

are acquainted with three dialects, the Sardiæ or Thebaic, in Upper Egypt, the Baluric or Memphitic, in Middle Egypt, and the Bashmuric in Lower Egypt (p. 35). The Coptic literature is entirely theological, consisting of translations of the Bible, Lives of Saints, &c., no geography, no history, and only a single medical tract (pp. 35, 36). The Coptic literature evidently ceased during the time that Christianity was professed in Egypt, and consequently before the Arabian conquest. So says Heeren (p. 36), and yet in a note in the same page he mentions "a Coptic manuscript of A.D. 802, and in the Vatican, some as late as the beginning of the tenth century." Indeed, Quatremère says (*Recherches sur l'Égypte*, Paris, 8vo, 1808, p. 32), "Dans les premiers temps de l'empire des Arabes, la langue égyptienne continua de fleurir," which could hardly be said of a language of which the literature was extinct. Till A.D. 718, the register of the divan at Cairo was made in Coptic, from that time it has been entered in Arabic (p. 37). Heeren says (p. 38), that "the Coptic probably bears about the same relation to the ancient Egyptian as the modern Greek does to the ancient." He also remarks, p. 84, "To me the Egyptians seem to have been exactly what the Copts their descendants now appear to the stranger who visits them."

1. Pettigrew (*History of Egyptian Mummies*, 4to, 1834, p. 137), says, "It seems probable that the introduction of the Coptic character was only coeval with that of Christianity." 2. Prichard (*Analysis of Egyptian Mythology*, 8vo, 1838, p. 96) seems to think that the ancient Egyptian was *not* the same as the Coptic, and that is apparently also the opinion of A. W. Schlegel (*Preface to Prichard*, p. xxvii.), who says that "the assertion is opposed to the history of the analogy of language." See Niebuhr, *Description de l'Arabie*, 4to, 1774, pp. 75-81.