

BOOK REVIEW

Clio's Other Sons: Berossus & Manetho. By JOHN DILLERY. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015. Pp. xxxvii + 494. Paper, \$50.00. ISBN 978-0-472-052271.

In this book, Dillery models how Berossus' *Babyloniaca* and Manetho's *Aegyptiaca* negotiate the boundaries of their native traditions with Macedonian political and Greek cultural hegemony. Against their scant remains and reception as types of modern concerns, of cultural appropriation by imperialist powers or of native resistance, Dillery contextualizes the authors' purposes and strategies in writing Greek narrative histories. By examining the two historians in parallel, Dillery highlights their similarities as native priestly elites, as members of the Macedonian courts, and as having access to native records, suggesting a conceptual space that fostered the creative interaction between Greek and native historical consciousnesses. This study not only enriches our appreciation of Hellenistic historiography, but provides a model for approaching the intersections of native and hegemonic worldviews.

After surveying Berossus and Manetho's contexts, the work examines how the historians represent central historical "vectors" of time and space. Dillery reconstructs how Berossus and Manetho represent Babylonian and Egyptian conceptions of historical time, avoiding the assumption that these cultures lacked historical consciousness, yet refusing to minimize the transformative encounter with Greek historiography. Addressing space, Dillery presents the native perspectives of the authors, and also the spaces occupied by texts in their cultures. The study's last division explores narrative history. Contrasting Greek narrative history with Babylonian and Egyptian non-narrative models, Dillery devotes chapters to how Berossus and Manetho transformed native materials into Greek-style narrative history. In conclusion he suggests "engagement" with Herodotus for understanding their relationship with the canonical author, rather than concealment or opposition.

Chapter one addresses the contexts of the *Babyloniaca* and *Aegyptiaca*, encompassing both Greek and native backgrounds. Dillery demonstrates Berossus and Manetho share numerous commonalities with early Hellenistic historians,

who were often local historians, avoiding the global scope of Herodotus and Thucydides, focusing on constructing local identity by compiling local documents. They were often attached to the Macedonian courts, providing a glorious past for the newly established kingdoms and undermining their rivals' claims. From the native side, the historians again occupy recognizable positions. Dillery reconstructs Manetho's role as a member of the native priestly elite in Egypt as interpreting foreign intervention in Egypt in terms of cycles of cosmic disruption and order and legitimating foreign rulers based on their support of the native priesthood. While the evidence for the priestly elite's role in Babylon is thinner, Dillery argues for a similar context for Berossus, especially as negotiating legitimation in return for official recognition of the priestly class.

The second chapter examines time in Berossus and Manetho, especially how they represent native understandings of historical time and their interactions with Greek models. Dillery displays Berossus as an innovator, adapting traditional king-lists by coordinating them with sages (modeling the cooperation of the Seleucid kings and Babylonian priests) and providing a precedent for the Macedonian calendar in Babylonian prehistory. Manetho is shown adapting native Egyptian material, responding to Greek historiography, transforming partial king-lists, whose purpose was primarily political, differentiating "true kings" from "usurpers", to a comprehensive, historical list. Dillery also sees Manetho representing his native tradition against Greek historians, correcting and supplementing Herodotus and using synchronism to fit key Greek events within his universal Egyptian matrix.

Chapter three addresses space, showing that the historians narrate their histories from local Babylonian and Egyptian perspectives, which, while unsurprising, contributes to the sense of balance between cooperation and resistance to Macedonian rule. Dillery focuses on particular spaces as legitimating the construction or recovery of historical texts: Berossus' localization of the flood narrative at Sippur exploits an archaeological understanding of that city's antediluvian history with the narrative of Xisouthros burying and recovering the original account of creation, legitimizing Berossus' own account. Similarly Dillery localizes Manetho in the "House of Life" or temple scriptorium, which authorized the (re-)construction of Egyptian history.

Chapters four through seven examine extant narratives within the *Babyloniaca* and *Aegyptiaca*. Chapter four introduces Dillery's main concerns, especially that narrative history is particularly Greek, and that Berossus and Manetho have transformed non- or micro-narrative native materials, engaging the Greek model.

The fifth chapter examines Berossus' narratives: the creation and flood, the battle of Carchemish, and the reign of Nebuchadnezzar II. Dillery compares available versions, probing Berossus' transformation of native sources in his Hellenistic context. For example, Berossus' understanding the creation story as a nature allegory reflects both the Babylonian construction of the myth and contemporary Greek approaches familiar from Euhemerus.

Chapter six sets Manetho's Hyksos narratives in the context of Egyptian *Königsnovellen*, especially that the narratives assimilate historical misfortunes to the mythical pattern of disruption and restoration of the world order. Dillery compares Berossus and Manetho's activities to Johnathan Z. Smith's category of "pre-apocalyptic" literature, placing moral authority in the priestly classes, but allowing foreign rulers to accommodate themselves to that authority. Chapter seven examines Berossus' and Manetho's relationships with the Greek tradition, arguing they neither conceal their engagement with Greek historiography, nor assimilate themselves entirely. Rather, their corrections of earlier historians figure them as "Greek", while, simultaneously, creating space to represent native historical understandings.

The afterword, contrasting Demetrius the Chronographer's (late 3rd cent. BC) *On the Kings of Judaea* with the *Aegyptiaca* and *Babyloniaca*, supports Dillery's argument that Berossus and Manetho exploit an opportunity in the early Hellenistic period to negotiate between Greek and native historical consciousnesses, and that in Demetrius' case the existence of a native narrative historical vision (in the Bible), lack of a native power-structure (for the Alexandrian Jews), and his later occurrence prevent him from negotiating between native and hegemonic historiographies as Berossus and Manetho did. A thorough bibliography and indexes conclude the volume. Altogether Dillery constructs a cogent theoretical position, that Berossus and Manetho are neither figures of "accommodation" or "resistance" but represent their native worldviews *by* engaging in Greek historiography, and provides sensitive, well-informed readings of the individual passages.

PAULOJENNUS

Whitworth University, pojennus@whitworth.edu