

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.24.03>

UDC: 811.133.1:355.01(477.75)"1853/1856"

Andriy A. Moroz

PhD in Philology, Associate Professor,
Department of Foreign Languages and
Methods of Teaching,
Berdyansk State Pedagogical University,
Berdyansk, Ukraine

<https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2671-774X>

e-mail: andriy7517@gmail.com



RUSSIAN SOLDIERS AND OFFICERS SEEN BY FRENCH WITNESSES OF THE CRIMEAN WAR (1853–1856) IN THE NOVEL BY L. BOUSSENARD “LE ZOUAVE DE MALAKOFF”: A LINGUOIMAGOLOGICAL ASPECT

Bibliographic Description:

Moroz, A. (2022). Russian Soldiers and Officers Seen by French Witnesses of the Crimean War (1853–1856) in the Novel by L. Bousсенard “Le Zouave de Malakoff”: a Linguoimagological Aspect. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 24, 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.24.03>

Abstract

The paper focuses on the means of verbalization of linguoimagology. The author analysed the linguistic characteristics of the interpretation of the perception of Russians by French soldiers during the Russo-Turkish war (1853–1856). L. Bousсенard’s novel “Le Zouave de Malakoff” (in 5 parts), which describes the war, was specifically selected for analysis. The author pays a lot of attention to the description of the battles of the Russians. L. Bousсенard assesses the events of the Crimean War, and the reader has the opportunity to consider them with the eyes of the Frenchman, as if involved in the campaign. This work fully covered the events of the mid-19th century that took place on the Crimean peninsula where the Russian, Turkish, Sardinian, French, and British armies were fighting.

On analyzing different aspects of discourse, it should be noted that from the linguoimagological standpoint the French vision of the Russians is presented in an ambivalent way. The author uses features with a positive connotation, as well as features containing negative attitudes in their semantics. The author conveyed different types of evaluations in his work. The writer used alliteration, simile, metaphor, hyperbole, occasional phrases, and repetitions. In general, the description of attacks and the retreat of armies is given in

the present tense. With this stylistic feature, the author makes the reader the witness, thus more colourfully revealing both the details of the battles and the nature of the parties involved.

Keywords: *linguoiimagology, evaluation, detail, alliteration, simile, metaphor, hyperbole.*

1. Introduction and Literature Review.

The field of linguoiimagology was proposed only a few years ago. The author of this term is Lyudmyla Ivanova, who researched the issues of linguoiimagology in her monograph “Russian Berlin in the linguoiimagological aspect” (Ivanova, 2016), and a set of papers, among which are “Imagology as a new direction of linguistic” (Ivanova, 2012), “The reception of France in the linguistic aspect” (Ivanova, 2014), “Synthesis of sciences – architecture – religion as a subject of linguistic description (based on the material of the journalism of N. V. Gogol)” (Ivanova, 2015), and others. Miloslavskaya published a monograph “The Russian language as a foreign language in the history of the European image of Russia” (2012), which examined issues related to the image of the studied country. But it should be noted that the term “linguoiimagology” was not used.

The thesis by Tupchiy (2018) analyses the image of England in the Russian linguistic consciousness of the end of the 16th – first half of the 19th centuries from the point of view of linguoiimagology. First, the author examines the assessment of the image of England in Russian-language sources, its linguistic embodiment, as well as the dynamics of this assessment over the specified period. The following aspects are examined: a) evaluation of the country and its inhabitants by the authors of the texts (recipients); b) evaluation of specified recipients and their texts by the author of the thesis, i.e. evaluation of examiners and their characteristics (Tupchiy, 2018, p. 26).

Issues of linguoiimagology were covered in the works by Bryk (2020) and Moroz (2019; 2020; 2022).

2. Aim and Objectives.

The *aim* of this paper is to convey the means of verbalizing the image of the Russians from the French point of view during the military events of 1853–1856 on the Crimean Peninsula. This issue has never been considered before in national or foreign linguistics.

It was achieved by solving the following *objectives*:

- to consider and describe the view of the French on the armies of Nicholas I and Alexander II;
- to highlight the positive and negative attitude of the French towards the Russians in the novel by L. Boussenard “Le Zouave de Malakoff”;
- to single out the linguistic means of evaluating the enemy's army by the French from the standpoint of linguoiimagology.

3. Methodology.

To show the complex nature of evaluating the image of the enemy, it is necessary to use a special method to analyse it. It should be based on the accumulated linguistic knowledge, methods, techniques and approaches for analysing linguistic facts.

The linguoiimagological method of studying an image is a set of techniques and procedures for an integrated approach to its assessment in different languages in order to discover the patterns of its verbalization.

To analyse the linguoiimagological aspect of the opposition “our” – “alien” in this paper, we use a descriptive method – a system of research methods used to characterize the phenomena of a language at the stage of its development. This is a synchronous analysis method.

The descriptive method includes the following steps.

First, we single out microtexts containing an assessment of the enemy in the Russo-Turkish War of 1853–1856, then we divide the microtexts into sentences, word combinations and finally words containing an assessment.

When conducting a search, we group lexemes into thematic-linguomagologemes, which are in turn divided into subsections called “linguomagologemes”. Each linguomagologeme consists of lexemes linked by a common theme.

On the third level, nominative-communicative and structural units are interpreted. The structural interpretation is performed using categorical and discrete analysis.

In this paper, evaluation is understood as a linguistic category as the attitude of speakers towards an object based on the recognition or non-recognition of its value in terms of the agreement or non-agreement of its properties with certain criteria of value.

4. Results.

The main goal of linguomagology is to study the verbalization of one nation's view of another people. In our study, we try to consider the point of view of the French on the Russian army during the Russo-Turkish war of 1853–1856. This war has become the subject of research by some contemporary authors, for example Amalvi (2011), Dufour (2012), Ishchenko (2008), Orekhov (2006; 2008), Sweetman (2001).

As language is a “guide to social reality”, it defines and processes our feelings (Sepir, 2012, p. 282), so to know people's worldview, one has to turn to linguistic units. Particular attention is paid to the study of the semantics and functioning of linguistic units, which has led to the recognition that the content of a linguistic unit is not limited to a conceptual component, but is essentially associated with knowledge, collective objects and phenomena of nationally and culturally oriented reality.

In this paper, evaluation, as a category of linguomagology, is understood as the attitude of native speakers towards the object, due to the recognition or not of its value in terms of conformity or non-compliance of its qualities with certain criteria of value.

Evaluation as a factor that structures the core of linguistic consciousness and forms the value picture of the world is considered by Karaulov, Yakovleva, Kasyanova, Ufimtseva, and others. The anthropocentric aspirations of modern linguistics compel us to recognize that the study of evaluation is truly impossible outside the value system of a particular culture, nation, historical era – outside the context that forms a person (linguistic personality) as subject and object of assessment. But understanding valuation solely as an opinion about values, in our view, narrows the boundaries of this category. The function of the evaluation is to correlate the subject and the event with an idealized model of the world, which finds its expression in others (not only the value), significant for the characteristics of the subject, such as the value of the possibility and inevitability, reliability and plausibility. The possibility of considering the evaluation from the viewpoint of such types of modal relations as doubt, probability, reliability, etc. is pointed out. Thus, evaluation should not be determined by value, but by importance, evaluation is the idea of importance, weight, value, need, usefulness, opportunity, aesthetics, ethics, etc. (in short, meaning) for human which is designated by evaluative predicates.

What is essential in the evaluative judgment is not the attitude of the object towards the value as such, but the expression of the idea of conformity or non-conformity of the object, the object of evaluation with the normative ideal, standard, sample, which may include values. Thus, if the value is centered on the norm, the evaluation is the result of a comparison with the norm. Evaluative values can be expressed at all levels of the linguistic

system. Evaluative semantics should be discussed, starting with affixes and ending with texts. But, first of all, estimated values are a type of predicate values.

Undoubtedly, the typology of evaluations can be based on various characteristics. Classification criteria can be selected such as evaluation method (absolute / comparative evaluations), axiological interpretation (evaluations with a “+” sign and with a “-” sign), the object of evaluation (evaluation of the properties of objects and evaluation of the situation, processes, states, etc.), the basis of evaluation (rational and emotional evaluations), etc.

Special evaluations can ultimately be taken to a general level and interpreted in terms of good and bad, but not vice versa: “It’s bad because it’s bad/ugly/unpleasant”, but it is logically incorrect to say, “it’s bad / ugly / unpleasant because it’s bad”. It should be noted that there is no obligatory correlation between good and useful / pleasant / appropriate, as well as bad with harmful / unpleasant / inappropriate. It is quite possible for such a state of affairs, when, for example, something harmful is assessed as good in a situation.

Meeting the ethical standard does not require a warning, so there are no special criteria that denote, for example, good behavior. They are replaced by constituent nouns with common words: to behave well, correctly.

Secondly, the different functional meaning of positive and negative evaluations for a person reflects the electrification of society, the tension of human passions, is realized in certain processes occurring in language. Indicative and often used affiliation of negative and positive evaluations: the vast majority of nouns in the field of negative evaluation and adjectives are to express a positive attitude of the speaker. Nouns characterize the object, revealing the basis of the evaluation and making the evaluative judgment more categorical: emotional evaluations are attributed to the object, rather than transmitted through the characteristics of its actions or properties. The verb, for example, refers to the evaluative characteristic of a certain time interval, the adjective shifts the accent of the person to its properties.

Thus, the results of linguistic research proper can serve as good factual material for culturological interpretation in the context of current problems of domestic axiology.

In linguoimagology, the axiological aspect plays a preponderant role, because it gives an appreciation of another nation or another people from the point of view of the norm, which is “theirs”. It is opposed to “stranger”.

From the perspective of this modern trend, the concept of self-esteem is very important. Ivanova notes:

1) evaluation characterizes not so much what is evaluated but who is evaluating, and this fact must be taken into account when drawing generalized conclusions;

2) in connection with the above, self-assessment is very important: how the author of the text assesses his homeland and his people;

3) assessment under the influence of a number of extralinguistic factors (political, economic, etc.) can change, as evidenced by the image of Germans and Germany in the consciousness of the Russian language of the Petrine era to the world wars to the present day (Ivanova, 2014, p. 387).

The evaluation of a nation by another nation is always subjective. A particularly interesting subject is the evaluation of two distinct nations by a person who belongs neither to the first nor to the second. For example, the point of view of Herzen on the British and the French (written between 1852–1864): “The Frenchman is really the opposite of the Englishman; English – a creature of the den, who likes to live alone, stubborn and rebellious; French – herd, bold, but easy to graze. Hence two completely parallel developments between which the English Channel is. The Frenchman constantly warns, interferes in everything, educates and instructs everyone; the Englishman waits, does not interfere at all in the affairs

of others and would be more ready to learn than to teach, but there is no time, you have to go shopping” (Herzen, 1988, p. 30).

In an overall assessment of the enemy, the question arises of considering the “own” – “foreign” opposition.

The problem of the “self” and the “other”, which we have chosen for the research, seems important and relevant to us for several reasons.

First of all, it is an experience of world history, filled with clashes, wars, skirmishes, aggressions, from which people of a culture of antiquity attacked the representatives of another culture – foreigners. The ethnic dual attitude “we – they”, distinguished by researchers from the most primitive societies, has proven to be stable and indestructible, in fact it covers the life of mankind for millennia.

However, the theme “one’s own and those of others” is not only relevant in connection with the existence of ethnic hatred. This confrontation is universal and penetrates various spheres of socio-cultural life. Throughout the 19th century, the world was divided into “own” and “foreign” for ideological reasons, it was alien to each other representatives of the western world (society of free peoples) on the one hand and the Russian Empire (serfdom) – on the other hand. Today, the line of alienation runs between the “golden billion” and all other humanity, as before in the middle of the 19th century – between rich and poor, between intellectuals and “people of the masses”. There are many other examples of the seriousness and extreme importance of the chosen problem.

It should be noted that a powerful layer of ideas focused on the analysis of semiotic aspects of the relationship of different sociocultural communities is contained in the works by Lotman. Based on the contexts of this thesis research, we can talk about the construction of Lotman’s semiotic model of the opposition of We-Stranger.

Scientists studied the mechanisms of the formation of images of the world, the penetration of texts from one society into another, the transformation of the semiotic system, the processes of development of a metalanguage of self-description of society, the peculiarities of certain models of culture, the laws of the semiotics of space. Lotman emphasized the role of the border between cultures, discovered the importance of the peripheral and central zones of the cultural space, revealed the essence and content of the processes of intercultural and intra-cultural (self-) communication.

In our main work, the opposition ‘Our’ – ‘Alien’ is analysed through the confrontation between the Russian Empire, on the one hand, and the troops of the Allies – Great Britain and France – on the other. We have chosen the state of war, because during military conflicts, it is better to understand one’s attitude towards others in all its diversity.

The evaluation is always different. Let us take a specific example. As Siari and Chervashidze point out, in the reconstruction of the Napoleonic era, the answer to the question “Who won the battle of Borodino?” largely depends on the nationality of the respondent (Siari et al., 2013, p. 43–44).

We have chosen L. Bousсенард’s novel “Le Zouave de Malakoff” for analysis, which has never before been considered in modern linguistics, and has not even been translated into Ukrainian.

It should be noted that the popularity of Bousсенард’s novels has known ups and downs. Readers of the Russian Empire of the early 20th century especially fell in love with them. At that time, all 40 volumes of the writer’s works were published. In the Soviet Union Bousсенард was little known. One of the few works to be printed was “Capitaine Casse-Cou”. By the way, this work has been translated into Ukrainian. As for “Zouave de Malakoff”, the original of the novel is not freely accessible on the Internet. We could only find it in the magazine format. Bousсенард actively collaborated with the “Journal des

Voyages et des Aventures de Terre et de Mer”, transmitting his notes after long trips to exotic countries. The author did not neglect the events that took place on the Crimean peninsula from 1853 to 1856. The novel “Le Zouave de Malakoff” began to appear on October 5, 1902, almost 50 years after the end of the Russo-Turkish war. The narrator of the story did not participate in the military events on the peninsula. He simply conveyed his vision of what had happened in the past and gave a subjective assessment of one or another fact in history.

5. Discussion.

The main character of the novel, nicknamed Jean Bris-Tout, is one of the most daring fighters of the Zouaves. It should be noted that these soldiers occupied a special place in the French army, characterized by courage, fearlessness and recklessness.

The French dictionary gives the following definition of the word “zouave”:

“A l’origine, soldat algérien d’un corps d’infanterie colonial créé en 1830. – Fantassin français d’un corps distinct des tirailleurs indigènes. 2. Faire le zouave, faire le malin, faire le pitre. Ne fais pas le zouave! Sois sérieux” (Dictionnaire le Robert, 1993, p. 1376).

As the definition shows, the Zouaves were not only respected, but they also had a reputation as clowns and light people.

Much attention is paid to the author of the novel describing the battles of the Russians, namely, the offensive and retreat of some units of the army of Nicolas I. Bousсенард gives an assessment of the events of the Crimean War of 1853–1856 and the reader has the opportunity to see it by the eyes of a Frenchman involved in the campaign.

The writer’s attention is chained to historical figures: Prince O. S. Menshikov, E. I. Tottleben, V. O. Kornilov, and some others:

“Stupéfait, exaspéré, Menchikoff aperçoit la gravité de sa situation. Il se sent perdu si le mouvement de Bosquet s’accroît. En homme d’énergie et de résolution, il veut écraser sans retard les divisions française. Il appelle ses réserves, infanterie, cavalerie, artillerie à cheval, des troupes admirables don’t il est sûr, et les lance avec furie sur les hommes de Bosquet” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 365–366).

Basically, the description of the approach and withdrawal of armies is given in the present time. With this stylistic technique the author makes the reader appear as an accomplice of the campaign, revealing in a more complete and colorful way the details of the battles, the peculiarities of the participating countries.

Characterizing Prince Menshikov, the author uses meliorative vocabulary: *homme d’énergie et de résolution, des troupes admirables* – approving his opponents. At the same time, lexemes with a negative connotation are used, which make it possible to assert a versatile approach to the enemy both from a positive and negative point of view:

“Cependant, le prince Menchikoff ne peut pas, ne veut pas admettre cette irruption des Français sur ce plateau. Il insulte et buscule ceux qui viennent lui annoncer que sa gauche est tournée. Il répète ces paroles désormais historiques: “C’est impossible!... Il faudrait, pour monter là, être matiné de singe et de tigre!”” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 365).

The author compares the skills of a French soldier to those of a monkey and a tiger. The writer uses exclamation marks to express the Commander-in-Chief’s astonishment and reluctance to believe the unbelievable.

Respect for the main person at that time in the Russian camp – Prince Menshikov is also expressed in the following sentence:

“*Sortie audacieuse de la garnison, irruption soudaine des troupes de Menchikoff qui surprend les Anglais à Balaklava et inflige un désastre à leur cavalerie, les alliés commencent à s’apercevoir qu’ils ont affaires à un ennemi redoutable*” (JVATM, 1903, 11.01.1903, p. 365).

The lexeme *redoutable* has a pronounced expressiveness and demonstrates the respectful attitude of the French author towards the adversary.

Like many French authors, Boussenard is fascinated by the talent of an eminent Russian engineer, Eduard Totleben, who supervised the construction of the siege structures in Sevastopol:

“*Malgré une cannonade effroyable, Sébastopol, grâce au génie de Totleben et au patriotisme de sa garnison, résiste aux allies et leur inflige des pertes cruelles. Partant de ce principe que l’offensive est la meilleure des défenses, les Russes attaquent sans relâche*” (JVATM, 1903, 11.01.1903, p. 102).

The lexeme *génie* conveys a positive attitude to the enemy and contains positive connotations.

Otherwise, the approach of ‘the elite hussar cavalry’ is considered:

“*Les hussards arrivent comme la foudre*” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 366).

This sentence compares the attack speed of the hussars to the speed of lightning.

The comparison is also performed in the following example:

“*Les Russes dévalent comme une avalanche en poussant des hurlements sauvages*” (JVATM, 1903, 8.03.1903, p. 255).

The author endorses the Russian hussars, using a lexeme with positive connotations *magnifique*:

“*Puis la fuite éperdue, en débandante folle, de ce magnifique régiment de hussards diminué de moitié*” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 366).

How exactly does the author of the story view the attack by the Russian military?:

“*Attaque héroïque, résistance furieuse, horions épiques, blessures affreuses, morts cruelles, acharnement égal, les adversaires sont dignes l’un de l’autres*” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 366).

The author uses alliteration – *héroïque – épiques [k], furieuse – affreuses [z], cruelles – égal [l]* into adjectives in order to convey the poetic sound of the description of the attack through rhyme and to show the attack in dynamics.

The author’s attention is also drawn to the appearance of the Russian military:

“*Mais rien ne peut arrêter l’élan des Français. Ils bondissent comme les tigres et se ruent sur la muraille humaine. Ils se trouvent devant de grans gaillards caffés de casquettes plates, vêtus d’immenses capotes grises sur lesquelles se croisent les buffleteries blanches, et chaussés de bottes dans lesquelles disparaît le bas du pantaloon vert. Il y a un corps à corps épouvantable. Puis des fracas de métal, s’accompagnant d’imprécations, de hurlements de bêtes torturées, de râles d’agonie. Solides, endurants, disciplinés, intrépides, ces geants à moustaches et à favoris opposent à la ruée de nos soldats la masse de leurs corps mutilés*” (JVATM, 1902, 26.10.1902, p. 382).

In the example above, first of all, such a detail is marked as the color of the shape – gray. Remember that the French were dressed in blue and the British stood out in red. The novelist’s attention is also drawn to the shape of the caps – flat. Moreover, Louis Boussenard describes the Russian soldiers as “géants”, “adultes” wearing “grosses bottes” using hyperbole. The author also draws attention to the mustache worn by Russian soldiers, as opposed to the Zouave, who had beards.

“Solides, endurants, disciplinés, intrépides” – qualities that are important in any context, but especially valuable in combat.

The author of the story uses the realia of “Cosaques” well-known to the French reader:

“Aux armes!... aux armes!... les Cosaques!”

“Une panique folle saisit tous maraudeurs. Ils abandonnent précipitamment leur butin, s'élancent à travers la cour, s'écrasent aux portes et s'enfuient éperdus, craignant les représailles de l'ennemi” (JVATM, 1902, 5.10.1902, p. 323).

This episode focuses on the exclamation marks that convey the horror and excitement of French soldiers as the Cossacks appear.

The author then refers to the preceding text:

“Plein d'admiration pour la vaillance des soldats moscovites, Napoléon disait d'eux: “Ce n'est pas tout de les tuer; il faut encore les faire tomber!”” (JVATM, 1902, 26.10.1902, p. 382).

The courage of the Russians is also given in the following example:

“Ne voulant ni se rendre ni s'enfuir, les Russes se font tuer sur place” (JVATM, 1902, 26.10.1902, p. 383).

In this example, the expressiveness was used twice by the negative particle “ni”.

Boussenard repeatedly appeals to the events of 1812, when the army of Kutuzov retreated from Moscow, destroying everything that bothered the French. The same thing happened during the withdrawal of the army of Alexander II from the walls of Sevastopol:

“Malakoff pris, Sébastopol est à nous. Les Russes le comprennent et se préparent à l'évacuer le soir même à cinq heures. Mais auparavant, le général Osten-Sacken, fidèle au tragique et formidable exemple de Rostopchine, veut accomplir le suprême sacrifice et ne rien laisser de la ville si héroïquement défendue” (JVATM, 1902, 26.10.1902, p. 384).

Then the author once again turns to the additional description of the tragedy of the city of Sevastopol:

“A minuit, pendant que la retraite s'opère dans un ordre admirable sur le pont immense de la grande rade, la destruction commence, implacable, sauvage et grandiose. Redoutes, magasins remparts, bastions, place d'armes, batteries sautent de tous côtés, sur l'immense ligne de défense. A l'intérieur, palais, monuments publics, demeures princières, casernes, maisons, église s'embrassent a la fois. Une mer de flames s'étend sur les débris de la ville et se reflète en une pourpre sanglante a plus de quinze lieueu!” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 365).

To underline the gravity of the events, L. Boussenard gives a detailed account of everything that was destroyed by the Austen-Saken army. He describes this action as *implacable, sauvage et grandiose* extremely negative about him.

But what has already been said is not enough. The author refers to additional descriptions, where he tells about the damage caused by the army of the Russian emperor:

“En même temps, il ordonne de tout incendier, fermes, aouls, meules de blé, villas, de facon à priver du moindre retranchement ces tirailleurs dont les armes à longue portée lui font tant de mal” (JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902, p. 365).

6. Conclusion.

To sum up, it should be noted that in the linguoimagological aspect, the French vision of the Russians in L. Boussenard's novel “Le Zouave de Malakoff” is presented in an ambivalent way. The author uses lexemes with a positive connotation, as well as lexemes which contain a negative attitude in their semantics. The author used alliteration, simile, metaphors, hyperbole, exclamation marks, and repetitions. Basically, the description of the advance and withdrawal of armies is given in the present tense. With the help of this stylistic means, the author makes the reader like an accomplice of the campaign, reveals in a more

complete and colorful way both the details of the fights, and the nature of the parties involved.

The French novelist refers to previous texts and draws a parallel between the events of 1812 near Moscow and the withdrawal of the siege by the Russian army from Sevastopol.

In other studies we will analyse the memoirs of soldiers participating in the events of the Eastern War of 1853–1856, also from the point of view of linguoimagology, and provide an analysis of the most frequent ways of representing the enemy.

References

Amalvi, Ch. (2011). *Les héros des Français. Controverses autour de la mémoire nationale* [French heroes. National memory controversies]. 352 p. [in French].

Bryk, M. M. (2020). *Verbalizatsiia variantiv spryiniattia obrazu Turechchyny predstavnykamy rosiiskoi ta anhliiskoi linhvokultur (na materialy romaniv pysmennykiv-bilinhviv)* [Verbalization of options for the perception of the image of Turkey by representatives of Russian and English linguistic cultures (on the basis of novels by bilingual writers)] : dys. ... kand. filol. nauk : 10.02.17. Kyiv : NPU im. M. P. Drahomanova, 269 s. [in Ukrainian].

Dictionnaire le Robert (1993). Paris. 1372 p. [in French].

Dufour, C. (2012). *L'histoire de France pour ceux qui n'aiment pas ça* [The history of France for those who don't like it]. Paris. 312 p. [in French].

Herzen, A. (1988). *Sochineniya v 4 t. T. 3. Byloe i dumyi* [Past and thoughts]. Chasti 6-8. Moskva : Pravda, 560 s. [in Russian].

Ivanova, L. (2012). *Imagologiya kak novoe napravlenie v lingvistike* [Imagology as a new direction in linguistics]. *Mova i kultura (Naukoviy zhurnal)*. Kiev : Izdatelskiy Dom Dmitriya Burago, 73–76. [in Russian].

Ivanova, L. (2014). *Retseptsiya Frantsii v lingvoimagologicheskom aspekte* [Reception of France in the linguoimagological aspect]. *Mova i kultura (Naukoviy zhurnal)*. Kiev : Izdatelskiy Dom Dmitriya Burago, 91–100 [in Russian].

Ivanova, L. (2015). *Sintez nauki – arkhitektury – religii kak predmet lingvoimagologichnogo opisaniya (na materiale publitsistiki N. V. Gogolya)* [Synthesis of science – architecture – religion as a subject of linguoimagological description (based on the material of journalism by N.V. Gogol)]. *Mir russkogo slova*. 1. Spb., 52–57 [in Russian].

Ivanova, L. (2016). *Russkij Berlin v lingvoimagologicheskom aspekte* [Russian Berlin in the linguoimagological aspect]. Kiev : Izdatelskiy dom Dmitriya Burago, 112 s. [in Russian].

Ishchenko, N. (2008). *Mifotvorchist u voienomu diskursi: natsionalnyi mif pro Krymsku viinu 1853-1856 rokiv u literaturi Velykoi Brytanii druhoi polovyny XIX stolittia* [Mythmaking in Military Discourse: The National Myth of the Crimean War of 1853-1856 in the British Literature in the Second Half of the Nineteenth Century] : dys. d-ra fil. nauk : 10.02.04 / Tavr. Nats. un-t im. V. I. Vernadskoho. Simferopol, 426 s. [in Ukrainian].

Miloslavskaya, S. (2012). *Russkiy yazyk kak inostrannyi v istorii stanovleniya evropeyskogo obraza Rossii* [Russian as a foreign language in the history of the formation of the European image of Russia]: monografiya / 2-e izd., stereotip. Moskva : FLINTA: Nauka, 400 s. [in Russian].

Moroz, A. A. (2019). *Boiezdannost anhliiskoi armii pid chas Rosiisko-turetskoi viiny (1853-1856 rr.) ochamy rosiian-svidkiv podii (linhvoinmaholohichnyi aspekt)* [Combat capability of the British army during the Russo-Turkish war (1853-1856) by the eyes of Russian eyewitnesses (linguoimagological aspect)]. *Visnyk MDU. Serii: Filolohiia. Mariupol*, 20, 217–225. [in Ukrainian].

Moroz, A. A. (2020). *Ukrainian and Russian realia in A. Royer's memoirs "English Prisoners in Russia" as an object of linguoimagological research*. *Pivdennyi arkhiv (filolohichni nauky)*. Zbirnyk naukovykh prats. LXXXII. Kherson : KhDU, 82–86. [in English].

Moroz, A. A. (2022) *The French Language and Culture from the Viewpoint of Russians during the Crimean War of 1853–1856 (Linguoimagological Aspect)*. *Scientific Journal of National Pedagogical Dragomanov University. Series 9. Current Trends in Language Development*, 23, 52–63. [in English].

Orekhov, V. (2006). *Russkaya literatura i natsionalnyi imidzh (imagologicheskiy diskurs v russko-frantsuzskom literaturnom dialoge)* [Russian literature and national image (imagological discourse in the Russian-French literary dialogue)]. Simferopol : AntikVA, 608 s. [in Russian].

Orekhov, V. (2008). *Mif o Rossii vo frantsuzskoy literature pervoy poloviny XIX veka* [The myth of Russia in the French literature of the first half of the nineteenth century]. Simferopol : OAO Simferopolskaya gorodskaya tipografiya, 200 s. [in Russian].

- Sepir, E. (2002). *Izbrannye trudy po yazykoznaniiu i kulturologii (per. s angl.)* [Selected Works on Linguistics and Cultural Studies]. Moskva : Progress, 656 s. [in Russian].
- Siari, Zh. & Shervashidze, V. (2013). *Obraz Napoleona vo Frantsii* [The image of Napoleon in France]. *Slovo.ru: Baltiyskiy aktsent*. 4 (1), 35–46. [in Russian].
- Sweetman, J. (2001). *The Crimean War (Essential Histories)*. London : Osprey, 96 p.
- 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 at the end of the 16th – first half of the 19th centuries: linguoimagological aspect]. Kiev. [in Russian].

Sources of Illustrative Material

- JVATM, 1903, 11.01.1903 = Bousсенард, L. Le Zouave de Malakoff. *Journal des voyages et des aventures de terre et de mer* (1903, Janvier 11). [in French].
- JVATM, 1903, 08.03.1903 = Bousсенард, L. Le Zouave de Malakoff. *Journal des voyages et des aventures de terre et de mer* (1903, Mars 8). [in French].
- JVATM, 1902, 05.10.1902 = Bousсенард, L. Le Zouave de Malakoff. *Journal des voyages et des aventures de terre et de mer* (1902, Octobre 5). [in French].
- JVATM, 1902, 19.10.1902 = Bousсенард, L. Le Zouave de Malakoff. *Journal des voyages et des aventures de terre et de mer* (1902, Octobre 19). [in French].
- JVATM, 1902, 26.10.1902 = Bousсенард, L. Le Zouave de Malakoff. *Journal des voyages et des aventures de terre et de mer* (1902, 26 Octobre). [in French].

Бібліографічний опис:

Мороз, А. А. (2022). Російські солдати й офіцери очима французьких свідків Кримської війни (1853–1856) у романі Л. Буссенара “Le Zouave de Malakoff”: лінгвоімагологічний аспект. *Науковий часопис Національного педагогічного університету імені М. П. Драгоманова. Серія 9. Сучасні тенденції розвитку мов*, 24, 37–46. <https://doi.org/10.31392/NPU-nc.series9.2022.24.03>.

Анотація

У статті сфокусовано увагу на засобах вербалізації лінгвоімагології. Автор проаналізував лінгвістичні особливості трактування сприйняття росіян французькими солдатами під час Російсько-турецької війни (1853–1856 рр.). Спеціально для аналізу було обрано роман Л. Буссенара “Le Zouave de Malakoff” (у п’яти частинах), в якому розповідається про цю війну. Л. Буссенар оцінює події Кримської війни, і читач, ніби живий учасник кампанії, має можливість розглянути їх очима французуса. У цьому творі повною мірою висвітлено події середини XIX століття, що відбувалися на Кримському півострові, де воювали російські, турецькі, сардинські, французькі та британські війська.

Проаналізувавши різні аспекти дискурсу, виявлено, що в лінгвоімагологічному вимірі французьке бачення росіян представлено амбівалентно. Автор використовує лексеми з позитивною конотацією, а також лексеми, що містять у своїй семантиці негативне ставлення, тим самим вдаючись до різних видів оцінки. Серед використаних засобів зафіксовано алітерації, порівняння, метафори, гіперболи, оказіональні фрази, повтори. Загалом опис атак і відступу армій подано в теперішньому часі. Цією стилістичною особливістю автор робить читача свідком, колоритніше розкриваючи деталі битв, характер сторін.

Ключові слова: лінгвоімагологія, оцінка, виразність, деталь, алітерації, порівняння, метафори, гіперболи.