

Łukaszewicz, Adam

Misphragmuthosis and the deluge

The Journal of Juristic Papyrology 25, 109-129

1995

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez **Muzeum Historii Polski** w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej bazhum.muzhp.pl, gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

Adam Łukaszewicz

MISPHRAGMUTHOSIS AND THE DELUGE

The text of Sextus Julius Africanus is a most useful excerpt of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*.¹ The text known from the quotation by Georgius Syncellus (κατὰ Ἀφρικανόν) contains a passage which reads:

Ὀκτωκαιδεκάτη δυναστεία Διοσπολιτῶν βασιλέων ἰς'.

Ἔκτος πρῶτος Ἀμῶς, ἐφ' οὗ Μωϋσῆς ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.

(...)

Πέμπτος, Μίσαφρις, ἔτη ιγ'

Ἔκτος, Μισφραγμούθωσις, ἔτη κς', ἐφ' οὗ ὁ ἐπὶ Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμός.

Ὅμοι ἐπὶ Ἀμώσεως τοῦ καὶ Μισφραγμούθωσεως ἀρχῆς κατὰ Ἀφρικανὸν γίνονται ἔτη ξθ'. Τοῦ γὰρ Ἀμῶς οὐδ' ὅλως εἶπεν ἔτη.²

"The Eighteenth Dynasty consisted of 16 kings of Diospolis. The first of these was Amos, in whose reign Moses went forth from Egypt. (...)

The fifth, Misaphris, for 13 years. The sixth, Miphragmuthosis, for 26 years: in his reign the flood of Deucalion's time occurred.

Total, according to Africanus, down to the reign of Amosis, also called Miphragmuthosis, 69 years. Of the reign of Amos he gave no years at all."

¹ J. VON BECKERATH, *Untersuchungen zur politischen Geschichte der zweiten Zwischenzeit in Ägypten*, Glückstadt 1964 (= *Ägyptologische Forschungen* 23), 11 ff.

² Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 52, transl. W. G. WADDELL, *Loeb Classical Library*, Cambridge – London 1980, 110–112. See below, n. 49.

We clearly see that the record quoted above mentions two different rulers: king Amos the founder of the dynasty, allegedly contemporaneous of the Exodus, and the sixth king of the dynasty called Amosis or Mispfragmuthosis, credited with 26 regnal years.

The purpose of this page is to discuss the identity of the king Mispfragmuthosis mentioned in the passages quoted above and interpreted by modern researchers as Tuthmosis III. This identification is commonly taken for granted. It is based on the apparent similarity of the Manethonian names Mispfragmuthosis or Mephrammuthosis³ and the actual premen of Tuthmosis III: *Menkheperre (Mn-hpr-R^c)*.

We will, however, postpone the discussion of the name of Mispfragmuthosis until an important detail of the passage quoted above had been considered.

In the statement about the king Mispfragmuthosis the historiographer says: "In his reign the flood of Deucalion's time occurred". That information should by no means be underestimated, even if at first it seems to be only a piece of mythology.⁴

Manetho certainly reproduces information taken from ancient Egyptian records. It is certainly more justified to see in his statement an echo of an actual natural disaster, rather than just a meaningless play with rudiments of Greek mythology applied to the Egyptian history.

The above statement of an important source invites us to search for information that would enable us to understand the nature of the event.

Tuthmosis III (*Mn-hpr-R^c Dhtj-msj w*) ruled — according to the most commonly accepted chronology — in the years 1490–1436 B.C.⁵ or — according to other estimates: 1479–1424.⁶ These dates cover a time close to the estimated

³ For the form Mephrammuthosis see Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 51 (Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum*, III 20), *Loeb Classical Library*, p. 108.

⁴ The present essay was written in Warsaw and Leuven in 1993 and 94, when Cl. VANDERSLEYEN's *L'Égypte et la vallée du Nil* (2), Paris 1995, was not yet available. Now, when this text goes to the printer, Cl. Vandersleyen's newest book brings a mention that earlier researchers did not venture, of the "Deucalion's cataclysm" under Amosis (*op. cit.*, 236 n. 4). I publish here my own remarks on the subject as they were originally written, with added mentions of Vandersleyen's work as a new bibliographical reference.

⁵ Cf. E. HORNING, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches*, (= *Ägyptologische Abhandlungen* 11), Wiesbaden 1964, 56–62. For a recent biography of Thutmosis III see A. TULHOFF, *Thutmosis III. 1490–1436 v. Chr. Das ägyptische Weltreich auf dem Höhepunkt der Macht*, München 1984.

⁶ E. g. W. BARTA, 'Die ägyptischen Sothisdaten und ihre Bezugsorte', *JEOL* 26, 1979–1980, 26–34; also Cl. VANDERSLEYEN, *L'Égypte*, 271 n. 1.

dates of the volcanic disaster which happened on the island of Thera (Santorini).⁷

There is positive volcanological evidence to show that the Thera eruption had an impact upon Egypt, and that in any case it was earlier than the reign of Amenophis III.⁸

It would be only natural if the disaster were recorded in Egypt. The catastrophe must have had consequences for the Egyptian coast and even for the interior of Egypt. We are induced to suppose that the disaster in the Aegean very soon became an element of Egyptian tradition and that even as late a historian as Manetho could find an echo of it in ancient Egyptian sources which were still available in his time.⁹

We are not going to analyse here the whole of the complex chronology of the event and of the involved reigns. These problems must be left to specialists in the field of Aegean archaeology and to researchers specialized in the intricate chronology of the New Kingdom.

It seems, however, rewarding to discuss here the links between Manetho's record and other Egyptian sources that probably contain an echo of the disaster. Thus, we wish to discover whether the traditional identification of the king Mispshragmuthosis as Tuthmosis III can be maintained.

Recent decades have brought a great progress in the research of the ancient Aegean. The discoveries at Thera confirm that a volcanic explosion destroyed the island and there are many reasons to believe that the disaster happened in the XVIth century B.C. Yet, the chronology of the event is not ultimately established. According to estimates based upon dendrochronological and ice-core evidence an enormous eruption of a volcano took place somewhere in the world in 1628 B.C.¹⁰

It is possible however that at Thera there were several disastrous events, and that the activity of the volcano extended over a long period.

⁷ H. GOEDICKE, 'The Northeastern Delta and the Mediterranean', [in:] *The Archaeology of the Nile Delta, Egypt: Problems and Priorities*, Amsterdam 1988, 165–175: Goedicke states that the cataclysm on Thera happened in the year 1483 B.C. according to the median chronology (p. 173).

⁸ The material of major importance are two pieces of pumice found by Petrie in Gurob. GOEDICKE states that they were found to come from Thera, 'The Northeastern Delta', 170.

⁹ The problem of Manetho's sources and the reliability of his work has been discussed by BECKERATH, *Untersuchungen*, 11–20.

¹⁰ For an exhaustive discussion see D. A. HARDY, A. C. RENFREW (eds.), *Thera and the Aegean World*, Vol. III, *Chronology, Proceedings of the Third International Congress, Santorini, Greece, 3–9 September 1989*, London 1990.

We are induced to suppose that the disaster of Thera later became the original source of Plato's tale about the end of Atlantis.¹¹

The impact of the catastrophe of Thera upon the coasts of the Mediterranean remained unknown until recent research brought the first unquestionable results.¹²

Even before Spyridon Marinatos made in 1970/71¹³ the most famous of his discoveries at Akrotiri (where he had excavated since 1967), thus opening a worldwide discussion concerning the problem of the volcanic eruption which destroyed the island, a Belgian egyptologist published a curious monument from ancient Thebes.

Claude Vandersleyen brought to the knowledge of the learned world a narrative of king Ahmose, the founder of the XVIIIth Dynasty, engraved upon a stele and concerning a storm that made considerable damage at Thebes at a time before year 22 of his reign.¹⁴ The text is not complete but it is preserved well enough in its lower part, containing the description of the storm.¹⁵ There is no explicit date and the text could be dated to an year earlier than 22 only on the basis of the shape of the lunar sign in the royal nomen (the way of writing of one of the hieroglyphs in the name of Ahmose changed in year 22). The cartouches were found on the fragments which, after Vandersleyen's first publication were subsequently identified in Karnak.¹⁶

According to different versions of the chronology of Ahmose's reign the storm must be dated between 1550 and 1517 B.C.¹⁷

¹¹ The much discussed idea of a connexion between the survival of the memory of the explosion(s) at Thera in Egyptian records and the tale of Atlantis appeared with the famous discovery at Thera. Cf. A. G. GALANOPOULOS, E. BACON, *Atlantis*, London 1969.

¹² GOEDICKE, 'The Northeastern Delta', see especially pp. 170–171.

¹³ S. MARINATOS, *Excavations at Thera*, I (1967), Athens 1968; II (1968), Athens 1969; III (1969), Athens 1970; *Sintomos odigos prosorinis ekthesis archeotiton Thiras*, Athinai 1971; IDEM, 'Thera. Key to the Riddle of Minos', *National Geographic*, 141, no. 5, 1972, p. 702 f.

¹⁴ Cl. VANDERSLEYEN, 'Une tempête sous le règne d'Amosis', *RdE* 19, 1967, 123–159; 'Deux nouveaux fragments de la stèle d'Amosis relatant une tempête', *RdE* 20, 1968, 127–134; cf. E. N. DAVIS, 'A Storm in Egypt during the Reign of Ahmose', *Thera*, III, 232–235.

¹⁵ VANDERSLEYEN, *RdE* 19, 1967, 123–159, pl. 8–10.

¹⁶ VANDERSLEYEN, *RdE* 20, 1968, 127–134; especially 128-9 and 132 (date).

¹⁷ Cf. DAVIS, *Thera*, III, 234. Most recently VANDERSLEYEN, *L'Egypte*, 213 ff. dates the reign of Amosis to c. 1543–1518 B.C. which gives c. 1521 B.C. as year 22.

At the time of Vandersleyen's publication the fact of the eruption was already known. It had been studied as early as the XIXth century.¹⁸ As for Marinatos, the researcher of Thera, he was interested in finding a connexion between the eruption at Santorini and the decline of the Minoan Crete since 1934 and in his paper of 1939¹⁹ he brought his proposals (including a date of 1500 B.C. for the eruption) to the attention of scholars. Yet, Vandersleyen's publication appeared before the apogee of the great discussion concerning the volcanic disaster of Thera. In his excellent commentary, the Belgian scholar, who attempted to explain also the meteorological aspect of the phenomenon reported in Ahmose's inscription,²⁰ did not mention the event at Santorini as a possible cause of the "darkness in the Western region" and of the destructive tempest.²¹

More recently, Goedicke advanced a plausible theory that the storm described by king Ahmose in the text of the stele published by Vandersleyen was probably nothing else than the impact of the volcanic disaster at Thera on the meteorological conditions in Egypt.²² A similar opinion has been expressed by Davis in a paper given at the Third Santorini Congress.²³

Parallels from modern times show that storms and rains are typical consequences of great volcanic eruptions.²⁴

Thus, the Stele of the Storm dating to the XVI century B.C. would rather support the traditional date of the volcanic event at Thera c. 1500 B.C.

Goedicke also pointed to a passage of the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus (British Museum 10047), which reads: "Year 11, 1st month of Akhet: 'Birth-

¹⁸ F. FOUQUÉ, *Santorin et ses éruptions*, Paris 1879; cf. his preliminary reports on the same subject: Premier rapport sur une mission scientifique à l'île de Santorin, (= *Annales des missions scientifiques et littéraires*), Paris 1867.

¹⁹ S. MARINATOS, 'The Volcanic Destruction of Minoan Crete', *Antiquity* 13, 1939, (no. 52), 425-439, cf. *Thera*, III, 17.

²⁰ VANDERSLEYEN, *RdE* 19, 1967, 155-156.

²¹ In his recent book, however, VANDERSLEYEN states (*L'Égypte*, 236): "On pourrait même se demander si la tempête commémorée par Amosis n'a pas quelque rapport avec ces circonstances; les tempêtes ne sont pas rares en Égypte; celle-ci dut donc être tout à fait anormale pour mériter un tel compte rendu".

²² H. GOEDICKE, 'The End of the Hyksos in Egypt' [in:] *Egyptological Studies in Honor of Richard A. Parker*, ed. L. H. LESKO, Hanover and London 1986, 37-47. See also: E. N. DAVIS, *Thera*, III, 232-235.

²³ E. N. DAVIS, 'A Storm in Egypt during the Reign of Ahmose', *Thera*, III, 232-235.

²⁴ Cf. DAVIS, *Thera*, III, 234.

day of Seth': It was caused by the majesty of this god that his voice (*hrw*) was heard; "Birth-day of Isis': The sky makes precipitation."²⁵

This remarkable passage has interested many scholars, from Erman onwards. Jürgen von Beckerath interpreted the date of the event as 12/13 September (Julian) = 29/30 August (Gregorian) of year 11 i.e. an year about 1550 B.C. He states further about the date: "eine Zeit, in der es jedenfalls heute in Ägypten kaum Gewitter und Niederschläge gibt. Doch wären solche Ereignisse im Normalfall ja wohl nicht aufzeichnenswert erschienen".²⁶

Goedicke hesitates to ascribe the thunderlike noise (the "voice of Seth") and the rainfall on the following day to the "main event" of the volcanic activity at Thera. He is nevertheless convinced that volcanic activity was observed from the northeastern Delta in the reign of Ahmose. Goedicke apparently prefers to place "the main event" in later times and even has a date for it in the reign of Hatshepsut: 30th April 1483 B.C.²⁷

The events described in the Rhind Papyrus and in the Stele of the Storm may perhaps refer to the same eruption of the Thera volcano. Davis is certainly right when he states that the text of the stele, mentioning the king's sojourn in the Thebaid, in the royal residence of Sedjefa Taouy, does not agree with other circumstances described in the papyrus (the conquest of the Delta by the Egyptian army, which would imply the presence of Ahmose in Lower Egypt). But the difference in time between the thunder and precipitation recorded in Rhind Papyrus and the storm at Thebes need not have been great: it could be exactly the time that allowed the king to return to Upper Egypt after the first unusual occurrences. The precipitation mentioned in the Rhind papyrus might not have been rain but tephra.²⁸ Moreover, a rain storm as a consequence of the eruption is likely to occur even a long time after the event.

As stated above, the Stele of the Storm has no precise date: it is only ascertained that it is earlier than Ahmose's 22 regnal year. The Rhind Papyrus provides us with the calendar date of the explosion within year 11. Yet, we have no certainty as to the absolute date of the 11th year (presumably of the last Hyksos king Khamudy, approximately contemporaneous with Ahmo-

²⁵ GOEDICKE, [in:] *Studies Parker*, 40. For a translation see also D. B. REDFORD, *Egypt, Canaan and Israel in Ancient Times*, Cairo 1992, 128: "Regnal year 11, first month of *akhet*, the birthday of Seth — a roar was emitted by the Majesty of this god. The birthday of Isis — the sky poured rain."

²⁶ BECKERATH, *Untersuchungen*, 211 n. 1.

²⁷ GOEDICKE, 'The Northeastern Delta', 174; see also below.

²⁸ GOEDICKE, [in:] *Studies Parker*, 41.

se).²⁹ Anyway, the ominous “day and night”³⁰ fell in an year of the second half of the XVIth century B.C. in the reign of king Ahmose.³¹

The evidence discussed above seems to be corroborated by the Hearst Medical Papyrus — datable possibly to the early Eighteenth Dynasty — which states that “Seth has banned the Mediterranean Sea” and will likewise “ban the Canaanite illness”.³² That may also, in Goedicke’s opinion, refer to the disaster. “The text dates from the reign of Amenhotep I, when the impact of volcanic activity in Egypt’s northeast was still fresh in people’s memory.”³³

According to Goedicke, Seth’s “banning” of the Mediterranean Sea implies the “successful rescue of Avaris from the Mediterranean as a model for the god’s expected help in stilling the “Canaanite illness”.³⁴ N.B. — according to Manfred Bietak,³⁵ “the Canaanite illness” may possibly have been a pestilence which perhaps ravaged among the population of Avaris.

Goedicke produces arguments to establish the date of the cataclysm on Thera which affected the northeastern Delta to year 7 of queen Hatshepsut i.e. 1483 B.C.³⁶ The evidence recorded by Goedicke is in the first place an inscrip-

²⁹ Cf. W. HELCK, ‘Zum Datum der Eroberung von Auaris’, *Göttinger Miszellen* 19, 33–34; now see VANDERSLEYEN, *L’Egypte*, 216–217 (“Khamoudy aurait succédé à Apophis peut-être vers l’an 7 d’Amosis”). If this is true, year 11 of Khamudy corresponds to year 18 of Ahmose, perhaps c. 1525.

³⁰ Cf. Plato, *Timaios*, 25 D: μίας ἡμέρας καὶ νυκτὸς χαλεπῆς ἐλθούσης.

³¹ Many dates have been proposed to replace the traditional date of 1580 B.C. as the beginning of the reign. Although there is no unanimity among scholars, the beginning of Ahmose’s reign of 26 years is usually placed between 1575 and 1539 B.C. Cf. HORNING, *Untersuchungen, chronological table*; Hornung’s earliest date is 1559: *ibid.*, p. 58; K. A. KITCHEN, ‘The basics of Egyptian chronology in relation to the Bronze Age’ [in:] P. ÅSTRÖM, *High, Middle or Low? Acts of an International Colloquium on Absolute Chronology Held at the University of Gothenburg, 20th–22nd August 1987*, Part 1, Gothenburg, 52. The recent tendency favours dates between 1550 and 1540. VANDERSLEYEN, in his newest publication suggests 1543 (*L’Egypte*, 213). For a chronological synthesis of the reign see Cl. VANDERSLEYEN, *Les guerres d’Amosis, fondateur de la XVIII^e dynastie*, (= *Monographies Reine Elisabeth 1*), Bruxelles 1971, 197–200 and *idem*, *L’Egypte*, 213–237.

³² GOEDICKE stresses the fact that the cult of Seth was closely associated with Avaris, that may be considered that god’s own town: ‘The Northeastern Delta’, 167–8; Cf. *idem*, [in:] *Studies Parker*, 41, n. 28; ‘The Canaanite Illness’, *SAK* 11, 1984, 91–105; see also ‘The »400-Year Stela« reconsidered’, *BES* 3, 1981, 25–42.

³³ GOEDICKE, [in:] *Studies Parker*, 41.

³⁴ GOEDICKE, ‘The Northeastern Delta’, 168.

³⁵ Lecture delivered in Warsaw on 10th January 1994.

³⁶ GOEDICKE, ‘The Northeastern Delta’, 172–173.

tion of Hatshepsut from Speos Artemidos. The queen reports a natural catastrophe including a water-torrent which barely missed her realm, a glow over the coast line (supposedly in the north) and a plague of refugees affecting Middle Egypt. The text mentions “the father-of-fathers who came at his time” i.e. Nun, the god of the primeval ocean, who caused a sudden flood of sea waters.³⁷

The text has no date. It is on the basis of the internal evidence of the inscription that Goedicke hypothesizes 1483 B.C. as the date of the event.

E. N. Davis argues that the date of the volcanic destruction of Thera in the 6th year of Hatshepsut proposed by Goedicke “seems to be too late, even according to conservative chronologies”,³⁸ but he hopes that the question will be clarified by geological research.

Another piece of evidence adduced by Goedicke is a text written on a granite naos from El-Arish in which storms raging for a period of 9 days are mentioned. The inscription belongs to a much later period, but according to Goedicke “the text was originally composed in the early reign of Tuthmosis III and should be seen as a historiographic account of the events of the early Eighteenth Dynasty. On its re-use the account was transposed into a mythical setting to stress the timelessness of the events.”³⁹

The difficulty in Goedicke’s observations is that he attributes a “predominantly seismic” nature to the “initial event” under Ahmose.⁴⁰ This is compatible neither with the evidence of the Rhind and Hearst papyri referring to the event under Ahmose and discussed by Goedicke nor with the Stele of the Storm. E. N. Davis is certainly right when he denies the “seismic character” of the event under Ahmose. “It is difficult to see how an earthquake could have caused the rainstorm at Thebes”.⁴¹

In view of the evidence recorded above, the information of Africanus about Deucalion’s flood under king Mischragmuthosis necessitates a serious reconsideration.

The dates of the reign of Hatshepsut were in later times ascribed to her successor on the throne of Egypt, Tuthmosis III. Therefore, to Manetho, the events

³⁷ GOEDICKE, *ibidem*, 172–3, cf. n. 31; W. HELCK, ‘Vater der Väter’, *NAWG*, 1965, 9, 176.

³⁸ DAVIS, *Thera*, III, 234.

³⁹ GOEDICKE, ‘The Northeastern Delta’, 173.

⁴⁰ GOEDICKE, ‘The Northeastern Delta’, 170.

⁴¹ DAVIS, *Thera*, III, 234.

of the year 1483 B.C. could possibly belong to the reign of Tuthmosis III and not to Hatshepsut.

May we assume with Goedicke that the main volcanic event and the subsequent flood (*tsunami*) occurred under Hatshepsut or Tuthmosis III, so that the event under Ahmose was but a prelude to the main catastrophe? That would certainly agree with the idea of a series of volcanic occurrences and would also corroborate Plato's record of a number of preliminary and partial destructions that preceded the ultimate fatal moment.⁴²

The contents of the Egyptian records seems rather to contradict the idea of an exclusively seismic disaster under Ahmose after which a fatal volcanic event would ultimately come (Hatshepsut / Tuthmosis III). The earlier event takes in Ahmose's stele a form which points to a volcanic and not to a seismic disaster. In particular the winds, darkness and rainfall indicate a volcanic explosion. The voice of Seth equally seems to be rather an echo of a volcanic explosion than a kind of roar of an earthquake. If in actual fact two major catastrophes (and not just one explosion under Ahmose) are recorded in the Egyptian sources of the early New Kingdom, and if the second disaster happened under Hatshepsut or Tuthmosis III, we must anyway take for granted that the earlier disaster was also volcanic.

The event under Ahmose seems to be ascertained. The question is whether half a century later another explosion followed. The solution can be brought only by geological research and by further analysis of the Egyptian evidence.

We shall now attempt to demonstrate that Manetho's information concerning Deucalion's flood, despite the usual identification of Misphragmuthosis by modern scholars, does not refer to a hypothetical disaster under Hatshepsut / Tuthmosis III.

The sameness of *Menkheperre* Tuthmosis III = Misphragmuthosis seems to be very dubious. The interpretation of Misphragmuthosis as *Menkheperre* shared by Gardiner with other scholars,⁴³ is based only on the apparent phonetic similarity of the two names and on the sequence of kings in the Manethonian record. Misphragmuthosis appears in the Manethonian lists after queen Amessis (usually interpreted as Hatshepsut) and a king named Tuthmosis.

It is notorious that the sequence of kings in the excerpts of Manetho is not reliable. The extant record contains errors and misunderstandings due to wrong

⁴² If only we agree that the catastrophe at Thera is the prototype of the story of Atlantis. This seems probable to the present writer.

⁴³ A. GARDINER, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, Oxford 1961, 444.

interpretation of the compound Egyptian royal names.⁴⁴

The superficial phonetic similarity of *Menkheperre* and Mephrammuthosis or Mispfragmuthosis is misleading. The number of regnal years does not agree either: Tuthmosis III ruled for an extremely long period of (almost) 54 years, while the extant quotations from Manetho unanimously state that Mephrammuthosis (Josephus) or Mispfragmuthosis (Africanus, Eusebius) ruled for 25–26 years. That latter number of years agrees exactly with the duration of the reign of Amosis (Ahmose) according to the Manethonian records. As already stated, the highest date of Ahmose is year 22, the conjectural dates of his reign, being e.g. 1552–1527 B.C. (Helck, *Beziehungen*, 99–101) or 1543–1518 B.C. (Vandersleyen, *L’Egypte*, 663).⁴⁵

What is even more important, Amosis’ double name is not unlikely to yield a form Mephrammuthosis *vel sim.*, as given in the Manethonian tradition. The king’s name was *Nebpehtyre* Ahmose. If, according to the evidence from cuneiform texts, *Nebmaatre* (Amenhotep III) could produce *Nimmuria* or *Mimmuria* (Egyptologists tend rather to agree with the phonetic evidence of the cuneiform records), *Neb* in *Nebpehtyre* could also sound *Ne* or *Me*. *Ph(tj)*⁴⁶ could easily give the Greek *ph* and all this, combined with the name of the sun-god, produced finally the form Mephres (Μήφρησ). Mephres together with Ahmose gave Mephrahmose = Mephramosis = Mephrammuthosis (under the influence of the numerous pharaohs named Tuthmosis in that dynasty). The form Mispfragmuthosis is undoubtedly nothing else than a false “correction” by a scribe of the form Mephrammuthosis or Miphrammuthosis.

The name Mephres is present in the Manethonian lists quite separately from Mephrammuthosis, which does not prove that in reality they were not the same ruler.⁴⁷ That the Manethonian king Μήφρησ allegedly ruled for 12 years

⁴⁴ Cf. BECKERATH, *Untersuchungen*, 13: “die Verdoppelung mancher Könige durch irrtümliche Berücksichtigung von Varianten”.

⁴⁵ GARDINER, *Egypt*, 443. For the history of that king see Cl. VANDERSLEYEN, *Les guerres d’Amosis, fondateur de la XVIII^e dynastie*, (= *Monographies Reine Elisabeth*, 1), Bruxelles 1971; W. HELCK, *Die Beziehungen Ägyptens zu Vorderasien im 3. und 2. Jahrtausend v. Chr.* (= *Ägyptol. Abh.* 5), Wiesbaden 1962, 99–101; W. HELCK, *Untersuchungen zu Manetho und den Ägyptischen Königslisten*, Berlin 1956, 65; E. HORNING, *Untersuchungen zur Chronologie und Geschichte des Neuen Reiches*, Wiesbaden 1964, chronological table; VANDERSLEYEN, *L’Egypte*, 663.

⁴⁶ For the disappearance of the final *tj* in *ph(tj)* see J. ČERNÝ, *JEA* 47, 1961, 151–152, cf. above, Menophres.

⁴⁷ Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 50 (Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 15. 95), *Loeb Classical Library*, 100; *ibidem*, fr. 51, Theophilus, *Ad Autolyca.*, III 19 (p. 108).

9 months (which agrees with the length of the rule of Tuthmosis I) and that in Manetho's record he figures as the 5th king of the XVIII Dynasty, seems not to have any importance for his true identity. (Suffice it to compare in the same list "Amenophis" who reigned for "31 years" and "who is reputed to be Memnon" neighbouring with "Horus, for 37 years", to whom the number of years of Amenhotep III is ascribed.)⁴⁸

Queen Amessis, although the deeds ascribed to her may be those of Hatshepsut, should more probably be identified as Ahmes (= Ahmes Nefertari).

There is also a solid basis for our identification of Mispfragmuthosis as Ahmose in the very text of Julius Africanus: 'Ομοῦ ἐπὶ Ἀμώσεως τοῦ καὶ Μισφραγμουθώσεως ἀρχῆς κατὰ Ἀφρικανὸν γίνονται ἔτη ξθ'. Τοῦ γὰρ Ἀμῶς οὐδ' ὅλως εἶπεν ἔτη.

"Total, according to Africanus, down to the reign of Amosis, also called Mispfragmuthosis, 69 years. Of the reign of Amos he gave no years at all."⁴⁹

Thus, we return to our initial point: in the Manethonian tradition according to Africanus (in Syncellus) there are two kings called respectively Amos and Amosis: Amos who was the founder of the XVIIIth Dynasty and Amosis, also called Mispfragmuthosis or Mephrammuthosis. The latter ruled allegedly later, as the sixth king of the dynasty, but strangely enough his rule lasted for exactly the same number of years as the rule of Amos (also called Amosis in other versions), the founder of the dynasty. To avoid the impression of a total confusion, Syncellus states: Τοῦ γὰρ Ἀμῶς οὐδ' ὅλως εἶπεν ἔτη "he (i.e. Manetho or Africanus) did not at all give the number of the years of Amos",⁵⁰ thus removing that unnecessary variant of the name. There can be no more any doubt that Amosis also called Mispfragmuthosis and Amos are in reality one and the same ruler.

The identification of Mephrammuthosis or Mispfragmuthosis as *Nebpehtyre* Ahmose is explicitly confirmed by the statement of Josephus derived from Manetho: "the Shepherds were defeated by a king whose name was Mispfragmuthosis."⁵¹

⁴⁸ Manetho, fr. 52, *Loeb Classical Library*, 113.

⁴⁹ Manetho, fr. 52, *Loeb Classical Library*, 110–113 (the English translation by WADDELL in the *Loeb Classical Library* edition: "Of the length of the reign of Amos he said nothing at all" does not agree with the Greek original); cf. n. 2.

⁵⁰ See above, n. 49.

⁵¹ Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 42 (Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 14. 86) *Loeb Classical Library*, p. 86: ἐπὶ δὲ βασιλείῳ, οὗ ὄνομα εἶναι Μισφραγμουθώσις ἡττημένους φησὶ τοὺς Ποιμένας.

Therefore also the passage containing the statement that under Misphragmuthosis the Deucalion's flood happened, refers to Ahmose. Thus, the passage of Africanus may be added to the Egyptian evidence of the strange occurrences under Ahmose.

The Egyptian sources state that under Ahmose the following phenomena occurred:

- (1) "the voice of Seth" (Rhind Papyrus)
- (2) the rainfall: (two sources: Rhind Papyrus, Stele of the Storm)
- (3) a cataclysm (mentioned by Manetho as the flood of Deucalion's time and vividly described in the stele of Ahmose). The word *κατακλυσμός* ("precipitation") used in the Manethonian text corresponds exactly with the nature of a volcanic rainfall.
- (4) the invasion of sea-waters into the region of the Delta (Hearst Papyrus).
- (5) darkness in the Western region (Stele of the Storm).

All these phenomena may seem to be consequences of a major volcanic eruption and indeed there is no better explanation of these records than the catastrophe of Thera.

Whether all these remarkable events occurred exactly at the same moment seems uncertain in view of the evidence of the Rhind Papyrus mentioning contemporaneous Egyptian victories in the Delta. As already observed above, that does not agree with the presence of the king in his Upper Egyptian residence at Sedjefa-Taouy near Thebes. However, there might have been intervals between the stages of the volcanic eruption. It is also probable, that at the beginning of the disaster the pharaoh immediately returned from Delta to Upper Egypt.

The supposed disaster under queen Hatshepsut remains *sub judice*. The sources dated to the reign of Hatshepsut may either reflect another (and possibly the final) stage of the Thera disaster, which, according to Goedicke, took place on 30th April 1483 or they may be a belated textual reflexion of the event of Ahmose's times. It seems more plausible to see in the events mentioned in the sources datable to the rulers of the XVIIIth Dynasty who reigned later than Ahmose nothing but a delayed echo of the catastrophe under Ahmose. It is possible that these later Egyptian sources, describing some phenomena which actually happened at the reported time, exaggerate their dimensions according to the already established pattern of the really great disaster which had happened in the times of Ahmose. Reproducing descriptions of ancient events was a well-known Egyptian usage. That may be the case of the inscription of Ramesses III from Medinet Habu (the outer face of the First Pylon's north tower), containing an allusion to "the force of Nun, when he breaks out and

lays low towns and villages in a surge of water".⁵²

It is not our purpose here to discuss the volcanological evidence and to comment the nature of the presumable *tsunami* of 1483 B.C. The solution of the chronological problems is a matter for a discussion among specialists of the Aegean culture, who now seem to have new material to establish a connexion between the data from the Egyptian sources and other evidence.

The character of the *κατακλυσμός* of Deucalion's time essentially agrees with the nature of the Egyptian evidence of the disaster under Ahmose.

There is no really contradictory evidence in the Egyptian records of the catastrophe of Thera. Though the main explosion may have been preceded by other symptoms of volcanic activity and perhaps by earthquake(s), there is no doubt that a great catastrophe happened under king Ahmose and that we even have the precise date of the event in the year 11 of the last Hyksos ruler (?).

Platonic record of the disaster of Atlantis explicitly mentions a number of *κατακλυσμοί*.⁵³ His statement may or may not be true as far as the historical prototype of the described situation is concerned. That depends on the reliability of Plato's sources, sources which are irretrievably lost.

Some interesting information can be found in the text of Thrasyllus known from the record of Clemens of Alexandria. He states in his chronological table:

ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μωϋσέως στρατηγίας καὶ Ἰνάχου ἐπὶ τὸν Δευκαλίωνος
κατακλυσμὸν (τὴν δευτέραν λέγω ἔπομβρίαν) καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Φαέθου-
τος ἔμπρησμὸν κτλ.⁵⁴

From that passage we can clearly see that:

- (1) Deucalion's cataclysm was considered the second in a series of great disasters.
- (2) The Φαέθουτος ἔμπρησμός happened at the same time as Deucalions flood.

The coincidence of the flood and disastrous fire from heaven agrees with the probable image of the volcanic disaster at Thera. Thus we might find a possible explanation not only of the Deucalion's flood but also of the myth of Phaethon.

⁵² Quoted after GOEDICKE, 'The Northeastern Delta', 174; cf. *Medinet Habu* II, pl. 102 = K. A. KITCHEN, *Ramesside Inscriptions, Historical and Biographical* V, Oxford 1983, no. 28, 97 f.

⁵³ Plato, *Timaios* 22–25.

⁵⁴ Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I 136.3 cf. JACOBY, *FGrHist* II 253 (p. 1152) = *FHG* III 503.3.

Moreover, Thrasyllos counts 340 years from the cataclysm (the second ἐπομβρία) to the Trojan War. In absolute dates that means 1533/2 B.C. for the cataclysm! The closeness to the estimated date of the eleventh year of Khamudy is astonishing! (cf. also Vandersleyen's dates of Ahmose 1543–1518 B.C.).⁵⁵

It is indeed not necessary to insist on the importance of the mention of the flood in connexion with an Egyptian king, whom we identified as Ahmose. It concerns undoubtedly the “main event” which happened under Ahmose and record of which was later kept in temple archives. The Egyptian record inspired not only the passage of Manetho, taken from the Egyptian annals, but also Plato's story of Atlantis. Plato explicitly states that Solon learned about the catastrophe of Atlantis from the Egyptian priests.⁵⁶

Thrasyllos' second cataclysm together with the burning of the Earth by Phaethon has a precise date. When had the first ἐπομβρία happened? The passage does not mention it explicitly. Was it identical with the disaster of the year 1628, confirmed by new evidence?

In the records that Josephus took from Manetho, there is an extremely interesting passage concerning the circumstances of the Hyksos invasion of Egypt:

Τουτίμαιος. ἐπὶ τούτου οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως ὁ θεὸς ἀντέπνευσεν, καὶ παραδόξως ἐκ τῶν πρὸς ἀνατολὴν μερῶν ἄνθρωποι τὸ γένος ἄσημοι καταθάρρησαντες ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν ἐστράτευσαν καὶ ῥαδίως ἀμαχητὶ ταύτην κατὰ κράτος εἶλον.⁵⁷

The presence of the word ἀντέπνευσεν in this context is not less mysterious than the enigmatic τουτίμαιος.

Although ἀντιπνέω may (rather rarely) be used in a metaphorical sense, this seems incompatible with the matter-of-fact style of the context. Therefore it cannot be excluded that in actual fact the “contrary wind” should be understood literally. The reference to the direction of the wind is not clear at first glance. However, if we look further into the sentence, we find there the information concerning the direction from which the invaders came. It seems to be a plausible guess if we interpret the passage quoted above in the following way:

⁵⁵ According to some estimates the last year of Khamudy is c. 1532. Cf. J. BAINES, J. MALEK, *Atlas of Ancient Egypt*, Oxford 1992, 36. According to VANDERSLEYEN, *L'Égypte*, 216–217, the date would be rather c. 1525; cf. above, nn. 17, 29, 31.

⁵⁶ Plato, *Timaios* 21E, *Loeb Classical Library*, p. 30.

⁵⁷ Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 14. 76.

“in his (“Toutimaïos”?) reign, I do not know how it happened that the god blasted in the opposite direction (i.e. from West to East) and paradoxically it was from the regions of the East that some people of obscure origin encouraged (by this fact) invaded the country (i.e. Egypt) and easily seized it without striking a blow”.

In the text the stress is laid on a paradox: a blast that came from an opposite direction (the West) and the invasion — another plague which, however, came from the East. There is also a logical connexion between the (super)natural disaster that happened to the Egyptians and the fact that the invaders *ῥαδίως ἀμαχητὶ ταύτην* (i.e. *τὴν χώραν*) *κατὰ κράτος εἶλον*. Otherwise the statement about the easiness of the conquest would remain unexplained. The use of *καὶ παραδόξως* in the sentence would be illogical if the expression: “the blast of god smote us” was just intended to anticipate the subsequent statement concerning the invasion.

The mention of the blast of god might perhaps refer to a blast produced by a volcanic explosion, obviously a much earlier one than the event recorded under Ahmose. Is it correct to associate the event which immediately preceded the Hyksos invasion with the volcanic explosion of 1628 B.C.? In such a case we would have not only additional evidence to advocate the theory of a series of catastrophes but also a *terminus post quem* of the invasion of Egypt by the Hyksos. It is not our purpose here to go too far into the field of Egyptian chronology. However, the chronology resulting from the evidence of Manetho seems to be confirmed by many other sources; for example it may be compared with the idea of Goedicke, who — on the basis of the “400-Year Stela” — suggested the date of 1655 B.C. as the beginning of the cult of Seth at Avaris.⁵⁸ Anyway, if the Hyksos rule lasted for about a century, and the date of their expulsion under Ahmose (Mephramuthosis) is c. 1525, the date of their invasion must be close to 1628. Further archaeological research in the Delta will probably soon bring an ultimate answer to the questions of the Hyksos chronology.

The catastrophe referred to by Manetho as “the blast of God” seems otherwise not to be recorded in the extant Egyptian sources. Its occurrence belongs to a very troubled time of Egyptian history from which there is little written evidence.

It seems that the Egyptian records of the cataclysm contain mentions of at least two separate volcanic events:

- (1) one in the XVIIth century B.C. (probable date 1628 B.C.)

⁵⁸ H. GOEDICKE, ‘The »400-Year Stela« reconsidered’, *BES* 3, 1981, 25–42. Cf. IDEM, ‘The Northeastern Delta’, 166–168, n. 9.

and

(2) another in the 11th year of Khamudy (c. 1525 B.C.) = the second cataclysm, *δευτέρα ἐπομβρία* of Thrasyllus, dated by him with amazing precision.

A third eruption on 30th April 1483 B.C. is but a hypothesis, not confirmed, however, by the Greek sources.

Only new geological and archaeological data could confirm the above reconstruction of the sequence of events and bring further information.

There is some evidence in classical sources of a conflict between river and sea-water. This notion is present in Lucan's *Pharsalia*⁵⁹ and in Statius' *Thebaid*.⁶⁰ Plutarch in his *De Iside et Osiride* 40.367 A-B attributes the presence of sea waters in Egypt to the power of Typhon (Seth).⁶¹ In the text of Plutarch, Nile water is associated with Horus, while sea water is identified with Seth. The sea (Seth) was expelled from the valley of Egypt by the power of Horus.⁶² It is noteworthy that the upsurge of fresh water is connected with rain.⁶³

Although it is possible to take that record concerning the primeval times at its face value i.e. as evidence to Egypt being formerly a sea-gulf, Plutarch's remarks may also bear an implicit echo of a sea-flood caused by Seth at a much later epoch.

Aelius Aristides praises a miracle of Sarapis who produced drinkable water in the midst of the sea.⁶⁴ A similar miracle (water offered to a *κυβερνέτης* and

⁵⁹ Lucan, *Pharsalia* 8. 444-445.

⁶⁰ Statius, *Theb.* 8. 358-362: *Qualis ubi aversi secretus pabula caeli | Nilus et Eoas magno bibit ore pruinas, | scindit fontis opes septemque patentibus arvis | in mare fert hiemes; paenitus cessere fugatae | Nereides dulcique timent occurrere ponto.* Cf. R. WILD, *Water in the Cultic Worship of Isis and Sarapis* (= *EPRO* 87), Leiden 1981, 228, n. 83.

⁶¹ Plut., *De Iside et Osiride* 40.367 A-B, cf. WILD, *Water*, 82, n. 77 (p. 228); Wild's quotation on p. 82: "... one should not reject that tradition that Typhon once had control over the land of Osiris since Egypt was at that time a sea. For that reason many seashells are found even to the present in the quarries and the mountains. Further, all the springs and wells, of which there are many, have salty and brackish water as though a stale vestige of the ancient sea collected there. In time Horus overpowered Typhon. That is, when a timely abundance of rain took place, the Nile, having forced out the sea, revealed the plain and filled it with its alluvial deposits."

⁶² Cf. WILD, *Water*, 82; 228 n. 78.

⁶³ *Ibidem*, 82, also 228, nn. 77 & 80.

⁶⁴ Or. 36.10; 45.29 (ed. KEIL).

subsequently to the inhabitants of Pharos) is perhaps described in a fragment of an aretology of Sarapis in *P. Oxy.* XI 1382 (II cent. A.D.).⁶⁵

The victory of Horus, the conqueror of the sea, over the evil power of Seth was until Roman times celebrated in the sanctuaries of Egyptian deities.⁶⁶ Both in Egyptian and Canaanite tradition there appears a myth of the struggle between a divine warrior and the sea.⁶⁷

It seems very probable that it was under influence of the great disaster of the reign of Ahmose that Seth began to assume the role of an evil deity. Before he was downgraded to his evil status he received honours as the patron of sea travellers.⁶⁸ No wonder that he was consequently blamed for a disastrous event brought about by the sea.

The voice of Seth known from the note on the Rhind Mathematical Papyrus cannot be anything else than an enormous noise in nature. It is probable that the event under discussion increased the belief in the special power of that particular god, who manifested his existence in such a terrifying way. As we said above, the awe thus inspired could however also contribute to the condemnation of that god for the disasters which he caused.

It is unlikely to assume that Manetho directly used the stele of Ahmose as his source of information. It should be rather taken for granted that the event was also recorded in other Egyptian sources.

Manetho's record in Africanus' excerpt mentions "the cataclysm of Deucalion's time". A "cataclysm" in Greek is literally not a flood but a precipitation. An enormous rainfall corresponds well with the nature of the volcanic disaster and agrees with both the stele of king Ahmose and the record of the Egyptian scribe preserved in the Rhind Papyrus. A *tsunami* must also have accompanied the earlier event of XVIIIth century B.C., if this is the signification of an allusion to "banning the Mediterranean" in the incantation against the "Canaanite illness".

It is impossible to make any supposition concerning the date of the Deucalion's cataclysm on the basis of the internal evidence of the Greek mythology. However, if a real person named Deucalion ever existed, his connexion with Crete is not impossible. The tradition, though, makes difference between the Thessalian Deucalion who escaped the flood and another Deucalion from

⁶⁵ *P. Oxy.* XI 1382 (II cent. A.D.).

⁶⁶ WILD, *Water*, 83.

⁶⁷ For a more extensive comment and literature see WILD, *Water*, 83, n. 84 (pp. 228-9).

⁶⁸ Cf. WILD, *Water*, 228 n. 84.

Crete. The fact that Ariadne's brother was named Deucalion like the hero of the deluge may, anyhow, have some significance.

Anyway, Africanus' record is a positive evidence of an ancient tradition associating the Deucalion's cataclysm with Ahmose.

It is certainly impossible to over-estimate the impact of the disaster which happened under king *Nebpehtyre* Ahmose (Mephrammuthosis) upon the mind of ancient people. We shall probably never know what they felt in those days and nights of darkness and fear. The scarcity of the Egyptian evidence may be simply due to the tendency not to invoke bad events in writing.⁶⁹ The very idea of the end of the world may owe a lot to that horrible day, a virtual *dies irae* which according to the much later and unexpectedly appropriate expression *solvet saeculum in favilla*.

The *κατακλυσμός* and *πυρκαϊαί*, Deucalion and Phaethon, the "fruitful association" as the author of the article on *Deukalion* in the *Real-Encyclopaedia* says, once attributed to the mere imagination of ancient writers, were not entirely fictitious. Darkness and an enormous rainfall were the share of the areas situated too far away to be hit by the shock wave. The coastal civilizations received a serious blow. A literary echo of the disaster is probably still present on the pages of the Bible where the darkness in Egypt is described.⁷⁰ Also the well-known description of the moving masses of water in the same source may be a reflexion of real events.

In Africanus' text concerning Amos there is an explicit statement 'Αμός, ἐφ' οὗ Μωϋσῆς ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ Αἰγύπτου.⁷¹ Also Josephus states elsewhere that the departure of the Shepherds was identical with the Exodus.⁷² Theophilus says that Moses was the leader of the expelled, although he follows the version

⁶⁹ Cf. the opinion of BECKERATH, *Untersuchungen*, 11.

⁷⁰ This idea has already been expressed by a Greek seismologist Angelos GALANOPOULOS, who in September 1970 at the International Santorini Congress advanced the hypothesis that the biblical plagues (Ex. 7–10) should be associated with the Thera explosion. Cf. A. GALANOPOULOS, E. BACON, *Atlantis*, London 1969; *Die Wahrheit über Atlantis*, München 1978.

⁷¹ Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 52 (Syncellus, pp. 115, 130, 133), *Loeb Classical Library*, p. 110.

⁷² Cf. Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 50 (Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 15. 94), ed: *Loeb Classical Library*, p. 100.

that the expulsion was due to Egyptian king Tethmosis.⁷³ However, this Tethmosis, according to Josephus, reigned “for 25 years 4 months”⁷⁴ which agrees with the actual reign of Ahmose, and with the count of Africanus, who states that Mispfragmuthosis reigned for 26 years.⁷⁵

This shows that a tradition — contradicted by other authors⁷⁶ — situated the Exodus under Ahmose. Since Mispfragmuthosis/Mephrammuthosis was in actual fact the same ruler (Ahmose), there is a striking coincidence of two events: Exodus and Deucalion’s flood. In this context there can be no doubt that only the mentions of Pi-Ramesse directly support the attribution of the Exodus to the Ramesside period. The Ramesside town name, however, was probably inserted into the original story by the redactors of the Bible in later times, when the Ramesside Egypt was much better remembered than the remote past of the beginnings of the XVIIIth Dynasty; as Vandersleyen states in his new publication, most of the Targums have Pelusium and Tanis instead of the city of Ramesses.⁷⁷ Therefore we are inclined to assume that the Exodus was an event contemporaneous with king Ahmose. Recently this point of view has been convincingly advocated by Cl. Vandersleyen.⁷⁸ Already Galanopoulos associated the supernatural occurrences accompanying the history of Moses and the Exodus with the Thera eruption.⁷⁹

Plato’s description of the disaster of Atlantis is probably a very late echo of the catastrophe in the Minoan world.

⁷³ Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 51 (Theophilus, *Ad Autolyicum* III 20), ed. Loeb Classical Library, p. 106–108.

⁷⁴ Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 50 (Josephus, *Contra Apionem* I 15. 94), ed. Loeb Classical Library, p. 100.

⁷⁵ Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 52, Loeb Classical Library, p. 112.

⁷⁶ Thrasyllus writes that γίνεται ἡ ἕξοδος κατὰ Ἰναχον, πρὸ τῆς Σωθιακῆς περιόδου ἐξηλθόντος ἀπ’ Αἰγύπτου ἔτεσι πρότερον τριακοσίοις τεσσαράκοντα ε. According to the same source Moses was anterior to the Deucalion’s flood, Clem. Alex., *Strom.* I 136.3, cf. JACOBY, *FGrHist* II 253 (p. 1152) = *FHG* III 503.3: ἀπὸ δὲ τῆς Μωϋσεως στρατηγίας καὶ Ἰνάχου ἐπὶ τὸν Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμὸν ... γενεαὶ τέσσαρες (?) ἀριθμοῦνται; Eusebius puts the Exodus at the end of the XVIIIth Dynasty: cf. the arguments of Syncellus against Eusebius, Manetho, *Aegyptiaca*, fr. 53, Loeb Classical Library, p. 114.

⁷⁷ P. MONTET, *L’Egypte et la Bible*, Paris 1959; VANDERSLEYEN, *L’Egypte*, 233 n. 1.

⁷⁸ VANDERSLEYEN, *L’Egypte*, 232–237.

⁷⁹ A. G. GALANOPOULOS, ‘Die ägyptischen Plagen und der Auszug Israëls aus geologischer Sicht’, *Das Altertum* 10, 1964, 131–137; ‘Tsunami. Bemerkungen zum Aufsatz »Die Santorin-Katastrophe und der Exodus«’ von W. KREBS’, *Das Altertum* 13, 1967, 19–20.

The Biblical tradition of the flood is probably unrelated, although the extant redaction of the Genesis is obviously much posterior to all the events discussed here.

The Mesopotamian stories of the flood concern presumably the same disaster as the one recorded in the Genesis. The date of the earliest Mesopotamian evidence, although in fact not very firmly established, is no doubt much earlier than the times of Ahmose⁸⁰ and than the year 1628. It is perhaps a matter to be discussed among specialists in Mesopotamian and Semitic studies, whether the diffusion of the flood story, which might have taken place in the times of the XVIIIth Dynasty, may be due to the occurrence of a new disaster (or more than one disaster) of a similar kind.

The Mesopotamian flood stories seem to be the closest extant parallel to the biblical story. The Graeco-Roman tradition of the flood with Deucalion and Pyrrha in the opinion of Mesopotamian researchers "is not certainly related at all".⁸¹ However, the biblical mention of the universal vice of the mixed population of the earth shows also some similitude to the Greek tradition. The Deucalion story may have received some colour from the Eastern tradition concerning a much earlier flood.

The Greeks distinguished between the archaic event (the flood of Ogyges) and the later Deucalion's cataclysm. The whole series consisted of three cataclysms, the last one being connected with the name of Dardanos. The following passage from Thrasyllus concerning Deucalion's flood, the disaster which was identical with the event under Mephramuthosis mentioned by Africanus, is certainly relevant to our discussion:

τὸν Δευκαλίωνος κατακλυσμόν (τὴν δευτέραν λέγω ἔπομβρίαν)⁸²

Unless the first ἔπομβρία was the cataclysm of 1628 B.C. or another disaster (one of the series) that immediately preceded the "main event" under Ahmose, it might conceivably be the "biblical" or "Mesopotamian" flood.

In the Mesopotamian tradition there is also a mention of a flood brought about by Marduk⁸³, different from the earlier disaster. It is not impossible that

⁸⁰ Cf. M. CIVIL, 'The Sumerian Flood Story', [in:] W. G. LAMBERT, A. R. MILLARD, *Atra-hasis. The Babylonian Story of the Flood*, Oxford 1969, 138–145.

The oldest datable mentions of the flood belong to the early IIInd millennium B.C. (the Isin dynasty).

⁸¹ W. G. LAMBERT *et al.*, *Atra-hasis*, 24.

⁸² Thrasyllus *apud* Clem. Alex. *Strom.* I 136.3 cf. JACOBY, *FGrHist* II 253 (p. 1152) = *FHG* III 503.3 cf. n. 72.

⁸³ P. F. GÖSSMANN, *Das Era-Epos*, Würzburg 1956, 14, especially lines 170ff.

the Marduk's flood is a mythical image of the disaster under discussion (Deucalion's flood).

Recent discoveries in the Nile Delta (Tell el-Dab'a) show that the mixed Egyptian, Hyksos and Canaanite culture was strongly influenced by the Minoan civilization. The final decline of Hyksos may be largely due to the impact of the event of year 11 of Khamudy. The supernatural help to the southern conqueror of the Delta could enormously strengthen religious feelings in Egypt and was likely to constitute an impulse to organize expeditions into the enemy territory in Asia.

We are not going to analyze deeply these implications. We do not intend either to go too far into the field of Egyptology. Our purpose here has been merely to identify Mispfragmuthosis/Mephrammuthosis as Ahmose and not *Menkheperre* Tuthmosis III and to add Manetho and Thrasyllus as witnesses to the extant Egyptian records of the cataclysm of Thera.

[Warszawa]

Adam Łukaszewicz

¹ A. GAROUDA, *Egypt of the Pharaohs*, Oxford 1961, 309; R. S. BIANCHI, 'Memnonkolosse', *Leben der Ägyptologie* IV, Wiesbaden 1981, 23 with references in s. 3.

² For a general discussion see G. W. BOWERBUCK, 'The Miracle of Memnon', *JASP* 21, 1984, 21-32. In a forthcoming study by the present writer, being a version of the *Aegyptiaca Antoniniana* (cf. n. 4) the problem of the date of the restoration works will be discussed.

³ A.-J. LEFRANÇOIS, *La statue vocale de Memnon considérée dans ses rapports avec l'Égypte et la Grèce*, Paris 1883, cf. *ibid.*, *Œuvres complètes*, I, 2, 1881, 1-236.

⁴ Cf. A. ŁUKASZEWICZ, *Aegyptiaca Antoniniana*, Warszawa 1993, 163-166 (in Polish).