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My subject is one of the grimmer stories in Herodotus, and its grimness may explain its neglect in most modern books about him.1 John Gould, in a wonderful book first published twelve years ago, endorsed the picture of Herodotus as a figure associated with laughter and exhilaration.2 Herodotus thus (we may say) becomes the laughing historian, just as Democritus was the laughing philosopher. This will mean that the historiographic counterpart of the weeping philosopher Heraclitus is Thucydides. It is entirely appropriate that a book in memory of George Forrest should occupy itself with Herodotus, not just for the obvious reason that he did so much important work on Herodotus, but because concentration on the laughing historian is the right way to remember our friend, who got so much fun out of the study of the ancient world and injected so much fun into it. When I think of George it is laughter that I think of above all, laughter of the life-affirming Herodotean sort, not the unpleasant sort which the weeping historian goes in for on the few occasions that he mentions laughter.3 Finally, my paper has much to say about Chios, and this


3 Lateiner (1977).
too is right for George who did so much to illuminate Chian history and epigraphy.

The laughter is there in Herodotus all right, but the simultaneous existence of a grimmer Herodotus is something Peter Derow has reminded us of in sharp and convincing style. He did so, in a friendly dialogue with Gould, in an interesting paper about the crucifxion episode involving Artayktes near the end of Book 9, which balances the stoning of the family of the Athenian Lykides at the beginning of the book. There is not much laughter there.

I propose to move back one book from there, to Book 8 (104–6). The context of the story is the defeated Xerxes’ decision in 480 bc to send his children ahead of him to Ephesus. They are to be accompanied there by Artemisia Queen of Halikarnassos, but guarded by Hermotimos of Pedasa, second to none among the king’s eunuchs. Then follows the digression. It begins by virtually repeating, from near the beginning of the History (1.175), the main curiosity about Hermotimos’ home town, Lelegian Pedasa, in Karia above Halikarnassos. The curiosity was its priestess who grew a long beard when something unfortunate, χαλεπώς, threatened Pedasa’s neighbours, ἀμφικτυόνοι, a solemn word elsewhere used by Herodotus only about Delphi. The term ‘Lelegian’, which I used above, deserves a word. The indigenous Lelegians, so we are told by the Hellenistic historian Philip of Karian Theangel, were used as serfs by the Karians in his own time, which puts them right at the bottom of the heap; Herodotus however equates Karians and Lelegians and says that they once occupied the islands (1.171).

Hermotimos, so Herodotus continues, extracted the ‘greatest requital’, the μεγίστη τίσις, of anyone we know of. There follows the story of his capture by enemies, his castration by Panionios of Chios, and his sale at Sardis as a eunuch: such people, Herodotus says in an aside, are, because of their complete trustworthiness, more valued by barbarians than men who have their testicles, παρὰ γὰρ τοῖς βαρβάροις τιμωτέρα ἐστὶ οἱ εἰναύξαντες τίσις εἰκεν τῆς πάσης τῶν ἐνορχέσιν. Panionios made his living in this ‘impious’ way (the word ἀνοσιώτατον is an extremely strong one): he sold castrated boys at Sardis and Ephesus. But Hermotimos was not unfortunate in every respect, because at Susa he rose to a position of honour under Xerxes. At first we are tempted to take this comment seriously but Hermo-

---

4 Artayktes: Hdt. 9.120; Lykides’ family: Hdt. 9.5, Derow (1995).
5 Philip of Theangel on Lelegians: FGrHist 74.1 F2.
timos’ later outburst shows that that would be a mistake—we are not really supposed to believe that worldly success was compensation or consolation for the loss of manhood. At the time of Xerxes’ outward journey, when the king is at Sardis, Heromitmos comes down to Myrian Atarneus on the mainland (καταβάς, the right verb for a journey towards the sea). There he finds Panionios again (by chance, κατά δή τι πρῆγμα, where δή τι means that Herodotus cannot or will not specify further, that is, it was a chance meeting*) and gets Panionios into his power together with his children and wife. The word for the whole family is πανοικία, an interesting word which I shall return to. Heromitmos does the luring by pretending to want to share with Panionios his good fortune and by inviting him to bring his household to Atarneus. Then he rounds on him as an ἀνοσιώτατος (that superlative adjective again) and asks what harm he had ever done Panionios that he should make him a nothing instead of a man; so much for the good fortune of trusty eunuch status. Then he forces Panionios to ἀποστέμευεν τὰ αἰðεὶα of his sons who are then forced to do the same to him. The Greek I have left untranslated is usually rendered ‘castrate’, but I shall be disputing this. The ring of the story closes with a second use of τίας and the main narrative continues.

This is a rich story indeed, as well as a dreadful one. I have found very little written about it. There is nothing in Gould despite his stress on reciprocity; nothing in Fehling’s book on Herodotus’ sources, though there are features which might have been expected to appeal to him. Nothing in Rosalind Thomas’s recent book about Herodotus’ intellectual milieu. Nothing, despite Panionios, in the excellent 1986 collection of essays about Chios edited by John Boardman and Jenny Vaphopoulou-Richardson; in that volume this story, together with the other interesting and plentiful Herodotean material about Chios in the Ionian Revolt and the Persian Wars, falls down a gap between Roebuck on Chios in the sixth century and Barron on Chios in the Athenian empire.7 Panionios does by contrast regularly feature in books and source-books on ancient slavery, where the story is treated as straightforward evidence for human traffic, something of a Chian speciality.8 Since ‘reciprocity’ is such a fashionable concept in
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* For κατά δή τι πρῆγμα see Denniston (1951: 212).
7 Fehling (1989); Thomas (2000). On Chios, see Boardman and Vaphopoulou-Richardson (1986); the chapters I refer to are Roebuck (1986) and Barron (1986).
8 For instance Wiedemann (1981: 107, cf. 84ff.) includes a long Athenaeus extract on Chians and slavery, including the Panionios story.
Greek social and religious studies these days, it would be surprising to find nothing about it in any of the relevant books, and there are indeed a couple of lively pages on Panionios and Hermotimos by David Braund in a recent edited collection of essays on reciprocity in ancient Greece. And the story features more than once in Thomas Harrison’s monograph on religion in Herodotus. But there is much more to be said, and I believe that Braund in particular is mistaken on one crucial point.

My own thesis will run as follows: for clarity’s sake I summarize and simplify for the moment and will elaborate the details later and give proper references. This story is not literally true. It conforms to a story pattern of a biblical type, the story in two halves of Joseph the Jew who became Joseph the Egyptian. Hermotimos is a Karian who is physically maltreated by castration and sold into Persia by a man from Chios called Panionios, who bears a unique personal name suggesting the Ionian festival and religious centre called respectively the Panonia and the Panionion. This half of the story stands for the combined process by which colonizing Greeks on the one hand subjugated the indigenous inhabitants of the East Aegean region, while on the other hand asserted their own superior and exclusivist identity by forming groupings such as the Panionion. I shall invoke the evidence of the fragmentary fifth-century writer Ion of Chios for a corresponding myth which has the early Chians, under their mythical king Hektor, simultaneously subduing the original Karian inhabitants of the island, and annexing the island to the Panionion. In the second half of the Herodotus story, the half located at Atarneus, Hermotimos has made the transition to Persian status; in reprisal he wipes out all the males in the Chian family of Panionios. This recalls and is, in a modern term, a ‘signifier’ for the catastrophe which befall Chios in 494 BC when as reprisal for the Ionian Revolt the Persians castrated the Chian boys and deported the girls. They did this to two other islands as well, but Herodotus singles out the fate of Chios because he has just reported not one but two portents which presaged disaster to the Chians alone. Both involved the mass deaths of groups of Chian children. I shall argue that Atarneus, a place on the Asiatic mainland but Chian, i.e. island territory, and the location of the revenge of

* Braund (1998: 166f); T. Harrison (2000a); note esp. his p. 58 and p. 69 for the awfulness of inflicting total loss of children, as happens to Panionios. The Hermotimos-Panionios episode is also briefly discussed by Aly (1941: 184, 187); cf. also Lateiner (1989: 143); Immerwahr (1966: 284f); Gray (2002: 308ff).
Hermotimos, is extremely important in the story: for its position see the map at Fig. 1, p. 42. It can be located from Herodotus’ narrative of Xerxes’ itinerary, and the remais are those at modern Kale Agili (Hdt. 7. 42. 1; Debord (1999: 267 n. 26) gives ancient and modern references). Atarneus is regularly associated in Herodotus with pollution and death, and its in-between status expresses both this polluted condition, and also the sexual and ethnic ambivalence of the two protagonists. Finally, I hold that this story of requital is not just itself a story with an internal hinge: it is itself placed at a crucial hinge in the whole nine-book narrative. Xerxes has just been defeated and this defeat can be seen as requital for the Persian savagery of 494 which was in turn requital for the Ionian Revolt itself.

But before I get on to the substance, I ought to say a few words about vocabulary and structure. I have already noted *amphiktyones*;¹⁰ I think the religious solemnity is meant to alert us to something important—that is, if the Pedasa sentence is to be retained at all, a point I return to shortly. Then there is πανοικία, ‘with all his family’, a word with sinister associations in Herodotus, although literally neutral and innocuous. This is the central one of three occurrences in Books 7, 8 and 9.¹¹ In the present case there is an extra resonance, in that the word picks up part of the sound and meaning of the personal name Panionios, a name to which (again) I shall return. Then there is the delay in the divulging of the sex of Panionios’ children; at first they are just called τὰ τέκνα and by what has been called an ‘archaic’ narrative delay,¹² they are not disclosed as masculine until the very end of the story, in fact at just the moment when they lose their masculinity. A final and important linguistic point: the verb ἐκτριμνω (‘cut out’) is used in 105 and that is indeed the regular word for ‘castrate’. But the revenge at the end of 106 is described as ἀποτριμνεῖν (‘cut off’) τὰ αἰδοία (§4, OCT line 1) and though all translations, and now David Braund and Thomas Harrison, repeat or in effect repeat the English word ‘castrate’ from the previous chapter, I claim that this is wrong. I suggest that the longer expression implies a more radical and comprehensive amputation of the whole genital area, αἰδοία. Enoch Powell gets halfway

¹⁰ For ἄμφικτην in the general sense of ‘near neighbours’, LSJ cites, apart from Hdt. 8. 104, only Pl. P. 4. 66 and 10. 8, N. 6. 39, but two of these refer to Delphi and the other to the Isthmian games. So the word seems to have a religious flavour.
¹¹ πανοικία: Hdt. 7. 113 (Pythios the Lydian); 9. 109.2 (Artaynto).
¹² For archaic narrative delay see Fraenkel (1950: 805).
Fig. 1. Chios and the western seaboard of Asia Minor.
there in his school commentary on Book 8, when he says that \( \alpha \delta \omega \alpha \) is used ‘here of the testicles only; elsewhere the penis is included’. If I am right, this will not be qualitative reciprocity but dramatic escalation. (It is certainly not quantitative tit-for-tat reciprocity because there are five victims not one, so there is escalation at that level too.) My rendering gives, so I claim, better sense to the very strong introductory remark (see above p. 38) about Hermotimos’ revenge being the ‘greatest requital’ we know of. At the end of Book 4 Herodotus, talking about the revenge taken by Pheretime, Queen of Kyrene, had said that the gods do not like excessive revenges; but perhaps that is only when they are carried out by women. (That is, real women like Pheretime rather than half-women like Hermotimos.) If I am right about what \( \alpha \delta \omega \alpha \) means, I do not think such an amputation could be long survived, because of blood loss; certainly not for long or with strength enough to carry out a similar operation on someone else. Which should, I suggest, make us doubt the literal truth of the whole story. (See further below p. 55.)

I now return to the detail of the story. First the Pedasa material at the beginning. It is omitted by one manuscript tradition, square-bracketed in the Oxford Classical Text, and scorned by most modern commentators. But I am reluctant to get rid of it, because of its structural and symmetrical appropriateness: the Pedasan priestess acquires a gender-specific attribute, a long beard. Conversely, that other Pedasan, Hermotimos, loses his essential sexual attribute by castration. In this connection we should not forget that Hermotimos’ role as guardian of Xerxes’ bastard, that is, ambiguous or marginal children is performed alongside Artemisia, about whom the king, in the course of the battle of Salamis, famously said a few chapters earlier that she was a woman who had become a man (8. 88. 3). In this respect she resembles the priestess but is unlike the eunuch—a man become a woman. We shall see that the bearded priestess is not the only reminiscence of this part of Book 1 in the Hermotimos episode. On the priestess, Mary Douglas points out to me that other comparable anthropological stories suggest that the woman is protected from violation by growing a beard, so the priestess is warning the town of danger or is being prepared to protect it. In this way feminine gender and masculinity are put together, masculinity denoting strength.

---

14 Hdt. 4. 205.
Still sticking with places, great interest attaches to Atarneus. I start from Braund’s remark that Panionios ‘makes the mistake of many others in Herodotus. . . . when he crosses from his own sphere into that of another (his enemy) . . . . While Panionios was on Khian territory he was safe, but he strayed to Sardis’ (Braund 1998a: 167). That would be interesting if it were right, but in fact ‘Sardis’ is a crucial mistake by Braund for ‘Atarneus’: Hermotimos encourages Panionios to settle his household ‘in that place’, ἐκεῖνη (OCT line 15; cf. LSJ for this use) and this clearly refers not to Sardis but to Atarneus. So, rightly, Stein (1893: 83), How and Wells (1912: 270), Powell (1939a: 131), and Waterfield (1998: 523). In any case, we can press Herodotus harder. Braund’s phrase ‘Khian territory’ is too simple. Atarneus, where both the meeting and the revenge occurred, both was and was not ‘Khian territory’. It belonged to that interesting category of territory, namely peraiai, mainland possessions opposite, περάς, an island. Sometimes these might exceed in extent and importance the island itself; the most celebrated such peraia is the Hellenistic Rhodian. So the in-between status of Atarneus, both an island and not an island, and according to Stephanus of Byzantium (entry ‘Atarna’) on the border of Lydia and Mysia, as well as on the cultural frontier between Greece and Persia, nicely reflects the sexual ambivalence of some of the main players in this tale. But let us recall the specific circumstances in which Chios acquired its peraia of Atarneus, which geographically is a good deal closer to Lesbos than it is to Chios. I conjecture that Chios could not expand due east because of the blocking presence of Erythrai. Atarneus was in fact the shameful price for which the mid-sixth-century Chians had surrendered the Lydian supplicant Paktyes. As a result of this act, Herodotus told us in Book 1, no barley from Atarneus was used in religious offerings, but everything from there was kept away from all sacrificial

15 For peraiai generally see Reger (1997: 466f.), Debord (1999: 264–272) and Horden and Purcell (2000: 133). For Atarneus and Chios in particular see Debord (1999: 267). Note that the two places are still mentioned together in 409 BC, see Diod. 13. 63. 4 for Chian exiles making a nuisance of themselves at Atarneus (but the place is evidently no longer securely Chian by this time, cf. the history of Samos and Anaia); and cf., a few years later, the similar events at Xen. Hell. 3. 2. 11 (plentiful corn then too, but again a trouble-spot). See also FGrHist 115 F291 (cf. below n. 18) for continuing Chian territorial interests in the Atarneus region, with R. Lane Fox (1986: 111 n. 51).

For Chios’ difficulty in acquiring the obvious peraia due east for the reason suggested in the text (Erythrai), we may compare Kos, which never had a peraia because (presumably) of the close proximity of Halikarnassos.
rituals. As Robert Parker once nicely put it, the Chians treated as defiled the land they received as reward. In Herodotean terms this was seven books ago, but if we have good memories we will surely feel that Atarneus is a sinister place, especially when we recall that Histiaios of Miletos, the instigator of the Ionian Revolt, was finally captured there while reaping the harvest to feed his hungry army (with, that is to say, polluted grain). His plans for revolt were moreover betrayed by his messenger Hermippus of, precisely, Atarneus. That was twenty chapters earlier (6.4). The army was destroyed. But the Book 1 passage is the really explicit indication that Atarneus is a bad place. (It eventually became malarial, after a plague of mosquitoes, Paus. 7.2.11. But I must not over-egg the pudding. I hope I have made the point that Atarneus was not a very nice place.) So here too, as with Pedasa, the Hermotimos story contains a reminiscence of Book 1 and indeed of the same general section of that book. Finally, on the subject of Atarneus, let me jump on to the fourth century BC, as structuralism generously allows me to do, and note that one of the most famous classical Greek eunuchs was also associated with Atarneus and also bore a theophoric name formed from Hermes (unless Hermotimos, as I think likelier, derives from the Hermos river). I refer to Hermias, ruler of Atarneus, the friend and pupil of Aristotle who met a miserable end tortured by the then Persian king Artaxerxes III. To return to the name of Hermotimos himself, Carolyn Dewald, in her notes to the recent World’s Classics translation of Herodotus, remarks that it looks suspiciously like ‘honour of the herm’ and she points out that herms are statues with genitals prominently displayed. This nice observation makes me all the sorrier that she follows those who delete the Pedasa material. Her point falls if Hermotimos, which unlike Panionios is not a particularly rare name, is after all a Flussname or ‘potamonym’ derived from

16 Hdt. 1.160.
18 Hdt. 6.28.
19 For the name Hermotimos—derived from Hermes the god or from the Hermos river?—see Sittig (1912: 113f., 130), leaving the point undecided.
20 For Hermias of Atarneus see Tod (1948: 165) and Wormell (1935). Hermias as eunuch: FrHist 115 Theopompos F 201.
the Hermos river. Hermippos, the Atarnean betrayer (above), may suggest that at least Hermias and Hermippos are Hermos-derivatives. Hermotimos is a Pedasian not an Atarnean, but the name might make one speculate about family links with Atarneus. The essential point is that Atarneus’ links are with the Hermos river, not with the river Kalkos to the north, opposite Lesbos. Dewald regretfully says nothing about the name Pamonios.

It is time to look at the Hermotimos-Pamionios story as a whole. It is not easy to find a parallel in Herodotus. But we may have better luck if, in accordance with one prevailing trend in our subject, we look towards the Near East and the Bible. The biblical career I invite you to consider and compare with Hermotimos is that of Joseph, which started life in the book of Genesis and was then so memorably novelized in the twentieth century by Thomas Mann in his four-volume book *Joseph and His Brothers*. In both stories the hero is initially subjected to physical maltreatment, castrated in the one case, thrown into a pit by his brothers in the other. Both heroes are then sold abroad into slavery, Hermotimos to Sardis, Joseph to Egypt. Both heroes make, from the worldly point of view, spectacular careers in their new homelands, both rising high in royal favour. Both heroes then, by a trick, get their one-time tormentors into their power. (Joseph does this by the ruse of the precious cup secreted in his brother Benjamin’s luggage, after which the brothers are arrested for theft and brought back.) Having achieved complete mastery and reversal, both heroes then reveal themselves; and both then assert that it is not they but a divine hand that has brought this turn of events about. But then the stories diverge sharply in their interpretation of the *meaning* of the divine intervention. Hermotimos, using the adjective *anostia*, wicked or impious, for the third time in this short story, says to Pamionios: ‘you thought to escape the notice of the gods when you contrived what you did against me; but they are just, and they have delivered you, the perpetrator of things *anostia*, into my hands’. Similarly—but also differently—Joseph says ‘I am Joseph your brother whom ye sold into Egypt . . . God sent me before you to

---

22 For the general trend see Burkert (1992) and West (1997). For biblical parallels with Herodotus in particular see Griffiths (1987: 41 and n. 7), citing Redford 1970. (Griffiths places Hdt. and the Joseph-Potiphar story side by side, although the Herodotean story he selects for comparison is not that of Hermotimos but that of the docteur Demokedes, the subject of his brilliant article; see also, for Kleomenes of Sparta, Griffiths (1989: 74 n. 17 and 76 n. 39). Cf. also n. 17 above.

23 For the story of Joseph see Genesis chs. 37-45
preserve you a posterity in the earth, and to save your lives by a great deliverance. It was not you that sent me hither but God.' The god of the Hebrews has brought things about so that a posterity shall be preserved for Jacob, i.e. Israel under his other name; the Olympian gods have brought it about that Panionios and his posterity shall be annihilated root and branch, *panoikie*.

I do not want to lose sight of Joseph and the tribal eponyms altogether, but equally I do not want to go further down this entertaining path of the biblical story-pattern. (In particular I leave aside questions of Near-Eastern influence on Herodotus; I confine myself to structural similarities.) Instead I shall talk about two features of the Herodotus story which might seem at first sight, but in fact wrongly, to root it in real space and time: first the eunuch aspect, which affects Hermotimos only if what was done to Panionios was more extreme than castration; and second Panionios and his interesting name. But in fact I shall argue that so far from constituting circumstantial details, these are give-away features indicating folk-tale and myth respectively.

First, eunuch status. This is an obvious difference between Joseph and Hermotimos. Joseph's success in Egypt owes nothing to his lack of physical manliness; on the contrary, normal sexual attractiveness and capacity ('goodly and well-favoured' in the language of the King James version of the Bible)\(^{24}\) is indicated by the trouble he got into with Potiphar's wife, a story comparable to Greek myths like Bellerophon, Hippolytus or Peleus. But how are we to assess Herodotus' generalizations about barbarians and their liking for eunuchs? If we ask what was so *anosion* about what Panionios did, one obvious answer would be that he was a Greek who castrated Greeks, whereas castration was a barbarian phenomenon. Hermotimos is certainly a Greek name, but Pedasa like Halikarnassos had some non-Greek features and was not properly integrated into the Hellenized urban network of Karia until the time of the satrap Mausolus in the fourth century. (Kallisthenes, a good and contemporary authority, says that Mausolus synoikized Pedasa, among other places, into Halikarnassos: *FGrHist* 124 F25.) We should not then assume Hermotimos to be more than part-Greek. There is however no doubt about the Greekeness of Panionios. But Panionios was not the only Greek in Herodotus to be associated with castration;

\(^{24}\) Joseph 'goodly and well-favoured': Genesis 39. 6.
there is Periander of Corinth who sent 300 Kerkyraian boys to the
Lydian king Alyuttes to become eunuchs (but was thwarted). So does
Periander prove that we were after all wrong to think that the rea-
sion Panionios was anosios was because he was a Greek castrating
Greeks? I think not. The Periander–Panionios parallel is not quite
exact, for three reasons. First because Panionios is himself the ca-
strator: what is despicable is that he seems to do the job himself.
Second, because Periander is a tyrant and thus a rule-breaker, and
thus a deviant, transgressive sort of Greek. Third, because Christiane
Sourvinou-Inwood has argued ingeniously and attractively that
the Periander story does not ‘reflect historical reality’ but that we are
dealing with a symbolic and initiatory loss of manhood. She treats
‘castration in Lydia’ as a significant variant of the usual initiatory
pattern but not as one which establishes historicity: the youths have
to go somewhere else to be symbolically punished, and the identity of
the ‘somewhere else’ was, she suggests, determined by Greek knowl-
edge of the real practice of castration in the kingdoms of the East. If
there is symbolism in the Panionios story it is, I shall argue, of a
different sort. But provisionally I do think Greekness is crucial to the
Hermotimos–Panionios story. Liminal Atarneus is exactly the right
place for the cultural confrontation to take place.

Here it is time to turn to the real-life phenomenon of the eunuch in
the Persian empire, a phenomenon which Sourvinou-Inwood does
Dictionary distinguishes between religious and secular eunuchs and
assigns the two types to different contributors; we are dealing with
the secular sort of eunuch. Were eunuchs of this sort really as wide-
spread and as crucial to oriental government as ancient Greek
historians and many modern ones liked and like to think? There are
two linguistic problems. One is a matter of Greek translation: eunou-
chos is a euphemism, ‘he who keeps the bed’, εὐνουχὸς ἐκτεινόμενος; the word is
formed analogously to klerouchos or ‘cleruch’, literally an allotment-
holder. Sometimes the ‘eunuchs’ we find in the sources may be better
translated ‘chamberlains’, who might or might not be anatomical
eunuchs. For instance, there are eunouchoi in Herodotus’ story of

\[25\] Periander and castration (Hdt. 3.48): Sourvinou-Inwood (1988: 171 and 180)
\[26\] See OCD under ‘eunuchs’ (R. L. G[ordon] for religious and E. D. H[unt] for sec-
    urlar); for a probably neutral adjectival sense of εὐνουχὸς see Sophocles F 789 Radt. On
    castration and eunuchs see now Taylor (2000), who notes (36) that Hermotimos is
    faithful to his master, his rage focuses safely on someone else.
Darius’ accession, but they may just be guardians of the royal bed-chamber; they carry messages in to the king (3. 77. 2).

There is a second linguistic ambiguity. Pierre Briant, in his recent history of the Persian empire, has a good section on eunuchs. He cuts back the phenomenon considerably; Ktesias predictably is a chief culprit, also Xenophon in the Cyropaedia (7. 5. 58 ff.), who seems to be applying to human eunuchs insights derived from his knowledge of gelded dogs and horses. For Briant, ‘eunuch’ may often just be a ‘titre aulique’—this is like the point I made above. He ingeniously suggests (p. 288) that copyists sometimes confused ωονοχός, cup-bearer, and ωονοχές, as in the case of Nehemiah, the king’s cup-bearer and certainly not a technical eunuch, contrary to some influential modern works. This is clever, though it would work better if the Hebrew word also used the three consonants N, KH, S which as far as I can see it does not (the word is sartis). Briant is however certainly right about Nehemiah, who along with Hermotimos is regularly cited as a high-grade eunuch in the Persian empire: some of the manuscripts of the Septuagint have ωονοχές not ωονοχός but the latter is certainly correct because it translates a Hebrew word mashkeh, cup-bearer. Then there is an a priori point: Mary Douglas points out to me that Nehemiah cannot be a eunuch because of the prohibition in Deuteronomy on men with crushed testicles entering the Assembly of the Lord. We can agree with Briant that much of the evidence for eunuchs, right down to the famous Bagoas at the time of Alexander, is anecdotal, novelistic, and bad. In fact, since Hermias of Atarneus is a different sort of case, Hermotimos turns out to be the best attested named historical eunuch employed in a high capacity in the Persian empire, if indeed his story is historical. For Persian eunuchs Sourvinou-Inwood cites a passage from Book 3 of Herodotus (3. 77), but these are the eunuchs in the Darius accession story and they are dubious, as I have suggested. A better passage for her purposes occurs later in the same book (3. 92) where eunuchos is not used, but Herodotus says the tribute from Babylon and Assyria

---

27 Briant (1996: 279–88, with note at 944 f.: section called ‘les eunuches’).
28 Nehemiah was not a eunuch, despite e.g. Hall (1989: 157), Lewis (1977: 20). The reading ωονοχές appears in some ms of the Septuagint (e.g. Codex Vaticanus) but the other transmitted reading, ωονοχός, is the right translation of Hebrew ‘mashkeh’, which means ‘cup-bearer’, lit. ‘one giving drink’: Brown, Driver and Briggs (1972: 1052 col. 2, lines 14–16 up). Ban on eunuchs entering the ‘assembly of the Lord’: Deut. 23. 1. Lewis compares Nehemiah to Ktesias’ Artoxares the Paphlagonian.
includes boys for castration.\textsuperscript{29} Here the word is \textit{ἐκτομίας} which is anatomically explicit. Better still is Herodotus' account of the reprisals for the Ionian Revolt (6.31-2), an important passage for my thesis. We are here told that the reprisals included the 'netting' of Chios, Lesbos, and Tenedos and, in accordance with an earlier threat, the castrating of the most beautiful boys and the deportation of the girls; the boys are made 'eunuchs instead of having their testicles', \textit{ἐπιοίειες ἀντὶ ἐὰν ἔναρχεος ἐνυφάκιος}—again explicit. The narrative concerns all three islands, but Herodotus is especially interested in Chios, which he lists in first place: I say this not just because of the order of the naming but above all because he precedes the account of the reprisals by not one but two stories (6.27) about portents of disaster to Chios alone, both involving the mass deaths of children.\textsuperscript{30} One group went as a chorus to Delphi but most of them died of plague; the other group was killed in a disaster to a school when the roof fell in. Clearly, the loss of children by these misfortunes is both a disaster in itself and a warning of a still worse disaster, the loss of further children not by misfortune but by deliberate mass castration and deportation just four chapters later. Demographically, this was a bad time for Chios. But to come back to eunuchs in general, Briant is right to be sceptical and I conclude that eunuchs, so far from settling Hermotimos’ historicity, merely involve us in deeper and muddier problems. What we ought to do, I suggest, is to distinguish between the practice of castration in the Persian empire (in fact, presumably for low-grade sex purposes), and the alleged phenomenon of the trusted very-high-level court eunuch (largely novelististic fantasy). In any case, as Braud shrewdly observes (see above, n. 9), Hermotimos’ trick on Panionios goes some way towards subverting the ‘trust eunuch’ stereotype (though see above, n. 26).

Next Panionios.\textsuperscript{31} In the year 2000, after the publication since 1987 of four volumes of the \textit{Lexicon of Greek Personal Names} (\textit{LGPN}),

\textsuperscript{29} \textit{μαῖας} \textit{ἐκτομίας} sent as tribute by Babylon and Assyria; Hdt. 3.92; for the 'netting' (the verb is \textit{ἐνυφάκια}, cf. 3.149: Samos, with Cecarelli (1993: 43–5)) of Chios Lesbos and Tenedos, and the mass castration of the best-looking boys and deportation of the prettiest girls see Hdt. 6.31–2 (for the threat to do this see 6.9).

\textsuperscript{30} Nagy (1990: 407–408) has an ingenious treatment of these portents.

\textsuperscript{31} On the name see Macan (1908: 521) and Bechtel (1917: 525), who compares \textit{Πανίσις}, \textit{Πάνθος}, and \textit{Πανθείς}; the first (possible but not certain) Panionios after Herodotus is from Beth Shearim, 3rd–4th cent. AD, see \textit{LGPN} vol. v, forthcoming. ‘Panionios’ as cult title of Apollo: \textit{IG II\textsuperscript{2}} 4995; of Hadrian: \textit{Lepth.} 1501 line 4. In Hdt. the MS variant \textit{Πανίσιος} (an attested name) is rejected by edd. and \textit{LGPN}. 
no study of a Greek individual mentioned by a Greek historian can neglect the onomastic evidence for the name borne by that individual. A check on published volumes of LGPN showed that Panionios was a very rare name because I could find only Herodotus' man and a quotation by Athenaeus of the Herodotus story. Both are of course in volume 1, *Islands and Cyrenaica*. Then a check which Elaine Matthews kindly did for me on unpublished LGPN files, including Asia Minor, confirmed that it is in fact unique: there is no other bearer of the name known to literature, epigraphy, or numismatics until a possible but not certain third- or fourth-century AD Palestinian. As a sort of adjective the word is a title of the emperor Hadrian.

Robert Parker warns me not to over-interpret the significance of the apparent uniqueness of the name. In his own witty formulation: 'as Aristotle might have said, nothing is commoner than uncommon names. You will, I think, find hapaxes on almost any page of LGPN'. I take this point, but nevertheless a meaningful and regularly formed Greek name which occurs in Herodotus, and is then (in effect) attested nowhere else at all, seems to me to be of considerable interest, and its possible implications worth pursuing. Let us first ask, what sort of name is Panionios and is it a plausible sort of name? Macan, whose Herodotus commentary may sometimes be wayward but often picks up aspects other commentators miss, suggested that the name was a defiant political statement of pan-Ionianism. As I say, Macan deserves credit for saying something about the name. More obviously plausible is Bechtel's view that Panionios belongs to a small but definitely attested category of *Festnemen*, that is, names derived from religious festivals. (Such names could also be derived from month-names but there is no month Panionios that I have been able to discover.) The festival in question is the Panhonia, the 'festival of all the Ionians', whose cult centre the Panhionion is described by Herodotus in the context of the Persian conquest of Ionia in 546. If that is right, the name Panionios becomes, I would observe, one of the earliest hard bits of evidence for the Panhionion and the Panhonia. That is, our man must have been given his name in, say, 520 BC. Of course that is later than 546, but some scholars, such as John Cook, have wondered just how far back the Panhionion's existence can be pushed. There is no archaeological evidence from the Archaic period, and the sceptic might want to argue that Herodotus, in talking about 546, might have retrojected the Classical institution, as might his contemporary Ion of Chios who, as we shall see, talks about the semi-
mythical phase of the Panionion. But against that sceptical possibility, the name Panionios is decisive. The name has, however, been routinely ignored in discussions of the problems of the early history of the Ionian league and the Panionia, e.g. by Wilamowitz, Wade-Gery, the German excavators in their 1967 Panionion und Melie; as by Nilsson—and everyone else.12

Why was the name not used again? Perhaps, like Adolf, it went out of fashion because its bearer was not an attractive role model. (But that would mean the story was current independently of Herodotus, otherwise we need to explain why there are no other Panionioi between 520 and Herodotus' time.) Or perhaps the existence of the Panonia was problematic in the classical period; indeed it was, and I argued twenty years ago that the Ephesia of Thucydides (3. 104) was none other than the old Panonia on a new site.13 But the move hardly happened before, say, 440, because Herodotus uses the present tense about the Panionion without awareness of the move away to Ephesus. So we still need to explain the absence of Panionios 520–440. There was nothing wrong with names formed from Ion; after all the unadjusted name Ion was famously borne by a Chian compatriot of Panionios. The fact remains, Panionios is never found again.

Let us try a different approach. I have suggested elsewhere14 that personal names are one control on the accuracy of the Greek historians; thus, epichoric Thessalian names in a Thessalian context reassure us that the historian mentioning them had done his research properly. The converse I now suggest is also true: an unattested name like Panionios may show the bearer to be unhistorical. What else might the name Panionios be doing? Might he in some sense represent and personify Ionianism? (So that in a way Macan would be right after all, though the Festname explanation is also true as I shall argue.) In favour of this idea there is one detail of the Herodotus story which I have held back until now, just as Herodotus holds it back—the number of Panionios' sons. Herodotus specifies that there were four of them. Now the bearer of another strongly Ionian name also famously had four sons, none other than Ion himself as recorded by Herodotus and repeated by Euripides in the Ion.15

---

13 Hornblower (1982).
14 Hornblower (2000).
15 The four sons of Ion: Hdt. 5. 66.2, Eur. Ion 1575–81.
Those sons gave their names to the four old Ionian tribes, i.e. the civic subdivisions into which the Athenians were organized before Kleisthenes made Athens a ten-tribe state for political purposes at the end of the sixth century. So my case for seeing Panionios as representative of Ionianism rests on two arguments: (1) the singularity of the name, and (2) the curious specification that, like Ion, he had four sons. I come back to Joseph: the sons of Jacob or Israel, that is Joseph and his brothers, were eponyms for the twelve tribes of Israel, a grouping which modern biblical scholars call an amphictyony, just like the twelve members of the Panionion. The sons of Ion were eponyms for the Ionian tribes Aigikoreis, Hookeites, Geleontes, and Argadeis: they were civically important at Athens until Kleisthenes. Even in the fifth century the old tribes survived religiously at Athens and they continued in use as the names of civic subdivisions in trans-Aegean Ionia. It may be objected: if I am right, why did Herodotus not simply use the name Ion? That would have been difficult, because Ion had a definite mythology of his own. Another answer is that Ion was not a rare personal name—there are several in Attica and the islands (including Ion of Chios and a well-known elegist from Samos) and even the Peloponnese. If Herodotus wanted to conjure up Ionianism, the unique name Panionios was a much more arresting way of doing so. If Hermotimos is Joseph, Panionios will be the eleven brothers who sold him; but I do not want to force every detail.

So what is Herodotus doing here? I invite you to go back a long way in time, or rather into the world of colonial myth. The local fifth-century historian Ion of Chios, quoted by Pausanias, tells us that Hektor, the early or more likely mythical king of Chios, fought and killed or drove out the early Karian inhabitants of the island; we recall that Herodotus said the Karians or Lelegians occupied the islands in early times. 16 Then, Ion continues, Hektor made Chios a

---

16 Ion of Chios on King Hector of Chios: Paus. 7. 4. 8–10 (= P’Hist. 392 F1): Τοϊν δὲ τῷ πανδόχῳ τρωγμένοις ἑστιν ἐν τῇ συγγραφῇ τοῦδε εἴρημα . . . ἀδέκκοντα δὲ καὶ Κάρμης ἐκ τῆς νήσου ἐπὶ τῆς Οἰνοποίους βασιλείας καὶ Λικναῖς ἐκ Εὔβοιας. Οἰνοποίους δὲ καὶ παίδων Ναυαγάν ὑπάρχει Λικναῖς τῇ ἄρχον ἀδέκκοντα δὲ καὶ Λικναίας ἐκ Λικναίων τῇ ἐκ Εὔβοιας κατὰ μάστιγα ἐκ Δελφῶν. Εὐκτικόν δὲ ἀπὸ Λικναίων τετράρχει γενόμενον βασιλεύον τῷ ὑψωτέρῳ Ἐκράτει καὶ Παρᾶς τοῖς αὐτοῖς ἐν τῇ νήσῳ, καὶ τοῖς μεν ἀπέκτεινεν ἐν τοῖς μάχαις, τοῖς δὲ ἀπελθεὶν ἡμᾶς ὑποπούσῳς, γενομένου δὲ ἀπαλλαγῆς πολέμου Χίου, ἀδέκκοντα τετρακάτι ἐκ μνήμης Ἑκτικόν ὁ υἱὸς καὶ Ιωνός δέν μανθάνεις ἐν Πανούσας τρέφοντας δὲ ἄλλον λαθέοις αὐτήν ἐπὶ ἁραγμαθία παρὰ τοῦ κοινοῦ φορτοῦ τοῦ τάγματος. τοιαύτα εἰρήμην ἐν Χίου Ίωνος εὐρίσκον τὸ μένῳ, ἔτη παρὰ θεοῦ, καθ’ ἀρχὴν αὐτῶν Χίου πελώτους εἰς Ταῦνας. (Ion the tragic poet wrote as follows in his History of Chios. While Oinopion was king, Karians came to the island, and Euboeans from
member of the Panionion. Here then we have, I suggest, an act of primeval violence which functions as a mythical archetype for Panionios’ castration of the Karian from Pedasa, and we see that Panionios is indeed a *Festname* of a sort. What I am arguing is that the ‘Hektor of Chios’ myth is a typically violent colonization myth which held that Chios and the Panionion came together in the context of a savage war against precisely Karians; correspondingly, the Panionios–Hermotimos story stands at one level for this early conflict, just as the story of Joseph and his brothers is thought to symbolize internecine tribal conflict but also the hope of reconciliation. Panionios in this first half of the story carries the full weight of his *Festname*: he is a ‘signifier’ for the archetypal colonizing Chians who subjugated the indigenous Karians and Lelegians and as part of the same mythhistorical process annexed the island to the Panionion. Hermotimos the Karian was captured by unspecified enemies in the story; surely none other than the Chians themselves under king Hektor. But then comes the revenge. In the Herodotus story the mutilated Karian from Lelegian Pedasa becomes a Persian high official, just as the ambivalent Karian Queen Artemisia rose high under Persian rule. It is important for my theory that Hermotimos should be a Karian in the first half of the story but a sort of Persian in the second half—just as Joseph the Jew becomes a sort of Egyptian; and this transition to Persian status is indeed exactly what happens to Hermotimos. The sinister in-between territory of Atarneus, island and not island, and frontier, i.e. liminal or marginal town, underlines the transition or ambiguity. Atarneus is, I argue, doubly polluted, first because of the betrayed suppliant Paktyes, and second because of its in-between, uncategorizable status; this is a notion familiar to anthropologists interested in concepts of pollution. So I would add to Parker’s comment about Atarneus in *Miasma* (above p. 45) the idea of *peraia* as pollution. Let us now turn to the second half of the story, the revenge of Hermotimos the Persian as he now is. To this corre-

Abai. After Onopion and his sons, Amphiklos reigned; he came from Histiaia in Euboia because of an oracle from Delphi. His great-grandson Hektor, who was also king, fought a war against the Karians and people from Abai on the island, killed some of them in his battles, and forced the rest to leave Chios under a trace. When the war in Chios was over it occurred to Hektor that the Chians ought to join the Ionians and sacrifice at the Panionion. Ion says Hektor was given a tripod as a *prae* for manly courage by the *koinon* of the Ionians. This is what I find Ion has written about Chios: he does not say how Chios came to belong to Ionia.

---

17 *Violent colonization myths*: Dougherty 1993a and 1993b.
spond, I suggest, the terrible Persian reprisals of 494 against islands of which Chios is given far the greatest prominence both in prospect (the children portents) and in the event (the island is named first). That is, in 494 B.C., the Persians, a category to which Hermotimos now in a real sense belongs, castrate the boys of Chios en masse. The plague, the collapsed roof and the Persian reprisals must have wiped out Chios demographically, punoikie we may say, just as in our story. Disaster was predicted for Pedasa in Book 1 (the bearded priestess), and for Chios in Book 6 (the portents about the children). We can add that the fatal, treacherous, and polluting character of Atarneus is prepared for in Book 1 (Paktyes), recurs in Book 6 (Hermippus the betrayer, and the story about the army of Histiaios), and reaches its climax in Book 8 (our passage). In the second half of the story then, Panionios and his sons stand both for Ionia as a whole, defeated in the Ionian Revolt, and also and especially for Chios in particular, the fate of whose children so preoccupied Herodotus. We should not forget the Chian girls completely; the boys were castrated and the girls deported, and this corresponds I suggest to amputation which is worse than castration. The troubles of Chios begin with treachery to a suppliant Paktyes and run right through Herodotus' entire work. Even after the Panionios passage we hear, very late in Book 8, of an abortive conspiracy against the tyrant Strattis of Chios. The conspiracy curiously enough involves seven conspirators, which, as Macan long ago and now Fehling note, is the same number as the Persian conspirators of Book 3; as with Panionios and the Persian employee Hermotimos, Chian and Persian events exhibit a nice symmetry.18

Where did Herodotus get all this from? Aly in 1921 thought the story (or Novelle as he called it) belonged to the category of 'Milestian Tales', but these are usually lewd or erotic, which is not quite right for our story; and it is anyway far from clear that this literary genre existed at so early a date.19 Jacoby, in the long 'Quellen' section of his great Pauly article on Herodotus, simply jumps over 8. 104-6, as we have seen (n. 1). But we can offer some ideas. Pedasa was not far from Herodotus' birthplace, Halikarnassos, so local Pedasan informants are an obvious possibility (Aly suggested this too). But for the Chian and Panonian aspect, we might think of Ion of Chios himself.

19 See Trenkner (1958), E. L. Bowie 'Aristides (2)' in OCD, and S. Harrison (1998) for Milestian Tales, about which much is obscure.
There is another, better and more immediate source. Only one of the seven Chian conspirators against Strattis is named, Herodotus son of Basileides, the only Herodotus in Herodotus other than himself. Hera-derivatives (like Hero-dotos) are not rare in Chios; but this is an intriguing name less for itself than because of the patronymic Basileides. It suggests to me the Basildal, the primeval kingly or priestly families of northern Ionia, that is, the Chios region. But who better placed than this priestly aristocrat to provide Herodotus with information not only on the failed coup against Strattis but on the Panionion, the Panonia—and Panionios?

A penultimate question: why is the episode placed just here? I have already remarked (p. 55) that Chios and Atarneus run right through the History; but the placing of this particular item is dead central. This is the hinge of Xerxes’ expedition; he has just lost the battle of Salamis and decided (8. 103) to withdraw from Europe to Asia, following Artemisia’s advice; he actually does so in 107. The Panionios–Hermotimos narrative, 104–6, fills the critical pause between decision to withdraw and actual withdrawal. It does so (if I am right about the name Panionios) by reminding us that adika erga, unjust acts, between Europe and Asia go back far in time, and it does so by resuming momentarily not only as Braund rightly says the theme of East–West or Greek–Persian requital, but also that of male–female reciprocity, with both of which the whole work began. The savage mass castrations of 494 were requital for the act of revolt in 500; the Persian failure at Salamis in 480 is requital for the savagery of 494. There is symmetry in that we are specifically told that it was on Xerxes’ outward journey that Hermotimos destroyed the children of Panionios when the king was at Sardis, but now on Xerxes’ return journey he guards the king’s children at Ephesus. Sardis and Ephesus were, we recall, the two places where Panionios plied his impious trade.

The final question is: how seriously am I suggesting all this? What, it may be asked, has happened to the Hermotimos who simply looked after Xerxes’ children in 480 BC? The best way to answer is by examining the Joseph analogy. Stories can work and be true at more than one level. For Thomas Mann, Joseph and his brothers simply provided the plot for a great sprawling tetralogy of a novel, underpinned by no discernible symbolism. Historians of early Israel see the Joseph

40 For Hera-derived names on Chios see Parker (2000: 72). Basileides is missing from LGPN I by what Elaine Matthews confirms is oversight.
narrative differently, in terms of internecine strife; for theologians it expresses God’s care for his chosen people the children of Israel; students of narrative see it differently again; and economic historians can note the timeless and authentic role of Egypt as corn-provider from the Pharaohs to the Ptolemies.\footnote{Shear (1978) for a massive Ptolemaic hand-out of corn.} Similarly the Panionios-Hermotimos story is at one level just an illustration of the mechanics of the ancient slave trade; at another it offers an effective narrative pause; at another it is a warning that the gods may permit and arrange spectacular revenges. But at yet another—and this has been the main message of my paper—it may say something timeless and structurally significant about relations and uneasy interaction in the east Aegean between three groups. These are first, religiously-bonded early Greek settlers; second, local non-Greeks like Karians and Lelegians whose early subjection was asserted and sealed by exclusive Greek groupings like the Panionion; and third, the eventual Persian masters and employers or slave-trading partners of both of them.

After I had delivered this paper in Oxford, one or two members of the audience wrote to me to ask if I thought Herodotus invented the entire story himself or got it from someone else, and they complained that I had not come quite clean on this point. The answer is that I have no idea, but that if a gun were put to my head I should prefer to say that he reported an amazing story he had been told and which he had not forgotten—who could? On the other hand I agree with Alan Griffiths that ‘Herodotus knows very well what he is about’ and that ‘he is aware how much suggestive depth can be added to a narrative by the selective inclusion of stories with an aura of the irrational’.\footnote{Griffiths (2000: 182). I am grateful to Alan Griffiths for help with correcting the proofs of this paper, and for valuable last-minute improvements.} That is, he used and transformed a macabre story which he had been told, and which he may well have realized was not literally true. I have tried to suggest that he exploited and transformed it in two ways: first, by deliberately placing it at a crucial hinge in his narrative, and second, by making it a signifier for some very large issues to do with the relations between Greeks and other ethnic groups.