

Thebes or No-Ammon. The mythologists represent Anubis as a subordinate son of Osiris, but his name is frequently compounded with that of Ammon. What is lacking in our knowledge from Egyptian sources, the mythology and legendary history of the Greeks will supply, for the older Greek writers constantly asserted the intimate connection of their theological system with that of Egypt. According to Diodorus Siculus and other writers, the son of the Egyptian Ammon was the Greek Bacchus or Dionysus, and the son of the latter was Oenopion. Dionysus, moreover, was known as Iacchos, and the island which celebrated his worship and over which his son Oenopion is said to have ruled, is that of Chios. Bochart derived Bacchus from Bar Chus, the son of Cush, and made him Nimrod. It is more rational to derive it from the form Pa-chons, in which the Coptic article is prefixed to the name of the divinity Chons. Oenopion, the man of wine and the king of Chios, is undoubtedly Anub son of Coz, the very word Anub denoting grapes in more than one Semitic language. It will be evident that I hold the old doctrine of Euhemerus, that heathen gods were in the main historical characters deified by their descendants, and that ancestor-, not nature-worship, was the origin of all systems of mythology, a doctrine received by the most honest of the Greeks, by all the fathers of the Church, and, indeed, by all reasonable men but a few ancient allegorising philosophers, who were ashamed of their national creed, and some over-poetic souls in the present day. In Ammon, therefore, the father of Coz and great-grandfather of Jabez, I am perfectly convinced that we should find Ammon, at once the son and the grandson of the patriarch Lot. He was one of the late divinities of Egypt. Mr. Osburn connects the fortunes of Moab and Ammon with those of the Hittites, and it is thus appropriate that the mention of Ammon's son Coz, should, in Chronicles, immediately follow that of the Hittite line of Ashchur.

The contemporaneousness of many of Manetho's dynasties, and the actual identity of certain Pharaohs whose names appear in different lists, is a doctrine which has the sanction of most living Egyptologists. We must look in vain upon the monuments for records of the so-called Shepherds, if we regard their greatest king, Apepi, as a distinct personage from Pepi or