



ROMAN VASKO

Kijevo nacionalinis lingvistikos universitetas, Ukraina
Kyiv National Linguistic University, Ukraine

SENOVĖS RITUALŲ SEMIOTINĖ RAIŠKA MANDAGUMO FORMOSE

Reflection of the Ancient Rituals Semiotics
in Cultural Etiquette Forms of Politeness

SUMMARY

The article discusses modern patterns of expressing wishes which are transformations of ancient pagan rituals. With the adoption of Christianity, these models and, above all, their form, such as wishes, undergo changes under the influence of biblical symbols. The main attention is paid to the relationship between the functions of non-verbal and verbal semiotics in the rituals of wishes in the mythological, religious-Christian and secularised worldviews. In addition, the point that the ritual is a set of consecutive ritual actions is supported. An attempt is also made to reveal the inner form of wishes through the prism of the theory of gift-exchange. The characteristics of external and internal pragmatics of the remnants of an ancient ritual is represented in wishes as cultural etiquette forms of gift-exchange or, as is customary to say in modern discourse studies, forms of politeness. The need for experimental studies of different ethnocultures aiming at the remains of ancient rituals in modern consciousness is substantiated.

SANTRAUKA

Straipsnyje aptariami šiuolaikiniai norus išreiškiantys elgesio modeliai, kurie laikomi senovės pagoniškų ritualų transformacijomis. Priėmus krikščionybę, šie modeliai, ypač tų modelių forma, pavyzdžiui, norai, keičiasi veikiant Biblijos simboliams. Didžiausias dėmesys skiriamas neverbalinės ir verbalinės semiotikos funkcijų santykio aptarimui norų ritualuose mitologinėje, religinėje-krikščioniškoje ir sekuliarizuotoje pasaulėžiūroje. Be to, palaikomas požiūris, kad ritualas yra iš eilės einančių ritualinių veiksmų rinkinys. Straipsnyje bandoma atskleisti vidinę norų formą per pasikeitimo dovanomis teorijos prizmę. Senovės ritualo išorinės ir vidinės pragmatikos ypatybės atsispindi noruose kaip kultūrinės pasikeitimo dovanomis etiketo formos arba, kaip įprasta sakyti šiuolaikiniuose diskurso tyrimuose, mandagumo formos. Straipsnyje pabrėžiama, kad būtina atlikti eksperimentinius skirtingų etnokultūrų reiškinių tyrimus siekiant iširti senovės ritualus, kurie išliko šiuolaikinėje sąmonėje.

RAKTAŽODŽIAI: semiotika, senovės ritualas, elgesio modelis, norai, neverbalinis ir verbalinis komponentai.

KEY WORDS: semiotics, ancient ritual, behaviour model, wishes, non-verbal and verbal component.

INTRODUCTION

The modern world of global digitalization is characterized by the impetuous dynamics of all sociocultural processes resulting in quite noticeable transformation of the behavioural etiquette forms and rules accepted in every society (see Larina 2009, Morina 2008, Korolyov 2019 et al.). And the basic scientific task for the theory and Philosophy of culture (and other contiguous subjects), according to Morina, is firstly the research of modern ongoing changes in the semiotic space of every ethnic community, and, secondly, the measurement of their activity (and, as it appears to us, by experimental method), that will give an opportunity to define the degree of their influence on the ritual-behavioural structures (Morina 2008: 1) the conceptual-ontological base of which are the admitted different types of politeness and the system of wishes in particular. Thus it should be noted that absolutely all modern patterns of behaviour evolved in the early ancient cultures, that afterwards were set as a system of

social conventions, interconnected images of activity, in the equal degree archetypal (unconscious) and stereotypic (conscious), according to Bayburin, ritual based activity (Bayburin 1993: 4–5).

Of the same point of view is Tyshchenko who suggests that “it was the ritual activity that became the basis for the formation of visual figurative thinking in humans. According to its genesis the ritual type of activity was conditioned by the processes of environmental sacralisation, by the need to perform one or another action as a self-sufficient condition for the transfer of collective experience” (Tyshchenko 2000: 26). And such an approach to the study of semiotisation and universalisation of the cultural experience, presupposing reconstruction of the preserved archetypal signs of ritual activity in the modern patterns of behavioural culture, in particular in such forms as wishes, seems in general relevant and perspective for the Philosophy and Sociology of culture.

ANCIENT NON-VERBAL RITUAL
AS PRIMARY SEMIOTIC-BEHAVIORAL PATTERN

Numerous studies of the ritual contain enough definitions of the notion “ritual” in its broad interpretation, among them is the work of Mechkovskaya “Language and Religion” in which, as it seems to us, the processes of both cognitive and linguocultural semiotisation of ritual activity are rather briefly but consistently and convincingly analysed, especially when considering the question “What is

more ancient: ritual, myth or language?” (Mechkovskaya 1998). Sceptics in this case will probably be right when they say that this scientific problem is not new, because it has already been resolved in many fundamental works on this subject (Bayburin, Eliade, Lévy-Bruhl, Lévi-Strauss, Toporov et al.). However, it is through the prism of the correlation of concepts “ritual–myth–language” that

one should study the mechanisms of semiosis of a person's primary ritual activity and its relics preserved in the minds of modern representatives of different ethnocultures.

The humanitarian scholars, discussing the genesis of the ritual, myth and language, came to the consistent conclusion that, in phylogenesis (as N. B. Mechkovskaya believes), ritual action was the primary semiotic process on the basis of which all mythological representations and language were formed as a semiotic system as well. It should be clarified that this type of activity of carriers of primary consciousness is most likely and, at least, was connected with the ontogenesis, i.e. "the process of the individual development of an organism and its mental organization from birth to the end of life" [...], because the term "phylogenesis" is mainly used when it comes to the development of organic forms [...]. Although, in principle, both processes should be studied in their close relation and correlation.

That the ritual is primary was mentioned in due time by Ivanov, who, based "on the latest (for that time of science) research, was convinced that the language of symbolic actions (Cognitive Semiosis – R. V.) both in the history of the individual, and in the history of the human race preceded the verbal sign (Lingvosemiosis – R. V.) and served as a basis for the assimilation of the latter" (Ivanov 1985: 351). Confirmations of this scientific conclusion is present in Biology, where even the behaviour of insects in the nature is also associated with the birth of ritual activity (Pavlov 2015: 298–

299), calling it pre-ritual. However, the most convincing evidence on this issue is given in the studies of archaic cultures (Baryshnikov 2006), which describe the most ancient non-verbal (i.e., not having verbal accompaniment) rituals; and, as was established, in many rituals the verbal part is generally secondary and was not obligatory. In particular, Baryshnikov writes that "in the era of primitive culture, significant events take place in the formation, first of all, of the human species "Homo sapiens", which took shape over several million years (Korolyova 2018), following from instinctive behaviour and innate reactions to conscious and expedient activity, initially having a ritual-magical and mythological character (Baryshnikov 2006: 183).

As is known, Mechkovskaya also writes about this, the ritual appears as the most ancient way of storing information in the non-written society. The information captured and saved in the ritual system of a certain ethnic group contained, firstly, a particular model of the world and, secondly, a certain model (archetype image) of people's behaviour in especially significant situations. The meaning of the ritual is precisely in the repetition, in the reproduction of the world's model of the tribe and ideas about proper behaviour (how to behave) in responsible and critical circumstances. Ritual observance was felt by archaic society as a guarantee of security and prosperity. Of course, such confidence really helped the tribe live, and besides, it preserved the ethnocultural identity of the non-written collective (Mechkovskaya 1998).

From these arguments follows the fact that the ritual as a semiotic-behavioural pattern is based on the repetition of magical actions (and, first of all, non-verbal ones), in which information about the creation of the cosmos (world order) from chaos, about the natural cycle of life and death, the change of cycles of winter and summer, day and night was originally encoded and transmitted [...]. The people involved in the ritual, had to repeat actions that had been made by the gods and which, ac-

ording to Lévi-Strauss, had the greatest value for holders of primary consciousness (or, as it is told in Philosophy – mythological worldview) (Lévi-Strauss 1994, 2011). The primary signs, that regulate behaviour (shouting, commands, gestures, body movings, etc.), were totems and taboo subjects. Totemic beliefs, according to Shubin, “were extremely practical because they cemented individuals into the family integrity and, therefore, they were the vital force” (Shubin 2015).

RITUAL AND RITES OF ITS PERFORMANCE WITH VERBAL ACCOMPANIMENT

Ritual themes, as a rule, and it has already been mentioned partially, present in the main and the most ancient myths, gradually underwent transformations, but they did not disappear completely, but they began to accompany various rites in the transformed, sometimes weakened and not even completely understood by performers form, they were associated mainly with the life cycle and economic activities of people.

All important events in the life of each ethnic group and its individual members were not just accompanied by rituals, but “experienced” by performing a ceremony: meetings and seeing off the seasons (significant milestones of the agricultural cycle); sowing, reaping, threshing; birth, wedding, death (funeral), etc. (Tyshchenko 2000). So the types of rituals appeared: calendar rites, wedding rites, funeral rites, etc., where the behavioural pattern of their performers was supplemented by verbal magic (ges-

ture and body somatics were accompanied by verbal spells, magical texts, word-addresses, etc., which in every culture adopted the construction of stable formulaic signs).

Rites helped society survive the drought, fight diseases, survive dangerous, difficult days (such as the days of the solstice, the new moon, etc.), facilitated the transition from one phase of the life cycle to another, set the proper sequence of actions during the ritual, for example, during the slaughter of cattle (previously it was a ritual of sacrifice, which was continued to be performed, albeit for a different purpose (for example, in the Christian Orthodox tradition, representatives of the Eastern rite after the Great Lent for the Easter holidays had to cut an animal), but in compliance with many of its requirements.

The ritual as a set of collective ritual actions repeats a sacred act from a mythological plot, only with verbal accompa-

niment, because with it, a person feels a close connection with all nature and with the cosmos. Most of the rituals in the pagan period allowed a person to feel the close connection of society with nature.

We are talking primarily about calendar rituals which are associated with natural phenomena – changing seasons, as well as worshiping the sun, moon and stars at the moments of their special position (solstice, solar eclipse, full moon, etc.) (Tyshchenko 2009). All these phenomena occupied an important place both in the mythological consciousness of ancient people, checking the rhythm of their lives with cosmic events, phenomena, objects, which gave the rituals a cosmic dimension and universal meaning, as well as in the pagan and later in the religious-Christian-biblical consciousness.

A person who took an active part in the life of nature was convinced that disastrous events could occur without his participation, which gave value to observe the sequence of ritual actions performed in the ritual, directly accompanied by verbal magic. That is why non-observance of tradition was cruelly “punished” (illness, up to epidemics,

crop failures, etc.), because a violation of the order of nature, in the maintenance and preservation of which the traditional culture took an active part, could entail unpredictable consequences, including death of the whole collective (Mechkovskaya 1998).

The reflection of verbal magic in a word can be cited as an example of the lexeme oath, the external and internal form of which contains relics of an ancient non-verbal ritual, since initially the fulfillment of the oath ritual was not based on a word (not its verbal expression), but in body movement, gesture (“speakers of Slavic languages while performing oaths bowed “to the ground”, touching it with the hand”), which confirms the reconstructed Proto-Slavic verb *kloniti, to which this word dates back (Trubachev 1983: X, 38). Subsequently, the oath became a certain verbal-formulaic promise (and its non-verbal component has survived until now), which is pronounced in certain situations and conditions, and most often in modern cultures it is already a stereotypical model of behavior, for example, in a situation of military oath with gesture component (N. B. Mechkovskaya).

WISHES AS A RITUAL BEHAVIOURAL PATTERN

According to Bayburin, any form of knowledge associated with the human ritual activities represents a specific sub-culture, it forms and structures the strength of its tradition as one of the types of cognitive attitude of man to the world (Bayburin 1990: 3).

As is known, object-material or natural taboo in archaic cultures began to be

extrapolated to language taboo, since words in antiquity performed primarily a magical function. It was believed that to name a thing aloud means to perform a ritual act with it (it is here that the sources of language taboo should be sought).

Thus, word magic or verbal magic is the use of verbal forms to influence in the right direction the state of being of things,

based on faith in the miraculous power of the word. And this power is associated with the ancient identification of the word in the primary consciousness with the thing designated by it or the action called by this word (Pavlovskaya 2009: 42).

The most revealing surviving relics of the ancient magic ritual are wish forms, which, according to Pavlovskaya, are conservative verbal symbolic formations. This means that in terms of their structure, they make up a set of almost motionless formulas and motives (Ibid.).

Their formal configuration suggests that the illocutionary influence of such verbal ritual formulas is largely due to their external pragmatism - the sign of the form of wishes. Therefore, in order for a given sign to fulfill its inherent conventional function of etiquette, it is necessary first to reconstruct the ritual, i.e., the symbolic space of its fulfillment. According to Aznaurova, the repetition of the use of the word in typified communication situations reflects its ritual nature and often contributes to the usual consolidation of pragmatic information in it (Aznaurova 1998: 38) (in archaic cultures magic was precisely what words were associated with). It is not by chance that their researchers (T. Agapkina, L. Vinogradova, L. Pavlovskaya, I. Korolyov et al.) believe that wishes in the system of ritual formulas occupy an intermediate place between forms of speech etiquette and conspiracy-magic texts. In wishes, as in specific pragmatic ritual formulas, which are primarily oriented toward reuse in typed situations, the pragmatic component at the level of external pragmatics is dominant and obligatory.

In each ethnic group, the verbal components of the ritual of wishes, reflecting the national models of the world, are standardized in the process of secondary semiosis. The pragmatic secondary essence of the addressed wish ontologically proceeds from the ancient ritual of belief in the magic power of the word: "wishing good (health, good luck, happiness, good harvest, wealth, etc.), the addressee is convinced that by pronouncing the contents of the wish he can help achieve / get the desired result. The conventionality of such internal pragmatism is that the addresser of the wish considers the truth of his intention to be potentially known to the addressee" (LED 1990: 396). Thus, the expression of a wish to the addressee in the form of a cliché magic formula is a remnant of an ancient ritual activity, where, on the contrary, the non-verbal component almost lost its function over time. In the theory of pragmatics, such an activity received a new terminological designation - "illocutionary act", by which its founders understand the expression of a communicative goal during the utterance of a particular statement (J. Austin).

Verbal wish formulas (as L. Pavlovskaya calls them) are a specific means of designating reality, since the act of ritual nomination does not imply the creation of a new name, but the selection of / search for the designation available in each language for the essence of the typical situation displayed (Pavlovskaya 2009: 33). Of course, this is so, if we follow the hypothesis that wishes are the remnants of a ritual where their nonverbal primary semiotic component is significantly transformed.

A similar point of view is expressed by Vinogradova, who believes that “a text containing wishes of the good also presupposes a ritual of pronouncing / expressing it (L. Vinogradov). Being, on the one hand, forms of speech etiquette, wishes establish relationships between people, and on the other, like magical texts, they maintain contacts (mythological – once established) of a person with supernatural forces capable of providing welfare (SDES, T. 1: 188). Based on this assumption, the issue of the most important function of the verbal component of the wish sign deserves special attention. Wishing the good to the addressee, the addresser hopes that even pronouncing it can help to achieve the desired. Orientation to verbal magic is realized in the form of (explicitly or implicitly) performative “wish”, which informally expresses the wish itself.

The main mythological and magical stored function of wishes is associated with the “gift exchange” between the performer of the ritual (addresser) and his addressee (Agapkina 1994: 170). In the system of prescriptions of modern social behaviour, which is a transform of ritual and magical practices and mythological representations, the exchange of gifts serves as the most important regulator of mutual relations between micro- and macro-sociums, families, individuals, etc. (Makovskiy 1996: 584). Nowadays gifts are expressed in material wishes (when people want money, prosperity) and social values (career, success, for example, in studies), vital (health, strength), religious and spiritual (God’s mercy, etc.).

Pavlovskaya argues convincingly that the most pragmatic verbal component of

the ritual of wishes is represented in small folklore genres, among which she considers phraseological units and in which wishes are semiotised through national symbols (see also Vasko 2019), for example, happiness and good luck in the English tradition. Such signs-symbols are numbers (odd) – R. Vasko: *There is luck in odd numbers* (expression of W. Shakespeare) and other components: *Much good may it do you; To wish one all the luck in the world.*

The gifts of happiness reflect the idea of the wheel of fortune: The ball of fortune is at one’s feet, as well as the image of the rope as a measurement of the life path in the biblical descent phrase: The lines have fallen to me in pleasant places. Among socially neutral wishes for happiness, an example is given as *As good fortune (luck) would have it*, and good luck *To wish one well (to wish well to one* (Pavlovskaya 2009: 112). The gifts of happiness reflect the idea of the wheel of fortune: *The ball of fortune is at one’s feet*, as well as the image of the rope as a measurement of the life path in the biblical by origin phrase: *The lines have fallen to me in pleasant places*. Among socially neutral wishes for happiness, such example is given, as *As good fortune (luck) would have it*, for a good luck – *To wish one well (to wish well to one* (Pavlovskaya 2009: 112)

Based on the fact that wishes are a gift (which was perceived in the archaic collective, first of all, as a source of security), the opinion of Tyshchenko is justified that this ontologically ritual initially implied attracting a “stranger” to the state “of his own” (Tyshchenko 2008: 4). Therefore, it is not by chance that A. Gurevich notes,

“the establishment of friendly relations, marriage, hospitality, memorial dinner, successful completion of a trade deal or peace negotiations [...], – all these ritual ceremonies were accompanied by mutual gifts” (Gurevich 1984: 234–235). Any gift as a ritual implied reciprocity, which played a very important role and continues to play it in the wedding ceremony. Therefore, thanksgiving forms are an important component for the integrity of the wishes ritual.

Thus, the word-gift and word-thanksgiving continue in modern patterns of expressing wishes to fulfill a magical function and act pragmatically on the recipient (Omarov 1996: 106).

The pragmatic impact on the recipient (addressee) is complex. And, first of all, this is a strong influence on the emotional and rational spheres of the recipient of the wish (gift), on his knowledge, and most importantly – on behaviour. Pavlovskaya names three main directions of pragmatic influence: 1) cultural, 2) social and 3) psychological. Influence at the

cultural level is carried out by the whole context of culture, the representative of which is the subject, otherwise the interpretation of the historical and cultural component of the wish will not be fully possible. Influence at the social level is the impact on the subject to whom the desire is addressed, as a representative of a particular ethno-national community, group, etc., which requires a deliberate choice of the means of such pragmatics. Influence at the psychological level is a personal, individual impact on a person and is carried out as empathy and the transition into the sphere of personal relationships and meanings (Pavlovskaya 2009: 47–48).

The described three types of influence of wish formulas should be considered as a complex cultural, social and psychological impact, which is fully realized in the context of a particular national culture with its inherent moral and ethical norms and concepts, but at the same time preserves the general cultural component of their ritual nature.

CONCLUSIONS

Thus, modern models of behaviour have deep ancient pagan roots in the situation of expressing wishes, because the use of the magic power spoken under the certain circumstances and for a specific purpose of the word goes back to the mythological stage of the worldview (including magic of spell, etc.). On the background of deeply rooted pagan archetypes Christian symbols begin to form and affirm in the subconscious and further in the conscious perception of the world.

And with the spread of Christianity, the remnants of the mythical pantheon of paganism were closely intertwined in the ritual of wishes: folk ideas adapted Christian concepts to a pagan world outlook, which, although in a transformed form, were preserved in the wish system of each national culture.

This is precisely how in culture emerged the need for “repeating the past,” the return to the experience of previous periods and epochs in which the interaction and interpenetration of

the object and subject, the general and the single, the profane and the sacred, that is, the epochs based on the archetypes of the mythological value model of the world. Hence the endless semiosis of mythology, being present vertically in all cultural periods without exception.

In the future development of this problem, it is possible to conduct an experiment with representatives of different ethnic cultures in order to identify relics of the mythological worldview in their modern behavioural patterns.

Literature and References

- Agapkina Tatiana, Vinogradova Lyudmyla. 1994. Blagopozhelaniye: ritual i tekst [Well-wishes: ritual and text]. *Slavyanskiy i balkanskiy fol'klor. Verovaniye, tekst, ritual*. 168–208.
- Austin John 1986. Slovo kak deystviye [Word as an Action]. *Novoye v zarubezhnoy lingvistike. Teoriya rechevykh aktov*. 17. 22–131.
- Aznaurova Elvira. 1988. *Pragmatika khudozhestvennogo slova* [The Pragmatics of the Artistic Word]. Tashkent: Fan.
- Baryshnikov Pavel. 2006. Arkhaicheskiy mif i sovremennoye mifotvorchestvo [Archaic myth and modern myth-making]. *Vestnik Rossiyskogo universiteta druzhby narodov. Seriya: Filosofiya*. (1). 182–189.
- Bayburin Albert. 1990. Ritual: svoye i chuzhoye [Ritual: one's own and another's]. *Folklor i etnografiya. Problemy rekonstruktsii faktov traditsionnoy kultury*. 3–17.
- Bayburin Albert. 1993. *Ritual v traditsionnoy kulture. Strukturno-semanticheskiy analiz vostochnoslavianskikh obryadov* [A ritual in traditional culture. Structural and semantic analysis of East Slavic rites]. SPb.: Nauka.
- Eliade Mircea. 2010. *Aspekty mifa* [Aspects of Myth]. 4-ye izd. Moskva: Akademicheskii proyekt.
- Gurevich Aron. 1984. *Kategorii srednevekovoy kultury* [Categories of medieval culture]. 2-ye izd., ispr. i dop. M.: Iskusstvo.
- Ivanov Vyach. 1985. Primechaniya [Notes]. In Levi-Stross K. *Strukturnaya antropologiya*. Moskva: Nauka. 340–364.
- Korolyov Igor. 2019. Cognitive and communicative category of cooperativity: ontological and gnoseological status. *Logos*. 98. 83–93.
- Korolyova Alla. 2018. Reconstruction of Early Migration Routes of Homo Populations. *Logos* 94. 159–166.
- Larina Tatiana. 2009. *Kategoriya veshlivosti i stil kommunikatsii. Sopostavleniye angliyskikh i russkikh lingvokulturnykh traditsiy* [Politeness category and communication style. Comparison of English and Russian linguistic and cultural traditions]. Moskva: Rukopisnyye pamyatniki Drevney Rusi.
- LES 1990 – *Lingvisticheskiy entsiklopedicheskiy slovar* [Linguistic Encyclopedic Dictionary]. pod red. N. D. Yartsevov. Moskva: Sovetskaya entsiklopediya, 1990.
- Lévi-Strauss Claude. 1994. *Pervobytnoye myshleniye* [Primitive Thinking]. per., vstup. st. i prim. A. B. Ostrovskogo. Moskva: Respublika.
- Lévi-Strauss Claude. 2011. *Strukturnaya antropologiya* [Structural Anthropology]. Moskva: Izdatelstvo AST.
- Lévy-Bruhl Lucien. 1994. *Sverkhystestvennoye v pervobytnom myshlenii* [Supernatural in primitive thinking]. Moskva: Pedagogika-Press.
- Makovskiy Mark. 1996. *Yazyk–mif–kultura. Simvolny zhizni i zhizn simvolov* [Language–myth–culture. Symbols of life and the life of symbols]. Moskva: Russkiye slovari.
- Mechkovskaya Nina. 1998. *Yazyk i religiya. Lektsii po filologii i istorii religiy* [Language and religion. Lectures on the philology and history of religions]. Moskva: FAIR.
- Morina Larisa. 2008. *Semiotika ritualizirovannykh povedencheskikh form kultury* [Semiotics of ritualized behavioral forms of culture]: avtoref ... dokt. filos. nauk. Sankt-Peterburg.
- Omarov I. 1996. Verbalnaya magiya (klyatvy i blagopozhelaniya) [Verbal magic (oaths and well-wishes)]. In Aul Kuppa. *Istoriko-etnograficheskiye ocherki 19–20 vv.* 45–50.
- Pavlov Sergey. 2015. Ritual “Ukhazhivaniya” kak neobkhodimyy instrument, zapuskayushchiy reproduktivnyy protsess nasekomykh [The “Courtship” ritual as a necessary tool that starts the reproductive process of insects]. *Vestnik Volzhskogo universiteta im. V. N. Tatishcheva*. 4 (19). 298–305.

- Pavlovska Lyudmyla. 2009. *Verbalni formuly pobazhan u riznostrukturnykh movakh: prahmasemantichnyy ta linhvokulturolohichnyy aspekty* [Verbal formulas of wishes in different structural languages: pragmasemantic and linguocultural aspects]: dys. ... kand. filol. nauk. Rivne.
- SDES 1995. – *Slavyanskiye drevnosti. Etnolingvisticheskiy slovar: v 5 t.* [Slavic antiquities. Ethnolinguistic Dictionary: in 5 vol. otv. red. N. I. Tolstoy. Moskva: Mezhdunarodnyye otnosheniya. Vol. 1.
- Shubin Vasiliy. 2015. *Tsenosti mifologicheskogo soznaniya* [Values of mythological consciousness]. Kultura. 3. 291.
- Toporov Vladimir. 1988. O rituale: Vvedeniye v problematiku [On the ritual: Introduction to the problems]. *Arkhaicheskiy ritual v fol'klornykh i ranneliteraturnykh pamyatnikakh.* 7–60.
- Toporov Vladimir. 1995. *Mif. Ritual. Simvol. Obraz: Issledovaniya v oblasti mifopoeticheskogo: Izbrannoye* [Myth. Ritual. Symbol. Image: Mythopoietic Studies: Favorites]. Moskva: Izdatelskaya gruppa "Progress" – "Kultura".
- Trubachev Oleh. 1983. *Etimologicheskii slovar slavyanskikhazykov. Praslavyanskiy leksicheskiy fond* [Etymological Dictionary of Slavic Languages. Pre-Slavic Lexical Fund]. pod red. O. N. Trubacheva. Vyp. Kh. Moskva: Nauka.
- Tyshchenko Oleh. 2000. *Obryadova semantika u slavyanskomu movnomu prostori: monohrafiya* [Ritual semantics in the Slavic linguistic space: monograph]. Kyiv: Kyyivskyy derzhavnyy linhvistychnyy universytet.
- Tyshchenko Oleh. 2008. *Movno-kulturnyy obraz "svoyikh" i "chuzhykh" v etnonominatsiyakh: semantika i prahmatyka (na materiali zakhidno- i skhidnoslovyanskykh mov ta folkloru)* [The linguistic and cultural image of "one's" and "other's" in ethno nominations: semantics and pragmatics (on the material of Western and East Slavic languages and folklore)]. *Slavyanskiy visnyk.* 7. 3–14.
- Tyshchenko Oleh. 2009. *Verbalnyy komponent rytualnoho tekstu v riznomovnomu vidbytti* [The verbal component of the ritual text in multilingual reflection]. *Zbirnyk prats z inozemnoyi filolohiyi.* 6–20.
- Vasko Roman. 2019. *Semiotic and Culturological Passportization of Numeric Phraseosymbols.* *Logos.* 98. 94–103.
- Vinogradova Lyudmyla. 2004. *Verbalnyye komponenty obryadovogo kompleksa (vliyaniye folklorного teksta na strukturu, semantiku i terminologiyu obryada)* [Verbal components of the ritual complex (the influence of the folklore text on the structure, semantics and terminology of the rite)]. *Yazyk kultury. Semantika i grammatika. K 80-letiyu so dnya rozhdeniya akademika Nikity Iliche Tolstogo (1923–1996).* Moskva: Indrik. 217–236.