

VULLERS, 938-939; *Fe*, 31; LAUFER, in *TP*, 1916, 477-478, and *Sino-Iranica*, 539 (but 金段 *chin-chia* is a misreading for 金段 *chin-tuan* = 金緞 *chin-tuan*, «gold satin», and Chao Ju-kua writes 花金 *hua-chin*, not *chin-hua*); LOKOTSCH, *Etym. Wörterbuch*, No. 1043, who starts from Pers. *kāmḥā*, itself explained as borrowed from Ch. «*kimša, kinša*» (= 金紗 *chin-sha* or 錦紗 *chin-sha*?); I have heard myself *kingāb* in Kāšyar and Turfan. In Turkish, we find Alt. Tel. Kir. Kkir *qamqa* (RADLOV, II, 490; > Russ. *kamka*, «damask», already in THEVET, 16th cent.; cf. BOYER, in *Rec. de mél. orient.*, 1905, 468), Sag. *qamyī*. Čay. *qumqa* of RADLOV, II, 1049, and BLOCHET, *Moufazzal*, 119 (cf. also *Bl*, I, 245) is probably to be read *qomqa* < *qamqa*. The true Chinese etymology has not yet been ascertained. The *chin-sha* quoted by LOKOTSCH on the authority of KARABAČEK is a possible combination, but unattested and phonetically unsatisfactory. One may think of 金錦 *chin-chin* (**kim-kim*), on which cf. *Br*, II, 125, but this would require that the forms with a labial ending, *kimχwāb*, *kingāb*, etc., are the most ancient, a conclusion which does not seem to be supported by such evidence as we have. It will be noticed that *qamqa* is not given by Kāšyarī in 1076, although he mentions other Chinese textiles. The word may have come to the West by sea, and only after the 11th cent.; but in such a case, the Turkish forms *qamqa*, etc., would be second-hand borrowings. The whole question must be studied afresh.

On «*sagri*», cf. YULE, *Hobson-Jobson*², 818; LAUFER, in *TP*, 1916, 478, and *Sino-Iranica*, 575; BROCKELMANN, *Kāšyarī*, 169; HOUTSMA, *Turk.-Arab. Glossar*, 81; POPPE, in *Izv. Ak. Nauk*, 1928, 57; LOKOTSCH, *Etym. Wörterbuch*, No. 1760.

For «*camutum*», KUUN (p. 374) has quoted DU CANGE's «*camuzzum*». But the word «*camutum*» occurs in the same form in a document written at Caffa in 1289 (*in zavis centum duodecim camuti*; BRĂTIANU, *Actes des notaires génois*, p. 185). YULE (Y, I, 395) has connected «*camut*» with both Pers. کامو *kāmū* and کیمخت *kīmuḥt* or کایمخت *kāīmuḥt*; and *kāmū* would seem to give some authority to the «*camu*» of F. But *kāmū* is a doubtful word of lexicographers, and its would-be Turkish form *kāmi* (VULLERS, 783) is otherwise unknown. On the contrary, *kīmuḥt*, «leather made from the croup of a horse or an ass», is common in Persian, and I think it gives the real etymology of *camutum*. *Kīmuḥt* seems to be a true Persian word, and, contrary to the general opinion but in agreement with LOKOTSCH, I believe that *sayrī* (> *šayrī*) was originally Turkish, and simply borrowed in Persian.

Joinville speaks of St Louis's garments in the following terms (DE WAILLY's ed. 1874, p. 667): «Ses robes estoient de camelin ou de pers; ses pennes de ses couvertours et de ses robes estoient de gamites, ou de jambes de lievres, ou d'aigniaux.» The word «*gamite*» has been explained as meaning «*chamois*» (cf. GODEFROY, s.v. «*gamite*»), but this is not satisfactory from a phonetic point of view and is not even discussed in VON WARTBURG's *Franz. Etym. Wörterbuch* among the forms derived from *camox*. I feel much more inclined to see in «*gamite*» another spelling of «*camut*». More puzzling is the following quotation from FAUCHET's *Antiquitez*, v, 11, which I find in HUGUET's *Dict. de la langue française du seizième siècle*, II, 66: «Ils [les Sarrasins] vont... couverts de sayons de couleurs, qu'encor' aujourd'hui ils nomment Camits.» If it be the same word, which would thus have still been known in the second half of the 16th cent., we ought to be able to find more traces of it.