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Purpose of this article is to consider the means of verbalizing the Russian realia in the memoirs by A. Royer “English Prisoners in Russia” in the linguiomagological aspect during the military events of 1853–1856 on the Crimean peninsula.

Methods. The research is based on the general scientific methods of synthesis, analysis, selection and systematization of the material. The work uses the linguiomagological method: a set of techniques and procedures of a comprehensive approach to image assessment in different languages to establish the laws of its verbalization. The descriptive method was also used – a system of research tools used to characterize language phenomena at the stage of its development. This is a method of synchronous analysis.

Results. In Alfred Royer’s memoirs, much space is given to the analysis of realia. It is the analysis, because the author tries not only to convey the sound of a word unknown to the English, but also to give it an interpretation. In the article the following definition of the term “realia” is used: realia are mono- and poly-lexical units whose basic lexical meaning is traditionally assigned to them (in terms of binary comparison) by a complex of ethno-cultural information alien to the objective reality of the language-receiver. In the article such realia as samovar, traktir, stoi, priama, sei chas, yamshchik and the incorrect proper name Poltova (instead of Poltava) are analysed in the linguiomagological aspect.

Conclusions. By the mid-nineteenth century, the Russian Empire was isolated from the rest of Europe. As evidence, the British did not know the realities that denoted life and were used in the everyday life of the inhabitants of the Russian Empire. Ways of realia’ interpretation in English are descriptive periphrasis and contextual interpretation. These means of reproducing Ukrainian and Russian realities fully convey the denotative meaning of the words, help the English reader better understand the life of the inhabitants of Southern Ukraine (at that time – a part of the Russian Empire), and in some way convey the local colour, adding a bright colouration to the used realities.
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1. Introduction

In recent years the problems of national mutual perception have become relevant in the domestic as well as European science of the humanitarian cycle. The main reason for this is the logic of the development of science itself, since without taking into account the characteristics of international reception it is impossible to understand general cultural laws, and, secondly, the process of globalization, as well as the desire of mankind to preserve and regulate the life of society as a multinational unity. Similar studies were carried out by scientists in the field of linguistic and cultural studies, ethnolinguistics, ethno-psycholinguistics and intercultural communication.

Interest to the description and study of interethic perception’s issues has its own history of development. Large-scale works appeared in France, Great Britain, Russia, Ukraine, Germany, which studied the nature and structure of national images, stereotypes, myths, etc. (Т. Денисова, Е. Дубинина, Л. Иванова, Т. Михед, Д. Наливаiko, В. Наривскайa, В. Орехов, Г. Сиваченко, К. Хорев).

Of particular interest from the position of the linguoimagological aspect is the Eastern War (1853–1856), in which the languages and cultures of Russians, British and French converged. В. Орехов conducted a study of the imagological discourse of the Russo-Turkish War of 1853–1856 from the position of literary criticism (Орехов, 2010). Н. Исхаченков defended his thesis on myth-making: “Myth-making in military discourse: the national myth of the Crimean War of 1853–1856 in the British literature of the second half of the 19th century” (Исаченко, 2008).

Purpose of this article is to consider the means of verbalizing the Russian realia in the memoirs by А. Ройер “English prisoners in Russia” in the linguoimagological aspect during the military events of 1853–1856 on the Crimean peninsula. Such an issue has never been considered before in domestic or foreign linguistics.

From the perspective of linguistics, the image of the nation was considered in the works by Л. Иванова, who proposed the term “linguoimagology”: “Russian Berlin in the linguoimagological aspect” (Иванова, 2016), “Medialinguistics in the linguoimagological aspect” (Иванова, 2017а), “French literature and writers in the perception of the Russian writers of the 19th century” (Иванова, 2017б), “Synergetics of the images of the author and the main character in the literary text (linguoimagological aspect)” (Иванова, 2019).

The thesis by А. Тупчий (Тупчий, 2018) analyzes the image of England in the Russian language consciousness of the late 16th – the first half of the 19th century from the viewpoint of linguoimagology, too.

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 Russo-Turkish War of 1853–1856. Then we divide the micro-texts into sentences, phrases and, finally, realia. At the third stage, we interpret nominative-communicative (the first stage) and structural (the 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 increasing globalization of the world is attracting peoples’ attention to one another. The image of a people or a country in the mind of another people is formed under the influence of three main factors: 1) objective reasons (historical, political, social); 2) subjective factors (personal impressions, experiences); 3) traditional ideas, stereotypes (Орехов, 2008: 7). All these factors and reasons are necessarily verbalized, that gives grounds for linguoimagology. When communicating with representatives of other nations, we necessarily assess them, extrapolating our opinion to the people as a whole.

2. What are the main goals of linguoimagology

First, a careful analysis and consideration of one’s view from the outside can serve to enrich national consciousness and deepen national self-knowledge. Second, knowing the details and peculiarities of someone else’s thoughts about oneself can help substantiate counter-argumentation if that thought seems controversial. Third, knowledge of the specific historical and cultural contexts in which the external image of the country was formed may prevent both the unconditional acceptance of this image and the complete rejection of it. Finally, fourth, an indication of the negative features of the image, that provided a constructive reaction to the criticism, can serve (self) improvement of the analyzed object.

Linguoimagology is closely related to the category of assessment. The problem of assessment is carefully studied in linguistics (Н. Арutyunova, Е. Wolf). It seems that the assessment of other peoples is realized by linguistic units of all levels of the language hierarchy, as well as by the use of precedent phenomena and means of intertextuality. Despite the stereotypes embodied in the popular consciousness, the assessment of the people and the country is not a constant but a changing category.

As the linguistic personality is reflected, according to the observations of Я. Карaulов, in all the texts there’s as much material as fiction, memoirs, epistolary, travel notes, containing description and assessment of other peoples and countries. They can serve for linguoimagological analysis.
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We have selected Alfred Royer’s memoirs “The English Prisoners in Russia” (Royer, 1854) for our analysis. This man was an officer in the Navy who was captured in 1854 near Odessa. The author describes in detail everything that he finds interesting for himself and his countrymen. He mentions not only something new, he also breaks established stereotypes about Russia in the mid-nineteenth century. As we know, this Royer’s work has not been translated into Ukrainian or Russian. The more relevant our research is. For the analysis, we have chosen the realia of the Ukrainian and Russian life, which, for the most part, looked somewhat strange and unprecedented to Europeans of the time. It seems that the process of borrowing by Europeans, on the one hand, and by Ukrainians and Russians on the other, was equally fruitful.

3. The significance of the Eastern War for the history of Russia

How important was the Crimean War (1853–1856) for Russia? In this respect, the concept of the so-called “nodal moments” of the Russian history, that is, the moments in which the main problems of its relation to the world and the world towards it were raised (Ким Ли Чун, 1998: 126).

The authors of this concept knowingly implement it mainly on the material of the 18–20th centuries, that is, characterize, if to follow the periodization of N. Berdyaev, “imperial” and “Soviet Russia” and distinguish the following “nodal points”: 1) the era of Peter’s transformations; 2) 1812; 3) the Crimean War; 4) 1917; 5) the Second World War; 6) the collapse of the USSR (Ким Ли Чун, 1998: 126).

Thus, it should be noted that the Crimean War had a great impact on the development of the Russian Empire and its significant consequences. Royer’s memoires are full of Ukrainian and Russian realia. It can be said that the author concentrates on these “unknown terms” as many sentences are devoted to their descriptions.

4. The definition of the term “realia”. Its classification and ways of translation

So, what does the term “realia” mean? According to the definition of R. Zorivchak, the realia is “the basic unit of language, which contains a traditionally fixed set of information and serves to form the thought and transmission of messages in the sentence” (Зорівчак, 1989: 33).

From the proposed definition, it follows that this concept is a variable category, a relative one, which clearly appears in the binary contractual juxtaposition of specific languages (and cultures), and the volume of the realia of the source language is constantly changing depending on the vocabulary composition of the target language, peculiarities of the material and spiritual culture-perceiver, on the intensity of cultural and ethnic contacts of the respective linguistic groups.

How can realia be interpreted in another language? Based on a comparison of English-language translations of the Ukrainian prose with their originals, the researcher R. Zorivchak (Зорівчак, 1989: 93) singled out various ways of reproducing semantic-stylistic functions of realities by means of the language of translation: 1) transcription (transliteration); 2) hyperonymic renaming; 3) descriptive periphrasis; 4) combined renaming; 5) calque, full and partial; 6) interlingual transposition at the connotative level; 7) method of identification (substitution); 8) finding a situational correspondent (contextual translation); 9) contextual interpretation (interpretation) of realities.

5. Analysis of the Ukrainian and Russian realia in A. Royer's memoirs “English prisoners in Russia”

In Alfred Royer’s memoirs, much space is given to the analysis of realia. The author tries not only to convey the sound of a word known to the English, but also to give it an interpretation. In doing so, the English officer sometimes makes mistakes, such as in the word Poltova, instead of the Ukrainian Poltava. From the Russian and Ukrainian life we find the realia of samovar and traktir: Here however we breakfasted, our tea being soon made with the assistance of the samovar. This is one of the most useful of Russian domestic implements, and very superior to our English urn. A funnel that passes through the centre of the urn, serves as a chimney to produce a draught of air, so that three pieces of charcoal, which are lighted outside the apartment, soon burn brightly, and in less than ten minutes the water boils, and is kept at the boiling-point as long as required (Royer, 1854: 76–77).

The realia is not highlighted graphically, but the author goes on to talk about the history of the samovar and its use. For the interpretation of the realia samovar the method of contextual interpretation was applied.

In interpreting the realia “traktir”, the contextual interpretation of “traktir de Londres” – “hotel” was also used, and the reality itself was taken in quotation marks: “I called the place an “hotel” at which we put up; this title however it did not assume, but was satisfied with the more modest denomination of “traktir de Londres” (which is, I suppose, a corruption of the German “traktirhaus”), as it only professed to provide refreshments (Royer, 1854: 82).

The realia that mean orders, namely, “to the right”, “to the left”, “to stand”, “now” are italicized and quoted. To interpret these realities, the method of descriptive periphrasis is used: When driving, there are certain words with which it is very necessary to be acquainted; for, although there is a rule as to which side of a road a carriage should keep, – just the opposite of our own, but which is the same all over the Continent, – Russian drivers do not appear always to conform to it; for I used frequently to hear our coachman call out to the carriages or wagons that we met, “Na prava!” (To your right!), “Na leva!” (To your left!) (Royer, 1854: 89–90).

Other linguistic material that interested Her Majesty’s Navy lieutenant were: “Stoi” and “Priama”. Besides the above-mentioned Russian words, which I could not help learning, there are three more which are particularly useful to a traveller, and which I will here record: – 1. “Priama” go straight on; 2. “Stoi”, halt, stop; – these are useful in directing the yamchik, or whipper of the horses (Royer, 1854: 89–90).

The realia “sei chas” is used several times. It seems to reproduce the nature of the Russian and Ukrainian state of mind: In Russia, whatever request you make of a Russian, you are answered, “Sei chas” (immediately) but which you may infer to mean just the contrary, as the people are most dilatory in their operations (Royer, 1854: 88).

The realia “Sei chas” is also interpreted by means of a descriptive periphrasis.
6. Conclusions

Thus, it should be concluded that because of the fact that by the mid-nineteenth century the Russian Empire was isolated from the rest of Europe, the British did not know the realities that denoted life and were used in the everyday speech by the inhabitants of the Russian Empire. Ways to interpret realities in English – descriptive periphrasis and contextual interpretation. These ways of reproducing Ukrainian and Russian realities fully convey the denotative meaning of the words, help the English reader to better understand the life of the inhabitants of Southern Ukraine (at that time – a part of the Russian Empire), and in some way convey the local colour, adding a bright colouration to the used realities.
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