



*Asesorías y Tutorías para la Investigación Científica en la Educación Puig-Salabarría S.C.
José María Pino Suárez 400-2 esq a Lerdo de Tejada, Toluca, Estado de México. 7223898473*

RFC: ATII20618V12

Revista Dilemas Contemporáneos: Educación, Política y Valores.

<http://www.dilemascontemporaneoseducacionpoliticayvalores.com/>

Año: VI

Número: Edición Especial.

Artículo no.:145

Período: Junio, 2019.

TÍTULO: Imágenes de la guerra de Crimea.

AUTORES:

1. Assist. Prof. Shalala Ramazanova.
2. Ph.D. Yuliya V. Yurova.
3. Ph.D. Liudmila N. Tretyakova.

RESUMEN: El artículo demuestra, que a través de la imagen en el idioma ruso, la conciencia de la segunda mitad del siglo XIX comprende el evento mundial, la guerra de Crimea. Las imágenes significativas incluyen imágenes de políticos rusos y extranjeros, figuras públicas, comandantes, etc. Las imágenes-símbolos de la guerra, la gloria de los rusos y la traición de Rusia y los rusos pertenecen a las imágenes del mundo inanimado.

PALABRAS CLAVES: la guerra de Crimea, la conciencia de la lengua rusa de la segunda mitad del siglo XIX, la imagen.

TITLE: Images of the Crimean War.

AUTHORS:

1. Assist. Prof. Shalala Ramazanova.
2. Ph.D. Yuliya V. Yurova.
3. Ph.D. Liudmila N. Tretyakova.

ABSTRACT: The paper proves that through the image in the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century comprehends the world event, the Crimean War. The significant images include images of Russian and foreign politicians, public figures, commanders etc. The images-symbols of war, the glory of the Russians and the betrayal of Russia and the Russians belong to the images of the inanimate world.

KEY WORDS: the Crimean War, the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century, image.

INTRODUCTION.

The figurative component is the brightest component of the concept. It consists of lexical units that convey a feature of the world perception of the Russian era of the Crimean War and contain significant national and cultural information.

Alefirenko (2018), Arutyunova (1990), Vezhbitskaya (1998), Maslova (2017), Mokienko (1995), Stepanov (1997), Teliya (1996), Ter-Minasova (2000), Zolotykh (2005), etc. they prove that the figurative linguistic units through a certain figurative and evaluative representation clearly and distinctly reflect the ethnocultural identity of the ethnos.

Imagery is a property of the word to reflect the figurative vision of the fact of reality. N.S. Novikova and N.V. Cheremisin notice figurative units of the language, making up the “system of intuitive ideas about reality”. They are semantically and stylistically more capacious and deeper compared to the separately considered word.

The figurative component is part of the meaning of the word. The origins of imagery, according to V.V. Vinogradov, are in the semantic ambiguity of the word in the text. The two-dimensionality of the semantics of the figurative word can be considered as the dictionary meaning of the word and plus “artistic-pictorial increments of meaning.

DEVELOPMENT.

Methodology.

The main method is chosen by the linguoculturological analysis, which involves the identification of linguoculturological concepts, component concepts, nominative fields and cognitive signs through the analysis of language means of their objectification. The method of description, component analysis, comparative method, methods of field description of language material, methods of quantitative processing of language data and continuous textual sampling of language material are also used.

Results and discussion.

Image in lingo cognitive and linguistic cultural studies.

Cognitive linguistic and cultural linguistics differently determine the origins of imagery. L. Adonina, O. Bondareva, O. Fisenko, K. Ismailova researches on the cognitive mechanism of imagery, where the object of study is the image as a cognitive phenomenon and a symbolic product, and the object of study is the cognitive mechanism of figurativeness as a conjugation of meanings of entities of various structures: representations, words, texts, style manners, and cultural eras.

Analyzing the vocabulary definitions of the concept “image”, the author pays attention to the relation of two interpretations of the image to the cognitive mechanism and psychological nature of the image and one to the artistic image. The researcher identifies a clear number of system-forming features of the image: representation, imprint in memory, mechanism, nature, aestheticized generalization, concept plus attitude, vision [Adonina et al. 2018; Yerizon et al., 2018; Umpawan, 2018; Abishov et al, 2018].

In modern cognitive linguistics, the figurative component is the product of the primary visual-sensual nomination.

In linguistic culturology, it is accepted to distinguish an image from a symbol, which is accompanied by “high meanings” of an extra linguistic nature. “The image serves as the foundation over which the symbol and the sign are built” [Alefirenko, 2004; Millanei et al, 2016]. It means figurative expressions are considered as products of the secondary nomination, which is based on the use of words in a figurative sense [Razavi et al, 2015; Laureano et al, 2018].

For our study, performed at the junction of linguistic culturology and cognitive linguistics, are significant as images of the primary (when the modeling concept is as a mental unit), and images of the secondary nomination (when explicating the concept is as a fragment of the national picture of the world

The image in the structure of the concept "Crimean War".

In the concept of "The Crimean War" of the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century, the figurative component is built on the elements of the living world and non-living world denotative spheres.

The images belonging to the living world are divided into anthroponymic, zoomorphic and ornithological.

The most frequent in the figurative component of the concept "Crimean War" are anthroponymic images.

Male images include European and Russian politicians.

Male images in the Russian language consciousness of the period of Crimean War are cognitive signs: “European politicians” (G.D. Palmerston, Louis-Napoleon, Napoleon I) and “Russian politicians” (Nikolai, Peter I). Explication is determined by the Russian linguistic consciousness of the second half of the nineteenth century. These cognitive signs are contemporaries perceive the Crimean War as a political phenomenon associated with the confrontation of real historical figures.

Anthropomorphic images of Europeans – politicians in the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century personalized and reduced to two real historical figures: Englishman G.D. Palmerston and Frenchman Louis Napoleon.

The Russian language consciousness linked the names of these European leaders with the betrayal of the Christian faith, the unleashing of war against the Russian Empire.

Proper names representing the concept of the “Crimean War” are as means of creating irony.

The imaginative component of the “Crimean War” concept contains a hidden assessment of European political figures. Caricatured in the Russian language picture of the world of the second half of the XIX century Ministry of Internal Affairs in the United Kingdom G.D. Palmerston – Here in the militant passion / Voivode Palmerston / hits Russia on the map / with the index finger. (Alferev V.P. "On the current war") / Вот в воинственном азарте / Воевода Пальмерстон / Поражает Русь на карте / Указательным перстом. (Алферьев В.П. «На нынешнюю войну»).

On the frivolity of the figure of Lord G.D. Palmerston indicates a qualitatively adverbial adverb in the excitement 'in a state of excitement, thoughtlessly'.

In the figurative component of the concept, "Crimean War" of the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century includes language units implicitly loaded with meanings and possible associative links. For example, in the poem of V.P. Alferyeva “To the present war” a semantic associative chain arises: “the lord – warlord – ruler of destinies”, which thanks to the historicities of the voivod, the peculiar to the Slavic linguistic culture, combined with the name of his own English lord, breaks down. A new semantic chain is formed: “voivod Palmerston is an inept warlord, able to easily hit the enemy only "on the map", "with index finger".

The image of Louis Napoleon semantically approaches the image of Napoleon I: Then we saved our native / country and honor and the Royal throne; / Then, on our steel chest, / Napoleon hurt himself!

(Glinka F.N. "Hurray!") / Тогда спасали мы родную / Страну и честь и Царский трон; / Тогда, о нашу грудь стальную, / Разшибся сам Наполеон! (Глинка Ф.Н. «Ура!»).

The name of the French ruler Napoleon I symbolizes the defeat of the allies in the Crimean War.

Against the background of the figure of Napoleon I, the figure of Napoleon III looks insignificant:

We saw this sword / and is is not in such hands ... (Alferiev VP "To the current war") / Мы видали шпагу эту / И не в этаких руках... (Алферьев В.П. «На нынешнюю войну»).

Strengthens the insignificance of the figure of Napoleon III his comparison with the little finger of the "corporal"

Napoleon I: He is your little corporal, / you are under the growth of his little finger; / Yes, and he did

not chew / All-Russian hotel. (Vyazemsky P.A. "Modern Notes") / Он – ваш маленький капрал, /

Вы ж – под рост его мизинцу; / Да и тот не разжевал / Всероссийского гостинцу. (Вяземский

П.А. «Современные заметки»). As you can see, in the Russian language consciousness of the XIX

century the figurative word has a connotative function, possessing semantic two-plans, expressiveness, emotivity, intensifying value, appraisal and artistic visual.

The image is a standard in the Russian language consciousness of the epoch of the Crimean War -

Peter I: And we are behind our kings, / with the soul believing Peter, / as for skilled leaders / we went

to greatness and goodness. (Maykov A. "In memory of Derzhavin. When receiving news of the

victories at Sinope and Akhaltsikhe") / А мы за нашими царями, / Душою веруя Петру, / Как за

искусными вождями / Пошли к величью и добру. (Майков А. «Памяти Державина. При

получении известия о победах при Синопе и Ахалцихе»). Peter I for the Russian public in the

second half of the nineteenth century was not just a historical figure. This is the sovereign; whose

name binds the security of Russian borders. In the Russian linguistic consciousness, the strength,

power, and historical mission of Tsar Nicholas are revealed through association with Peter I: ... The

one who put down the purple, / and as a sailor and carpenter lived; / For Russia I went to suffer, to

learn, / who wished to be reborn, / to reborn his people! (Maykov A. "In memory of Derzhavin. When

receiving news of the victories at Sinope and Akhaltsikhe") / ...Тот, кто сложил с себя порфиру, / И как матрос и плотник жил; / За Русь пошел страдать, учиться, / Кто восхотел переродиться, / Чтоб свой народ переродить! (Майков А. «Памяти Державина. При получении известия о победах при Синопе и Ахалцихе»).

In the Russian language consciousness of the era of the Crimean War, a parallel arises Menshikov between Caesar.

Guy Julius Caesar is Ancient Roman political leader and political figure, commander, writer. Possessing the brilliant abilities of a military strategist and tactic, he won the battles of the civil war and began reforming Roman society and the state. The activities of Gaius Julius Caesar radically changed the cultural and political image of Western Europe. A quality adjective bad serves to contrast these historical figures: Menshikov was bad, Caesar” ...

Cognitive sign "Turkish politicians" - Osman Pasha, Ali Pasha, Ibrahim Pasha, Sultan Abdul-Mejid I. For example, ... Piastrov from thirty will give Sultan (Vyazemsky P.A. "Odessa") / ... Пиастров с тридцать даст Султан (Вяземский П.А. «Одесса»).

The image of the Sultan (Abdul-Mejid I) in the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century connects close to the image of Judas Iscariot who was the traitor.

In the figurative component “The Crimean War”, the cognitive signs “French” and “Russians” stand out, which do lexical units reflecting ideas about the French and themselves Russian ethnic group of the middle XIX century explicate.

Fractional image of the enemy of Russia, built on semantic dissimilation – it is not badly for the masters / European portraits, / Commanders, sages, / Rotozeyam, literacy, / And to Frenchman from Bordeaux, / And to the arrogant lord ...). (Vyazemsky P.A. “Modern Notes”) / – А не худо б господам / Европейским лицедеям, / Полководцам, мудрецам, / Ротозеям, грамотеям, / И Французу из Бордо, / И заносчивому лорду... (Вяземский П.А. «Современные заметки»).

The integral image of the defenders of Russia is opposed to the fractional image of the enemy of Russia: To everyone, in the eagle's nest / without asking, who buried his face ... (Vyazemsky P.A. "Modern Notes") / Всем, в орлиное гнездо / Не спросясь уткнувшим морду... (Вяземский П.А. «Современные заметки»). The metaphor "Russia - the Eagle's Nest" explicates not only the integrity, but also the greatness of Russia.

The Russian language consciousness of the era of the Crimean War is antonymous; that is connected with Russia, the Russians have a positive connotation, and what is associated with the allies is negative.

Female images are emotionally saturated in the Russian language consciousness of the epoch of the Crimean War. Emotiveness acts as a semantic component of expressiveness [Alefirenko, 2004], [Zolotykh, 2005]. The emotive component conveys specific feelings: a positive (encouraging) attitude towards women.

A woman in the Russian language consciousness of the Crimean War era is not only a sister, mother, but also a defender of the fatherland. The lexical units of the sister, sister of the Holy Cross community, explicate the cognitive attribute "defenders of the fatherland".

The image of the sisters of the Holy Cross community is bright, emotionally rich. Sisters of the Holy Cross community were the first to respond to military events in the Crimea. They helped physicians in organizing care for the wounded and sick.

In structure of the figurative component "Crimean War", the cognitive signs reflecting the family relations are bright.

Cognitive sign "sister" - Inspired by the heroic courage, / as sisters, you went after the brothers to fight! (Rostopchina E.P. "Sisters of the Holy Cross Community") / Нет! Вдохновенная отвагой богатырской, / Как сестры, вы пошли за братьями в бой! (Ростопчина Е.П. «Сестрам

Крестовоздвиженской общины»). Russian women are brave, ready for self-sacrifice for the benefit of the motherland.

The cognitive signs "uncle", "nephew" and their exponents uncle and nephew characterize the images of Louis Napoleon and Napoleon I.

The images of Russians and Europeans are opposed to each other as two spiritual antipodes.

Europeans in the Russian language consciousness: Nelson's descendants, inglorious descendants / Shame You managed to clothe the British flag. (Vyazemsky P.A. "Odessa") / Потомки Нельсона, бесславные потомки / Стыдом Британский флаг вам удалось облечь. (Вяземский П.А. «Одесса»).

Russians are 'defenders of Christianity'. For example, But God is with us! Hooray! Our feat is holy, / and for Christ, who does not give life to joy! (Dostoevsky FM. "On the European events in 1854") / Но с нами Бог! Ура! Наш подвиг свят, / И за Христа кто жизнь отдать не рад! (Достоевский Ф.М. «На европейские события в 1854 году»).

Europeans are 'traitors to Christianity'; for example, Dampers of the Divine Light (Dostoevsky FM, "On the European Events in 1854") / Гасители божественного Света (Достоевский Ф.М. «На европейские события в 1854 году»).

The cognitive attribute "proclaims victories" reflects the faith of society and poets in deafening words.

The symbol of Russia is the image of an eagle: It flies to St. Petersburg with good news, / that it took its Russian army, / that they were lit up with a new honor / Nestlings of the Eagle (Vyazemsky P.A. "Modern Notes") / Летит он в Питер с доброй вестью, / Что Русских рать свое взяла, / Что озарились новой честью / Птенцы Державного орла (Вяземский П.А. «Современные заметки»).

The ornithological image-symbol of the eagle is universal for the Russian linguistic culture of the Crimean War era. Initially, the eagle belonged to the realm of images and only after 1882, when the coat of arms of the Russian Empire was decorated in a gold shield with a black double-headed eagle

crowned with two imperial crowns, over which the same, but large, crown with two waving ends of the ribbon of the Order of St. Andrew, the image of an eagle acquired a symbolic meaning and the image became “secondary meaning”. In modern linguistic consciousness, the double-headed eagle is a symbol of statehood - a double-headed eagle with a single-headed eagle, / And a galloping lion with a one-horned horse, ... (Khomyakov A.S. "The Court of God") / Двуглавый орел с одноглавым орлом, / И скачущий лев с одноногом конем... (Хомяков А.С. «Суд Божий»).

The constant of the Russian linguoculture is the zoomorphic image of the troika. The Troika acts as a symbol of Russia, of its enormous distances. The national Russian way to harness horses three in a row appears in the middle of the XVIII century. This method quickly became widespread due to its undeniable advantages: high speed, greater carrying capacity and good maneuverability. The European double sled team was of little use for long journeys along the Russian virgin lands. When harnessed with a troika, the horses occupied a wider space than the wagon, reducing the probability of the rider falling out of the carriage. In addition, the three horses pulled the carriage much faster, the load was distributed over three horses, and therefore the horses could be less tired. All foreigners who experienced riding in a troika unanimously argued that there was no more dashing and quicker ride.

The image of the troika in the concept of "The Crimean War" is associated with good news: Here the three are rushing away / along the main road, / the courier flies from behind the Danube / in the dust and glory of the battle. (Vyazemsky P.A. "Modern Notes") / Вот мчится тройка удалая / Вдоль по дорожки столбовой, / Летит курьер из-за Дуная / В пыли и славе боевой. (Вяземский П.А. «Современные заметки»).

In the concept of "The Crimean War" of the Russian language consciousness of the second half of the XIX century an association “sword - thunder - war” is built up.

The cognitive attribute “divine judgment” contains information reflecting the conformity of religious morality with religious rules.

The cross, the shrine, the faith, the throne are key concepts for Russian linguistic culture.

The cross in the Russian Orthodox linguistic culture denotes an ancient sign denoting God, the Highest. It is a subject of religious veneration.

The throne in the Russian language consciousness is a symbol of power. The throne along with the sword, scepter and orb are attributes of justice, courage, anger and firmness.

A shrine for the Orthodox is all consecrated or separated for the Lord.

Faith acts as an image – symbol: Expose, - and again, your Russia / will stand for faith, / And Orthodox soldiers / Weapons will win! (Rostopchina E.P. “Prayer for the Militiamen”); we have not lost our faith / (As was some Western people); / we are resurrected from the dead by faith, / and the Slavic race lives by faith. (Dostoevsky FM. "On the European events in 1854") / Велишь, – и снова Русь твоя / За веру постоит, / И православных воинов / Оружье победит! (Ростопчина Е.П. «Молитва об ополченцах»); Мы веры нашей, спроста, не теряли / (Как был какой-то западный народ); / Мы верую из мертвых воскресали, / И верую живет славянский род. (Достоевский Ф.М. «На европейские события в 1854 году»).

Key to the Russian language consciousness of the era of the Crimean War is the substantive image of the keys of the Bethlehem temple. This image gets a new meaning in the era of the Crimean War, is the starting point of its beginning.

The keys of the Temple of Bethlehem, which Turkey took away from the Orthodox Greeks, became the symbol of faith, the rights of the primacy of the Orthodox Church in Holy Places in the era of the Crimean War. In 1853, Muslim Turkey, encouraged by France, England and the Vatican, took the keys of the Church of Bethlehem from the Orthodox Greeks and transferred them catholics (Calendar "Holy Russia") / В 1853 г. мусульманская Турция, поощряемая Францией, Англией и

Ватиканом, отобрала у православных греков ключи Вифлеемского храма и передала их католикам. (Календарь «Святая Русь»). The Bethlehem key in the eyes of Eastern Christians symbolized the primacy of the church that possesses it.

In the concept of the “Crimean War”, the core semantic components that define the component – the concept of “faith” in the Russian language consciousness of the era of the Crimean War are: united, holy, cathedral.

The cognitive sign “symbol of statehood” is a two-headed eagle, a single-headed eagle, a flag, a scepter. These lexemes are culturally significant. N.F. Alefirenko, S.G. Vorkachev, V.V. Vorobev, V.I. Karasik, V.A. Maslova, S.M. Mezenin, V.N. Telia and other scientists suggest that the linguistic cultural patterns considered in linguoculturology are the result of a visual compilation and selection of culturally significant events and situations.

The symbol of statehood is the flag - And the flag under the stars of the night. (Khomyakov A.S. "The Judgment of God") / И флаг под звездами ночными (Хомяков А.С. «Суд Божий»).

The national flag in the Russian linguistic culture of the middle XIX century acquires a symbolic meaning. Before Peter I, the state lived without a national flag - a sign uniting the people. The symbols of the unity of the people, statehood were God and the King. They went to war with the enemy with church banners and regimental banners depicting the Savior.

The appearance of the Russian flag is associated with the name of Peter I, who issued a decree on January 20, 1705, obliging to raise the red-blue-white flag on all Russian ships.

The tricolor in the Russian linguoculture had its own symbolism. In the traditional Russian, costume has most of all white, blue and red. It was believed that the white color is divine, blue is heavenly, spiritual, and red is earthly, human. Also, in the Russian linguistic culture white color symbolized faith, blue - hope, and red - love.

Scepter is the oldest symbol of power – ... More tangibly and brighter than thirty years / Implemented under the scepter of Nicholas. (Maykov A. "Message to the camp") / ...Все осязательней и ярче тридцать лет / Осуществляется под скиптром Николая. (Майков А. «Послание в лагерь»).

The scepter became part of the attributes of royal power in 1584 at the wedding of the kingdom of Fyodor Ivanovich. The keyholder in the Russian language has become the synonym for the word king.

Actualization of the cognitive sign “betrayal of Christianity” in the Russian language consciousness in the concept of the “Crimean War” indicates that serving the Christ is significant for the Russian person - Christian for the Turk to Christ! / Christian is defender of Mahomet! (Dostoevsky F.M. "On the European events in 1854") / Христианин за турка на Христа! / Христианин – защитник Магомета! (Достоевский Ф.М. «На европейские события в 1854 году»).

In the Russian linguistic consciousness of the era of the Crimean War, the Great Saturday acts as a symbol of Christianity: And you chose the day, the great Saturday, / To treacherously attack Christians: / To the Judas who issued Christ, you will be employed / Piastrov from thirty will give Sultan. (Vyazemsky P.A. "Odessa") / И выбрали ж вы день, великую Субботу, / Чтобы предательски напасть на Христиан: / Иудам, выдавшим Христа, вам за работу / Пиастров с тридцать даст Султан (Вяземский П.А. «Одесса»).

The image of the city in the concept of Russian language consciousness is significant for the Russian language consciousness of the mid-19th century.

The cognitive signs of "Christian cities", "Muslim cities" are actualized as follows: How many cities and villages there are in the world, / And which are Christian, / And which are basurmanist; ... (Maykov A.N. "Shepherd") / Сколько в свете есть городов и сел, / И которые христианские, / И которые басурманские;... (Майков А.Н. «Пастух»).

The city symbolizes security. This is a refuge from enemies. It is not by chance that the antithesis “Moscow - Paris” arises in the Russian language consciousness of the epoch of the Crimean War, which has a complex cognitive structure: “Moscow is burnt down,” “Paris is a city of enemies saved”. We lit our Moscow / Like a prayer altar - / and, not remembering evil, saved / we are your hostile city. (Vyazemsky P.A. “Modern Notes”); and I saw that, for our cities / and for Moscow, - our Tsar did not take revenge / and with a white banner of mercy / He covered the capital of France. (Glinka F.N. "Hurra!") / Мы Москву свою зажгли / Словно жертвенник молебный – / И, не помня зла, спасли / Мы же город ваш враждебный. (Вяземский П.А. «Современные заметки»); И видел, что, за наши грады / И за Москву, – наш Царь не мстил / И белым знаменем пощады / Столицу Франции покрыл. (Глинка Ф.Н. «Ура! »).

The appearance of images of the burnt hometown and the saved city of enemies is not accidental. This is the actualization of the recent historical past - the war of 1812, when, during the occupation by Napoleon I of Moscow, a fire broke out that almost destroyed the city.

The image of Moscow is a symbol of Russian sacrifice, the collapse of Napoleon’s plans.

The figurative component of the concept "Crimean War" includes nouns - geographical names. They represent the cognitive signs of "our cities" and "cities of enemies".

Our cities are the sufferer, Odessa is a young, younger sister, Tsarevna, and Sevastopol is native.

Other cities (cities of opponents) - Paris extravagant, Danzig, Saragossa, Troy.

There are images of Russian cities – Odessa, Sevastopol: And you are a sufferer, Odessa is young, / you are the southern star in Russian heaven, / You are the younger sister in the family of your native land / Tsarevna in Russian cities! (Vyazemsky P.A. "Odessa") / Одессы, Севастополя: А ты страдальца, Одесса молодая, / Ты южная звезда на Русских небесах, / Ты младшая сестра в семье родного края / Царевна в Русских городах! (Вяземский П.А. «Одесса»).

For the Russian language, consciousness is characterized by a metaphorical perception of Sevastopol: Sevastopol - Moscow, Sevastopol - Troy. Sevastopol, the walls of which were played the second Iliada. If in these 2 months nothing is broken, then, perhaps, the siege of Troy will continue, and then we will look at what steak sludge Ulysses. (Pirogov N.I. "Sevastopol Letters of N.I. Pirogov 1854-1855") / Севастополь, подъ стѣнами котораго разыгрывалась вторая Иліада. Если въ эти 2 меѣсяца ничего не рѣшится, то, пожалуй, будетъ продолжаться, какъ осада Трои, и тогда посмотримъ, какой бифштекс сдѣлается Улиссом (Пирогов Н.И. «Севастопольскія письма Н.И. Пирогова 1854-1855»).

The image of the Kremlin in the Russian language consciousness embodies strength, pride of the Russian empire, which did not tolerate offense and the collapse of Napoleon III's plans: Who was full of land, / who took off to the pyramids - / and was thrown into dust from the Kremlin, / Not tolerated resentment (Vyazemsky P.A. "Modern Notes").

Cognitive sign is "victory". The symbol of the victory of the Russians and the awards of the winners, their courage is the victorious cross: the Tsar will thank the messenger, / and in honor and beauty / on the chest he will impose / Victorious crosses (Vyazemsky P.A. "Modern Notes") / Кем полна была земля, / Кто взлетал на пирамиды – / И был сброшен в прах с Кремля, / Не стерпевшего обиды. (Вяземский П.А. «Современные заметки»). The cross in the Slavic linguoculture acquires a sacred meaning.

The cognitive signs of "military successes of the Russian empire" and "military failures of the allies" reflect public perceptions related to Russia's ability to repel the enemy.

The Russian weapon in the Russian language consciousness of an era of the Crimean war symbolizes military progress (Guns – that your wood! Helmets copper, / Paula are bent, boots in dust: / Go – the dale groans! You feel – force brings down, ... (Maykov A.N. "Shepherd") / Ружья - что твой лес! Каски медные, / Полы загнуты, сапоги в пыли: / Идут - стонет дол! Чуешь - сила валит,...

(Майков А.Н. «Пастух»), whereas weapon of opponents, on the contrary, – inability to resist to Russians. In hands of Russians, even the trihedral poker turns into the weapon capable to inflict over the opponent defeat.

CONCLUSIONS.

Thus, the figurative concept of the “Crimean War” concept includes anthropometric images associated with the names of European politicians (GD Palmerston, Louis Napoleon, Napoleon I), Turkish politicians (Sultan Abdul-Mejid I), Russian politicians (Peter I, Nikolai), enemies (French, English, Turks, basurmen), defenders of the fatherland (warriors, squads of glory, sister of the Holy Cross community, Suvorov, Gorchakov, Leaders, Schilder, Ushakov, Soimon), Europeans, Russians, Russians, and a poet.

Object images include symbols of statehood and faith. There is the cross, the throne, the shrine, the flag, the scepter, the miraculous icon, the symbols of victory – the cannon.

The subject image of the “keys of the Bethlehem temple” symbolizes the reasons for the start of the Crimean War, and the subject image of the piastre is a betrayal of Orthodoxy and Christ.

The symbol of sin, the criminality of the enemies in the concept of "Crimean War" of the Russian language consciousness of the XIX century. is the great Saturday.

The images of Russia and the Kremlin reflect the greatness and invincibility of the Russians, as well as the ornithological images of the eagle (two-headed eagle, single-headed eagle, eagle's nest).

Acknowledgements.

The publication has been with the support of the “RUDN University Program 5-100.

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES.

1. Abishov, S., Polyak, D., Seidullaeva, G., & Kermeshova, Z. (2018). Meaning of fiction in formation of student’s identity. *Opción*, 34(85-2), 186-204.

2. Adonina L., Bondareva O., Fisenko O., Ismailova K. (2018). The Creation of Methodology of Technical Universities Students' Intellectual Skills Formation and Development in the Foreign Language Course with the Consideration of Cognitive Processes Flow // European research studies journal. – Vol. XXI. – 2018. – P.124 – 131
3. Alefirenko N.F. (2004). Cognitive semantics and linguistic cultural studies // Humanitarian research: the journal of basic and applied research. – Astrakhan: Astrakhan University. – 2004. – №3. – P. 65-69
4. Arutyunova N.D. (1990). Language and time // Language and the world of man. – M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1999. – P. 687-736
5. Laureano, R. M., Fernandes, A. L., Hassamo, S., & Alturas, B. (2018). Facebook satisfaction and its impacts on fundraising: a case study at a Portuguese non-profit organization. Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management, (1).
6. Millanei, A., Dorafshan, S. M. H. G., & Bayrami, A. (2016). Sunnite Religious View about Jurisprudence Nature of Istisna Contract. UCT Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Research, 4(1), 25-27.
7. Mokienko V.M. (1995). Ideography and historical etymological analysis of phraseology // Questions of linguistics. – 1995. – №4. – P.3-13
8. Polyanskaya E.N., Fisenko O.S. and Adonina L.V. (2017). Social Values in Management of Social Work // International Journal of Control Theory and Applications. Volume: №.10 (2017). Issue №:32 (2017). – P.211-220
9. Razavi, S. M., Nasirian, M., & Afkhami, I. (2015). The effectiveness sleep hygiene training on the job performance of employees Shift or rotating shifts parvadeh tabas coal companies in. UCT Journal of Management and Accounting Studies, 3(1), 5-7.

10. Stepanov Yu.S. (1997). Constants. Dictionary of Russian Culture (Research Experience). – M.: School "Languages of Russian culture", 1997. – 824 p.
11. Teliya V.N. (1996). Russian phraseology. Semantic, pragmatic and linguistic and culturological aspects. – M.: School "Languages of Russian culture", 1996. – 288 p.
12. Ter-Minasova S.G. (2000). Language and intercultural communication. – M.: Slovo, 2000. – 624 p.
13. Umpawan, T. (2018). Design of prototype of Kra Isthmus Otop Center. Humanities & Social Sciences Reviews, 6(2), 34-43. <https://doi.org/10.18510/hssr.2018.625>
14. Yerizon, Putra, A. A., & Subhan, M. (2018). Mathematics Learning Instructional Development based on Discovery Learning for Students with Intrapersonal and Interpersonal Intelligence (Preliminary Research Stage). International Electronic Journal of Mathematics Education, 13(3), 97-101.
15. Zolotykh L.G. (2005). Cultural concepts, objectified by phraseological units in the system of language and speech // Ethnocultural constants in the Russian language picture of the world: genesis and functioning. – Belgorod: Publishing house of BelSU, 2005. – P. 86-90.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

1. Adonina L.V., Rummyantseva N.M., Fisenko O.S. (2017). Management of Education in the Concept of Educational and Pedagogical Teachings of M.M. Speranskii // International Journal of Control Theory and Applications. – V. – № 10. – 2017. – 187-197
2. Arutyunova N.D. (1998). Types of linguistic meanings // Event evaluation, fact. – M.: Science, 1998. – 388 p.
3. Kargina N.V., Ficenko O.S., Polyanskaya E.N. (2017). Technology of social management in organization in the Russia federation: the theoretical aspect // The Turkish online Journal of Design Art and Communication TOJDAC, December 2017 Special Edition. – 2017. – P. 1970-1979

4. Kornilova T.V., Matveenko V.E., Fisenko O.S., Chernova, N.V. (2015). The role of audio and video means in the training of foreign philologists concerning national vocabulary of Russian language // Journal of Language and Literature. 2015. T. 6. №4. P. 390-392
5. Maslova V.A. (2001). Linguoculturology: Textbook. allowance for stud. higher studies. institutions. – M.: Academy, 2001. – 208c.
6. Fisenko O., Suvorova E. (2018). Russian Nietzsche: To a question about linguistic commenting of texts of V.V. Rozanov in foreign audience (the II certified level) // European research studies journal. Volume XXI, Special Issue 2. 2018. P. 635-642
7. Wezhbitskaya A. (1996). Language. Culture Cognition. – M.: Russian dictionaries, 1996. – 416 p.
8. Wezhbitskaya A. (1999). Semantic universals and description of languages. – M.: Languages of Russian culture, 1999. – 900 p.

DATA OF THE AUTHORS.

1. Shalala Ramazanova. Ardahan University Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences. Head of the department of Russian Language and Literature. Asst. Prof. Email: shalalaramazanova@ardahan.edu.tr

2. Yuliya V. Yurova. PhD in Pedagogy, Associate professor of Department of Russian language №3 the Faculty of Russian language and General education disciplines of Russia (RUDN University) Email: julia_ju2042@list.ru

3. Liudmila N. Tretyakova. PhD in Law, Associate professor of Department of Russian language №3 the Faculty of Russian language and General education disciplines of Russia (RUDN University). Email: Tretyak_LN@mail.ru

RECIBIDO: 9 de mayo del 2019.

APROBADO: 23 de mayo del 2019.