

The παιδαγωγός in Euripides' *Ion*: An Unwitting Purifier of Athenian Identity

Benny Kozian

1. Introduction

WHEN EURIPIDES' *ION* was performed during the Peloponnesian War, Athenian identity was being thoroughly challenged in various ways.¹ The *Ion* itself contributes to this public debate.² It is a play about identities—individual and collective, real and fictional, possible and impossible.³ Playing out various attempts

¹ On the historical context see A. W. Saxonhouse, “Myths and the Origins of Cities: Reflections on the Autochthony Theme in Euripides' *Ion*,” in J. P. Euben (ed.), *Greek Tragedy and Political Theory* (Berkeley 1986) 252–273, at 255–257; J. C. Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* (Cambridge 2019) 36–46. Exact dating of the performance is contentious, with suggestions spanning the entire decade of the 410s; for an overview of the debate see G. Martin, *Euripides, Ion* (Berlin 2018) 24–32; Gibert 2–4.

² On Attic tragedy and Athenian ideology in general see S. Goldhill, “Civic Ideology and the Problem of Difference: The Politics of Aeschylean Tragedy, Once Again,” *JHS* 120 (2000) 34–56; J. Gregory, “Euripides as Social Critic,” *G&R* 49 (2002) 145–162; W. Allan and A. Kelly, “Listening to Many Voices: Greek Tragedy as Popular Art,” in A. Marmorodoro et al. (eds.), *The Author's Voice in Classical and Late Antiquity* (Oxford 2013) 77–122. On *Ion* in particular, Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 255; C. Dougherty, “Democratic Contradictions and the Synoptic Illusion of Euripides' *Ion*,” in J. Ober et al. (eds.), *Demokratia* (Princeton 1997) 249–270, at 263–264; K. Zacharia, *Converging Truths. Euripides' Ion and the Athenian Quest for Self-definition* (Leiden 2003) 145–149, 181–186; M. Barbato, *The Ideology of Democratic Athens. Institutions, Orators and the Mythical Past* (Cambridge 2020), esp. 25–37, 80–81.

³ D. J. Conacher, *Euripidean Drama: Myth, Theme and Structure* (Toronto 1967) 267–268; J. Kindt, “Apollo's Oracle in Euripides' *Ion*. Ambiguous Identities

at constructing particularly Kreousa's and Ion's identity,⁴ it ultimately invites its audience to consider the matter anew not just for these individuals but also for the contemporary Athenian citizen body,⁵ which is prefigured in these royal figures.⁶

In this process of negotiating competing identities, the role of the παιδαγωγός has often been neglected or downplayed.⁷ Scholars commonly oversimplify this complex character by highlighting only one aspect of him,⁸ or dismiss him as a side

in Fifth-Century Athens," *AncNarr* 6 (2007) 1–30; J. Radding, "Paeanic Crises: Euripides' *Ion* and the Failure to Perform Identity," *AJP* 138 (2017) 393–434; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 33–34, on the fragmentariness of *Ion*'s characters. On the multi-layered discourse of autochthonous identity see Barbato, *The Ideology* 82–114.

⁴ F. Zeitlin, "Mysteries of Identity and Designs of the Self in Euripides' *Ion*," *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 144–197, at 145–151. For a balanced view of *Ion*'s religiously, socially, and politically critical and affirmative aspects see Zacharia, *Converging Truths*, esp. 145–149. On *Ion*'s difficult generic classification, Zacharia 150–162; Martin, *Euripides, Ion* 7–10; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 59–63.

⁵ Cf. Barbato, *The Ideology* 56, 80–81.

⁶ Pace Barbato, *The Ideology* 105–108.

⁷ The fairest assessments of his role: H. Brandt, *Die Sklaven in den Rollen von Dienern und Vertrauten bei Euripides* (Hildesheim 1973); Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 255; Zeitlin, *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 144–197.

⁸ Unaltered revival of Erechtheus: e.g. N. Loraux, "Kreousa the Autochthon: A Study of Euripides' *Ion*," in F. I. Zeitlin et al. (eds.), *Nothing to Do with Dionysos? Athenian Drama in Its Social Context* (Princeton 1990) 168–206, at 186–187 (original: N. Loraux, *Les enfants d'Athéna* [Paris 1981] 197–253); Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 26–27, 142. Loyalty to Kreousa: e.g. A. P. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived. Euripides' Plays of Mixed Reversal* (Oxford 1971); G. Müller, "Beschreibung von Kunstwerken im *Ion* des Euripides," *Hermes* 103 (1975) 25–44; D. J. Mastronarde, "Iconography and Imagery in Euripides' *Ion*," *CSCA* 8 (1975) 163–176; B. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch im *Ion* des Euripides. Untersuchungen zum 3. Epeisodion des Dramas* (Bonn 1977); Loraux 173–174; C. Morenilla and J. V. Bañuls, "El Pedagogo de *Íón*," in C. Morenilla et al. (eds.), *A la sombra de los héroes. Teatro y sociedad en la antigüedad clásica* (Bari 2014) 207–229, at 209; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion*. Xenophobic masculine aristocrat: e.g. Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 256–260; Zeitlin; Morenilla and Bañuls 225–

character.⁹ This essay, by contrast, highlights (a) the integral preliminary function that his character, ‘his’ storyline, and its immediate echoes (725–1228, 1229–1319)¹⁰ have in constructing Kreousa’s (and Ion’s) final identity. Instead of simply playing out a possible alternative or challenge,¹¹ his actions are a necessary preparation for *Ion*’s actual ending. In fact, his character is indispensable to the play and has far-reaching implications, with regard to political identity. In particular, I claim that (b) he figures as a character foil gradually endowed with traits, motifs, and notions that turn him into a representation of the uncivilized Other incompatible with Athenian autochthonous identity.¹² Therefore, (c) his symbolic humiliation and disappearance from the plot excludes him from Athenian self-understanding, dissociates Kreousa (and Ion) from these associations, and thus purifies their Athenian identity.¹³

226. Unseriousness/absurdity: G. B. Walsh, “The Rhetoric of Birthright and Race in Euripides’ *Ion*,” *Hermes* 106 (1978) 301–315, at 303; Saxonhouse 267–268; Martin, *Euripides, Ion* 4, 327; K. Zacharia, “The Marriage of Tragedy and Comedy in Euripides’ *Ion*,” in S. Jäkel et al. (eds.), *Laughter Down the centuries II* (Turku 1995) 45–63; Zacharia 172–176.

⁹ E.g. Gibert, *Euripides, Ion* 31–32; Martin, *Ion* 6 n.6, 328; Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 7–8; A. P. Burnett, “Human Resistance and Divine Persuasion in Euripides’ *Ion*,” *CP* 57 (1962) 89–103, at 98–100.

¹⁰ For structural overviews see Martin, *Ion* 3–5; Gibert, *Euripides, Ion* 23–28. Particularly on the present section, Martin 325–480; Gibert 237–317.

¹¹ So F. Solmsen, “Euripides’ *Ion* im Vergleich mit anderen Tragödien,” *Hermes* 69 (1934) 390–419, at 390–406; D. J. Conacher, “The Paradox of Euripides’ *Ion*,” *TAPA* 90 (1959) 20–39.

¹² On the notional difference of ἀτόχθων and χθόνιος/γηγενής see V. J. Rosivach, “Earthborns and Olympians: The Parodos of the *Ion*,” *CQ* 27 (1977) 284–294, at 297–301; N. Loraux, “The Origins of Mankind in Greek Myths: Born to Die,” in Y. Bonnefoy (ed.), *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies* (Chicago 1992) 90–95, at 90. On the ambiguousness of autochthony (indigenoussness vs. earthbornness), see Rosivach; Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 268–272.

¹³ Cf. F. Meinel, *Pollution and Crisis in Greek Tragedy* (Cambridge 2015) 212–243. Pace Barbato, *The Ideology* 106.

2. *A malleable character: constructing the Other*

Unlike previous interpreters, I do not take the Pedagogue as a simple side character among Xouthos, Chorus, Messenger, Prophetess, or comparable (slave) roles in other plays who are simply 'dramatic functions'.¹⁴ He has a distinctive character which goes beyond playing a mere auxiliary role to Kreousa,¹⁵ or the unaltered dramatic embodiment of (Kreousa's father) Erechtheus.¹⁶ In fact, he plays one of the play's leading roles precisely because of his servile status, temporarily limited stage appearance, and especially his anonymity.¹⁷ Instead of signalling insignificance, these features are key indicators of his relative indeterminacy and malleability, unique in *Ion*: whereas Ion and Kreousa are meant to develop their new individual Athenian identity, the Pedagogue moves between several ultimately impossible identities—from father-surrogate or deputy of the collective Erechtheid dynasty to the uncivilized non-Athenian Other (see §6.a–c below).¹⁸ As we shall see, he assumes not only

¹⁴ So e.g. Zacharia, in *Laughter Down the Centuries* II 50; Ebbott, in *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* 369. On *Ion*'s secondary characters, Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 31–32 (though including the Pedagogue). On other Euripidean slaves cf. Brandt, *Die Sklaven*; F. Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters in Greek Tragedy. The Shaping of Heroes* (Leiden 2012). Cross-comparisons carry the danger of reductionism and are beyond this essay's scope. On Euripides' reevaluation of slave roles see Yoon, esp. 157–158; Brandt 5–23.

¹⁵ So Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 82–85; Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 264–265.

¹⁶ So e.g. Morenilla and Bañuls, in *A la sombra de los héroes* 222 n.44.

¹⁷ Previous scholarship (e.g. Mastronarde, *CSCA* 8 [1975] 163–176; B. D. McPhee, "Apollo, Dionysus, and the Multivalent Birds of Euripides' *Ion*," *CW* 110 [2017] 475–489; Radding, *AJP* 138 [2017] 393–434) has largely focused on *Ion*'s iconography and hymnodal imagery as projection surfaces to negotiate the ambivalent autochthonous identity. I argue that the Pedagogue's distinctive anonymity functions as such a surface (*pace* Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters* 92–96).

¹⁸ On further instances of norm and otherness in *Ion* see Zeitlin, *PCPhS* n.s. 35 (1989) 177–182; Ebbott, in *A Companion to Greek Tragedy* 366–375. On the tent description, B. Goff, "Euripides' *Ion* 1132–1165: The Tent," *PCPhS* n.s. 34 (1988) 42–54.

multiple roles inappropriate to him (e.g. father, master), but is also associated with concepts and images related to the dynasty (e.g. primitive natural power, Giants). He thus becomes a contrastive character foil that threatens, and is altogether incompatible with, *Ion*'s construction of a humanely civilized and divinely ordered world. His character, and everything associated with it, is doomed to fail and disappear from the discursive horizon of Athenian identity.

3. *Inappropriateness anticipated*

His entrance with Kreousa (725–746) foreshadows and frames the events and themes of his post-revelatory storyline (763–1319). As an unexpected and (seemingly) unnecessary character,¹⁹ he rushes into proceedings he would not naturally be part of. In a light tone that clashes with the preceding stasimon and the upcoming events,²⁰ he converses extensively with Kreousa about seemingly irrelevant subjects which contrast with their visit's serious political purpose: their strange intrafamilial relation²¹ and the Pedagogue's decrepitude.²²

¹⁹ On his sudden appearance see Martin, *Ion* 328; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 237.

²⁰ This formal opposition lends ἀλίσαξ ὁ πάρος ἀρχαγός ὦν / Ἐρεχθεὺς ἄναξ (723–724) an ambivalent revelatory sense—if these verses are not too lacunose for proper understanding (Martin, *Ion* 77, 324–325) *Pace* Martin, I think that we can make some sense of them: King Erechtheus, founding father of past ages, indeed has collected his forces (ἀλίσαξ; albeit controversial and considered a *locus desperatus* by Martin, I am inclined to agree with him [77] in retaining this reading, if any). Yet, Erechtheus is instantiated only by the decrepit Pedagogue (725–727). What the Chorus doomfully forebodes, the Pedagogue cannot initially live up to; cf. Zeitlin, *PCPhS* n.s. 35 (1989) 170; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 26. Once he can (1040 onwards), he (mis-)directs those forces against (human and) divine order (anticipated in ἔπαυρε σαυτὸν πρὸς θεοῦ χρηστήρια, 727; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 238).

²¹ Especially the Pedagogue uses an extraordinary form of address in calling her θύγατερ throughout (except δέσποινα 808, τέκνον 765, παῖ 1018, and despite shifts in their actualized relationship); cf. E. Dickey, *Greek Forms of Address: from Herodotus to Lucian* (Oxford 1996) 63–77.

²² Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 85.

Particularly the emphasis on his intimate links with Kreousa's mythical ancestors²³ and his old age²⁴ situate him in a distant past, somehow displaced into the dramatic present.²⁵ Furthermore, he and Kreousa even consider him(self) a father-surrogate, which is an interpersonally (and psychologically: §§4–5.b) strange familial role.²⁶ Given Kreousa's dependence on the natal οἶκος, yet lack of alternatives, it might be understandable, but is inadequate nonetheless. Besides the enormous age difference, it is the traditionally more distant tutor role and his incapability to cater to her psychological needs (§5.a–b) that make this relation unsustainable. She thus also assigns him a socio-political role beyond his servile status: as a tutor, he belongs only to the domestic, not the public sphere of the dynasty.²⁷ As a slave, he lacks the political rights of a free-born citizen, and could never serve the political or representative functions of a dynastic ruler.²⁸ Finally, he himself (unwittingly) foreshadows the inappropriateness that he demonstrates throughout the plot in a still more comprehensive sense: his poor eyesight (ὅταν ἐγὼ βλέπω βραχύ, 744) may correspond to a flawed perception of himself

²³ παιδαγωγὸν Ἐρεχθίδεω πατρὸς 725, 733; ἀξίων γεννητόρων 735. On the mythological tradition of the Erechtheidai in general see J. H. Blok, "Gentrifying Genealogy: On the Genesis of the Athenian Autochthony Myth," in U. Dill et al. (eds.), *Antike Mythen: Medien, Transformationen und Konstruktionen* (Berlin 2009) 251–275, at 258–263; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 4–18; Barbato, *The Ideology* 82–87. On Euripides' *mythopoiesis*, Martin, *Ion* 22–23; V. Dimoglidis, "Metamythology in Euripides' *Ion*," *eisodos. Zeitschrift für Literatur und Theorie* (2020.1) 10–27.

²⁴ γήρως 739, πρέσβυ 725, πατρὸς / τ' οὐμοῦ ποτ' ὄντος, ἦνικ' ἦν ἔτ' ἐν φάει 725–726.

²⁵ On *Ion*'s temporal layers, Ch. Wolff, "The Design and Myth in Euripides' *Ion*," *HSCP* 69 (1965) 169–194, at 171–172.

²⁶ Cf. Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 26–27; pace Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters* 93 n.226.

²⁷ Cf. Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 12–15, 83; Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters* 9; Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* 114–115.

²⁸ Walsh, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 304; Morenilla and Bañuls, in *A la sombra de los héroes* 227–228.

and his circumstances.²⁹ As I shall argue (§6.c), in particular his self-claimed swiftness of thought (τὸ τοῦ ... νοῦ ταχύ, 742) does not manifest as such, but instead as excessive eagerness (προθυμία), i.e. ill-considered rashness.³⁰

Hence, the entrance scene programmatically anticipates his misplacedness in the present circumstances (1) in terms of epoch, belonging to another age; (2) interpersonally, assuming an unfitting familial role; and (3) thereby socially and politically transgressing his servile status. Besides, (4) he himself foreshadows his misperceptions and ill-considered, altogether inappropriate behaviour, instances of which I will analyse now.

4. *Usurping the throne*

In his accusation speeches against Xouthos and Ion, most notably, he shows pretensions to being a dynastic ruler who fears secret conspiracy (δομάτων τ' Ἐρεχθέως / ἐκβαλλόμεσθα, 810–811).³¹ Firstly, he acts as if he were a political decision-maker, representing the Erechtheid dynasty. After evaluating the given circumstances (816–831) and considering possible actions, he commends a preventive attack against the intruders (843–846).³² Secondly, even if he flags his behaviour as motivated by mere sympathetic loyalty to his δέσποινα (σὺν ... σοι νοσῶ, 808),³³ and

²⁹ On the correspondence of (faulty) vision and (lack of) social insight in general see L. Coe, “Sight and Blindness: The Mask of Thamyris,” in M. Squire (ed.), *Sight and the Ancient Senses* (London 2016) 237–248. Cf. Polyphemus in *Od.* 9, whose single eye parallels his narrow-mindedness. I owe these suggestions to Dr. Matthew Chaldekas.

³⁰ Cf. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 8–9, though neglecting the discrepancy of self-perception and reality; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 239.

³¹ Cf. Martin, *Ion* 348, on the λάθρα “leitmotif” (816, 819, 822; 820, 825, 826).

³² Cf. Morenilla and Bañuls, in *A la sombra de los héroes* 224–225. Pace Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 22–23, he goes beyond a mere “Beraterfunktion.” On his sophistic and impious rationalism, Wolff, *HSCP* 69 (1965) 183–184; Walsh, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 304–307.

³³ On his loyalty to Kreousa as dynastic representative see Martin, *Ion* 327; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 237; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 27.

proactively offers his help (σοὶ ... συνεκπονεῖν θέλω, / καὶ συμφρονεῖεν παῖδ[α], 850–851), as might befit his status,³⁴ his way of thinking casts him as a political ruler. He does not show much concern for Kreousa's unfulfilled personal desire for children and the resulting individual suffering.³⁵ Rather, he thinks from a political point of view exclusively in kinship terms, concerned with the continuation of a noble and pure royal lineage (τυραννίδ' αὐτῷ περιβαλεῖν ἔμελλε γῆς, 829; ἐξ σὸν δῶμα δεσπότην ἄγει, 838; ἐσφίκισ' οἴκους, 841).³⁶ From this perspective, Kreousa becomes a mere representative of the Erechtheid dynasty whose only task is to produce a legitimate heir or, if she fails to do so (stigmatized by her barrenness: 817, 840), to secure the lineage's continuity otherwise (e.g. by accepting a noble-born *Kuckuckskind*, 839–841; or with a surrogate mother's help, 841–842).³⁷ In fact, after her monody, he even appears confused about her individualised female perspective (§5.b on 925–930). He lacks, it seems, an understanding of her, or in fact anybody's, personal identity. His world consists only of sociopolitical roles, of masters

³⁴ Cf. προδεδόμεσθα 808, ὑβριζόμεσθα 810, ἐκβαλλόμεσθα 811, σε ... φιλῶν 812, and earlier τι θεσφάτοισι δεσποτῶν νοσῶ 755 (if attributed to him; W. Kraus, "Textkritische Erwägungen zu Euripides' *Ion*," *WS* 102 [1989] 35–110, at 68–69; *pace* M. Huys, "Euripides, *Ion* L. 752–755 and 763–765: Kreousa's Reaction to the False News of her ἀτεκνία," *Hermes* 121 [1993] 422–432, at 425–428), διοιχόμεσθα 765 (if attributed to him; Kraus 70). Taking them at face value, most commentators (e.g. Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 247) overlook the strong dynastic role that the Pedagogue actively and purposefully usurps through his speech acts in contrast with the actual queen's inertia.

³⁵ His unempathetic pragmatism also appears in 769–773 (his μῆπω στενάξεις, answered by Kreousa's ἀλλὰ πάρεισι γόοι), followed by his callous rational questioning despite Kreousa's increasing complaints. *Pace* Martin, *Ion* 327, he is just the opposite of an "empathetic audience."

³⁶ Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 87; Ch. Segal, "Euripides' *Ion*: Generational Passage and Civic Myth," in M. W. Padilla (ed.), *Rites of Passage in Ancient Greece: Literature, Religion, Society* (Lewisburg 1999) 67–108, at 77–78; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 78–82.

³⁷ *Pace* Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 26, lines 836–842 are thus anything but concerned with a deprived mother's personal feelings.

and servants, rulers and ruled, natives and strangers. Likewise, he himself can at best assume the collective public identity which represents the entire Erechtheid dynastic past.³⁸ His speeches frame him as the personification of dynastic interests who is not merely speaking for, but embodying the royal ancestors,³⁹ knowingly forgetful of his domestic role and servile status.⁴⁰ Ironically, thus, his made-up conspiracy theory not only denigrates Xouthos and Ion with the charge of attempted usurpation of Athens, but opts for such an attempt by himself. Unwittingly self-revealing, he imagines himself ἐπεισελθὼν δόμοις / οὐ δαῖθ' ὀπλίξει (851–852), just as Xouthos is a ξένος ἐπεισελθὼν πόλιν / καὶ δῶμα (813–814). Just as Xouthos intrudes in Erechtheid Athens, so the Pedagogue rushes into the (figurative representation of) Ionian Athens of Ion (and Kreousa).⁴¹ In short, by arrogating to himself the unfit role of a free-born dynastic ruler, in social and political terms he behaves as a rebellious slave.

5.a. *Kreousa's emancipation*

How, then, does Kreousa react to such behaviour? From her monody on, she gradually becomes alienated from the Peda-

³⁸ Remarkably, he refers to these δεσπότες usually in the plural (735–737, 852, 1043, cf. 755, 966, 968, 1000)—except in his own seizure of power (808–812), or when referring to illegitimate masters (771 Xouthos, 838 Ion).

³⁹ Cf. Martin, *Ion* 328: the Pedagogue is the one “who most consistently thinks in terms of the fate of the house”; also Conacher, *TAPA* 90 (1959) 37 n.49; Walsh, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 313; Morenilla and Bañuls, in *A la sombra de los héroes* 227 n.55.

⁴⁰ Lines 854–856 explicitly question contemporary insurmountable status boundaries: apart from their name (τοῦνομα), slaves, if they are ἐσθλός, are said to be by no means inferior to free-born people (τὰ δ' ἄλλα πάντα τῶν ἐλευθέρων / οὐδὲν κακίων δοῦλος, 855–856). Cf. Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 5–6, 12–13; Walsh, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 304–305; Gregory, *G&R* 49 (2002) 154–159.

⁴¹ Cf. Walsh, *Hermes* 106 (1978) 313. Both the speech act and its content (the proposed attack) thus are an attempt to revive the Erechtheid past, rejecting any progressive tendencies. This metaphorical reading lends τροφεῖα δεσπότες / ἀποδοῦς (851–852) the ambivalent overtone of his pay-back of the old against the new.

gogue, which parallels her self-emancipation from the natal Erechtheid οἶκος.⁴² It ultimately enables her (1) to abandon him as a father-substitute by confessing her sufferings; (2) to deflate his political ambitions by taking over dynastic responsibilities herself; and eventually (3) to cope with the Erechtheid past altogether, prevailing over its undesirable notions by his expulsion and her negotiations with Ion (see n.86 below). I aim to show next that, far from being an adequate father-substitute or self-empowered ruler, the Pedagogue recedes into the role of a slave, executing his mistress's orders, becoming her 'partner in crime'. Eventually, though, through his disappearance, he is separated from her altogether.

5.b. *Kreousa's psychological turn ... misunderstood*

Uncertain about her prospects of maternity and still coping with the aftermath of her rape, she initially treats the Pedagogue, the last relic of her natal family, as a surrogate father (§3). However, through his speeches, she realizes his lack of understanding, (partly) provoking her monody. Reducing her to her dynastic function alone (legitimate childbirth: §4), he ignores her individual sufferings, and fails to provide the required support. Therefore, I read her monody as a temporary renunciation of this public role (cf. 859–863),⁴³ an outburst (864–875) which prioritizes personal psychic relief instead (στέρνων / ἀπονησαμένη ῥῶζων ἔσομαι, 874–875).⁴⁴ Afterwards, however, the Pedagogue

⁴² Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 85–86, 97; cf. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 48–49.

⁴³ The causal relation of his speeches to her monody has not yet been investigated. Cf. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 38–40, on the confusion of earlier scholarship about the monody's function and its place and motivation with regard to the Pedagogue's preceding speeches—even J. Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* II (Oxford 1981) 341–342, and Martin, *Ion* 82, 347–359, would still debate 844–858 (Diggle) or 839–858 (Martin). More balanced accounts of both the Pedagogue's speeches and the monody are cited in the following note.

⁴⁴ S. E. Hoffer, "Violence, Culture, and the Workings of Ideology in Euripides' *Ion*," *CLAnt* 15 (1996) 289–318, at 303–306; H. J. Westra, "The

proves himself incapable of helping yet again.

First, unsure how to classify her revelations, the Pedagogue is confused (926).

(ᾧ) θύγατερ, οὔτοι⁴⁵ σὸν βλέπων ἐμπίπλαμαι 925
 πρόσωπον, ἔξω δ' ἐγενόμην γνώμης ἐμῆς.
 κακῶν γὰρ ἄρτι κῦμ' ὑπεξαντλῶν φρενί,
 πρύμνηθεν αἴρει μ' ἄλλο σῶν λόγων ὑπο,
 οὓς ἐκβαλοῦσα τῶν παρεστῶτων κακῶν
 μετήλθεσ ἄλλων πημάτων κακὰς ὁδοὺς. 930

It is not simply the information's novelty (or incompleteness),⁴⁶ but rather the new kind of psychologically subtle, personal feelings that forces him to resort to (incongruous)⁴⁷ nautical imagery to vent his confusion. He is seized from behind (928) by another wave different from (928) the one he has just managed to overcome with his political problem-solving skill (927). Through her vehement utterance (929), for him, she deviates onto evil paths of miseries unheard of (930).

Then (936–969), once he hears about a born, lost, but perhaps still living child (947), his interest shifts to the whereabouts of this potential legitimate heir (950–969).⁴⁸ Hearing that she herself exposed the new-born, his questions gain an accusatory tone directed at the god *and* her (πῶς ... ἔτλης 958, τλήμων σὺ τόλμησ 961).⁴⁹ After all, it is not her personal suffering, but the dynasty's

Irreducibility of Autochthony: Euripides' *Ion* and Lévi-Strauss' Interpretation of the Oedipus-Myth," in J. Davidson et al. (eds.), *Greek Drama III Essays in Honour of Kevin Lee* (London 2006) 273–279, at 276; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 14–15; cf. Solmsen, *Hermes* 69 (1934) 397–399; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 78–82.

⁴⁵ οὔτοι L : οἴκτου Nauck. Cf. G. Murray, *Euripidis fabulae* II (Oxford 1904); Kraus, *WS* 102 (1989) 74–75; *pace* Diggle, *Euripidis fabulae* II 345; Martin, *Ion* 381.

⁴⁶ So e.g. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 41–42; Martin, *Ion* 379–381; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 267.

⁴⁷ Martin, *Ion* 381.

⁴⁸ Cf. Martin, *Ion* 387.

⁴⁹ Cf. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 131; Hoffer, *CLAnt* 15 (1996) 302; *pace* Martin, *Ion* 388–389; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 270–271.

plight (δόμων σῶν 966, σὲ καὶ πατέρα σὸν δυστυχοῦντας 968) he laments most intensely.⁵⁰ He does cry, but not so much for Kreousa as for the lost chance of an uncomplicated throne succession.⁵¹

5.c. *Kreousa's frustrated activism*

Kreousa, by contrast, seems to show little interest in these changeable public affairs (τὰ θνητὰ τοιαῦτ'· οὐδὲν ἐν ταῦτῳ μένει, 969). On my interpretation, this commonplace expresses her exasperation admittedly about her hopeless situation, but mainly about his failure to understand and support her—which he only exacerbates by the immediate, unsympathetic transition to plotting revenge (μή νυν ἔτ' οἴκτων, θύγατερ, ἀντεχώμεθα, 970).⁵² Unsure where to turn (971) without being entirely clueless (cf. 984 onwards), she consults the Pedagogue for inspiration, thus casting him no longer as a father-surrogate, but as partner in plotting the crime.⁵³ Realizing, however, the unfeasibility of his suggestions (970–983), she accepts to take matters into her own hands⁵⁴—though already significantly biased by his violent, revenge-seeking horizon of possible actions.⁵⁵ Albeit for pernicious ends, it is the first time that she takes over dynastic

⁵⁰ Cf. Martin, *Ion* 326, 390; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 271.

⁵¹ Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 89; *pace* Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 42; Segal, in *Rites of Passage* 88.

⁵² Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 89; Martin, *Ion* 390.

⁵³ On the division of agency, Martin, *Ion* 390–391; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 57, 237–238, though underestimating the Pedagogue's part.

⁵⁴ Cf. Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 47–49, on Kreousa's surprising activity, and her liberation “aus der Bevormundung des Greises” (48).

⁵⁵ On the question of responsibility in general, see Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters* 85–92; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 32, 272. Those who attribute major guilt and responsibility to Kreousa primarily invoke her proposal (e.g. Burnett, *CP* 57 [1962] 92–97; Martin, *Ion* 390–391), but often neglect the Pedagogue's biasing influence through his accusation speeches and plotting suggestions, especially through his ideas of theomachy, marital or filial kinship murder—an influence still palpable in her allegations against using Pedagogue's terms of usurpation and burning (1290–1305).

responsibility, acts as befits her royal role, and establishes her discursive authority through her own elaborate proposal (984–1019). It is therefore, I argue, that the Pedagogue recedes into his servant role (ὑπηρέτης 986), willingly executing her commands (σὸν λέγειν, τολμῶν δ' ἐμόν 1020, ἡμεῖς δ' ἐφ' ᾧ τετάγμεθ' ἐκπονήσομεν 1040), which prepares his final transformation.

6.a. *Preparing the uncivilized Other*

In her proposal—a lengthy aetiology of the double-edged Gorgonic bracelet as an Erechtheid heirloom (984–1019)—Kreousa evokes symbols of primitive violence (Gigantomachy 987–988, Gorgo 989–991, snakes 993),⁵⁶ links them to the family narrative, and thus bestows them on the bracelet.⁵⁷ Hence, the person who has it seems symbolically charged with them.⁵⁸ Significantly, it is the Pedagogue who receives the bracelet from her (1029–1030), thus taking on these qualities.⁵⁹ Hence, this symbolic act enables Kreousa, the current dynastic representative, to dissociate herself from notions of chthonic primitive violence which instead go over altogether to the Pedagogue, who represents the Erechtheid past.⁶⁰ On the one hand, this prepares for the thorough renegotiation of Athenian autochthonous identity between Kreousa and Ion during *Ion's* Exodos (1250–1622; see n.86 below).⁶¹ More immediately still, on the other, it triggers the Pedagogue's transformation into the uncivilized Other, ready for expulsion from the Athenian civic sphere.⁶² It parallels

⁵⁶ On these recurring themes see Mastronarde, *CSCA* 8 (1975), esp. 167–168; Rosivach, *CQ* 27 (1977) 284–294; Loraux, in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* 168–206.

⁵⁷ Cf. Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 22–23, on the bracelet's autochthonous ambivalence.

⁵⁸ Rosivach, *CQ* 27 (1977) 291.

⁵⁹ Cf. Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 32, 58.

⁶⁰ Cf. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* 111–112; Segal, in *Rites of Passage* 99–100.

⁶¹ Cf. Zeitlin, *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 153–154.

⁶² Along with him, the bracelet will disappear. Its tradition as an

his supposed rejuvenation before leaving the stage which, albeit oft-observed, remains unsatisfyingly explained.⁶³ I shall now interpret it in terms of his total unfitness in any human or divine order.

6.b. *The Pedagogue rejuvenated*

Whereas all other characters gradually mature, the Pedagogue symbolizes not just a standstill, but a temporal and moral regression. Kreousa and Ion, by contrast, undergo a significant progressive change individually: she emancipates herself within the dynasty and as its public representative (§5.a–c), he proceeds to adulthood and enters the royal family as a legitimate successor.⁶⁴ Furthermore, these characters allow the Erechtheid monarchy to progress from the mythic past of their ancestors to a historical present that anticipates the future, from a rule of primitive chthonic forces to civilized order.⁶⁵

The Pedagogue, by contrast, reverses this process, receding in time. In his entrance (§3), his old age, poor sight, and physical weakness as well as his hackneyed utterances show him displaced into the present. Eventually, however, just before the murder attempt, he seeks to return to a stage of (past) youthfulness (ὦ γεραιὲ πούς, νεανίας γενοῦ, 1041), well aware that this is chronologically impossible (cf. κεί μὴ τῷ χρόνῳ πάρεστί σοι, 1042).⁶⁶

Generationally, he regresses from the aristocratic customs of the Erechtheid past (cf. ἄξι' ἀξίων γεννητόρων / ἦθη φυλάσσεις,

Erechtheid heirloom ends, giving way to redefined traditions involving new symbolic items—such as Kreousa's recognition tokens (cf. 1410–1438). Analogously, it is there that the unused positive Gorgonic potential is finally actualized by Kreousa for a redefinition of autochthony.

⁶³ Cf. Martin, *Ion* 404–405; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 237–238, 278–279.

⁶⁴ On Ion's development see Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 70–76.

⁶⁵ Cf. e.g. Wolff, *HSCP* 69 (1965) 171–172; Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* 103–105; Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 254–256; N. Loraux, “Myth in the Greek City: the Athenian Politics of Myth,” in Y. Bonnefoy (ed.), *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies* (Chicago 1992) 40–46; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 58–63; Blok, in *Antike Mythen* 262.

⁶⁶ Cf. Zeitlin, *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 170; Segal, in *Rites of Passage* 88–89.

735–736), ultimately to a moral state of pre-civilized violent lawlessness and impiety.⁶⁷ In social terms, it is manifest in his disregard for any marital and filial obligations (by suggesting the murder of Kreousa’s husband and his child: 976, 978). On a religious level, he even considers revenge on Apollo by burning his temple (πίμπρη τὰ σεμνὰ Λοξίου χρηστήρια, 974), thus first introducing the option of θεομαχία rejected by Kreousa (973, 975).⁶⁸ Moreover, he has no concerns about committing sacrilege by murdering a former temple-slave in a sacred tent (ιεραῖσιν ἐν σκηναῖσιν, 982) during a religious ritual (1032–1033, 1187–1188).⁶⁹ This attitude, dismissive of any human or divine order, culminates in his final statement which disregards piety (εὐσέβεια, 1045) in case of conflict and rejects the validity of any law, if doing so benefits the agent (ὅταν δὲ πολεμίους δράσαι κακῶς / θέλη τις, οὐδέεις ἐμποδὼν κείται νόμος, 1046–1047).⁷⁰ This stance is highly reminiscent of the Gigantomachic or Erechtheid past (cf. 277–282) but is certainly misplaced in *Ion*’s present. Hence, in stark opposition to the progressive civilizational development of the other characters, the Pedagogue regresses in time and seeks to overthrow civilized order. Coexistence among civilized beings becomes impossible, his disappearance necessary.⁷¹

⁶⁷ Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 90–92; Gauger, *Gott und Mensch* 134; Segal, in *Rites of Passage* 89; Mastronarde, *CSCA* 8 (1975) 165–171; Zeitlin, *PCPhS* n.s. 35 (1989) 162.

⁶⁸ Kreousa herself, unlike the Pedagogue, never (really) considers theomachy; *pace* J. LaRue, “Creusa’s Monody: *Ion* 859–922,” *TAPA* 94 (1963) 126–136, at 127–128; Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* 121–122; Rosivach, *CQ* 27 (1977) 290–291; Zacharia, in *Laughter Down the Centuries* II 61, and *Converging Truths* 98; cf. Saxonhouse, in *Greek Tragedy* 273; Zeitlin, *PCPhS* n.s. 35 (1989) 187 n.54; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 55–57, on θεομαχία on the part of the Pedagogue and Kreousa.

⁶⁹ He first raises this option (982), Kreousa later only summarizes it (1032–1033).

⁷⁰ Cf. Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters* 96.

⁷¹ Cf. Hoffer, *CLAnt* 15 (1996) 300–301; Yoon, *The Use of Anonymous Characters* 95–96.

Finally, I shall show how his personal rejuvenation is framed to facilitate his expulsion.

6.c. *Προθυμία and πρόθυμοι: expulsion and purification*

A programmatic reading of the Messenger's speech (1106–1228),⁷² which depicts that expulsion, can elucidate not only the Pedagogue's rejuvenation, but in fact his overall function in the plot: his inappropriate behaviour in the libation ritual epitomizes his behaviour throughout his storyline.

One key term, used by Ion, is *προθυμία* (1211).⁷³ What the Pedagogue himself deemed *ταχυτής τοῦ νοῦ* (742) has ultimately emerged as nothing but ill-conceived, juvenile rashness.⁷⁴ He always acts first, but nevertheless inadequately throughout. At the start, it shines through in his know-it-all commonplaces (742–746), his initiative in questioning the Chorus (752–807: 752–755, 769–773), the priority of his usurpation speeches relative to Kreousa's monody (808–858 vs. 859–922), his untimely initiation of the plotting (970–1047: 970)—significantly advanced by his ill-considered proposals (970–983), misleading Kreousa's own plans (984–1019).⁷⁵

The wish for restored youth (1041–1042)—itself a naïve hope wrapped in an absurd invocation to his own foot⁷⁶—just seems to make explicit what has guided all his behaviour and is finalized in his inept gate-crashing of the banquet. Coming by (*παρελθόν* 1171) again at an inopportune time, he, without noticing,⁷⁷

⁷² On the importance of the tent's allusive imagery for Athenian identity see Müller, *Hermes* 103 (1975) 39–44; Mastronarde, *CSCA* 8 (1975) 163–176; Goff, *PCPhS* N.S. 34 (1988) 47–50; Zeitlin, *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 174–177; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 32–37.

⁷³ Different from *προθυμία / ποδῶν* (1109–1110), cf. Zeitlin, *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 192 n.112.

⁷⁴ Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 239, 278–279.

⁷⁵ Brandt, *Die Sklaven* 86–88.

⁷⁶ Cf. Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 278, on parallels.

⁷⁷ *Pace* Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 300–301, I would not consider the laughter

only arouses the attendees' laughter (γέλων, 1172) and immediately initiates his clumsy attempt at poisoning. If the tent represents Ion's configuration of Athens,⁷⁸ then the attendees' laughter, a verdict of social impropriety,⁷⁹ along with Ion's indictment of προθυμία (1211) is symbolic: such juvenile over-eagerness embodied by the Pedagogue—fraught with notions of a dark chthonic past, prone to action before consideration, irreconcilable violence over compromise-seeking negotiation—is inappropriate in the new Athens and needs to be excluded.⁸⁰

Therefore, the second key term πρόθυμα (“preparatory offering,” 1173),⁸¹ introduced by the Messenger, neatly captures the Pedagogue's function—both on a scenic level and for the entire *Ion*: he contributes only a πρόθυμα not just to the libation ritual, but especially to *Ion*'s negotiation of Athenian identity.⁸² It is not

provoked as the Pedagogue's deliberate tactic, but rather an unwanted side effect of his behaviour, further evidencing his inappropriateness; cf. Martin, *Ion* 441.

⁷⁸ Cf. Goff, *PCPhS* N.S. 34 (1988) 47–50; Zeitlin, *PCPhS* N.S. 35 (1989) 165–169.

⁷⁹ Cf. Zacharia, in *Laughter Down the Centuries* II 55–56.

⁸⁰ On this necessity, Wolff, *HSCP* 69 (1965) 189; cf. Burnett, *Catastrophe Survived* 8; Alan and Kelly, in *The Author's Voice* 96–98. Cf. more broadly Richard Seaford's idea of tragic tyrants—i.e. actual, not self-proclaimed rulers—who in a play need to fail or perish to prepare the *polis* for democracy: “Tragic Tyranny,” in K. Morgan (ed.), *Popular Tyranny* (Austin 2003) 95–116; cf. also Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 36–46. The Pedagogue's function on the intradynastic level is thus analogous to that of such monarchs within their political community. I owe this hint to an anonymous referee.

⁸¹ LSJ s.v. πρόθυμα is ambiguous, alternatively also the adverbialised neuter plural of πρόθυμος “eager.” To my knowledge, no commentator has yet established the connection for these two terms in the *Ion*.

⁸² Answering the helpful challenge, posed by an anonymous referee, whether I take the play on πρόθυμος as a pivotal aspect of Euripides' argument or only an authorial *jeu d'esprit* (their phrase), I would think that it befits Euripides in particular to ‘kill these two birds with one stone’ and so encapsulate key elements of the plot, but in a word-play charged with tragic

yet the entire story but only prepares for the main act still to come, being its purificatory preliminary.⁸³ This it achieves through the Pedagogue's final expulsion (1213 onwards), imitating chthonic earth-swallowing (cf. 281–283). Yet, this process contains a significant difference⁸⁴ from that tradition: with Kreousa and Ion, the disappearance of those notions is meant to be permanent.⁸⁵ The Pedagogue ultimately takes with him the undesirable chthonic notions related to the Erechtheid past. Hence, it is here that the expulsion of the Other of Athenian autochthonous identity occurs dramatically, dissociating it from Kreousa and Ion as the future representatives of a purified conception of autochthony.⁸⁶

irony. Of course, this need not imply that its full meaning is discernible by everyone in the audience, but the verbal and phonological similarity as well as the scenic context help convey its basic meaning nonetheless. A similar case could be made for the programmatic nature of 727 (see n.20 above). For the deliberate association of θύειν and προθύμια by Euripides cf. *IT* 616–617. On the general idea of an inevitably consecutive order of ritual (human) sacrifices there (albeit not relating it to the mentioned passage), see D. Sansone, “The Sacrifice-Motif in Euripides' *IT*,” *TAPA* 105 (1975) 283–295, at 286–289.

⁸³ Put differently, the Pedagogue's rejuvenation into Erechtheus must fail before Ion's can succeed (cf. ἀνηβῆ δ' Ἐρεχθεύς, 1465; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 43).

⁸⁴ On this pattern of myth continuation, Loraux, in *Greek and Egyptian Mythologies* 40–45; Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 87–98.

⁸⁵ By contrast, Xouthos can be part of future Athens; cf. Zacharia, *Converging Truths* 101. Albeit eventually absent from stage and thus marginalised, his figure is not incompatible with Athenian self-understanding; *pace* Loraux, in *Nothing to Do with Dionysos?* 185–186; Gibert, *Euripides. Ion* 31.

⁸⁶ Cf. Meinel, *Pollution* 237–243. However, this event requires public recognition and ratification on the discursive level as well, to complete the removal from Kreousa and Ion. Therefore, in their subsequent interaction, these primitively violent chthonic notions are reiterated (cf. 1261–1265). However, Ion misattributes them to Kreousa (*pace* Wolff, *HSCP* 69 [1965] 183–184), ignorant of the Pedagogue's role in the plot. After the Pedagogue's disappearance, I argue, these notions are misplaced with Kreousa (cf. M. Lloyd,

7. Conclusion

The Pedagogue is indeed one of *Ion*'s pivotal figures, a contrastive foil tasked with purifying Athenian identity as Euripides constructs it in this play. His behaviour is marked by its inappropriateness in interpersonal, social, and religious terms. A hybristic slave, he transgresses his status by positioning himself as Kreousa's father-surrogate, and fails to provide the personal support that Kreousa hopes for. Moreover, by usurping the role of a dynastic ruler he overestimates by far the possibilities of his sociopolitical status. A hybristic mortal, he is overconfident in mere human rationality to decode the Apolline oracle and discover a hidden plot. Besides, it is he who first introduces the notion of theomachy and shows no concerns about committing sacrilege. In speech and deed, he shows a juvenile rashness (προθυμία) and inclination to ill-considered violent action that parallels the metaphorical rejuvenation he undergoes: both personally and generationally, he seeks to revive the remote past of his youth, utterly different from *Ion*'s present.

For the discourse of Athenian autochthonous identity, his character is, in its very indeterminacy, instrumentalised as a contrastive foil upon which the undesirable notions of autochthony are projected, but eventually excluded altogether from *Ion*'s

“Divine and Human Action in Euripides’ *Ion*,” *A&A* 32 [1986] 33–45, at 43–44). The impasse thus provoked can only be solved by divine intervention (cf. Rosivach, *CQ* 27 [1977] 291–292). Instead of silencing *Ion*'s allegations (so Martin, *Ion* 480), the Pythia (1320–1368) and Athena (1549–1622) subtly reassure that, along with the Pedagogue, these notions have already vanished. He suddenly disappeared from the stage, and so ought they to be excluded from the discursive sphere—without further questioning their whereabouts. After all, the set of characters and Athenian identity are better off without them. However, to prepare the positive renegotiation of Athenian autochthonous identity of *Ion*'s Exodos (cf. Kreousa's δῶμ' ἐστιοῦται, γὰρ δ' ἔχει τυράννουσ' / ἀνηβῶ δ' Ἐρεχθεύς, 1464–1465), a πρόθυμα—which re-enacts the flipside of autochthonous identity in the Pedagogue's actions and problematizes this flipside between *Ion* and Kreousa, but which eventually is superseded by a prosperous autochthonous identity according to the divinely-ordained plan—was necessary.

redefinition of Ionian-Athenian identity. For the Pedagogue figures as the pre- or anti-civilized Other which embodies the primitive, destructive chthonic forces of earth associated with the Erechtheid dynasty's past. His disappearance therefore functions as a preparatory purification (πρόθυμα) which leaves a 'cleansed' concept of autochthony for Kreousa and Ion, and thus enables them to cope with their ancestral past. Therefore, the Pedagogue is crucial for negotiating Athenian identity in *Ion*. He personifies what henceforth makes up the *non*-Athenian, and must therefore be dissociated from Athenian self-understanding.⁸⁷

March, 2023

Queens' College, Cambridge
University of Cambridge
bennyko147@gmail.com

⁸⁷ This paper is a revised and extended version of an essay written during my M.Phil. at the University of Cambridge, under the supervision of Dr. Henry L. Spelman. It is most of all to him that I owe great thanks for his numerous helpful comments on language, style, and argument of previous drafts, as well as our insightful discussions. I would also like to thank Dr. Matthew Chaldekas for his comments on the paper. I first encountered *Ion* in a seminar by Prof. Christian Brockmann at the University of Hamburg during summer term 2021 which engendered my lasting fascination for this Euripidean play in particular.