

Vasileios Dimoglidis

*Reflecting upon language on the Greek tragic stage: towards an interpretation of metalanguage in Euripides' Ion**

Abstract

In this paper, I argue that Euripides in the *Ion* deploys his onstage figures to comment, in a self-referential way and in some select moments, on the nature and function of language, thus offering some instances of metalanguage. Euripides grafts in the *Ion* utterances that hearers are likely to decode on more than one level—utterances encompassing not only the conveyed message but also some additional information as to how the message is (to be) realized (in nonverbal behavior, or in a particular vocal register such as loudly or softly, spoken or sung), performed (within ancient Greek theatrical conventions), or received (for example, as having the authority of myth or oracle). Through my analysis, I aim to contribute to the scholarship on Euripidean metapoetry, shedding light on the tragic poet's reflections on one of the primary components of a theatrical play.

In questo articolo sostengo che nello *Ione* Euripide utilizza i suoi personaggi in scena per commentare, in modo autoreferenziale e in alcuni momenti selezionati, la natura e la funzione del linguaggio, offrendo così alcune istanze di metalinguaggio. Euripide innesta nello *Ione* enunciati che gli ascoltatori possono decodificare a più livelli. Queste espressioni comprendono non solo il messaggio trasmesso, ma anche alcune informazioni aggiuntive su come il messaggio esso debba realizzato (nel comportamento non verbale o in un particolare registro vocale, come ad alta o bassa voce, parlato o cantato), eseguito (all'interno delle antiche convenzioni teatrali greche) o ricevuto (ad esempio, come se avesse l'autorità del mito o dell'oracolo). Attraverso la mia analisi, mi pongo l'obiettivo di contribuire alla ricerca sulla metapoesia euripidea, facendo luce sulle riflessioni del poeta tragico su una delle componenti primarie di uno spettacolo teatrale.

Although it has long been noted that in Euripides' (so-called) tragic-comedies, «the voices become audible as voices» and that «much of the time one hears not only what is said but how it is said, in a way seldom known to earlier tragedy»¹, scant attention has been paid to *Ion*'s language, and especially to the moments when the figures of the play are made to reflect upon such concepts as language, communication, and speech delivery².

* I am profoundly indebted to Helen Gasti, Pavlos Piperias, Katerina Synodinou, Kathryn Gutzwiller, and Maria Gerolemou for their insightful comments. A previous version of this paper was presented at the 2022-2023 «Postgraduate Work in Progress» Series at the University of London (Institute of Classical Studies). I want to thank the audience for their fruitful feedback. I would also like to express my gratitude to the anonymous reviewers of *Dionysus ex Machina* for their valuable criticism that has improved this paper. Any errors that remain are mine alone.

¹ WHITMAN (1974, 4).

² BUDELMANN (2000, 17) in his introduction states that Euripides' language deserves to be studied in its own right. Since then, prolific bibliography has been published on this issue. See for instance CHONG-

In this paper, I argue that Euripides in the *Ion* deploys his onstage figures in order to comment, in a self-referential way and in some select moments³, on the nature and function of language, thus offering some instances of metalanguage⁴. In doing so, he reveals (even with the implicitly imposed by the genre⁵) his own thoughts and concerns on the speech-delivery, the dynamics of onstage language, and the function of language in situations of emotional tension. Through my analysis, I aim to contribute to the discussion of Euripidean metapoetry, shedding light on the tragic poet's reflections on one of the primary components of a theatrical play.

The scholarship that has significantly influenced my analysis includes the studies of Cole (2008) and Torrance (2013). Focusing on two passages of the *Ion* (ll. 265-74 and ll. 987-95), Cole asserts that Euripides' characters emphasize the instability of their own mythology and annotate, in a self-referential way, the play's mythic innovation. In her monograph, Torrance (2013) examines various metapoetic strategies in Euripidean tragedy and the role of the ancient audience in unraveling these strategies. She concludes by suggesting that Euripides' «oeuvre is characterized by an overwhelming pervasiveness of metapoetic elements in combinations not present in the other tragedians»⁶. In addition to these two contributions, recent bibliography has highlighted other aspects of Euripidean metapoetics in the *Ion*. For instance, Diamantakou-Agathou (2012) and Dimoglidis (2018) have focused on the *Ion*'s intertextual familiarity with Aristophanes and Aeschylean satyr play respectively. Thornburn (2001) and Dimoglidis (2020), following and expanding Thornburn's observations, have examined the «internal playwrights» in the *Ion*. However, metalanguage in Euripides' *Ion* has been neglected by scholarship.

GOSSARD (2008), SCHUREN (2015), VAN EMDE BOAS (2017), and VAN EMDE BOAS (2022). Although these scholars examine aspects of verbal communication in Euripides' plays, they do not deal with the self-referential instances of the Euripidean language.

³ I do not suggest that metalanguage is particularly pronounced in this play; instead, I argue that it is a feature contributing to the play's metapoetic dimension. Based on (and adapting) ROSENMEYER (2002, 107, also cited in TORRANCE 2013, 2f., and 3, n.8), I shall be using the term 'metalanguage' to identify specific dramatic movements which are brief and of not of such potency that they pervasively color the total dramatic experience. Thus, I also agree with TORRANCE (2013, 2f.) who writes that «metatheatrical or metafictional references represent select moments during a performance rather than an overarching framework». After all, the core of a play is what follows the *meta-*, while everything *meta-* is attached as a layer to this core.

⁴ «Metalanguage» is a form of language that describes or comments on another, the object-language (ELAM 2002², 183), and as «metalinguistic» I define the intra-dramatic pointers that refer to the language itself, its nature, and its function. MEY (2001², 173-174) writes that metalanguage «indicates a language that is about language, one level 'up' from the language itself, the 'object language' [...]. A metalanguage indicates, comments on, examines, criticizes etc. what happens on the level of the object language» (p. 173). Cf. FINCH (2003², 9).

⁵ Metapoetry is implicit in tragedy but explicit in comedy because of the conventions of each genre. Cf. TAPLIN (1986, esp. 171) and TORRANCE (2013, 300).

⁶ TORRANCE (2013, 300).

I also want to clarify that I am not suggesting that Euripides' *Ion* is a meta-play itself, like Pirandello's plays, or a play where metalanguage turns out to be omnipresent. I am examining this play as a case study, contending that moments of metalanguage can be found and analyzed in all tragic (and comic) authors, possibly to varying degrees in every play. While Euripides' *Bacchae* is often considered the primary case study for metapoetry⁷, the *Ion* stands out as «self-referential to a degree unparalleled anywhere else in Euripides»⁸. Within this framework of «unparalleled self-preferentiality», I argue that Euripides 'grafts' in the *Ion* moments of a «language that is about language»⁹.

In the first episode and during the first dialogue between Creusa and Ion, Creusa recounts that she bursts into tears upon seeing Phoebus' temple, and she retraced an old memory (ll. 247-51). She also ponders the lack of recourse for those suffering from the unjust acts of those in power (ll. 252-54). In commenting on Creusa's statements, Ion characterizes her wording in ll. 247-54 as ἀνερμήνευτα (τί χρημ' ἀνερμήνευτα δυσθυμῆ, γόνοι; l. 255 «why are you unhappy over things beyond interpretation, madam?») ¹⁰, indicating that they are inexplicable and impossible to interpret. Importantly, Ion's use of the verb δυσθυμέω («to be dispirited, despond» ¹¹) likely serves a dual purpose by not only commenting on Creusa's mental state but also implying a commentary on the manner in which Creusa's emotions are being verbally expressed ¹². With this question, Ion encourages Creusa to articulate and clarify the inexplicability of her previous statements ¹³. However, Creusa, in response, attempts to sidestep providing Ion with a clear answer, and through the absolute negation expressed with οὐδὲν ¹⁴, she endeavors to shift the focus of their dialogue: οὐδὲν· μεθῆκα τόξα· τὰπὶ τῶδε δὲ / ἐγὼ τε σιγῶ, καὶ σὺ μὴ φρόντιζ' ἔτι (ll. 256f. «It is nothing; I have let fly what I have to say. Now I am staying silent about the matter, and you do not think about it any longer»).

⁷ See TORRANCE (2013, 2). Both SEGAL (1982) and BIERL (1991) have published monographs focusing mainly on Euripides' *Bacchae*. Especially Segal's contribution paved the way for all the following studies examining metapoetry.

⁸ COLE (1997, 96).

⁹ MEY (2001², 173f.).

¹⁰ Citations from Euripides' *Ion* refer to the edition of DIGGLE (1981) unless otherwise stated; translations are adapted from LEE (1997, 46-157).

¹¹ For the meanings, see LSJ⁹ 457, s.v. δυσθυμαίνω, /-έω.

¹² In this first dialogue, the differences between Creusa's and Ion's wording are dictated by their respective mental state. Ion, being dispassionate, tends to express himself with more extended utterances compared to Creusa. On the other hand, Creusa is agitated, and this is why her utterances are clipped. For this issue, see LEE (1997, 188 ad 252-54). For the interrelation between mental/emotional state and wording, see also MIRTO (2009, 238f. ad 237-527).

¹³ Cf. DELATTRE (2016, 6) who notes that this dialogue or maybe even the whole play shall explain Creusa's unexplained sadness.

¹⁴ MARTIN (2018, 205 ad 256) stresses that through the term οὐδὲν, Creusa «is trying to change the topic, evading an answer that would reveal too much».

The combination of Creusa's sorrow, triggered by her past and intensified upon witnessing Apollo's temple, coupled with her unfamiliarity with Ion, compels her to remain silent (ἐγὼ τε σιγῶ..., l. 257). Conversely, Xuthus, elated by the belief, instilled by Apollo, that he has found his son, engages in a dialogue with Ion. In the second episode, Xuthus exits Apollo's temple and identifies Ion as his son according to the oracle's prediction. Ion, skeptical and resisting acceptance, asks with incredulity: (ποῦ δέ μοι πατήρ σύ; ταῦτ' οὖν οὐ γέλωσ κλύειν ἐμοί; l. 528 «how can you be my father? Isn't this a joke on me to hear?»). Xuthus dismisses Ion's skepticism, responding with confidence: οὐ· τρέχων ὁ μῦθος ἄν σοι τὰμὰ σημήνειεν ἄν (l. 529 «no! The story as it runs forward would quickly make my situation clear to you»). The noun μῦθος has a rich semantic spectrum, capable of conveying meaning on various levels. Cole (2008, 315) emphasizes the metapoetic resonance of this term in the *Ion*'s l. 529, suggesting that μῦθος here «points to Ion's conventional mythological pedigree» In contrast, Martin (2018, 278f. *ad* 529) disagrees with Cole, and contends that the participle τρέχων «specifies the meaning of μῦθος and thus rules out the meaning 'myth' in this context» In my view, the significance and the connotations of this noun hinge on Xuthus' intended usage and aims. Among its various meanings, μῦθος can also mean «word/speech/conversation»¹⁵, and as a marker of textual deixis, refers to forthcoming discourse (that is, ll. 530ff.). Xuthus underscores the paramount importance of his «unrolling account» in the dialogue, believing that the upcoming narrative will resolve the misunderstanding. Additionally, the participle τρέχων may allude, even if slyly¹⁶, to the speech performance, specifically to the use of trochaic tetrameter employed in this scene, wherein the speech becomes «running» with a more pronounced and intense 'beat'¹⁷ than the trimeter¹⁸.

Stunned by the revelation, Ion seeks clarification from Xuthus. With his inquiry καὶ τί μοι λέξεις; (l. 530 «well, what are you going to tell me?»), Ion, while using future tense, prompts Xuthus¹⁹ to flash back to his previous statements and provide further

¹⁵ See LSJ⁹ 1151, *s.v.* μῦθος II and I3.

¹⁶ In commenting on the phrase τρέχων ὁ μῦθος, GIBERT (2019, 211 *ad* 529) has observed that «a sly allusion to trochaic meter is possible».

¹⁷ MARTIN (2018, 272 *ad* 510-565) notes that «the change of metre generally signals intensification of dramatic speech or action».

¹⁸ In commenting on this scene, MIRTO (2009, 257 *ad* 510-29) notes that the catalectic trochaic tetrameters in ll. 510-65 highlight the emotional tone, which becomes increasingly intense as the stichomythia progresses. Cf. MASTRONARDE (1994, 319 *ad* 588-637), who also posits that «in scenes in which it [*i.e.* the trochaic tetrameter] is used not only are the emotions more agitated or the tone somehow altered by frenzy or demonic authority [...] but physical movement is either being initiated or becoming more rapid».

¹⁹ MARTIN (2018, 279 *ad* 530) believes that Ion's utterance καὶ τί μοι λέξεις; (l. 530) is «probably not just an invitation to speak but a provocation». Martin is right to the extent that Ion refuses to believe in what Xuthus tells.

explanations or elaborations of these statements²⁰. The addition of the pronoun μοὶ in the Euripidean idiom τί λέξεις; indicates Ion's active involvement in the speech production, suggesting an invited speech delivery where Ion becomes not only the grammatical indirect object but also the narrative direct object of Xuthus' λέγειν. The response provided by Xuthus, πατήρ σός εἰμι καὶ σὺ παῖς ἐμός (l. 530, «I am your father, you are my son»), fails to satisfy Ion. Consequently, Ion asks in the next line: τίς λέγει τάδ' [ε]; (l. 531, «who says these things?»). The use of the pronoun τάδε, functioning as a marker of textual deixis, specifically refers to the content of Xuthus' prior statement (πατήρ σός εἰμι καὶ σὺ παῖς ἐμός, l. 530) whose credibility and validity is searched by Ion in a subject of λέγειν other than Xuthus. Upon Xuthus' revelation that the announcement stems from Apollo's oracle (ὅς σ' ἔθρεψεν ὄντα Λοξίας ἐμόν, l. 531 «Loxias, who brought you up although you were mine»), Ion is ultimately convinced since the subject brings a divine prestige²¹.

After acknowledging Xuthus as his father, Ion directs his inquiry towards the identity of his mother. Through his question ἐκ τίνος δέ σοι πέφυκα μητρός;²² (l. 540, «But from what mother was I born to you?»), Ion initiates a new narrative trajectory, specifically concentrating on the issue of his mother's identity. This shift seems motivated by a desire to scrutinize and validate Xuthus's narrative²³. Confronted with uncertainty regarding Ion's mother, Xuthus is compelled to admit, οὐκ ἔχω φράσαι (l. 540, «I am not able to say»). This lack of awareness on Xuthus' part aligns with his incapacity to φράζειν («to talk and provide explanations»)²⁴, justifying his terse wording in this passage. The strategic use of language-related terms such as λέξεις (l. 530), λέγει (l. 531), and φράσαι (l. 541) imparts substantial importance to the theme of language and speech within the

²⁰ Citing Barrett on *Hippolytus*' l. 353, GIBERT (2019, 211 *ad* 530) notes that Ion's utterance καὶ τί μοὶ λέξεις is «probably a variation on the Euripidean idiom τί λέξεις, which always looks *back* to something shocking the speaker has just heard, as well as forward to an explanation or elaboration of it».

²¹ The credibility of the divine prestige of Apollo as a subject of λέγειν is quite strong, given Ion's swift acceptance of the oracle as «true». Ion's unwavering dedication to Apollo's temple results in him embracing Xuthus' report without raising any objections.

²² The ἐκ is an emendation proposed by Boethe and adopted by almost all the editors (*contra* Murray who keeps the ἔα of the ms L). If we keep ἔα and consider it an exclamation, that would mean that Ion indicates his surprise before asking his following question (cf. LSJ⁹ 465, s.v. ἔα). If we consider it to be the imperative of ἐάω, then it might mean «hands off» (Murray's interpretation cited in OWEN 1939, 108 *ad* 540 and LEE 1997, 220 *ad* 540 with no reference to Murray) and show Xuthus' affection. Scholars agree that Boethe's ἐκ is correct. For instance, OWEN (1939, 108 *ad* 540) notes that ἔα «is unidiomatic and implies a show of affection from Xuthus which would be inappropriate here». LEE (1997, 220 *ad* 540) is of the same opinion and adds that «the interjection ἔα is [...] out of place».

²³ LEE (1997, 220 *ad* 540) notes that «Ion turns to his mother's identity, partly because this offers a way of verifying Xuthus' story».

²⁴ I think that Xuthus uses the verb φράζω and not a similar one (e.g. λέγω) in order to emphasize that he is unable not only to speak, but also to explain through speech what Ion seeks after; in other words, for Xuthus, language/speech cannot help him at all right now. For the meanings of the verb φράζω, see LSJ⁹ 1952f., s.v. φράζω.

dialogue. This emphasis not only highlights the centrality of communication but also accentuates the role of λέγειν in the interaction between Xuthus and Ion. λόγος serves as the conduit through which Ion endeavors to ascertain the alleged truth about his identity, with Xuthus leveraging language to convince Ion of their purported father-son relationship. As Xuthus finds himself unable to provide answers to Ion's questions about his mother (ll. 541-43), Ion tactfully redirects the conversation, stating «come, let us touch on another discussion» (l. 544). Xuthus concurs, expressing agreement: τοῦτ' ἄμεινον, ὃ τέκνον (l. 544, «that is better, my son»). He recognizes that the new narrative trajectory²⁵ proposed by Ion extricates him from the predicament caused by his inability to answer Ion's questions²⁶. The verbs λέγω and φράζω are ordinary words and they do not always have a metalinguistic resonance. In this case, however, Euripides uses Xuthus and Ion, and their dialogue about Ion's parents, as the framework where words of speech are used to annotate the role of λόγος in Xuthus' attempts to inform and persuade Ion, and suggest that the focus is not solely on conveying content but also on the act of communication itself, emphasizing its functions and significance within the narrative.

After witnessing the («false») recognition between Xuthus and Ion, Creusa's maids foresee impending sadness and woes when their lady encounters Xuthus with his son (ll. 676-80). Despite the earlier death threat by Xuthus at the end of the second episode should they communicate what they had witnessed to Creusa, the maids, undeterred, contemplate defying these warnings. In the second stasimon, they ponder whether they should finally disclose the news to their lady:

φίλοι, πότερ' ἐμᾶ δεσποίνα
τάδε τορῶς ἐς οὓς γεγωνήσομεν
†πόσιν ἐν ᾧ τὰ πάντ' ἔχουσ' ἐλπίδων
μέτοχος ἦν τλάμων†;

Friends, should we cry out these things clearly to the ears of our mistress? †She, the wretched woman, who shared with her husband hopes in every respect† (ll. 695-98).

In these lines, the women of the Chorus introduce a tension between τορῶς...γεγωνήσομεν and ἐς οὓς, expressing themselves paradoxically. Creusa's maids want to confess, if they finally decide to do so, what they have heard to Creusa *sotto voce* (ἐς οὓς, l. 696), but at the same time they suggest that they will deliver it τορῶς (l. 696).

²⁵ LEE (1997, 220 *ad* 544) rightly notes that Ion realizes that «Xuthus can convey no further useful information from the oracle; he [*i.e.* Ion] therefore turns to a rigorous application of logic, in the use of which Xuthus proves sadly deficient».

²⁶ As MARTIN (2018, 282 *ad* 544) has observed, «Xuthus [...] is relieved that the interrogation is finished». Cf. GIBERT (2019, 212 *ad* 544).

Euripides employs this adverb with two meanings, thus creating a double entendre²⁷: the women wonder whether they should provide a precise and distinctive (LSJ⁹ 1807, *s.v.* *τορός* I 2) report of the previous narrative between Xuthus and Ion, but, at the same time, this adverb might also indicate the «piercing» that is, loud, volume of the voice (LSJ⁹ 1807, *s.v.* *τορός* 1)²⁸. Despite their preference for speaking *sotto voce*, they must project their voices audibly to reach the external audience. The term *τορῶς* signifies not only a loud vocal tone but also articulacy²⁹ – both indispensable qualities for making their onstage speech intelligible to the audience, especially in a vast theater with a large and diverse audience³⁰. Euripides orchestrates a synchronization between the *χορευταί*, who must care for the words to be understood by the audience (*τορῶς*), and the represented characters (Creusa's maids), who express their desire to confidentially confess everything to Creusa by lowering their voices (*ἐς οὐς*). Euripides employs his Chorus in order to reflect upon the distinction between high and low volume, suggesting that the delivery of speech should lean towards being audible.

In the third episode, Creusa, accompanied by the Old Man, queries her maids about the oracle Xuthus received regarding their infertility: *σημήνατ'· εἰ γὰρ ἀγαθὰ μοι μηνύσετε, / οὐκ εἰς ἀπίστους δεσπότης βαλεῖς χάριν* (ll. 750f. «explain to me. If you reveal to me good news you will not throw away a favor on a mistress who is ungrateful»). Creusa's imperative *σημήνατε* a demand for a clear response³¹ from the women of the Chorus, yet their initial words remain opaque: *ὠ δαΐμον* (l. 752 «Ah, fortune!»). Through her response *τὸ φροῖμιον μὲν τῶν λόγων οὐκ εὐτυχές* (l. 753 «the opening of what you

²⁷ For the meanings of this word, see also CHANTRAINE (1977, 1126 *s.v.* *τορεῖν*), who notes that the word *τορός*, when used for the language or the voice, means «distinct, penetrating, piercing». In Greek tragedy this term (either the adjective or the adverb) is used usually by the Chorus (except for Aeschylus' *Libation Bearers*, l.32). Cf. Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* (ll. 615f.: *αὕτη μὲν οὕτως εἶπε μανθάνοντί σοι / τοροῖσιν ἔρμηνεύσιν εὐπρεπῶς λόγον*, ll. 1062f.: *ἔρμηνέως ἔοικεν ἢ ξένη τοροῦ / δεῖσθαι· τρόπος δὲ θηρὸς ὡς νεαυρέτου*), *Suppliants* (l. 274: *βραχὺς τορός θ' ὁ μῦθος...*); [Euripides'] *Rhesus* (ll. 76f.: *Ἐκτορ, ταχύνεις πρὶν μαθεῖν τὸ δρώμενον· / ἄνδρες γὰρ εἰ φεύγουσιν οὐκ ἴσμεν τορῶς*). LIAPIS (2012, 92 *ad* 76f.) has observed that the adverb *τορῶς* in Euripides occurs only in the *Ion*. Cf. GIBERT (2019, 233 *ad* 695f.).

²⁸ LSJ⁹ 1807, *s.v.* *τορός* I («of the voice, piercing, thrilling») mentions Euripides' *Ion* 696.

²⁹ The first meaning («clear, distinct, plain») could have a metaperformative resonance as well; clear/distinct/plain will be not only the content of the Chorus' utterance, but also their articulation.

³⁰ The same qualities might be echoed in the verb *γεγωνήσομεν* as well, since it means «to shout so as to make oneself heard, speak articulately» (LSJ⁹ 340, *s.v.* **γεγωνέω*). However, this usage is rather epic, and in tragedy (especially in Euripides) has faded to merely «proclaim, announce». See LIAPIS (2012, 138 *ad* 269f.), who notes (on *Rhesus* 269f.) that in tragedy «*γέγωνα* has come to mean merely 'to proclaim, to announce'».

³¹ The verb *σημαίνω* means «indicate, give signs, signify, declare». See LSJ⁹ 1592f., *s.v.* *σημαίνω*. This verb is sometimes related to Delphic oracles, for instance Heraclit.93 DK: *ὁ ἄναξ, οὗ τὸ μαντεῖόν ἐστι τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖς, οὔτε λέγει οὔτε κρύπτει ἀλλὰ σημαίνει* (for the latter, see LSJ⁹ 1592, *s.v.* *σημαίνω* 3). In this context, Creusa employs the imperative *σημήνατε* to urge the women of the Chorus to reveal the oracle given to Xuthus by Apollo. For Creusa's anticipation of receiving favorable news from the Chorus through this *σημήνατε*, see PELLEGRINO (2004, 264 *ad* 750f.).

have to say is not auspicious»), Creusa is made to provide a commentary on the opening words of the Chorus' answer. She makes a semantics analysis of the Chorus' exclamations through which she also invites the audience to consider the implications of the Chorus' words and the potential ramifications for the characters involved in this dialogue. The Chorus repeat the same vagueness: ἰὼ τλᾶμον (l. 754 «Ah, poor one!») and εἶεν· τί δρῶμεν θάνατος ὧν κείται πέρι; (l. 756 «Ah, ah! What are we to do in a case where death threatens?»). Creusa's next question τίς ἦδε μοῦσα, χῶ φόβος τίνων πέρι; (l. 757 «what is this song and what are you afraid of?») has a double meaning. On the one hand, she seeks clarification about the content of the previous lines sung by the Chorus³²; on the other hand, she is wondering about the generic identity of these lines³³ since she, though recognizing the lyrical nature of the utterances (μοῦσα «song»)³⁴, struggles to categorize them (τίς «what?»). At the same time, it is likely that the noun μοῦσα here not only encompasses the meaning of «song» but also refers to the tonal quality of their voice, which in fact verbalizes their emotional state. The exclamations ἰὼ δαῖμον (l. 752) and ἰὼ τλᾶμον (l. 754) are non-iambic, and their Doric vocalization indicates that they are being sung, while they could be the beginning of dochmiacs which are abruptly interrupted by Creusa because they do not correspond to the auspicious news she has been hoping for (...εἰ γὰρ ἀγαθὰ μοι μηνύσετε, l. 750)³⁵.

In response to the Chorus' revelation that Xuthus has found his son and that she will remain childless (ll. 761f., and ll. 776f.), Creusa exclaims:

τόδ' ἐπὶ τῷδε κακὸν ἄκρον ἔλακες <ἔλακες>
ἄχος ἔμοι στένειν

this is the peak of woe you have uttered, <uttered>, coming on top of the other, a grief for me to lament (ll. 776f.).

³² See LEE (1997, 247 *ad* 756-59).

³³ Creusa's question may be due in good part to the self-referential εἶεν of the previous line (εἶεν· τί δρῶμεν; θάνατος ὧν κείται πέρι..., l. 756). According to MARTIN (2018, 337 *ad* 756), the particle εἶεν «marks a transition not just to a new topic but also to a new mode of utterance, from lament to deliberation». Here I follow Martin's text who accepts and adopts the word εἶεν (ms L). The change of εἶεν to αἰαῖ has been suggested by Schmidt, and adopted by Diggle. This change is unnecessary according to MARTIN (2018, 337 *ad* 756).

³⁴ The noun μοῦσα means «music, song». See LSJ⁹ 1148, *s.v.* Μοῦσα. See also GIBERT (2019, 241 *ad* 757), who notes that the term μοῦσα «corresponds to the (lyric) manner of the Chorus' outbursts in 752 and 754».

³⁵ GIBERT (2019, 240 *ad* 752-54) stresses that these exclamations have a non-iambic rhythm and their Doric vocalization indicate that they are sung in a style or to a melody that Creusa instantly recognizes as inauspicious. These exclamations, Gibert writes, «are too short for definitive metrical analysis, but either could be the beginning of a dochmiac, which would suit the context».

The verb *λάσκω* is not infrequently used in referring to oracles (meaning, in this case, «to utter an oracle»)³⁶, and here it carries a metalinguistic resonance in the sense that Creusa identifies what the Chorus have said with oracular authority. Creusa's statement also holds a metaperformative value since the *ἔλακες* (l. 776), which means «shout, scream, cry aloud»³⁷ refers to how the preceding choral lines were uttered, and to the high volume of the voice. The use of the second singular person of the verb suggests that these lines were likely spoken by the Chorus' leader, and Creusa appears to be responding to the question she posed before twenty lines about the identity of the Chorus' lines (τίς ἦδε μοῦσα...; l. 757). My argument is strengthened by Creusa's utterance *πῶς φής; †ἄφατον ἄφατον† ἀναύδητον / λόγον ἐμοὶ θροεῖς*³⁸ (ll. 783f. «what are you saying? †Untold, untold†, unutterable words you cry out»): the verb *θροέω*, semantically connected to the previous verb *λάσκω*, means «to utter aloud/to scare, terrify»³⁹, and specifies both the loudness of the Chorus' voice and the effect (terror) that the contents of the Chorus' utterance had upon Creusa⁴⁰. The news announced by the Chorus agitates Creusa to such an extent that she considers what she has been told to be so terrible that it is impossible to be uttered⁴¹. The two descriptors of Creusa's inability to verbalize what she has heard (*ἄφατον, ἀναύδητον*) correspond to the escalation of Creusa's frustration.

Creusa's astonishment at the news concerning Xuthus and also her intense emotional strain have accumulated in the near-sixty lines where she has remained silent

³⁶ Cf. Aristophanes' *Wealth* 39, where the slave Cario asks his master Chremylus τί δῆτα Φοῖβος ἔλακεν ἐκ τῶν στεμμιάτων; («What then did Phoebus pronounce from his holy wreaths?» transl. Loeb). SOMMERSTEIN (2001, 137 ad 39) notes that l. 39 is a tragic quotation, and the verb *λάσκω* «is frequently used in tragedy in relation to oracular and prophetic utterances».

³⁷ For the meanings of the verb, see LSJ⁹ 1031, s.v. *λάσκω*. LSJ⁹ mentions Euripides' *Ion* 776 under the meaning (III 2) «shriek forth, utter aloud». Commenting on *Alcestis*' 343-47, DALE (1954, 78 ad 343-47) writes that through *λάσκω*, the tragedians refer to «the voice of oracles, to the human voice raised in song», and «to loud human utterance». I am not quite sure though that in Euripides it means «'utter' in general». I believe that this verb refers to the volume of the voice. Commenting on Sophocles' *Trachiniae* 824f., EASTERLING (1982, 175 ad 824f.) observes that the verb *λάσκω* «means 'shout', 'scream', often used of prophetic utterance [...] no doubt because the voice of the entranced prophet was unlike normal speech». Cf. GIBERT (2019, 244 ad 777).

³⁸ The ms **L** gives *ἄφατον ἄφατον* (l. 783), which is adopted by Diggle inside *crucis*, while LEE (1997, 250 ad 783f.) posits that the repetition «suits Creusa's pleonastic style but requires the acceptance of unlikely forms of dochmiac». Badham (not recorded in Diggle's *app.crit.*) has suggested *ἄφατον ἄφραστον*. MARTIN (2018, 342 ad 783) endorses Badham's conjecture, and suggests that «the transmitted double *ἄφατον* is metrically implausible and produces anadiplosis in a position that is unusual in a dochmiac». For Martin, the term *ἄφραστον* «cures both problems and removes the awkward constellation of one repeated and one unrepeated adjective». Cf. also GIBERT (2019, 245 ad 783).

³⁹ The verb *θροέω* means «cry aloud, tell out, utter aloud, scare, terrify». See LSJ⁹ 807, s.v. *θροέω*.

⁴⁰ SCHUREN (2015, 20) compiles all instances of the verb *θροέω* in Attic tragedy, and notes that this verb «may specify the volume, form, style and contents of the utterance».

⁴¹ MARTIN (2018, 342 ad 783) posits that the alliterative *tricolon* of synonymous adjectives (*ἄφατον ἄφραστον ἀναύδητον*) highlights that what Creusa has learned is so horrendous that it is unutterable and renders speechless, and signifies Creusa's struggle to find the words to express and cope with the situation.

(ll. 800-58). Staying silent and listening to the dialogue between the women of the Chorus and the Old Man, Creusa finally breaks her silence⁴², and embarks on a lyric monody which she starts with the question ὦ ψυχά, πῶς σιγάσω; (l. 859 «my soul, how am I to keep silent?»). It has already been observed that this very question is perplexed⁴³, and that the «apostrophe to one's soul generally expresses the internal conflict of those who must impose self-control...or take courage»⁴⁴. I think that in this very case Creusa's internal conflict is socially triggered and is between keeping her rape by Apollo secret (πῶς δὲ σκοτίας ἀναφήνω / εὐνάς, αἰδοῦς δ' ἀπολειφθῶ; αἰδοῦς δ' ἀπολειφθῶ; ll. 860f.) or taking advantage of the dynamics of speech as her only 'weapon' to fight against Apollo's wrongdoings. In Creusa's question, Euripides echoes a reflection on the dipole «silence-speech» and on the function of each part of this dipole. Silence is now being transformed into a verbal (and more concretely, lyric) outburst through which Creusa tries to compensate for her psychological passion and at the same time answers her own question⁴⁵. As yet, the deep feeling of shame about her rape by Apollo has been what leads her to remain silent⁴⁶, but now she feels that αἰδῶς can no longer prevent her from speaking out and revealing the truth⁴⁷: τί γὰρ ἐμπόδιον κώλυμι ἔτι μοι; (l. 862 «but what obstacle is still in my way?»)⁴⁸. During the first episode and the first dialogue with Ion,

⁴² For the use of silence in Greek tragedy, see for instance TAPLIN (1972); AÉLION (1983); NIKOLAIDOU-ARABATZI (2020). For the role that Creusa's both silence and monody play in the *Ion*, see MCCLURE (2020, 227-36).

⁴³ For ZACHARIA (2003, 81, n. 117), the function of the question in l. 859 is complex, for the fact of uttering already breaks the silence. According to Zacharia, this utterance is almost a performative question.

⁴⁴ MIRTO (2009, 286 *ad* 859-80).

⁴⁵ For Creusa's lyric anapests as fitting her anguish and conveying her intense emotions, see MIRTO (2009, 286 *ad* 859-80).

⁴⁶ Because of her αἰδῶς, Creusa credited the story of her intercourse with Apollo to a supposed friend of hers. For the issue of αἰδῶς that runs the *Ion* and describes its characters' behavior, see ll. 336, 341, 395, 977. The passages are compiled by ZACHARIA (2003, 81, n.119). For αἰδῶς in Euripides, see CAIRNS (1993, 265-342). According to WEISS (2008, 43), Creusa's «own sense of shame, itself perhaps an internalized form of society's expectations, has hindered her from speaking out». For MASTRONARDE (2010, 262), «Creusa [...] construes her concealment of the shameful secret of illicit childbirth as part of her having engaged in 'contests of virtue' in the eyes of her husband and the world, a contest she sees no point in carrying on after her husband's apparent betrayal». MARTIN (2018, 362) writes that «the external situation has changed in such a way as to no longer forbid her speaking: up to now her roles as wife and potential mother have imposed αἰδῶς, the necessary consciousness of her reputation (863-9)».

⁴⁷ MCCLURE (2020, 232) stresses that although Creusa «deliberates at first whether to stay silent or speak out, in the end [she], like the chorus, chooses the latter, even though it will bring her shame». Cf. SCAFURO (1990, 144f.).

⁴⁸ Cf. the ll. 834-39 of Euripides' *Iphigenia in Tauris*, where Iphigenia during the recognition with her brother Orestes says out: τόδ' ἔτι βρέφος / ἔλιπον ἀγκάλαισι νεαρὸν τροφοῦ / νεαρὸν ἐν δόμοις. / ὃ κρεῖσσον ἢ λόγοισιν εὐτυχοῦσά μου / ψυχά, τί φῶ; θαυμάτων / πέρα καὶ λόγου πρόσω τάδ' ἐπέβα. In this case, Iphigenia believes that the speech is not enough to express the joy she experiences. Iphigenia underlines the uncanny quality of the event and likens the recognition with Orestes to something that is beyond wonders. The utterance λόγου πρόσω may mean «beyond reason». What is beyond wonders (θαυμάτων πέρα) is beyond reason (λόγου πρόσω), but their «reunion is said to be 'far beyond (πρόσω) reason'. What is far beyond reason may well be beyond wonders and it is certainly beyond speech. It is

Creusa, after saying that a friend of hers was raped by Apollo, and watching Xuthus arrive on stage, exhorted Ion to opt for silence instead of speech because of her belief that speech could have unexpected force and cause her problems with her husband:

...τούς λελεγμένους λόγους
σίγα πρὸς ἄνδρα, μή τιν' αἰσχύνῃ λάβω
διακονοῦσα κρυπτά, καὶ προβῆ ἄλογος
οὐχ ἥπερ ἡμεῖς αὐτὸν ἐξειλίσομεν

[...] say nothing to my husband about our conversation, so that I, helping someone secretly, may not be disgraced, and so that the conversation may not move on otherwise than as we unfold it (ll. 394-97).

It is precisely because of this belief that she now prefers to speak out in order either to overturn her current situation or to seek after redress for the wrongdoing she thinks she has suffered⁴⁹. Besides, she also claims that her previous decision to choose silence over speech has proved to be fruitless:

φροῦδαι δ' ἐλπίδες, ἅς διαθέσθαι
χρήζουσα καλῶς οὐκ ἐδυνήθην,
σιγῶσα γάμους,
σιγῶσα τόκους πολυκλαύτους

and all my hopes are gone which I wished to arrange well but could not, when I was silent on this union, silent on the lamentable childbirth (ll. 866-69).

During her monody and after her first lyric outburst, Creusa exclaims that she is about to blame Apollo⁵⁰:

σοὶ μομφάν, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ,
πρὸς τάνδ' ἀγάν ἀδάσω

You, child of Leto, I shall blame you with this light of day (ll. 885f.).

Creusa's utterance μομφάν...ἀδάσω is a speech act⁵¹. Her language *does* what it describes in the sense that, while uttering these lines, Creusa also performs their meaning

likely that Euripides chose the ambiguous λόγου and not the metrically equivalent but unambiguous λόγων in order to suggest that the recognition defies both rational expectations and a verbal, rational account." The analysis here belongs to KYRIAKOU (2006, 281f. *ad* 839-41).

⁴⁹ For Creusa's perception that words can have unexpected force, see MUELLER (2010, 380). For the issue of the justice Creusa hopes for by stopping being silent, see ZACHARIA (2003, 81).

⁵⁰ For Creusa's choice to blame first Apollo (because he is the first source of her sufferings) and not Xuthus, see MIRTO (2009, 286 *ad* 859-80).

⁵¹ For the speech act theory, see AUSTIN (1962), SEARLE (1969 and 1979). For further discussions on the «speech acts theory», see THOMAS (1995, 93-99); MEY (2001², 92-133); CUTTING (2002, 15-23); ELAM (2002², 140-52); FINCH (2003², 35f., and 160-62); GRIFFITHS (2006, 148-53); HUANG (2007, 93-118);

(that is, the blame against Apollo)⁵². Since the phrase μομφάν...αὐδάσω explicitly describes the type of the speech act being performed (language that denounces), then this statement can be considered an «explicit performative utterance»⁵³. By directly connecting the speech act to a second-person addressee (σοὶ μομφάν), Creusa emphasizes the directness and intentionality of her speech act, making it clear that her words are not mere expressions, but deliberate actions of condemnation directed towards Apollo⁵⁴. Thus, through her speech, Creusa not only vocalizes her blame but also assumes agency and responsibility for her words and their consequences. Moreover, Creusa, while having a flashback of her past (ll. 887-902), refers to the moment of her rape by Apollo and to her resistance:

λευκοῖς δ' ἔμφυς καρποῖσιν
χειρῶν εἰς ἄντρου κοίτας
κραυγὰν ἾΩ μᾶτέρ μ' αὐδῶσαν
θεὸς ὀμεινέτας
ἄγες ἀναιδεία
Κύπριδι χάριν πράσσω.

Seizing me by my pale white wrists, you led me, my lover-god, to lie down in a cave
as I loudly cried 'O mother' (ll. 891-97).

By narrating her past cry ἾΩ μᾶτέρ in the theatrical present, Creusa re-enacts her past verbal behavior⁵⁵. What was performed in the past (αὐδῶσαν) is now repeated on stage⁵⁶, only this time its content changes since the cry (κραυγὰν) turns into a denunciation

BIRNER (2013, 175-204); KISSINE (2013). Speech act theory has been scarcely applied to Greek tragedy. See, however, PRINS (1991) for speech acts in Aeschylus' *Eumenides*; HEUNER (2006) for Sophocles' *Antigone*; DUÉ (2012) for lament as speech act in Sophocles with special focus on the *Antigone* and the *Electra*.

⁵² Cf. MIRTO (2009, 286 *ad* 859-80) who has characterized Creusa's monody as «a sort of anti-hymn». For the elements that construct this anti-hymn, see the insightful analysis of MIRTO (2009, 288f. *ad* 881-922).

⁵³ For the «explicit performative utterances», see HEAL (1974); THOMAS (1995, 47-49). For the concept of «explicit performativity» of a language, see CRUSE (2000, 334-36). SCHUREN (2015, 20) comments on Euripides' *Helen* 1416 αὐθις κέλευσον, ἵνα σαφῶς μάθωσί σου, and more concretely on Helen's utterance αὐθις κέλευσον, and writes that «Helen's order αὐθις κέλευσον [...] immediately followed by Theoclymenus' performative statement αὐθις κελεύω (*Helen* 1417) explicitly identifies the latter's utterance as an order». I also believe that Helen's subordinate clause ἵνα σαφῶς μάθωσί σου (αὐθις κέλευσον, ἵνα σαφῶς μάθωσί σου, l. 1416) is of great (metalinguistic) importance as it explains the purpose of Helen's order and maybe it also refers to the audience of the performance. Additionally, by performing Helen's linguistic order and by reproducing a same verbal behavior (he also creates a speech act) with verbal similarities, Theoclymenus has Helen become the director of his own word choice and linguistic behavior with himself obeying her orders, while at the same time the adverb σαφῶς is very likely to refer to the way his utterance is being delivered.

⁵⁴ Cf. MCCLURE (2020, 234f.), who posits that «Creusa's words are clearly meant to be taken as an overt condemnation of Apollo, as she states in her initial apostrophe to the god (σοὶ μομφάν, 885)».

⁵⁵ Cf. RUTHERFORD (2012, 265), who observes that through direct speech Creusa's trauma is re-enacted.

⁵⁶ See MARTIN (2018, 374 *ad* 893).

(μομφάν), maybe because of the ineffectiveness of the former (the cry did not help her escape the rape). The participle αὐδῶσαν (l. 893), although contemporaneous with the imperfect main verb ἄγεις (l. 896), makes Creusa's narrative more vivid and contributes to the synchronization between past and present. Finally, the utterance ἐς φῶς αὐδᾶν καρύξω (l. 911⁵⁷ «I will proclaim it to the light of day!») indicates the desired effectiveness of Creusa's αὐδᾶν: Creusa desires that her words, both past and present, become utterly public. The metaperformative quality of this utterance is highlighted by the combination of the vowels (ε, ου, αυ, α, α, υ, ω) which underlines the acoustic effect of the αὐδᾶν⁵⁸. It is worth mentioning that the elements of personal deixis make Creusa the primary subject of speech production. Euripides has Creusa give prominence both to the linguistic and lyrical «I» of this very narrative and to the concept of the voice⁵⁹, which she deploys through the basic means of the ancient theater (besides the exploitation of the *opsis*), that is, the λέγειν, in order to craft a lyrical manifesto denouncing Apollo and his wrongdoings. In doing so, Creusa seizes the opportunity to emphasize the dynamics of speech, voice, lyricism, and ultimately the dynamics of this very monody.

The dynamics of Creusa's monody are immediately underlined also by the women of the Chorus. As soon as Creusa finishes her song, they emphasize its emotional impact: οἴμοι, μέγας θησαυρὸς ὡς ἀνοίγνυται / κακῶν, ἐφ' οἴσι πᾶς ἂν ἐκβάλοι δάκρυ (ll. 923f. «Ah me, what a vast treasure-trove of evils is opened up! Everyone would shed a tear at this»). Creusa's revelations also agitate the Old Man, who now says out:

τί φῆς; τίνα λόγον Λοξίου κατηγορεῖς;
 ποῖον τεκεῖν φῆς παῖδα; ποῦ 'κθεῖναι πόλεως
 θηρσὶν φίλον τύμβευμι; ἄνελθέ μοι πάλιν

⁵⁷ For l. 911 ms L gives ἐς οὔς (adopted by Murray); cf. SANTÉ (2017, 114) who changes it into εἰς οὔς for metrical reasons. Diggle changes it into ἐς φῶς (φῶς is the suggestion of Wilamowitz). For a discussion, see MIRTO (2009, 291 ad 881-922), and GIBERT (2019, 265 ad 911), who notes that «if φῶς is correct, Creusa's denunciation now reaches its most 'public' phase». I believe that even if we were to keep ἐς οὔς, the «public» character of Creusa's denunciation can anyhow be traced in the use of καρύξω (see LSJ⁹ 949, s.v. κηρύσσω), so φῶς is not absolutely necessary. On the other hand, οὔς would serve as the complement to Creusa's verbal activity, signifying that Creusa links her verb to her intended target. MIRTO (2009, 291 ad 881-922) adopts ἐς φῶς and suggests that this version «is necessary because a public accusation (καρύξω) made by whispering the truth in the ear of the interlocutors [that is, ἐς οὔς] would make no sense». However, Creusa's paradox (ἐς οὔς - καρύξω) would align with her internal struggle, emphasizing the intimate and personal nature of her denunciation, as if proclaiming her truth directly into the ears of Apollo.

⁵⁸ My wording here is influenced by GASTI (2013, 40, n. 25).

⁵⁹ For the prominence Creusa gives to either her «I» or her voice, see for instance her utterances: σιγάσω (l. 859), ἀναφήνω (l. 860), ἀπολειφθῶ (l. 861), ...κώλυμι' ἔτι μοι (l. 862), στέρομαι...στέρομαι (l. 865), οὐκ ἐδυνήθην (l. 867), κρύψω (l. 874), ἔσομαι (l. 875), ἐμαί (l. 876), ἀποδείξω (l. 879), αὐδάσω (l. 886), τίκτω (l. 897), βάλλω (l. 899), ἐξεύξω (l. 901), αὐδῶ (l. 907), καρύξω (l. 911). Cf. RYNEARSON (2014, 58f.) who speaks about «Creusa's insistence on her own voice».

What are you saying? What is the charge you make against Apollo? What is this child you say you bore? and where in the city did you place his body, welcome to the wild beasts? Go back to your story! (ll. 931-33).

The Old Man specifies Creusa's monody as an accusation (κατηγορεῖς), thus confirming the dynamics Creusa desired (σοὶ μομφάν, ὦ Λατοῦς παῖ, / πρὸς τάνδ' αὐγὰν αὐδάσω (ll. 885f.). Through the imperative ἄνελθέ μοι πάλιν (l. 933 «go back to your story»), the Old Man actually requests that Creusa reiterate her previous narrative and provide at the same time a clearer elaboration of its contents⁶⁰. In l. 933 the Old Man performs a «directive speech act»⁶¹, that is, a command for a retrospective speech serving his own interest (μοι)⁶². Neither the directive force of this imperative nor the felicity of the command are contingent upon the authority of the speaker⁶³, since the Old Man is a servant of Creusa's house; they are both hinge on the fact that the verbal action requested is about to benefit both the speaker (the Old Man) and the hearer (Creusa)⁶⁴: the Old Man will have the chance to learn the details of the shocking news, and Creusa will gain another chance to use speech and narrative as a means of denouncing the wrongs she endured. Following the Old Man's imperative, Creusa revisits the issues narrated in her monody, offering at the same time additional details (*Ion*, ll. 934ff.). However, it should be noted that Creusa's narrative now takes the form of stichomythia (ll. 934-1028) and the Old Man's imperative seems to prompt Creusa to employ a new type of speech. Since her monody did not provide the desired details, the Old Man now seeks a different form

⁶⁰ According to WEISS (2008, 44), the Old Man's question τί φής; (l.931) is triggered by the ambiguous language of Creusa's monody, and the «old tutor requires a clearer elaboration of its contents».

⁶¹ The «directive speech acts» or «directives» (one of the five kinds of speech acts: assertives, directives, commissives, expressives, and declarations) are attempts by the speaker to get the hearer to do something/speaker's attempts to direct the hearer towards some goal. Cf. SEARLE (1979, 13f.); MEY (2001², 120); CUTTING (2002, 17, and 19f.); GRIFFITHS (2006, 152). For the imperative as a main directive mode, see for instance BIRNER (2013, 192).

⁶² The Old Man asks Creusa for what Jocasta asks the second herald in the *Phoenissae*: ... ἄλλ' ἄνελθέ μοι πάλιν, / τί τάπὶ τούτοις παῖδ' ἐμῶ δρασεῖετον (*Phoenissae* 1206f.). Both the Old Man (because of his astonishment) and Jocasta (because of her anxiety over her sons, Eteocles and Polynices) seek after a narrative not only retrospective, but more detailed as well. The verb ἀνέρχομαι, when used to point out a conversation, means «come back to a point, recur to it and say». For the meanings, see LSJ⁹ 135, s.v. ἀνέρχομαι II 2. The ancient scholiast comments on l. 1207 of the *Phoenissae*: ἄλλ' εἰς τὴν ἀρχὴν τοῦ λόγου ἀνάδραμε καὶ διήγησαι τί μέλλουσι δράσαι (SCHWARTZ 1887, 377 ad 1207). Cf. MASTRONARDE (1979, 67, n. 46). GIBERT (2019, 268 ad 932f.) notes that *Ion*'s ἄνελθέ μοι πάλιν is «a quasi-formulaic request 'to go back over the details'». ERCOLANI (2000, 91) writes that the Old Man's imperative may signal the change of speaker on stage. It should be also mentioned that although the herald in the *Phoenissae* does not repeat his narrative, he does give further details (*Phoenissae* 1208ff.).

⁶³ In discussing PALMER's (1986) arguments on the directive force of the imperatives, CRUSE (2000, 339f.) notes that the directive force of a command is «not at all dependent on the authority of the speaker», but the «felicity of the command is».

⁶⁴ Cf. CRUSE (2000, 340), who posits that the directive force of the imperatives is «dependent on whether the action is more likely to benefit the speaker or the hearer...». Cruse also argues that «the prototypical use of the imperative is to elicit actions which are beneficial to the speaker».

of discourse – one that allows him, as participant in this new type of speech, to inquire about the specifics.

In the third stasimon (ll. 1048-1105), the Chorus reflect on the issue of female presence in poetry⁶⁵. In Aristophanic comedy and elsewhere, Euripides was alleged to be misogynist⁶⁶ because of the presentation and revelation of women's iniquities on stage. For example, in the *Thesmophoriazusae*, a comedy whose main theme is Euripides' misogyny, one of the Chorus' women complains that Euripides' tragedies consistently place blame on women:

βαρέως φέρω τάλαινα πολὺν ἤδη χρόνον
 προπηλακιζομένας ὀρώσ' ἡμᾶς ὑπὸ
 Εὐριπίδου τοῦ τῆς λαχανοπωλητρίας
 καὶ πολλὰ καὶ παντοῖ' ἀκουούσας κακά.

I have long unhappily endured seeing us [women] insulted by Euripides, this son of the herb-selling woman, who loads us with every kind of indignity (*Thesmophoriazusae*, ll. 385-88).

The Chorus in the *Ion* comment in a self-referential way on the female rebellion against the women's negative portrayal⁶⁷. Creusa's maids complain:

ὀρᾶθ', ὅσοι δυσκελάδοι-
 σιν κατὰ μοῦσαν ἰόντες αἰείδεθ' ὕμνοις
 ἀμέτερα λέχεα καὶ γάμους
 Κύπριδος ἀθέμιτος ἀνοσίους,
 ὅσον εὐσεβία κρατοῦμεν
 ἄδικον ἄροτον ἀνδρῶν
 παλίμφομος αἰοιδᾶ
 καὶ μοῦσ' εἰς ἄνδρας ἴτω
 †δυσκέλαδος ἀμφὶ λέκτρων

Look, all you who, advancing down the path of the muse, sing in discordant songs of our love-affairs and unholy unions made by a lawless Aphrodite! See how far we women outdo in piety the unjust breeding of men! Let recanting song and discordant music go against the beds of men! (ll. 1090-1098).

⁶⁵ Not only in Euripidean poetry, but in general. LEE (1997, 278 *ad* 1090ff.) observes that «the stories of Eriphyle, Clytemnestra, Phaedra and Stheneboea were well known as were the misogynistic views of poets like Semonides and Archilochus». On the other hand, see GUIDORIZZI (2001, 123, n. 93), who stresses that the women of the Chorus here refer specifically to tragic poetry.

⁶⁶ For the issue of the Euripidean misogyny, see for instance MARCH (1990), and PELLEGRINO (2004, 291 *ad* 1090-95 where further bibliography).

⁶⁷ RYNEARSON (2014, 59) stresses that in these lines, the women of the Chorus «comment on the situation in language that reinforces the metapoetic import of Creusa's song». Cf. PAPAPOPOULOU (2008, 150) who claims that the biggest paradox in the presence of the female element in Attic tragedy is the fact that female characters are actually created by male poets. According to Papadopoulou, there are instances where the tragedy comments in a self-referential way on this phenomenon, as it happens in *Ion*'s ll. 1090-98 and in *Medea*'s ll. 416-30.

The women of the Chorus consider poems or songs (ῥυμοίς) to be δυσκέλαδοι (ll. 1090f.), that is, discordant⁶⁸. The evaluative judgment embedded in this adjective is twofold: the Chorus believe that the derogatory content of these (men's) poems diminishes their aesthetic quality, and therefore these poems are unfavorably valued (κατὰ μοῦσαν)⁶⁹. As if engaging in a musical contest against men⁷⁰, and in response to their disparaging portrayal, the women of the Chorus now declare their intent to counterattack men with their own song⁷¹: παλίμφομος ἀοιδὰ / καὶ μοῦσ' εἰς ἄνδρας ἴτω / †δυσκέλαδος ἀμφὶ λέκτρων (ll. 1096-1098). The desired potency of the Chorus' current song is to be found in the term παλίμφομος «recanting» (l. 1096), which underlines the women's «an eye for an eye» perception, and here specifically «a chant for a chant»⁷². At the same time, the phrase καὶ μοῦσ' εἰς ἄνδρας ἴτω / †δυσκέλαδος ἀμφὶ λέκτρων (ll. 1097-1098), with the preposition εἰς indicating a fight against someone⁷³, shows the women's desire for this song (μοῦσα) to turn into a weapon against men (εἰς ἄνδρας ἴτω)⁷⁴. Importantly, the characterization of the women's song as δυσκέλαδος does not suggest a lack of artistic skill but rather implies that it will involve slander against men.

⁶⁸ For the meanings of the adjective δυσκέλαδος, see LSJ⁹ 457, s.v. δυσκέλαδος.

⁶⁹ The main meaning of the preposition κατὰ, when an accusative follows, is «down, downwards». Cf. LSJ⁹ 883, s.v. κατὰ B. IAKOV (2001², 25) classifies *Ion*'s 1091 as one of the cases where the noun μοῦσα denotes song, music, or poetic culture, and more rarely the inspiration. Based on Iakov, I would say that the utterance κατὰ μοῦσαν (l. 1091) in the *Ion* signals the complaint of the Chorus about men lacking poetic/musical culture or inspiration.

⁷⁰ GIBERT (2019, 288 ad 1090-95) comments on the utterance κατὰ μοῦσαν ἰόντες (l. 1091) and writes that «it may hint ... at entering a musical contest».

⁷¹ According to THORNBURN (2001, 226), Creusa's servants boast in l. 1094 that they surpass men in piety, and urge that men's infidelity be proclaimed in song (ll. 1096-98). «Such sentiment», writes Thornburn, «from these Athenian women may either anticipate or acknowledge the misogynistic feelings against Euripides himself that Aristophanes' parodies in *Thesmophoriazousae*, staged about the same time as the *Ion*». For the first plural person (ὄσον εὐσεβίᾳ κρατούμεν, l. 1094) as a sign of women's unity, see RISTORTO – REYES (2021, 235).

⁷² For the meanings of this adjective, see LSJ⁹ 1292, s.v. παλίμφομος. For scholars' assumption that *Ion*'s παλίμφομος ἀοιδὰ might be an allusion to Stesichorus' palinodes, see MARTIN (2018, 421 ad 1096). These comments of the *Ion*'s Chorus are expressed in Euripides' *Medea* by the play's Chorus as well. The leader of the Chorus in the *Medea* says out: τὰν δ' ἐμὰν εὐκλειαν ἔχειν βιοτὰν στρέψουσι φάμαι / ἔρχεται τιμὰ γυναικείῳ γένει / οὐκέτι δυσκέλαδος / φάμα γυναικῆς ἔξει. / μοῦσαι δὲ παλαιγενέων λήξουσ' ἀοιδῶν / τὰν ἐμὰν ὑμνεῦσαι ἀπιστοσύναν (*Medea* 414-22). The Chorus here, having witnessed Medea conceiving her plans, believe that the means to redress women's reputation is revenge. For *Medea*'s passage, see also the comments of MASTRONARDE (2002, 242f.).

⁷³ For the preposition εἰς as referring to fighting against someone (a person or god), see DIGGLE (2021, 430f., esp. 431, s.v. εἰς E1). Cf. LSJ⁹ 491, s.v. εἰς IV 2.

⁷⁴ In a sense, this play has indeed highlighted so far men's flaws and wrongdoings, among other themes. Cf. GUIDORIZZI (2001, XIX), who suggests that the *Ion* could be seen as a 'female-tragedy' if not a 'feminist one' since we see that all male characters in the play are depicted as morally flawed and unattractive figures in one way or another. While there are indeed various other themes explored in this play, such as *Ion*'s journey of self-discovery/identity, Creusa's quest to find her child, reflections on the role and responsibility of the gods, and political discussions, it is evident that the stark contrast between male and female representations is also a significant aspect of the *Ion*.

Creusa's maids finally confess to their lady what they have heard, and she makes an unsuccessful attempt to kill Ion. After Apollo's intervention and Pythia's appearance on stage, Ion and Creusa recognize each other. In her happiness of finding her son, Creusa is wondering:

ὦ ὦ λαμπρᾶς αἰθέρος ἀμπυχαί,
 τίς ἀύδαν ἄύσω, βοάσω; πόθεν μοι
 συνέκυρσ' ἀδόκητος ἠδονά;
 πόθεν ἐλάβομεν χαράν;

Ah, ah! Expanse of the brilliant ether, what words am I to speak, to cry out loud?
 From where did this unexpected joy come to me? From where did I get this delight?
 (ll. 1445-49).

Through these questions Creusa is made to reflect on the use and function of language when deployed in a context of communication and in expressing (here positive) emotions that are difficult to be transcribed into speech⁷⁵. Creusa is wondering what type of speech she should use in order to verbalize the happiness she experiences⁷⁶. The answer to this question is given by Creusa herself once she chooses to express her joy by singing lyric lines, while Ion continues to recite his lines in iambic trimeter. However, there is no absolute predominance of just one lyrical tone, as Creusa does not choose a single metrical scheme suitable to reproduce metrically the joy she feels, but she goes for various metrical structures: penthemimer, enoplian, dochmiac, bacchiac, cretic⁷⁷. This may also be indicated by the question τίς (l.1446). Creusa's utterance ἄύσω, βοάσω conveys both the message (ἄύσω) and some additional information (βοάσω) on how this utterance is to be performed, since βοάσω as a performative statement, can identify Creusa's lyric lines as a «cry», also indicating the high volume of her voice. Creusa's joy is expressed through song⁷⁸, and Euripides also grafts this song with features highlighting aspects of its own performance.

⁷⁵ Cf. MIRTO (2009, 327 *ad* 1437-88), who stresses that Creusa's questions «underline how ineffable such unexpected joy is».

⁷⁶ CATENACCIO (2023, 79) has observed that in Creusa's monody «speech was associated with distress», while her cry here «expresses wonder and joy».

⁷⁷ For a detailed metrical analysis of the reunion duet, see SANTÉ (2017, 151-67); MARTIN (2018, 505-508 *ad* 1439-1509) and GIBERT (2019, 328-33 *ad* 1439-1509).

⁷⁸ CHONG GOSSARD (2008, 2) notes that «Euripides' surviving plays and fragments contain eleven *epirrhematic amoibaia* in duet form», and observes that «Creusa sings at the finale of *Ion* because she is a woman, and because Euripides reserves song (and other modes of communication) for his female characters to express sentiments that male characters must learn but cannot experience for themselves». See also GOLDHILL (2012, 96) who comments on three recognition scenes in Euripides (*Iphigeneia in Tauris* 827-99, *Ion* 1439-1509, and *Helen* 625-97) and stresses that in these cases there is a woman singing lyrics and a man responding in iambs. Goldhill contends that «this may suggest a generalized attitude towards the greater emotionalism of females».

On the other hand, while discovering his true identity (that Apollo is his father), Ion invites his mother near him, and says:

τὰ δ' ἄλλα πρὸς σὲ βούλομαι μόνην φράσαι.
 δεῦρ' ἔλθ'· ἐς οὓς γὰρ τοὺς λόγους εἰπεῖν θέλω
 καὶ περικαλύψαι τοῖσι πράγμασι σκότον.

But for the rest, I want to talk to you alone. Come here; for I wish to say this in a whisper and shroud the subject in darkness (ll. 1520-22).

These lines might be considered metacommunicative⁷⁹. Ion acknowledges that, due to the presence of Creusa's maids and his attendants⁸⁰, private communication is rather difficult⁸¹. To secure the desired privacy, which probably fits his purity⁸², he resorts to an interesting solution. Ion's lines, functioning as internal stage directions⁸³, suggest that he recites his next lines (ll. 1523ff.) as an *aside* with Creusa next to him⁸⁴. In this way, Euripides indicates that this stage convention (that is, the *aside*) is rather preferable or appropriate in cases where a character does not want to be heard by the Chorus or by other people present. Through these lines, Euripides comments on the nature of theatrical/onstage communication, showing that the presence of an internal audience intercepts the concept of secret/private conversation between two or more characters. That is to say, whatever is said on stage turns out to be public.

To sum up, in this paper I have focused on the metalinguistic features present in Euripides' *Ion*, specifically examining instances where the tragic poet, using his onstage characters as conduits, reflects on such concepts as language, communication, and speech delivery. More concretely, through these features, Euripides establishes a connection between emotions and verbal expression, providing commentary on this intricate relationship. He also accentuates the dynamic nature of onstage speech, and explores the consequences of both silence and speech production. At the same time, Euripides suggests

⁷⁹ For the term «metacommunication», see WIDDOWSON (2008, 58); CRAIG (2016).

⁸⁰ These are the attendants Ion brought with him on stage while chasing Creusa. The stage directions of their onstage presence are the second plural person imperatives of Ion's utterance λάζυσθε τήνδε θεομανῆς γὰρ ἤλατο / βωμοῦ λιποῦσα ξόανα· δεῖτε δ' ὠλένας (ll. 1402f. «Grab her! In a fit of divine madness she has leapt away from the altar and its images. Bind her arms!»). Cf. BAIN (1977, 60f.).

⁸¹ See OWEN (1939, 175 *ad* 1520); BAIN (1977, 59-61). For contrary points of view, see LEE (1997, 313 *ad* 1521), who disagrees with Bain, and notes that the stage action in ll. 1520-22 just «underlines the intimate nature of the discussion», and REHM (1992, 143) who writes: «By taking Creusa aside and promising to 'bury all of it [*i.e.* her past affairs] in darkness' (1522), Ion reenacts the processes of secrecy that the play has shown to be futile and potentially fatal».

⁸² MIRTO (2009, 333 *ad* 1512-52) observes that Ion's wish here to whisper «is in harmony with [his] obsession with purity».

⁸³ Cf. GIBERT (2019, 341 *ad* 1520-22) who posits that Ion's words in ll. 1520-22 «serve as stage directions for a private conversation and draw attention to the embarrassment public disclosure would cause».

⁸⁴ For the *asides* in Greek tragedy, see for instance BAIN (1977); cf. DAMEN (2014, 151), who notes that what constitutes an *aside* is «the words one character addresses in secret to another or the audience».

that actors and χορευταί have to speak loudly in order to be heard by the external audience, implying the impracticality of private communication on stage. Euripides grafts in the *Ion* utterances that the audience is likely to decode on more than one level—utterances encompassing not only the conveyed message but also some additional information as to how the message is (to be) realized (in nonverbal behavior, or in a particular vocal register such as loudly or softly, spoken or sung), performed (within ancient Greek theatrical conventions), or received (for example, as having the authority of myth or oracle).

bibliography

AÉLION 1983

R. Aélion, *Silences et Personnages Silencieux chez les Tragiques*, «Euphrosyne» I 31-52.

AUSTIN 1962

J.L. Austin, *How to Do Things with Words. The William James Lectures Delivered at Harvard University in 1955*, Oxford.

BAIN 1977

D. Bain, *Actors and Audience. A Study of Asides and Related Conventions in Greek Drama*, Oxford.

BIERL 1991

A. Bierl, *Dionysos und die griechische Tragödie. Politische und «metatheatralische» Aspekte im Text*, Tübingen.

BIRNER 2013

B.J. Birner, *Introduction to Pragmatics*, Malden, MA.

BUDELMANN 2000

F. Budelmann, *The Language of Sophocles. Communalty, Communication and Involvement*, Cambridge.

CAIRNS 1993

D. Cairns, *Aidos. The Psychology and Ethics of Honour and Shame in Ancient Greek Literature*, Oxford and New York.

CATENACCIO 2023

C. Catenaccio, *Monody in Euripides. Character and the Liberation of Form in Late Greek Tragedy*, Cambridge.

CHANTRAINE 1977

P. Chantraine, *Dictionnaire Étymologique de la Langue Grecque. Histoire des Mots, Tome IV-1, P-Y*, Paris.

CHONG-GOSSARD 2008

J.H. Kim On Chong-Gossard, *Gender and Communication in Euripides' Plays. Between Song and Silence*, Leiden-Boston.

COLE 1997

A. Th. Cole, *The Ion of Euripides and its Audience(s)*, in L. Edmunds – R.W. Wallace (eds.), *Poet, Public, and Performance in Ancient Greece*, Baltimore-London, 87-96.

COLE 2008

S. Cole, *Annotated Innovation in Euripides' Ion*, «CQ» LVIII 313-15.

CRAIG 2016

R.T. Craig, *Metacommunication*, in K.B. Jensen et al. (eds.), *The International Encyclopedia of Communication Theory and Philosophy*, Hoboken, NJ, 1-8.

CRUSE 2000

A. Cruse, *Meaning in Language. An Introduction to Semantics and Pragmatics*, Oxford.

CUTTING 2002

J. Cutting, *Pragmatics and Discourse*, London-New York.

DALE 1954

A.M. Dale (ed.), *Euripides. Alcestis*, Oxford.

DAMEN 2014

M.L. Damen, *Asides*, in H.M. Roisman (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy*, Chichester, 151-53.

DELATTRE 2016

C. Delattre, *Périégèse et Exégèse dans l'Ion d'Euripide: Complémentarité des Pratiques Discursives et Unité de l'Intrigue*, «Rursus» IX 1-12.

DIAMANTAKOU-AGATHOU 2012

K. Diamantakou-Agathou, *Euripides versus Aristophanes, Ion versus Birds: A possibility of «paracommic» referentiality*, «Mediterranean Chronicle» II 2 15-29.

DIGGLE 1981

J. Diggle, *Euripidis Fabulae. Vol. 2, Supplices, Electra, Hercules, Troades, Iphigenia in Tauris, Ion*, Oxford.

DIGGLE 2021

J. Diggle (ed), *The Cambridge Greek Lexicon. Volume 1. A – I*, Cambridge.

DIMOGLIDIS 2018

V. Dimoglidis, *Όψεις θεατρικής αυτοαναφορικότητας στην Πάροδο του Ίωνα του Ευριπίδη. Μια πιθανή περίπτωση «παρασατυρικής» παραπεμπτικότητας*, «Mediterranean Chronicle» VIII 207-37.

DIMOGLIDIS 2020

V. Dimoglidis, *Metamythology in Euripides' Ion*, «Eisodos - Zeitschrift für Literatur und Theorie» 2020.1 Frühling 10-27.

DUÉ 2012

C. Dué, *Lament as Speech Act in Sophocles*, in K. Ormand (ed.), *A Companion to Sophocles*, Malden, MA., 236-50.

EASTERLING 1982

P.E. Easterling, *Sophocles. Trachiniae*, Cambridge.

ELAM 2002²

K. Elam, *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*, London-New York.

VAN EMDE BOAS 2017

E. van Emde Boas, *Language and Character in Euripides' Electra*, Oxford.

VAN EMDE BOAS 2022

E. van Emde Boas, *Euripides*, in M. de Bakker – I.J.F. de Jong (eds.), *Speech in Ancient Greek Literature. Studies in Ancient Greek Narrative. Volume Five*, Leiden and Boston, 448-71.

ERCOLANI 2000

A. Ercolani, *Il Passaggio di Parola sulla Scena Tragica: Didascalie Interne e Struttura delle Rheseis*, Stuttgart.

FINCH 2003²

G. Finch, *How to Study Linguistics. A Guide to Understanding Language*, Hampshire-New York.

GASTI 2013

H. Gasti, *Σοφοκλέους Ηλέκτρα 147-149: Ένα Σχόλιο Ποιητικής και Θεατρικής Αυτοσυνειδησίας*, «Logeion» III 33-50.

GIBERT 2019

J. Gibert, *Euripides. Ion*, Cambridge.

GOLDHILL 2012

S. Goldhill, *Sophocles and the Language of Tragedy*, Oxford.

GRIFFITHS 2006

P. Griffiths, *An Introduction to English Semantics and Pragmatics*, Edinburg.

GUIDORIZZI 2001

G. Guidorizzi, *Euripide. Ione*, Milan.

HEAL 1974

J. Heal, *Explicit Performative Utterances and Statements*, «PhilosQ» XXIV/95 106-21.

HEUNER 2006

U. Heuner, *Killing Words: Speech Acts and Non-Verbal Actions in Sophocles' Tragedies*, in I.F.J. de Jong – A. Rijksbaron (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek Language. Aspects of Diction, Syntax and Pragmatics*, Leiden-Boston, 201-12.

HUANG 2007

Y. Huang, *Pragmatics*, Oxford.

ΙΑΚΟΝ 2001²

D. Iakov, *Η Ποιητική της Αρχαίας Ελληνικής Τραγωδίας*, Athens.

KISSINE 2013

M. Kissine, *From Utterances to Speech Acts*, Cambridge.

KYRIAKOU 2006

P. Kyriakou, *A Commentary on Euripides' Iphigenia in Tauris*, Berlin-New York.

LEE 1997

K.H. Lee, *Euripides Ion*, Warminster.

LIAPIS 2012

V. Liapis, *A Commentary on the Rhesus Attributed to Euripides*, Oxford.

MARCH 1990

J. March, *Euripides the Misogynist?*, in A. Powell (ed.), *Euripides, Women, and Sexuality*, London and New York, 32-75.

MARTIN 2018

G. Martin, *Euripides. Ion. Edition and Commentary*, Berlin-Boston.

MASTRONARDE 1979

D.J. Mastronarde, *Contact and Discontinuity. Some Observations of Speech and Action on the Greek Tragic Stage*, Berkeley.

MASTRONARDE 1994

D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides. Phoenissae*, Cambridge.

MASTRONARDE 2002

D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides. Medea*, Cambridge.

MASTRONARDE 2010

D.J. Mastronarde, *The Art of Euripides. Dramatic Technic and Social Context*, Cambridge and New York.

MCCLURE 2020

L. McClure, *Silence and Song in Aeschylus' Agamemnon and Euripides' Ion*, in E. Papadodima (ed.), *Faces of Silence in Ancient Greek Literature. Athenian Dialogues I*, Berlin and Boston, 217-37.

MEY 2001²

J.L. Mey, *Pragmatics. An Introduction*, Malden, MA.

MIRTO 2009

M.S. Mirto (a cura di), *Euripide Ione*, Milan.

MUELLER 2010

M. Mueller, *Athens in a Basket: Naming, Objects, and Identity in Euripides' Ion*, «*Arethusa*» XLIII/3 365-402.

NIKOLAIDOU-ARABATZI 2020

S. Nikolaidou-Arabatzi, *Aristophanes' Parody in the Ranae 907-933: A Guide of Understanding the Technique of Silence in Greek Tragedy*, «*Logeion*» X 261-85.

OWEN 1939

A.S. Owen (ed.), *Euripides Ion*, Oxford.

PALMER 1986

F.R. Palmer, *Mood and Modality*, Cambridge.

PAPADOPOULOU 2008

T. Papadopoulou, *Ανθρωπολογία, Κοινωνιολογία και Λογοτεχνική Παράδοση: Το Γυναικείο Στοιχείο στην Αρχαία Ελληνική Τραγωδία*, in A. Markantonatos – C. Tsagalis (eds.), *Αρχαία Ελληνική Τραγωδία. Θεωρία και Πράξη*, Athens, 149-77.

PELLEGRINO 2004

M. Pellegrino (a cura di), *Euripide. Ione*, Bari.

PRINS 1991

Y. Prins, *The Power of the Speech Act: Aeschylus' Furies and their Binding Song*, «*Arethusa*» XXIV/2 177-95.

REHM 1992

R. Rehm, *Greek Tragic Theatre*, London-New York.

RISTORTO – REYES 2021

M.A. Ristorto – S.S. Reyes, *El himno a Enodia en el Ion de Eurípides*, «*Cuadernos de Literatura. Revista de Estudios Lingüísticos y Literarios*» XVI 227-39.

ROSENMEYER 2002

T.G. Rosenmeyer, *'Metatheater': An Essay on Overload*, «*Arion*» X 87-119.

RUTHERFORD 2012

R. Rutherford, *Greek Tragic Style. Form, Language and Interpretation*, Cambridge.

RYNEARSON 2014

N. Rynearson, *Creusa's Palinode: Gender, Genealogy, and Intertextuality in the Ion*, «*Arethusa*» XLVII 39-69.

SANTÉ 2017

P. Santé, *Euripide. Ione. I canti*, Pisa-Rome.

SCAFURO 1990

A.C. Scafuro, *Discourses of Sexual Violation in Mythic Accounts and Dramatic Versions of 'The Girls Tragedy'*, «Differences» II 126-59.

SCHUREN 2015

L. Schuren, *Shared Storytelling in Euripidean Stichomythia*, Leiden-Boston.

SCHWARTZ 1887

E. Schwartz, *Scholia in Euripidem. Vol. I. Scholia in Hecubam, Orestem, Phoenissas*, Berlin.

SEARLE 1969

J.R. Searle, *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*, Cambridge.

SEARLE 1979

J.R. Searle, *Expression and Meaning. Studies in the Theory of Speech Acts*, Cambridge.

SEGAL 1982

C. Segal, *Dionysiac Poetics and Euripides' Bacchae*, Princeton, N.J.

SOMMERSTEIN 2001

A. Sommerstein, *Aristophanes. Wealth. Edited with Translation and Commentary*, Warminster.

TAPLIN 1972

O. Taplin, *Aeschylean Silences and Silences in Aeschylus*, «HSCP» LXXVI 57-97.

TAPLIN 1986

O. Taplin, *Fifth-Century Tragedy and Comedy: A Synkrisis*, «JHS» CVI 163-74.

THOMAS 1995

J. Thomas, *Meaning in Interaction: An Introduction to Pragmatics*, London-New York.

THORNBURN 2001

J.E. Thornburn, *Apollo's Comedy and the Ending of Euripides' Ion*, «AClass» XLIV 221-36.

TORRANCE 2013

I. Torrance, *Metapoetry in Euripides*, Oxford.

WEISS 2008

N. Weiss, *A Psychoanalytical Reading of Euripides' Ion: Repetition, Development and Identity*, «BICS» LI 39-50.

WHITMAN 1974

C.H. Whitman, *Euripides and the Full Circle of Myth*, Cambridge, MA.

WIDDOWSON 2008

M. Widdowson, *Metacommunicative Transactions*, «Transactional Analysis Journal» XXXVIII 58-71.

ZACHARIA 2003

K. Zacharia, *Converging Truths. Euripides' Ion and the Athenian Quest for Self-Definition*, Leiden-Boston.