POPULAR TRADITIONS OF THE COPTIC LANGUAGE

W. H. WORRELL

1. This paper is intended as a synopsis of the most important and generally interesting results of my study of materials collected within the last two years and a half by Dr. Werner Vycichl in Zéniya and other Coptic communities. The statements will be necessarily brief, and the demonstrations and examples scant or wanting. Vycichl has an article in the long-delayed June, 1936, number of the Mitteilungen d. deutschen Instituts f. äg. Altertumskunde in Kairo, and a full publication is under way.

2. For the past eighty years a traditional pronunciation of Coptic has been giving way to a so-called "reformed" pronunciation, instituted by the Patriarch Cyrillus IV (1854–61) and furthered by Claudius Bey Labib (d. May 5, 1919), which introduced Modern Greek values. This is now being pushed by every available means, and the old pronunciation is characterized as that of ignorant peasants in Upper Egypt. The older tradition is now to be found, so far as we know, only in Upper Egypt. The best locality is Zéniya, near Luxor. Not long ago Asyût and Naqāda were centers; and humble persons from the former region who may still be discovered in Cairo will yield a good tradition.

3. This old tradition, in its purest form even, is far from the original pronunciation but is substantially that of ca. a.d. 1000. It is meager, arabicized, and conventionalized, as I have set forth in Coptic Sounds. But it is a family tradition carried on in connection with community
and church life, not derived from printed texts. A great many peasants still can read aloud and understand the sacred texts, and their children are still taught Coptic, though the local kuttābs have declined, so they say, since the days of ʿAurābī Pasha (ca. 1882). It was once the custom to teach both boys and girls to read and understand, and also to “speak.” This embraced stories and legends, the weather, prices for cattle, deaths, visits, etc., and was practiced particularly after church services. The extent and character are documented in the Alphabetarion of Michael, printed as late as A.D. 1886. Most of the phrases are fresh and non-Arabic, some are startlingly so. Words were still coined for “coffee,” “tobacco,” “kerosene,” and “soap”; though there was none for “tea,” “cotton,” and “bedbug.” This would date the latest word-forming period as extending down to 1870 (“kerosene”) or 1886 (“soap”); but the argument is not a strong one, for the words may be artificial. However ṢON, “coffee,” was coined ca. 1500, when coffee was introduced into Egypt, for it signifies the drink as well as the bean, as does Amharic ያት. In Arabic بین means the bean only.

4. There is a twilight zone, consisting of (1) Arabic idioms in Coptic (e.g., ὄφθη γιοτ "γιοτ", (2) Coptic words inflected as Arabic (e.g., ἀμφάρα, “beardless” < ἄμφαρα), (3) Coptic words completely arabicized. To the third class belongs a number of literary Arabic words: ἄρτο < ἀρτο, ἀρτο < ἀρτο, ἀρτο < ἀρτο, and a very large number of vernacular and semiliterary words, some of which (e.g., ἀρτο < ἀρτο) are used in Syria.

5. Modern Copts know only Boheiric, never having heard of other dialects. Since there is no external evidence that Boheiric ever became the vernacular of Luxor and vicinity, or even of Asyūṭ, and since the peasants of Zenīya know only Boheiric, it follows that their Coptic is derived from, or remodeled by, the church idiom which was introduced in the eleventh century. Nevertheless, they still pronounce ὅ as ὅ, and occasionally omit the prothetic vowel of Boheiric and Arabic—evidences of a Sahidic or Sahidic-Achmimic tradition.

6. A number of genuine late Coptic words or expressions may be recovered: σιγρά, “sugar”; ἀρτο ἀρτο, “live long!” with
the reply ΟΥΟΡ Ν-ΘΟΚ ΦΟΜΤ ΦΕ ΝΡΟΜΠΙ used after drinking coffee; ФΝ ΝΕΜΑΚ, ФП ΕΦΕΑΡΕΤΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕΡΕ
Analogy binds the group: jōsāb, moīsās, ġabrijāl, brofīdās (alongside of brōfidās); ġgladijōs, ġarsanijōs, magariōs, mengariōs, ġaṭamarōs (earlier spelled قطمارس); būṭrus, būlus, mōrgōs.

8. There is no "murmelvokal" in the modern pronunciation of words ending in a double consonance, e.g.: šōlh, əwʌɑ; aḷb, ɛxpi; masf, ɛɑq; aradf, ɛpɑq; šidk, ɑɪɪk; wōśd, ɑwʌwτ. (This is also true of the Chassinat text, where ɪ ámb = Koyɔзн; ɛ ámb = MΗpτ.) But a "murmelvokal" may appear when there are three final consonants, e.g.: šōlhās, əwʌɑɛ; kṛemdis, ɛɾɛmτɛ. The sharp contrast maintained between sodám, ɔwɛm, and šōlh supports my contention (Coptic Sounds, chap. i) that there is no helping vowel ("murmelvokal") when no vowel ɛ is written; and opposes Till's contention (ΑΖ, LXVIII, 121; cf. Polotsky, ibid., LXIX, 128) that a vowel may or may not be written in such words. (Disregard of this fact has led us, Polotsky points out, to the introduction of false forms into dictionary and grammar. Vulgar spellings, ɦpɛp, ɦpɛp, are probably due to drawled pronunciation of a slow scribe.) Nevertheless, the helping vowel in šōlhās justifies Vycichl's reservation (ΟLξ, 1934, No. 12, Col. 733) that a helping vowel may be pronounced, at least in difficult consonantal combinations.

9. The prothetic vowel, indicated in Boheiric by a dot or grave accent over an initial consonant (there is no prothetic vowel in Sahidic), is pronounced as ɛ except when its consonant is s or ʃ (w, ʃ), e.g., ēbre, ʃpə; ědbæ, ʃɛɛ; isne, ěnə; ʃlɛ, ʃlə (now accented on prothetic vowel, under Arabic influence).

10. Accented vowels seem today to be neither definitely long nor definitely short. This may be partly the effect of cantillation or of pedantic school instruction. But perhaps there was little quantity even in early Coptic times. Vycichl suggests that, in Boheiric, ɛ and ɔ may have been more open than h and w and not necessarily shorter. Before h, where a-resonance "opens" a vowel, h > ɛ and w > ɔ; e.g., ʃɛζ, ʃɔζ. (Before b this does not occur: ʃpəb, ʃpəḍ.) Before j, where i-resonance "closes" a vowel, ɛ > h and ɔ > w; e.g., ɛhrin, ɔik. Before w, whose w-resonance also "closes" a vowel, ɔ > w; e.g., ɛpwoy. (But ɛ does not become h, it becomes ɑ; e.g., ɳαy, "time".) If Vycichl is right, then the
situation is the opposite of that in Greek where η and ω are said to be the open vowels and ε and ο the close ones. I prefer to think that early Boheiric had quantity, and that long vowels were also close vowels, as they should be from physiological considerations; i.e., I think that ε and ο were more open than Η and Ω and were usually short; though they may have been used to represent long vowels in special cases, such as ΜΕΩ, ΜΟΩ, where quality seemed more important than quantity. The disregard of quantity in modern pronunciation is probably due to artificial conditions.

11. The outstanding feature of the "old" pronunciation, and the one most condemned (e.g., Coptic Sounds, p. 127), is giving Η and Ε the value of â/a. Though generally regarded as an Arabic feature, it is as old as the Chassinat text (ca. 1000?) at least. At Luxor and elsewhere bêt > bat in bat ˁabûha. Perhaps this is a Coptic influence. Old transliterations generally make Η = â, except in the names of persons and places. Many hymns rhyme in â, with Η = â; e.g., ΤΛΒ with ΝΗΒ. At Ebshawai Η is always â. The modern name of the letter Η is hâda. In the unaccented ultima of Greek words the a-value of Η was preserved by transferring the accent to that syllable; e.g., bro̴fitâs, matîdâs. But the Zêniya-Asyût tradition antedates the general leveling of Η to â, in that it distinguishes words in which Η = â from words in which Η = i. In the definite assignment of words to the one or the other of these groups, there was complete agreement between Bistauros, Zeniâ and Môhârib the ˁarîf of el-ˁArâki. Certain principles are involved, and these may be inherited from Egyptian, if they are not the result of later analogical groupings. E.g., ΒΛΗ is bâl; and the qualitative of every biconsonantal verb is pronounced with â. ΜΗΡ, "bound," is mâr, but ΜΗΡ, "beyond," is mîr. Feminine adjectives ending in Η are pronounced with i, e.g., ΧΑΜΗ, kami; ΧΑΗ, ha-i.

12. In some sixteen cases the Η-words in â are known, through the researches of Albright (Vocalization) or on some other grounds, to have had originally the vowel u. They are ΜΗ, "urine," ΒΛΗ, ΜΗΙ, "truth," ΜΗΤ, ΤΗΒ, ΕΒΡΗΧ, ΩΘΗΝ, ΣΡΗΠΙ, ΕΒΙΗΝ, ΗΗΒΣ (Albright); ΩΗΝ (Assyr. šûnu), ΑΡΗΒ (πίφως), ΩΘΗΝ (πόθες, χιτων), ΚΗΒΙ (Nub. kube [Vycichl]), ΧΗΠΙ (κύρη), ΗΡΠΙ (Old Nub. ΟΡΠΙ [Vycichl]), Baˁrât, jurb, Beled es-Siyâq, orb, yet Greek ιρπις.
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2H, "front," resembles 2ΩT sufficiently to permit a cryptogram (Drioton, Notes sur le cryptogramme de Montouemhet), in spite of the contemporary Assyrian mantimenē. ƠYH, ERHM, and TEBNH have plurals in -WΩYI; Boheiric WMHN corresponds to Sahidic WΜOYN, and all four words are now pronounced in ā. All this appears to indicate that H at the beginning of its use in Coptic stood for a sound derived from ū, though resembling ĩ. This could only have been ū, ō, or something similar.

13. Of some fifty-five words in which H = ĩ, only four can be controlled by outside sources: Ĉ-ΩHM, “eye-paint,” = στίμμυ, Latin stimmi; MAPHC, “south,” is contained in مَرْصَى; BHCA (proper name) = وَرِصَا; BHNI, “swallow (bird),” is mine in Nubian (Vycichl). MIP, mîr, “beyond,” appears in Albright (p. 44, No. 20) as mûru; but Albright assures me (October 16, 1936) that it may as well be mîru. However, there is no doubt of the existence of a large number of words in which H = ĩ. If H in early Coptic times stood for ū or ō, or something similar, which by ca. a.d. 1000 had become ā, it is also true that H stood for another sound, surely very similar to ū, ō, etc., which during the same time had become ũ; and that sound was very probably the unrounded counterpart of ū, ō, etc., which is ĩ, ē, etc. Since H is not usually confused in Coptic with I, the original value must have been rather ē, etc., than ĩ. H then had two values, one rounded—ō, and the other unrounded—ē. These were probably close rather than open (see sec. 10). Two difficulties here present themselves: Original Egyptian ĩ becomes classical Coptic ē and modern Coptic ā. Original Egyptian ū becomes classical Coptic ō and modern Coptic ā. The difficulties have not been solved. Perhaps Arabic substitutions are involved.

14. Before or after r the H which is ō sometimes is written I, as Albright has pointed out (p. 50, ll. 23 f.; ll. 27 f.; pp. 53, bottom, f.). CΠT (= CΡHT, Peyron < Zoëga), TΠP, and BΠP are from forms having ū or u originally. For some reason they have got into the other H-class and emerge as modern I instead of ā. The exact character of r is unknown, but it may be presumed that it modified ō in such a way as to prevent its becoming ā by Arabic substitution. H may have been ū.

Cf., however, PH† (*u), PHΣ (*i), PH¥, PPHT (Vycichl).
15. In a very few cases the “old” pronunciation appears to be wrong. If the name Bāwit, ΠΑΥΗΤ (Sahidic; see Maspero-Drioton, Fouilles exécutées à Baouit, No. 434), is the qualitative of ḏwd, it should be b-awād (see sec. 11) not b-awīd (Vycichl). Yet Bistauros and Girgis say b-awīd. Clearly ΠΑΥΗΤ is a passive participle (*i), not a qualitative (Vycichl). Similarly, εΒΗΑ should be awāl (Girgis) not āwīl (Bistauros), if ΒΗΑ is a qualitative. ΨΧΙ is usually pronounced sifs, as it should be (cf. ξύφος, ἱστάνει, Nub. sibid [Vycichl]), but sometimes sāfis. The suffix -艿HΝΟΥ, if derived from *kunū and not from *kinā (Zimmern, Vgl. Gr., p. 69), should be *tānu and not tīnu. But Sahidic Copts had nothing to guide them in the pronunciation of Boheiric -艿HΝΟΥ for they had merely -ςTΝ (Vycichl). TH is pronounced dae, and should be *dī because <dj; CAH is isle, and should be *isla (Albright, p. 50, ll. 31 f.—a complicated history); ΧΗΜΗ is given as kēmi and immediately corrected to kāmi; ΦΠΗ is given as êbre (Bistauros) and corrected to êbra (Yassa); ΤΗΜΗ is given as ēsme. Here H has the value e or æ, and this is due probably to uncertainty as between ā and i; not due to Modern Greek influence, which would give i.

16. Like H, the letter E (in spite of its name, ēje) usually stands for an a-sound, and this is usually short in accented, unaccented, and falsely accented (sec. 7) syllables, e.g., anāḥ, ΕΝΕΣ; tōlāb, ΘΩΛΕΒ. That this is the proper Coptic sound is inferred from the fact that Coptic is distinguished from Greek, e.g., in the phrase taj dē da, ΘΛI ΔΕ ΤΕ, “this woman however is”; though Greek words are given both values, e.g., τεοδοκία, δορόταος, bnewma/bnawma. As in the case of H, this value is as old as the Chassinat text; and it may or may not be due to Arabic influence. Unlike H, the E does not have two pronunciations; and Coptic words containing E do not fall into the expected a-group and i-group. There is but one group—the a-group. The single case of sIl, ΕΕ, “yes,” should, however, be noted.

17. That there were originally two groups, however, is seen from the fact that Albright (p. 17) cites four words in which E goes back to a u-sound: ΜΕΡ, ΩΝΕ, ΜΕ, and ΧΜΠΕΣ. Also, since māh, ΜΕΣ, “full,” is a qualitative, it probably goes back to *mūh (secs. 10 and 11). If E is more open than H (sec. 10), perhaps E originally stood for φ and ε, the more open varieties of ö and ē (sec. 13).
18. Greek influence accounts for ἐδβᾶ, ΤΦΕ; and se,_CE, "yes."
19. ω is generally ð; but when final it may become ðw, as in amaðow, ΕΜΛΩ. Nevertheless, it is sometimes ù, e.g., in the interpolation, ω. Before two consonants it is o, e.g., aðorð, ἘΧΩΡΖ, doubtless under the influence of Arabic. The name of the letter is ð.
20. The letter O is hardly to be distinguished in pronunciation from ω. Though it has the expected open quality in hodhād, ṣOTHΕΤ, it is ðu (like the name of the letter) when final; it is ù when final (both accented and unaccented) and elsewhere; it is ù in šallud (sic!), δαλοδ, and hūde, ŏt. For the u-value of O and ω in the Chassinat text see Coptic Sounds, p. 127. It has the Greek value in brōfidas, lengthened in kaṭāmarās.
21. The combination OY (which has no name) is ù in ḫūn, ḫOYN, but more often a fluctuating thing that is heard as ù or ð, e.g., ṣbnûdi ṣbnûdi (Farshūt); ṣamûl, ṣamôl; smô. For fluctuation between OY, ω, and O in Theban documents see Coptic Sounds, pp. 104 and 105. In Greek words Y occurs by itself, with the value i. Consonantal OY, ω, is treated below (sec. 32).
22. The letter I (called jāda) is pronounced i and I, e.g., afjimi, bIrô, ΠΙΟ, never otherwise; though it is clear that, e.g., in CΠΙΤ, ΩΠΠ (Albright, p. 18), the vowel goes back to ù and is an H (ö), modified by P probably into ù (sec. 14). This may be the value of I in words like ΓΩΙΜ, whose plurals have an o—ΩΙΜΩ.
23. The letter Λ (called alfa) is always a, except before E (a), when it becomes e by dissimilation, e.g., bimē áda-, ΠΙΜΑ ᾖΤΕ--; bimē anára-, ΠΙΜΑ ΕΝΕΡΕ--.
24. The unaspirated stops, Π and T, are pronounced (?) sometimes as b, d, but usually as b, d; and the latter have generally been used in my transcriptions. Vycichl is certain he hears only b, d.
25. The letter Π (called bej) is pronounced b/ð, as it should be (Coptic Sounds, p. 19), and never p; though the lack of p in Arabic would in itself exclude the Coptic sound. Φ (called fij) is also pronounced b/ð in Coptic words, and not p, the correct value. It is not necessary to see here a Sahidic trait (Π for Φ), because the absence of p in Arabic is a sufficient explanation; and the corresponding stop, Ω, is rendered by t, because that sound does occur in Arabic. Occasionally Φ is pronounced f, under the influence of Greek words or of modern
style; or because of the effort to produce a lacking voiceless sound like b. Fricative \( \Phi \) is treated below (sec. 33). \( \Upsilon \) (called ébsi) is simply \( \Pi \Pi \). \( \Pi \Pi \) is pronounced buw, e.g., rabuwi, \( \varphi \lambda \beta \beta i \), because final \( \Pi \) is b and initial \( \Pi \) is w. Fricative \( \Pi \) is treated below (sec. 31).

26. The letter \( \Upsilon \) (called dāu) is pronounced d/\( \varphi \), as it should be, and never t, except when final, e.g., in \( \varphi \omega m T \). \( \Theta \) (called tūtte) is t, but occasionally \( \phi \), under Modern Greek influence. The precision of distinction between \( \Theta \) and \( \Upsilon \) is remarkable. It is observed even in tōlāb, \( \Theta \omega \delta \epsilon \beta \), where the accent has shifted. That this is the inherited result of a once-operative Boheiric rule (Ludwig Stern, \textit{Koptische Grammatik} [Leipzig, 1880], sec. 19) is certain, for \( \Upsilon \) and \( \Theta \), without distinction, are pronounced d/\( \varphi \)/t (un-aspirated) when unaccented, or originally unaccented, but are pronounced t (aspirated) when accented, however weakly, in Greek words, e.g., teodokia, \textit{θεοδοκία}; ἡριστός, \textit{χριστός}; τόδρος, \textit{θεόδορος}. \( \Lambda \) (called dalda) is nearly always d/\( \varphi \), though the Modern Greek \( \sigma \) is occasionally heard. \( \Upsilon \) (called dij) is simply \( \Upsilon \).

27. The letter \( \kappa \) (called kābba) is always pronounced k at the present time. In the seventh century it was still g in Sahidic, for place-names in Upper Egypt have \( \jmath \) (in that dialect of Arabic, g) to represent Coptic \( \kappa \), e.g., \( \kappa w c, \kappa e q T, \kappa e k a t h p i o n, \kappa a i n h p o l i c, \tau k w o y \); so also early loan words: \( \pi e k o y r, \pi e k a w a, \kappa a t a m e r o s \). Also in Boheiric it was still g, for place-names in Lower Egypt (or imported from there) have \( \jmath \) (in the Cairo dialect of Arabic, g) for Coptic \( \kappa \), e.g., \( \jmath k e b i, \jmath k e b i \); \( \lambda p o \theta \eta h k h, \lambda p o \theta \eta h k h \) [\( \lambda p o \theta \eta h k h \) in the Cairo-Alexandria pronunciation of \( \jmath \) as \( \prime \), which invalidated \( \jmath \) as a sign for Coptic \( \kappa \). The Chassinat text equates Coptic \( \kappa \) with \( \jmath, \jmath \), and \( \jmath \); that of Carsanova-Sobhy equates it with \( \lambda \) and \( \varphi \); the Galtier text equates it with \( \lambda \) only. The change is thus evidently due to graphic causes.
28. The letter **X** is always k in Coptic words. This was the value in the seventh century, for the Arabs heard it as ʃ, e.g., *KwpX*, kūra; *ApXWn*, arku (magical texts). It is never pronounced as ḫ except in Greek words. The letter ⡪ occurs only in Greek or other foreign words, and here it follows the Greek rule: ḡ before a, o, u; gj before i, e. Double, ⡪.twig, it is ʃg or ʃ. The pronunciation of ⡪ as ḫ is due to the Cairo ḫ = g, by overcorrection. The letter ⠠ (called eksi) is simply ⠠.

29. The letter ⠠ (called ʃanxa) is ʃ. When pronounced g, that is due to the Cairo pronunciation of ḫ as g.

30. The letter ⠵ is always š, and has no connection with ⠠ in consciousness.

31. The letter ⠣ (called bëda, vëda), except when final, is pronounced w, v, and possibly the bilabial β (Vycichl thinks not). The second and third are non-Arabic; and the second is derived from the third, which is probably the original sound. At the end of a syllable ⠣ is b.

32. The combination oy (which has no name), when functioning as a consonant, e.g., *Oywφ*, *CWOYN*, is always w. After o and ō the w is sometimes lost, e.g., ḫō, ḫū, *CζOoy*; mō, *Mwoy*; but it never becomes a separate vowel. ывать (called ha, ḫe, possibly because of some forgotten function) occurs in foreign words, received via Greek, as v, e.g., lāvī, ḫewu. In the combination ⸧ it is always w in Coptic words; but in Greek words the w is sometimes lost, e.g., ḫgládios, Klaúdios.

33. The letter υ (called fāj) is f, possibly the bilabial f. The letter ϕ is given the same sound at times, either through Greek influence or in an effort to produce the non-Arabic p (see sec. 25); and it always has the value f in Greek words.

34. The letter ς (called sāmma) is usually pronounced s. But it is š at times, before a palatal vowel, e.g., śl, *CCE*; or after š, e.g., bašenš, *Piawanc* (Farshūt); šiši, *CiCl* (Farshūt); or under the influence of Semitic (Arabic?) forms of proper names, e.g., šemeën, *CyMEOYN*; aššer, *ACCHP*. The letter ⠼ is always z—an Arabic sound, supposedly not Coptic.
35. The letter ω (called saj) is usually š. Before j it may become ż, e.g., mažj, ΜΑΩΧ, a non-Arabic sound.
36. The letter l, when it functions as a consonant, is j, e.g., bajōd, ΠΛΙΩΤ; fōj, ΤΡΩΙ; šojs, ΔΟΙΟ. But when followed by a consonant in the same syllable, it may be lost (el-ςAraki, near Farshūt), e.g., ōk, ΔΙΚ; šōš, ΔΟΙΟ; wōni, ΟΥΨΙΝΙ. It is frequently not heard before H in ḫōs, ΙΧΧΟΥΣ.
37. The letter b (called ḏaj) is always ḏ, never q. The letter x in Greek words has the value ḏ before back vowels and before r, otherwise š, even when the vowel has undergone further change, e.g., šāra, χαʔrē. The letter z (called hori) is simple h, e.g., htōu, δΟΟ; rarely ḏ, e.g., aʔroḥ, ΕΛΡΩΡ; and it sometimes disappears, e.g., anā, ΕΝΕ΢.
38. The letters λ (lōla), μ (mej), Ν (niʔ), and p (rōw) are pronounced as l, m, n, r (trilled), respectively. Doubled μ is sometimes simplified, e.g., mën, ΜΜΟΝ (el-ςAraki). Ν before Π is not assimilated. ΝΚ is pronounced ḏk, e.g., doʔk, ΤΩΝΚ.
39. From the time when Coptic ceased to be commonly spoken, down almost to the present, there have existed a school language and a Coptic-Arabic jargon. That these are not entirely derived from sacred texts, but have traditional contact with living Coptic, appears from many facts above adduced, chief of which are: differentiation of a-Ħ from i-Ħ, of Coptic x from Greek χ, of aspirated t from unaspirated t, of words with ē from words without ē between two final consonants, special values for final B and final T, peculiar consonantal use of OY and I, tenth-century accentuation, traces of non-Boheiric phonology and vocabulary, and (possibly) new expressions of seeming genuineness.
40. Zēnīya tradition shows that Greek letters were not always taken over with their current Greek values, if indeed we know what those were; that the original values of H and ē must be reconsidered; that modern peasant tradition is not so corrupt and arbitrary as we have supposed. Otherwise it requires no serious revision of the views set forth in Coptic Sounds.