



DOI: 10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-2-314-327

EDN: LASALL

UDC 811.111'01-112:398

Research article / Научная статья

The Opposition of the 'Own — Alien' Space in the Anglo-Saxon Charms

Olga I. Prosyannikova  , Kseniya V. Skorik ,
Lubov V. Kotsubinskaya 

Pushkin Leningrad State University,

10, Peterburgskoe shosse, Pushkin, Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation, 196605

 olgapros@mail.ru

Abstract. The study is devoted to the peculiarities of the representation of the category of space in Anglo-Saxon charms. The linguo-semiotic model of space allows accentuating a charm text's binary structure, which, within the framework of the study, is considered as the opposition of the 'own — alien' space. The relevance of the research is due to the unflinching interest in the study of traditional folk spiritual culture and the reconstruction of ancient world visions, such as, in particular, archaic concepts of space. The latter invites a question about ancient charms as a source to restore the picture of the world of the primitive worldview since the charms had clearly preserved some value-semantic elements of the archetypal image of the world. The scientific novelty of the paper is attributed to the description of the dichotomous structure of spatial representations in Anglo-Saxon charms, with an emphasis placed on revealing spatial objects in rituals and charms. Of particular attention are the vertical and horizontal models of the representation of the 'own — alien' dichotomy in the texts of the charms and prayers. As a result, it was determined that their binary structure has a border zone where the 'own' space has a specific objectification in the material world while 'alien' space is reflected Abstractly, at the associative level, and does not possess pronounced distinctive features.

Keywords: the picture of the world, category of space, ritual

Article history:

Received: 05.10.2022

Accepted: 15.02.2023

For citation:

Prosyannikova, O.I., Skorik, K.V. & Kotsubinskaya, L.V. (2023). The Opposition of the 'Own — Alien' Space in the Anglo-Saxon Charms. *RUDN Journal of Language Studies, Semiotics and Semantics*, 14(2), 314–327. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-2-314-327>


© Prosyannikova O.I., Skorik K.V., Kotsubinskaya L.V., 2023



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

Оппозиция «свое — чужое» пространство в англосаксонских заговорах

О.И. Просянникова  , К.В. Скорик , Л.В. Коцюбинская 

Ленинградский государственный университет им. А.С. Пушкина,
196605, Российская Федерация, г. Санкт-Петербург-Пушкин, Петербургское ш., 10
 olgapros@mail.ru

Аннотация. В исследовании особенностей репрезентации категории пространства в англосаксонских заговорах лингвосемиотическая модель пространства позволяет выделить бинарную структуру, которая рассматривается в статье как оппозиция «свое — чужое» пространство. Актуальность исследования обусловлена интересом к изучению традиционной народной духовной культуры и реконструкции древних представлений о мире, в частности, архаических представлений о пространстве. Поднимается вопрос о древних заговорах как источнике, дающем возможность восстановить картину мира первобытного мировоззрения, поскольку в них сохранились ценностно-смысловые элементы архетипического образа мира. Новизна исследования видится в описании дихотомической структуры пространственных представлений в англосаксонских заговорах. Основное внимание уделяется выявлению пространственных объектов в ритуалах и заклинании. Отмечены вертикальные и горизонтальные модели представленности дихотомии «свой — чужой» в текстах заговоров. В результате определено, что бинарная структура имеет зону пограничья или границы, «свое» пространство имеет конкретную объективацию в предметном мире, «чужое» пространство отражается абстрактно, на ассоциативном уровне, не имеет четких характеристик.

Ключевые слова: картина мира, категория пространства, ритуал, заклинание

История статьи:

Дата поступления: 01.07.2022

Дата приема: в печать: 15.12.2022

Для цитирования:

Prosyannikova O.I., Skorik K.V., Kotsubinskaya L.V. The Opposition of the ‘Own — Alien’ Space in the Anglo-Saxon Charms // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2023. Т. 14. № 2. С. 314–327. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2023-14-2-314-327>

Introduction

According to Yu.S. Stepanov, the ‘own — alien’ opposition, permeates all cultures and appears ‘one of the main concepts of any collective, mass, traditional, or national worldview’ [1]. Yu.M. Lotman notes the conceptualization of the world in terms of the ‘own — alien’ dichotomy as an obligatory law for constructing a semiotic system in which division occurs into ‘our own’ safe space and hostile ‘foreign’ [2]. Being one of the basic and universal binary oppositions, the analyzed antithesis was formed in the process of cognition of the environment and objects of the surrounding realm and establishing relationships with the outer world. For this reason, the opposition ‘own — alien’ was considered and interpreted from very different points of view. Thus, T.V. Tsivyan, recognizing the universality of semiotic

oppositions in the model of the world, applied linguistic analysis to describe binary structures that have arisen as a result of classifying human activity [3. P. 5–6]. From the point of view of cultural universality, the dichotomous pair is described in the works of V.V. Ivanov and V.N. Toporov, concluding on a dominant role of the opposition in the system of ideas of the ancient Slavs [4]. I.V. Zakharenko considered this opposition in the spatial code of culture based on phraseological material [5]. A.K. Baiburin described the binary structure of space in ritual texts, explaining the psychological foundations for the division of space into ‘own’ and ‘alien’ in rituals [6].

The presented study considers the ‘own — alien’ opposition in terms of space. Space is one of the conceptual categories that make up the picture of the world, representing the spatial code of culture, the linguo-semiotic model of which has a pronounced organized structure. Lexis and phraseology with spatial meaning represent this model and manifest language worldview and its locative components. Spatial code of culture is identified in paramics, first of all in monophrasal ones in which the opposition ‘own — alien’ is realized as a universal and is actualized at all levels of their content (subject-thematic, logical-semantic, image-conceptual, object-image). Such manifestation makes the opposition a significant element in semantic and linguocultural analysis [7–11], in comparative description and translation [10; 11]. Charms, as an ancient folklore genre, preserved intracultural information in the most concise form. That, first of all, refers to the spatial ideas about the universe, which allows reconstructing the semantic parameters of this image [12. P. 108]. Therefore, the purpose of the article is to reveal the explication of the opposition of the ‘own — alien’ space in Anglo-Saxon charms.

Spatial representations reflect human perception of reality, the result of the conceptualization and categorization of the world, and, in particular, the differentiation of space and its division. Spatialization and somewhat mental ‘attitude sensing’ created a feeling of being a part of a harmonious Universe, thuswise resting beyond danger in a realm of stability [13. P. 34].

The peculiarity of the perception of space in a charm is explained by the fact that one of the conditions for success in achieving the goal of the charm was the location of the ritual performance. Therefore, as a rule, this place gets particularly indicated and described, often in detail. Since the very charm is pretty much an appeal to otherworldly forces, to a magical otherworldly world for assistance, then its space is divided into its ‘own’, where a particular person is located, and ‘alien’, embellished with the existence of mythological characters. Thus, the charm represents a vivid implementation of the semiotic opposition ‘own — alien’. The division of space, in this case, is presented as a set of concentric circles with a contestant and his immediate environment placed in the very center [5. P. 16]. The division into these spheres is because the ‘own’ space has already been domesticated and belongs to a particular person, while ‘alien’ belongs to the gods, otherworldly forces. The interaction of these

oppositional spheres occurs through dialogue that a person enters when the habitual and natural course of events gets violated, which forces a contestant to turn to those who, in his opinion, are able to restore this course of events, thuswise solving the problem [6. P. 5].

The interaction of these two spheres is described in detail by A.K. Baiburin, who defined the relationship between the parties as an agreement, when contact is established (through an appropriate ritual) with the magical world with supernatural power, and also as a situation that requires assistance and gets resolved through an exchange, performing some manipulations, and other actions [14. P. 182]. The position for obtaining headway in such an agreement is determined both in the ritual and in the charm.

Also, if the realm of the ‘own’ space is conceived in the images of a house and habitual immediate environment, then the image of an ‘alien’ one does not possess more or less distinct characteristics or pronounced features and might ‘be represented as ‘no locus’, the world of non-existence, non-being, and nothingness’ [15. P. 92–93]. For this reason, the localization of the alien world is quite challenging since its images are contradictory and diverse, do not have definite coordinates, and are defined rather generally. ‘Alien space’ is determined primarily by the distance from its opposite, which is fixed by ‘homeland’. The transition from one world to another can be designated as a frontier zone; however, the separation of the two worlds is not always fixed by a clear borderline. According to D.B. Gudkov, such a conditional line between ‘own’ and ‘alien’ is endowed in cultural consciousness with important significance, representing a symbol of social and personal meanings [16. P. 52]. M.A. Konovalova marks the ‘center of the world’ and the place of transition from one world to another as the most important horizontal ‘territories’, which are endowed with the most sacred meaning [17. P. 137]. The conditional division of space into fragments (one’s inner world, personal space and beyond, another (stranger) world) reflects the structure of the world and is inherent in human understanding of the world around, common for the views of the early medieval period [18. С. 300]. Thus, in these charms that have preserved, in particular, archaic ideas about the surrounding world, the division of space into ‘friend-or-foe’ loci could be clearly traced.

Materials and methods

The texts of Anglo-Saxon charms presented in collections by Felix Grendon ‘The Anglo-Saxon Charms’ [19] and Godfrid Storms ‘Anglo-Saxon Magic’ [20] served as the background material for the study. The work uses a cultural-semiotic approach that allows reproducing the system of representations peculiar to the mythological consciousness, which found its expression in folklore texts and therefore has to be recognized and reconstructed. In turn, the linguo-cultural

approach allows identifying the representation of the cultural ‘friend or foe’ phenomenon at the linguistic level. Contextual analysis has been used to study the implementation of spatial representations in terms of context.

Results. The dichotomous structure of space in charms

The study of beliefs and practices of Anglo-Saxon period reveals two models of representation of oppositional spaces: horizontal and vertical. The vertical model can be designated as ‘earth (house) — sky’, which corresponds to the opposition ‘own — alien’ space. Most often, such a model is observed in charms, which is due to the location of a contestant making a request from his space to heaven as a mythical space, the dwelling place of a god — an omnipotent creator who can grant assistance. For example, the texts of the metrical charms *Æcer-Bōt* (1) and *Sīðgaldor* (2) with an appeal to heaven and the heavenly patron, embody a vertical model:

(1) ‘Geunne him ēce drihten and his hālige, þe on **heofonum** synt, þæt hys yrþ sī gefriþod wið ealra fēonda gewæne, and hēo sī geborgen wið ealra bealwa gehwylc, þāra lyblāca geond land sāwen’ [19. P. 172]. May the eternal lord and his holy ones, who are in heaven, grant him that his produce be guarded against any enemies whatsoever.

(2) ‘<...> ac gehæle mē ælmihtig and sunu and frōfregāst, ealles wuldres wyrdig dryhten, swā swā ic gehyrde, **heofna** scyppende’ [19. P. 174]. <...> May the almighty protect me, and the son, and the Holy Spirit, and the glory of the almighty, the creator of the heavenly.

The horizontal model can be observed based on man’s movement on earth in horizontal coordinates through the verb of motion **fēran** (1), movement relative to the four cardinal points (2), the model of a circle with a center:

(1) «<...> find þæt feoh and **fere** þæt feoh and hafa þæt feoh and heald þæt feoh, and **fere** hām þæt feoh, þæt hē nāfre nabbe landes, þæt hē hit oðlāde, ne foldan, þæt hē hit oðferie, ne hūsa, þæt hē hit oðhealde» [19. P. 180]. <...> find this cattle, bring this cattle home, keep this cattle, own this cattle, and that he never takes the cattle to other lands, and fields, to conceal in a different place.

(2) «Gif hit sý innorf, sing þonne on **fēower healfe þæs hūses** and æne on **middan**» [19. P. 178]. If these are household items, chant to the four sides of the house and once in the middle.

(3) «Genim āne grēne gyrde and læt sittan þone man **onmiddan hūses** flōre and bestrīc hine **ymbūtan** and cweð <...>» [19. P. 172]. Take a green branch and let the man sit in the middle of the house, wave the branch around him and say <...>.

The examples above confirm the structure of the horizontal model in the form of a circle, centered on the man with his house and the developed surrounding space, and the ‘alien’ space, which existence is placed outside this circle. The midpoint of the house is perceived as the center of the world, the place of transition of ‘own’

space (the space of the house) into the sacred, where the exchange with otherworldly forces takes place.

Vertical and horizontal models may coincide within the same charm and have some intersection points. Such intersections are observed through spatial movements, i.e. through appeals to heaven and the Almighty. The *Æcer-Bōt* (Land-Remedy) charm provides an interesting example of how the models of vertical and horizontal spaces intersect as the meeting of the ritual and the spell spaces take place.

The structure of this charm consists of nine sequentially performed rituals, each of which ends with a charm. The movement in the ritual occurs in a horizontal space with reference points in the form of substantive objects, parts of the world, and the sun.

‘Genim <...> **fēower tyrf on fēower healfa þæs lands** <...>. And bere siþþan ðā tyrf tō **circean**, <...> and wende manþæt grēne to ðan wēofode, and siþþan gebringe man þā turf þær hī ær wæron ær sunnan setlgange. <...> wende þē þonne **ēastweard** and onlūt nigon siðon ēadmōdlīce and cweð ðonne þās word <...>. Wende þē þonne III **sunganges** <...>. <...> Þonne man þā sulh forð drīfe and þā forman furh onscēote. <...> Nim þonne ælces cynnes melo <...> and lecge under þā forman furh’ [19. P. 172, 176]. Take then at night, before it dawns, four sods from **four sides of the land** <...>. ...bear afterward the sods into **church** <...>. <...> turn to the altar <...>. ...and afterward have someone bring the sods to where they were before, before sunset. Turn yourself then **eastward**, and bow nine times humbly, and say then these words <...>. Turn then thrice with the **sun's** course <...>. Then have someone drive forth the plough and the first furrow cut. Take then each kind of flour <...> and lay it under the first furrow.

The performance of the ritual takes place in transition from the field (**lands**) to the church (**circean**) and vice versa, i.e. within the main spatial dominants of the text of the charm, and goes down in horizontal space, which is emphasized by the deliberate repetition of activity verbs (**niman, beran, wendan, bringan, drīfan**), as well as by deictic markers (**tō, ær wæron ær, ēastweard**).

Charms or prayers that are pronounced between rituals shift space into a vertical plane at the moment of turning to heaven, to God. This celestial space is mentioned several times through the charm: *heofon* ‘heaven’, *hēahreced* ‘temple high’, *heofonrīce* ‘the heavenly kingdom’: ‘Ēastweard ic stande, ārena ic mē bidde, // bidde ic ðone mæran domine, bidde ðone miclan drihten, // bidde ic ðone hāligan **heofonrīces** weard, // eorðan ic bidde and **ūpheofon**, // and ðā sōþan sancta Marian, // and **heofones** meajt and **hēahreced** // þæt ic mōte þis gealdor mid gife drihtnes // tōðum ontȳnan...’ [19. P. 174]. Eastward I stand, for mercies I pray, // I pray the great domine [lord], I pray the powerful lord, // I pray the holy guardian of heaven-kingdom, // earth I pray and sky // and the true sancta [holy] Mary // and heaven's might and high hall, // that I may this galdor by the gift of the lord.

The presence of two opposite spaces predetermines the border zone, that is, their conditional separation. Signs of localization of such a zone can be remoteness from the ‘domesticated’ space both in horizontal and vertical coordinates. The archaic consciousness represented the border as a strip of no man's space. In the charms, the border is determined by the place of transition from ‘own’ to ‘alien’ space and, according to E.A. Brunova, was designated at the early stages of the development of thinking by objects of the natural landscape, and later — by specifically designed objects and structures [13. P. 34]. In the charm to ward off swine plague *Wið swīna fǣr-steorfan*, the door symbolizes a conditional borderline, which indicates its semiotic status:

‘<...> hōh ðā wyrte on fēower healfe and on þān **dore**, dō rēcels tō [19. P. 210]. <...> hang weeds on the four sides (of the house) and on the door, burn it, and then add incense.

The space of a border zone may also be represented by a larger area, easily accommodating all the contestant’s motions (*gā*), as well as the performance of the very ritual: ‘Þonne hēo tō þān brōce **gā**, þonne ne besēo hēo, nō ne eft þonne ho þanan **gā**; and þonne in oþer **hūs** oþer hēo ūt ofēode and þær geburge metes’ [19. P. 208]. Then she must walk to that brook when no-one can see her, nor [see her] when she returns from there, and then she must go into another house than the one she departed from and bury the food there.

Thus, various loci of the ritual are well explicated within the border zone: a church, a field, a cemetery, and a river. In the mind of an ancient person, these places are sacred since it is there that the ritual is performed as the only regulated way of communication between people and otherworldly forces, and also as the only place where the successful implementation of the desired occurs [14. P. 187].

The sampling of such locations includes the church, which in this case, according to A.K. Baiburin, represents the border of the transition to a foreign world, the place for the implementation of the mentioned agreement, and an exchange of various values: people, crops, etc. [14. P. 184]. The church becomes a place for performing a ritual for a medico-magical charm to protect the childbirth (or to bring a child to term without miscarriage) *Wið Lætbyrde* (1), and also in a charm against elf-shot (internal injury, an allusion to magical elf-shot) *Wið Ælfadle* (2):

(1) ‘And þonne sēo mōdor gefēle þæt þæt bearn sī cwic, gā þonne tō **cyrican**, and þonne hēo tōforan þān **wēofode** cume, cweþe þonne: Crīste, ic sǣde, þis gecyþed’ [19. P. 206]. And when that mother perceives that the child is alive, she must then walk to church and when she comes before the altar, she should then say: To Christ, I said, has this been made known!

(2) ‘On þām ilcan ūhte gang ærest tō **ciricean** and **þē gesēna** and gode þē **bebēod**. <...> Gang þonne swīgende ...ær þū cume tō þære wyrte þe þū <...>. ādelf þā wyrt <...>. Gang <...> tō **ciricean** and lege under **wēofod** <...>’ [19. P. 190]. On the same day, first go to church, cross yourself and entrust yourself to God. Then

go silent <...> till you find a weed, <...> dig it out, <...> go back to church and put it under the altar.

In the latter example, the implementation of the opposition ‘own — alien’ space in the locus of the church (ciricean) is also carried out by the inclusion of a characteristic ritual gesture that reproduces the symbol of the Cross (**þē gesēna**), canonically symbolizing the unity of the human and divine worlds, and the verb form (**bebēodan** — *entrust*), metaphorically indicating the transcendental nature of the journey between spaces.

The presence of the church in texts of pagan descent has been discussed by many folklore scholars, suggesting that with the advent of Christianity pagan markers in charms were replaced with Christian ones [21–26]. Scholars believe that in pagan times charms mentioned a different place for the performance of the ritual, and the appeal was addressed to a pagan deity. The mention of the church as a place of ritual performance appeared in the texts instead of the pagan sanctuaries, so the pre-Christian pagan magic of the northern tradition continued under the needs of religious and liturgical practices [23. С. 10]. The view is also held that generalization without any precise definitions of location testifies to pagan markers since pagan worship practices were not limited to the only possible place for the ceremony. W. Chaney believes that the disappearance of the references (In the charm texts) to the places of pagan affiliation did not lead to the desacralization of the charm itself, just because the pagans had more faith in verbal communication with otherworldly forces and gods [27. P. 197]. That is also confirmed by the fact that in most Anglo-Saxon charms, the performance of the ritual and incantation is delegated from the sorcerer to someone in search of assistance. Thus, magical power was seen more in word and action than in the place of the ceremony [28. P. 443, 464]. Perhaps this is the reason that in most charms, the place of their execution is either not indicated at all or given as a generalized representation.

Locations in both charms and rites may also refer to natural objects and represent a fairly generalized example of space. In many incantations, the place of the ritual performance is indicated by the river separating this world and the other, which, according to T.V. Toporova [29. P. 17], assigns it with a liminal status:

(1) ‘<...> sing þis þriwa nygan sīðan, on æfen and on morgen, **on** þæs mannes hēafod ufan and horse on þæt wynstre ēare on **yrnendum wæterem** and wend þæt hēafod ongēan **strēam**’ [19. P. 172]. <...> sing this three times in the morning and evening over the head of the man and into the left ear of the horse in the **running water**, and turn his head against the **stream**.

The locus of the river as a symbol of the transition between the worlds is also emphasized in the numerous oppositions presented in this example. They are implemented way not only in spatial markers: vertical spatial orientation (**ufan**), horizontal orientation (**ongēan**), inside/outside oppositions (**on þæt wynstre ēare**), but also in the temporal, which can be observed in the semantics of grammatical adjuncts (**on æfen and on morgen**), describing the circadian rhythms of the change

of day and night and representing a metaphorical image of the close connection between the human and spirit realm.

(2) ‘Rud molin hātte wyr̥t weaxeþ be **yr̥nendum wætre**. Gif þū þā **on** þē hafast, and **under** þīnum hēafodbolstre and ofer þīnes hūses durum, ne mæg ðē **dēofol** sceþpan, inne| ne ūte’ [19. P. 200]. Water pepper this herb is called, she grew near **running water**. If you put it under the pillow and hang it above the doorway, the **devil** won’t hurt you anymore either inside or outside.

The analysis of this example shows that the river, symbolizing the border between the worlds, in the pagan picture of the world was able to endow objects and plants with magical properties that could be used as protection from the hostile forces of the otherworld (**dēofol**). The opposition human/spirit realm is built according to the anthropocentric model, where a man (**þē**) and his house (**hūses**) are surrounded by the opposing world of spirits, which is manifested in the use of markers of horizontal spatial orientation above/below (**on/under**) and opposition internal/external (**inne/ne ūte**). Two symbols of the border between the human and the otherworld — the door (**duru**), the material border related to the human world, and a plant growing along the river (**wyr̥t**), pertaining to the natural world — serve as an additional characteristic/feature of the opposition ‘own — alien’.

(3) ‘Sē **wīfman**, sē ne mæge **bearn** āfēdan, **nime** þonne ānes blēos cū meoluc on hyre handa, and **gesupe** þonne mid hyre mūþe, and gange onne tō **yr̥nendum wætere** and **spīwe** þær in þā meolc’ [19. P. 208]. Let that woman who cannot nourish her child then take the milk of a cow of one colour in her hands and then drink it with her mouth, and then walk to running water, and spit the milk into it, and then ladle a mouthful of that water with that same hand, and swallow it all.

This would also be a perfect illustration of the flexibility of the ‘own’ world’s boundaries, where the human body (**wīfman**) already acts as a border between the worlds, thereby sacralizing the process of human birth. Therefore, an appeal in the incantation to one of the forces of nature — water (**wæter**) — is symbolizing the beginning of a new life, which is also emphasized in the verb forms describing ritual actions, united by the semantics of ‘transition from one to another’ (**bearn**, **niman**, **sypian**, **spīwan**).

(4) ‘<...> weorp þā wyr̥ta on **yr̥nende wæter**’ [19. P. 210]. ... drop the weed into the running water.

Water appears here as a boundary line, which, on the one hand, marks the place of transition to another world, and on the other, running water also represents a cleansing symbol, endowed with the ability to carry away diseases, ailments, and troubles with the stream.

Of the natural spatial objects mentioned in the charms, J. Roper attributes forests, roads, hills, mountains, and seas to the typical or general locations since they are not identified in any way either by a given name or affiliation with a sacred place [24. P. 68, 73]. However, the charms and prayers researcher E. Bozoky believes that in the worldview of ancient people, these objects were places of ‘transition’ from

illness to recovery [30. P. 105]. Adhering to the opinion of the latter, the authors also refer these kinds of locations to the border zone, citing in favor of this viewpoint the lines from the epic part of the metrical charm *Wið Dweorh* (Against a Dwarf) where the deliverance from diseases occurs at the moment when the spider-creature, saddling the dwarf-demon, takes him away across the seas: ‘Ongunnan him of þæm lande līþan. Sōna swā hȳ of þæm lande cōman þā ongunnan him þā cōlian’ [19. P. 166]. ...both began // To rise from the land, spring from the earth // As they leapt up, their limbs grew cool (i.e. the wounds stopped burning).

Thus, the plot of this incantation text can be interpreted as follows: the spider saves from the disease, taking the dwarf to the ‘alien’ world, where the diseases come from and where they are expelled to.

The concept of an ‘alien’ world, which is located behind natural objects, seas, forests, is created to a greater extent in an associative way. As per A.K. Baiburin, ‘alien’ space has no clear boundaries and becomes more and more Abstract as the ‘own’ world gets specified. Therefore, its further detailed elaboration requires penetrating this foreign world and mastering it as well, which transfers it into the category of one’s own [14. P. 185]. This world is inaccessible and therefore possesses no specific characteristics; it only becomes assumed during the incantations that are addressed to heaven. The penetration of the alien (foreign) world into the developed (domesticated) space occurs with the advent of misfortune, disaster, or illness. And then the ritual actions should protect their world, expelling the otherworldly forces of evil. In an Old English charm against sudden/severe stabbing pain *Wið Færstice*, the disease is presented in the form of formidable creatures that have flown in from behind the mountains, from a ‘foreign land’: ‘Hlūde wæran hȳ, lā hlūde, ðā hȳ ofer þone hlæw ridan; wæran ānmōde, ðā hȳ ofer **land** ridan’ [19. P. 164]. They were loud, yes, loud, when they rode over the (burial) mound // they were fierce when they rode across the land.

Nigon Wyrta Galdor (The Nine Herbs Charm) says that herbs (‘these nine plants defeat nine venoms’) are able to defeat any diseases that come from the East, North, and West: ‘<...> ænig āttor cume ēastan flēogan oððe ænig norðan cume oððe ænig westan ofer werðēode’. Thus, the disease appears as venom, and the same phrase is repeated like a refrain: ‘<...> þām laþan, ðe geond lond fereð’ (the horror who travels over land) [19. P. 194]. In all cases, the location of the other world is defined as a space remote from the ‘own’ (‘across the sea’), as an ‘alien’ world, the residence of evil forces, a source of illnesses, troubles, and misfortunes.

Conclusion

Reviewing the results, it should be noted that the dichotomy of ‘own — alien’ space is presented in Anglo-Saxon incantations in vertical and horizontal models. This opposition is objectified both in ritual actions and

charms. ‘Own’ space is defined as developed and centered around the man, his house, and the surrounding objects. The division of spaces runs along the border zone between the worlds and may have a distinct designation in the form of a door, a field, or a river. It is also a zone suitable for performing a ritual, which course involves communicating with the otherworld, so the purpose of the charm gets realized. The sphere of the ‘own’ world is quite flexible and has no fixed restrictions; it can shift as the subject moves. ‘Alien’ space does not possess particular characteristics and gets objectified more often associatively, taking the form of a distant world largely at the expense of detailed elaboration of ‘own’ space. Explication of ‘alien’ space occurs during the invasion of otherworldly forces into the developed space in the form of diseases, misfortunes, and disasters.

References

1. Stepanov, Yu.S. (2004). *Constants: Dictionary of Russian Culture*. Moscow: Academic project. (In Russ.).
2. Lotman, Yu.M. (1996). *Semiosphere. Inside the Thinking Worlds*. Part 2. Moscow: Languages of Slavic Cultures. (In Russ.).
3. Tsviyann, T.V. (2006). *Model of the World and Its Linguistic Foundations*. Moscow: KomKniga. (In Russ.).
4. Ivanov, Vyach. Vsev. & Toporov, V.N. (1965). *Slavic Language Modeling Semiotic Systems: Ancient Period*. Moscow: Nauka. (In Russ.).
5. Zakharenko, I.V. (2013). Archetypal opposition ‘us vs. them’ in the spatial code of culture. In: *Language, consciousness, communication: Collection of Scientific Articles*. Iss. 46. Moscow. pp. 15–32. (In Russ.).
6. Baiburin, A.K. (1990). *Folklore and Ethnography: Problems of reconstruction of the facts of traditional culture*. Leningrad: Nauka. (In Russ.).
7. Ivanov, E.E., Lomakina, O.V. & Nelubova, N.Yu. (2021). Semantic analysis of Tuvan proverbs: models, imagery, concepts (against the European peremiological background). *New Research of Tuva*, 3, 232–248. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2021.3.17> (In Russ.).
8. Ivanov, E.E., Lomakina, O.V. & Petrushevskaya, Ju.A. (2021). The National Specificity of the Proverbial Fund: Basic Concepts and Procedure for Determining). *RUDN Journal of Language, Semiotics and Semantics*. 12(4), 996–1035. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2021-12-4-996-10325> (In Russ.).
9. Lomakina, O.V. (2022). Tuvan paremiology: its linguocultural and linguoaxiological potential. *New Research of Tuva*, 1, 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2022.1.1> (In Russ.).
10. Bredis, M.A. & Ivanov, E.E. (2022). Linguocultural comment in poly-lingual dictionary of proverbs. *Russian Journal of Lexicography*, 26, 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.17223/22274200/26/1> (In Russ.).
11. Bredis, M.A. & Ivanov, E.E. (2022). Proverbial factors in translating Tuvan proverbs in the light of normative and poly-lingual paremiography (as contrasted to English and Russian languages). *New Research of Tuva*, 1, 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2022.1.2> (In Russ.).
12. Shindin, S.G. (1993). Spatial Arrangement of the Russian Voodoo Universe: The Image of the World Center. In: *Research in the Field of Balto-Slavic Spiritual Culture. Spells*. Moscow: Nauka. pp. 108–121. (In Russ.).
13. Brunova, E.A. (2007). The concepts of homeland in the English language and culture. *Bulletin of Chelyabinsk State University*, 15, 33–42. (In Russ.).

14. Baiburin, A.K. (1993). *Ritual in Traditional Culture Structural and Semantic Analysis of East Slavic Rites*. St. Petersburg: Nauka. (In Russ.).
15. Strakhov, A.B. (1988). Slavic folk concept of non-being, non-existence and nothingness in terms of its spatial aspect. In: Symposium 'Ethnolinguistics of Text: Semiotics of Small Folklore Forms'. Vol. 1. Moscow: Institute of Slavic Studies publ. pp. 92–94. (In Russ.).
16. Gudkov, D.B. (2002). Essay on the border. In: *Language, consciousness, communication: Collection of Scientific Articles*. Iss. 22. Moscow. pp. 51–57. (In Russ.).
17. Konovalova, M.A. (2016). Chronotopic Vocabulary of Verbal Charms (on the Example of Russian Verbal Charms of Karelia). *World culture at the crossroads of cultures and civilizations*, 4(16), 135–145. (In Russ.).
18. Krasnykh, V.V. (2003). 'Own' among 'strangers': Myth or reality? Moscow. (In Russ.).
19. Grendon, F. (1909). *The Anglo-Saxon Charms*. NY: Columbia University.
20. Storms, G. (1948). *Anglo-Saxon Magic*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff.
21. Gelling, M. (1962). Place-Names and Anglo-Saxon Paganism. *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*, 8, 7–26.
22. Hill, T.D. (2012). The Rod of Protection and the Witches' Ride: Christian and Germanic Syncretism in Two Old English Metrical Charms. *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*, 111, 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.5406/jenglgermphil.111.2.0145>
23. Ciaran, A. (2013). Ex Ecclesia: Salvific Power Beyond Sacred Space in Anglo-Saxon Charms. *Incantatio. An International Journal on Charms, Charmers and Charming*, 3, 9–32.
24. Roper, J. (2006). Personal and Place Names in English Verbal Charms. *Il Nome del Testo*, 8, 65–75.
25. Prosyannikova, O.I. & Skorik, K.V. (2018). Features of pagan culture in Anglo-saxon and old Slavic charms. In: *Fornunatov's Readings in Karelia*. Petrozavodsk: Petrozavodsk State University Publ. pp. 204–207.
26. Prosyannikova, O.I. & Skorik, K.V. (2019). Pagan Characters in Anglo-saxon and Russian charms. *Rhema*, 1, 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.32862/2500-2953-2019-1-36-47>
27. Chaney, W. (1960). Paganism to Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England. *The Harvard Theological Review*, 53, 197–217.
28. Tornaghi, P. (2010). Anglo-Saxon Charms and the Language of Magic. *Aevum*, 84, 439–464.
29. Toporova, T.B. (2017). *Epic word: designations of water in the 'Elder Edda'*: monograph. Moscow: TEZAURUS.
30. Bozoky, E. (2013). Medieval Narrative Charms. In: *The Power of Words: Studies on Charms and Charming in Europe*. Budapest and New York: Central European UP. pp. 101–116.

Библиографический список

1. Степанов Ю.С. Константы русской культуры. М.: Академический проект, 2004.
2. Лотман Ю.М. Семиосфера. Внутри мыслящих миров. Ч. 2. М.: Языки русской культуры, 1996.
3. Цивьян Т.В. Модель мира и ее лингвистические основы. М.: КомКнига, 2006.
4. Иванов Вяч.Вс., Топоров В.Н. Славянские языковые моделирующие семиотические системы (Древний период). М.: Наука, 1965.
5. Захаренко И.В. Архетипическая оппозиция «свой — чужой» в пространственном коде культуры // Язык. Сознание. Коммуникация : сб. статей. Вып. 46. М.: МАКС Пресс, 2013. С. 15–32.
6. Байбури А.К. Фольклор и этнография: Проблемы реконструкции фактов традиционной культуры. Л.: 1990.

7. Иванов Е.Е., Ломакина О.В., Нелюбова Н.Ю. Семантический анализ тувинских пословиц: модели, образы, понятия (на европейском паремиологическом фоне) // Новые исследования Тувы. 2021. № 3. С. 220–233. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2021.3.17>
8. Иванов Е.Е., Ломакина О.В., Петрушевская Ю.А. Национальная специфичность пословичного фонда (основные понятия и методика выявления) // Вестник Российского университета дружбы народов. Серия: Теория языка. Семиотика. Семантика. 2021. Т. 12. № 4. С. 993–1032. <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2299-2021-12-4-996-10325>
9. Ломакина О.В. Тувинская паремиология: лингвокультурологический и лингвоаксиологический потенциал // Новые исследования Тувы. 2022. № 1. С. 6–16. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2022.1.1>
10. Бредис М.А., Иванов Е.Е. Лингвокультурологический комментарий в полилингвальных словарях пословиц // Вопросы лексикографии. 2022. № 26. С. 5–29. <https://doi.org/10.17223/22274200/26/1>
11. Бредис М.А., Иванов Е.Е. Провербиальные факторы перевода тувинских пословиц в аспекте нормативной и полилингвальной паремиографии (на фоне русского и английского языков) // Новые исследования Тувы. 2022. № 1. С. 17–36. <https://doi.org/10.25178/nit.2022.1.2>
12. Шиндин С.Г. Пространственная организация русского заговорного универсума. Образ центра мира // Исследования в области балто-славянской культуры. Заговор. М.: Наука, 1993. С. 108–121.
13. Брунова Е.А. Представления о своей земле в английском языке и культуре // Вестник ЧелГУ. 2007. № 15. С. 33–42.
14. Байбурин А.К. Ритуал в традиционной культуре. Структурно-семантический анализ восточнославянских обрядов. СПб.: Наука, 1993.
15. Страхов А.Б. О пространственном аспекте славянской концепции небытия // Этнолингвистика текста: Семиотика малых форм фольклора. М.: 1988.
16. Гудков Д.Б. Эссе о границе // Язык. Сознание. Коммуникация. Вып. 22. М.: 2002. С. 51–57.
17. Коновалова М.А. Хронотопическая лексика заговоров (на примере русских заговоров Карелии) // Мировая культура на перекрестке культур и цивилизаций. 2016. № 4(16). С. 135–145.
18. Красных В.В. «Свой» среди «чужих»: Миф или реальность? М., 2003.
19. Grendon F. *The Anglo-Saxon Charms*. N-Y: Columbia University, 1909.
20. Storms G. *Anglo-Saxon Magic*. The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1948.
21. Gelling M. Place-Names and Anglo-Saxon Paganism // *University of Birmingham Historical Journal*. 1962. № 8. P. 7–26.
22. Hill T.D. The Rod of Protection and the Witches' Ride: Christian and Germanic Syncretism in Two Old English Metrical Charms // *Journal of English and Germanic Philology*. 2012. № 111. P. 145–168. <https://doi.org/10.5406/jenglgerphil.111.2.0145>
23. Ciaran A. Ex Ecclesia: Salvific Power Beyond Sacred Space in Anglo-Saxon Charms // *Incantatio. An International Journal on Charms, Charmers and Charming*. 2013. № 3. P. 9–32.
24. Roper J. Personal and Place Names in English Verbal Charms // *Il Nome del Testo*. 2006. № 8. P. 65–75.
25. Просяникова О.И., Скорик К.В. Черты языческой культуры в англосаксонских и старославянских заговорах // Фортунатовские чтения в Карелии. Петрозаводск: Издательство ПетрГУ, 2018. С. 204–207. (In Russ.).
26. Просяникова О.И., Скорик К.В. Языческие персонажи в англосаксонских и русских текстах заговоров // *Rhema. Рема*. 2019. № 1. С. 36–47. <https://doi.org/10.32862/2500-2953-2019-1-36-47> (In Russ.).
27. Chaney W. Paganism to Christianity in Anglo-Saxon England // *The Harvard Theological Review*. 1960. № 53. P. 197–217.

28. *Tornaghi P.* Anglo-Saxon Charms and the Language of Magic // *Aevum*. 2010. № 84. P. 439–464.
29. *Топорова Т.В.* Эпическое слово: обозначения воды в «Старшей Эдде»: монография. М.: ТЕЗАУРУС, 2017. (In Russ.).
30. *Bozoky E.* Medieval Narrative Charms. The Power of Words: Studies on Charms and Charming in Europe. Budapest and New York: Central European UP, 2013. pp. 101–116.

Information about the authors:

Olga I. Prosyannikova, Dr.Sc. (Philology), Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Foreign Languages and Professional Communication, Pushkin Leningrad State University; *e-mail*: olgapros@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-9080-3058, ResearcherID: J-8619-2017, SPIN 7162-9848

Kseniya V. Skorik, Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor of the Department of Foreign Languages and Professional Communication, Pushkin Leningrad State University; *e-mail*: ksenyapro@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-7894-549, Researcher ID: AAE-1111-2022, SPIN 1001-6737

Lyubov V. Kotsubinskaya, Ph.D. in Philology, Associate Professor, Head of the Department of Linguistics and Translation, Pushkin Leningrad State University; *e-mail*: l.kocubinskaya@lengu.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-5520-0235, ResearcherID: AAD-6444-2022, SPIN 7443-8020

Сведения об авторах:

Просьянникова Ольга Игоревна, доктор филологических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой иностранных языков и профессиональной коммуникации, Ленинградский государственный университет им. А.С. Пушкина; *e-mail*: olgapros@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-7894-5491, ResearcherID: J-8619-2017, SPIN 7162-9848

Скорик Ксения Владимировна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент кафедры иностранных языков и профессиональной коммуникации Ленинградский государственный университет им. А.С. Пушкина; *e-mail*: ksenyapro@mail.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-7894-549, Researcher ID: AAE-1111-2022, SPIN 1001-6737

Коцюбинская Любовь Вячеславовна, кандидат филологических наук, доцент, заведующий кафедрой лингвистики и перевода, Ленинградский государственный университет им. А.С. Пушкина (Санкт-Петербург, Россия); *e-mail*: l.kocubinskaya@lengu.ru

ORCID: 0000-0001-7894-5491, ResearcherID: AAD-6444-2022, SPIN 7443-8020