CATEGORIZATION OF THE REALITY FRAGMENT
“ORNAMENTS” IN EAST SLAVIC AND ANGLO-SAXON WORLD PICTURES

The article is devoted to the review of comparative characteristics of the categorization of one of the fragments of reality in the Old Russian and Old Slavonic languages, based on a cognitive approach, which allowed us to identify the unique and universal in the perception of the element of material culture. Ornament, its linguistic representation, functions, role in the process of historical and cultural evolution has undergone certain changes. Therefore, the study of categorization of jewelry in the world pictures of the two peoples provides an opportunity to expand and deepen the knowledge of human cognitive activity. The analysis of the material proves the close approaches of the ancient Eastern Slavs and Anglo-Saxons to jewelry, based on the syncretism of pagan and Christian values. On the basis of the definitional analysis, the main features of the meanings of the words nominating jewelry have been identified, which allows us to identify isomorphic and allomorphic characteristics of the names in the two languages and to state as universal their economic, social and cultural significance in the world pictures of the East Slavic and Anglo-Saxon peoples. The unique features of the perception of ornaments in the meanings of the names of ornaments by the ancient Russians and Anglo-Saxons have been revealed.
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This article is devoted to the study of the names of ornaments in the East Slavic and Anglo-Saxon pictures of the world in the framework of the cognitive approach. Comparing and contrasting world pictures and, consequently, languages, shows that each language forms a unity of the universal and the unique. The unique manifests itself as a difference in the way experience is conceptualized, causing the effect of linguistic relativity. The manifestation of the universal is connected with the general structure of the human perceptual-cognitive apparatus [Shafikov, 1996, p.95]. The real world forms a continuous continuum in which there are no clear boundaries between objects. The blurred boundaries between objects of the world and the complex interrelation of properties and relations between these objects from the cognitive point of view form the prerequisites for differences between languages [Shafikov, 1996, p.95]. The cognitive approach explains the principal isomorphism in languages, as it focuses attention on uniform principles of categorization and structure of categories in all languages. Perceptual and social categories show that universalism lies in the very human nature of language speakers. Categories formed as a result of cognitive processes accumulate and organize information about objects of the surrounding reality. The study of such a fragment of reality as jewelry on the material of Old Russian and Old English brings us closer to understanding what representatives of the East Slavic and Anglo-Saxon cultures put into this concept.

Most of the studied works on the problem of categorization are based on the material of modern languages. It is important to reconstruct a fragment of the picture of the world on the material of Old Russian and Old English, to study the process of categorization in relation to the ancient culture.
Purpose

Problems of categorization in linguistics in the aspect of human cognitive activity in relation to the subject reality are a significant object of research of many scientists [Evans, 2006; McCune, 2016; Meaning, Mind and Communication. Explorations in cognitive semiotics, 2016; Ostermann, 2015; Talmy, 2000]. Thus, in cognitive science there are various opinions on the definition of the categorization process [Koshelev, 2017; Skrebtsova, 2018]. Y. A. Schrader calls it categorization [Semantika i kategorizatsiia, 1991], A. V. Kravchenko, E. S. Kubryakova, E. G. Orlyanskaya, F. Ungerer, etc. put at the head of the process of categorization, which results in the category itself [Ungerer, 1999; Kubriakova, Demiankov, Pankrats, Luzina, 1997; Orlianskaia, 2002; IAzyk i mysl sovremennaia kognitivnaia lingvistika, 2015]. N. N. Boldyrev and E. Roche give a broad definition of categorization [Rosch, 1978; Boldyrev, 2000; Boldyrev, 2018]. F. Ungerer and X. J. Schmid note that the process of categorization is carried out on the basis of reference points or basic categories [Ungerer, 1999, p. 3]. The concept of basic categories is developed in prototype semantics, one of the positions of which is to assign objects to this or that category on the basis of their proximity to a prototype [Rosch, 1978]. In prototypical semantics, in the development of which E. Roche’s research played a major role, word meaning is understood as knowledge, on the basis of which the object or phenomenon denoted by a word belongs to a certain category. Lexical meaning is formed as a result of analyzing the properties of prototypes — typical or best representatives of the category denoted by a given word. Imagination, perception and socio-cultural factors play a special role [Rosch, 1978, p. 30]. L. Wittgenstein with his ideas of family resemblance, centrality and gradation, Lotfi Zadeh who created the theory of fuzzy sets, R. Brown who studied «base level categories» and others successfully dealt with prototypicality issues. [Lakoff, 1995, p. 154]. Prototypes testify to the peculiarities of traditions and beliefs of this or that society due to the socio-cultural determinacy of this phenomenon. They directly depend on cognitive and cultural contexts [Ungerer, 1999]. A consequence of this is the difference of prototypes of one category in the representatives of different cultures. Prototypical semantics is characterized by a radial structure (in E. Roche’s terminology, a «horizontal» structure [Rosch, 1978, p. 30]): it distinguishes a «center», represented by a prototype, and a «periphery». Alongside with «horizontal» categorization, there is also «vertical» categorization, i.e. taxonomic categorization based on the principle of inclusion and generalization [Rosch, 1978,
p. 30], which suggests relations between concepts of different levels of generalization, basic — central level of categorization with fixation of maximum information, superordinate and subordinate [Rosch, 1978]. At the basic level, a single mental image can reflect the entire category as a whole. Members of this level are quickly identified and remembered. Common and simple words are used to name them [Lakoff, 1995]. According to J. Lakoff, the basic level is determined along with the figurative perception by such factors as physical interaction and the role of realities in the culture [Lakoff, 1995]. Being the middle level in the hierarchy «from the general to the particular», the basic level correlates general and special characteristics of the object [Boldyrev, 2018], and its constituents, characterized by the highest degree of abstraction, contain generalized features and are characterized by the collective function [Ungerer, 1999].

**Methods and Materials**

The method of research is a comparative analysis in determining isomorphisms and allomorphisms in the meanings of language representations, which involves a comprehensive approach to research: description is used along with the definitive method to identify explicit semantic features of the names based on the interpretations of lexicographic sources and glossaries, interpretation in the cultural context, which allows to compare the information obtained by the definitive method with cultural and historical data and to compare the information with the data from the cultural and historical sources.

The material for the study is represented by 137 lexical units, recorded in the Dictionary of the Russian language of the 11th–17th centuries [Slovar russkogo iazyka XI–XVII vv T.I–XXIII, 1975–1996], I. I. Sreznevsky's Dictionary of the Old Russian Language [Sreznevsksii, 1893–1912], and 135 linguistic units, selected by the method of continuous sampling from Dictionary of Old English: A to I online [Dictionary of Old English, 2018], Middle English dictionary [Middle English dictionary, 1952–2001], Bosworth-Toller dictionary [Bosworth, Toller, 1997] and glossaries to Old English texts [Fowler, 1966; Irving, 1953; Whitelock, 1967; Wrenn, 1967]. This article is not aimed at considering the issues of the first fixation of the word, changes in the definition during the Old Russian or Old English periods, so the year of the first mention of the name is not indicated. The figure after the nomination determines the place of the meaning in the dictionary article, the definitions of the names are presented in the modern Russian script.
Results and Discussion

On the basis of the definitional analysis, a number of attributes, which are included in the meanings of the names of ornaments in the Old Russian language, were identified. Some signs (e.g., «value of realia») may be included in the content of all constituents of the category under study, while others (e.g., «symbol of military valor, symbol of victory») — only in the value structure of one or more denominations. The highlighted features are prototypical and constitute the meaning of the «ideal» ornament. Having identified the prototypical attributes «decoration», «value of the reality», «status of the bearer», «function», «aesthetics of the reality», «object of attention» as priority characteristics, the center of the names with these attributes in the meaning was determined in the analyzed group. Lexical units лёгкота2 — that which constitutes beauty; ornamentation; добродётель2 — a work of art, jewelry, carvings; утворь — украшение; names with the root -крас-: красование — any thing that draws attention to itself by its beauty, ornamentation; adornment; красота — jewelry, jewels, outfits; красьба — jewelry; красение(-ье)3 — that which adorns, adornment; благоукрасление — a great piece of jewelry; украшение — ornamentation most fully reflect belonging to a group. Names with a large share of abstractness are in a substitution relation оздоба and сънарядь — ornamentation. This gives reason to speak of the dominant role of abstract representations in the East Slavic picture of the world.

Names крута — women’s clothes, jewelry; кузнь2 — jewelry in general (mostly women’s), pearl necklaces, glass; обнизанная кузнь — women’s jewelry; узорочие — precious things with cast, carved, woven or embroidered patterns are located near the nuclear zone of the group and also have a rather high level of abstractness. Close to the center are also the lexical units нарядь10 — a set of auxiliary details for decorating, adorning sth.; клейноть2 — a jewel, a treasure, злато3, золото3 — articles made of gold or containing gold, серебро2, сребро—срђбро=съребро2 — silver in things, silver things, jewelry.

The names that have retained their original meaning in the modern Russian language have a lower level of abstraction, кольцо, перстень, серьга, ожерелье, and lexical units that have acquired the status of archaisms today, верига — chain, neck jewelry, камень/ камы3/ камень(-и)/ камецъ/ камьцъ/ камешекъ2/ камышекъ2 — gemstone, буторное каменье — gemstones used for jewelry, каменье дорогое — gemstones.

As part of the near-core zone, these nominations are generalized nominations for the names on the periphery of the group.
The study of the analyzed group along the «vertical» allowed us to determine the hierarchy of names of ornaments in the Old Russian language. This typological characterization was based on the logical-conceptual principle. The names of ornaments are distinguished according to the main generic attributes, which became the basis for distinguishing groups and subgroups. The main generic feature of the distribution of lexical units by lexical-semantic features is the status of the bearer. The following specific attributes were singled out: the material used for making the ornament, the ornament's place in a costume complex, the function of the ornament, the form of the ornament, etc. The generic parameters allowed to determine a typological scheme for the names of ornaments. Three lexical-semantic groups were identified based on a generic attribute (“ornaments which all members of Old Russian society had the right to wear”, “ornaments worn by clergymen,” “tsar’s ornaments”). The specific attribute «material» formed the basis for the classification of lexical-semantic subgroups «jewelry» and «jewelry made of fabric. The characteristic of jewelry according to the place of wear allowed us to single out the «headaddresses» subgroup. The subgroups «jewelry of the high priests,» «jewelry of the hierarchs of the Orthodox Church,» «monastic jewelry,» and «jewelry of the servants of the Holy See» were distinguished on the basis of the actualization of the «wearer status» attribute. The functional quality of the realia was the basic feature for singling out the subgroups «decorations — insignia and symbols» and «articles of ceremonial attire. The lexical-semantic subgroups were distinguished on the basis of the characteristics of the material from which the jewelry was made (“jewelry made of metal,” «jewelry made of stones,» «jewelry made of other materials») and its purpose (“decoration,» «jewelry as a detail of church clothing,» «sign of power/sign of honor/symbol,» «award»). Lexical-semantic microgroups were classified according to the place of attachment or wearing an ornament (“trim on the edges,” «trim on the sleeves,» «trim on the shoulders,» «trim on the even fabric field,» «hand decorations,» «ear decorations,» «breast decorations,» «neck decorations) and by their form (“buttons,» «loops, clasps”). The names that made up the microgroup segments are characterized by the method of manufacture (“lace,» «applique,» «embroidery») and form (“fringe, braid, ribbon, lace, tassels,” «loops, clasps»). Thus, the names of ornaments in Old Russian represent a five-level hierarchy. The lexical units belonging to lexical-semantic groups have the highest level of abstraction. The basic units of the hierarchy are the names constituting lexical-semantic subgroups and lexical-semantic subgroups. The least level of abstraction is possessed by the ornamentation nominations, represented in lexico-semantic microgroups and their segments. Consequently, the center of the analyzed group, if it is analyzed
along the horizontal dimension, consists of lexical units of the first level of
the hierarchy of names, which are in hyper-hyponymic relations with other
representatives.

The names of metal ornaments identify lexical units nominating gold
and silver, which, as jewels and absolute equivalents of exchange, have
been universalizations of trade, political and economic reality for several
millennia: злато, золото — articles made of gold or containing gold,
серебро, сребро = сребро = сребро = сребро — silver in things, sil-
er things, jewelry.

There was no modern opposition in the naming of hand jewelry:
кольцо — «a metal headband worn on the fingers as an ornament» and
перстень — «a ring with some gemstone for a finger of the hand». In Rus-
sian, as in Old Russian, in the general meaning of «an ornament on the
finger of the hand» are used derivatives of *пьст, (перстень, перстенек).

«Manual jewelry» is represented by the names of rings andbrace-
lets. Lexical unit обруч in the language of the monuments of the XI–
XVII centuries is recorded in the meaning of «ring-shaped ornament on
the hand». Probably, this lexical unit acted as a generalizing name for the
analyzed ornaments.

Ear ornaments are identified by the denomination серьга —
ear ornament. In synonymous relations with it were the lexical units
пенькиши/пенькищи — серьги, усерязь. Hypo-hyperonymic rela-
tions consist of the names голубцы — колты — одинцы: earrings-pen-
dant earrings-single pendant earrings. The synonymic series consists of
the names одинчикъ, серьги одинакие, одинцы; двойни (двойны),
dвойчатки, серьги одноенки. In the «part/whole» relationship are the
lexical units серьга — колты, колодка — pendants in the form of bars
on the jewelry.

«Neck jewelry» had a lexeme-dominant necklace-adornment worn
on the neck. However, in the monuments of the Old Russian literature
this lexical unit was used in several meanings. The meaning «decoration
on the neck» is preserved in the modern Russian language. The meanings
«collar of different kinds and purpose: ornament (mainly made of pearls,
sometimes of gold with precious stones, on a textile basis), having the
form of a collar, a collar, and also of other forms», «ceremonial shoulder
strap of kings (barmy)», «перлина» in the contemporary Russian language
are leveled. The meaning of «ornament on the neck, a necklace» had the
nomination огорлие/огрълие.

The basis for the selection of lexical units from Old English glossaries
was the presence in the dictionary definition of integral semes and semi-
nal components «decoration», «serving as decoration», «for decoration»,
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«kind of decoration», «decorated, decorated», «valuable, expensive», «fes-
tive», «solemn», «precious things», «preciousness», etc. On the basis of the
definitional analysis, a number of features have been identified, which are
included in the meanings of the names of ornaments in Old English. As
in Old Russian, some features (e. g., «value of realia») are included in the
content of all constituents of the studied category, others (e. g., «symbol of sorrow») — only in the structure of the meaning of one or more denomi-
nations. These characteristics are prototypical and constitute the meaning
of the names of ornaments in Old English. The dictionaries and glossaries
do not indicate the possibility of wearing jewelry by women, excluding the
notation of jewelry (rings) as gifts to women. There is a clear masculinity
towards this fragment of reality, as the prerogative to wear jewelry belongs
to a man, in particular to a konung, his cronies and warriors.

Lexical units gold, bēah (beag), maddum (mabbum) the most com-
plete reflection of belonging to a group. This gives grounds to speak about
the dominant role of nominated realities, and, consequently, about the
greatest value of rings and gold in the Anglo-Saxon picture of the world.

Names gold2 — jewelry as a treasure trove, sinc — jewelry as a trea-
ure, hring — ring, fretwe — an ornament, a treasure, hyrst — ornament,
jewel are further from the nuclear zone of the group. However, they have
a rather high level of abstractness. Superonyms are also lexical units sigle
ond since-fret — gemstones in a setting, jeht — jewelry as wealth, pros-
perity, gestreon — jewelry as wealth, income, goods, gim — stone, jewel,
searo-gim — intricate gemstone.

A lesser level of abstraction is possessed by the names of madbum-
hord — a precious treasure, gif-sceatt — jewelry as a precious gift, bēah-
hord — a treasure trove of rings, gold-mabbum — gold object, jewelry,
treasure, mabbum-gestreon and feoh-gestreon — treasure. For example,
for the name beag-degu the relevant attributes are 1) obligation; 2) form;
3) place of wear. Name seolfren fyet is on the periphery of the category
under study, which gives grounds to speak of the lowest value of the nomi-
nated realia (silver plates). At the same time, endowed with the periph-
eral status, these nominations correlate with the lexical units belonging to
other lexical associations.

Thus, the radial structure of the analyzed group is decomposed into
center and periphery. The continuum between the center and the periph-
ery is filled with units with different levels of abstraction, i.e. names both
sharing with the «ideal» adornment the fundamental features and hav-
ing in their composition characteristics distinct from it. The horizontal
structure allows us to make a conclusion about the most and the least
prioritized jewels in the Anglo-Saxon picture of the world.
The names of ornaments in the typological, «vertical» characteristic are distinguished according to the main generic characteristics. The main generic feature of the distribution of lexical units by lexical-semantic features is, as in Old Russian, the status of the bearer and function. The definition analysis allowed us to determine the generic characteristics, among which are «the material from which the ornament is made» «the location of the ornament» «the form of the ornament» «the function of the ornament» etc. The generic parameters allowed us to determine a typological scheme of ornament names. In the system of names of ornaments, four lexical-semantic groups (“ornaments that all representatives of Anglo-Saxon society had the right to wear» «ornaments for warriors» «decorations for konungs» «ritual decorations») were identified based on generic attributes «status of wearer» and «function. The specific feature «material» served as a basis for the classification of lexical-semantic subgroups «jewelry» and «jewelry of fabric». The characteristic of jewelry according to the place of its wearing allowed us to single out the subgroup «headresses. The functional dignity of the realia was the basic indicator for singling out the subgroups «decorations- insignia of distinction» and «articles of ceremonial attire» «decorations in funeral rites» and «decorations in church ceremonies. The basis for the selection of lexical-semantic subgroups was the characteristics of the material from which the decorations were made (metal, stones, other materials) and their purpose (“decoration» «chain mail» «sign of power/sign of distinction/symbol» «award» «jewelry — gift of a konung»).

The study of «vertical» categorization consists in singling out the levels of categorization of the reality fragment «ornaments». The analysis shows that the names of ornaments are represented by three levels: superordinate, basic and subordinate. At the superordinate level is the appellation welja the attribute common to the basic components of the group is the attribute «wealth,» which is refined at the basic level to the attributes of «property» (e.g., in the sceatt — jewelry as property, wealth, money), «ornament as treasure» (maddum — treasure, wealth) and «ornament» (bêah — ringlet, ring), fryetwe — ornament, treasure.

The names of the basic level are characterized, in turn, by collective features relative to the representatives of the subordinate level. On the contrary, the values of the subordinate level names include the features specifying the features of the nominations, standing higher in the hierarchical ladder. An example is the lexical units of the lexical-semantic subgroup «jewelry». The attributes «ornament» and «treasure» are disclosed and clarified at the subordinate level to the attributes «precious stones» and «gold jewels», «ring-shaped jewelry». Thus, the nomination gim — «gem», «jewel» is subordinate to the lexical units searo-gim — «a
curious gem, precious stone», gim-cyn — «a gem-kind, precious stone», gold-gim — «gold jewel» and eorcan-stan — «a precious stone, pearl, topaz, the yellow, or orient topaz». Name gim has in its meaning the attributes of «gem», «jewel», which is collective for all other lexical units located lower in the categorical hierarchy. Names of the subordinate level concretize the main feature, highlighting additional qualitative characteristics of ornaments. In the lexical units searo-gim — a curious gem, precious stone and gim-cyn — a gem-kind, precious stone contains the idea of an ornament in the form of a stone, which has a certain value and is a fancy product. At the same time, in the meaning of the nomination searo-gim is complemented by the «necklace» feature, on the basis of which the functional characteristic of the object is determined: in the Anglo-Saxon culture gemstones were part of the neck jewelry. On the basis of the definitional analysis it is established that behind the name eorcan-stan is a specific type of gemstone — yellow topaz or pearl. The attribute «jewel», which is part of the structure of the meaning of the name gim gem, jewel, is concretized in the semantics of the lexical unit gold-gim, which is made up of the values of the lexemes gold and gim: a gem, jewel. On the basis of this we can assume that in the Anglo-Saxon culture the value was represented by jewelry, the material of which was gold and stones.

The most informative is the basic level, which is manifested by a greater number of features included in the structure of the meaning. The names of the subordinate level are mainly represented by composite (feoh-gestreon, gif-sceatt), linguistic units, while basic level nominations are simple units (feet, frctwe, seolfor, beah) which facilitates their use.

The categorical composition of the representatives of the analyzed part of the lexical system is distinguished by the unity of several characteristics. Thus, in the definition of the names bring — 1) a ring, circle, circuit, cycle, orb, globe; 2) festoon; 1) ring, twisted ornament, 2) armour made of interlocking rings, give grounds to state the specificity of the perception of the nominated objective thing, defined as a material object — ring-shaped products, i.e. rings and chainmail. These explicit attributes allowed to determine the form of the reality — a round object, represented as one or more connected rings. The object named hring, was actually a decoration for hands, head, ears, etc., but also a part of men’s clothing. It should be noted that the chain armor acted not only as a military armor, but was an obligatory attribute of festive events, feasts, receptions, i.e. it represented a warrior’s decoration.

The presented definitions of the lexical units indicated the possible range of the analyzed nominated realities within the subgroup, the main
feature of which is a ring-shaped form: rings proper (beah, hring). Names of neck ornaments — necklaces — are distinguished within the subgroup. The subgroup is represented by the names heals-beag, sigle ond sinc-fcet. Microgroups of gemstone names are distinguished within a subgroup (searo-gim, gim-cyn, sinc-gim, eorcan-stan) which are part of the necklaces (sigle ond sinc-fcet) names of precious metals (gold, seolfor).

The setting for precious metal jewelry has traditionally been gold and silver sinc-fcet — 1) a costly vessel, a vessel of gold or silver; 2) a receptacle for treasure, a casket. The hand jewelry subgroup includes items of wrist jewelry — bracelets: earm-reade, earm-beag, beag-wrlda.

A subgroup of head jewelry is represented by the name of the crown — hring.

An analysis of the content of meaning distinguished as objects with gradationally expressed abstract semantics (wundur-maddum, maddum-wela, gestreon), as well as things of utilitarian use with a specific meaning (feet, earm-beah).

The syncreticity of the abstract and the concrete is a distinctive feature of the analyzed group. The segment of reality under study is characterized by the presence of synonymic connections: sine, sinc-gestreon, maddum-gestreon, feoh-gestreon — ornament as a treasure. The meaning of «ornament» is represented by nominations with different shades of meaning: gim-cyn, searo-gim, sinc-gim. The analyzed group also includes names naming actions in relation to jewelry: beag-pegu, hring-pegu, hring-weordung.

**Conclusion**

The functions of ornaments in the Old Russian picture of the world consisted in providing stability, economic and financial well-being in a family, in demonstration of a position in society, in adherence to traditions. In the Anglo-Saxon culture, jewelry served as a means of establishing social and friendly relations, a means of payment, reward, etc. The notion of valuable objects was formed under both pagan and Christian worldviews and was characterized by diffusion. At the same time, there was established the fact of close intertwining in the meanings of the names of various aspects of life of the East Slavs and Anglo-Saxons (financial, economic, aesthetic, social, etc.), which allows us to talk about the importance of these objects for Old Russian and Anglo-Saxon culture.

As a result of categorization of the fragment of reality «ornaments» «horizontally» its structure was reconstructed and prototypical features were singled out. The vertical hierarchy allowed to distinguish in the
compared languages a structure that differs in the number of semantic groups, subgroups, and subgroups. Thus, there were distinguished 3 semantic groups in Old Russian and 4 semantic groups in Old English. If in Old Russian society decorations were important among all groups of population, but persons of spiritual rank were especially distinguished, then among the Anglo-Saxons decorations were especially important for warriors and for acts of performing various rituals. The difference in the number of allocated subgroups is also explained by the role of the clergy in Old Russian society, who, as a wealthy estate, sought to show their closeness to God’s throne, including with jewelry (filled with symbolic meaning).

The material under study showed much similarity in their perceptions of one of the fragments of reality. In the world picture of the Anglo-Saxons and ancient Eastern Slavs dough intertwined Christian and pagan values, which is reflected in the attributes «symbol of light», «sacredness», «element of church attributes, crucifixes, church vestments», «ritual reality/attribute of funeral ceremonies», «object of theft/object of theft during an attack», «adornment as evil/adornment as a curse». Financial and economic side of was reflected in the representations about jewelry of the Anglo-Saxons and ancient Russians, as evidenced by the attributes «trophy», «reality having practical value / material value», «object of exchange / means of payment». The signs «evidence of royal generosity/evidence of generosity of the konung/characteristic of the subject of royal blood», «social status of the bearer/evidence of noble origin/means of increasing prestige/symbol of honor, dignity», «memory object/family value», «object of pride, honor» show the importance of society and relations in it for the bearers of the Old English and Old Russian cultures. Representatives of the two peoples regarded jewelry as an object of close attention, admiration, pleasure and joy, an object of art, a special, rare object.

There was manifested the mentality of peoples in meanings of ornaments’ names. Thus, for the Eastern Slavs, economic and financial stability of the family, reflected in the attributes «object of accumulation», «dowry», «object of trust/sturdy object», «object of search». There was also important the opinion of others, which manifested itself in the actualization of such characteristics as «object of display», «hallmark of Christian», «symbol of shame», «symbol of wisdom». We can speak about interest and concern for country as well, that manifested in the attribute «wealth of country», are particularly important.

For the Anglo-Saxons, the priority areas of life were:
- the military sphere, which was also reflected in the meanings of the ornaments’ names, which are characterized by the attributes
«chain mail as a warrior’s ornament» «military armor», «material of military armor»; «decorated weapons»;
— the social sphere, as shown by the attributes of jewelry: «women’s symbol of the royal dynasty», «an essential attribute of festive feasts», «the means of establishing social relations»;
— the financial sphere, which manifested itself in the actualization of the characteristics «golden object», «gold of the highest standard», «huge treasure»;
— spiritual life, based on Christian faith, but with elements of mythological thinking, which was reflected in the attributes of jewelry «unbroken ring», «jewelry as protection, shelter», «object of distrust», «symbol of death», «life-giving power of military armor».

The meaning of the ornaments’ names is determined by a set of signs of meaning, reflecting the social, mythological, financial, economic and other aspects of life of representatives of Old Russian and Old English culture, formed under the influence of pagan and Christian worldview.
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