

Since the publication of DE SACY's *Mémoire sur la dynastie des Assassins* (*Mém. Ac. des Inscr.* IV [1818], 1-84), there has been no doubt that our word «assassin» goes back to an original form meaning «consumer of حشيش *ḥašīš*», *i. e.* of Indian hemp (Father LAMMENS's *Remarques*, Beirut, 1890, No. 28, in favour of «Ḥasan Sabāḥ», miss the mark). But there are in Arabic two words meaning «consumer of *ḥašīš*»: 1. حشيشي *ḥašīšyy* (> vulg. *ḥašīšī*), pl. حشيشيين *ḥašīšyyin* (> vulg. *ḥašīšīn*) and more grammatically, حشيشية *ḥašīšyāh*; 2. حشاش *ḥaššāš*, pl. حشاشين *ḥaššāšīn*. DE BIBERSTEIN KAZIMIRSKI (*Dict. arabe-français*, I, 430), LOKOTSCH (*Etym. Wörterbuch*, 1927, No. 839), *Der Grosse Brockhaus* of 1928 (*s. v.* «Assassinen»), O. BLOCH (*Dict. étym. de la langue franç.*), G. WIET (in G. HANOTAUX, *Hist. de la nation égyptienne*, IV, 434) agree that «assassin» comes from *ḥaššāšīn* (BLOCH gives in fact «ḥachchâchî», *i. e.* *ḥaššāšī*, which does not exist, any more than «ḥachāchī» [= *ḥašāšī*], in DEVIC's *Dict. étymol.* or in the Supplement to LITTRÉ). In *EI*, «assassin» is said to come from *ḥašīšīyun* (as if the unwritten final *-un* of the nominative in classical Arabic had given the final nasal of «assassin»); but that final was no longer pronounced in the current speech of the 12th-13th cent., and I do not know of any word then borrowed from Arabic where it can still come into account). D'OHSSON (*Oh*, III, 203) simply derives «assassin» from *ḥašīšīn*. MURRAY thinks that the old French forms are based on the Arabic singular, but that the form finally adopted in European languages is based on the plural; although he does not express any definite view, it seems that he derives the old French plural forms of the «hassisis» type from *ḥašīšī* (sing.) and «assassin» from *ḥaššāšīn* (pl.). This solution may look fairly reasonable; still I am not satisfied that it meets all the requirements of the case.

Benjamin of Tudela has in Hebrew «Kašīšīn» (DE SACY, *loc. cit.* 23); the Armenian form (with final *-h* of the plural) is «Hašīšīḥ» (cf. *Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., I, 382, 482, 486); *Χασίοι* of Anna Comnen and Nicetas must be wrong forms of *Χασίσιοι* (DE SACY, 22); Nicephorus Phocas gives *Κασύσιοι* (with *υ* pronounced *i*; cf. QUATREMÈRE, *Hist. des Mongols*, 122). Forms with the initial aspiration are met with in the West as «Heissessini» in Arnold of Lubeck (DE SACY, *loc. cit.* 21), «Heresim» (read «Hesesim» < \*Hesesin) in Jacques de Vitry (QUATREMÈRE, *loc. cit.* 122), «Haxasini» in Rubrouck (*Wy*, 210, 286, 287), «Hassisi» etc., in *Gestes des Chiprois*, 775-777; «Hassassins» and «Hasassins» in *Annales de la Terre Sainte* (*Arch. de l'Orient latin*, II, II, 454, 455); and even «Chazisii» (*Y*, I, 141).

There are innumerable examples without *h-*, including Lat. pl. «assassini» in William of Tyre (*Gesta Dei per Francos*, I, 994), Joinville's «assacis», Hethum's «assasins» or «assisiens» (*Hist. des Crois.*, Arm., II, 168), «assissini» and «assisini» in *Liber bellorum Domini* (*Arch. de l'Orient latin*, I, 304, 312), etc.

The omission of an initial *h-* in transcriptions is of frequent occurrence and does not affect here the problem of etymology (see «Abasce», «Avariun»). But the two points in the above transcriptions which create difficulties are the alternation of the *-i-* and *-a-* in the second syllable, and the presence or absence of an *-n* in the last. Sometimes, the presence or the absence of the *-n* may be due to mere chance, as, for instance, in the *Gestes des Chiprois* (in French), pp. 775-777, where the following forms are met with: p. 775, «Hassissés» (3 times); p. 776, «Hassisins» (once), «Hassissins» (twice), «Hassisi» (5 times); p. 777, «Hassisi» (once). It seems evident that