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An avis ara among the Egyptologists taking his or her interest in Manetho’s tradition might call the book by J. Dillery a much awaited undertaking. Manetho’s evidence was treated in fundamental works by D. Redford1) and R. Gozzoli2) and touched quite at length in connection with the Hyksos period by Th. Schneider3); besides, the personality and works of Manetho were considered recently enough in I. Moyer’s study of Egyptian Hellenism4). The authors of this review have every reason to add that Manethonia is an important object of their own research, though, their publications being mostly Russian, this addition is not quite helpful5). However, a new monographic treatment of Manetho’s tradition is important: to find another one in the extent bibliography on, we probably have to go back sixty years from now to the work by W. Helck6) and then probably as far as the antiquarian research by F.W. Unger7). That is why those who realized the importance of the subject were likely to anticipate the appearance of this book with great expectations.

This review is prepared when a period of time has elapsed since the book appeared; and earlier reviews allow saying that these expectations were felt justified. The book was much appreciated, which is certainly fair as to the wide context (indeed, from the Greek Early Hellenistic historiography to the view of historical events at Hawaii; cf. pp. 3-32, 34-345), in which the hellenophile Oriental historiography was considered. Earlier discussion of Dillery’s book is also useful for the present review in one respect: it allows avoiding its all-round consideration and concentrating on points of special importance and interest. It is also suitable to leave aside the Berossus’ part of the book and to discuss here the treatment of the Manethonian tradition exclusively. Not only this review is written primarily from the viewpoint of Egyptology but also Berossus’ material is given in the book a narrower, rather subordinate place.

Let us start with enumerating the points of source analysis, in which we are in accord with the author. Dillery considers the “shepherds’ fragments” (“Hyksos I”; frg. 42 Waddell), the story of Sethos and Harmais (frg. 50 Waddell) and the “lepers’ fragment” (“Hyksos II”; frg. 54 Waddell) in Josephus’ Contra Apionem to be faithful quotations from Manetho, though he suspects that Josephus could have known Manetho’s Aegyptiaca in two somewhat varying versions (p. XII, 201, 207 et al.). Incidentally, Dillery shares with a number of earlier authors the view that Josephus’ tradition of Manetho can be trusted8): and it is excellent that this view became standard in the present-day scholarship. With Osw. Murray9) Dillery considers Hecataeus of Abdera to have been the prototype author for Diodorus’ Book One on Egypt and the contemporary and courtier of the Satrap Polye米 (p. 23-27). He does not doubt either Hecataeus of Miletus or Herodotus to have visited Egypt and reproduced a number of phenomena in their writings to the best of their understanding (e.g. pp. 90, 120) — a view mostly unchallenged after the Egyptological marginalia to Herodotus by A.B. Lloyd10)). In these points Dillery reiterates the positions formulated before; however, these positions, alternative as they are to once fashionable hypercriticism of ancient tradition, are really worth reiteration and make a sound base for further research.

The book has, in fact, two prefaces: a preface as such (“Preface: Berossus and Manetho — Who They Were?”), p. VII-XXXVIII, and “Introduction” (p. 3-51). The latter hardly deserves this name, as it gives an important account of the early Hellenistic historiography, its role at royal courts and the situation of local Egyptian and Babylonian elites after the Macedonian conquest. In a way, both these introductory parts contribute to the formulation of the book’s major problem: what was the aim of Manetho and Berossus writing the histories of their respective countries in alien tongue? Dillery felt it necessary to emphasize the positions of P. Green, who once characterized Berossus as “sedulous imperial bootlicker”, a collaborator who facilitated foreign rule in his land11) and of I. Moyer, who considered Manetho’s Aegyptiaca “an indigenous attempt to make explicit the

proper historical role of the Egyptian pharaoh, and also to teach the Ptolemies and other Greeks at court to read Egyptian history in an Egyptian fashion\textsuperscript{12).} The author defines these opinions as two “extremes” (p. XIV), though their polarity is not to be overrated: anyway, in both cases the Oriental historians are well-intentioned towards Macedonian princes. Dillery speaks about the estimated target audience of the Greek texts by Manetho and Berossus and remarks that the choice of the Greek language does not necessarily imply that this audience was composed of Greeks or Macedonians (p. XXI); he considers the problem of the so-called “losers’ history” made up by defeated peoples and intended to prevent the elimination of their cultures (p. XXV-XXVI); and in due course he assesses the importance of writing history by those standing close to the early Hellenistic courts and by kings themselves (p. 28-32). This consideration of Manetho’s and Berossus’ histories \textit{Sitz im Leben} is somehow lost out of sight in the following chapters of the book; and when Dillery comes back to it, he states (actually, at lesser length) that the aim of the Oriental historians was “the preservation of the integrity of both civilizations in the face of foreign domination” (p. 107). The answer to this question is also given by Dillery: in Manetho’s and Berossus’ works “\textit{Sitz im Leben}” indicates the latter option. Though here the author does not resume the term “losers’ history”, the hypothesis described with it seems to solve for him the major problem of the book.

Nevertheless, two questions arise about such solution: if Manetho’s task was to convey in his writing the essence of his civilization, why to accomplish it by means of historical narration particularly? Suppose, the answer to this is that Manetho’s writings were not just history: after all, Plutarch quoted him in \textit{De Iside et Osiride} in connection with religious matters (frgg. 77-80 Waddell). However, the next question is: if Manetho wrote in order to preserve the self-consciousness of the Egyptians, why did he do it in Greek? There is an example of preserving the self-definition of an Egyptian social strata by means of \textit{Egyptian} written tradition presumably in the early Hellenistic time: the \textit{Épic of Pêtau-bastis} reflecting the values of the Lybian military elite (of its descendents rather) is believed to have been recorded in Demotic under Ptolemy II Philadelphus\textsuperscript{14).} The answer to this question is also given by Dillery: in Manetho’s and Berossus’ works “Greek authors on Babylon and Egypt were somehow answered in the Greek language by a Babylonian and Egyptian, at a time when Greek culture was dominant in both places because of the Macedonian conquest” (p. 351). These histories were therefore a cultural reaction to the Macedonian conquest, and their target audience was conquerors. But this explanation is at variance with the one discussed before; and they are hardly complementary, as they really should imply for Manetho and Berossus different target audiences and, respectively, different language choice.

A solution, however, can be simple enough. Dillery repeatedly stated that Manetho’s and Berossus’ works were the first narrative histories embracing the entire existence of their respective civilizations; and he is probably right in that. Moreover, it is not likely that the Egyptians had narratives embracing lengthy periods of their history: according to a handy definition by R. Gozzoli, their knowledge of the past was shaped into novelistic “(hi)stories” relevant of specific kings and rulers\textsuperscript{15).} Historical narrative as such was a form invented by Greeks; and, in fact, it was not so long before the Hellenism that it achieved the scale of all-embracing Greek “national” history (in writings by Thucydides and especially by his continuators in the 4th century B.C.\textsuperscript{16)).} The intention of Manetho and Berossus to write the “national” histories of their respective countries must have been backed, in the first place, by their ability to do it, i.e. by their acquaintance with the Greek historical genre at a degree allowing implementing it in their own work. However, borrowing this genre together with its regular language allowed also addressing their works to a very large audience: both to the new Macedonian masters of their lands and to their upper and middle classes speaking and reading fluently in Greek by the time these works were written.

Here one should pay attention that, according to the tradition preserved by Syncellus, Manetho wrote his work “for” Ptolemy Philadelphus and following Berossus (FGrHist. 610. T. 11). This means that his work appeared when the Macedonian domination over Egypt was well-established (indeed, it lasted half a century) and not likely to fall down: Manetho’s compatriots had to accommodate to this reality and, in the first place, to learn the language of their country’s new administration. At the same time, Dillery is certainly right to single out synchronisms between the events of the Egyptian and the Greek past as an important feature of Manetho’s work (pp. 97-117); however, to explain their use merely by “his engagement with Greek historical writing on Egypt and with the new Macedonian rulers of his land” (p. 117) is somewhat vague and meager. Saying that Thouris aka Polybus at the boundary between Manetho’s second and third \textit{tomoi} was a contemporary of Troy’s downfall (frgg. 55-56a-b Waddell) meant that the Egyptians and the Greeks shared virtually the same basic boundary separating their illustrious antiquity from what they might have called their un-mythological, “modern” history of the actual First Millennium B.C. And the synchronism between Deucalion’s flood and the reign of Misfragmuthosis (frg. 52) went much further than that: it indicated that the flow of Egyptian history started long before the event that inaugurated the history of Greece! These synchronisms proved both to Egyptian and Greek readers of Manetho’s work that Egypt possessed by far not lesser and poorer history than Greece; and this was neither a preservation of civilization’s integrity nor a response to Greek historiography but rather an answer to the moral challenge addressed to the Egyptian civilization by the mere fact of its submission to aliens.

\textsuperscript{12)} Moyer, op. cit., 140-141.
\textsuperscript{14)} K.A. Kitchen, \textit{The Third Intermediate Period in Egypt (1100-650 B.C.)}, Warminster 1986, 461 and n. 163.
\textsuperscript{15)} Gozzoli, op. cit., 14-15.
Dillery’s treatment of Manetho’s synchronisms deserves further discussion. As already said, he is probably right to ascribe to them a special importance: but it is not wise to overemphasize their uniqueness or to depict them as unique with the trend of the early Hellenistic historiography (e.g., with the work of Timaeus: p. 161). Let alone the fact that any dating “B.C./A.D.” is also a synchronism between an event and a number of years that elapsed since an alleged event of now remote past, and that using such device is unavoidable in any time-reckoning. But, long before Manetho, Herodotus’ story of the Egyptian king Proteus and the events of the Trojan War (II. 112-120) was a synchronism in itself; and Isocrates in his Busiris recurred to a well-thought synchronism between the events of Egyptian and Greek past based on generations’ and years’ reckoning (ch. 36-37). One might ask if it is really necessary to define as “synchronisms” in any sense what Dillery himself called “identifications” (pp. 111-113). But a problem about the real synchronisms that Dillery did not discuss is if the word “real” should not be understood here in all seriousness – in “identifications” (pp. 64-65a-b Waddell) and connects it (rightly) with the Demotic Prophecy of the Lamb developing the same theme (p. 172). The manuscript preserving it (p. dem.Vindob. 10000) dates to the Roman time, namely to 4 A.D.23). According to E. Reymond, the colophon of the text “shows that the scribes in the scriptorium of the local pr- nh were engaged in copying literary works of early date”24); hence, for Dillery, the conclusion “that the transmission of texts such as the Prophecy of the Lamb was due precisely to the House of Life” (p. 173). However, the colophon of the Prophecy of the Lamb mentioned neither a “House of Life”, nor a priestly rank of the scribe; moreover his name Hbši seems to the students of the text non-Egyptian (Aramaic), though his father’s name Mrḥw is Egyptian25). Needless to say, even the use of a text transmitted in a “House of Life” does not necessarily imply that Manetho belonged to such institution or worked there; but, even assuming that, the possibility to connect the Prophecy of the Lamb to the tradition of some “House of Life” is, to say the least, vague.

Dillery finds another argument for Manetho’s work in a “House of Life” in a statement about the murder of Ammanemes, the second king of Dynasty XII, by his own eunuchs (frg. 34-36 Waddell). A phrase from the Instruction of Amenemhat I to Senwosret I (“if I had quickly taken weapons in my hand, I would have made the back-turners retreat with a charge”; p.Mill. 2.3) is understood as a parallel to Manetho’s statement, as the word “back-turner” (hms) might allegedly denote a “bugger”26) or someone “effeminate”27) (p. 176). It can be added that the outright translation “eunuchs” was employed by M. Korostovtsev28); and A.H. Gardner in his history of Egypt also suggested that cover the time of the first Olympiad at 776/5 B.C. Manethonian synchronisms might and probably do reflect an ideological tendency of his work; but besides they might be just true. If so it is worth a special investigation how was their veracity achieved.

Speaking about the “space”, in which Manetho’s narrative was created Dillery discussed not so much the location of his work at a specific place of Egypt as its Sitz im Leben in the Egyptian society of the period. In his idea, Manetho’s work was performed at a “house of life” (pr- nh), i.e. in one of the storages and laboratories of priestly knowledge mentioned in a number of Egyptian texts (p. 161-169, with numerous references to sources and literature). Dillery’s idea seems a plausible supposition but he wants to make it, more than that, a real hypothesis by giving to it a substantiation. Here, however, some questions arise. Dillery highlights Manetho’s evidence about “Bocchoris, in whose reign lamb spoke” (frgg. 64-65a-b Waddell) and connects it (rightly) with the Demotic Prophecy of the Lamb developing the same theme (p. 172). The manuscript preserving it (p. dem.Vindob. 10000) dates to the Roman time, namely to 4 A.D.23). According to E. Reymond, the colophon of the text “shows that the scribes in the scriptorium of the local pr- nh were engaged in copying literary works of early date”24); hence, for Dillery, the conclusion “that the transmission of texts such as the Prophecy of the Lamb was due precisely to the House of Life” (p. 173). However, the colophon of the Prophecy of the Lamb mentioned neither a “House of Life”, nor a priestly rank of the scribe; moreover his name Hbši seems to the students of the text non-Egyptian (Aramaic), though his father’s name Mrḥw is Egyptian25). Needless to say, even the use of a text transmitted in a “House of Life” does not necessarily imply that Manetho belonged to such institution or worked there; but, even assuming that, the possibility to connect the Prophecy of the Lamb to the tradition of some “House of Life” is, to say the least, vague.

Dillery finds another argument for Manetho’s work in a “House of Life” in a statement about the murder of Ammanemes, the second king of Dynasty XII, by his own eunuchs (frg. 34-36 Waddell). A phrase from the Instruction of Amenemhat I to Senwosret I (“if I had quickly taken weapons in my hand, I would have made the back-turners retreat with a charge”; p.Mill. 2.3) is understood as a parallel to Manetho’s statement, as the word “back-turner” (hms) might allegedly denote a “bugger”26) or someone “effeminate”27) (p. 176). It can be added that the outright translation “eunuchs” was employed by M. Korostovtsev28); and A.H. Gardner in his history of Egypt also suggested that

---

17) K. Geus, Eratosthenes von Kyrene: Studien zur hellenistischen Kultur- und Wissenschaftsgeschichte (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte 92), Munich 2002, 314-315
18) F. Jacoby, Das Marmor Parium, Berlin 1904, 146.
22) Hornung et al., op. cit., 247-258.
25) Thiessen, loc. cit.
Manetho reflected the distant reminiscences of that episode. However, an Egyptologist (indeed, any scholar) supporting this hypothesis ought not to avoid discussing a possibility that the king survived the assassination attempt, which is advocated by a number of scholars (mostly, from the evidence of the same text that the plot against the king took place before he elevated his son Senwosret to the status of coregent: p.Mill. 2.5.6-30). For the sake of argument, it might have been sufficient for Dillery, without personally investigating the text anew, just to side with those who deny this possibility; but this had to be done at any rate. Deplorably, Dillery does not mention this Egyptological discussion at all; he merely passes to a “difficulty” for his interpretation posed by the fact that Manetho spoke, undeniably, about the murder of Amenemhat II and not I (p. 176). This difficulty is really serious but not insurmountable. There is enough confusion between the alleged deeds of the historical Senwosret III (Herodotus’ Sesostris) and those of Senwosret I in Hecataeus'/Diodorus’ story of Sesoosis (Diod. I. 53-58)32); so why not to suppose that Manetho partly confused the memories of Amenemhat I, the father of Senwosret I, and Amenemhat II/Ammenemhes, the father of the historical Senwosret II presented by Manetho as the father of Senwosret III/Sesostris? The matter is not that such supposition should necessarily be true; but it is better than nothing. But here Dillery does really nothing: he merely states that the “difficulty” exists and passes on to saying that anyway “the ‘Instruction [of Amenemhat]’ was exactly representative of the sorts of texts that were to be found in the House of Life” (p. 176). Argument that Manetho did use the text is finally confined to this. There are no further real arguments that Manetho worked in a “House of Life”; and at a long last this supposition, plausible as it is, still does not become a substantiated hypothesis. Most probably, it just cannot become one. To put a full stop to this issue, the meaning “eunuchs” or any other sexual connotation for ḫns in p.Mill. 2.3 is by no means a standard meaning of the word (Wb. III. 367; Hannig, AWb. II. 1977); this is an inference based on arbitrary interpretations of the whole passage.

Finally, Dillery turns to the geographical definition of the “space”, in which Manetho’s work was created (p. 181-182): he is probably right to doubt that its biases were mostly Memphite or Lower Egyptian. Nevertheless the mention of Mnevis (frg. 8-10 Waddell) is a rather meager base to speak of any Heliopolitan trend of his work, though such assumption fits with the location of Manetho’s priesthood at Heliopolis (App. I Waddell).

An important part of Dillery’s work is the treatment of narratives that he considers the authentic tradition of Manetho’s text, in which a notable place belongs to the story of the Hyksos’ domination in Egypt narrated by Josephus. Dillery’s theses on the role of the Hyksos accounts and the very term “Hyksos” (ὑκσώς) in Manetho’s work are following: (1) Manetho introduced this term explaining it as “sovereigns of foreign lands” (i.e. Egyptian ḫw ḫswt, which at that time could be transcribed in Greek just as Ṿksōs; p. 324–326). (2) For Manetho this was a sort of allusion to the Ptolemies (also ḫw ḫswt at the head of Egypt, sometimes formally defined with this term, like the Hyksos kings of Avaris) and a kind of political lesson for them. The lesson read that there had once been “bad ḫw ḫswt” ruling over Egypt, i.e. the Hyksos kings of Avaris, hostile to Egyptians and their religion; now the Ptolemies, the “new ḫw ḫswt”, can nevertheless be good sovereigns and legitimate kings of Egypt, if only they pay full respect to Egyptian clergy, gods and temples (p. 326, 328). (3) Nevertheless, it is true that in Manetho’s quotation by Josephus the word-combination “rulers of foreign lands” was not used at all; instead the word Ṿksōs was translated in quite a different way as βασιλεῖς ποιμένες = “kings-shepherds” and used as a designation of a certain Asiatic people/group (ἕναςκό), not of its rulers (Jos. Conr. Ap. § 82). But Dillery believes this resulted from a corruption of Manetho’s text by Josephus or some other interpolator who replaced Manetho’s correct translation (“rulers of foreign lands”) with the wrong one (“kings-shepherds”; p. 325–326).33) It is highly improbable that Manetho could make a mistake in translating the Egyptian word-combination rendered by him as Ṿksōs, or give for it an incorrect folk etymology, or construe his own incorrect etymology instead of the right one, which had to be well-known to him. Thus, if the form Ṿksōs really descended from the Egyptian title ḫw ḫswt, Manetho would have given just this translation (p. 325). The derivation of Ṿksōs from ḫw ḫswt is accepted by Dillery as a firm presumption (p. 324); and, together with this, the former point brings him to the conviction that the authentic (and totally unknown) Manetho’s text did give to this word a translation “rulers of foreign lands”, though no traces of this are found in extant tradition.

To comment on this complicated matter, let us recall that Manetho’s narrative preserved by Josephus has in fact two consecutive pieces of information on the word “Hyksos”. The first one is that the exact origin of those Asiatic conquerors who made Avaris their royal seat was obscure and ignore (Jos. Conr. Ap. § 75) and thus remained undefined; but the Egyptian tradition labeled them as a specific people (อุตνοςκό) with an Egyptian denotation, which could be rendered in Greek script as Ṿksōs = Hyksos (id. § 82). Meanwhile, in Manetho’s times this transcription, due to changes in Egyptian phonetics, could equally render two completely different word-combinations (though written differently, they could be pronounced from some moment quite similarly):

(1) * ḫw(w) ḫswt “sovereigns of foreign lands” (as some Hyksos kings of Avaris styled themselves34) and as the Turin

---

33) Dillery agrees with J. Barclay (Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary, Vol. 10: Against Apion, Leiden 2007, 60 n. 329, cf. 56 n. 314) that Josephus is the most probable candidate for the role of this text-falsifier (p. 325). It does not seem convincing, as Josephus says from his own face that he believes the word “Hyksos” to have been translated most probably not “kings-shepherds” but “captives shepherds” (Conr. Ap. § 83; this would have really better conformed to the evidence of the Old Testament on the Hebrews in the Egyptian captivity, whom Josephus persistently wants to equate with Manethos’ Hyksos in his Contra Apionem).
Canon styled later six members of the Hyksos dynasty it listed; see below).

(2) *ḥqꜢ(w) šꜢsw, which could mean in different times "kings of Shasu-bedouins", or "shepherd kings", or "kings-Shasu/bedouins" ("ruling Shasu/bedouins"), or "kings-shepherds/kingly, ruling shepherds", depending on one or another meaning of Egyptian word šꜢsw/şꜢsw ("Shasu-bedouins") in the Second Millennium B.C.: Wb. IV. 412.10–11, “Easterners” in the archaizing usage of the First Millennium B.C.26 and "shepherds" in the normal usage of the First Millennium B.C.28)

Another piece of information on the word ἰκσῶς (Hyksos) in Manetho’s quotation by Josephus is that the Egyptian word-combination transcribed by this form was a compound, in which ἰκως means “kings” and σῶς means “shepherds”, the whole of it meaning “kings-shepherds” (βασιλεῖς ποιμένες; Contr. Ap. § 82); in other words, it is stated that the transcription ἰκσῶς renders *ḥqꜢ(w)-šꜢsw. The same understanding of the word ἰκσῶς is presumed by the fact that the Hyksos as a people are called simply “shepherds” (ποιμένες) both in Manetho’s narrative preserved by Josephus (literally dozens of times) and in its shortening reproduced by Afancus and Eusebius (frg. 43, 45, 47, 48a,b Waddell). For nearly a century this translation was thought to be a mistake of Manetho or some interpolator instead of “sovereigns of foreign lands” (see below). However, earlier generations of Egyptologists27) were sure that it was correct, i.e. that there has once existed the denotation ἰκτίσης ἱδρυτης ("kings-Shasu/bedouins/shepherds") coined by Egyptians to designate the Asiatic people, which was thought to have seized a part of Egypt and established there their “Asiatic” kingdom of Avaris; and that Manetho merely followed and reproduced this tradition. The only ground for subsequent scholars to reject this view was the fact that the word-combination *ḥqꜢ(w) šꜢsw was not attested or presumed in any Egyptian source other than the discussed passages of Manetho’s work, while the designation ἰκτίσης ἱδρυτης was really used in the Second Millennium B.C. to style the Hyksos kings (though only kings, not their people or group; see above).

Whichever of these two opinions is correct, it is highly improbable that Manetho or any other author would have specially inserted in a Greek historical narrative a Greek transcription of an Egyptian word without explaining its meaning to a Hellenophone reader. Thus, only three options are plausible: (1) either Manetho himself used in his text the word ἰκσῶς and translated it as βασιλεῖς ποιμένες (= *ḥqꜢ(w)-šꜢsw “kings-shepherds”); (2) or both the word and the translation were introduced by some unidentified interpolator31); (3) or Manetho translated the word ὰκσῶς as “foreign rulers” but someone else later threw in an incorrect translation (“kings-shepherds”) instead and misused it as a name of people and not rulers’ title.

This third option is chosen by Dillery. However, the second and especially the third options arouse strong questions. The translation “kings-shepherds” is reflected in Manetho’s tradition by far not only in Contr. Ap. § 82. It has already been noted that in Manetho’s narrative quoted by Josephus the Hyksos as a specific people are called “shepherds” (ποιμένες) dozens of times, which presumes the use of the same translation of the word. Besides, the Christian chronographers rendering Manetho defined his dynasty of the former six Hyksos kings of Avaris in a following way: “The Fifteenth Dynasty of Shepherds (ποιμένες), they were Phoenicians, six foreign kings (ἐξόνι βασιλεῖς), who seized Memphis…” (Africanus; frg. 43 Waddell); “The Seventeenth Dynasty, the Shepherds (ποιμένες), other kings, 43, and the Thebans, or the Diospolitans, 43. Totally the Shepherds and the Thebans reigned 151 years” (Africanus; frg. 47 Waddell): “The Seventeenth Dynasty was the Shepherds (ποιμένες), brothers, Phoenicians, foreign kings (ἐξόνι βασιλεῖς), who seized Memphis…” (Eusebius; frg. 48 Waddell). Obviously, the same translation “kings-shepherds” is reflected here; moreover, it is clear that the word-combination “foreign kings” (ἐξόνι βασιλεῖς) in passages quoted is the precise equivalent of the title ἰκτίσης ἱδρυτης in respect to rulers. The fact that the word ποιμένες (resp. “kings-shepherds” of Contr. Ap.) stands in the same formula aside of these ξένοι βασιλεῖς, resp. ἰκτίσης ἱδρυτης, as quite another designation with different meaning (namely, as an ethnic designation, because it is put on the standard place of a local or ethnic definition for Manethonian dynasties; cf. “Eighth Dynasty – Memphites, 5”; “Twenty-Fifth Dynasty – Ethiopians, 3”; “Twenty-Seventh Dynasty – Persians, 8”; etc.) shows that Manetho in the view of his epitomizers did really designate the Hyksos kings by their status as “foreign rulers” but also independently of this defined their etnios as “shepherds” (resp. “kings-shepherds”).

Is it really plausible that some falsifier of Manetho’s text was so authoritative that he succeeded in a traceless obliteration of the way Manetho translated and used the word “Hyksos” and in replacing with his own false practice? To achieve this he had to disseminate the word ποιμένες (”shepherds”) as the ethnic designation of the Hyksos throughout Manetho’s text; he had also to do it so cunningly that Josephus and the epitomizers took his product for Manetho’s genuine text and used his forged “kings-shepherds” and Manetho’s genuine “foreign kings” (ἐξόνι βασιλεῖς in the tradition of chronographers) as two distinct denotations that Manetho had allegedly used to designate the Hyksos’ ethnies and the status of their kings respectively. We believe that this is quite improbable. If so, the third of the options that we defined above, preferred by Dillery, cannot be accepted. As for the two remaining options, within their scope Manetho definitely did not use the word ἰκσῶς as a rendering of the title ἰκτίσης ἱδρυτης: he either understood and directly explained

31) If so, this was most probably not Josephus, whose manner in Contra Apionem does not allow us in fact to suspect him of conscious and direct falsifying the sources available to him, especially when quoting them literally.
this form as quite another word-combination *ḥqꜢ(w)-ḥꜢswt (the first option); or he did not use it at all (the second option), which is unlikely. Thus, contrary to Dillery’s idea, Manetho’s use of the word ḫσwš (even regardless of the question, to which Egyptian word-combination it came back in reality and not just in the opinion of Manetho) could not allude to the title ḫqꜢ(w) ḥꜢswt at all, be it in respect of either Avaris’ kings or the Ptolemies.

At last, even regardless of all that has been previously said, would it really make sense for Manetho to allude to the Ptolemies and thus to give them a lesson, as Dillery believes, by denoting the Hyksos kings “foreign rulers” in a Greek text (he actually did it, though not in the context presented in Contr. Ap. § 82 but at any rate in that portion of his text, to which belonged the use of the word-combination ἐξ ἄνω βασιλείας reflected in due course by the epitomizers)? One possibility is that such allusion would not be understood at all by the Greek readers of Manetho’s Aegyptiaka and by the Ptolemies themselves; and this is the most probable. In fact, the denotation ḫqꜢ ḫꜢswt was used as the Two Ladies’ name of Philip Arridaeus⁴¹) but did not reappear in any Egyptian royal name of the Ptolemies; and its other appearances in the Ptolemaic time are extremely few⁴²). The current use of this denotation at the Hellenistic time in respect of rulers was probably too scanty for the allusion suspected by Dillery to have worked effectively even in the Egyptian milieu; for the Greeks and Macedonians such allusion would have been as good as non-existent. Another, less probable, possibility is that the suspected allusion wouldbe understood by Manetho’s readers; but in such a case it would have most probably caused their wrath on him. How else would the Ptolemies or their supporters react on a parallel between them and the model “bad rulers” of the past, as the Hyksos kings were presented by Manetho? Let alone the fact that Manetho’s narrative showed the Hyksos to have been expelled from Egypt twice for the utter benefit of the country. Thus, the admonition allegedly given to the Ptolemies by Manetho, according to Dillery’s idea, would have been either unheard or, if heard, most dangerous to its author. Would Manetho really want to take a risk to give it?

Some mistakes concerning Manetho’s evidence on Hyksos have to be corrected. Dillery says that, according to Manetho, the first six Hyksos kings of Avaris ruled 511 years in toto (p. 343). In fact, Manetho gave to them 259 years 10 months (Jos. Contr. Ap. § 79–81), while 511 years is the sum given to their reigns and the reigns of following (unnamed) Hyksos kings, “descendants of those aforementioned” six rulers. These “descendants” ruled at Avaris between the reign of the six Hyksos enumerated by their names and the “great” war against Avaris waged by Thebais and other native Egyptian kingdoms (Contr. Ap. § 84–85). It is quite important that in Manetho’s view the first six Hyksos kings were followed by some other Hyksos successors also at Avaris.

According to Dillery, “it is a matter of tremendous importance that only the first four rulers in the Turin List are styled “Hyksos” kings; the last three, beginning with Khayan, are given normal pharaonic titulature” (p. 88). In fact, the Turin Canon lists six, not seven rulers of ḫqꜢ ḫꜢswt dynasty (X.22–29). Their names (except the last one, Khamudy, not attested in monuments: X.28) are lost; no Egyptian royal title is given to either of them in the Canon; and one cannot know for sure, which titles and names derived from monuments could belong to any king of this Hyksos dynasty in the Turin Canon. The concluding formula of the fragment in question “[..]ḫqꜢ(w) ḫꜢswt 6 ruled 1[08] years” (X.29) refers to all summarized 6 kings.

Dillery states that Manetho included in his royal list even kings considered illegitimate in Egyptian tradition, such as “the Hyksos kings, discussed above” (i.e., the six Hyksos kings of Avaris; p. 96). However, the Egyptian tradition, at least under Dynasty XIX, considered these kings, though bad in their deeds and in their treatment of Egypt, to have been its legitimate rulers. Not only they were listed in the Turin Canon as ḫqꜢ(w) ḫꜢswt 6 (maybe even ṣwsw ḫqꜢ(w) ḫꜢswt 6) but also the famous literary text (Quarrel of Apollois and Serenene styled Apohis, the Hyksos king of Avaris, ṣwsw (i.e. legitimate sacral king of Egypt) with all formalities due to this status (cartouche and determinatives of divinity accompanying his name, etc...), this style reflecting the attitude of the Egyptian compilers towards this ruler.

As for the story of Sethos and Harmais (a great conqueror and his evil brother, who has never been a king though usurped some royal insignia and rebelled against his brother before being expelled by him), Dillery forwarded a rather important idea that Manetho attached this story to a certain king “Sethos” (obviously Sety) of the royal list he used; in this way the story got its position in Manetho’s historical scheme, as seen in the literal quotation by Josephus (Contr. Ap. 98–105: p. 213, 307). This, incidentally, implies that the epitomizers, who connected the same story with the previous Manetho’s Harmais, actually the king (see Eusebius’ version in frg. 53a-b Waddell) misunderstood and rendered wrongly Manetho’s tradition (the same quotation of

---

⁴¹) This possibility seems to the reviewers most probable. Yet it does not mean that Manetho made here a mistake ascribed to him within the generally accepted hypothesis, i.e. that he or his source misunderstood the word-combination found elsewhere and meaning actually “foreign rulers” as a quasi-ethonynm “kings-shepherds” due to their similarity in pronunciation. Such a mistake could be made by someone hardly knowing the Egyptian writing and literary tradition and taking his information from half-obscured and distorted oral tales. All Dillery’s considerations against a possibility of such a mistake (p. 325) seem very convincing; and the very fact that Manetho’s epitomizers use designations ἐξ ἄνω βασιλείας (“foreign kings” = ḫqꜢ ḫꜢswt) and ὀποίες (”shepherds”) distinctively and alongside with each other presumes most probably that Manetho himself used them in the same way. Thus, one should come to a conclusion that the Late Egyptian tradition and particularly Manetho really used the term ḫqꜢ(w) ḫꜢsw ḫꜢswt (= ḫqꜢ(w) in Manetho’s Greek script) as a designation of the Hyksos as an ethnic group regardless of the fact that they continued to denote the Hyksos kings (as it had been done in the Turin Canon) with the designation ḫqꜢ(w) ḫꜢswt (= ḫqꜢ(w) in Manetho’s terminology preserved by epitomizers). Contrary to the general view in current historiography, the latter word-combination was used by Manetho separately from his own ḫqꜢ(w) ḫꜢswt and had actually nothing in common with it. The fact that Manetho described the Hyksos as a group coming “from the Eastern lands” (Contr. Ap. § 75), while the term ḫꜢswt had in the First Millennium B.C. exactly the meanings “Easterners” (in archaising language) and “shepherds”) (in spoken language) and while the historical Shasu of the New Kingdom lived just to the east of Egypt, strengthens this possibility and allows returning to the solution of the problem once chosen by its first students (see above, note 37).


⁴³) D.B. Redford, ”The Hyksos in History and Tradition”, Or. 39, 1970, 14 n. 2; see now also: D. Candelora, ”Defining the Hyksos: A Reevaluation of the Title ḫqꜢ ḫꜢswt and Its Implications for Hyksos Identity”, JARCE 53, 2017, 218.
Manetho’s text by Josephus listed Harmais (I) as a king preceding Sethos and his rebellious brother Harmais for a few reigns. And Manetho himself, when defining the chronological position of the story, made obviously a mistake in comparison with the historical reality, in which there was only one “Harmais” (obviously the king Horemhab) near or at the top of power. Undoubtedly, the story used by Manetho reflected the reminiscences of Horemhab and Sety I (shown as his brother); however, contrary to reality, this story somehow deprived “Harmais”/Horemhab of his royal status, so that Manetho could not identify him with the king “Harmais”/Horemhab known to him from kings’ lists. Manetho must have inevitably come to the conclusion that the story told about some later “Harmais”, a mutineer prince in the reign of Sethos/Sety I (just as it is attested in Manetho’s quotation by Josephus). For Manethonian account of Sethos’ great conquests in Asia Dillery found a number of convincing parallels in folklore, Greek literary models and the legend of Sesostris (pp. 307–315). However, it must be added that the core of this account can be assuredly traced to the historical reality, namely to the wars of Sety I. In fact this hardly needs a prove: a narration by a learned Egyptian about the vast conquests of a king “Sethos” in Asia, the first Egyptian king of this name, a close successor of the king “Harmais” and the latter’s predecessors in Manetho’s list (undoubtedly the rulers of Amarna time43), can hardly be taken for something else than for a memory of the successful activities in Asia resumed by the historical Sety I.

Summing up the impressions from the book by J. Dillery, one might say that its definition as important and stimulating is true: this is a sizeable contribution to the Manethonian theme, with a number of good observations and judgements. Nevertheless, the amount of unproved points in it and amendments needed to it is also impressive. It is worth notice in this discussion that Egyptology possesses good, not recent but still up-to-date marginalia to the texts by Herodotus and Diodorus (see notes 10 and 32) but nothing of the kind for the Manetho’s fragments. Hasn’t the time come to produce a similar commentary to it? Any student of history knows that there is no better remedy to the weakness of blank spots and omissions in this discipline than an extended and sound work at its sources.
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