21. ʕ, the equivalent in Old Coptic most often for /ʕ/, but also sometimes for /ʃ/, derives from the demotic sign for ḫ, the first usual form. Name assigned: *6-spiraled grapheme.

22. ʔ, the equivalent in Old Coptic (Hor.) of /h/ or (DMP and less clearly) /x/, but systematically equivalent to /ʕ/ in proto-Coptic P (an inversion of the ʕ presented just above?), derives from the demotic sign for ḫ, the usual form (?) or first, third, or sixth variant (strongly developed on the graphic level), or eventually also from the demotic sign for ḫ, tenth variant (?). Name assigned: 9-spiraled grapheme.

23. /ʃ/ probably also derives from some variant of a demotic sign, but which? For phonological reasons, one cannot compare it with the sign for r, second usual form, or the sign for j, third variant, or the sign for l, second usual form, or even the sign for u, fourth variant. Name assigned: fraction-stroke-shaped grapheme.

24. /c/ (Mich.) does indeed seem to derive from the demotic sign for ḫ, second usual form. Name assigned: stretched-capital-sigma-shaped grapheme.

25. ḫ, the equivalent in Old Coptic of /h/ (Schm. and Ox.), or again perhaps /h/ (DMP), has particularly variable graphic forms: it may be almost vertical (Ox.) or more or less sloping (Schm.); its loop may be closed (Ox.) or less angular and largely open, in the manner of a demotic ḫ (Schm., see further on). ḫ derives from the demotic sign for ħ, the usual form or the first of the variants (with, probably, a fairly clear influence from the sign for č, the second usual form; see also the fifth, sixth, and seventh variants, and again, phonologically incompatible, the sixth of the variants of the demotic sign for w). Name assigned: P-shaped grapheme, though one might specify in Ox. three-corner P-shaped grapheme, in Schm. inclined-open-P-shaped grapheme, or in a different way demotic-h-shaped grapheme.

26. /h/ derives from the demotic sign for ħ, the third of the usual forms (and fifth and sixth variants). Name assigned: hook-shaped grapheme.

27. /ʃ/ derives from the demotic sign for ḫ, a compromise (clearly evolved) between the first usual form and the last variant. Name assigned: minuscule-alpha-shaped grapheme.

28. α /ç/ derives from the demotic sign for ḫ, second usual form (graphically evolved). Name assigned: reversed-pi-shaped grapheme.

29. δ /ç/ perhaps derives from the demotic sign for ḫ, the first or second variant (graphically evolved); it is difficult to see its origin in one or other of the variants of the sign for g. Name assigned: divided-triangle-shaped grapheme.

30. The grapheme of Mich. for /c/ (?) and that of Par. 1 for /č/ (?) (see no. 13 and Kasser, 1980, p. 269) are decidedly too doubtful to merit being studied here and named, given present knowledge.

**BIBLIOGRAPHY**


**RODOLPHE KASSER**

'AYIN. 'Ayn (= 'i) is the voiced laryngeal fricative (Vergote, 1945, pp. 10, 72–76, 79–80), the Arabic ʕ. It belongs to the phonological inventory of ancient and also later Egyptian, perhaps even as far as the beginnings of demotic (cf. Vergote, 1945, pp. 122–23, and 1973, pp. 31–32; du Bourguet, 1976, pp. 3–4, 75). However, it probably does not belong any longer to the phonological inventory of Coptic or even Pre-Coptic, not even as a cryptophone, in contrast to aleph. (Hence, this discussion will set aside the hypothesis of those who have been tempted to see, or have actually thought to see, a phonemic survival of ' in the second element of the graphic vocalic gemination [see gemination, vocalic] typical of certain lexemes belonging to ʕ etc.)

Like the lost 3 or the revived /ʕ/ (cf. aleph), ʕ' nonetheless plays an important role in Coptic phonology; its presence, although anterior to Coptic, has not only influenced the vocalization of contemporary Egyptian but has also often left its mark in the vocalization of certain Coptic dialects and subdialects. On the other hand, it will be noted that in numerous cases ' itself has not entirely disappeared but has survived in some way, being transformed into /ʕ/, this phonological aleph (in tachysyllabication) normally appearing in orthography (as a phenomenon of bradysyllabication) through the graphic doubling of the phonologic tonic vowel preceding this /ʕ/ ("echo effect"), except in the final position (see below and syllabication).

Thus, according to Vergote (1973, pp. 30–33):
(1) At the beginning of the tonic syllable, both at the beginning and within the word, ' has disappeared in Coptic without leaving traces (e.g., 'anah /ɑnɑ/ ḫ̣aṭ, life; wa'āb > /wɛp/ ʿayon, be pure) or, just as in the other positions (see below), the ' (after the general disappearance of ɔ) has taken the value of the laryngeal occlusive /w/, which is rendered by the first element (unstressed but the most-voiced) of a hiatus in the archaising form of writing mit ' /m/ > languages or DIALECTS etc. S etc. /rmanda/ /frandw, B /ramarb/ /frandb, M /rmanda/ /frand, F5 /lmanda/ /lmand, rich.

(2) At the beginning and end of the unstressed pretonic syllable and in the stressed final syllable, ' has generally disappeared, though leaving traces in the vocalization ("anteriorization" of the stressed vowel, or articulation of vowels more and more forward, /ɔ/ > /ɑ/ and /ɑ/ > /ɔ/, /ɔ/ being less forward than /ɑ/, and /ɑ/ even less forward than /ɛ/); thus atomic ι: S, B tonic a instead of ɔ; F tonic e instead of ι, as in ι'anāḥita /ianɑhɪtɑ/ /ianɑhɪtɑ, etc., oath; yā-da'īr > /ja-dɔːr/ ˈaʊx ˈoʊx, etc., wash the hands. At the end of monosyllabic words the ' > /' / is sometimes preserved in some way (tachysyllabically) in A and F and there rendered (orthographically) by the second element (unstressed and the less-voiced) of a hiatus (where it plays the role of a 'similaglide'; cf. Kasser, 1981b, p. 35), while in B this essentially vocalic linkage has become a veritable diphthong (its second element being the glide /j/) as in ba' > ba' > S /bɑ/ ˈɛɑ, A, L /bɑː/ ˈɛɑ, B /bɑː/ ˈɛɑ, F /bej/ ˈɛe(6), palm (cf. ALEPH, end of article); but note, on the other hand, ḏaba' > S, A, L /bɑː/ ˈɛɑ, B /thbɑː/ ˈɔrɑ, F /thbɛ/ ˈtɛɑ, ten thousand.

(3) At the beginning of the unstressed syllable before a consonant and in the unstressed final syllable of a word, ' has been preserved (in some way) in Coptic in the form of /'/, except in M, W, V4, F4, B (and its subdialects), and G, as in šadu > /ʃdɑ/ S HWQD, B QT, to cut. When ' was the third radical, there was inversion (except in some particularly archaic idioms; see below), but the ' > /' / did not modify the "timbre" of the vowel, as in mišu > S /mɪʃɑ/ ˈmɪʃɑ, B /mɪʃ/ ˈmɪʃ, crowd. Here, however, the archaic orthography will be noted (unstressed finals in -a instead of the usual -e or -i, with at the same time generally no graphic vocalic gemination), which attracts attention in some idioms: the PROTO-DIALECT P (in its most ancient form, phonologically very often similar to a reconstructed *p̩P̩, cf. DIALECT P) and the peripheral and often archaic subdialect F7; they are survivals from a stage in which the metathesis had not yet taken place and ' has retained its value, preserving the /a/ that derives from old α and u (which shows the late date of the change in question). F5 and V5 for their part present at once the gemination caused by ' > /' / and the peculiar atomic final vocalization (-e instead of the usual -i) resulting from the still active influence of '. Finally, F4, V4, and W appear in a manner analogous to P and F7, with, however, in this case, as in V5 and F5, an atomic final vowel in -e instead of the usual -i, as in mišu > P (and F7) /mešɑ/ ˈmeʃɑ, W, F4 /mešɑ/ ˈmeʃɑ, F5 /mɛsɑ/ ˈmɪʃɑ (S, B see above), crowd; dābu > P /tɛbɑ/ ˈtɛbɑ, F5 /tɛbɑ/ ˈtɛbɑ, cf. S /tɛbɑ/ ˈtɛbɑ, B /tɛbɑ/ ˈtɛbɑ, the finger (cf. Kasser, 1981a, 94–95). In the cases of '/ < ' at the end of a tonic syllable before a consonant, S presents an a instead of ι; on the other hand, it has a tonic ι before the '/ derived from other consonants, as in ḏi.f > /dɔːr/ TOT, his hand. This proves that at the time of the general change at first in B, later in S, from /a/ to /o/ between the seventh and the sixth centuries A.D., ' had preserved its value as a voiced laryngeal fricative and had not yet become the unvoiced laryngeal occlusive /w/ called ALEPH (Vergote, 1973, pp. 31–32). On the other hand, the presence of the tonic ι in B, despite the disappearance of '/ < ', shows that the latter phoneme is still later (e.g., wa'āb /wɑːb/ ˈoʊx /ˈoʊx, holy), when the ' precedes h, S and B and even A and L present an ι; it must be concluded that by differentiation ("dissimilation") between the two laryngeal frications, the voiced and the unvoiced, ' had already become '/ before the general change of /a/ to /o/ had come about (e.g., yāhū > S, A /ʃo/ ˈoʊo, B /ʃo/ ˈoʊo, moon). The ' that ends the atomic final syllable of a word has undergone a metathesis, without, however, modifying the quantity of the tonic syllable, which thereby became closed; when the second radical was h, either ' disappeared or (after metathesis) it was entirely assimilated to this consonant; sometimes ' was changed into h > z; e.g. pāmā > S /pɒmɑ/ ˈpɒmɑ, B /pɒmɑ̃/ ˈpɒmɑ̃ (cf. F5 /pɒmɑ/ ˈpɒmɑ, ίŋg, to change; ŏhā > S /ɒhɑ/ ˈɒhɑ, B etc. /ɒhɑ/ ˈɒhɑ, etc., stand, stay; dama > S /dɒmɑ̃/ ˈdɒmɑ̃ (F5 = S), B /dɒmɑ̃/ ˈdɒmɑ̃, book (Vergote, 1973, pp. 30–33).
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BASHMURIC. The history of the Bashmuric dialect is in large measure that of a “phantom dialect.” Coptic Egypt had many more dialects than modern science has been able to identify from the texts discovered, but some of these never reached the literary stage. Others did (perhaps poorly enough), but none of their witnesses has been found as yet. Hence, they are as good as completely lost. Such might have been the fate of Bashmuric if it had not been saved from oblivion by a Coptic grammarian of the fourteenth century (Garitte, 1972), Athanasius of Qûṣ, who wrote in Arabic as follows (cf. Scala c opte 44 in the National Library, Paris, p. 154, left column, 11, 14-22, trans. W. Vycichl; cf. Kasser, 1975, p. 403):

...and you know that the Coptic language is distributed over three regions, among them the Coptic of Mîṣr which is the Sahidic, the Bohairic Coptic known by the Bohaira, and the Bashmuric Coptic used in the country of Bashmur, as you know; now the Bohairic Coptic and the Sahidic Coptic are (alone still) used, and they are in origin a single language.

The first scholars who in the seventeenth century set themselves to the serious study of Coptic had at their disposal only an extremely limited documentation—above all, Bohairic texts, some Sahidic, and Fayyumic texts in even smaller number. Hence, they had before their eyes three Coptic idioms or “dialects,” and they knew the text of Athanasius of Qûṣ, who also spoke of three Coptic “dialects” and indicated their names and their location. These Coptologists thus sought to give to the “dialects” they knew the names mentioned by the bishop of Qûṣ.

For Sahidic and Bohairic, the identification was made without difficulty. The Sahidic and the Bohairic of Athanasius having been identified, there remained, on the one hand, the Fayyumic documents and, on the other, the mention of the “Bashmuric” dialect. How could they not yield to the temptation to confuse them—the more so since one then recovered the tripartite scheme dear to the Egyptologists, with the three chief regions marked by Egyptian history, Upper, Middle, and Lower Egypt?

In Tatam's grammar (1830) one sees that the texts of the third dialect, which could not be assimilated to those of the first (Bohairic “Coptic”) or the second (“Sahidic”), are perforce those of “Bashmuric.” Georgi (1789) affirmed that the region of Bashmur, of which the learned fourteenth-century grammarian spoke, is not the one in the eastern Delta but another Bashmur, deriving from the Coptic nap̄m, territory “beyond the river,” or the Egyptian oases of the Western Desert, including the Fayyum (cf. Quatremeré, 1808, pp. 147-228, for whom Fayyumic could not be the famous “Bashmuric” of the bishop of Qûṣ; hence, Quatremeré gave to Fayyumic the name Osâitic). Champollion (1811, 1817) took up this terminology without contesting it; likewise Peyron (1835, 1841), Schwartz (1850), and others. Later still, at the time when the first Akhmimic texts appeared, Bouriant (1884-1889), by a very curious reasoning, identified them with Fayyumic and hence with Bashmuric, although recognizing very well the dialectal differences that rendered them fundamentally dissimilar (Kasser, 1975, p. 405).

Maspero (1899) was, it seems, the last author who called one F text Bashmuric, without explaining why he maintained such an opinion, although it had long been contested and become outmoded. In fact, some twenty years earlier, Stern (1880, p. 12, n. 1), following Quatremeré (1808), had already categorically rejected this terminology: “It was not out of