

金段 *chin-chia* was a misreading of 金段 *chin-tuan*, commonly used for 金緞 *chin-tuan*, «gold brocaded satin», and phonetically, could not give the etymology of *kīmḥāb*. LAUFER himself (*TP*, 1916, 477; *Sino-Iranica*, 539) proposed 錦花 *chin-hua*, «as, for instance, used by Čao Žu-kua with reference to the brocades of Ta Ts'in».

Some of the above hypotheses can be disposed of at once as phonetically impossible: such are HOFFMANN's *chin-sha* (**kjəm-ša*) and ROCKHILL's *chin-chia* once correctly read *chin-tuan* (**kjəm-d'uân*). LAUFER's *chin-hua* is a slip and does not in fact exist; in the above-mentioned passage, Chao Ju-kua speaks of *hua-chin* «flowered damask» (*HR*, 103), a term which he uses more than once (for instance in the sections corresponding to *HR*, 115 and 155).

The *chin-ch'i* (**kjəm-k'jiē*) adduced by PHILLIPS is, from Han times downwards, a well-attested term, which is used for instance by both Chou Ch'ü-fei in 1178 (*Ling-wai tai-ta*, 3, 2 b) and Chao Ju-kua in 1225 (*HR*, 141²¹⁻²²) in their accounts of foreign countries. One of the components of *chin-ch'i* is 錦 *chin* (**kjəm*), the very word we usually translate «brocade». The word *chin* is formed with a right half *po* meaning «silk», which ought to be the «radical» if it had not been left out of the modern system of 214 radicals, and a left half *chin* which originally meant «metal», and later «gold», but which is to be taken here as a phonetic. Of course the composite character might indicate that there was in the spoken language a «silk» fabric called *chin* because it was partly made of «metal» or «gold» (*chin*) threads, so that, in the written character meaning «brocade», the *chin* half would play a double part, semantic and phonetic, a case of frequent occurrence in Chinese script. We must not forget, however, that such a view would run counter to the oldest definitions of *chin* in native works: all agree in making *chin* a «silk textile of different colours», without any allusion to the use of gold or silver in its manufacture. *Chin* is in principle «silk damask»; the usual, but misleading translation «brocade» (not to speak of the mistaken «gold brocade») can be retained only for the modern loose use of the latter word, not for its original meaning of a textile made of gold and silver threads. True *chin* had a «ground» (地 *ti*) on which the portions in other colours were woven; when no «ground» was used, the textile was called 織成 *chih-ch'êng* «weaving-made» (a term which misled European translators, and in particular HIRTH in *China and the Roman Orient*). As to *ch'i* (**k'jiē*), it differed from *chin* by being a damask silk of one colour only. The purpose of this apparent digression on the history of *chin* is to show that Chinese *chin*, not being a «gold» brocade, exactly fits in with the descriptions we have of mediaeval «camocas». On the other hand, the *kīm-* of *kīmḥāw* is exactly what we should expect, in T'ang times, as a transcription of *chin* (**kjəm*), be it *chin* «metal», «gold», or *chin* «silk damask», «brocade» (the Cantonese pronunciation «*kam*» adduced by HIRTH, in fact *kəm*, has not to be taken into consideration since we must start from *kīmḥāw*, not from *kamḥā*). There are, however, certain difficulties in PHILLIPS's hypothesis. One is that *chin* and *ch'i* are properly the names of two different textiles and that the composite term *chin-ch'i* is a class designation, somewhat bookish, and not very likely to have passed abroad. But the main objection is of a phonetical order. While *chin* (**kjəm*) accounts for *kīm-* of *kīmḥāw*, *ch'i* (**k'jiē*) cannot well be transcribed as *-ḥāw*. In the 9th-10th cents., we know a few cases when Ch. *k-* is rendered by Arabs or Persians as *ḥ-*, for instance in *Ḥanfū* < Kuang-[chou]-fu (see «Quinsai» and «Çaiton»), or *Ḥamju* (Ḥamču) < Kan-chou (see «Campcio»); but in neither case