



DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-4-1100-1117

EDN: JCMLTD

UDC 811.111:342(470)


Research article / Научная статья

Correlation of *Concept* and *Image* in the Process of Algorithm development for Analyzing the Image-Concept of a State

Ksenia P. Posternyak¹  , Kirill P. Posternyak² 

¹Don State Technical University, *Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation*

²Southern Federal University, *Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation*

 xana2437@gmail.com

Abstract. The article is topical due to the interest of scientists to the images of states as subjects of politics and their formation and transformation in political discourse. The article contains the theoretical substantiation of the use of the term “image-concept” and offers the algorithm for analyzing linguistic material in synchrony and diachrony. Using this algorithm we describe the means of verbalization of 4 layers of the image-concept “Russia” in the British media discourse of 1916–1922, the period crucial for our country. Thus, we reveal the range of nominations, means of evaluation, metaphors as well as associations formed by British journalist in texts devoted to Russia.

Keywords: nomination, evaluation, metaphor, association, political modalization

Authors' contribution:

The authors contributed equally to this article.

Conflicts of interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Article history:

Received: 01.09.2024

Accepted: 15.09.2024

For citation:

Posternyak, K.P. & Posternyak, K.P. (2024). Correlation of *Concept* and *Image* in the Process of Algorithm development for Analyzing the Image-Concept of a State. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 15(4), 1100–1117. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-4-1100-1117>

© Posternyak K.P., Posternyak K.P., 2024




This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/legalcode>

Соотношение понятий *концепт* и *образ* в процессе разработки алгоритма анализа образа-концепта государства

К.П. Постерняк¹  , К.П. Постерняк² 

¹Донской государственный технический университет, *Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация*

²Южный федеральный университет, *Ростов-на-Дону, Российская Федерация*
 xana2437@gmail.com

Аннотация. Использование термина *образ-концепт* в качестве цели и средства изучения образа государства нуждается в теоретическом обосновании; на основе научных парадигм лингвистической концептологии и лингвистической имагологии проводится сопоставление понятий *концепт* и *образ*, что позволяет получить представление об общих и специфических чертах рассматриваемых вербально-ментальных образований. Понимание лингвокультурного концепта позволило авторам исследования разработать алгоритм анализа языкового материала в синхронии и диахронии.

Ключевые слова: номинация, оценка, метафора, ассоциация, политическая модализация

Вклад авторов:

Вклад авторов равнозначен на всех этапах исследования и подготовки текста статьи.

Заявление о конфликте интересов:

Авторы заявляют об отсутствии конфликта интересов.

История статьи:

Дата поступления: 01.09.2024

Дата приема в печать: 15.09.2024

Для цитирования:

Posternyak K.P., Posternyak K.P. Correlation of *Concept* and *Image* in the Process of Algorithm development for Analyzing the Image-Concept of a State // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2024. Т. 15. № 4. С. 1100–1117. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2024-15-4-1100-1117>

Introduction

Last decade witnesses the increased political and economic tension between some countries based on various reasons. This process is obligatory reflected in the media space of the states. T.A. van Dijk notes that media texts take part in the formation of definite public opinion [1. P. 35], and public conscience in the broad strata of the population. This means that people form their opinion about other states through the prism of images created by journalists who construct positive or, more often, negative images of other states in compliance with a certain political order [2. P. 26] (thus carrying out political modalization, which presupposes the formation of a positive or negative attitude towards the subjects of politics [3. P. 61]. In this situation it is important to know mechanisms and means of forming the image of “one’s own” and “foreign” state and the influence of this image on the public of their own and foreign countries. Therefore, the relatively young interdisciplinary

science Imagology unexpectedly turned out to be one of the most popular fields of research with scientists in various humanitarian fields. The image of a foreign state is studied by politicians, literary scholars, historians, sociologists, linguists that provides the many-sided analysis of the object of research and thus ensures its reliability. Scientists, studying the linguistic aspect of the representation of the image of an “alien”, “other” people or country, make a significant contribution to the development of this science, revealing the linguistic devices of image formation.

Another science, linguistic conceptology, approaches the solution of this problem from the other side, having in its arsenal the tools of cognitive sciences and defining the linguocultural concept, including the concept of the state, as a mental unit determined by culture and verbalized by language [4. P. 76].

Our study is carried out within the framework of two scientific paradigms — linguistic imagology and linguistic conceptology. The central object of investigation of linguistic imagology is the image, and of linguistic conceptology — the concept. Both terms are accepted by linguists as mental-verbal structures, but each of them has its specific features. It has become apparent for linguists The non-identity of the terms “concept” and “image” is quite obvious as well as their dialectical unity. So, the use of the double term “image-concept” requires theoretical comprehension.

Theoretical Framework

First of all, it should be emphasized that meaning of the term “concept” in Russian linguistics is slightly different from the meaning of this term in the Western humanities. American linguists George Lakoff and Mark Johnsen use this term only as linguistic one, synonymous of terms “notion”, “meaning” [5]. But Russian linguists understand “a concept” wider, approaching to it not only from a linguistic point of view, but also from the point of view of cognitive sciences. We agree with the Russian linguist T.G. Serebtsova, who states that such understanding of «the concept» is “exclusively the property of Russian science because in the world nobody have ever heard of a concept and conceptology as a branch of cognitive science and cognitive linguistics” [6. P. 334]. Indeed, the vector of Western cognitive linguistics research goes in a slightly different direction.

Speaking about the term “concept”, it necessary to mention that for the first time in the Russian science the original term “concept” was used by the philosopher A.S. Askoldov-Alekseev in 1928 in his article “Concept and Word”. The scientist defined the term “concept” as a mental formation of a dynamic nature, replacing a certain set of objects. At the same time, A.S. Askoldov-Alekseev paid attention to the factor of perception: the counter consciousness can interpret the concept in its own way, modifying it [7. P. 267–279].

In the end of the 20th, Russian Academician Yu.S. Stepanov and his linguistic school resumed the study of the concept according to A.S. Askoldov’s understanding and continued to participate in the development and formation of domestic conceptology as a science.

In course of the development of linguoconceptology, linguists who share the linguistic approach to the study of the concept (S.A. Askoldov, D.S. Likhachev, Yu.S. Stepanov, V.V. Kolesov, V.N. Telia, etc.), came to an agreement that a concept is the sum of all the meanings and connotations of a word. Taken together, linguocultural concepts form the conceptual sphere that exists in the collective consciousness and reflects culture [8. P. 151–152].

Actually, the notion “concept” has got several different approaches in modern Russian linguistics besides the linguistic approach mentioned above. The *culturological* approach considers culture as a set of concepts. Therefore, according to this approach, the concept is treated as a unit of culture in the empirical world of man [9. P. 89]. The *cognitive* approach assumes that the concept is formed by the semantics of a linguistic sign. Linguists who support this point of view agree that a concept is a complex cognitive process, which stipulates the description of the structure of a concept that motivates the nomination process and explains the names of things and objects assigned to them in the lexical system of the language [10. P. 91]. V.A. Maslova combines the last two approaches, characterizing the concept as a product of the collision of meaning and experience of an individual or an entire nation or “culturally marked verbalized meaning” [11. P. 58].

In Russian linguistics there are also different approaches to the structure of the concept. Many scientists, generally recognizing that the linguocultural concept is multilayered in structure, disagree on the number and nature of its components. N.F. Alefirenko notes the complexity and multi-tiered nature of the linguocultural concept, which, in addition to semantic content, includes evaluative and relative-evaluative semantics, fixing a person’s attitude to a particular reflected object [12. P. 144].

Such scientists as L.O. Cherneyko & V.A. Dolinsky [13], V.V. Krasnykh [14], V.I. Karasik [9] and others believe that the linguocultural concept is at least a three-dimensional formation, including conceptual, subject-metaphorical and evaluative components.

Summarizing the results of their research, we can say that the **notional** (informational-factual) component reflects the definitional and indicative side of the linguocultural concept.

The **metaphorical layer** includes perceptual (sensory experience), figurative (metaphors associated with the concept) and precedent (associations with literary characters) components. At the same time, the core of the **metaphorical layer** of the concept is the image as a set of cognitive metaphors fixed in the collective consciousness [15]. These metaphors make it possible to represent complex phenomena through simple ones [5].

The **axiological (evaluative) layer** of the linguocultural concept is its cultural significance, reflecting the basic values of culture [16]. The evaluative component characterizes the degree of importance of this mental-verbal structure both for the individual and for the entire linguistic community.

Along with the three components of the linguocultural concept considered above, it seems possible to single out the **associative component**, since the structure of the concept includes various connotations and associations [17]. In order to form certain associations text creators deliberately regularly use the name of one concept together with the names of certain other concepts (for example, “aggression”, “poverty”, “friendliness”, “achievements”, etc.). As a result, the name begins to evoke associations with the corresponding concepts.

S.G. Vorkachev also draws attention to the fact that “the linguocultural concept has a set of distinctive features, including emotional experience, semiotic density — representation by a number of linguistic units and synonymized symbols; the inclusion of the concept name in the associative links that have developed in the lexical system of the language; and the possession of a specific linguistic metaphor” [16. P. 19]. Moreover, the concept, according to S.G. Vorkachev, can perform a heuristic function, being an instrument of cognition [18. P. 4].

Thus, from the point of view of linguaconceptology, the term “concept” can be regarded as a mental-verbal structure, which includes four components: 1) the notion; 2) metaphors representing the notion; 3) the evaluations associated with this notion; 4) a system of verbal national-specific associations formed in the process of using the concept name.

It is important to emphasize that such understanding of the linguocultural concept allows us to consider it not only as a goal, but also as a means of analysis, which “presupposes the analysis of linguistic means from a certain angle of view, namely, as means of conceptualizing reality” [19. P. 22]. This approach to understanding the concept also provides us with an algorithm for analyzing linguistic material both in synchrony and diachrony. In the latter case, we deal with the comparative analysis of the means of verbalizing the components of the concept in different time periods.

The other component of the complex term “image-concept” — **an image** the cognitive nature of which has been noted for a long time and in various paradigms of knowledge. According to the linguist A.A. Potebnya, images are means of reducing mental efforts; they are “substitutes for those masses of thoughts from which they arose” [20. P. 520].

This is the first stage of cognition, on the one hand, and the verbalization of the thought, on the other. Images form not only a pre-scientific (naive) picture of the world, but also a scientific one, which is impossible without Abstract notions, in the materialization of which language participates actively. Some linguists even consider images “the initial cause, the starting point for the formation of the concept” [21. P. 50].

In imagology the image of the “alien” is studied as an emotionally colored stereotypical image existing in collective consciousness [22. P. 31]. This is essentially a generalized portrait of the country and its people [23]. Speaking about the image of the state, the linguists consider it as a special mental-verbal

formation that has distinctive features in comparison with the concept. This is also confirmed by the definition contained in explanatory dictionaries, where image is described as “a mental picture created in a poem or story by descriptive wording”¹. According to L.B. Nikitina, the term “image” can be replaced by the synonymous one — a picture” [24. P. 97].

These definitions emphasize the following essential characteristics of the image as a mental and verbal structure: **subjectivity** and **creativity**. The latter is understood as the creative principle, going beyond the usual use of the word. N.F. Alefirenko understands by this “new associative relations necessary for linguistic modeling of a particular phenomenon of national culture, for the formation of a linguistic picture of the world in the imaginative representations” [25. P. 71]. Indeed, from the standpoint of imagology, the image is characterized as a “subjective image of the picture of the world” [26. P. 116].

We are talking about an **individual** linguistic conceptualization of the world, which is **opposed** (although inextricably linked with it) to the linguistic conceptualization carried out by **society** and fixed in the speech and texts.

In the latter case, linguistic signs and texts verbalize concepts, the formation of which is “synchronous-diachronic, because they are represented by linguistic units that appeared at different times. According to this approach, **society** is viewed as a community of native speakers that has existed for a very long time and is composed of several generations” [19. P. 123]. That is, concepts accumulate **all** knowledge, ideas, opinions and assessments about a fragment of reality stored by a society over a long historical period.

Concepts as linguistic universals, “slots” of meaning in human consciousness [24. P. 98]. are mainly focused on the categories of **essential and typical features** and familiar meanings [27]. On the one hand, they are connected with the evolution of people’s ideas about a certain fragment of reality; on the other hand, at each specific moment of time, these concepts determine the perception of a fragment of reality by society at the level of language and communication (ibid.).

In the **image**, in contrast to the concept, the **personal author’s** perception of reality is reflected. It is a transformation, modeling of reality in accordance with life experience, ideas, beliefs and imagination of an individual. If the concept accumulates all the knowledge about a fragment of reality that exists in society, an individual author’s interpretation of a certain fragment of reality takes place in the image, which has its own “conceptual vectors of representation” [28. P. 253]; i.e. some aspects of a fragment of reality are represented as dominant, actualized with the help of pictorial and expressive means of language, while others, on the contrary, are not described in details or are omitted.

¹New Webster’s Dictionary (1989). URL: <https://www.merriam-webster.com> (accessed: 23.02.2024). P. 750.

The same concept can be embodied in different images, each of which draws attention to certain aspects of a fragment of reality, possessing a conceptual space that is different from the conceptual spaces of other images. For example, the image of a woman embodying the concept of “woman” in the work of J.G. Byron’s “Don Juan” includes, in particular, such conceptual components as “passion”, “impermanence”, “betrayal”, and the image of a woman in works of Alexander Pushkin — contrasting conceptual components: “modesty”, “constancy” and “loyalty” [28. P. 683].

The fact of the image dependence of the concept in the process of its verbalization is recognized by many researchers, therefore, one should pay attention to the method of creating the image and the conditions for its existence. In this sense, it becomes extremely important to track the process of concept verbalization at the initial stage, i.e. through the formation of an image. The image can be expressed by units of different levels of language: from a word to a whole text. Its creation involves the vocabulary of certain thematic groups, evaluative statements, a variety of pictorial and expressive language means, including emotional and expressive vocabulary, various tropes and figures of speech (metaphor, epithet, metonymy, comparison, irony, antithesis, oxymoron, etc.).

Thus, these linguistic means can form different sides of the image — an axiological image, a phraseological image, a metaphorical image and others, which together can represent a certain integral image. Let’s consider the various components of image formation.

A **metaphorical image** is “a dynamic, nationally-specific, cultural-linguistic structure reflecting the ideas of native speakers about a person, object, phenomenon or concept, which are based on the transfer of the linguistic form according to the associative similarity of the properties of denotations” [29. P. 95]. Metaphors are originally created by individuals and being the result of individual author’s creative activity become a collective property and replenish the figurative (metaphorical) layer of the concept.

The **axiological image** is determined by several reasons, including the **historical and cultural context**, which contributes to the transformation of reality in the image [30. P. 40]. The same famous historical figures (for example, Nicholas II or Stalin) can be perceived in completely different ways in different time periods.

K. Boulding was one of the first to point out the variability, in particular, of the axiological image of the state, caused by changes in international relations. According to K. Boulding, “the understanding of the mechanism of transformation of the “alien image” into the “enemy image” becomes very important in the process of mutual perception of different peoples” [31. P. 113].

Foreign policy, or the policy of war and peace, which regulates relations with other states, is inextricably linked with the creative process of forming such images; the policy of images complements the policy of power [32. P. 192]. **Stereotypes** play an important role in this process. Stereotypes as culturally conditioned irrational

components are stable and are manifested in the image of the state, which is formed in the texts of different eras and genres, despite the changes taking place in the country. Like any stereotype, the image of the state is constructed on the basis of a relatively small number of assessed parameters and may contain not always correct information [33. P. 61]. That is, with the help of the image of the state, **stereotypes** that have in the collective consciousness of society can be reproduced and consolidated, and new ones can be purposefully formed as contrasting with the original ones.

Today the point of view is widespread, according to which the constructed image of the state often “turns out to be more important for building international relations than the objective characteristics of the state” [34. P. 257].

K. Boulding initially drew attention to the **ideological meaning** of the purposefully formed image of a foreign country. In his opinion, “a nation is a formal and informal creation of historians, and a national image is essentially a lie, or at least an image of the truth from a certain angle” [35. P. 5].

A huge role in the creation of ideologically determined verbal images of states belongs to the media with their enormous power of influence on the mass audience. The image of the state created in the media can influence the consciousness, emotions, activity and actions of certain people and an entire population group [36. P. 96].

Many factors influence the creation of images of states in the media. One of the main ones is the **creative activity of journalists** with their views, preferences, their axiological picture of the world [37. P. 32–36]. Very often, all their creations are saturated with **emotionality** and involve the **purposeful modeling** of the image of an enemy state or an ally state. If a rational text can be interpreted by the audience in different ways, an emotionally rich image appealing to the emotional sphere evokes approximately the same reaction that is desirable for the media among most readers, contributing to the formation of a negative or positive image of the state in their minds. Because of this, emotionality, along with evaluation, is an integral property of the image of the state, which is emphasized in the definition of this image by K. Boulding. According to him, image characterizing is “an integral cognitive, evaluative and emotional structure” [35. P. 120–121].

The integrity inherent in the image of the state and noted by K. Boulding is considered by various scientists as the most important property of the image. I.A. Tarasova claims that the image and the concept convey the same deep meaning, but the way of representing this meaning is different: the image is continuous and undivided, while the concept is discrete and analytical. But this difference is in the sphere of language [38. P. 175]. A.A. Zalevskaya and V.A. Pishchalnikova also emphasize that the image resists dismembering and conveys a holistic view of an object or phenomenon [38. P. 77].

Investigating the specific features of both terms “concept” and “image”, scientists pay attention to the correlation of these notions and their level of relationship. I.V. Borisenko is sure that the imagological image as a fact of national identification

can correlate with the concept, the “clot” of culture, as the “particular” with the “general”, as the sensual, emotional-axiological with more conceptual, logical, cognitive “ [40. P. 26].

According to O.V. Tomberg, the relationship between the concepts of “image” and “concept” is ambiguous. On the one hand, the concept as a mental-verbal structure includes the entire amount of knowledge about a certain fragment of reality that exists in society” [41. P. 256]. Therefore, it is broader than the image. On the other hand, “an image arises from a complex of concepts which, in turn, form the conceptual space of this image. In this case the image is broader than the notion of “concept”, insofar as it is the sum of conceptual areas” [41. P. 256].

S.G. Vorkachev and V.A. Pishchalnikova treat the concept as a methodological construct, an instrument which gives the possibility of a concept to act not only as a goal, but also as a tool of analysis.

Summing up the comparison of the concept and the image as mental-verbal formations, we argue that the concept can be embodied in the language both in a logical and creative form; 2) the concept is formed by the whole society and reflects the most typical features of a fragment of reality, the image is an individual author’s creation that reflects a subjective view of the world; 3) concept is the sum of all knowledge, ideas and opinions accumulated by society about a fragment of reality and the image focuses on individual sides of a certain fragment; 4) the image includes various conceptual spheres, which, as society adapts the image, enrich the content of the concept represented by the image; 5) the concept is formed over a long historical period, the image is connected with a specific historical period.

Thus, a deep internal connection between the terms “concept” and “image” is revealed, as well as their clear differentiation, which ultimately allows the use of the compound term “image-concept” to develop a method of pragmalinguistic analysis of representing the image-concept of the state in the unity of its conceptual, imaginative, evaluative and associative components.

The identification of the characteristic features of both terms in their unity should determine our capabilities in identifying both the image-concept itself and the process of its formation. The detection mechanism is based on a special algorithm of analyzing linguistic means used in this process.

Methodology

Taking into account the said-above, the complex term “image-concept” can be used in scientific research, in which *the purpose of the analysis* is the image, including the image of the state, as an integral object serving as a figurative form of representation of the concept (i.e., its verbal visualization, picture) in different historical periods, and the means of analysis — a concept as an algorithm for the analysis of linguistic material involved in the construction and modification of the image. This algorithm, which involves identifying the means of verbalization of the four components of the concept (conceptual, figurative, ativevalue and associative), will make it possible to identify

the procedural mechanism for the formation of any image-concept of the state in any type of discourse — fictional, media, political, everyday, etc. at any length of time in synchronicity or diachrony.

In our research work, we use such algorithm for analyzing the image-concept of the state in the field of political media discourse, because a huge role in its formation belongs to the media, which can represent the state as a positive or negative one, “presenting events related to the political life of the country from a certain angle vision <...> in the desired for the author direction in accordance with his beliefs and social order” [3. P. 61].

Results

The object of our scientific interest was the image-concept of Russia, formed by the British press at a turning point for our country at the beginning of the 20th century — 1916–1922, before the organization of the Soviet Union. The material for our research was the English newspapers of 1916–1922 years.

It is worth noting that this period is interesting not only in connection with the cardinal changes in the life of our state, but also with the change in relations between Russia and Great Britain, which affected the image of our country created in the British mass media at that time.

According to our definition, the image-concept of the state created in the media can be defined as a dynamic verbal-mental pattern purposefully formed in the process of ideologically determined creative activity of journalists with a pronounced emotionality and evaluation, reflecting the variability of the ethnocultural manifestation of the concept in a specific historical and political context. In order to identify the image-concept of “Russia” formed in the British media in 1916–1922, we analyzed 520 articles of the British media discourse, fully or partially devoted to Russia, in which 631 examples were found.

We discover the largest number of examples in «The Manchester Guardian» (307). (Now this newspaper is called «The Guardian»). The rest of the examples were identified in other publications, respectively: The Times (92), The Freedom (52), The International Woman Suffrage News (48), The Western Daily Press (37), The Justice (17), The Mansfield Reporter (15), The Buchan Observer and East Aberdeenshire Advertiser (9), The Birmingham Daily Post (7), The Coventry Evening Telegraph (7), The Daily Herald (7), The Globe (6), The Daily Record (5), The Gloucestershire Chronicle (5), The Dublin Daily Express (3), The Sheffield Daily Telegraph (2), The Worker’s Dreadnought (1), The Bath Chronicle and Weekly Gazette (1), The Dundee Courier (1), The Labor Leader (1), The Liverpool Echo (1), The Sheffield Independent (1), Birmingham Daily Gazette (1), The Cambridge Daily News (1), The Scotsman (1), The Hartlepool Northern Daily Mail (1), The Huddersfield Daily Examiner (1), The Birmingham Mail (1).

The analysis showed that the formation of the image of Russia went through the following stages: Russia is a powerful empire and an ally of Britain (1916–1917);

New Russia, which overthrew tsarism and strives for democracy (the period after the February Revolution (1917–1918); Russia, a country exhausted by wars and revolutions (1919–1920); an authoritarian Bolshevik Russia (1920–1922) gaining strength. The dynamics of the formation of this image-concept in British political media discourse was also significantly influenced by the international situation and relations between Great Britain and Russia. Taken together, these factors significantly influenced the angle from which the events in Russia were viewed in the British press.

At the beginning of the 20th century (1916 — early 1917), Russia was perceived in Britain as an empire, which was a collection of non-independent territories governed from a single center. It was considered as an ally of Britain in the fight against Germany during the First World War and was seen as a source of raw materials and an important supplier of agricultural products, a consumer of British products and its ally. During this period, British journalists formed such an image with the help of the **nominations** that they had used in relation to Russia for several hundred years: *Russia, the Russian Empire, Holy Russia and the Russian State*. The phrase *Holy Russia* was used by journalists to emphasize the righteousness of Orthodox Russia, which needed to be rid of obscurantism of the “disgusting charlatan and scoundrel” G. Rasputin, who was causing harm to the country and the throne.

The **metaphoric** component of the image-concept “Russia” is presented in the British press of this period with words and combinations that emphasized the growing political tension in Russia. This was represented as a disease, for which journalists began to use **morbial metaphors** associated with illness and death (*revolutionary melodies, remedy, recovery, Russian exhaustion, worn out*); as well as the **agricultural metaphor field**, with the help of which the British press often compared Russia to a field that different countries could use for their own purposes.

The **evaluative** component is expressed in evaluative epithets. In January 1917 the British highly regarded Russia as a military ally (an epithet *a great ally of England*) and as *a great military power*. At the same time Russia was *poor* and *agricultural* country for Britain.

The **associative** component of the image-concept “Russia” in the British press was represented by microcontexts, which included the name of the country and the word “ally” (*Russia is an ally*).

After the February Revolution of 1917, journalists began to form **associations** of the lexeme Russia with lexemes *weakness and chaos*, describing the deteriorating economic and political situation in Russia. At the same time, in the spring of 1917, welcoming the February Revolution, British journalists introduced a new **nomination** — *new Russia*. Emphasizing the importance of democracy for building a new type of state in Russia, they applied the **construction metaphor** (*democracy for Russia is the only cement*).

Since 1919, when the Bolsheviks had been in power for almost two years in Russia, the British press had to admit the seriousness of their intentions, using the *Bolshevik Russia nomination*. At the end of 1919, another nomination, *Soviet Russia*, appeared. In connection with the transfer of the capital of Russia from Saint Petersburg to Moscow, the metonymic replacement of the lexeme *Russia* — the lexeme *Moscow* — began to be used in the British press.

In the period 1919–1920, at the height of the Civil War and the Intervention, **anthropomorphic metaphors** appeared in the British information field, representing Russia as *the leader of the Slavs, a member of the Communist Party, a Communist*, as well as a man with the Domocles sword of intervention above his head (*over the head of the Russia*), but which will not allow itself to be killed without a fight (*sink without a fight*), responding with a strong blow (*to hit back and hit hard*).

In the articles about Russia British journalists continued to use **morbial and physiological metaphors** (physical conditions inherent in humans). Disease (*meladies*) was the name of the problems generated by the revolution, and their elimination was like a *remedy*: (*agonized Russia, the indefinite postponement of Russia's recovery, starving Russia*). For Britain itself there was a threat of the spread of Bolshevism (*the roots of the cancer*).

The theatrical metaphor *theatrical Russia* was often used, which emphasized the unpredictability of Russia, its eccentricity.

The construction metaphor (*The ruin of Russia*) showed the extent of the collapse of the Russian Empire.

But even when calling for help to Russia in its terrible plight, the British press does not forget that the purpose of these actions will be to conquer Russia as a sales market for its goods (**an artifact metaphor** *as a market for our goods*) and a source of natural resources (**an artifact metaphor** *the source of supplies*).

The evaluative component of the concept-image Russia in British media discourse in this period contains evaluative adjectives with mostly negative connotations: *darkest, ruined, unhappy, worn out, anxious, undecided, brutally treated, not united, less powerful, weak, chaotic, not philanthropic, barbaric, distracted, autocratic disorganized, devastated by the war, helpless*. In some situations, fearing Russia' union with Germany, journalists even used the epithet *hostile*.

Epithets with a positive connotation were mostly limited to the epithet *great*, including superlatives. It appeared in different contexts related to Russia's past and its prospects for the future. The British have rated Russia in the past as the largest food-exporting country in the world (an estimated epithet *the greatest food-exporting country in the world*), so they hope that it will continue to be so.

It is interesting to note that in the articles of British newspapers of this period dreams were often expressed about the future of Russia after overcoming all difficulties and upheavals. One gets the impression that some British journalists sincerely believed in a bright future for Russia.

They used evaluative adjectives with positive connotations: *free, independent, purified and reinvigorated, well-governed, law-abiding and peaceful, democratic, cleaner and stronger, happy and contented* to create a positive image of Russia in the future and convince readers that the overthrow of the autocracy and difficulties will serve to move Russia forward towards building a new a modern state with all the attributes of progress and democracy (as the British understand them).

In the next period in 1921–1922, when Britain finally recognized the emergence of a new type of state, the press again began to use the **nomination** *new Russia*. During this period, when Soviet Russia proved its viability, British journalists used the **physiological metaphor** of *regeneration of Russia*, emphasizing the beginning of economic recovery. Some journalists linked the way out of the global crisis with the restoration of Russia, using the **construction metaphor** of *restoration*, as well as **game metaphor**, representing Russia as an intelligent political player in the international arena (*playing Poker with Russia, the international play of poker*). With the help of **artifact metaphors**, they emphasized the importance of Russia's natural resources for Britain, reminded of the pre-revolutionary status of Russia as an important supplier of grain to Europe (*a granary of Europe*), and with the help of **natural metaphor** (*desert*) they described the catastrophic level of the fall of the agricultural sector in Russia at that time, warning of negative prospects for Europe, which caused a negative image of Soviet Russia.

The **evaluative component** in this period is expressed by an epithet *an important element* that estimated Russia as a member of the economic system of Europe, both in the past and in the future.

Thus, after conducting a linguistic analysis of the verbalization of the image-concept "Russia" in the British media discourse in 1916–1922, we can conclude that the image of Russia, created with the help of various linguistic means in the British press during this period, was dynamic and had opposite vectors of assessment due to the saturation of that period with various historical events.

At the beginning of this period, Russia was described as a powerful empire with strong Orthodox traditions, an ally of Great Britain in the war against Germany, an important supplier of various products to Britain and a valuable market. After the overthrow of the tsarist regime, journalists formed the image of a new Russia, as a country standing on the path of democracy, but weakened by wars and revolutions, where chaos, devastation and hunger reign. Russia's catastrophic position was contrasted with its former prosperity. By the end of the period, by 1922, Russia began to be portrayed as a country gradually overcoming difficulties, returning to the world arena in a new status. However, at the same time, in the publications of journalists, Russia turned from an ally into an enemy that should be feared, because the growing Bolshevik authoritarian Russia began to be viewed as a threat to Britain.

Concluding Remarks

We assume to have demonstrated the practical use of the tools we have developed for identifying the structure and representation of a concept, as well as transforming the image associated with it, using the example of Russia in one of the crucial periods of its history. Such a linguistic tool can help in the solution of a wide variety of linguistic problems in the study of the mechanisms of formation of state images in many discourses (artistic, everyday, political, media), and also opens up prospects for further work concerning the images-concepts of the states in various linguistic cultures.

References

1. Van Dijk, T.A. (1995). The Mass Media Today: Discourses of Domination or Diversity. *Javnost. The Public (Ljubljana)*, 2(2), 27–45.
2. Posternyak, K.P. (2021). *The dynamics of the verbalization of the image-concept "Russia" in the British media discourse in the XX–XXI centuries* [dissertation]. Belgorod. EDN: CMCKER (In Russ.).
3. Boeva-Omelechko, N.B., Kostenko, T.F. & Volodko, V.G. (2016.) The contrast of representation of political conflicts in American and Russian presidential discourses. *Proceedings of Southern Federal University. Philology*, 3, 61–68. <https://doi.org/10.18522/1995-0640-2016-3-61-68> EDN: WMUJPV (In Russ.).
4. Karasik, V.I. & Slyshkin, G.G. (2001). Linguocultural concept as a research unit. In: *Methodological problems of cognitive linguistics*. Voronezh: VorSU. pp. 75–79. EDN: WGNDZZ (In Russ.).
5. Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (1980). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
6. Skrebtsova, T.G. (2018). *Cognitive linguistics: classical theories, new approaches*. Moscow: YASK Publ. (In Russ.).
7. Askoldov, S.A. (1997). Concept and word. In: *Russian literature*, V.P. Neroznak (Ed.). Moscow: Academia. pp. 267–279. (In Russ.).
8. Likhachev, D.S. (1993). *The concept sphere of the Russian language. Essays on the philosophy of artistic creativity*. RAS, Institute of Russian Literature (Pushkin House). Saint Petersburg: BLITZ. EDN: ZGYZQL (In Russ.).
9. Karasik, V.I. (2002). *Language circle: personality, concepts, discourse*. Volgograd: Peremena. EDN: QQWTKL (In Russ.).
10. Bessonova, O.L. (2013). *Procedures for the analysis of concepts while conducting comparative typological studies*. Lugansk: Publishing house of the State Institution LNU named after Taras Shevchenko. (In Russ.).
11. Maslova, V.A. (2004). *Poet and Culture: Marina Tsvetaeva's Concept Sphere. A Study Guide*. Moscow: Flinta: Nauka. EDN: QRDVDT (In Russ.).
12. Alefirenko, N.F. (2006). *Language, cognition and culture: cognitive-semiological synergetics of the word*. Volgograd: Peremena. EDN: QSMETF (In Russ.).
13. Cherneyko, L.O. & Dolinsky, V.A. (1996). Fate as an object of conceptual and associative analysis. *Moscow State University Bulletin. Series 9. Philology*, 6, 20–41. EDN: VYJVYI (In Russ.).
14. Krasnykh, V.V. (1998). *Virtual reality or real virtuality? (Human. Consciousness. Communication)*. Moscow: Dialogue-MSU. (In Russ.).
15. Vorkachev, S.G. (2003) The concept as an “umbrella term”. In: *Language, consciousness, communication*. V. 24. Moscow: Maxpress. pp. 5–12. EDN: UBCONJ (In Russ.).

16. Vorkachev, S.G. (2016). Ex pluribus unum: linguocultural concept as synthesis education. *Russian Journal of Linguistics*, 2, 17–30. EDN: WHFFGT (In Russ.).
17. Frumkina, R.M. (1992). *Concept, category, prototype. Linguistic and extralinguistic semantics*. Moscow. EDN: QUIOHN (In Russ.).
18. Vorkachev, S.G. (2009). Categorical synthesis: from linguocultural concept to linguocultural idea. *Izvestiya VSPU*, 2, 4–8. EDN: MEGZST (In Russ.).
19. Ivanova, E.V. (2007). Social and individual in linguistic conceptualizing the world. *Cognitive language studies*, XXX, 122–125. EDN: ZMQGLJ (In Russ.).
20. Potebnya, A.A. (1976). *Aesthetics and poetics*. Moscow: Art. Series: History of aesthetics in monuments and documents. (In Russ.).
21. Boldyrev, N.N. (2019). *Language and the system of knowledge. A cognitive theory of language*. Moscow: YASK Publ. (In Russ.).
22. Papilova, E.V. (2011). Imagology as a humanitarian discipline. *Bulletin of the Moscow State University for the Humanities M.A. Sholokhov. Philological sciences*, 4, 31–40. EDN: OORQMV (In Russ.).
23. Sidorskaya, I.V. (2015). “Image” or “image” of the country: what the media represent. In: *Actual problems of research of communication aspects of PR-activity and journalism: collection of materials of the scientific seminar*. P. 4. Pskov: Pskov State University publ. pp. 64–84. EDN: VIZMNZ (In Russ.).
24. Nikitina, L.B. (2011). Linguistic image-concept: about the nature of a complex term. *Bulletin of the Chelyabinsk State University. Series: Philology. Art criticism*, 24(239), 57, 97–99. EDN: OXALOH (In Russ.).
25. Alefirenko, N.F. (2003). *Concept verbalization problems. Theoretical research*. Volgograd: Peremena. (In Russ.).
26. Kozlova, A.A. (2015). Imagological method in studies of literature and culture. *Observatory of culture*, 3, 114–118. EDN: XABGRH (In Russ.).
27. Gorelova, Y.R. (2018). City as a concept and visual art form. *Urban studies*, 1. URL: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=24086 (accessed: 23.02.2024). (In Russ.).
28. Boyeva-Omelechko, N.B. & Kolganova, K.S. (2015). Conceptualization of the Image of The Lady in G. Byron’s Work of Fiction “Don Juan”. *Cognitive language studies*, XX1, 682–684. EDN: TZWSRD (In Russ.).
29. Pshenkin, A.A. (2003). The role of metaphor in the description of political life in Russia (based on English-language publications). In: *Materials of the conference of young scientists*. Barnaul: BSPU Publ. Part 2. pp. 94–105. (In Russ.).
30. Evtushenko, O.V. (2010). *Fiction speech as a tool of cognition*. Moscow: Languages of Slavic cultures. EDN: UGNUOB (In Russ.).
31. Boulding, K. (1956). *The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society*. Michigan: University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor.
32. Tehranian M. (1999). *Global Communications and World Politics: Domination, Development and Discourse*. Lakewood: Colarado Christian University: Lynne Rinner.
33. Smirnova, A.G. (2016). Perception of an external threat as construction of the image of the state. *Yaroslavl State University named after P.G. Demidov*, 15, 60–64. EDN: WJZQYD (In Russ.).
34. Kiselev, I.Yu. (2007). The problem of the state image in international relations: a constructivist paradigm. *POLITEX*, 3, 253–261. EDN: KNUZZL (In Russ.).
35. Boulding, K. (1959). National Images and International Systems. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 3(2), 120–131.
36. Linets, A. (2016). Image Construction in Modern Virtual Space. *Journal of International Scientific Publications. Language, Individual & Society*, 10, 93–98.
37. Kleshchina, N.N. (2017). The metaphorical nature of the image of Russia in the American media and the image of the United States in the Russian media of the past and present. *Power*, 9, 32–36. EDN: ZGQFJX (In Russ.).

38. Tarasova, I.A. (2009). Image or concept? On the question of the categories of the author's consciousness. *Linguistic being of a person and an ethnos*, 15, 173–176. EDN: ZOARXF (In Russ.).
39. Pishchalnikova, V.A. (2007). *History and theory of psycholinguistics*. Moscow: MSLU. EDN: QBWLYZ (In Russ.).
40. Borisenko, I.V. (2008). *The national image of Russia: philosophical cultural analysis* [dissertation]. Rostov-on-Don. EDN: PNEXNV (In Russ.).
41. Tomberg, O.V. (2015). Literature study in the context of philological imagology. *Bulletin of the Nizhny Novgorod University. N.I. Lobachevsky*, 2, 255–259. EDN: UOGYHN (In Russ.).

Библиографический список

1. Van Dijk T.A. The Mass Media Today: Discourses of Domination or Diversity // *Javnost /The Public* (Ljubljana). 1995. № 2(2). P. 27–45.
2. Постерняк К.П. Динамика вербализации образа-концепта «Россия» в британском медиадискурсе XX—XXI вв. : дисс. ... канд. филол. н. Белгород, 2021. EDN: CMCERK
3. Боева-Омелечко Н.Б., Костенко Т.Ф., Володько В.Г. Контрастная репрезентация политических конфликтов в американском и российском президентских дискурсах // *Филологические науки*. 2016. № 3. С. 61–68.
4. Карасик В.И., Слышкин Г.Г. Лингвокультурный концепт как единица исследования // *Методологические проблемы когнитивной лингвистики*. Воронеж : ВорГУ, 2001. С. 75–79. EDN: WGNDZZ
5. Lakoff G., Johnson M. *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1980.
6. Скребецова Т.Г. Когнитивная лингвистика: классические теории, новые подходы. М. : ЯСК, 2018.
7. Аскольдов С.А. Концепт и слово // *Русская словесность* / под ред. В.П. Нерознака. М. : Academia, 1997. С. 267–279.
8. Лихачев Д.С. Концептосфера русского языка // *Русская словесность: от теории словесности к структуре текста: антол.* М. : Ин-т народов России, 1997. С. 280–287. EDN: ZGYZQL
9. Карасик В.И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. М. : Гнозис, 2004. EDN: QQWTKL
10. Бессонова О.Л. Процедуры анализа концептов при проведении сравнительно-типологических исследований // *Лингвоконцептология: перспективные направления : монография*. Луганск : Луганский национальный университет имени Тараса Шевченко, 2013. С. 87–117. EDN YORQOJ
11. Маслова В.А. Поэт и культура: концептосфера Марины Цветаевой. М. : Флинта: Наука, 2004. EDN: QRDVDT
12. Алефиренко Н.Ф. Язык, познание и культура: Когнитивно-семиологическая синергетика слова. Монография. Волгоград : Перемена, 2006. EDN: QSMETF
13. Чернейко Л.О., Долинский В.А. Имя судьба как объект концептуального и ассоциативного анализа // *Вестник МГУ. Сер. 9. Филология*. 1996. № 6. С. 20–41. EDN: VYJVYI
14. Красных В.В. Виртуальная реальность или реальная виртуальность? (Человек. Сознание. Коммуникация). М. : Диалог-МГУ, 1998.
15. Воркачев С.Г. Концепт как «зонтиковый термин» // *Язык, сознание, коммуникация*. Вып. 24. М. : Макспресс, 2003. С. 5–12. EDN: UBCONJ
16. Воркачев С.Г. Ex pluribus unum: лингвокультурный концепт как синтезное образование // *Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Лингвистика*. 2016. № 2. С. 17–30. EDN: WHFFGT
17. Фрумкина Р.М. Концепт, категория, прототип // *Лингвистическая и экстралингвистическая семантика*. М. : Мысль, 1992. EDN: QUIOHN
18. Воркачев С.Г. Категориальный синтез: от лингвокультурного концепта к лингвокультурной идее // *Известия Волгоградского государственного педагогического университета*. 2009. № 2. С. 4–8. EDN: MEGZST

19. *Иванова Е.В.* Социальное и индивидуальное в языковой концептуализации мира // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2017. Вып. XXX. С. 122–125. EDN: ZMQGLJ
20. *Потебня А.А.* Эстетика и поэтика. М. : Искусство, 1976.
21. *Болдырев Н.Н.* Язык и система знаний. Когнитивная теория языка. М. : ЯСК, 2019. EDN: OXLIYG
22. *Папилова Е.В.* Имагология как гуманитарная дисциплина // Вестник МГТУ им. М.А. Шолохова. Филол. науки. 2011. № 4. С. 31–40. EDN: OORQMV
23. *Сидорская И.В.* «Образ» или «имидж» страны: что репрезентируют СМИ // Актуальные проблемы исследования коммуникационных аспектов PR-деятельности и журналистики : сб. материалов научного семинара. Псков : Псковский государственный университет, 2015. Часть 4. С. 64–84. EDN: VIZMNZ
24. *Никитина Л.Б.* Языковой образ-концепт: о природе сложного термина // Вестник Челябинского гос. ун-та. Серия: Филология. Искусствоведение. 2011. № 24(239). Вып. 57. С. 97–99. EDN: OXALOH
25. *Алефиренко Н.Ф.* Проблемы вербализации концепта: теоретическое исследование. Волгоград : Перемена, 2003.
26. *Козлова А.А.* Имагологический метод в исследованиях литературы и культуры // Обсерватория культуры. 2015. № 3. С. 114–118. EDN: XABGRH
27. *Горелова Ю.Р.* Город как концепт и визуально-художественный образ // Урбанистика. 2018. № 1. Режим доступа: https://nbpublish.com/library_read_article.php?id=24086 (дата обращения: 23.05.2020).
28. *Боева-Омелечко Н.Б., Колганова К.С.* Концептуализация образа женщины в произведении Дж.Г. Байрона «Дон Жуан» // Когнитивные исследования языка. 2015. Вып. XXI. С. 682–684. EDN: TZWSRD
29. *Пшенкин А.А.* Роль метафоры в описании политической жизни в России (на материале англоязычных публикаций) // Матер. конф. молодых ученых. Барнаул : Изд-во БГПУ, 2003. Часть 2. С. 94 —105.
30. *Евтушенко О.В.* Художественная речь как инструмент познания. М. : Языки славянских культур, 2010. EDN: UGNUOB
31. *Boulding K.* The Image: Knowledge in Life and Society. Michigan: University of Michigan Press: Ann Arbor, 1956.
32. *Tehranian M.* Global Communications and World Politics: Domination, Development and Discourse. Lakewood : Colorado Christian University. United States: Lynne Rinner, 1999.
33. *Смирнова А.Г.* Восприятие внешней угрозы как конструирование Образа Государства // Вестник Ярославского государственного университета им. П.Г. Демидова. Серия Гуманитарные науки. 2016. № 15. С. 60–64. EDN: WJZQYD
34. *Киселев И.Ю.* Проблема образа государства в международных отношениях: конструктивистская парадигма // ПОЛИТЭК. 2007. № 3. С. 253–261. EDN: KNUZZL
35. *Boulding K.* National Images and International Systems // The Journal of Conflict Resolution. 1959. Vol. 3. (2). P. 120–131.
36. *Linets A.* Image Construction in Modern Virtual Space // Journal of International Scientific Publications. Language, Individual & Society. 2016. Vol. 10. P. 93–98.
37. *Клещина Н.Н.* Метафоричность образа России в американских СМИ и образа США в российских СМИ прошлого и настоящего // Власть. 2017. № 9. С. 32–36. EDN: ZGQFJX
38. *Тарасова И.А.* Образ или концепт? К вопросу о категориях авторского сознания // Языковое бытие человека и этноса. 2009. № 15. С. 173–176. EDN: ZOARXF
39. *Пищальникова В.А.* История и теория психолингвистики. М. : МГЛУ, 2007. EDN: QBWLYZ
40. *Борисенко И.В.* Национальный образ России: философско-культурологический анализ : дисс. ... канд. филол. наук. Ростов-на-Дону : Южный федеральный университет, 2008. EDN: PNEXNV

41. Томберг О.В. Изучение литературы в контексте филологической имагологии // Вестник Нижегородского университета им. Н.И. Лобачевского. 2015. № 2. С. 255–259. EDN: UOGYHN

Information about the authors:

Ksenia P. Posternyak, PhD in Philology, Translator, Department of Information and Publication Activities, Don State Technical University, (1, Gagarina Sq., Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation, 344000); *Research interests*: English language, imagology; *e-mail*: xana2437@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-5227-878X. SPIN-код: 1323-6389, AuthorID: 1036402. ResearcherID: F-9049-2018; Scopus Author ID: 57211295072.

Kirill P. Posternyak, PhD student, Department of Linguistics and Professional Communication, Institute of Philology, Journalism and Intercultural Communication, Southern Federal University (105/42, Bolshaya Sadovaya Str., Rostov-on-Don, Russian Federation, 344006); *Research interests*: Imagology, political media discourse; *e-mail*: kir-posternyak@yandex.ru
ORCID: 0000-0002-5272-5113. SPIN-код: 5508-4473, AuthorID: 949684.

Сведения об авторах:

Постерняк Ксения Павловна, кандидат филологических наук, переводчик, Управление информационно-публикационной деятельности, Донской государственный технический университет, (344000, Российская Федерация, г. Ростов-на-Дону, пл. Гагарина, д. 1); *сфера научных интересов*: английский язык, имагология; *e-mail*: xana2437@gmail.com

ORCID: 0000-0002-5227-878X. SPIN-код: 1323-6389, AuthorID: 1036402. ResearcherID: F-9049-2018; Scopus Author ID: 57211295072.

Постерняк Кирилл Павлович, аспирант кафедры лингвистики и профессиональной коммуникации института филологии, журналистики и межкультурной коммуникации, Южный федеральный университет (344006, Российская Федерация, г. Ростов-на-Дону, ул. Большая Садовая, д. 105/42); *сфера научных интересов*: английский язык, имагология, политический медиадискурс; *e-mail*: kir-posternyak@yandex.ru

ORCID: 0000-0002-5272-5113. SPIN-код: 5508-4473, AuthorID: 949684.