Traveler]. Kyiv: Vyd-vo NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova. P. 177–183. (in Russian).
- Ishchenko, N. (2008). *Mifotvorchist u voiennomu diskursi: natsionalnyi mif pro Krymsku viinu 1853-1856 rokiv u literaturi Velykoi Brytanii druhoi polovyny XIX stolittia*. [Mythmaking in the Military Discourse: the National Myth of the Crimean War of 1853-1856 in British Literature of the Second Half of the 19<sup>th</sup> Century]. Simferopol: Tavr. Nats. un-t im. V. I. Vernadskoho. 426 p. (in Ukrainian).
- Karpenko-Ivanova, U. (2006). *Freym "Vooruzhennoe protivostoyanie" v russkoy, angliyskoy, italyanskoy kulturno-yazykovoy traditsii*. [The 'Armed Confrontation' frame in the Russian, English, Italian Cultural and Linguistic Tradition]. Kyiv: Izdatelskiy Dom Dmitriya Burago. 232 p. (in Russian).
- Malahov, V. (1997). «*Voyna kultur*», ili intelektualnyi na granitsah. [The War of Cultures, or Intellectuals on the Borders]. Mocowa: October. № 7. (in Russian).
- Miloslavskaya, S. (2012) *Russkiy yazyk kak inostrannyiy v istorii stanovleniya evropeyskogo obraza Rossii*. [Russian as a Foreign Language in the History of the European image of Russia Formation]. Moscow: FLINTA: Nauka. 400 p. (in Russian).
- Ryabov, O. (2003). *Natsiya i gender v vizualnykh reprezentatsiyah voennoy propagandyi*. [Nation and Gender in Visual Representations of Military Propaganda]. Retrieved from: <http://ivanovo.ac.ru/alumni/olegria/Nation2.htm>. (in Russian).
- Sabitova Z. (2014). *Yazykovaya kartina mira: yazykovye svidetelstva vzhivaniya naroda v prirodu*. [Linguistic Picture of the World: Language Witness of the People Acting in Nature]. Mocow: FLINTA : Nauka. P. 370–380. (in Russian).
- Tupchiy A. V. (2018). *Obraz Anglii v russkom yazykovom soznanii kontsa XVI – pervoy poloviny XIX vv.: lingvoimagologicheskiy aspekt*. [The Image of England in the Russian Linguistic Consciousness of the Late XVI – First Half of the XIX Centuries: Linguoimagological Aspect]: PhD thesis – Russian Language. Kyiv. 282 p. (in Russian).
- Aho, J. (1994). *This thing of darkness: a sociology of the enemy*. Seattle: Univ. of Washington Press. 189 p.
- 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*. 2<sup>nd</sup> series. London: P. & D. Colnaghi & Co. and Longman, Brown, Green and Longmans. 136 p.
- Collins English dictionary*. (1991). 3-d ed. Glasgow: Harper Collins Publishers. 1791 p.

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

- Harle, V. (2000). *The enemy with a thousand faces: The tradition of the Other in Western political thought and history*. Westport, Conn.: Praeger. 232 p.
- Hosking, G. (1997). *Russia: people and empire, 1552-1917*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press. 548 p.
- Keen, S. (1986). *Faces of the enemy: reflections of the hostile imagination*. San Francisco: Harper and Row. 292 p.
- Oxford Advanced Encyclopedic Dictionary*. (1992). Oxford: Oxford University Press. 1081 p.
- Royer, A. (1854). *The English Prisoners in Russia*. London: Chapman and Hall. 543 p.
- Russell, W. (1857). *Complete history of the Russian War, from its commencement to its close: giving a graphic picture of the great drama of war / by Russell, correspondent of the London Times*. Toronto, C. W.: Bostwick & Barnard. 181 p.
- Sun-tzu. *The Art of War*. Retrieved from: <http://classics.mit.edu/Tzu/artwar.html>

Article submitted on 29 July 2019.

Accepted on 17 October 2019.

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.  
doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>

**РОСІЙСЬКА АРМІЯ МИКОЛИ І ОЧИМА АНГЛІЙЦІВ ПІД ЧАС РОСІЙСЬКО-ТУРЕЦЬКОЇ ВІЙНИ 1853-1856 РР. (ЛІНГВОІМАГОЛОГІЧНИЙ АСПЕКТ)**

© МОРОЗ Андрій Анатолійович

*канд. філол. наук, доцент*

*кафедра іноземних мов і методики викладання*

*Бердянський державний педагогічний університет*

*вул. Шмідта, 4, м. Бердянськ, Запорізька обл., 71100, УКРАЇНА*

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

*[ORCID: 0000-0003-2671-774X](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2671-774X)*

**Анотація:**

У статті проаналізовано погляди британських солдатів, офіцерів і журналістів на їхніх противників – росіян під час Російсько-турецької війни 1853-1856 рр. з точки зору лінгвоімагології. Ця наука вивчає засоби вербалізації іміджу. Для дослідження були відібрані спогади свідків Кримської війни, примітки журналістів, листи англійських солдатів і офіцерів. Особливий інтерес представляє оцінка, яку англійці надають ворогу. Досліджуються такі аспекти: росіяни в бою, хитра поведінка солдатів війська Миколи I, озброєння. Британські письменники звернули увагу на колір офіцерів (синій) і виділили колір солдатів (сірий), який відрізнявся від червоного, що використовувався в Англії. Автори наголошують на незадовільному стані звичайного солдатського одягу (низька оцінка) та відмінному стані елітних військ (висока оцінка). Крім того, англійські письменники звертали увагу на бороди росіян, які в той час не були широко поширені в Європі, але вважалися ознакою святості в Росії, і їх носили переважно дворяни. Автори мемуарів використовують наступні засоби інтерпретації лінгвоімагологічного аспекту: інверсія, метафора, знаки оклику, суперлативи, лексичні повторення, стереотипи, деталі і навіть французькі запозичення. Естетична та етична оцінка використовується для додавання оповіді виразності.

**Ключові слова:** лінгвоімагологія, оцінка, виразність, деталь, міжкультурна комунікація.

Статтю подано 29 липня 2019.

Схвалено до публікації 17 жовтня 2019.

Moroz A. (2019). The Russian Army of Nicholas I, Seen by the British during the Russian-Turkish War of 1853-1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect). *Accents and Paradoxes of Modern Philology*, 1(4), pp. 56-71.

doi: 10.26565/2521-6481-2019-4-4

<https://periodicals.karazin.ua/accentsjournal>