

Nataliia STEFANOVA,

orcid.org/0000-0002-8699-9219

Doctor of Philology, Associate Professor,

Professor at Professor O. M. Morokhovsky Department of English Philology,

Translation and Philosophy of Language

Kyiv National Linguistic University

(Kyiv, Ukraine) stefanova.nataliya2017@gmail.com

PRIMARY VALUE THINKING OF INDO-EUROPEANS IN RECONSTRUCTED RELICS OF THEIR LANGUAGE

*The article is devoted to studying the reconstruction of the Indo-European language based on a fixed register of words denoting cultural, moral, religious concepts, which may indicate the political and social structure of society at that time and highlight the values of the Indo-European community. The language can serve as a means of accumulating and preserving culturally significant information. Turning to Indo-European origins, the researcher receives tools to reproduce the most critical components of the worldview of Indo-Europeans and identify the values of the Indo-European language community in the bowels of which all European civilization was born. The article aims to study the etymological versions of the Indo-European roots for the lexemes truth, good, beauty, and benefit and reconstruct Indo-European's syncretic ideas about fundamental value categories, which eventually acquired the status of crucial value concepts of any linguistic culture. It is grounded that the ethnic consciousness of Indo-Europeans was mythological and syncretic. The main phenomena of the life of the Indo-European ethnic group were rituals and taboos, which united all members of the Indo-European community and formed values that were relevant to them and determined the appropriate behaviour. It is concluded that the value ideas of Indo-Europeans about good indicate the idea of union between themselves and the deity to know the truth to enjoy the material and later spiritual benefits embodied in the concept of benefit. The primary Indo-European *d-roots recorded the idea of the Indo-European community about beauty, which was formed in the worshipping of higher powers and observation of celestial phenomena and was accompanied by a sense of harmony and happiness.*

Key words: *Indo-European ethnic group, value guidelines, ethnic consciousness, etymological versions.*

Наталія СТЕФАНОВА,

orcid.org/0000-0002-8699-9219

доктор філологічних наук, доцент,

професор кафедри англійської філології, перекладу і філософії мови

ім. професора О. М. Мороховського

Київського національного лінгвістичного університету

(Київ, Україна) stefanova.nataliya2017@gmail.com

ПЕРВІСНЕ ЦІННІСНЕ МИСЛЕННЯ ІНДОЄВРОПЕЙЦІВ В РЕКОНСТРУЙОВАНИХ РЕЛІКТАХ ЇХНЬОЇ МОВИ

*Стаття присвячена вивченню проблематики реконструкції індоєвропейської мови на основі зафіксованого реєстру слів, що означають культурні, моральні, релігійні поняття, можуть свідчити про соціальний устрій суспільства того часу, а також висвітлюють ціннісні орієнтири індоєвропейської спільноти. Саме мова може бути засобом накопичення і збереження культурно значущої інформації. Звертаючись до індоєвропейських першозначень, дослідник отримує інструменти для відтворення найважливіших складників картини світу індоєвропейців і виявлення ціннісних орієнтирів індоєвропейської мовної спільноти, в надрах якої зародилася вся європейська цивілізація. Мета статті полягає у вивченні етимологічних версій першозначень індоєвропейських коренів для лексем truth, good, beauty, benefit і реконструкції синкретичних уявлень індоєвропейців про засадничі ціннісні категорії, які з часом набули статусу ключових ціннісних концептів лінгвокультури. Обґрунтовано, що етнічна свідомість індоєвропейців була міфологічною і синкретичною. Основними феноменами життя індоєвропейського етносу були ритуал і табу, які об'єднували всіх членів індоєвропейської спільноти та формували ціннісні орієнтири, що були актуальними для колективу і зумовлювали відповідну поведінку. Зроблено висновок, що ціннісні уявлення індоєвропейців про добро (good) свідчать про ідею об'єднання себе і божества для пізнання істини (truth) з метою отримання задоволення від матеріальної та пізніше духовної вигоди, що уособлювалося в понятті «користь» (benefit). У першозначеннях індоєвропейських *d-коренів зафіксовано уявлення індоєвропейської спільноти про красу (beauty), яке формувалося в процесі поклоніння вищим силам і спостереження за небесними явищами, що супроводжувалося відчуттям гармонії та щастя.*

Ключові слова: *індоєвропейський етнос, ціннісні орієнтири, етнічна свідомість, етимологічні версії.*

Formulation of the problem. A modern cognitive linguistic and comparative study is a modern foundation for developing comparative-historical and typological linguistics, as well as a new research direction – axiolinguistics. With the help of the last, it is possible to explore and measure the worldview value senses of the other linguistic culture representatives, to determine particular value guidelines dominated at one time or another of human development. It is linguistic and comparative study and one of its new directions, namely axiolinguistics that deal with the problems of the value guideline origin of the Indo-European language family, which is the founder of all subsequent European civilization. Turning to the past, to the primary worldview forms, religions, art, and of course Proto-language, we can understand socio-cultural phenomena and values of the present and assume the actualization of certain values in the future. In such appeal to the ancestors, their culture and Proto-Language, we see the **relevance** of the study. **The article aims** to study the etymological versions of the Indo-European roots for the lexemes truth, good, beauty, and benefit and reconstruct Indo-European's syncretic ideas about fundamental value categories, which eventually acquired the status of crucial value concepts of any linguistic culture.

Recent research. Problems of the origin of the Indo-European family of peoples, the reconstruction of Proto-languages, the formation of consciousness of Indo-Europeans with their nuclear and ethnic archetypes devoted the attention of the researchers (T. V. Gamkrelidze, L. L. Zaliznyak, M. M. Makovsky, N. I. Tolstoy, V. I. Karasik) and were on the focus of linguistic and comparative study at all times. However, the new anthropocentric principle of modern linguistics returned scientists to the study of the “soul of language” by reflecting in it the value system of each ethnic group (E. A. Karpilovskaya) and stimulated the development of a new science – linguistic axiology (N. D. Arutyunova, M. F. Alefirenko, O. L. Bessonova, T. I. Vendina, E. F. Serebrennikov, G. I. Prikhodko, A. R. Arakelova).

Presentation of the research material. The axiological ideas and research methods have long been most widespread in ethnology and sociology, in which the study of cultures was conducted through the prism of symbols and values of different ethnic groups. However, the actualization of the ideas of anthropological linguistics, which turned to the study of the “soul of language”, i.e. the objectified worldview in it, the value system of the ethnos, gave a powerful impetus to the development of linguistic axiology (Вендина, 1998: 39).

Linguoaxiological issues in the stated interparadigm focus on the development of their

own theoretical and methodological frameworks, based on which it will be possible to explain which linguocognitive mechanisms of values are reflected in the minds of specific ethnic cultures and how each language interprets the results of this reflection based on their own assessments. In general, the historical experience of science, especially the history of scientific knowledge, shows that the content of cognitive values is dynamic and variable due to the following main factors: sociocultural conditions of cognitive activity, philosophical reflection on the content of these values, type of cognitive objects, and most importantly, ways and means of their expression.

According to A. R. Arakelova, “values are a philosophical category, but this phenomenon is studied through the prism of various humanities – sociology, cognitive psychology, culturology, and, of course, linguistics. Meanwhile, the concepts covered by the term “values” have always been determined by the relevant currents and direction of philosophical thought that prevailed in a given period” (Аракелова, 2017). Values, the highest guidelines that determine people's behaviour, are the most crucial part of the linguistic worldview; they exist in the culture, not in isolation but interdependently and they constitute the value view of the world (Карасик, 2004). This principle was transported to modern anthropocentric linguistics since it began a reorientation from the structural research of the language to the analysis of the connections of the language and consciousness, language and man's cognition of the world. People and values are at the center of such research, and it explains the need for the development of a taxonomy of values already in ancient times. This gave grounds to assume that the conceptual triad Truth-Good-Beauty gradually became philosophical. Value concepts TRUTH, GOOD, BEAUTY and BENEFIT (defined by ancient philosophers as value categories, which, of course, acquired the status of key-value concepts of any linguoculture or axioconceptosphere) were formed in the mythological and cosmogonic consciousness of its archaeological consciousness.

In the process of interdisciplinary discussion of this issue, we also considered in detail various ambiguous interpretations of the term “ethnos” (Стефанова, 2020: 213), which in linguistics have taken place since the development of Indo-European studies (T. V. Gamkrelidze, J. Dumezil). There are still disputes about the origin of such an ancient community as Proto-Indo-Europeans and particularly around their descendants – Indo-Europeans, primarily identifying these ancient peoples as an ethnic entity. Preliminary analysis of works related to this topic shows that most scholars use the terms “Indo-European ethnic group

and its Proto-language” (A. G. Cherednichenko). We agree with one of the most cited definitions of the term “ethnos” proposed by J. V. Bromley, who understands this concept as “a historically formed set of people with common, relatively stable features of culture (including language) and psyche in a given area, and with awareness of its unity and difference from other similar formations” (Бромлей, 1973: 57–58). In Indo-European linguistic studies (L. L. Zaliznyak, T. V. Gamkrelidze), the main topic was the localization of Indo-Europeans and the search for their ancestral homeland (territory of residence and subsequent migrations). Reconstruction of the language of the Indo-European people based on a preserved register of words in modern Indo-European languages (they denote household items, geographical objects, the political and social structure of society, traditions, cultural, spiritual, religious artefacts and concepts) reflect their ethnic consciousness (Люзова, 2006). It was the main task of classical linguo-comparative studies and Indo-European studies in the XIX-th century.

The term “Indo-European ethnos” is defined as a set of people who had their own language, the primary centre of their localization and subsequent hypothetical territory of residence. It was a place where traditions and culture were formed, and hence the ethnic primary consciousness, including the primary ideas of truth, good, beauty, benefit and their cognition, understanding.

A. G. Cherednichenko argues that, despite the fragmentation of Indo-European speech (common ancestral language) into dialects as a reasonably early phenomenon, there is no doubt the fact of its former actual existence, as well as the ethnos of its speakers (Чередниченко, 2014–2015: 8). Many researchers of mythological thinking assert (M. M. Makovsky, V. N. Toporov, N. I. Tolstoy) that it is a ritual, taboos, and other forms of social life were aimed at realizing the benefits and harms for each of its members. Directly in line with magical thinking, the primary meanings were developed. They became the predecessors of the extensive lexical and semantic system of Indo-European languages in the later stages of evolution. In their cosmological concepts, the mythological prototype is interpreted through a combination of macrocosm and microcosm, reaching the foundations of good and evil, entropy and harmony, life and death. Such theses give grounds to say that the word’s primary meaning is a unique source for evidence of the syncretism of the idea and name (Тищенко, 2000). We agree with the researcher, who considers that in archaic ritual systems, the same ritual is performed and at the same time is described by the verbal magic formula of the word-sign and the

thing denoted by this word. Thus, the mythological understanding and comprehension of nature and its symbolism were reflected in the ancient magical formulas, which were formed into words in the process of cultural development.

As the speech was identified with the word in Indo-European languages, this is how the primary meanings were formed. They reflected the ideas of ancient people about the objects of existence. While analysing the mythological thinking and symbolism of the Indo-European cult, there is a confirmed assumption that they correlated the same things with different objects, and the same action caused associations with different actions and related objects in their minds. The word becomes a generic (syncretic) name of a set of objects connected by semantic associations. Therefore, the mythopoetic interpretation of the word has its own specificity. There is a hypothesis that language arose in ritual, a system of actions performed in a strictly established order, in the traditional way and at a particular time and is the primary mechanism of collective memory, which largely determines human life (Маслова, 2001: 40). Ritual is an essential means of maintaining the standard norms and values of the people because the complex ritual system is associated with symbol, imitation and perception and is based on the dominant aspects of the human psyche (see *ibid.*).

Defending the ritual origin of language, O. V. Tishchenko says that “ritual was the original locus in which the formation of language as a sign system, the combination of the signified with the signified. Ritual activity became the basis for the emergence of a visual, figurative type of thinking” (Тищенко, 2000: 26]. The researcher is convinced that this approach allows us to consider a system of cosmogonic archaic ideas through the prism of verbalized experience, which reflects the results of human cognitive activity.

Also, most symbols had several meanings because they expressed ideas designed to perform different semantic loads and, mainly, opposite meanings. Thus, like the symbol, the same Indo-European root could express opposite meanings (Tresidder, 2001: 6), which is reflected in the ambivalent nature of the value concepts TRUTH, GOOD, BEAUTY and BENEFIT. These value concepts are the core of the axioconceptospheres of each ethnic group, including Indo-Europeans.

For that, we should consider the primary semantics of the value meanings of Indo-Europeans, reflected in the diachronic layer of the concepts TRUTH, GOOD, BEAUTY, BENEFIT, which were their ethnic constants as products of syncretic mythological

consciousness. To do this, it is necessary to turn to mythology, the image of the first man and the primary meanings, in the creation of Heaven-Father and Earth-Mother participated. Reconstruction of the name of the mythoconcept (lexeme) Heaven has Indo-European origin ***ham-/*kem-** with the meaning “cover”, and was associated in Indo-Europeans with “generating (impregnating)” origin (Левицкий, 2010).

While the Earth from Indo-Europeans root ***grind-/grand-/grund-** “grind”, ***grendan-/grunduz-** “soil”, “grain”, “earth” (Левицкий, 2010: 227), symbolically has meaning “fertilizing (impregnating) seeds with birth”. The source of the semantic motivation of the divine pair Heaven and Earth is the rain that gives life, purifies, the lightning that accompanies it, or the blow of a meteorite. In the Etymological dictionary of Germanic Languages the author gives a convincing etymology of Heaven (from Indo-European roots ***himin-/himina-**), as a place from which stones (meteorites) fall (Левицкий, 2010: 263). This union was the beginning of life in the Universe and the birth of man.

Subsequently, the Earth was detached from Heaven, which is traced in Indo-European Proto-Language in the meaning “cut, dissect” (Indo-European roots ***ger-/ker-**), which turned into a semantic dyad “top-bottom” (***ger-/ker-** top, ***ned-** bottom). Since movements and actions accompanied by gestures (raising hands, bending the body to the bottom), the act of tearing and dissection, which resorted to the participants of the ritual action, were in the centre of the mythological ritual action as a semiotic system, this cult was the basis of many Indo-European roots and Proto-Forms.

While researching the etymology of the name of the concept TRUTH (lexeme *truth*), we find correlative reflexes with the symbolism of Heaven and derivative-genetic relations with the lexeme *tree* (the model of the World Tree), which reaches Indo-European root ***tris**. For a long time in many cultural traditions, the world model was determined by the mythological image of the World Tree. It served as a model for the transition from chaos to an ordered world, as the central axis of the world that connected Heaven and Earth, the cycles of life and death, the mysterious laws of existence. The World Tree is a metaphorical model of the harmonious combination of the Universe and man. In turn, Indo-European form ***tris** reaches the root ***drew-o**, which is a suffixal formation from the Indo-European roots ***deru, *dreu-** with the meaning “to be firm, stable”, as well as “harmony, order”. These previous observations on the symbolism of the origins of the lexeme *truth* give grounds to assume that its internal form was based on the ideas about the image of the tree, because a well-rooted tree is strong, steadfast, stable and robust.

In Indo-European culture, stability and faith were associated with the oak, around which the ritual of sacrifice and other sacred magical acts took place. It was considered a sacred tree associated with the centre.

The common origin of “stability, firmness, steadfastness, faith and trust” is preserved in semantic structure of the lexeme *trust*. It gives grounds to speak of *truth* as such, which is based on a convincing and firm belief in something.

The primary semantization of the concept GOOD and the etymology of its name indicate that the lexeme *good* comes from Indo-European roots ***ghedh-**, which had the original meaning “to unite, to be united”, “to bind”, “to be associated” (Humble), ***ghu-to, *ghut-** “something which is summoned”, “someone who is summoned in a ritual to perform a miracle”, as well as Indo-European root ***gheu (e)** – “to call, to beg”, “a sacrificial animal brought to the deity”. Symbolically, the primary meaning of these roots can be described as a “divine being called to the sacrifice” (<https://www.etymonline.com/search?q=god>).

The original semantics of “to summon a deity” of mentioned Indo-European roots has connections with the sensory notion of “supernatural creation”, “deity”, which is caused in the ritual to perform a miracle, a wonder, which later meant “God” (derivative ***guda-**) in Proto-Germanic variant (Левицкий, 2010: 247). These versions indicate a specific cognitive formula, which reflects the idea of Indo-Europeans about the need for collective survival – unity for such joint actions as harvesting, hunting, warfare. Etymological versions reflect the idea of uniting strong, worthy and faithful men to perform a collective ritual of offering gifts to God for good weather, harvest and other material goods.

Analysis of the register word *beauty* (value concept BEAUTY) shows that it has Indo-European origin from a diminutive form ***dwenelo-**, the Indo-European root ***deu-2** with meaning “to do, perform”, “show support, respect”, “worship, respect”, “mighty, powerful” (Online Etymology Dictionary). We assume that it was associated with the ritual acts of sacrifice and was reduced to the primary meanings of “be on fire”, “to burn” and Indo-European roots ***dau-/*du-** with the meaning “shine, sparkle”. The ritual of sacrifice caused the performers to feel joy and satisfaction and hope for further protection and expectation of miracles from divine power. Cult rituals and ceremonies were somehow connected with fire, burning of the sacrificial animal, which found its reflection in the first meaning “be on fire”, “to burn”, as well as the meanings “shine, sparkle” of Indo-European root ***dau -/*du-**.

One more meaning of the mentioned roots is “pretty”, “fine, handsome”. Lexeme *beauty* also reaches Indo-European root **deiuo-* with the meanings “daylight sky”, “heavenly”, “God”. Indo-European root **dyeu-* in the mentioned meanings is reconstructed for the Sanskrit word *deva* “god”. We also assume that the words connected with the divine sphere were formed employing this root, among them are deity, deific, divine, deism. Analyzed etymological versions indicate that the Indo-Europeans associated the idea of beauty with the outside aspects of the objects, as well as with the appearance of human beings, which reflected the inner emotional state in the process of worship of gods, contemplation of celestial phenomena and feeling of pleasure and happiness from it. It is here that we can find the primary semantic connections with beauty as “aesthetic beauty”.

The lexeme *benefit* (the value concept BENEFIT) also reaches Indo-European **d-*roots, specifically suffixal (adverbial) form **dwenelo-* “do, perform”, “demonstrate support, respect” and Indo-European roots **dhe-*, **deu-* (2) in the sense of “put”, “do”, “perform”; “respect, worship” (Online Etymology Dictionary). Based on the Indo-European syncretic

meanings of “do, create”, we can assume that it was a question of human performance of good, kind, useful and beneficial actions. The presented etymological versions make it possible to reconstruct the primary meanings as pleasure from good deeds done, perfect rituals and, consequently, receiving material benefits and gifts from higher divine forces.

Conclusions. Language serves as a means of accumulating and storing culturally significant information. In some units, this information is implicit for a modern native speaker, hidden by age-old transformations, and can be indirectly extracted. A cultural linguist must apply some special techniques to extract cultural information embedded in linguistic signs (Маслова, 2001). The primary value thinking of Indo-Europeans about *good* indicate the idea of union between themselves and the deity to know the *truth* to enjoy the material and later spiritual benefits embodied in the concept of *benefit*. In the primary Indo-European **d-*roots recorded the idea of the Indo-European community about *beauty*, which was formed in the process of worshipping higher powers and observation, which was accompanied by a sense of harmony and happiness.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Аракелова А. Р. Лингвоаксиологические характеристики современного англоязычного дискурса моды : дисс. ... канд. филол. наук : 10.02.04. Пятигорск, 2017. 222 с.
2. Бромлей Ю. В. Этнос и этнография : научная монография. Москва : Наука, 1973. 285 с.
3. Вендина Т. И. Этнолингвистика, аксиология и словообразование. *Слово и культура. Памяти Н. И. Толстого*. Москва : Индрик, 1998. Т. 1. С. 39–48.
4. Гамкрелидзе Т. В. Индоевропейский язык и индоевропейцы: в 2 т. Тбилиси : Издательство Тбилисского университета, 1984. Т. 1–2.
5. Карасик В. И. Языковой круг: личность, концепты, дискурс. Москва : Гнозис, 2004. 389 с.
6. Левицкий В. В. Этимологический словарь германских языков. Винница : Нова Книга, 2010. Т. 1. 616 с.; Т. 2. 368 с.
7. Лозова О. М. Психосемантика етнічної свідомості: проблеми й тенденції розвитку. *Науковий вісник кафедри ЮНЕСКО*. 2006. № 12. С. 162–168.
8. Маковский М. М. Лингвистическая генетика. Проблемы онтогенеза слова в индоевропейских языках. Москва : Издательство ЛКИ, 2007. 208 с.
9. Маслова В. А. Лингвокультурология : учебное пособие для студентов вузов. Москва : Academia, 2001. 208 с.
10. Стефанова Н. О. Етносеміотрична параметризація аксіоконцептосфер у британській та українській лінгвокультурах : дис. ... докт. филол. наук : 10.02.17, 10.02.21. Київ, 2020. 564 с.
11. Тищенко О. В. Обрядова семантика у слов'янському мовному просторі : монографія. Київ : Київський державний лінгвістичний університет, 2000. 236 с.
12. Толстой Н. И. Проблема реконструкции древнеславянской духовной культуры. *Язык и народная культура. Очерки по славянской мифологии и этнолингвистике*. Москва, 1995. С. 41–60.
13. Топоров В. Н. Исследования по этимологии и семантике: в 2-х т. Индоевропейские языки и индоевропейская. Москва : Языки славянских культур, 2006. Т. 2. 544 с.
14. Чередниченко А. Г. О религии древних индоевропейцев (по итогам анализа лексико-семантического поля «религия» раннего индоевропейского праязыка). *Древности*. 2014–2015. Вып. 13. С. 8–18. URL: http://nbuv.gov.ua/UJRN/drev_2014-2015_13_3.
15. Online Etymology Dictionary. URL: <https://www.etymonline.com/>.
16. Tresidder, J. The complete Dictionary of Symbols. San Francisco : Chronicle Books. 544 p.

REFERENCES

1. Arakelova, A. R. Lingvoaksilogicheskie harakteristiki sovremennogo angloyazychnogo diskursa mody [Linguoaxiological characteristics of modern English-language fashion discourse] : diss. ... kand. filol. Nauk : 10.02.04. Pyatigorsk, 2017. 222 p. [in Russian]

2. Bromlej, Yu. V. Etnos i etnografiya : nauchnaya monografiya [Ethnicity and ethnography: scientific monograph]. Moskva : Nauka, 1973. 285 p. [in Russian]
3. Vendina, T. I. Etnolingvistika, aksiologiya i slovoobrazovanie [Ethnolinguistics, axiology and word-formation]. *Slovo i kul'tura. Pamyati N. I. Tolstogo*. Moskva : Indrik, 1998. T. 1. P. 39–48. [in Russian]
4. Gamkrelidze, T. V. Indoevropskij yazyk i indoevropejcy [Indo-European language and Indo-Europeans]: v 2 t. Tbilisi : Izd-vo Tbilisskogo un-ta, 1984. T. 1–2. [in Russian]
5. Karasik, V. I. Yazykovoj krug: lichnost', koncepty, diskurs [Linguistic scope: personality, concepts, discourse]. Moskva : Gnozis, 2004. 389 p. [in Russian]
6. Levickij, V. V. Etimologicheskij slovar' germanskih yazykov [An etymological dictionary of Germanic Languages]. Vinnica : Nova Kniga, 2010. T. 1. 616 s.; T. 2. 368 p.
7. Lozova, O. M. Psykhosemantyka etnichnoi svidomosti: problemy y tendentsii rozvytku [Psychosemantics of ethnic consciousness: problems and development trends]. *Naukovyi visnyk kafedry YuNESKO*. 2006. № 12. P. 162–168. [in Ukrainian]
8. Makovskij, M. M. Lingvisticheskaya genetika. Problemy ontogeneza slova v indoevropskikh yazykah [Linguistic genetics. Problems of ontogeny of words in Indo-European languages]. Moskva : Izdatel'stvo LKI, 2007. 208 p. [in Russian]
9. Maslova, V. A. Lingvokul'turologiya : uchebnoe posobie dlya studentov vuzov [Linguoculturology: a textbook for university students]. Moskva : Academia, 2001. 208 p. [in Russian]
10. Stefanova, N. O. Etnosemiometrychna parametryzatsiia aksiokontseptosfer u brytanskii ta ukrainskii linhvokulturakh [Ethnosemiometric parameterization of axioconceptospheres in British and Ukrainian linguistic cultures] : dys. ... dokt. filol. nauk : 10.02.17, 10.02.21. Kyiv, 2020. 564 p. [in Ukrainian]
11. Tyshchenko, O. V. Obriadova semantyka u slovianskomu movnomu prostori : monohrafiia [Ritual semantics in the Slavic language domain]. Kyiv : Kyivskiy derzhavnyi linhvistychnyi universytet, 2000. 236 p. [in Ukrainian]
12. Tolstoj, N. I. Problema rekonstrukcii drevneslavjanskoj duhovnoj kul'tury. *Yazyk i narodnaya kul'tura. Ocherki po slavyanskoj mifologii i etnolingvistike* [Problems of reconstruction of Old Slavonic spiritual culture. The language and folk culture]. Moskva, 1995. P. 41–60. [in Russian]
13. Toporov, V. N. Issledovaniya po etimologii i semantike [Researches in etymology and semantics]: v 2 t. *Indoevropskie yazyki i indoevropistika*. Moskva : Yazyki slavyanskih kul'tur, 2006. T. 2. 544 p. [in Russian]
14. Cherednichenko, A. G. O religii drevnih indoevropejcev (po itogam analiza leksiko-semanticheskogo polya "religiya" rannego indoevropskogo prayazyka) [On the religion of the ancient Indo-Europeans (based on the analysis of the lexical and semantic field "religion" of the early Indo-European Proto-Language)]. *Drevnosti*. 2014–2015. V. 13. P. 8–18.
15. Online Etymology Dictionary. URL: <https://www.etymonline.com/>.
16. Tresidder, J. The complete Dictionary of Symbols. San Francisco : Chronicle Books. 544 p.