

THE DAUGHTERS OF AGAMEMNON (SOPH. EL. 153–163)

οὔτοι σοὶ μούνα,
τέκνον, ἄχος ἐφάνη βροτῶν,
πρὸς ὃ τι σὺ τῶν ἔνδον εἶ περισσά,
οἷς ὁμόθεν εἶ και γονᾶ ξύναιμος,
οἷα Χρυσόθεμις ζῶει και Ἰφιάνασσα,
κρουπτᾶ τ' ἀχέων ἐν ἦβᾳ
ἄλβιος, δν ἄ κλεινὰ
γᾶ ποτε Μυκηναίων
δέξεται εὐπατρίδαν, Διὸς εὐφρονη
βήματι μολόντα τάνδε γᾶν Ὀρέσταν. (Soph. El. 153–163)

Scholars have always felt slightly uneasy about the mention in this context of Iphianassa who apparently also lives in the palace but does not feature elsewhere in the play. Since reference is subsequently made in the agon (516 ff.) to a further, previously sacrificed daughter, it is possible that Sophocles always had in mind a quartet of daughters such as the L scholiast indicates was the case in the *Cypria*¹).

However, the actual words και Ἰφιάνασσα, complete with hiatus, appear to be taken over from Agamemnon's catalogue of his daughters at Il. 9.144–5: τρεῖς δέ μοί εἰσι θυγατρεις ἐνὶ μεγάρω εὐπήκτω, / Χρυσόθεμις και Λαοδίκη και Ἰφιάνασσα (cf. also Il. 9.286–7). Thus it has seemed more likely to many that Sophocles was thinking essentially in Homeric terms in 153–63 and non-Homeric terms later when the context demanded use of the sacrificed daughter motif not found in Homer.

Support for this latter view can be found in the number of Homeric verbal echoes in the *Electra* as a whole²), taken in conjunction with the variety of sources used by Sophocles for other aspects of the play. Thus quite apart from his use of the *Cypria* to provide *Electra* with a motivation for events at Aulis (El. 566 ff.) and his reliance on the Hesiodic version of the family of Menelaus and Helen (El. 539–41), there are clear echoes of both the Odyssean and Oresteian pictures of Agamemnon's murder³).

A technical inconsistency between 153–63 and the agon would naturally be involved⁴). This would not, however, be noticeable in performance. Moreover, it

1) ἢ Ὀμήρω ἀκολουθεῖ εἰρηκότη τὰς τρεῖς θυγατέρας τοῦ Ἀγαμέμνονος ἦ, ὡς ὁ τὰ Κύπρια, τέσσαράς φησιν, Ἰφιγένειαν και Ἰφιάνασσαν (note on El. 157).

2) Cf. e.g. the frequent echoes of Il. 23.287 ff. in El. 698 ff.

3) Cf. e.g. Soph. El. 1415 with Aesch. Ag. 1343, and Soph. El. 95–9 and 193–6 with Od. 11.406–11 and 418–24 respectively.

4) It is easiest to explain the L scholiast's first alternative with regard to the number of daughters (see note 1 above) as based on a tacit acknowledgement of this inconsistency. A. D. Fitton Brown, PCPhS 12 (1966), pp. 20 ff., ingeniously but unnecessarily posits at El. 157 the existence of an ancient *varia lectio* ἱφι ἀνάσσει known to the scholiast. To judge from this same scholiast's comment on El. 155 (... ἀδελφαὶ αὐτῆ εἰσι δύο μετριώτερον τὴν συμφορὰν φέρουσαι) it is also unlikely that he had in mind the possibility suggested below in this paper.

would be possible on either view to argue for some particular artistic motivation lying behind Sophocles' introduction of the otherwise otiose Iphianassa in 157. Kaibel, for example, suggested that the mention of *two* other daughters more moderate in their behaviour makes the chorus' criticism of Electra that much stronger. More recently, R.P. Winnington-Ingram finds in the additional daughter subtle support for his emphasis on the 'dark' side of the play. Taking up Jebb's comment that the verb ζῶει (157) "has more point when it is remembered that *one* sister had perished", he argues that the mention of Iphianassa is designed to bring to mind the similar sounding Iphigenia⁵).

But there is, in fact, another possible solution to the whole problem, which involves taking ζῶει with Χρυσόθεμις alone. It is normally taken with Ἰφιάνασσα as well, because both daughters are naturally referred back to τῶν ἔνδον (155) which is understood to mean 'those inside (the palace)'. The picture changes, however, if τῶν ἔνδον bears the more general meaning 'those in the family'. The chorus could then be saying that Electra's sorrowful reaction to misfortune is more excessive than that of the other relevant members of her family, namely the living Chrysothemis, the dead Iphianassa (who must be supposed to have faced even sacrificial death with more equanimity than Electra is now displaying), and finally the exiled Orestes.

Now the influence of Aeschylus and Euripides naturally leads to the supposition that the nameless sacrificed daughter of the agon is Iphigenia. A scholion at Il. 9.145, however, notes that as the tragedians turned Laodice into Electra, so Iphianassa was the daughter called Iphigenia by Euripides, a point borne out by Lucretius' choice of Iphianassa for his sacrificial victim (1.86). Moreover, Hesiod called her Iphimede (Fr. 23(a) Merkelbach/West). The fact that *Iphigenia* is known as the title of one of Sophocles' lost tragedies⁶) does not necessarily mean that the dramatist couldn't have used the name Iphianassa for the sacrificed daughter in another context, if up to three names for the young woman were potentially interchangeable⁷).

Against this interpretation, of course, it must be admitted that the expression of ἔνδον almost invariably means 'those physically inside (a house or city)' as opposed to those physically outside⁸). However, 'those inside' are often the same as the household or family anyway. Thus in a passage like Eur. Med. 244, a wife can be indicated allusively by the formula τοῖς ἔνδον⁹), and at Soph. El. 820-1 Electra's 'invitation' πρὸς ταῦτα καινέτω τις, εἰ βαρύνεται, / τῶν ἔνδον ὄντων presumably includes Aegisthus who is physically away from the palace at that particular

5) R. P. Winnington-Ingram, *Sophocles: An Interpretation*, Cambridge 1980, p. 224 with footnote 26, and p. 336.

6) Cf. TrGF Vol. 4 (Radt), pp. 270-4.

7) The scope for variation in the number as well as the names of the daughters is well illustrated in Euripides (contrast Orestes 22-3 with IT 374, 562 etc.). Hesiod also apparently credited the sacrificial daughter with only one sister, to whom he already gave the name Electra (see Fr. 23(a) Merkelbach/West):

8) It should be noted, however, that when used on its own ἔνδον is never so rigidly restricted to the significance 'inside'. Thus at Od. 16.202 in the expression πατέρ' ἔνδον ἔόντα it has the more general sense of 'at home' or 'back' or 'back home'. Cf. Od. 16.301, 16.355 etc.

9) Cf. Eur. El. 1037 τάνδον . . . λέκτρα, Or. 928 τάνδον οἰκουρήμαθ', and Pl. Symp. 176e8 ταῖς γυναιξὶ ταῖς ἔνδον where the reference is to the women of the household who, although in the women's quarters, are no more physically under the roof of the house than the men engaged in the symposium.

moment¹⁰). Relevant too is the use of the formula οἱ ἐκτός to indicate, at the opposite end of the scale, foreigners or the public at large¹¹).

Furthermore, although it is easier in one sense, given the binding effect of οἶα . . . ζώει καὶ . . . τ' . . ., to take ζώει with all three children, the usual interpretation produces some disjointedness in the sentence anyway. The reason for this is that while τῶν ἔνδον with the meaning 'those inside the palace' is closely linked with οἶα, it is in no way relevant to Orestes, with the result that the τ' clause becomes rather awkwardly tacked on at the end¹²). This difficulty, at least, is eliminated if τῶν ἔνδον is made relevant to all three examples, with the highly compressed οἶα Χρυσόθεμις ζώει (which presumably = οἶα Χρυσόθεμις ἔστιν, ἢ ζώει) standing as a *contrast* with Ἰφιάνασσα, and with τ' introducing the further example of the exiled, male sibling who is in a different category again¹³).

Though the unusual meaning which would have to be given to τῶν ἔνδον remains, of course, as an objection to this solution, it also has in its favour that it would free Sophocles from any taint of unnecessary 'name-dropping' or of possible confusion about the number of Agamemnon's daughters. It might also be said to support Winnington-Ingram's view of the play in that a reference to the sacrifice at line 158, albeit fleeting, would be explicit. On the other hand, of course, as with every point of interpretation in this elusive play, it might just as well be argued that Sophocles went out of his way to avoid drawing attention to the sacrifice motif here, choosing for the name of his victim the less emotionally-charged Iphianassa from the non-sacrificial Iliadic context.

Victoria University of Wellington

J. F. Davidson

10) Cf. Il. 13.363 where the words ἔνδον ἔοντα are applied to the Trojan ally Othryoneus even although at that moment he is being killed on the field of battle by Idomeneus.

11) E. g. Pl. Lg. 629d τοὺς ἐκτός τε καὶ ἀλλοφύλους and Plb. 2.47.10 πρὸς τοὺς ἐκτός. Cf. also Aesch. Cho. 471-3 δώμασιν ἔμμοτον / τῶνδ' ἄκος οὐκ ἀπ' ἄλλων / ἔκτοθεν, ἀλλ' ἀπ' αὐτῶν.

12) Kamerbeek e. g. suggests a semi-colon after Ἰφιάνασσα. There is also some problem about the extent of Orestes' imagined sorrow, which is tied up with the interpretation of ἀχέων (159). Jebb takes this as the participle, but almost every other commentator understands it to be genitive plural of the noun, which releases Orestes even from sorrow in moderation (this view is strongly argued by Kamerbeek). For dissatisfaction with both alternatives and a discussion of possible emendations, see G. Müller, *Hermes* 106 (1978), pp. 4-5.

13) If necessary, ἔστι can be understood with the τ' clause.