

# CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

VOLUME LXIX, NUMBER 4

October 1974

---

## IPHIGENIA IN AULIS: THIRD STASIMON

GEORGE B. WALSH

WHEN the chorus sings the third stasimon of the *Iphigenia in Aulis* (1036 ff.), the preparations for Iphigenia's sacrifice are all but complete, the event seems inevitable, and Clytemnestra has discovered Agamemnon's plot. Iphigenia has been brought to Aulis by the false promise of a wedding with Achilles, to be in fact Artemis' sacrificial victim for the good of the Greek expedition against Troy. The pathos of Iphigenia's real situation is heightened by its contrast with the happiness she looked for. The third stasimon narrates the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, an event of supreme felicity which embodies precisely what Iphigenia hoped for but now lacks, and which the chorus explicitly offers as a measure of Iphigenia's cruel fate: she should not be a sacrificial animal but a bride for kings (1085 ff.). Thus, like a significant number of Euripidean lyrics,<sup>1</sup> the third stasimon of the *Iphigenia in Aulis* stands out in contrast to the dramatic situation and serves to define it by showing us what it is not.

1. These include, most obviously, the escape odes, as well as some narrative odes like the first stasimon of the *Electra*, which have often been condemned as irrelevant to their dramatic contexts because the events they narrate contrast so strongly with the events of the plays in which they appear. The point made by the third stasimon of the *IA* is analogous to that of escape odes. In escape odes, the chorus says in effect, "I wish I were somewhere else because happiness is not to be had here." In the third stasimon of the *IA* the chorus says, "How sad it is that happiness is not to be found here." While the first stasimon of the *Electra* conveys a similar meaning,

The contrast between the ode and its context is achieved by several means, in addition to the basic difference between Thetis' marital celebration and Iphigenia's sacrifice. Euripides seems to have adapted the legends both of the Atreids, and of Peleus and Thetis, in such a way as to make the two differ as much as possible. First, he has bypassed a popular version of the Peleus and Thetis myth which represented Peleus as having overcome Thetis by force, making love to her only once, and another according to which Zeus forced Thetis to marry against her will, and she abandoned Peleus after the birth of Achilles.<sup>2</sup> In the ode, all this is suppressed, and Thetis' wedding is depicted with an untainted grace. On the other hand, Euripides shows us an element of violence in the background of Clytemnestra's marriage to Agamemnon (1149 ff.) that is not found in any other extant version of the story. Clytemnestra says that Agamemnon killed her first husband Tantalus and her infant child, forced her into marriage, and escaped her brothers'

it does not do so explicitly. It is perhaps because of this difference that critics are less apt to condemn the *Iphigenia* ode as irrelevant to its context. Cf. G. M. A. Grube, *The Drama of Euripides* (London, 1941), pp. 115 f. and 431 f.; H. D. F. Kitto (*Greek Tragedy*)<sup>3</sup> [London, 1961], p. 40) only complains that the point is saved until the last stanza, so that the bulk of the ode does seem irrelevant.

2. See Pind. *Nem.* 4. 62 ff.; Soph. *Frag.* 154, 155, and 561 (Nauck); Apollod. 3. 13. 5; Ovid *Met.* 11. 221; and Ap. Rhod. 4. 790 ff. Cf. F. Jouan, *Euripide et les chants cypriens* (Paris, 1966), pp. 69 ff.

vengeance only at the intervention of Tyndareus.<sup>3</sup> In Thetis' marriage to Peleus, there is no hint of the unpleasantness that mars the lives of the dramatic characters.

The difference between Thetis' and Clytemnestra's marriages is symptomatic of a difference between the ode and the dramatic action that is more general and pervasive than the simple matter of the presence or absence of unpleasantness. The ode entirely lacks a sense of the personal, that is, of character and motivation, and of the individual's response to his circumstances. The subject of the ode is neither Peleus nor Thetis, but the wedding itself. This, it has often been remarked, is depicted in the manner of a vase painting with three images of frozen motion: the dancing of the two choruses, framing Ganymede's libation. In the strophe, the narrative scarcely advances at all,<sup>4</sup> and the bride and groom, who are not mentioned until the ninth verse (1044), seem little more than names to which the glory of the occasion may be appended. On the other hand, in the dramatic action, the final event turns upon Iphigenia's self-conscious response to the sacrifice which she calls her wedding (1397 f.):<sup>5</sup> she is no still figure in the poet's tableau, and what engages our interest even more than her situation is Iphigenia herself.

Ode and play differ also in the way each depicts the gods, and this difference complements the one we have just noted in the way each depicts human beings. The wedding of Peleus and Thetis was a favorite poetic *topos* for intimacy between gods and men, and the blessings conferred by

the gods.<sup>6</sup> For intimacy of this sort, the gods must be both anthropomorphic and benign, as indeed they are in the ode; in the play they are neither. Instead, a human emotion—hope—is made a divinity (392), and a divinity—Aphrodite—becomes a human emotion, the murderous passion of the Greek army (1264). Artemis is to be the recipient of the sacrifice, but until the final moment at the altar only a passive recipient: the effective cause of the sacrifice is the demand of the Greeks in which Iphigenia acquiesces and against which Achilles cannot prevail; Agamemnon, we know, would abandon the Trojan expedition if left to his own devices (1259 ff.) but the army will not let him.

Thus, the remote and serene felicity that characterizes the ode in contrast to its context is evoked in part by an inversion of the way the gods and men are treated in the remainder of the play. The people of the ode seem no more than emblems of good fortune, a fortune dispensed by kindly gods. Ganymede, perhaps as much as anyone in the ode, is evidence of this reduction of the human characters. His personal beauty (cf. *Il.* 20. 234) and his golden bowl grace the wedding feast; he is the favorite of Zeus (1050). Yet he is a Trojan (1049, 1053) and, at the banquet he attends, the eventual birth of his people's destroyer is celebrated. There can be no distress for him in this anomaly, because he is the beloved of Zeus and wants nothing else, but for ordinary human beings such as the chorus of the *Trojan Women* the anomaly is reason for lamentation (*Tro.* 820 ff.): μάταν ἄρ', ὦ χρυσέας ἐν οἶνοχόαις ἄβρα

3. Clytemnestra's point is that she is a good wife in adversity—faithful although her marriage was forced, unlike Helen who chose Menelaus freely (66 ff.) but betrayed him nonetheless.

4. See W. Kranz, *Stasimon* (Berlin, 1933), pp. 254 ff., and O. Panagl, *Die "dithyrambischen Stasima" des Euripides* (Diss., Vienna, 1967), *passim*, for Euripides' "dithyrambic" narrative technique in general.

5. That character and motivation, absent from the ode,

loom large in the dramatic action is a point few would dispute. J. Jones, *On Aristotle and Greek Tragedy* (London, 1962), pp. 247 ff., goes even further in arguing that the *IA* "is strictly about the psychology of indecision" (emphasis added).

6. See, e.g., Alcaeus Frag. B10 L.-P. and Hes. *Cat. Frag.* 81 Rzach. For the wedding of Harmonia and Cadmus as another such *topos*, see Sittig, *s.v.* "Harmonia," *RE*, VII (1912), 2379 ff., and Pind. *Pyth.* 3. 86 ff., where Peleus and Cadmus are spoken of in the same terms.

βαίνων, / Λαομεδόντιε παῖ, / Ζηνὸς ἔχεις  
κυλίκων πλήρωμα, καλλίσταν λατρείαν.

If felicity as the ode depicts it is remote from human experience, that does not make it less desirable. On the contrary, as I suggested earlier, the wedding of Peleus and Thetis represents precisely what Clytemnestra wants for her daughter, what brings them to Aulis, and what they miss so much when the plot to sacrifice Iphigenia is uncovered. This point is emphasized by the manner in which Iphigenia's prospective wedding is referred to elsewhere in the play. The music of the ode, the sound of the *λωτός*, and the stamping of feet, are anticipated by the messenger who announces Iphigenia's arrival (435 ff.). The conventional theme of blessedness is associated both with Iphigenia's wedding and that of Peleus and Thetis (1076; 439 and 1404); the *εὐδαιμονία* proper to the wedding of mortal and divinity in the ode belongs to Iphigenia too: she is a royal child, and the joy of her nuptials is so great that she is like a goddess in comparison to those less fortunate (590 ff.; cf. 428):

ἰὼ ἰὼ· μεγάλοι μέγαλων  
εὐδαιμονία· τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως  
ἶδετ' Ἰφιδέειαν, ἄνασσαν ἐμήν,  
τὴν Τυνδάρειω τε Κλυταμνήστρῳ  
ὡς ἐκ μεγάλων ἐβλαστήκασ'  
ἐπὶ τ' εὐμήκεις ἦκουσι τύχας.  
θεοὶ γ' οἱ κρείσσους οἱ τ' ὀλβοφόροι  
τοῖς οὐκ εὐδαίμοσι θνητῶν.

The third stasimon is particularly appropriate as a measure of the happiness Iphigenia is denied for two other reasons. First, because Peleus and Thetis are the parents of Achilles, and the ode celebrates Achilles' birth, Achilles is made to appear most desirable as a bridegroom just when we know that, after all, he will not marry Iphigenia. The ode provides the informa-

tion Clytemnestra had solicited as a concerned mother about the parentage of her prospective son-in-law (692 ff.): his antecedents could not be more glorious. Moreover, if Iphigenia and Achilles were to be married, the third stasimon would be their epithalamium. Narrative songs of legendary or divine marriages may once have been sung at real weddings.<sup>7</sup> This one, about the bridegroom's parents, sounds much like a celebration designed specifically for Iphigenia's wedding.

The contrast between the third stasimon and its context, which evokes the pathetic difference between Iphigenia's expectations earlier in the play and her present predicament, is only one facet of the relationship between the ode and the play as a whole. Like the first stasimon of the *Electra*, this ode also shares themes and images with the dramatic action, and the manner in which they are treated by the ode colors our response to subsequent stage events. As the play continues after the third stasimon, pathos ceases to be the outstanding feature of Iphigenia's situation and the false marriage becomes a minor issue. In both ode and play, the center of emphasis shifts part way through from the past, and what might have been, to the present and future. In the play, the questions of the future are: can the sacrifice, at the last, be prevented, or, if it cannot, how will the characters of the play respond to it? As these questions are answered, we find a poetic design completed which unites the themes of weddings and war, female and male virtue, as they are variously treated in the ode and the dramatic action.

The course of the action following the third stasimon seems at first to depend entirely upon Achilles. His role as Iphigenia's potential bridegroom is finished,

7. One possible example is Sappho Frag. 44 L.-P., but the evidence is slim. Cf. D. L. Page, *Sappho and Alcaeus*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford, 1965), pp. 70 ff.; H. Weir Smyth in *Greek Melic*

*Poetry* (London and New York, 1900), p. cxvii; and A. S. F. Gow, *Theocritus*<sup>2</sup> (Cambridge, 1952), II, 348.

and he has emerged instead as her potential savior, even before the ode is sung. The turning point comes in the middle of the episode preceding the third stasimon, when Clytemnestra learns from a servant what Agamemnon intends (873; cf. 959 f.). Achilles promises his aid in preventing the sacrifice, granting the wish of Clytemnestra who confronts him in suppliant posture. Prompted by her need, and her hope that he will be able to help her, she lays heavy emphasis upon his divinity<sup>8</sup> (e.g., 896, 901, 903, and 911 where Clytemnestra goes so far as to compare him to an altar at which she seeks sanctuary: οὐκ ἔχω βωμὸν καταφυγεῖν ἄλλον ἢ τὸ σὸν γόνυ). Achilles says that he is not a god, as she thinks, but will become one in Iphigenia's defense (973 f.). The ode takes this up, and appears to confirm Clytemnestra's expectations of Achilles, with the story of his blessed and semidivine parentage. Achilles has sworn by his divine origins to save Iphigenia (948 ff.); the ode assures us that the goddess Thetis was indeed his mother. Does it therefore follow that Iphigenia will be saved by him?

The ode itself, although it enhances Achilles' stature, does not draw the conclusion that he will be able to live up to his promise to Clytemnestra. On the contrary, the ode makes it clear that Achilles' heroic future—his prophesied triumph in the Trojan war—is just what prevents him from helping to save Iphigenia. While the strophe illuminates the remote, serene figures of Peleus and Thetis, the subject of the antistrophe is Achilles himself. Both in tone and in content the antistrophe approaches the reality of the dramatic situation more closely; its imagery pre-

figures what Achilles' role is actually to be when his powers are put to the test.

The change in tone between strophe and antistrophe, from serene to excited, and in content, from things remote from the dramatic action to more immediate ones, may be measured in two sets of matched and dissimilar figures: Ganymede, in the strophe, and Hephaestus, in the antistrophe (1049 ff. and 1071, with approximate response); the Muses, and the Centaurs (1040 ff. and 1058 ff.). Both Ganymede and Hephaestus are cupbearers of the gods.<sup>9</sup> Here, one is associated with the wedding celebration, the other with weapons of war. Ganymede is the most beautiful of all mortals; Hephaestus is a cuckold, a mechanic, a cripple, and a figure of fun for the other gods. Ganymede, as we have seen, is a figure of remote felicity who has nothing to do with the struggles of men; Hephaestus, his ungraceful counterpart, contributes directly to men and their wars.

In the strophe, the Muses dance at the wedding; in the antistrophe, Chiron and the Centaurs come to hail the birth of Achilles. Poetry is the province of the Muses, prophecy is Chiron's: both poetry and prophecy involve some form of mediation between the divine and human spheres. Indeed, the two arts overlap, since Chiron as a prophet is called one "knowing the Apolline muse" (1064 f.). Euripides, however, has chosen to distinguish sharply between them here by making Chiron the prophet, and surrounding him with the raucous Centaurs.<sup>10</sup> The well-groomed ladies of the strophe, dancing with their golden sandals flashing in the sun, are replaced in the antistrophe by a Dionysian band of revelers, carrying

8. Cf. Iphigenia's analogous role as a divine σωτήρ, pp. 246 ff.

9. For Ganymede, see pp. 242 f.; for Hephaestus, see *Il.* 1. 584 ff.: the incident is unique, but memorable, and its point is the incongruity of Hephaestus' performing this function.

10. The presence of the Centaurs, with their alcoholic

tastes (*ἐπὶ . . . κρατήρᾳ τε Βάκχου*, 1060 f.), may suggest that other, less fortunate celebration of Perithoos and Hippodameia: cf. *Od.* 21. 295 ff., *Il.* 2. 742; Ovid *Met.* 12. 219 ff.; Pindar *Frag.* 150 Bowra; and Panagl, *op. cit.* (n. 4), pp. 298 ff.

rustic equipment and making loud, uncouth noises (ἀνέκλαγον, 1062).

Chiron's companions set the tone for his prophecy of violence: the birth of Achilles, the voyage to Troy, and the immense destruction which is its aim.<sup>11</sup> This, of course, has a direct bearing on the dramatic situation, for if Achilles is to go to Troy, Iphigenia must die, as she herself explains (1386–90); if Achilles is to be a great hero in war, he cannot be the hero who will save the girl. The Myrmidons who, according to Chiron's prophecy, will accompany him in battle (1067 f.) will also be among those who demand that Iphigenia be sacrificed (1352 f.). The cry of the Bacchic Centaurs will be echoed later as the clamor of the Greek army overwhelms Achilles (ἐνικώμην κεκραγμοῦ, 1357).

In the antistrophe, then, the ode moves closer to the dramatic situation and so finds its culmination in Achilles. The high point of the first forty-four verses is Chiron's prophecy, which, in contrast to the essentially visual and static images of the strophe, approaches lively, direct speech with the use of the vocative and the second person pronoun. Instead of the wedding gifts to Peleus and Thetis, which would be more directly germane to the story of the marriage celebration, the chorus sings of the Hephaestean armor given by Thetis to her son.<sup>12</sup> The band of Centaurs seems to represent the mob that surrounds Achilles at Aulis. However, the portion of the third stasimon that is devoted to Achilles seems to leave us with a paradox if it is taken as a measure of his role in the dramatic action as Iphigenia's savior: it glorifies Achilles without qualification, but at the same time precludes the possibility that he will keep

his promise to Clytemnestra, who had put so much trust in his heroic abilities.<sup>13</sup>

This apparent contradiction in what the ode tells us about Achilles exemplifies what is perhaps the most pervasive problem faced by the characters of the drama: the conflict between their public character—their roles as they are determined by any number of external circumstances—and their personal desires, strengths, and weaknesses. For Achilles, his divine birth, the expectations of society, the prophecy of Chiron all require a demonstration of ἀρετή as it is conventionally defined in a heroic figure, that is, in a warrior at Troy. He can use his power only within the narrow bounds prescribed by external circumstances; he cannot act the hero's part to save Iphigenia as he would like, out of his own sense of his honor. Similarly, Agamemnon can only be king and ruler of his people if he violates his deepest paternal instincts.

When the third stasimon presents us with the public character of Achilles, the external image of him to which Clytemnestra had addressed herself,<sup>14</sup> we have already been exposed to quite a different image of the man, a less heroic but more personal and rounded one. This is the Achilles with whom we have to reckon in the play, not the Trojan warrior, and the more of himself he reveals the less likely it seems that he will be able to save Iphigenia. In the play he is outside the narrow bounds that limit his ability to behave gloriously.

Euripides' Achilles is not unlike Homer's, but there are some telling differences. Euripides has borrowed the characterization of Achilles as inconsistent and highly emotional in his regard for himself, but by putting these qualities in a different context he changes the way they affect

11. ἐκπυρώσων, 1070, is a word found only in Euripides and later prose: cf. *Tro.* 301, *HF* 421, *Bacch.* 244.

12. Cf. Jouan, *op. cit.* (n. 2), p. 84.

13. Cf. Grube, *op. cit.* (n. 1), p. 432.

14. Cf. p. 244.

our response to the man as a hero. Achilles' inconsistency here does not seem to be that of a magnificent spirit provoked beyond self-knowledge or self-control, but the result of youthful naiveté oddly combined with a philosophical education.

In his speech at 919 ff., Achilles tells us that he is *ὑψηλόφρων*; he does not obey the Atreidae when they lead badly. He praises rational argument and moderation (920 ff.) and claims to have learned equanimity from his tutor Chiron (924). At the next moment he is incensed by Agamemnon's use of his name to lure Iphigenia to Aulis, considering it an attack upon his own purity (940 f.). Often, Achilles' behavior seems inappropriate. His dignity and self-control break down in bathos in his first encounter with Clytemnestra, when she greets him with affection as her future son-in-law and he fends her off as if she were making sexual overtures on her own behalf.<sup>15</sup> On the other hand, when we expect outrage on his part he can be coldly detached: had Agamemnon only asked, he might well have agreed to lend his name to the plot against Iphigenia (963 ff.).

Achilles' plan to save Iphigenia by means of rational persuasion—to cause Agamemnon *βέλτιον φρονεῖν* (1011)—is so clearly hopeless from the start that it destroys his ability to play the role of *σωτήρ* convincingly. We see rational decision-making at work earlier in the drama, when Menelaus confronts Agamemnon with his lack of resolution (320 ff.). Agamemnon attempts to persuade Menelaus that he has let go of all reason (*τὸ λελογισμένον*, 386; cf. 922). However, when Agamemnon learns that Clytemnestra and Iphigenia have already arrived at Aulis, he is ready to concede the argument but Menelaus

forestalls him. They agree to spare Iphigenia, not in rational discourse (*τῶν παλαιῶν ἐξαφίσταμαι λόγων*, 479), but in pity (478). Pity and reason, however, mean nothing in the face of the mob's pitiless irrationality, a force that is irresistible and divine (511 ff., 1264). Thus, Iphigenia will fail to alter the situation with her emotional appeal at 1211 ff., and Clytemnestra, acting on Achilles' advice, will fail in the use of reasoned argument. Achilles' sophistic claim that *λόγοι γε καταπαλαίουσιν λόγους* evokes only a *ψυχρά . . . ἐλπίς* (1013 f.).

Euripides' characterization of Achilles as something less than a hero must color our response to the glorification of Achilles in the third stasimon. As he cannot live up to the ode's image of him, the prophecy of his heroic achievements at Troy sounds at Aulis a note of bitter irony. The irony of the ode's treatment of Achilles in the antistrophe is much like the irony of the wedding celebration in the strophe; one illuminates the role that Achilles will not play at Aulis, the other the role that Iphigenia will not play. The chorus itself has hinted at the significance of such images of legendary blessedness in the present grim situation in relating the birth of Helen. Considering the terrible destruction she brings to Troy, the story of her parents' miraculous mating seems *παρὰ καιρόν* (800).

The fact that Achilles is denied his role as a hero and Iphigenia hers as a wife is part of a larger design in the drama, in which the roles of women and men are confused and inverted. As Achilles cannot exercise masculine *ἀρετή* at Aulis, he becomes the representative of the more feminine virtue, *αἰδώς*; as Iphigenia's

15. This resembles the scene in the *Ion*, when Xuthus embraces his putative son and is taken for an old pederast (for which see B. Knox, "Euripidean Comedy" in A. Cheuse and R. Koffler [eds.], *The Rarer Action* [New Brunswick, 1970], pp. 80 ff.), and another in the *Helen*, when Menelaus

arrives on stage seeking help and Helen takes him for a rapist. In these two plays, however, the comic touch is appropriate to the tone of the play; in the *IA*, the effect of the scene is jarring.

feminine αἰδώς does not help her at Aulis, she decides instead to achieve something closer to the masculine ἀρετή. By considering how this design emerges in the dramatic action we may be able to answer the chorus' plaintive question at the end of the third stasimon (1089 ff.):<sup>16</sup>

ποῦ τὸ τᾶς Αἰδοῦς  
ἢ τὸ τᾶς Ἀρετᾶς ἔχει  
σθένειν τι πρόσσωπον,  
ὅποτε τὸ μὲν ἄσεπτον ἔχει  
δύνασιν, ἃ δ' Ἀρετὰ κατόπι-  
σθεν θνατοῖς ἀμελείται,  
Ἀνομία δὲ νόμων κρατεῖ,  
καὶ <μῇ> κοινὸς ἀγὼν βροτοῖς  
μή τις θεῶν φθόνος ἔλθῃ;

Achilles' principal exhibition of αἰδώς is his respect for the suppliant appeal of Clytemnestra (cf. Iphigenia's supplication at 1246, ἀλλ' αἰδεσάί με καὶ κατοίκτιρον βίου). He has been trained by Chiron, who is εὐσεβέστατος (926), and he sets himself against the army, which represents τὸ ἄσεπτον, having been roused to a destructive passion by Odysseus. In a lighter vein, Achilles is respectful of well-born ladies, and apostrophizes αἰδώς when he first sees Clytemnestra (821).

Iphigenia, for her part, shows at first a kind of αἰδώς in the form of feminine modesty (994, 997) and embarrassment at her predicament (1342), so that she seeks to avoid facing Achilles. But in her circumstances, nicety of feeling is something Clytemnestra believes Iphigenia cannot afford (1343 ff.): οὐκ ἐν ἀβρότῳ κείσαι πρὸς τὰ νῦν πεπτωκότα. / ἀλλὰ μῖμν'· οὐ σεμνότητος ἔργον, ἣν ὀνόμεθα. Clytemnestra is right, for what is finally needed is ἀρετή, not αἰδώς. Although even ἀρετή cannot prevent the sacrifice, it can transform it into a heroic event that transcends

the dramatic situation and the pointlessness of the war and approaches the remote, paradigmatic felicity of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis.

The customary form of female ἀρετή is the private, hidden realm of sex and reproduction, which reaches final fulfillment in the bearing of heroic sons. This is exemplified by Thetis in the third stasimon, and stated in general terms in the first (568 ff.): μέγα τι θηρεύειν ἀρετάν, / γυναιξὶ μὲν κατὰ Κύπριν / κρυπτάν . . . That Iphigenia is denied her promised marriage is the central circumstance of the drama. Instead, she acquires a more masculine and public sort of ἀρετή, of which her courage in facing the sacrificial knife is partial evidence (πᾶς δ' ἐθάμβησεν κλύων / εὐψυχίαν τε κἀρετὴν τῆς παρθένου, 1561 f.). Her role is analogous to Achilles' as a warrior, in acting as the savior of Greece (Achilles is Θεσσαλία μέγα φῶς, 1063; Iphigenia, Ἑλλάδι . . . φάος, 1502), and her reward is the fame (1383, 1504) customarily accorded to the male hero who saves his city (566 ff.).

Although she may not marry as a bride, by consenting to the sacrifice Iphigenia comes close to recreating the legendary marriages of the past. She acquires, with her fame, the blessedness of a wedding (1383 f.; cf. 1404 f. and 1076). She sees the sacrifice itself as her wedding, the destruction of Troy as her offspring (1397 ff.):

δίδωμι σῶμα τοῦμὸν Ἑλλάδι.  
θύετ', ἐκπορθεῖτε Τροίαν. ταῦτα γὰρ μνημεῖά μου  
διὰ μακροῦ, καὶ παῖδες οὗτοι καὶ γάμοι καὶ δόξ' ἐμή.

The connection of weddings and war is not merely figurative. As a parent of the destruction of Troy, Iphigenia plays the same

16. Ἀνομία and τὸ ἄσεπτον refer to the situation leading to the Trojan war: they are opposed to ἀρετή, which has been defined as a form of civic virtue (570 ff.), and the expedition, as even Menelaus admits, has no social value. It is the result of an arbitrary oath, Menelaus' lust which he has already

renounced, and the selfish ambitions of Odysseus (ἰδία πράσων, 1363). The demagogue and the mob have more power than Agamemnon the king, and so Ἀνομία (1095) prevails. Ἀνομία may also refer to Agamemnon's blood-guilt (399), incurred in the sacrifice of his daughter.

role as the principals of the divine marriages of the past: Leda and Zeus who produced Helen, and Peleus and Thetis who produced Achilles. Helen and Achilles, in turn, are the first and last causes of Troy's downfall. Moreover, as a result of the sacrifice, Iphigenia approaches the divine status of those whom she imitates. She requires no tomb (1443 ff.) because the altar of Artemis will be her monument. This is not modesty. Iphigenia allows herself to be thought of as a godlike σωτήρ, and she is confirmed in her view by her miraculous rescue at the end of the play. At the moment of sacrifice, she is stolen away and becomes truly one of the gods (1608): ἡ παῖς σαφῶς σοι πρὸς θεοὺς ἀφίπτατο.

It would seem that, contrary to expectation, by becoming a heroine of godlike proportions, Iphigenia succeeds in attaining something of the ideal felicity depicted in the third stasimon, and so answers the chorus' question, "Where does virtue have power?" with a resounding "Here!" Her achievement does not, however, overshadow entirely the other, grimmer aspect of the play. Clytemnestra does not know whether to believe that Iphigenia has really been rescued by the gods (1615 ff.), and

in her disbelief and (1171 ff.) her resentment of Agamemnon there is a sinister allusion to the events of the *Oresteia*. Also, although Iphigenia is a heroine, her cause seems less than ideal even as she herself envisions it: when she justifies the subjugation of Asians to Greeks on the grounds that Asians are slaves in any case, we must recall that her father the king has said he is a slave to the mob (1401, 450).

As in the *Electra*, the ideal world of heroes and divinities in the ode is played off against the reality defined by the dramatic action, where the flaws of characters are revealed and the results of "heroic" achievement do not always seem heroic in fact. The ideal world of the lyric may also be to some extent recreated in the dramatic action, and the realities of the drama are found hidden in the lyric's images of the ideal. Yet the real and the ideal sound dissonant notes that cannot at the end be made to harmonize. In the *Electra*, this dissonance is perhaps harsher, but even in the *Iphigenia in Aulis* it remains strong, in spite of the play's miraculous ending where the ideal world of benign gods and human blessings seems to demand recognition as real.

UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO