

This is an author's preprint. This review is published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* 136: 242 (DOI: 10.1017/S0075426916000598) and should be cited from that edition.

DILLERY (J.) **Clio's Other Sons: Berossus and Manetho, With an Afterword on Demetrius**. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2015. Pp. xxxviii + 494. 9780472052271. \$50 (pbk).

After a decade of renewed interest in Clio's 'other sons', John Dillery's thought-provoking monograph represents a significant addition to Hellenistic history and the study of connections between the Greek world and Near East. After an introduction on Hellenistic historiography and the place Egyptian and Babylonian elites under Persian and Hellenistic rule, the book is divided into two main sections: 'The Vectors of History: Time and Space' (chapters 2-3) explores each writer's cultural and intellectual affiliations through their use of chronology and geography, while 'Narrative History' (chapters 4-7) offers new readings of the narrative sections of the *Babyloniaca* and *Aegyptiaca* and presents the core of Dillery's argument that Greek historiography was the decisive stimulus for these 'native histories'. The afterword uses Demetrius the Chronographer to throw into relief the distinctive features of Manetho and Berossus' work, and the book ends on a poignant parallel with Andean historiography of the c16th CE, where Berossus and Manetho (or rather, the versions fabricated by Annius of Viterbo) found an unexpected reception.

Dillery considers the two authors through multiple analytical lenses, offering new insights on topics as varied as Berossus' dating of the Flood (76-9), Greek 'narrative mannerisms' in Manetho (310-13) and the possible 'proto-apocalyptic' orientation of the *Babyloniaca* and *Aegyptiaca* (129, 218-229 and *passim*). One of the strengths of the book is the way in which it situates Berossus and Manetho within a broader Hellenistic context. Dillery argues persuasively that Berossus in particular should be viewed as a *local* historian and aligned with contemporary writers in the Greek-speaking world: the promotion of Babylon in his vision of antediluvian history and his account of the Flood, which diverges from traditional Mesopotamian accounts, can be compared with the local appropriation of panhellenic myths in Hellenistic Greek texts like the Lindian Chronicle (136-48; 183-92). Another strength is that the interwoven analysis of the two authors enables the reader to appreciate the differences between their works, a welcome corrective to a tendency among some previous scholars to homogenise them. Thus, the surviving fragments of Manetho do not show an obvious local slant (81-2); Manetho's account may be anti-Persian and Berossus' somewhat pro-Persian (88-9; 297-9); and if authentic, Manetho's synchronisms between the Egyptian and Greek past find no counterpart in Berossus (97-117).

The question of authenticity raises the major problem for any analysis of Manetho or Berossus: the fragmentary state of their works and their complex channels of transmission. At times, Dillery perhaps goes beyond the limits of the evidence in his reconstructions of what has been lost, for example the idea that Sesostris' activities 'must have bulked large' in the *Aegyptiaca* and that would have functioned as an equivalent to Berossus' Nebuchadnezzar (179, 313). The attempt to construct a concrete channel for Greek influence on Berossus and Manetho via '*philoi*-historians' at the Hellenistic courts (13-27) faces similar problems. With Manetho's relationship to the Ptolemies we are on slightly firmer ground, but Berossus' court connection

rests solely on Tatian's statement that he wrote 'for the third Antiochus' after Alexander (T2). Some of the '*philoi*-historians' are also hard to pin down: while Demetrius of Phalerum's importance as a *philos* to Ptolemy I is indisputable, most of our sources make no mention of intellectual advice, and Dillery is forced to rely here on the problematic *Letter of Aristaeas*. Finally, the loss of all parchment or papyrus from first-millennium Mesopotamia limits our ability to assess Berossus' relationship to pre-existing traditions. While it is true that no Aramaic narrative historiography from the Persian period survives (348), we cannot be sure that none existed; if the full written record had reached us it might have shown that Berossus is less innovative, or less Hellenic, than we think.

In a work which offers unparalleled scope and depth in its examination of these two writers it may seem churlish to point out what is missing. However, a number of recent studies on Berossus that provide important intersections with Dillery's treatment should be noted, in particular on Berossus' relationship to Babylonian and Greek intellectual traditions (G. De Breucker, 'Berossos between tradition and innovation', in K. Radner and E. Robson, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Cuneiform Culture* (2011) 637-657; R. J. Van der Spek, 'Berossus as a Babylonian chronicler and Greek historian', in id., ed., *Studies in Ancient Near Eastern World View and Society* (2008) 277-318) and his portrayal of the Neo-Babylonian kings and Hanging Gardens (P.-A. Beaulieu, 'Berossus on Late Babylonian history', in Y. Gong and Y. Chen, eds., *Special Issue of Oriental Studies. A Collection of Papers on Ancient Civilizations of Western Asia, Asia Minor and North Africa* (2006) 116-149).

Yet none of this detracts from the value of this immensely learned and stimulating book, which sets the study of both Berossus and Manetho on a new footing, and should inspire more historians to devote attention to Clio's neglected offspring.

KATHRYN STEVENS
Durham University
kathryn.stevens@durham.ac.uk