

In Mongolian, the modern word for cotton (not «cotton goods») is *kübüŋg* (*köböŋg*, *köbäng*), Kalm. *köwŋ*; it occurs as *kubun* in Manchu. SCHOTT had thought of connecting this word with 古貝 *ku-pei* (\**kuo-puâi*), «cotton» (*ku-pei* will be discussed below). LAUFER (*Sino-Iranica*, 574) declared that such a derivation was «impossible in view of the labial surd» of the Chinese term, and proposed an Iranian origin, adducing *kubas* in Waḥī, a Pamir dialect. The objection is of no value, since there was no *p* in Mongolian, nor in early Manchu, and these languages used *b* in its stead (for instance, the Chinese 螺貝 *lo-pei* [\**luâ-puâi*], «conch» [used as a musical instrument], has given in Mongolian *labai*, «horn»; see «Cowry»). As to the Pamir form, it is true that HJULER, *The Pamir languages*, 38, gives for «cotton» Šuynī *paḥta*, Waḥī *kubās*. But BENVENISTE draws my attention to the fact that this form has not been confirmed by subsequent inquiries: MORGENSTIERNE, *Indo-Iranian frontier languages*, II, 15\*, and H. SKÖLD, *Materialien zu den iran. Pamirsprachen*, 1936, 162-163, give only *paḥta* for «cotton» in Waḥī, and in other dialects such forms as Yidya-Munji *karvasē*, *karbos*, «cotton», or Šuynī *kärbōs*, «cotton goods», «muslin» (W. LENTZ, *Pamir-Dialekte*, I, 1933, 173); so that HJULER's *kubās*, if it was correctly noted, must be a local, recent, and perhaps individual development. It may be due to the retrogressive action of the labial consonant, and is perhaps to be compared with Burušaski *gupas* (cf. LORIMER, *The Burushaski Language*, III, 173), probably borrowed from the Indo-Aryan. But, whatever the truth may be about the Waḥī *kubas* and the Burušaski *gupas*, the Mongolian *kübüŋg* appears at too late a date to be a form directly borrowed from the Iranian. No mediaeval text has given a Mongolian word of the type of *kübüŋg*; on the contrary, we know now that the ancient Mongolian word for cotton was not *kübüŋg*, but كيباز *kebāz* (*kibāz*) or كيبز *kābiz* (POPPE, *Mongol'sko-Tyurkskiĭ slovar'*, Leningrad, 1938, 218), that is to say was fundamentally the same as Uighur *kābāz*. The earliest mention I can trace of a word of the type of *kübüŋg* is the *k'u-pu*, \**kubu*, «cotton» (*mien-hua*), of the late Jučen Vocabulary acquired by AUROUSSEAU (Nos. 382, 975). Moreover, Jučen \**kubu* and Manchu *kubun* cannot be separated from Goldi *kūfa*, «cotton» (cf. GRUBE, *Goldisch-Deutsches Wörterverzeichnis*, in L. VON SCHRENCK, *Reisen*, III, App., II, 30). My impression is that SCHOTT was probably right; it must have been *ku-pei* (\**kuo-puâi*) which passed into the Tungus languages; the original vowel *a* of the second element has been retained in Goldi, but became *-u-* in Jučen and Manchu under the influence of the preceding labial consonant; and, if so the *-n* of the Manchu *kubun* must be of secondary appearance, and it is from the Manchu that the word was borrowed by the late Mongols. The earlier occurrence of the word in Tungus languages disposes at the same time of RAMSTEDT's hypothesis (*Kalm. Wörterbuch*, 242), which would trace *kübüŋg* (*köbüŋg*) to the Mongolian root *köb-*, «to swell».

In Central Asia, the word *karpāsa* did not travel beyond the Uighur country and Mongolia; it did reach China, however, from the south, in a transcription which, in pre-T'ang and T'ang texts, is sometimes 吉貝 *chi-pei* (\**kĭĕt-puâi*), though more usually 古貝 *ku-pei* (\**kuo-puâi*); the term is then always used in descriptions of Indo-China and Indonesia, or for presents sent from these regions. While everybody agrees that these transcriptions are ultimately connected with *karpāsa*, it is evident that they are not a direct representation of the Sanskrit word. WATERS, GROENEVELDT (*Essays relating to Indo-China*, 2nd series, I, 142, 185), and HIRTH had