

Possibly Oriental elements in Slavonic folklore. *Kłobuk*

Kamil Stachowski, Olaf Stachowski*
(Kraków)

Abstract: The paper discusses a mythical creature known in Polish folklore as *kłobuk*, how it got its name, the Slavonic background of the word, and its relation to Turkic *kalbuk*. Usually, the Slavonic word is derived from Turkic; phonetic problems are sometimes mentioned but they do not tend to be viewed as critical. The present paper approaches this established etymology with more reservation and concludes that both Slavistic and Turkological work is necessary in order to connect the two words with an acceptable degree of probability.

Keywords: Slavonic, Turkic, etymology, folklore, mythology.

Özet: Bu yazıda Polonya folkloründe *kłobuk* olarak bilinen mitolojik bir varlık tartışılmakta, bu ismin nasıl alındığı, sözcüğün Slav dillerindeki tabanı ve Türkçe *kalbuk* ile bağı değerlendirilmektedir. Esasen Slav dillerindeki sözcük Türkçeden kaynaklanmaktadır. Bazen fonetik sorunlardan bahsedilirse de bu eleştirel olarak görülme eğiliminde değildir. Mevcut makale varolan etimolojiye kuşku ile yaklaşır ve hem Slavistiğe hem de Türkolojiye ait çalışmaların kabul edilebilir derecede bir olasılıkla iki kelimenin ilişkilendirilmesi için gerekli olduğu sonucuna varır.

Anahtar sözcükler: Slav dilleri, Türk dilleri, etimoloji, folklor, mitoloji.

1 Introduction

The present paper discusses a mythical creature, its name, and the word that became its name. The creature is a domestic spirit of Polish folklore,

* Jagiellonian University, Kraków; Kamil Stachowski, kamil.stachowski@gmail.com; Olaf Stachowski, olstach@gmail.com.

the name is *kłobuk*, and it is thought to be of Turkic origin, stemming from the same source as later *kołpak*.

The entire complex is moderately tangled. We will not provide a complete, ready etymology; in fact we will speak against the one that is commonly accepted, and offer nothing to replace it. We will present the current ethnographic and linguistic situation, summarize the state of research, and add some commentary and new ideas to it.

Several researchers were more or less directly involved in the writing of this paper. In particular, we want to express our gratitude to Prof. Anna Tyrpa and Prof. Barbara Grabka of the Institute of the Polish Language of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow for their cordial help and allowing us access to the library and unpublished materials for *Słownik gwar polskich* (SGP), and to Vít Boček, PhD, of the Academy of Sciences of the Czech Republic for Slavistic consultation. Needless to say, all remaining errors are ours alone.

2 Ethnography

It is a widely known fact that there are virtually no written sources concerning the Slavonic religion; all proposals of the possible source idea and historical transformations of the *kłobuk* belief complex are for this reason performed based on its 19th century folklore records, which may be safely assumed to not represent the original pre-Christian belief stratum faithfully. This short presentation of the topic should then be considered more as a descriptive analysis of the case as it appears in texts extant today than a true explanation because of our lack of any considerable proof.

The *kłobuk* is believed to be primarily a household spirit whose chief function is to bring wealth to his human patron, acquired usually through theft (Toeppen, 1867, p. 36). Its appearance is said to be that of an animal, a human child or a will-o'-the-wisp. The animal forms attributed to the *kłobuk* are mostly those of birds, namely a black hen, goose, crow, owl, magpie and duck; besides, the spirit may appear as a black cat. Those

forms seem to point to the nature of the spirit as understood in its original context as chthonic; waterfowl has been linked with the Underworld in the Slavonic religion, because as fire was seen as essentially solar and thus the domain of ouranic gods, so water has been seen as primarily connected to the Lower World and the domain of Veles. (Szyjewski, 2003, pp. 63, and 78) The use of a black hen in traditional Slavonic folk magic is well known, likewise the connection of the owl to various demonic beings. The dark colour of the animal, as well as the owl and cat forms underscore the nocturnal characteristic. The function of the spirit as a wealth-giver and mischievous trickster seems to support this interpretation. The way a *kłobuk* is said to interact with humans has led some researchers to speculate about its possible connection to the concept of a shamanic guardian spirit (Szyjewski, 2003, p. 154). Considering the scarce resources concerning the pre-Christian religion of the Slavonic peoples it seems to be quite a far-fetched hypothesis; the discussion on possible shamanic elements in the pre-Christian Slavonic religion has not been settled satisfactorily and probably will not be unless new discoveries are made and shed some light on the topic that is currently dominated by sheer speculation.

The informants describing the spirit as appearing in human or human-like form have variously described it as a child, a child-sized adult or a dwarf (Toeppen, 1867). The appearance of a will-o'-the-wisp, a floating flame or a fireball are much rarer in extant descriptions; it is however notable that sometimes a tail of flame is mentioned when talking about the *kłobuk* as seen when flying in the form of a bird.

It is believed that one may 'gain' a *kłobuk* for him or herself by inviting a wet animal of the aforementioned kinds indoors during a rainy night and giving it food and a comfortable place to sleep. The next day some money or a pile of grain may be found in the place the animal rested, signifying it having been a *kłobuk* who had taken its zoomorphic form. The spirit is believed to later return to the house where it was treated well, and if the homeowner leaves for it a place in the house (usually a barrel filled with soft textiles or a place in the attic) and regularly leaves

offerings of food (scrambled eggs and wheat noodles are considered most appropriate), the spirit is said to settle at its human patron's house and work for him, stealing grain and precious items from the host's neighbours. It is believed that while the spirit is not essentially malicious, it is however easy to offend; to which it reacts by taking the homeowner's possessions and leaving forever or sometimes even setting fire to the household. (Toeppen, 1867.)

An alternative and highly interesting from the scholarly point of view way to gain a *kłobuk* is to 'grow' it on one's own by burying a stillborn child or fetus under the threshold of the house. The child, representing all the potential of its unrealized life (Szyjewski, 2003, p. 195) manifests under such circumstances as a *kłobuk* bound to the house and its owners. This mythological complex tells much about the older strata of the belief, linking it to protective and wealth-giving household spirits connected to the family, such as the Roman *lares familiares*, Anglo-Saxon hobgoblin, Lithuanian *aitvaras* and other similar beings extant in the religions of the Indo-European peoples. This correlation could signify that the belief in the *kłobuk* may be the last link in the undocumented chain growing ultimately out of the PIE religion, and therefore controverting the hypothesis of the belief being of Turkic origin. The other interesting aspect of that mythologem is its connection to a wider archetype of protective ancestral spirits which have been buried under or around the house, being possibly one of the most primordial myths connected with human settling and urbanization, documented as early as in Jericho's cult of skulls (Tubb, 1998).

The belief in the *kłobuk* being widespread in Warmia and Masuria, protective means have been devised to banish the spirit when it is thought to come to steal one's possessions; the most common one, unsurprisingly, is making the sign of the cross. (Toeppen, 1867, pp. 38f) The second most common apotropaic gesture seems to point to a pre-Christian layer of folk belief, consisting of showing the spirit one's naked bottom. It is not quite clear if it is the showing of the buttocks or the genitals that is crucial; however the belief complex of the genitals having antidemonic powers

because of their status as a natural symbol of fertility and creative power in general is well-known in anthropological literature under the name of *anasyrma*. The sign of the cross may also have been made on haystacks, piles of grain and in general all precious objects that were feared to be stolen by a *kłobuk* – and that usually was when a neighbor has rapidly gained wealth.

As has been already stated, similar creatures are present in Central European folklore also outside of Warmia and Masuria or Slavonic countries at large; similarity of ideas allowing the mixing and conflation of particular legendary accounts and secondary characteristics of the spirit such as specific forms in which it appears. Such a relationship may exist between the *kłobuk* and the German *kobold*, which we are now going to describe briefly. The *kobold* seems to be similar to the *kłobuk* in certain important respects, which, in scope of the history of the region, may suggest a conflation of previously separate folkloric traditions of Warmia and Masuria and Prussia. The region alternated between periods of Prussian and Polish rule between mid-15th and mid-17th century, and remained effectively Prussian until 1945; the cultural influence of German settlers began in early 13th century and has always remained strong. It has been noted that folklore ideas and beliefs have mixed in different regions of Prussia because of the introduction of a nation-wide compulsory conscription after the country's defeat in the Napoleonic Wars (Błażewicz, 2014).

The *kobold* is a spirit showing itself as a child, a small person or a will-o'-the-wisp; living in households or at other places frequented by humans, such as mines and ships; helping in chores or bringing money in exchange for care and food offerings being left in certain places. Ashliman writes: "Should someone take pity on a *kobold* in the form of a cold, wet creature and take it inside to warm it, the spirit takes up residence there" (2006, p. 46). It has also been proposed that the *kobold* may be a later derivative of the reconstructed concept of *kofewalt*, a spirit having power over a room in the house (Dowden, 2000, p. 229). The similarities seem essential enough to allow for a conflation of the original belief complex of a variety

of different household spirits of protective or mischievous nature in the Slavonic folk religion with the more specified kobold, which is the obvious reference point for describing the *kłobuk* for Toeppen, who openly equates these terms (Toeppen, 1867). Such a process may have resulted in the *kłobuk* being described much more like the German kobold than similar spirits in other regions of Poland or Slavonic countries at large, appearances shifting more quickly than specific ritual technologies (such as the mentioned creation of the *kłobuk* from a stillborn child buried under the threshold or the means of banishing it by *anasyrma*) which usually reflect more ancient worldviews, as is the case for example with Pagan ritual structures being adapted into European Christianity in the Middle Ages. If such a process took place, it would invalidate the hypothesis of the *kłobuk* being of Turkic origin, as proposed by Brückner [1927] and later repeated in many ethnological studies; rather, we would suggest seeing it as a Germanized form of a native Slavonic belief.

3 Etymology

When looked at from afar, the etymology of *kłobuk* appears to be essentially established; Dźwigoł (2004: 19) says simply

Stara, może już prasłowiańska pożyczka orientalna, zapewne jakiejś **kalbuk*, jest źródłem wyrazu *kłobuk*, nazwy nakrycia głowy, wysokiej spiczastej czapki, kapelusza (Sławski SE II, 257–258). Na Warmii i Mazurach i – rzadziej – sąsiednim Mazowszu *kłobuk* i forma bez metatezy *kolbuk* są synonimami *latańca*, nazwy demona znoszącego gospodarzowi zboże lub pieniądze.¹

and does not return to the question of origin again. But a closer investigation reveals some unclear moments in this etymology. Let us inspect them in more detail.

1 An old, perhaps already Proto-Slavonic Oriental borrowing, probably **kalbuk* or similar, is the source of the word *kłobuk*, the name of a headwear, a tall, pointed cap, hat (Sławski SE II 257–258 [= Sławski, 1958]). In Warmia and Masuria and, less often, in the neighbouring Mazovia, *kłobuk* and the form without metathesis, *kolbuk*, are synonyms for *lataniec*, the name of a demon who brings grain or money to the farmer.

3.1 Pol. *kłobuk*

3.1.1 Pol. *kłobuk* ‘cap, hat’ and ‘a domestic spirit’

The word *kłobuk* ‘a domestic spirit’ has a fairly limited geographic reach. It is only known in Warmia and Masuria, in the vicinity of the city of Olsztyn (for phonetic variants, see SGOWM). The word itself, however, is known throughout the country, only typically with the meaning ‘(a specific kind of) cap or hat’. Other meanings also exist but, except for two, all can be easily reduced to ‘cap, hat’ (see 3.2, and below). The two exceptions are ‘northern goshawk; northern sparrowhawk’, and our ‘domestic spirit’.

Polish etymologists have not paid much attention to this pair, perhaps regarding it as two local innovations without import for the general picture; Boryś (2005) omits the word entirely, Bańkowski (2000) and Brückner [1927] omit these meanings, and it is only Sławski (1958) who mentions them, suggesting that they may also derive from the meaning of ‘headwear’. (In fact, his wording is not entirely clear: “na Mazurach i Warmii *kłobuk* : *kolbuk* oznacza ‘złego ducha, diabła’ [...]; postać *kłobuch* w młp. i śląs. spotyka się też w znaczeniu ‘jastrząb, krogulec’ [...], oba ostatnie znaczenia pochodzą chyba od ‘nakrycia głowy’, por. ros. *kłobúk*, *kłobučók* ‘kapturek nakładany na głowę ptakom myśliwskim, zwłaszcza sokołom’”² – that is to say, depending on whether he regards ‘northern goshawk’ and ‘northern sparrowhawk’ as one or two meanings, the suggestion does or does not also apply to our meaning. Perhaps not, given that Sławski used a comma to separate ‘hawks’ from the justification, and a semicolon to separate them from ‘a domestic spirit’, and only provided a justification for the ‘hawks’.)

Whatever Sławski’s intention, a shift from ‘cap, hat’ to ‘domestic spirit’ is not impossible. *Kłobuk* can mean various kinds of caps and hats,

2 In Warmia and Masuria *kłobuk* : *kolbuk* denotes ‘an evil spirit, devil’ [...]; the shape *kłobuch* in Lesser Poland and Silesia is also found to mean ‘northern goshawk, northern sparrowhawk’ [...], the latter two meanings deriving perhaps from ‘headwear’, cf. Russ. *kłobúk*, *kłobučók* ‘cap put on the heads of birds of prey, especially hawks’

with proportions ranging from those of a *cappello romano* or a mushroom hat, as in the Podhale region, to those of a *capotain* or a top hat, as in the Orthodox Church. Local and historical changes in the semantics of *klobuk* reflect this diversity, and attest to our word's potential to acquire a new meaning based solely on the similarity of physical appearance; e.g. in Polish, there is a 15th century attestation as a *plurale tantum* with the meaning 'bubbles on water; bubbles created during the rain' and a 16th century one for 'the bud of a flower, especially of a rose' (both Sławski, 1958), Brückner [1927] mentions 'bellflowers' for Polish and 'sugarloaf' for Cz. *klobouk*, while ÈSSJa 'blister' for Macedonian and a Russian dialectal phrase *клубук пены* 'high head (of beer)'. Standing perhaps no taller than a pointed hat, even the little kobold may in this light appear like a 'bud' sprouting from the ground.

3.1.2 G *Hödeken* &c.

But there is another possibility which, to our minds, appears to be considerably more plausible. In the German tradition, spirits, and especially kobolds, are sometimes given nicknames, and it is not rare for them to be derived from some characteristic element of the creature's clothing, in particular its hat. We have found more than a dozen of such names: *Heinz Hütlein*, *Hellekeplein*, *Hodeke* ~ *Hödeken* ~ *Hoidike*, *Hopfen* ~ *Hopfenhütel* ~ *Hopfenhütl*, *Hubert Hochhut* ~ *Hubert Huhot* ~ *Huppet Huhot*, *Hutzelmänn*, *Hütchen*, *Langhut*, *Martin Pumphet* ~ *Pumphet*, *Mütchen*, *Rotmütchen*, *Timpehut* (Arrowsmith, 2009, p. 112; Feldmann, 2009, p. 148; Grimm, 1854, p. 476; Hartinger, 2001, p. 5; HdA, s.vv. *Eisenhütlein*, *Hut*, and *Kobold*; Helland, 1906, p. 579; Kapell, 1907, p. 124; Kraft, 2011, p. 130; Laistner, 1894, p. 121; Simrock, 1864, pp. 473f; Wolf, 1843, pp. 570f; Wolf, 1852, p. 65), and maybe also *Eisenhütel*, *Eisenhütlein*, and *Fingerhut* (Arrowsmith, 2009, p. 112; Grimm, 1854, p. 476; HdA, s.v. *Eisenhütlein*, and *Kobold*; Simrock, 1864, p. 474; Wolf, 1852, p. 65).

At least some of those names are tied to specific places: *Heinz Hütlein* to Siegburg (HdA, s.v. *Hut*), *Hodeke* to Hildesheim (Helland, 1906, p. 579), *Hopfenhütel* to Austria (Feldmann, 2009, p. 148), *Hubert Hochhut* ~ *Hubert Huhot* ~ *Huppet Huhot* to Cologne (HdA, s.v. *Hut*; Wolf, 1852, p. 65), *Hödeken* to Hildesheim (HdA, s.v. *Hut*), *Hütchen* to Hildesheim (Helland, 1906, p. 579; HdA, s.v. *Hut*) and Thuringia (HdA, s.v. *Hut*), *Martin Pumphut* to Lusatia and Vogtland (HdA, s.v. *Hut*), *Mützen* to Freiberg (HdA, s.v. *Hut*), and *Rotmützen* to the Low Countries (cf. Kapell, 1907, p. 124; Laistner, 1894, p. 121; Simrock, 1864, p. 473, and Wolf, 1843, pp. 570f). It seems reasonable that such affectionate names would be only given to the local, familiar spirit but unfortunately, we were not able to establish where the other names belong or, more importantly, whether one such name was also in use in East Prussia.

The possibility of a German influence in Warmia and Masuria is a given (see 1). One, probably unnecessary, parallel example is the German word *Kobold* which exists in modern Polish in several phonetic shapes in Warmia and Masuria (*chobold*, *chobut*, *kobold*, *kobut*), in Silesia and Lusatia which also are regions with a long history of strong German influence, and, in singular instances in Mazovia and the Gorce mountains (Dźwigoł, 2004, p. 25).

There is very little we can say about the time of calquing. In general, the word is probably Proto-Slavonic; its earliest attestation in Polish is from 1136, as a surname, and probably in the standard meaning of ‘cap, hat’ (see 3.2). German settlement in Warmia and Masuria begins in the 13th and gains impetus 14th century. In Polish, other meanings of *klobuk* appear in 15th and 16th century literature (see above) but neither is in any way related to ‘domestic spirit’. The earliest Polish attestation of the borrowed G *Kobold* is from 1583 (WDLP). According EM (pp. 34f), kobolds belonged since the 18th century to the standard repertoire of fairy tale tellers and learned literature on curiosities; by the 20th century, they

have all but waned from human memory. The oldest recording of our word that we are aware of comes from the 1835.³

*
**

To sum up, *klobuk* ‘cap, hat’ appears to be a native word in Polish, in the sense that it has been present in it for probably as long as Polish can be considered a separate language (see 3.2). The local, East Prussian semantic shift to ‘domestic spirit’ is a later development, in all likelihood under the influence of such German nicknames for kobolds as *Hütchen*, *Hödekin*, *Mützchen*, &c.

3.2 Slav. **klobukъ* and Ткc. ***kalbuk*

3.2.1 Slav. **klobukъ*

As was mentioned in 3.1, *klobuk* is not just a Polish word; it is in fact common across the entire Slavonic world: Cash. *klobuk* | Cz. *klobouk* | Pol. *klobuk* | Polab. *klüběk* | Slk. *klobúk* | LSorb. *klobyk* | USorb. *klobuk* || Brus. *клябук* | Russ. *клобук* | Ukr. *клобу́к* || Bulg. *клобук* | Mac. *клобук* | SCr. *klòbuk* | Sln. *klobúk*, plus various dialectal shapes such as Bulg.dial. *klambúk*, *klombúk* | Cz.dial. *klobuk*, *koblók* | Pol.dial. *kolbuk*, *klobuch* | Russ.dial. *коблук*, &c. (BER; Bezlaj, 1982; ESJS; ÈSSJa; Gluhak, 1993; Machek, 1957, 1958; Polański, 1971; Rejzek, 2001; SEK; Schuster-Šewc, 1984; Sławski, 1958; Snoj, 1997).

The attestations are essentially as old as can be had: OCS *клобоукъ* | OBulg. *клобоучъць* (1073) | OCz. *klobúk*, *koblúk* | OPol. *klobuk*, *kobluk* | ORuss. *клоубукъ* (1152) (Avanesov, 1991; BER; ÈSSJa; Filin, 1975–; Machek, 1968; SJS; Sławski, 1958; Tenišev, 2001, p. 484), also in

3 Mrongovius (1835): “Kolbuk oder kolbog [...] der Aberglaube in Preuß. Pohlen, z. B bei Ortelsburg (Szczytno) hält ihn für einen Geift der in Gefalt eines fliegenden Drachen feinen Berehrern durch den Schorftein Geld zuträgt; es ist dieses vielleicht der heidnifche Merkur.” — Rykaczewski (1849): “PUCK [...] duch napowietrzny [‘aerial spirit’], kolbuk” — Toeppen (1867, p. 16): “kolbuk (= Kobold)”.

personal names (e.g. Pol. *Kłobuczek* (1136), *Kłobukowic*; Bańkowski, 2000; Cieślíkowa et al., 2000), place names (e.g. Pol. *Kłobuck*,⁴ *Kłobukowice*), and ethnonyms (ORuss. чърнии клобуци for Turkic tribes living in the Black Sea region; see Golden, 1996).

The meanings are a little more diversified; almost universally ‘(a specific kind of) cap or hat’ (including ‘helmet’ in Polish and elsewhere, and in East Slavonic mostly limited to religious or monastic headwear), sometimes ‘bubble on the surface of a liquid’ (e.g. Bulg.dial., Cz., Mac., OPol.; Brückner, [1927]; ÈSSJa; Sławski, 1958), only sporadically ‘bellflower’ (Pol.; Brückner, [1927]), ‘blister’ (Mac.; ÈSSJa), ‘coltsfoot’ (Cash.; Lorentz, 1975), ‘(flower) bud’ (Pol.; ÈSSJa; Sławski, 1958), ‘jellyfish’ (SCr.; Schuster-Šewc, 1984), ‘a measure of grain [a vessel]’ (SCr.dial.; Schuster-Šewc, 1984), ‘rafter’ (Sln.; ÈSSJa), ‘sugarloaf’ (Cz.; Brückner, [1927]; probably a calque of G *Zuckerhut*), ‘the top sheaf on a haystack’ (Pol.dial., Sln.; ÈSSJa, SGP), perhaps also ‘pointed tip’, ‘hillock’, ‘a bend in the terrain’ (see fn. 4), and exceptionally ‘northern goshawk; northern sparrowhawk’ (Pol.dial.; Sławski, 1958; SGP), and ‘a domestic spirit’ (3.1).

Except for the last two, all can be easily reduced to ‘cap, hat’ – either through the shape (‘bellflower’, ‘blister’, ‘coltsfoot’, ‘sugarloaf’, &c.), or through the function (‘rafter’, ‘the top sheaf on a haystack’). For the two ‘hawk’s, a convincing tertium comparationis is provided by Sławski (1958; see fn. 2) and our ‘domestic spirit’ can also be eventually linked to ‘cap, hat’, only through a slightly less direct path (3.1).

4 The name of the town appears in the sources in the 13th century but the settlement is surely older; it had already had a parish church in 1135 (Rospond, 1984). There have been at least four attempts at etymologizing the name; all unanimously link it to *klobuk* but they do not agree on its meaning: Długosz ([1440–80], p. 163) mentions *galea ferrea* (‘a kind of helmet’; *galea* itself was used in various contexts (eLMILP) but the adjective makes the phrase clear), Rymut (1987) derives it from a personal name (which, in Cieślíkowa et al. [2000], he also reduces to ‘a kind of helmet’), while Malec (2003) and Rospond (1984) believe the relevant meanings are ‘pointed tip’, ‘hillock’, and possibly ‘a bend in the terrain’. These last three are particularly interesting because they are not mentioned by any other dictionary we have consulted, and neither Malec nor Rospond specify the source of their knowledge.

Consequently, Slavonic etymologists are quite unanimous in reducing the contemporary forms to PSlav. **klobukъ* ‘headwear’. This, in turn, they almost universally derive from Turkic, either just linking it more or less directly to the attested *kalpak* ‘cap, hat’ (Bezljaj, 1982; Dybo, 2010, p. 24; Fasmer, 1967; Fedotov, 1996; Holub & Kopečný, 1952; Machek, 1957, 1968; Miklosich, 1886; Rejzek, 2001; Šanskij, 1982; Šanskij, Ivanov & Šanskaja, 1971), or deriving it from its supposed protoform ***kalbuk* (BER; Berneker, 1908; ESJS; ÈSSJa; Gluhak, 1993; Menges, 1955, p. 331; Rejzek, 2001; Snoj, 1997; Sławski, 1958; and probably also Bańkowski, 2000; Brückner, [1927]; Polański, 1971; Schuster-Šewc, 1984; and SEK).

The idea appears to have been first put forward by Miklosich (1886). It was criticized by Brandt (1887, p. 35) on phonetic grounds (lack of justification for Tkc. *p* > Slav. *b* and *-ak* > *-uk*), while Schachmatov (1912, pp. 98f) suggested a Celtic mediation between Turkic and Slavonic. The only other propositions that we are aware of are two by A. Matzenauer (one from 1870 (after ESJS), < It. *cappelluccio*, one from 1881 (pp. 172f), < *ko* + *obluk* = OCS облоукъ < облъ ~ обълъ ~ обълъ ‘round’), one by K. Moszyński (1934, p. 677; < G *Kobold*), and just a remark by Rospond (1984, s.v. *Klobuck*), that the word is perhaps in fact native. All of these suggestions are consistently rejected in etymological dictionaries, if they are even mentioned at all. At most, it is acknowledged that the phonetic changes following the borrowing are not entirely clear.

Such an admission is not unjustified. If the original Turkic shape was indeed ***kalbuk* then its adaptation in Proto-Slavonic as **klobukъ* would be rather imaginable; however, if it was different, perhaps closer to the actually existing *kalpak*, then we can see little reason for it to have yielded **klobukъ*, be it during the borrowing or at any later stage.

3.2.2 Slav. and Tkc. *kalpak*

As it happens, the attested Tkc. *kalpak* was later borrowed to one or more Slavonic languages again and resulted, with or without some additional

mediation, in: Cz. *kalpak* (OCz. *kolpat*) | Pol. *kołpak*⁵ (1554) | Slk. *kalpak* (dial. *kolpak*) | LSorb. *kalpak* || Brus. *каўпак* | Russ. *колпак* (ORuss. *калпакъ* ~ *колпакъ*; 15th c.) | Ukr. *ковпак* || Bulg. *калпак* | Mac. *калпак* | SCr. *kàlpak* | Sln. *kàlpak*, &c. (Berneker, 1908; Fasmer, 1967; Sławski, 1958); their meanings ‘tall, pointed hat’ (not quite unlike the one gnomes tend to be depicted with), also ‘headwear’, ‘fur hat’, ‘military hat’, ‘tall hat brimmed with fur’, exceptionally ‘cockscorb’ (Mac.dial.; Sławski, 1958), ‘hubcap’ (modern Pol.), ‘a measure of volume’ (ORuss.; Sławski, 1958), ‘various covers of a shape similar to a hat’ (Russ.; Sławski, 1958), and somewhat surprisingly ‘fool, dunce’ (Russ.; Sławski, 1958), the latter perhaps related in some way to the *dunce cap* of the English-speaking world. The word was also borrowed to several other languages in Asia, and from the Slavonic languages, it spread further into Europe; TMEN (§ 1506) provides a convenient list, but for English see Urban (2015, pp. 116f), for Hungarian cf. also EWU and Zaicz (2006), for Lithuanian Smoczyński (2007), and for Polish fn. 5.

The time of the borrowing was probably 15th–16th century, based on the earliest attestations. This is the period when Oriental style costumes were becoming fashionable in Eastern Europe, a taste that would spread westward across the continent in the following centuries. In 16th and 17th c. Poland *kołpaki* were worn with dresses of a western cut, later with the so-called national costume (*kontusz*, *żupan*; Drążkowska, 2012, p. 287).

Naturally, comparing the phonetic adaptation of a 15th/16th c. borrowing to that of a Proto-Slavonic one is not necessarily justified, but *kołpak* &c. do nonetheless provide a suggestive counterexample. It was already Miklosich (1886) linked it with *kłobuk*, and we suspect some of the later objections to his etymology of *kłobuk* might have been to some degree inspired by *kołpak*.

5 The Polish word is usually derived from Turkic via Russian; see e.g. Sławski (1958) and TMEN (§ 1506) where also further bibliography is listed. However, according to Drążkowska (2012, p. 157), it was Tatars who popularized this particular kind of hat in Poland – and, we may suppose, at the same time a name for it. We want to merely raise a flag here that the point requires a more detailed study not only linguistic but also from the point of view of cultural history.

3.2.3 Turkic ****kalbuk**

Be that as it may, the phonetic difficulties of deriving *klobuk* from **kalpak* did certainly ease the acceptance of ****kalbuk** as the Turkic etymon by Slavonic etymologists. The trouble is that, while Turkic etymologists are not in any way unanimous about the etymology of the word, the one point that they do agree on is that it did not sound ****kalbuk**.

The relevant Turkic forms are: Az. *galpag* | Gag. *kalpak* | Tksh. *kalpak* | Trkm. *galpak* || Bshk., KarBlk, Kar.E, Kirg., Kklp., Kmk., Kzk., Nog. *kalpak*, Kar.SW *kolpak* | Tat. *kalpak*, *kalfak* || Uigh. *kalpak* | Uzb. *qalpâq* || Khak. (Kyzyl) *halbah* | Tuv. *halban* | WYug. «калмак» || Yak. *çalpāk*, *çalpaç* || Chuv. *kalpak* (Ašmarin, [1934]; AzRS; BshkRS; ÈSTJa; GagTS; KarBlkRS; KhakRS; KirgRS; KmkRS; Malov, 1957; NogRS; Pekarskij, 1907–1930; R II 269; SKzkP, s.v. *kuiz*; TatRS; TrkmRS; UjgRS; UzbRS), almost all meaning ‘a kind of hat’ (usually ‘felt’ and ‘pointed’), and only sporadically ‘cap, lid’ (Kzk., Tat. *kalpak*; Eren, 1999; TatRS), ‘hair on a baby’s head (until the first haircut)’ (Trkm.; TrkmRS), ‘lampshade’ (Khak.; KhakRS), or ‘the top of a hat’, ‘sunflower head’ (both Nog.; NogRS). The word is also present in some Mongolic languages, e.g. Klmk. *çalwŋ* (possibly a borrowing from Turkic, see TMEN, § 1506), WMo. *qalban* (both ‘a kind of hat’; KlmkRS, KWb) whence it was borrowed to Tuv. *halban* ‘ear flaps of a hat’ (VEWT). The majority of historical and dialectal attestations are no more diversified, e.g. Chag., Ott. *kalpak* || Tksh.dial. *galpak*, *kalbak*, *kaplak* | Uzb.dial. *qalpâq* (ÈSTJa, R II 269). The word does not feature in DTS or Clauson (1972).

Thus, it is only Ott. *kalabak* and Tksh.dial. *kabalak*, both ‘(felt) cap, hat’ (ÈSTJa, Men 1680), that do not evidently point to a reconstruction of **kalpak*. Perhaps also related, and suggesting a different original sounding, are the several forms with *-u-*: Kklp. *kulpak* ‘payot’, Tksh.dial. *kulpak* ‘hair’, and Trkm. *kulpak* ‘1. children’s uncut hair; 2. pigtailed; 3. inflorescence of maize’ (ÈSTJa; cf. the meaning of Trkm. *galpak* above)

Though it is probably irrelevant for the ultimate origin of our word, we should note that some of the forms above result from later borrowing: Chuv. *kalpak* is probably from Tatar or at any rate not a continuant of the common Turkic form (ÈSTJa, phonetic reasons), Kar.SW *kolpak* is probably from Polish (ÈSTJa, phonetic reasons), Tuv. *halbaŋ* is probably from Mongolic (ÈSTJa, VEWT), and Yak. *çalpāk*, ÈSTJa suggests, is from Russian. We suspect that explaining the long *ā* (Russ. *колпак*) may have been the only reason for this last suggestion but, unmentioned by ÈSTJa, there also exist Yakut shapes with a short *a* (see above) which appear to be a good phonetic match for the general Turkic *kalpak*.

As for the ultimate origin, we are aware of the following propositions (in chronological order):

1. Menges (1955, p. 331) comes closest to ***kalbuk* by separating Slav. *kolpak* and *klobuk* into two independent borrowings, from two different etyma: *kolpak* < **kaly.p.ak* or **kaly.pa.k*, while *klobuk* < **kaly.b.uk*. Apropos the latter he mentions Tar. *qalpuq* ‘lips of horses and sheep; thick lips’ < **kaly.p.uk*. It is not clear what the root **kaly-* would have meant, or exactly why the *-p* would have been voiced in one form and remain voiceless in the other. Other than compatibility with Slav. *klobukъ*, we can see very little reason to postulate the *-uk* suffix when effectively all the attested forms end in *-ak*. In its current shape, this proposition must be considered difficult to defend.
2. Egorov (1964) does not explicitly indicate the ultimate source; he merely asks the reader to compare Ar. *qalbaq* ‘hat, calpac’. Likewise, Fedotov (1996) only refers to Egorov (1964) without clearly stating his own opinion. We hold with TMEN (§ 1506) according to which the borrowing was in the opposite direction.
3. M. Asamutdinova (1969; after ÈSTJa) suggests that the *-lp-* forms are secondary to the original *kaplak*, and that *kalpak* itself was coined from *kapla-* ‘to cover’. L. Levitskaja expands this idea onto Tksh.dial. *kabalak* (ÈSTJa). See below.

4. M. Habičev (1971; after ÈSTJa) derives our word from *kal-* ‘to remain, to stay’. ÈSTJa rightly rejects this idea for semantic and phonetic reasons (Trkm. *kāl-* with a long vowel).
5. AHD (online and the 1992 and 2000 printed versions) explains the Turkic word as a borrowing from MPers. *kulāfak* ‘cap’, diminutive of *kulāf* ‘hat’. Urban (2015, pp. 118f) rightly rejects this idea for phonetic reasons.
6. ÈSTJa does not provide a ready etymology of its own, but it does cite several South-Siberian forms with a similar sounding and meaning ‘broad’, ‘flat’ (Khak., *halbah*, Tof. *halbah*, *kalbak*, Tuv. *kalbak*, and *kalbaj-* ‘to be broad, flat’), and suggests that, together with *kaplak* ‘cap, lid’, they might play a role in explaining our word. This is an interesting idea but the authors themselves admit that more data need to be collected before it can be properly evaluated. It is not impossible that the relation is in fact opposite and that it is ‘broad’ and ‘flat’ that evolved from ‘cap, hat’.
7. Eren (1999) considers the word to be built from *kalp* ‘cap, lid’ (Tksh.dial.; the literary meaning is ‘mold, matrix’; cf. Kzk., Tat. *kalpak* ‘cap, lid’) + *-(a)k* DIMIN. Urban (2015, p. 119) rightly rejects this idea for geographic and historical reasons.
8. Finally, M. Stachowski (KEWT and Urban, 2015, p. 119) suggests that our word goes perhaps ultimately to **kapā* ‘to close, to cover’, whence **kapālak* > *kabalak* > *kalabak* > **kalybak* > *kalpak*. He admits himself, however, that both *kabalak* and *kalabak* are only attested in Anatolia and can hardly be proposed as sources for e.g. Tatar or Uighur forms.

Of the above, only the third and the last proposition appear to be defensible in their current shape (*kapla-* ‘to cover’ and **kapā-* ‘to close, to cover’). They share a common weakness which is that they rely on a very peripheral shape with *-pl-*, attested only in the Turkish provinces of Kütahya (‘a kind of hat’; DS) and Ordu (‘a piece of iron put on the blade of an axe before it becomes completely worn out’; DS), and therefore

must assume that all the other forms across the entire Turkic world are metathetic. Of course, this is not impossible if we assume the metathesis had occurred sufficiently early; then the *-pl-* shapes would be doubly metathetic, perhaps owing to a secondary hypercorrectness which in this case would in fact revert the correct, original shape.

4 Summary and conclusions

Two relatively recent events are fairly certain: **1.** The early modern or modern shift from ‘cap, hat’ to ‘a domestic demon’ in Pol.dial. *klobuk*, under the influence of G *Hütchen* &c. – this conclusion is pointed to both by ethnography (see 2) and by etymology (3.1), and **2.** The late mediaeval or early modern borrowing of Tkc. *kalpak* to, among others, several Eastern European languages from which it later spread westward (3.2.2). For one the specific German nickname remains to be identified, for the other the exact paths of expansion and the precise dates, but the overall schemes of both appear to be satisfactorily clear.

Equally clear, it seems, is that Slav. *klobuk* &c. go back to **klobukъ* (3.2.1), while Tkc. *kalpak* &c. do not (3.2.3). Probably the most problematic is the *u* in the second syllable. It would be maybe easier to explain if the borrowing were from Slavonic to Turkic but this is nearly impossible for geographic and historical reasons. At this point, we should perhaps concede that, tempting as it may be, a connection between the two sets of words is actually quite unlikely in light of what we know about them. It may seem rather frivolous to attribute phonetic similarity, semantic identity, and historical possibility to pure chance, but in our judgment the evidence we currently have does not suffice to show it is anything but.

We would like to leave this topic with one last thought for considering which Slavacists are better equipped than ourselves. On the Slavonic ground, semantic shifts from ‘cap, hat’ to ‘something resembling a hat’ have not been uncommon; perhaps such a shift could also have occurred in the opposite direction and **klobukъ* is in fact native, related to **klobъ*

‘something coiled into a ball’ > ‘skein’ but also ‘withers’, ‘thenar’, and others?

Abbreviations and References

Ar. = Arabic; **Az.** = Azeri; **Brus.** = Belarusian; **Bshk.** = Bashkir; **Bulg.** = Bulgarian; **Cash.** = Cashubian; **Chag.** = Chagatai; **Chuv.** = Chuvash; **CS** = Church Slavonic; **Cz.** = Czech; **dial.** = dialectal; **Gag.** = Gagauz; **G** = German; **IE** = Indo-European; **It.** = Italian; **Kar.E.** = Eastern (Crimean) Karaim; **Kar.SW** = Southwestern (Halych) Karaim; **KarBlk.** = Karachai-Balkar; **Khak.** = Khakas; **Kirg.** = Kirghiz; **Kklp.** = Karakalpak; **Klmk.** = Kalmyk; **Kmk.** = Kumyk; **Kzk.** = Kazakh; **LSorb.** = Lower Sorbian; **M-** = Middle; **Mac.** = Macedonian; **Nog.** = Nogai; **O-** = Old; **Ott.** = Ottoman; **P-** = Proto; **Pers.** = Persian; **Pol.** = Polish; **Polab.** = Polabian; **Russ.** = Russian; **SCr.** = Serbo-Croat; **Slav.** = Slavonic; **Slk.** = Slovak; **Sln.** = Slovene; **Tar.** = Taranchi; **Tat.** = Tatar; **Tkc.** = Turkic; **Tksh.** = Turkish; **Tof.** = Tofalar; **Trkm.** = Turkmen; **Tuv.** = Tuvinian; **USorb.** = Upper Sorbian; **Uigh.** = Uighur; **Ukr.** = Ukrainian; **Uzb.** = Uzbek; **WMo.** = Written Mongolian; **WYug.** = Western Yugur; **Yak.** = Yakut;

AHD = *American Heritage Dictionary* (6th March 2016). Retrieved from <https://www.ahdictionary.com>

Arrowsmith, N. (2009). *Field guide to the little people. A curious journey into the hidden realm of elves, faeries, hobgoblins & other not-so-mythical creatures*. Woodbury

Ashliman, D.L. (2006). *Fairy Lore: A Handbook*. Westport, Connecticut.

Ašmarin, [1934] = Ашмарин, Н.И. (1994). *Словарь чувашского языка. Чăваш сăмахёсен кёнекен* (Vol. 6). Чебоксары. (Original work published 1934)

Avanesov, 1991 = Аванесов Р.И. et al. (Eds.). (1991). *Словарь древнерусского языка (XI—XIV вв.)* (Vol. 4). Москва.

AzRS = Tağıyev, M.T. et al. (2006). *Azərbaycanca–rusca lüğət*. Bakı.

Bańkowski, A. (2000). *Etymologiczny słownik języka polskiego* (Vol. 1). Warszawa.

- BER = Георгиев, В. И. et al. (Eds.). (1979, and 1986). *Български етимологичен речник* (Vol. 2, and 3). София.
- Berneker, E. (1908). *Slavisches etymologisches Wörterbuch* (Vol. 1). Heidelberg.
- Bezljaj, F. (1982). *Etimološki slovar slovenskega jezika* (Vol. 2). Ljubljana.
- Błażewicz, P. (2014) (ed.). *Jakuba Turowskiego Klucz do bardzo ważnych Tajemnic*. (Original work published 1840) (After Toeppen, 2014)
- Boryś, W. (2005). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Kraków.
- Brandt 1887 = Брандт, Р. (1887). Об этимологическом словарѣ Милошича. *Русский филологический вѣстникъ*, 18, 1–40.
- Brückner, A. (1989). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego*. Warszawa. (Original work published 1927)
- BshkRS = Ураксин, З. Г. (Ed.). (1996). *Башкортса-русса һүзлек. Башкирско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- Cieślikowa, A., Szymowa, J., & Rymut, K. (2000). *Słownik etymologiczno-motywacyjny staropolskich nazw osobowych* (Vol. 1). Kraków.
- Clauson, G. (1972). *An Etymological Dictionary of Pre-Thirteenth-Century Turkish*. Oxford.
- Długosz [1440–1480] = Przedziecki, A. (Ed.). (1864). *Joannis Długosz Senioris Canonici Cracoviensis Opera Omnia* (Vol. 9: *Liber Beneficiorum Dioecesis Cracoviensis* (Vol. 3: *Monasteria*)). Cracovia.
- Dowden, K. (2000). *European Paganism: The Realities of Cult from Antiquity to the Middle Ages*. London, New York.
- Drażkowska, A. (2012). *Ozdoby i nakrycia głowy na ziemiach polskich od X do końca XVIII wieku*. Toruń.
- DS = *Türkiye’de Halk Ağzından Derleme Sözlüğü* (Vol. 8). Ankara 1975.
- DTS = Надеяев, В.М., Насилов, Д.М., Тенишев, Э.Р., & Щербак А.М. (1969). *Древнетюркский словарь*. Ленинград.
- Dybo, A. (2010). Bulgars and Slavs: Phonetic Features in Early Loanwords. In E. Mańczak-Wohlfeld, & B. Podolak (Eds.), *Studies on the Turkic World. Festschrift in Honour of Stanisław Stachowski* (pp. 21–40). Kraków.
- Dźwigoł, R. (2004). *Polskie ludowe słownictwo mitologiczne*. Kraków.

- Egorov, 1964 = Егоров, В. Г. (1964). *Этимологический словарь чувашского языка*. Чебоксары.
- eLMILP = *eLexicon Mediae et Infirmae Latinitatis Polonorum* (4th March 2016). Retrieved from <http://scriptores.pl/elexicon>
- EM = Ranke, K., Brednich R.W. et al. (Eds.). (1996). *Enzyklopädie des Märchens. Handwörterbuch zur historischen und vergleichenden Erzählforschung* (Vol. 8). Berlin, New York.
- Eren, H. (1999). *Türk Dilinin Etimolojik Sözlüğü* (2nd ed.). Ankara.
- ESJS = *Etymologický slovník jazyka staroslověnského* (Vol. 6, and 8). Praha 1996, and 1998.
- ÈSSJa = Трубочёв, О.Н. (Ed.). (1983). *Этимологический словарь славянских языков. Праoslavянский лексический фонд*. (Vol. 10). Москва.
- ÈSTJa = Левитская, Л.С., Дыбо, А.В., & Рассадин, В. И. (1997). *Этимологический словарь тюркских языков* (Vol. 5). Москва.
- EWU = Benkő, L. (Ed.). (1993–1994). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Ungarischen*. Budapest.
- Fasmer, 1967 = Фасмер, М. (1967). *Этимологический словарь русского языка* (Vol. 2). Москва.
- Fedotov, 1996 = Федотов, М.Р. (1996). *Этимологический словарь чувашского языка* (Vol. 1). Чебоксары.
- Feldmann, C. (2009). *Von Aschenputtel bis Rotkäppchen. Das Märchen-Entwirrbuch*. Gütersloh.
- Filin, 1975– = Филин, Ф. П. et al. (Eds.). (1975–). *Словарь русского языка XI—XVII вв.*. Москва.
- GagTS = Baskakov, N.A. (Ed.), Gaydarci, G.A., Koltsa, E.K., Pokrovskaya, L.A., & Tukan, B.P. (1991). *Gagauz Türkçesinin Sözlüğü*. (İ. Kaynak, & A.M. Doğru, Trans.). Ankara.
- Gluhak, A. (1993). *Hrvatski etimološki rječnik*. Zagreb.
- Golden, P. (1996). The *Černii Klobouci*. In Á. Berta, B. Brendemoen, & C. Schönig (Eds.), *Symbolae Turcologicae. Studies in Honour of Lars Johanson On his Sixtieth Birthday 8 March 1996* (pp. 97–107). Stockholm.
- Grimm, J. (1854). *Deutsche Mythologie* (3rd ed.). (Vol. 1). Göttingen.

- Hartinger, W. (2001). *Hinterm Spinnrad oder auf dem Besen. Frauen im deutschen Märchen und Hexenglauben*. Opladen.
- HdA = Hoffmann-Krayer, E., & Bächtold-Stäubli, H. (Eds.). (1987). *Handwörterbuch zur deutschen Volkskunde. Abteilung I. Aberglaube*. Berlin, New York. (Original work published 1927–1942)
- Helland, A. (Ed.). (1906). *Topografisk-statistisk beskrivelse over Finmarkens amt* (Vol. 2). Kristiania.
- Holub, J., & Kopečný, F. (1952). *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého*. Praha.
- Kapell, F. (1907). Erdgeistersagen im Selfkant und im Limburg. *Zeitschrift des Vereins für rheinische und westfälische Volkskunde*, 4, 123–128.
- KarBlkRS = Тенишев, Э.Р., & Суюнчев, Х.И. (Eds.). (1989). *Къарачай-малкъар-орус сѣзлюк. Карачаево-балкарско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- KEWT = Stachowski, M. (2016). *Kurzgefaßtes etymologisches Wörterbuch der türkischen Sprache*. Manuscript in preparation.
- KhakRS = Баскаков, Н.А., & Инкижекова-Грекул, А.И. (1953). *Хакасско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- KirgRS = Юдахин, К.К. (1985). *Киргизско-русский словарь. Кыргызча-орусча сөздүк*. Фрунзе.
- KlmkRS = Муниев, Б.Д. (1977). *Хальмг-орс толь. Калмыцко-Русский словарь*. Москва.
- KmkRS = Бамматов, З.З. (Ed.). (1969). *Кумыкско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- Kraft, M. (2011). *Märchenhaft und mörderisch. Ehealltag im Märchen*. Göttingen.
- KWb = Ramstedt, G.J. (1935). *Kalmückisches Wörterbuch*. Helsinki.
- Laistner, L. (1894). Der germanische Orendel. *Zeitschrift für deutsches Altertum und deutsche Litteratur*, 38, 113–135.
- Lorentz, F. (1975). *Pomorantisches Wörterbuch* (Vol. 4). Berlin.
- Machek, V. (1957). *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského*. Praha.
- Machek, V. (1968). *Etymologický slovník jazyka českého a slovenského* (2nd ed.). Praha.

- Malec, M. (2003). *Słownik etymologiczny nazw geograficznych Polski*. Warszawa.
- Malov, 1957 = Малов, С.Е. (1957). *Язык Желтых уйгуров. Словарь и грамматика*. Алма-Ата.
- Men 1680 = à Mesgnien Meninski, F. (1680). *Thesaurus linguarum orientalium turcicae, arabicae, persicae ...* Vienna.
- Menges, K. (1955). Altajische Lehnwörter im Slavischen. *Zeitschrift für Slavische Philologie*, 23(2), 327–334.
- Miklosich, F. (1886). *Etymologisches Wörterbuch der slavischen Sprachen*. Wien.
- Moszyński, K. et al. (1934–1936). *Atlas kultury ludowej w Polsce*. Kraków.
- Mrongovius, C.C. (1835). *Dokładny Słownik Polsko-Niemiecki. Ausführliches Polnisch-Deutsches Wörterbuch*. Königsberg in Preußen.
- NogRS = Баскаков, Н.А. (Ed.). (1963). *Ногайско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- Peкарский, 1907–1930 = Пекарский, Э.К. (1907–1930). *Словарь якутского языка*, Санкт-Петербург – Петроград – Ленинград.
- Podhajecka, M. (2016). Erazm Rykaczewski's *A Complete Dictionary English and Polish ...* (1849): Uncovering the Compilation Process. *International Journal of Lexicography*, 29(1), 1–30.
- Polański, K. (1971). *Słownik etymologiczny języka Drzewian połabskich* (Vol. 2). Ossolineum.
- R = Радлов, В.В. (1899). *Опыт словаря тюркских наречий. Versuch eines Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte* (Vol. 2/1). Санкт-Петербург.
- Rejzek, J. (2001). *Český etymologický slovník*. Leda.
- Rospond, S. (1984). *Słownik etymologiczny miast i gmin PRL*. Ossolineum.
- [Rykaczewski, E.]⁶ (1849). *Dokładny słownik angielsko polski. A complete dictionary English and Polish and Polish and English ...* Berlin.
- Rymut, K. (1987). *Nazwy miast Polski* (2nd ed.). Ossolineum.
- Šanskij, 1982 = Шанский, Н.М. (1982). *Этимологический словарь русского языка* (Vol. 2). Москва.

6 The name of the author is not given on the title pages but cf. Podhajecka (2016).

- Šanskij, Ivanov, & Šanskaja, 1971 = Шанский, Н.М., Иванов, В.В., & Шанская Т.В. (1971). *Краткий этимологический словарь русского языка. Пособие для учителя* (2nd ed.). Москва.
- Schachmatov, A. (1912). Zu den ältesten slavisch-keltischen Beziehungen. *Archiv für Slavische Philologie*, 33, 51–99.
- Schuster-Šewc, H. (1984). *Historisch-etymologisches Wörterbuch der ober- und niedersorbischen Sprache* (Vol. 2). Bautzen.
- SEK = Boryś W., & Popowska-Taborska H. (1999). *Słownik etymologiczny kaszubszczyzny* (Vol. 3). Warszawa.
- SGOWM = Stamirowska Z., & Perzowa H. (Eds.). (1987–). *Słownik gwar Ostródzkiego, Warmii i Mazur*. Ossolineum.
- SGP = unpublished files for Karaś, M., Reichan, J., Okoniowa, J. et al. (Eds.). *Słownik gwar polskich*, courtesy of the Institute of the Polish Language of the Polish Academy of Sciences in Cracow.
- Simrock, K. (1864). *Handbuch der Deutschen Mythologie mit Einschluß der nordischen*. Bonn.
- SJS = *Slovník jazyka staroslověnského. Lexicon linguae palaeoslovenicae* (Vol. 2). Санкт-Петербург 2006. (Original work published Praha 1973)
- SKzKP = Aqtay, G., & Jankowski, H. (2011). *Słownik kazachsko-polski*. Kraków.
- Smoczyński, W. (2007). *Słownik etymologiczny języka litewskiego*. Wilno.
- Snoj, M. (1997). *Slovenski etimološki slovar*. Ljubljana.
- Sławski, F. (1958). *Słownik etymologiczny języka polskiego* (Vol. 2/1(6)). Kraków.
- Szyjewski, A. (2003). *Religia Słowian*. Kraków.
- TatRS = Асылгараев, Ш.Н., Ганиев, Ф.А., Закиев, М.З., Миннуллин, К.М., & Рамазанова, Д.Б. (Eds.). (2007). *Татарско-русский словарь. Татарча-русча сүзлек*. Казань.
- Tenišev, 2001 = Тенишев, Э.Р. (Ed.). (2001). *Сравнительно-историческая грамматика тюркских языков. Лексика* (2nd ed.). Москва.
- TMEN = Doerfer, G. (1967). *Türkische und mongolische Elemente im Neupersischen unter besonderer Berücksichtigung älterer*

- neupersischer Geschichtsquellen, vor allem der Mongolen- und Timuridenzeit* (Vol. 3). Wiesbaden.
- Toeppen M. (1867). *Aberglauben aus Masuren mit einem Anhang, enthaltend: Masurische Sagen und Märchen*, Danzig.
- Toeppen, M. (2014). *Wierzenia mazurskie*. (E. Piltzówna, & T. Ostojski, Trans.). P. Błażewicz et al. (Eds.). Dąbrówno.
- TrkmRS = Баскаков, Н.А., Каррыев Б.А., & Хамзаев, М.Я. (Eds.). (1968). *Туркменско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- Tubb, J. (1998). *Sanaanites*. London.
- UjgRS = Рахимов, Т.Р. (Ed.), Наджип, Э.Н. (1968). *Уйгурско-русский словарь*. Москва.
- Urban, M. (2015). *The Treatment of Turkic Etymologies in English Lexicography. Lexemes Pertaining to Material Culture*. Kraków.
- UzbRS = Кары-Ниязов, Т.Н., & Боровков, А.К. (1941), *Узбекско-русский словарь*. Ташкент.
- VEWT = Räsänen, M. (1969). *Versuch eines etymologischen Wörterbuchs der Türksprachen*. Helsinki.
- WDLP = de Vincenz, A., & Hentschel, G. (22nd February 2016). *Das Wörterbuch der deutschen Lehnwörter in der polnischen Schrift- und Standsprache*. Göttingen – Oldenburg. Retrieved from <http://www.bkge.de/wdpl.php>
- Wolf, J.W. (1843). *Niederländische Sagen. Gesammelt und mit Anmerkungen begleitet*. Leipzig.
- Wolf, J.W. (1852). *Die deutsche Götterlehre*. Göttingen, Leipzig.
- Zaicz, G. (2006). *Etimológiai szótár. Magyar szavak és toldalékok eredete*. Budapest.