LINGUISTIC IMAGOLOGY: ORIGIN AND APPLICATION

Sofia D. Kamalova
MGIMO University (Moscow, Russia)
salyam19@mail.ru

The article dwells on the origin and development of linguistic imagology, a new field of research which studies the linguistic aspect of foreign image representation in fiction literature, mass media and other types of discourse, as well as the linguistic means of reflecting the relations between the auto-image (image of "the self") and the hetero-image (image of "the other"). The specific approach offered in the paper is based on the analysis of nine multicultural novels about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict written in English. It consists in singling out two degrees of estrangement between the auto- and the hetero-image, with alienation and the image of an *alius* making an accent on differences and misunderstanding, and alterity together with the image of an *alter*, on similarities and propinquity. Lexico-semantic and stylistic analysis of the novels, carried out in the article, reveals linguistic tools which are employed to represent the hetero-image as either an *alius* or an *alter*.
Keywords: linguistic imagology, alter, alius, auto-image, hetero-image, multicultural literature, the Israeli-Palestinian conflict.

1. INTRODUCTION

The second half of the 20th century was marked by a whole series of social events and phenomena, such as postwar recovery and decolonization, human rights movement and promotion of multiculturalism, etc., which required new interdisciplinary approaches of humanities towards interpersonal, international and intercultural communication. Imagology was one of the new fields of research that responded to the challenges of the time. As it follows from the etymology of the term itself imagology is the study of images, namely the images of a foreign nation and of one's own as well. According to M. Beller, "imagology studies the origin and function of characteristics of other countries and peoples, as expressed textually, particularly in the way in which they are presented in works of literature, plays, poems, travel books and essays" [Beller, 2007, p. 7]. It deals with ethnic images in general and with national stereotypes and prejudices in particular, aiming to research their origin and evolution, and analyze their functioning in various types of discourse. It is important to underline that the correlation between the images of "the self" and "the other" is also in the focus of imagology.

The issues of otherness and alterity, which are today viewed within the context of various social, political and cultural phenomena, such as globalization and migration, date back to ancient times. Modern approaches towards understanding ethnic and cultural diversity are considered to have been shaped by ancient Greek philosophers who sought to describe neighbouring barbarians (those who did not speak Greek), for example in Egypt and Persia.

Thus, Plato's "Timaeus", "Leges", "Epinomis", Aristotle's "Politica", Tacitus' "Germania" and of course Herodotus' "Historie" all serve as valuable geo-ethnographical works which in their time dealt with the perception of foreignness and fostered identity. With the advent of ethnocentric ideas, which contributed to the use of stereotypes and served as an instrument of regulating the relationships with foreign peoples, including the legitimization of wars, the number of historiographic and geographic treatises grew [Nippel, 2007, p. 33]. Alterity was also perpetuated in stories and myths as well as epic literature about monstrous creatures, such as Cyclops, Pigmies, Amazons, which were believed to have inhabited foreign lands [Ibidem, p. 34]. The holy books of monotheistic religions contain explanations and instructions of ethnographic character as well. Thus, P. Hoppenbrouwers considers the biblical books of "Genesis" and "Exodus", for instance, as "outstanding sources of wandering stories" [Hoppenbrouwers, 2007, p. 45]. At the beginning of the Middle Ages, as the scholar notes, with the increasing number of direct contacts between the peoples of early modern states the works on national characteristics and the description of stereotypes became much more elaborate [Ibidem, p. 57]. It is also noteworthy that during this period of time Europe witnessed the development of a new genre of writing, which was called the "mirror of princes" and which served as instructions for kings on how to behave and to rule. As J. Leerssen underlines, Machiavelli's "The Prince" modified the genre so as to guide monarchs across their "dominions, enemies and allies" [Leerssen, 2007, p. 63].

The works of the Enlightenment thinkers, such as "Inquiry concerning human understanding" (1748) by D. Hume, "De l'esprit des lois" (1748) by Montesquieu, "Principi di una scienza nuova d'intorno alla natura delle nazioni" (1725) by Giambattista Vico and "Essai sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations et sur les principaux faits de l'histoire depuis Charlemagne jusqu'à Louis XIII" (1756) by Voltaire, with their focus on the nature of man and humanity, put a philosophical spin on national stereotypes and ethnic characteristics [Leerssen, 2007, p. 70]. While in the Enlightenment philosophy national characters were considered to be divergent from some abstract invariant standard, later, namely in the works by J. G. Herder, the status of the norm was given, on the contrary, to peculiarity and diversity. Hence, in the nineteenth century the discussion of national identity was based on international difference, on the peculiarity of a particular people against the backdrop of humanity in general [Ibidem, p. 73]. This caused the burgeoning popularity of comparative studies. Furthermore, the new approach towards national thought altered philology, first turning it into a combination of anthropology and linguistic, literary and historical analyses, as applied by J. Grimm, and later mingling it with a form of national psychology, Völkerpsychologie, declared by M. Lazarus and H. Steinthal as a separate discipline aiming at the investigation of national spirit through psychological methods [Leerssen, 2007, p. 74; Dukic, 2009, p. 76]. Thus, the nineteenth century, according to J. Leerssen, marks the "pre-history" of imagology [Leerssen, 2007a, p. 18].

The significant role of philology in the discussion of national character is also revealed in the merging of linguistic and literary types of research and the conception of Comparative Literature as a consequence of the preceding rise of Comparative Linguistics. The use of ethnic

stereotypes and images as tools of explaining and interpreting literary traditions rather than as subjects of investigation and thorough research, the classification of literature by the token of the author's physical nationality and thus by language – all this led to the overly deterministic and essentialist approach towards the very idea of what a nation is, with the premise that the latter is "a 'real' thing pre-existing its articulation and persisting independently from it" [Leerssen, 2007a, p. 20].

Here we arrive at the inevitable urgency of a critical analysis of national characterization and the revision of the historicized notion of ethnic diversity. It is not a coincidence that the resolution of the issue in question, i.e. the emergence of imagology, falls on the end of the Second World War [Leerssen, 2007a, p. 21]. Critical attitudes towards the positivistic and deterministic views on the notions of national character and identity prevailing in the nineteenth century appeared long before the end of the war. However, it was the tragedy of the Second World War that triggered a serious shift in the way humanities treated national representation. In 1947 the professor of Sorbonne University J.-M. Carré published the monograph "Les *Écrivains français* et le mirage allemande (1800-1940)", where he demonstrated how the romanticized and idealized depiction of Germany, as described in Mme de *Staël*'s "De l'Allemagne" and other literary works by Romanticism authors, created a long-standing myth, or "mirage", of Germany as the 'land of poets and philosophers', which eventually concealed from France the militaristic mood of the neighbouring state on the brink of the war [Polyakov & Polyakova, 2013, p. 16]. Later M.-F. Guyard in the essay "L'étranger tel qu'on le voit" from his famous book "La Litterature comparée" developed Carré's views suggesting that Comparative Literature should focus on the research "not of nationality *per se*, but of nationality 'as seen', as a literary trope", "as a convention, a misunderstanding, a construct" [Leerssen, 2007a, p. 22].

In the 1960s Belgian professor of Aachen University H. Dyserinck followed in the footsteps of the founding fathers of imagology. It was he who finally granted the then new sub-discipline of Comparative Literature its current name – imagology. H. Dyserinck pointed out the "de-ideologizing" and "de-mythologizing" functions of imagology and, taking into account the supra-national viewpoint on the correlation between the hetero-image (image of "the other") and the auto-image (image of "the self") – the function of investigating post-national identity models [Dyserinck, 2003].

Currently the most prominent modern researcher of imagology, professor of Amsterdam University, J. Leerssen, numerously cited above, when criticizing the naïve essentialism of the late 19th – early 20th centuries and its view on nation, nationality, national character and stereotypes, introduced a new term – "ethnotype" – to refer to "representations of national character". The researcher characterized ethnotypes as "discursive objects: narrative tropes and rhetorical formulae" without any "objectively existing *signifié*" [Leerssen, 2016]. Furthermore, ethnotypes are revealed in opposition, which returns us back to Dyserinck's focus

on the notions of auto- and hetero-images. Leerssen then substantiated the post-national stance of imagology by singling out those universal polarities which are usually employed when describing different nationalities or ethnicities, like northern/ cerebral vs southern/sensuous, western/ individualistic/ active vs oriental/ collective/ passive. According to the scholar, these characterological oppositions are actually "nationally unspecific" and serve as role patterns traditionally focusing, strange as it may seem, on ethnic differences rather than similarities [Leerssen, 2007a, p. 29].

From this historical overview of how imagology developed it is obvious, that even though it directly stems from Comparative Literature, it still incorporates the findings of many other humanities like philosophy, anthropology, sociology, history, ethnography, and more specifically, intercultural communication, discourse analysis, linguistics, etc. It is only logical that some researchers choose to focus on a particular aspect of imagology. Thus, there are studies of the historical aspect of imagology, which centers on the evolution of foreign image representation throughout the history of a particular country or at a particular historical period, especially during a conflict [Senyavsky & Senyavskaya, 2006]. Some researchers focus on the religious aspect of imagology, studying how different religious communities perceive and represent each other [Andreicheva, 2016].

The linguistic aspect of imagology, which is the subject matter of this paper, focuses on the language means used in the representation of hetero-images and their correlation with auto-images in different types of discourse. Against the backdrop of literary studies of otherness D.-H. Pageaux was among the first prominent imagologists who stressed the role of the linguistic aspect in the research of the representation of hetero-images, especially at the lexical level. He underlined the necessity to analyze semantic fields, both synchronically and diachronically, comprised of the lexical units which are employed to describe the image of "the other", as well as loanwords that denote the realities of the foreign culture. While in the first case the researcher should be concerned with the lexico-semantic means of character representation, in the second case the emphasis is not just on decodification of the meaning but rather on frequency and etymology of loanwords as they can also take on the role of a symbol. Moreover, semantic (and we should add stylistic) analyses incorporate axiological as well as ideological components, which outline the nature of the relations between the auto-image and the hetero-image [Polyakov, 2013, p. 21, 105; Pageaux, 1997].

Defining national representations as tropes and textual strategies, J. Leerssen also points out the role of textual interpretation, which includes linguistic analysis, in his observations on the methodology of imagology [Leerssen, 2007a, p. 28].

Linguistic imagology can take on various forms of approach towards an imagological text. For example, professor of Tampere University A. V. Zelenin, focusing on the use of the ethnonym "Germans" in the Russian literature, studies its semantic surrounding with the emphasis on the evaluative component of the concept and the way German speech is reproduced, or rather parodied, in Russian texts. According to the researcher, the analysis of foreign speech imitation is a very important aspect of linguistic imagology [Zelenin, 2013, p. 63]. The emotional and axiological components of image construction at the semantic and

pragmatic levels of language are analyzed in the research by K. V. Kostina [Kostina, 2011] and L.P. Ivanova [Ivanova, 2015], while professor of Glasgow University Sh. Khairov dwells on the evaluative and ideological aspects of the image of the Cyrillic script in different textual genres [Khairov, 2017].

2. MATERIAL AND METHODS

To reveal the ways in which linguistic imagology can be employed in the analysis of foreign images in literature and the research of the correlation between the auto- and hetero-images, we carried out lexico-semantic and stylistic analyses of English fiction books focused on one of the most tragic and prolonged political and military conflicts in human history, that is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. These books are: “Habibi” by Naomi Shihab Nye, “Tasting the Sky” by Ibtisam Barakat, “Where the Streets Had a Name” by Randa Abdel-Fattah, “Checkpoints” by Marilyn Levy, “Real Time” by Pnina Moed Kass, “The Book of Trees” by Leanne Lieberman, “The Enemy Has a Face” by G. Miklowitz, “Broken Bridge” by Lynne Reid Banks and “The Shepherd’s Granddaughter” by Anne Laurel Carter. The novels that we have selected can be classified as multicultural literature as they, being written in English, deal with “groups of people that are distinguished racially, culturally, linguistically and in other ways from the dominant white, Anglo-Saxon, Protestant, patriarchal culture” [Cai and Sims Bishop, 1994, p. 57]. The majority of the authors belong to the culture they describe as they are either of Jewish (P.M. Kass, M. Levy, L. Lieberman, G. Miklowitz) or Palestinian Arab (R. Abdel-Fattah, I. Barakat, N.Sh. Nye) origin, except for L.R. Banks and A.L. Carter, who nonetheless lived in the region for several years.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The lexico-semantic and stylistic analyses of the image of “the other” and of the linguistic means employed to represent the correlation between the hetero-image and the auto-image prove the necessity to differentiate between the notions of *alter* and *alius*, which stand for different degrees of estrangement. Both terms are borrowed from Latin. While *alter* is defined as “one of two, second” [https://latin-dictionary.net/search/latin/alter], *alius* means “different, changed” [https://latin-dictionary.net/search/latin/alius]. According to M. Swiderska, *alter* is “one of two similar, complementary ‘others’” while *alius* is a stranger “situated outside the world of a particular group, nation, or culture” [Swiderska, 2013]. In terms of interpersonal communication, *alter* is the one we want to interact with, and thus the one involved in the conversation while *alius* is “the foreigner somewhere else, not involved in the ongoing activity, socially excluded, outside of the space of interaction, outside of the dyad of conversation” [Jungbluth, 2015, p. 216-217].

In the analyzed novels an *alius* usually takes the form of a label, a stereotype, sometimes even a slur, inserted into either direct speech or an inner monologue, both emotionally charged,

pronounced as a rule by a teenage character. Structurally and semantically, such utterances often resemble a myth, like in the following example: *Every one of you has a moustache* [Kass, 2004, p. 141]. According to the plot of the book "Real Time" by P.M. Kass, this phrase is pronounced by an Israeli soldier examining a Palestinian doctor at a checkpoint. The stereotypization of the image of a Palestinian man and the affirmative character of the statement turn it into an overgeneralization based on a prejudice. In another example the author emphasizes the use of the lexeme "boss": *I always answer in Hebrew because it shows him I know who is boss. He is my boss. A real boss, the Boss of my life because he is Israeli* [Kass, 2004, p. 45]. Here a Palestinian teenager, who always addresses his Israeli employer as "Boss" describes the way he speaks to the latter. The use of gradation based on lexical repetition culminating in the capitalization of the label "Boss" and its contextual synonymization with the ethnonym "Israeli" endow the utterance with a sarcastic connotation.

Other examples of labels and invectives used in direct speech and inner monologues are *animal* [Nye, 1999, p. 95], *terrorist* [Kass, 2004, p. 66], *suicide bomber* [Levy, 2008, p. 7], *the enemy* [Levy, 2008, p. 51].

An alleged *alius* is the one who denies, or at least is not ready to accept, the values of a group, and thus poses a threat to the very existence of this group. Implicitly, the description of "the other" as an *alius* is usually drawn by means of the semantic fields of death and destruction, like in the examples below:

1. *I am lying under a seat. A metal bar is pressing into my face. There is a shoe on my chest. A man's shoe. I can see my arm bone. There's no flesh on it. I am screaming, screaming, screaming. No one hears me. I will die. I will die. The smoke, a heavy sweet sick smell, ambulances, sirens* [Kass, 2004, p. 83].
2. *"I peck things for my father." – "Not peck. A bird pecks. Pack." <…>. – "I packed things for my father. Settlers break window. Settlers write bad words on store. No tourists come. He close… closed… store"* [Carter, 2008, p. 124].

The first example is an excerpt from the inner monologue of a Jewish girl who has become a victim of a terrorist attack. The simple syntactical structure of the short sentences, as well as lexical (*screaming, screaming, screaming*) and phrasal (*I will die. I will die*) repetition make the extract resemble a stream of consciousness. The text appeals to several senses simultaneously, including the sense of touch (*pressing*), vision (*I can see*), smell, whose description looks even more expressive by means of alliteration (*the smoke, a heavy sweet sick smell*), and sound (*screaming, sirens*), and thus the vividness of the scene is intensified. Even though there is no direct description of the image of "the other", depicting the catastrophic aftermath of their activity sheds light on the antagonistic aspect of the "self-other" relations.

The second excerpt is a dialogue between a teacher of English and a Palestinian schoolgirl who is given the task to describe in English what she did during her summer vacation. The discrepancy between what is actually said and what children usually say when they speak about their summer adventures, between the humorous effect from the reproduction of the phonemic mistake (*peck* vs *pack*) and the abrupt failure of the pun, and most importantly, between the content of the speech, that is the description of tragic events, and its form, that is

the imitation of broken English, enhance the expressiveness of the text. Broken English is not only imitated by means of reproducing phonemic (*peck – pack*) mistakes, but also grammatical (absence of articles, incorrect use of verb forms) mistakes, the use of three dots to mark pauses in the tentative speech of the girl, and parallel structures based on anaphoric repetition (*Settlers break… Settlers write…*), and it thus embraces different levels of the language system. It should be underlined that the description of dramatic events in simple, even simplistic language, be it the imitation of broken speech or other stylized versions of a language or of a speech manner, is a very powerful technique of conveying the message.

The linguistic reflection of the so-called routinization of the conflict also provides for the expression of alienation and estrangement. The term "routinization" is borrowed from the works by the professor of Tel-Aviv University D. Bar-Tal, who describes the process of routinization as the result of society members living in the conditions of a long-lasting conflict which becomes an integral part of their daily life. The four ways in which a conflict becomes routinized, according to D. Bar-Tal, include constant exposure to the images of the conflict, to the everyday flow of information about the conflict and to the "military language" describing the conflict, and daily behavioral practices imposed by the authorities such as thorough security checks in public places [Bar-Tal & Vered, 2014, p. 44-45]. The linguistic analysis of the novels about the Israeli-Palestinian conflict demonstrates how the language of conflict is reflected in jokes and sarcastic expressions, which creates a separate, military, topic within the wider notion of humorous discourse. Mocking the realities of the conflict the characters on the one hand learn to live with them, trying to adapt, and on the other hint at their bitter disappointment with the existing state of affairs. The following example demonstrates how jokes about the conflict reflect the gap between the opposing sides: *"I mean, really," Karim says with a sigh, "with drivers hardly ever able to reach even fourth gear thanks to these checkpoints, they're doing us a favor. Saving us gas, you know"* [Abdel-Fattah, 2010, p. 146]. The ironic effect is produced by the clash between the negative meaning of the phrase *with drivers hardly ever able to reach even fourth gear* and the inherently positive connotation of the prepositional phrase *thanks to* and is then developed in the sarcastic continuation of the utterance (*they're doing us a favor; saving us gas*).

The use of deictic words is by far the most explicit means of expressing difference and alienation between the auto-image and the hetero-image, as this helps to draw the semantic fields of "us" and "them", or "us" and "you", which can be demonstrated by the following examples:

1. *You Israelis have a country, we don't. We also deserve a country* [Kass, 2004, p. 143].
2. *People were killing each other. We were demolishing their houses, and they were bombing our buses* [Lieberman, 2010, p. 192].

The opposition between “us” and “you” in the first example is intensified by the pleonasmic combination of the pronoun “you” with the ethnonym “Israelis”, while the dichotomy “we – they” in the second excerpt is emphasized by the rhetorical figure of chiasmus.

It should be underlined once again that such clash between the images of “the self” and “the other”, which takes the form of an *alius*, occurs mostly in the direct speech or inner monologues of teenage characters. However, *alter*, which, as we mentioned above, represents the lesser degree of alienation between the auto- and the hetero-images, is often described with the help of deictic words too. “The self” and “the other” in this case are usually united into one circle and opposed to a third party. Another linguistic technique consists in the use of inclusive “we” uniting sides of the conflict:

1. *You know, Netta, we’re in the good old USA now. Not Israel or Palestine where you and I are not equals. We should talk sometime. We have a lot more in common with each other than with these American kids* [Miklowitz, 2003, p. 23].
2. *Mixed in with the weeping families are newspaper reporters and a television crew. Someone with a WNS press tag. And men in Arab headdress. We all live here, don’t we?* [Kass, 2004, p. 110]

The sequence of personal pronouns in the first example alternating between the dichotomy “I – you” and the inclusive “we” as opposed to yet another hetero-image (*these American kids*) sets the stage for the focus on similarities rather than differences between the Palestinians and Israelis. The second excerpt is the inner dialogue of an Israeli soldier visiting his girlfriend in hospital after a terrorist attack. Here the stylistic device of parcellation, separating the homogeneous units (*newspaper reporters, a television crew, someone with a WNS press tag, men in Arab headdress*), which function as the subject of the microtext, precedes the inclusive “we” that is intensified by the use of the adjective “all” with the semantics of unification and the question tag at the end of the last sentence. This adds to the philosophical character of the soldier’s inner speech.

Alterity rather than alienation oftentimes comes to the fore even before a book starts, that is in the dedication or the epigraph of the book. For example, N. Sh. Nye in one of the three epigraphs to her novel “Habibi” cites Anndee Hochman, an American journalist and writer who wrote about Palestinians and Jews: “We are *challah* and *hummus* eaten together to make a meal” [Nye, 1999], and in the dedication Nye writes: “…for all the Arabs and Jews who would rather be cousins than enemies” [Ibidem]. The eye-catching gastronomic metaphor and the juxtaposition of the lexemes with the opposite pragmatic value (*cousins* and *enemies*) point at the necessity to focus on the similarities rather than differences between the two peoples.

Other manifestations of intertextuality conveying the idea of propinquity and sameness include allusions to Biblical texts, namely to the story of Abraham and his sons Ishmael and Isaac, who were half-brothers and who are considered to be the forefathers of Arabs and Jews respectively. Thus, the two peoples are compared with “cousins” [Nye, 1999; Abdel-Fattah,

2010, p. 132] or "brothers" [Levy, 2008, p. 151; Lieberman, 2010, p. 192] who despite disagreement and quarrels will always remain bonded to each other.

The image of *alter* is also revealed in numerous aphoristic sentences and maxims permeating the novels under discussion, like in the examples below:

1. *It is just that nobody has realized that laughter sounds the same, whether it shakes its way out of an Israeli or a Palestinian* [Abdel-Fattah, 2010, p. 67].
2. *Once you have lunch with the "enemy," it's harder to make generalizations* [Levy, 2008, p. 149].

The personification of laughter in the first excerpt emphasizes the similarities between the Palestinians and the Israelis, while the use of the word "enemy" between the quotation marks in the second example reveals the mythologized character of the lexical unit and reverses the dictionary meaning of the word.

Finally, we would like to return to the idea we mentioned in the Introduction about the use of code-switching and loanwords borrowed from the foreign language pertaining to the foreign culture described in a book. It is obvious that such words and even whole phrases possess strong expressive power as they always stand out from their textual surrounding, even graphically, as in most cases they are printed in italics. It should be underlined that we use the two terms – code-switching and loanwords – separately, as the former stands for language means of different levels ranging from phonemes and morphemes to lexemes and even groups of sentences and are not registered in the dictionaries of the recipient language, while the latter denotes words which have already entered it [Kolomeytseva, 2016, p. 13; Krysin, 2004, p. 203]. In our research the recipient language is English while the donor languages are mainly Arabic, Hebrew and Yiddish.

Speaking about the thematic distribution of code-switching and loan-words, it is possible to single out such groups as greetings (*shalom, alaykum essalaam, Sabah-al-khair*), names of food and dishes (*falafel, maramia, hummus*), family members (*yaba, ima, baba*), items of clothing (*keffieh, yarmulke*), religious terms and sacral language (*behawenha Allah, hajj, Kaddish*), social and political terms (*intifada, yored, kibbutz, munawarat*). Names of the characters, or anthroponyms, used in the books comprise another significant group. In some novels they convey a symbolic meaning, like the name of *Amani*, which can be translated from Arabic into English as "wishes" and is associated not only with the girl's personal wish to become a shepherd but also with the wish of the Palestinians to get freedom [Carter, 2008, p. 57], or the name of *Baruch Ben Tov,* which means "blessed be the memory of the good son" in Hebrew and which was chosen by the protagonist who had gone through the horrors of the Holocaust [Kass, 2004, p. 166].

Palestinians and Israelis share a lot in terms of their culture and language (Arabic and Hebrew are both Semitic languages), which is illustrated in the following example: "Liyana's mind flew forward at full speed. She realized there shouldn't be anything shocking about his

being Jewish in a place made up mostly of Arabs and Jews. It's just that she hadn't even *thought* of it. And wasn't his name Omar an Arabic name? When she mentioned this, stuttering, he laughed roundly so his fabulous teeth showed. "*Omer*, my friend," he said, "with an *e* not an *a* – which is a Jewish name. You don't like it as much?" [Nye, 1999, p. 164]. This excerpt describes the reaction of a Palestinian-American girl at learning that her new friend she has recently met in Jerusalem is Jewish. The reflexive function of the anthroponyms *Omar* and *Omer* emphasizes the conventional character of the line between the images of "the self" and "the other" as it can be enough to replace just one letter in a person's name to threaten his or her status of being considered an *alter* rather than an *alius*.

4. CONCLUSIONS

Linguistic imagology as the study of the linguistic aspect of foreign image representation and of the correlation between the auto-image and the hetero-image in various types of discourse is a relatively young, yet very prolific field of research. Imagology itself, though officially formulated in the middle of the 20th century, dates back long to the ancient times when the issues of otherness and identity were already perpetuated in philosophical and historical treatises. Today, with the acceleration of globalization on the one hand and the conservation and protection of local cultures on the other, imagological research is especially acute.

The linguistic imagological approach of studying the correlation between "the self" and "the other", offered in this paper, is focused on the necessity to differentiate between two different degrees of their estrangement – between alterity and alienation and thus between an *alter* and an *alius*, where the notion of alterity underlines similarities and possibilities of having a dialogue with "the other" while alienation stems from the focus on differences and struggle between the auto- and the hetero-image.

The lexico-semantic and stylistic analysis of 9 novels, devoted to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict, reveal that alienation finds its reflection mostly in the direct speech and inner dialogue of teenage protagonists and is usually expressed in the form of labels and myths about "the other", descriptions based on semantic fields of death and destruction, caused by the "enemy", and even sarcastic remarks about the conflict, which are an element of the routinization of the conflict, and very often by means of deictic words. The latter, however, is a very fruitful way of highlighting not only alienation but alterity as well, especially in combination with other linguistic means such as the inclusive *we*. The accent on similarities is also made in the books' epigraphs, dedications and other manifestations of intertextuality, which contain references to the genetic closeness of the two peoples and often allude to the Biblical stories of Abraham and his sons. Aphoristic sentences about equality and hope for peace are usually pronounced by more mature characters rather than teenage protagonists. Another linguistic means widely employed in the analyzed multicultural novels to describe hetero- and auto-images is the use of loanwords and code-switching. As they are expressive and eye-catching by default, their use does not go unnoticed. Of special interest is their reflexive function as it serves as food for

thought about the propinquity of the Arabic and Hebrew languages and thus of Palestinians and Israelis proper.

Linguistic imagology is also concerned with such issues as the representation of intercultural dialogue and conflict in the media discourse, the linguistic expression of postnational identity, the study of ethnic stereotypes and prejudices, and others topics which need scientific interpretation and may become the subject matter of future research.

REFERENCES

1. Abdel-Fattah, R. (2010). *Where the streets had a name*. New York: Scholastic Press.
2. Andreicheva, M.Y. (2016). Religioznaja imagologija: predmet i zadachi novogo istoriko-imagologicheskogo napravlenija [Religious imagology: subject and objectives of the new historical imagological direction]. *Istoricheskie, filosofskie, politicheskie i juridicheskie nauki, kul'turologija i iskusstvovedenie. Voprosy teorii i praktiki [Historical, philosophical, political and legal sciences, cultural studies and art history. Questions of theory and practice], 11(73): 2*, 37-40 (in Russian).
3. Banks, L.R. (1994). *Broken bridge*. New York: Avon Books.
4. Barakat, I. (2007). *Tasting the sky: a Palestinian childhood*. Harrisonburg: Melanie Kroupa Books.
5. Bar-Tal, D., & Vered, S. (2014). Routinization of the Israeli-Arab conflict: the perspective of outsiders. *Israel Studies Review, 29(1),* 41-61.
6. Beller, M. (2007). Perception, image, imagology. In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.) *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters (A critical survey)* (3-16), Amsterdam – New York, NY: Rodopi.
7. Cai, M., & Sims Bishop, R. (1994). Multicultural literature for children: towards a clarification of the concept. In A.H. Dyson & C. Genishi (Eds.). *The Need for Story: Cultural Diversity in Classroom and Community* (57-71), Urbana, IL: National Council of Teachers of English.
8. Carter, A.L. (2008). *The shepherd's granddaughter*. Toronto: House of Anansi Press, Groundwood Books.
9. Dukic, D. (2009). The concept of the cultural imagery: imagology with and not against the early Völkerpsychologie. In E.F. Coutinho (Ed.). *Discontinuities and Displacements: Studies in Comparative Literature. Proceedings of the XVIII. Congress of the ICLA* (71-80), Rio de Janeiro: Aeroplano editora.
10. Dyserinck, H. (2003). Imagology and the problem of ethnic pdentity. *Intercultural Studies, 1*. Retrieved from https://is.muni.cz/el/1421/podzim2009/NIDCC03_01/um/2_Dyserinck.pdf (accessed: 07 July, 2020).
11. Hoppenbrouwers, P. (2007). Medieval peoples imagined. In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.). *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of*

National Characters (A critical survey) (45-62), Amsterdam – New York, NY: Rodopi.

12. Ivanova, L.P. (2015). Sintez nauki – arhitektury – religii kak predmet lingvoimagologicheskogo opisanija (na materiale publicistiki N. V. Gogolja) [The Synthesis of Science – Architecture – Religion as a Subject of Linguistic Imagology (Based on the Publicist Articles by N.V. Gogol)]. *Mir russkogo slova [The world of the Russian word], 1,* 52-56 (in Russian).
13. Jungbluth, K. (2015). Crossing the border, closing the gap: otherness in language Use. In P. Rosenberg, K. Jungbluth, & D.Z. Rhobodes (Eds.). *Linguistic Construction of Ethnic Borders* (209-229), Peter Lang Edition.
14. Kass, P. (2004). *Real time*. Boston: Graphia, Houghton Mifflin Company.
15. Khairov, Sh. (2017). Grafika kak ob''ekt lingvisticheskoj imagologii. O nekotoryh tipah jesteticheskih i ideologicheskih ocenok doreformennoj kirillicy v Rossii do i posle 1918 g. [The alphabet in linguistic imagology. Ideological and aesthetic values in the disputes on the prereform Cyrillic letters in Russia before and after 1918]. *Studi Slavistici, XIV,* 293-307 (in Russian).
16. Kolomeitseva, E.B. (2016). *Inojazychnye vkraplenija v sovremennom hudozhestvennom tekste (na materiale anglijskogo jazyka) [Code-switching in modern fiction texts] (Candidate thesis).* The Herzen State Pedagogical University, St. Petersburg, Russia (in Russian).
17. Kostina, K.V. (2011). *Aksiologicheskij aspekt jazykovoj reprezentacii obraza Rossii v sovremennom nemeckom mediadiskurse [The axiological aspect of the linguistic representation of Russia in the German modern media discourse] (Candidate thesis).* Irkutsk State Linguistic University, Irkutsk, Russia (in Russian).
18. Krysin, L.P. (2004). *Russkoe slovo, svoe i chuzhoe [The Russian word, own and alien]*. Moscow: Jazyki slavjanskoj kul'tury (in Russian).
19. Latdict. *Latin Dictionary and Grammar Resources*. Retrieved from https://latin-dictionary.net/search/latin/alter (accessed: 20 July, 2020).
20. Latdict. *Latin Dictionary and Grammar Resources*. Retrieved from https://latin-dictionary.net/search/latin/alius (accessed: 20 July, 2020).
21. Leerssen, J. (2007). The poetics and anthropology of national character (1500-2000). In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.). *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters (A critical survey)* (63-75), Amsterdam – New York, NY: Rodopi.
22. Leerssen, J. (2007a). Imagology: history and method. In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.). *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters (A critical survey)* (17-32), Amsterdam – New York, NY: Rodopi.
23. Leerssen, J. (2016). Imagology: on using ethnicity to make sense of the world. *Dossier Monographique: Les stéréotypes dans la construction des identités nationales depuis une perspective transnationale, numéro 10, Automne 2016.*

Retrieved from http://imagologica.eu/cms/UPLOAD/Imagology2016.pdf (accessed: 3 July, 2020).
24. Levy, M. (2008). *Checkpoints*. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society.
25. Lieberman, L. (2010). *The book of trees*. Orca Book Publishers.
26. Miklowitz, G. (2003). *The enemy has a face*. Grand Rapids: EerdmansBooks for Young Readers.
27. Nippel, W. (2007). Ethnic images in classical antiquity. In M. Beller & J. Leerssen (Eds.). *Imagology: The Cultural Construction and Literary Representation of National Characters (A critical survey)* (33-44), Amsterdam – New York, NY: Rodopi.
28. Nye, N.Sh. (1999). *Habibi*. New York: Aladdin Paperworks.
29. Pageaux, D.-H. (1997). Image/Imaginaire. In C.C. Barfoot (Ed.). *Beyond the Pug's Tour. National and Ethnic Stereotyping in Theory and Literary Practice* (367-379), Amsterdam-Atlanta.
30. Polyakov, O.Y., & Polyakova, O.A. (2013). *Imagologija: teoretiko-metodologicheskie osnovy [Imagology: theoretical and methodological framework]*. Kirov, Russia: Raduga-Press (in Russian).
31. Senyavsky, A.S., & Senyavskaya, E.S. (2006). Istoricheskaja imagologija i problema formirovanija "obraza vraga" (na materialah rossijskoj istorii XX veka) [Historical imagology and the development of the image of the enemy]. *Vestnik RUDN. Serija "Istorija Rossii"[RUDN Bulletin. Series "History of Russia"], 2(6)*, 54-72 (in Russian).
32. Swiderska, M. (2013). Comparativist imagology and the phenomenon of strangeness. *Comparative Literature and Culture, 7*. Retrieved from http://docs.lib.purdue.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=2387&context=clcweb (accessed: 06 July, 2020).
33. Zelenin, A.V. (2013). Nemcy v russkoj kul'ture (Lingvisticheskaja imagologija) [Germans in the Russian culture (Linguistic imagology). *Russkij jazyk v shkole [The Russian language at school], №4*, 63-71 (in Russian).

How to cite this article:

Kamalova, S.D. (2020). Linguistic imagology: origin and application. *Professional Discourse & Communication*, 2 (3), 10-22. https://doi.org/10.24833/2687-0126-2020-2-3-10-22